

IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

<http://WirelessMAN.org>



Roger B. Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group
r.b.marks@ieee.org
20 February 2009

To: RevCom
Re: P802.16 Submittal

I have submitted an application for the approval of draft P802.16Rev2/D9 under the P802.16 revision PAR. The review is on the agenda for the RevCom meeting of 18 March 2009.

When the application was filed on 4 February, the third recirculation was still open. Following its closure on 14 February, I would like to provide updated results. All voters with Disapprove status at the start of the recirculation have converted to Approve. However, one voter converted from Approve to Disapprove, with the following comment:

From: *Jayaram Ramasastry*

Page: *[none]*

Line: *[none]*

Subclause: *[none]*

Category: *General*

Comment: *This standard needs major revisions as it does not represent the needs of the marketplace.*

Proposed Change: *needs modifications to support much lower average data rates, improvement over 802.11 systems, and better economics*

In the myBallot system, the following response has been entered to this comment:

Resolution Status: *Out of Scope*

Resolution Detail: *Noting that the recirculation did not address changes to the average data rates or economics, the 802.16 Working Group Chair and the 802.16 Maintenance Task Group Chair, acting with the authorization of the 802.16 Working Group, have ruled this comment Out of Scope of the recirculation since it does not meet the requirements of Subclause 5.4.3.2 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, which states that comments associated with a 'do not approve' vote "shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted document, portions of the balloted document affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted document that are the subject of unresolved comments associated with negative votes." Furthermore, the comment fails to fulfill the requirement stated in Subclause 5.4.3.1 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual that a Disapprove vote "must be accompanied by one or more specific objections with proposed resolution in sufficient detail in a legible form so that the specific wording of the changes that will cause the negative voter to change his or her vote to 'approve' can readily be determined."*

I have notified Mr. Ramasastry directly, by email, of this response. He has acknowledged that notification.

Given that this comment has been ruled out of scope for the reasons cited, I understand that no further recirculation is required, per Subclause 5.4.3.2 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual:

Once the document has achieved 75% approval, comments in subsequent ballots associated with a "do not approve" vote shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted document, portions of the balloted document affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted document that are the subject of unresolved

comments associated with negative votes. If comments associated with a “do not approve” vote are not based on the above criteria, the comments may be deemed out of scope of the recirculation. Such comments need not be addressed in the current ballot and may be considered for a future revision of the standard.

The final approval ratio, as reported by myBallot, was 165 Approve and 1 Disapprove.

The third recirculation resulted in an additional coordination comment as well:

Style: *Editorial Coordination Coordination*

From: *Michelle Turner*

Page: 2

Line: 2

Subclause: *[none]*

Category: *Editorial*

Comment: *The following references are not cited in text: IEEE Std 802, IETF RFC 1213, IETF RFC 1902, IETF RFC 1903, IETF RFC 2132, IETF RFC 2576, IETF RFC 2578, IETF RFC 3394, IETF RFC 341. They will need to be moved to the bibliography if they are needed for informative purposes only. However, if they are needed for the implementation of the standard, they will need be cited in text. If this is the case, a recirculation will be required.*

Proposed Change: *[none]*

In the myBallot system, the following response has been entered to this comment:

Resolution Status: *Principle*

Resolution Detail: *Two of the normative references on this list - IEEE Std 802 and RFC 2578 - are in fact already cited directly in the text of the standard. Also, while the reference list does not include IETF RFC 341, it does include several of the form RFC 341N, but each of these is also cited in the text. It appears that RFC 1213, 1902, 1903, 2132, 2576, and 3394 are not cited in the text. Since they are not needed for the implementation of the standard, we have no objection to having each of these (RFC 1213, 1902, 1903, 2132, 2576, and 3394) moved from the References to the Bibliography when the final version is prepared for publication by the editorial staff.*

I have notified Ms. Turner directly, by email, of this response. She has acknowledged that notification.

Note that this comment obsoletes the response in the RevCom application regarding “Coordination comments and responses,” since the only coordination comments received to that point had come in the initial ballot round. Accordingly, I have updated the application, as attached, to point to a revised coordination comment response.

Please contact me regarding any further issues that may arise.

