
Project	IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group	
Title	Results of 802.16 Letter Ballot #1	
Date Submitted	1999-10-28	
Source	Roger Marks NIST 325 Broadway, MC 813.00 Boulder, CO 80303	Voice: 303-497-3037 Fax: 303-497-7828 Email: marks@nist.gov
Re:	IEEE 802.16-99/05 ("Development Plan for 802.16.1 Air Interface Standard")	
Abstract	This document summarizes the results of 802.16 Letter ballot #1, in which a motion to approve Document IEEE 802.16-99/05 was approved.	
Purpose	For reference.	
Release	The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by 802.16.	
IEEE Patent Policy	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE Patent Policy, which is set forth in the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws < http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws > and includes the statement: “IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, if there is technical justification in the opinion of the standards-developing committee and provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder that it will license applicants under reasonable terms and conditions for the purpose of implementing the standard.”	

Results of 802.16 Letter Ballot #1

Roger Marks
Chair, 802.16

Motion

"To accept Document IEEE 802.16-99/05 <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/16/docs/99/80216-99_05.pdf> as the Development Plan for the 802.16.1 Air Interface Standard."

Dates of Letter Ballot

Open: 17 September 1999

Close: 27 October 1999

Result

60 Approve, 1 Do Not Approve, 1 Abstain

Approval ratio: 60/61 = 98.4%

Voting ratio: 62 voters out of 106 members = 58.5%

Motion approved.

Comments received with "Approve" vote

(1) The timeline is challenging but not absurd, and nothing is to be gained by any relaxation at this stage. As with all plans it may need to be adapted to meet constraints encountered during the development process and timescales should not be held sacrosanct if the quality of the standard is at risk. On the other hand no delays to planned dates should be accepted without very good reason.

(2) Just a few minor comments on the schedule...

The turn-around time from comment resolution at a meeting to starting a letter ballot (e.g., session #8) may be too fast (same day) because the editor will need a couple days to fully integrate the comments, fix formatting, etc. and then send the draft out. But a couple days change here and there won't change the overall schedule.

The proposed work during the holidays (12/24, 1/5) in session number 5 might not happen, but that shouldn't be a big problem. Session #5 will probably have much discussion around the MAC/PHY proposals.

It seems to me that much work has to happen between session #6 and 7: The invited proposals may need the help of editor(s) to unify the look-and-feel of the documents to make them easy to compare. Also, simulation/measurement results that allow for apples-to-apples comparison of the proposals should be available at session #7. Thus, session #7 seems the most "risky" part of the schedule to me.

(3) I assume that updates may be made to this plan as need by vote at Plenary sessions or by letter ballot.

(4) I propose that Sponsor ballot recirculation end at 01/02/09 to allow a full 10 working days of review.

Comments received along with "Do Not Approve" vote

(1) Do Not Approve,

but will if the following issues are clarified:

-The relationship between uninvited proposals and suggested improvements & mergers must be defined in detail. Especially if suggested improvements & mergers have an easier track to be handled in the meeting.

-To previous comment. Does "friendly amendment" mean that the proposal automatically gets a free slot? If so, then strict rules to what a "friendly amendment" is must be defined.

-What is the due date for withdrawal of a proposal?

Obviously these items are not a problem if the number of proposals is modest. But with a high number of proposals, we'll certainly run out of time in the meetings (it is not fair if the chair don't allocate equal opportunities like time for all proposals).

My opinion is, that improvements & mergers shall be highly encouraged especially if they smoothen the process or helps in finding a compromise. Nevertheless, attempts to slow down the convergence through additional proposals (consuming time to process as well as probably postponing decisions) should be somehow discouraged or restricted. The schedule is anyhow tight, and should be to meet the objectives of a standard in a foreseen future...

Detailed ballot results

Full results are on the web < <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/16/private/ballots/ballot01.html>>.