

IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

<http://WirelessMAN.org>



Dr. Roger B. Marks
325 Broadway, MC 818.00
Boulder, CO 80305 USA
Tel: +1 303 497 7837
<mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org>
14 October 2005

Dear P802.16e Ballot Group:

Thank you for your participation in the Sponsor Ballot Recirculation of P802.16e/D11, which ran from 12-27 September 2005.

Comments were received and resolutions have been prepared. Some changes have been made to the draft. At this time, we are requesting that the IEEE Balloting Center initiate a fifteen-day recirculation of the new draft P802.16e/D12 (file *P80216e_D12.pdf*). For a complete list of changes from the latest recirculation, please see the document IEEE 802.16-05/072r2 (file *80216-05_072r2.pdf*). In some cases, the comments and resolutions refer to document numbers of the form C802.16e-05/ijk. These documents are available at <http://ieee802.org/16/tge>. This ballot is being conducted under the procedure for conditional approval of the LMSC Policies and Procedures <http://ieee802.org/policies-and-procedures.pdf>.

While we received Disapprove comments from one voter during the last recirculation, all were resolved to his satisfaction, and he has indicated his intent to vote Approve. Another three previous Disapprove voters have also indicated an intent to vote Approve. This leaves three Disapprove voters, one of whom had earlier indicated satisfaction with all comment resolutions and an intent to vote approve during the prior recirculation.

A list of the Disapprove voters, accounting for those who have informed us of their intent to change their vote, is included as Annex 1 of this letter. The two unresolved Disapprove comments, which are virtually identical and both of which were from a much earlier recirculation (of draft D8) and have been recirculated numerous times, are provided in Annex 2 below.

Please take this opportunity to review the material. You are not obligated to reply; if you do not, your current vote will stand. Based on the changes to the draft or on the Disapprove comments and responses, you may change your vote and/or submit additional comments. If you wish to re-vote or comment, please keep the deadline in mind. Instructions have been provided by the IEEE Balloting Center.

Please note that we believe we have made all reasonable efforts to resolve all comments. We are submitting Draft D12 to RevCom and anticipating its review on the December agenda.

Sincerely,

Roger Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

Annex 1: Disapprove Voters

Remi Chayer
James Gilb*
Brian Kiernan

*Previously indicated that all comments were resolved satisfactorily and indicated intended to vote Approve during D11 recirculation.

Annex 2: Unresolved Disapprove Comments and Responses

Comment submitted by [Brian Kiernan](#) Comment Number [4379](#) Draft under Review # [P802.16e/D8](#)

Comment Type [Technical, Binding](#) Starting Page # [573](#) Starting Line # [1](#) Clause [12](#)

Comment

I object to the resolution of comments [#3520](#) and [#3521](#), both of which dealt with system profiles. Without adoption of definitive system profiles [802.16e](#) cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients.

Definitive system profiles are absolutely required. Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution [C80216e-05_60r2](#) or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

Response (updated for [P802.16e/D12](#) recirculation)

This comment refers to the rejection of earlier comments by other voters recommending adoption of proposed system profiles for mobility. The proposed profiles were originally rejected as being incomplete, and neither the original voters nor others resubmitted updated versions.

It is the expectation of the [802.16 WG](#) that mobile profiles will be developed as part of a future effort, similar to what was done for the fixed version of the standard. It should also be noted that the original voters who proposed the mobile profiles, as well as all but one of the other voters with comments similar to this, have switched their votes to Approve.

Comment submitted by [Rémi Chayer](#) Comment Number [4387](#) Draft under Review # [P802.16e/D8](#)

Comment Type [Technical, Binding](#) Starting Page # Starting Line # Section

Comment

I object to the resolution of comments [#3520](#) and [#3521](#), both of which dealt with system profiles. I object to the resolution of Comment [3250](#) in [80216-05_12r3](#) (which was related to comments [#1850](#), [#1859](#), [#1861](#) and [#1864](#) in [80216-05_010](#)). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution [C80216e-05_60r2](#) was a start.

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

Response (updated for [P802.16e/D12](#) recirculation)

See response to Comment [4379](#), which makes virtually the same point.