Sincerely,

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

Attachments:

P802.16 RevCom Application, dated 2009-02-04

Email notification to Disapprove voter

**IEEE-SA STANDARDS BOARD
FORM FOR SUBMITTAL OF PROPOSED STANDARDS**

1. PROJECT NUMBER: P802.16

2. DATE: 2009-02-04 (updt 2009-02-20)

3. TITLE: Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: Air Interface for Broadband Wireless Access Systems

4. SPONSOR (Full name of society/committee): IEEE Computer Society/Local & Metropolitan Networks Committee + IEEE Microwave Theory and Techniques Society

5. BALLOTING COMMITTEE: C/LM/WG802.16 and MTT/SCC

6. NAME OF WORKING GROUP: IEEE 802.16 Working Group

7. NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER

Roger B. Marks
WiMAX Forum
4040 Montview Blvd
Denver, CO 80207
United States

Telephone: 1 619 393 1913

Fax: none

E-Mail: r.b.marks@ieee.org

8. DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT (Check one from each column.)

- New
- Revision
- Reaffirmation
- Stabilization
- Withdrawal

- Standard
- Recommended Practice
- Guide
- Amendment/Corrigenda to an existing standard (Indicate number and year) _____

- Full Use (5-year life cycle)
- Trial Use (2-year life cycle)

8A. REAFFIRMATION ONLY:

The Sponsor confirms that the balloting group agrees that this standard continues to be useful in its current form and contains no significant obsolete or erroneous information.

- Yes No
-

9. BALLOT INFORMATION

List the interest categories of **eligible** balloters only. Refer to the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual and the Working Guide for Submittal of Proposed Standards for the rules of balloting committee classification.

Academic	8	General Interest	69	Gov't/Militar	3	Producer/User	98/34
Interest Category	No.	Interest Category	No.	Interest Category	No.	Interest Category	No.

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBLE BALLOTS

	INITIAL BALLOT		RECIRCULATION BALLOT (if applicable)	
	Draft 6a Number	Date Closed: 11-Sept-2008 Percentage	Draft 9 Number	Date Closed: 14-Feb-2009 Percentage
Eligible Balloters	212	100%	212	100%
Ballots Returned	174	82	183	86
Affirmatives	123	76	169	99
Negatives with Comments	38	N/A	1	N/A
Negatives without Comments	1	N/A	0	N/A
Abstentions	12	6	13	7
Reasons for abstentions:	Lack of time = 9 Lack of expertise = ____ Conflict of Interest = ____ Other = 4			

10. RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS AND NEGATIVE VOTES

All balloting group members, observers, and coordinating groups have been advised of substantive changes made with respect to the balloted draft standard (in response to comments, in resolving negative votes, or for other reasons) and have received copies of all unresolved negative votes with reasons from the negative voter and the rebuttal, and have been advised that they have an opportunity to change their votes.

- A. Have unresolved comments accompanying negative votes been circulated? *Include unresolved negative comments and rebuttal.* Yes No No unresolved comments
- B. Have substantive document changes been circulated? Yes No No substantive changes

11. COORDINATION ACTIVITY (Not required for reaffirmation)

Using the abbreviations listed below, indicate the response received from each committee/organization required for coordination and include a copy of the response. Include documentation authorizing coordination by common membership, if applicable.

R = Received R/C = Received with comment NR = Not received

Committee/Organization	Response	Committee/Organization	Response
SCC10 (IEEE Dictionary)	NR		
SCC14 (Quantities, Units, & Letter Symbols)	R		
IEEE Standards Editorial Staff	R/C		
IEEE Registration Authority Committee (RAC)	NR		

Indicate below any unresolved problems from coordination activities.

