Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 001 Comment submitted by: Savoula Amanatidis Other 2003/01/10

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section

MEMO

TO: Balloting Center
FROM: Savoula Amanatidis
DATE: 10 January 2003
RE: Editorial Coordination of P802.16a/D3

I have reviewed P802.16a/D3 and I have the following comments:

a) A new copyright statement has been written for drafts. Please replace the current copyright statement with the following. Please use 2003 as the copyright date, and place this statement above the Abstract instead of on the bottom as a footnote.

b) Please change the year to 2003 in the running foot—the copyright line at the bottom of every page.
c) On p. 1, the information above Clause 1 is incorrect. Please delete the NOTE, the second paragraph, and the sentence instructing

to "*Replace Clause 1 through Clause 9 and Annex A through Annex G with the following:*".
d) The last three paragraphs of Clause 1 Overview should be 1.1 Scope; that is, 1.1. Scope should begin with "The scope of this recommended practice. . .".
e) In Clause 2 References, please provide the missing date, and add the footnote for IEEE Std 802.16-2001 stating from where it can be obtained.
f) Would you like users to refer to the most recent version of the publications in Clause 2? If yes, then please reword the beginning sentence:

This recommended practice shall be used in conjunction with the following publications. When the following publications are superseded by an approved revision, the revision shall apply.

g) Clause 4 Abbreviations should be reworded to "Clause 4 Acronyms and abbreviations".
h) On p. 44 in 5.7.1.1 at the end of the fourth sentence, please add a character space after the period.
i) Figure C.5, C.7, C.9, and C.10 appear fuzzy. If possible, please provide sharper art figures.
j) The Working Group will need to provide source information (native application software and platform) for all figures. If possible, please provide the figures separately as well, preferably in TIF, EPS, or WMF format.
k) Since some of the figures are derived or obtained from sources other than the Working Group itself, please obtain and supply permission from those sources. Please do the same if any tables have been obtained from other sources.
l) Please begin Annex A, Annex B, Annex C and Annex D on a new page.
m) At the time of submission to the Board, or just prior to publication, you will need to supply a mailing address for each member of the Working Group that worked on this recommended practice. This will ensure that all members of the Working Group receive a complimentary copy of the published recommended practice.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Savoula Amanatidis
Managing Editor, IEEE Standards Activities

Voice: +1 732 562 3831 Fax: +1 732 562 1571 Email: s.amanatidis@ieee.org

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Accepted-Modified** **Recommendation by** Nico van Waes

(a) implement as proposed except place copyright statement at bottom of page

b) Please change the year to 2003 in the running foot—the copyright line at the bottom of every page

(c) The proposed note and instructions in D3 are part of the the required format for an amendment and should therefore be kept.

d) The last three paragraphs of Clause 1 Overview should be 1.1 Scope; that is, 1.1. Scope should begin with "The scope of this recommended practice. . .".

e) In Clause 2 References, delete date for ETSI standard "(2001-12), and add a footnote for IEEE Std 802.16-2001 stating from where it can be obtained.

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

(a) implement as proposed except place copyright statement at bottom of page

b) Please change the year to 2003 in the running foot—the copyright line at the bottom of every page

(c) The proposed note and instructions in D3 are part of the the required format for an amendment and should therefore be kept.

d) The last three paragraphs of Clause 1 Overview should be 1.1 Scope; that is, 1.1. Scope should begin with "The scope of this recommended practice. . .".

e) In Clause 2 References, delete date for ETSI standard "(2001-12), and add a footnote for IEEE Std 802.16-2001 stating from where it can be obtained.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 002 Comment submitted by: Savoula Amanatidis Other 2003/01/10

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # Starting Line # Fig/Table# Section

MEMO

TO: Balloting Center
FROM: Savoula Amanatidis
DATE: 10 January 2003
RE: SCC10 Coordination of P802.16a/D3

I have reviewed P802.16a/D3 and I have the following comments regarding Clause 3 Definitions.

a) According to 10.4.2 of the *IEEE Standards Style Manual*, when defining terms "the term should not be used in its own definition". Therefore, the following definitions will need to be revised.

- **3.1.7 digital modulation**
- **3.1.24 block bandwidth (*B*)**
- **3.1.25 Channel bandwidth (*BO*)**
- **3.1.32 radiation pattern envelop (RPE)**
- **3.1.39 terminal equiment**

b) Please note that all terms defined in IEEE standards are incorporated into IEEE 100, *The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms*. For this reason, it is important that terms and definitions have as general an application as possible. Therefore, the following definitions will need to be revised:

- **3.1.13 Frequency Range 1** [Note that this definition is repeated as 3.1.49—please delete.]
- **3.1.14 Frequency Range 2**
- **3.1.15 Frequency Range 3**

c) Please revise Definition **3.1.51 Raleigh fading** so that it begins with a complete sentence.