(none)

12. PATENT/COPYRIGHT and REGISTRATION ISSUES

- A. Any patent letters of assurance (LoAs) received by the Sponsor are to be forwarded to the PatCom Administrator [Fax: + 1 732 875 0524].
- B. Is there any copyrighted material in the proposed standard? Yes No
If yes, include copyright release(s).
- C. Is the registration of objects and/or numbers a provision of the proposed standard? If yes, include a proposal for review by the IEEE-SA Registration Authority Committee (RAC). Yes No Already approved by RAC

13. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ACTIVITIES (Not required for reaffirmation)

A. If any of the following statements apply, please check the box accordingly:

- It is intended to submit this document to ISO or ISO/IEC JTC1 via their Fast-Track method.
 It is intended to submit this document to IEC for adoption as an IEC/IEEE Dual Logo document.
 This document is a revision to a document previously adopted by either ISO, IEC or ISO/IEC JTC1.
 This document was jointly developed with another organization.
 This document will form the basis of, or be included in, another organization's standard.

B. For the boxes checked above, please indicate the organization, technical committee name/number and contact information.

Organization: ISO IEC ISO/IEC JTC1 ITU Other

Name of the organization, if Other:

Technical Committee/Subcommittee Number:

Technical Committee/Subcommittee Name:

Contact Information for the Person Responsible for Coordinating this Project:

Name: José Costa
 Phone Number: 1-613-763-7574
 Email Address: costa@nortel.com

14. UNIT OF MEASUREMENT (check one)

- International System of Units (SI) - Metric Inch/Pound Both Not measurement sensitive
 Other _____

15. Source Materials Submitted to IEEE Standards Department

- A. Have electronic versions of the source documents (text and figures) been provided? Yes No Format: .fm
- B. Will a diskette or other online material be required to accompany the published standard? Yes No

16. Submission checklist (X = included in submittal package N/A = Not applicable)

	Submission Package Item	List URL if online
X	This submittal form	
X	Ballot summary form(s) (1 per ballot cycle)	
X	Copies of unresolved negatives & rebuttals	
X	PAR and PAR approval letter	
X	Coordination comments and responses	http://iee802.org/16/docs/08/80216-08_049r3coordR1.pdf
X	.pdf of final balloted draft #D9	
X	Permissions & copyright releases	

PROJECT NUMBER: _____

DATE: _____

This draft standard has been developed in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Sponsor and I am authorized by those policies and procedures to make this submittal.

Signature of Submitter

Title (role in Sponsor)

FOR STANDARDS DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

Signature of IEEE-SA Officer

IEEE-SA Standards Board Chair

Title

Date

Return to:

IEEE Standards Department
RevCom Secretary
445 Hoes Lane
PO Box 1331
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331

From: jay Ramasastry
Subject: Re: response to P802.16 Revision recirculation comment
Date: 18 February 2009 9:55:09 PM MST
To: "Roger B. Marks" <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Reply-To: jay Ramasastry

Thanks for the response.

Jay R

-----Original Message-----

From: "Roger B. Marks" <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Sent: Feb 18, 2009 6:26 PM
To: Jay Ramasastry
Cc: Jonathan Labs
Subject: response to P802.16 Revision recirculation comment

Dear Mr. Ramasastry,

I would like to acknowledge receipt of the following IEEE-SA Sponsor Ballot comment submitted in the P802.16Rev2/D9 recirculation:

From: Jayaram Ramasastry
Page: [none]
Line: [none]
Subclause: [none]
Category: General
Comment: This standard needs major revisions as it does not represent the needs of the marketplace.
Proposed Change: needs modifications to support much lower average data rates, improvement over 802.11 systems, and better economics

In the myBallot system, the following response has been entered to this comment:

Resolution Status: Out of Scope
Resolution Detail: Noting that the recirculation did not address changes to the average data rates or economics, the 802.16 Working Group Chair and the 802.16 Maintenance Task Group Chair, acting with the authorization of the 802.16 Working Group, have ruled this comment Out of Scope of the recirculation since it does not meet the requirements of Subclause 5.4.3.2 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, which states that comments associated with a 'do not approve' vote "shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted document, portions of the balloted document affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted document that are the subject of unresolved comments associated with negative votes." Furthermore, the comment fails to fulfill the requirement stated in Subclause 5.4.3.1 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual that a Disapprove vote "must be accompanied by one or more specific objections with proposed resolution in sufficient detail in a legible form so that the specific wording of the changes that will cause the negative voter to change his or her vote to 'approve' can readily be determined."

Regards,

Roger B. Marks <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access <<http://WirelessMAN.org>>