For more information, please see 10.4.2 Construction of the definition clause in the *IEEE Standards Style Manual* (http://standards.ieee.org/guides/style/section4.html#527).

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Savoula Amanatidis
Managing Editor, IEEE Standards Activities

Voice: +1 732 562 3831 Fax: +1 732 562 1571 Email: s.amanatidis@ieee.org

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

(a) delete from 3.1.7 "Digital modulation is"
delete from 3.1.24 "Block bandwidth B is defined to be"
In 3.1.25 delete in first sentence "channel bandwidth B0 is defined to be" . In seconde sentence replace "The channel bandwidth" with "This". In second paragraph replace "the channel bandwidth of this composite transmission is defined to be" with ":" and delete "of the channel bandwidths". Delete the whole of NOTE1.
In 3.1.32 delete "The RPE is"
In 3.1.39 delete "Terminal equipment encompasses"
In 3.1.53 delete "Is"

(b) Delete 3.1.13, 3.1.14, 3.1.15 and 3.1.49 and replace all references to the various frequency ranges with the actual values i.e 2-11GHz, 10-23.5 GHz, 23.5-43.5 GHz, 43.5 - 66 GHz.

(c) In 3.1.51 change start of sentence to "A propagation phenomenon caused by....."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 003 **Comment submitted by:** Bruce Barrow Other 2003-01-08

Comment Type Technical **Starting Page #** ? **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section**

The expression "-114 (dBW/m2)/MHz", which appears in 5.2.5,and similar expressions that appear there, in Table 11, and elsewhere are not correct, because the decibel level cannot be divided. If the expressions were correct, we would have -114 (dBW/m2)/MHz = -228 (dBW/m2)/(2 MHz), which is clearly nonsense. %%

Suggested Remedy

Avoid the division sign, using phraseology such as%%"The coordination trigger values of -114 dBW for 1 m2 and a bandwidth of 1 MHz (24,26, and 28 GHz bands), and -111 dBW (38 and 42 GHz bands), are employed ...."

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** Accepted-Modified **Recommendation by** Remi Chayer

Use the standard ITU-R expression "xx dB(W/m^2) in any 1 MHz band"

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted-Modified

Use the standard ITU-R expression "xx dB(W/m^2) in any 1 MHz band"
Change all entries for psfd in the draft to this format

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Although the original recommended practice used the same format as we have proposed in the amendment, it is preferred to use the international convention as used by ITU, as this is now widely recognized. The recommendation ITU-R F.1403 details psfd requirements and uses the new proposed expression format.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 004 **Comment submitted by:** Jim Dickerman Other 2003-01-11

Comment Type Technical, Non-binding **Starting Page #** **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section**

Roger,

We were able to get the 802.16.2a D3 draft and reviewed it. Technically it looks very sound and several of the results matched independent work we had done so that was reassuring for us. The only comment we have is about why the network deployment assumptions for "mesh" are so different than PMP. We were under the impression that both technologies were trying to meet the same deployment scenarios. Specifically in Table 31 the mesh cell radius is 2km while the corresponding PMP in Table 30 is 7km. This also shows up in the number of nodes for mesh being limited to 100 per sector. It would seem this would dramatically increase the number of backhaul points in a network and make it cost prohibitive to deploy. Was this a consideration during the development of the standard? For comparison our deployment scenarios have always been up to 8-10km radius with up to 1000 nodes per sector.

Jim Dickerman
VP of Engineering
CoWave Networks
510 657-0612 x116
jim@cowave.com

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 89, table 31 change cell radius to 3.2 km to be consistent with the analysis.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The concept of a cell is different between a mesh and PMP systems. For a mesh system the "cell" size affects the total number of consecutive hops, for which there is a limit dependent on the system parameters. The example included is based on the only contributions provided for this topic. Although other examples might be possible, there are no contributions to support these cases.

The cell radius in table 31 was incorrect.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16.2a/D3-2002** **Ballot Number:** **0000354** **Comment Date**

Comment # **005** **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** iii **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** Part.

Working Group Officer wording is not in typical format.

Suggested Remedy

Change "This document was developed by the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access, which develops the WirelessMAN™ Standard for Wireless Metropolitan Area Networks.

IEEE 802.16 Working Group Officers" to:

"This document was developed by the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access, which is responsible for Wireless Metropolitan Area Network (WirelessMAN™) Standards. The IEEE 802.16 Working Group had the following officers:"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 006 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** iii **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** Part.

Task Group Officer wording is not in typical format.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Primary development was carried out by the Working Group's Task Group 2:

Task Group 2 Officers" to:

"Primary development was carried out by the Working Group's Task Group c, which had the following officers:"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "Primary development was carried out by the Working Group's Task Group 2:

Task Group 2 Officers" to:

"Primary development was carried out by the Working Group's Task Group 2, which had the following officers:"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 007 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** iv **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** Part.

WG list wording is not in typical format.

Suggested Remedy

Change "The following members of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access participated in the Working Group Letter Ballot in which the draft of this standard was approved:" to:

"The following members of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access participated in the Working Group Letter Ballot in which the draft of this standard was approved, voting for approval, disapproval, or abstention::"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
008	Roger	Marks	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	i			Title

Title is not in conventional IEEE form.

Suggested Remedy

Change title to "IEEE Recommended Practice for Local and metropolitan area networks Coexistence of Fixed Broadband Wireless Access Systems - Amendment 1"

Same change on Page 1.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 009 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section**

Note the following issue:

Yvette:

We have an amendment (to a different standard: 802.16.2) under ballot. Because it became so complicated and virtually incomprehensible, the editors and Working Group decided to basically put it in the form of "replace most everything in the base standard with this new version." If this is acceptable to the ballot group, do you foresee any problems with the approach?

Roger

Suggested Remedy

Roger,

Wouldn't it have been preferable to make this a revision rather than an amendment? If you still want to go along the amendment path, there is nothing that prevents you from doing this. You may be reprimanded at RevCom, since they may suggest that a revision would have been more appropriate, but I'm not sure whether any offenses would have occurred. Other things may happen, e.g., deferment until you consider their recommendation that you do a revision instead. It would be up to the committee to decide what action they would take.

I would suggest that the easier solution would be to request a PAR change and denote the project and ballot as a revision. In either case, I'd decide what the best publishing format would be. Without seeing the document, an extensive revision like the one you mentioned would probably be best published as the base document with all changes indicated (strikethroughs, underlines, and notes if entire sections were deleted). We can talk about this also next week.

Regards,

Yvette Ho Sang
Manager, Standards Publishing Programs
IEEE Standards Activities

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Rejected

The document structure is intended to make reading easier, and this has required the replacement and re-ordering of substantial amounts of

text. Without this , the amendment would be extremely difficult to follow.

The draft is in accordance with the PAR. Now that the document has initial sponsor ballot approval, the WG is not in a position to change the process and is obligated to proceed towards publication as quickly as possible.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
010	Roger	Marks	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	1			

Document number of base standard is incorrect.

Suggested Remedy

Change "IEEE Recommended Practice 802.16.2-2002" to:

"IEEE Standard 802.16.2-2001"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 011 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 1 **Starting Line #** 27 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

After the instructions to replace clauses 1 through 9 and Annex A through G, there are 5 new clauses, 1-5. The on page 52, line 44 there are instructions to insert the following clauses 10 through 22, but what follows is clauses 6-Annex D.

What portions of the original document are being replaced by what and which portions of the original document stay, if any. It's not clear whether this amendment completely replaces the original document (disappointing if this is the case), or merely amends it.

Suggested Remedy

Clarify the editing instructions and the relationship between this amndment and the original document.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Delete the instruction on page 52 line 44

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
012	Roger	Marks	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 2 **Starting Line #** 1 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 1

Scope is unacceptable to RevCom since it does not match that on PAR.
Likewise, Purpose statement from PAR must be included for RevCom approval.

Suggested Remedy

Insert Scope and Purpose from PAR.
Put a different title over material in existing Scope section.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Insert Scope and Purpose from PAR, numbered 1.2 and 1.3
Insert "1.1 Introduction" at line 33 on page 1
Move text in existing "scope" to continue after current page 1 line 61
In first para of old "scope, revert to "The intent..."
In second para delete "The scope of"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Given that we are replacing the text of the old document and the scope and purpose of the amendment is only partially that of the entire document, including the scope and purpose verbatim doesn't seem to be an option. Included text is as close as can be to a literal merger of the original and amendment scope and PARs.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
013	Roger	Marks	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	2	46		

Title of second reference is incorrect.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Standard" to "IEEE Standard"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 014 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 3 **Starting Line #** 61 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 3.1.13

Frequency range 1, as defined here, disagrees with frequency range 1 defined in section 3.1.49 on page 6, line 44.

Suggested Remedy

define one of the two as frequency range 4 so that there is no ambiguity, but also so that 10-23.5 might be addressed some day.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Superceded

superceded by resolution of comment#2

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 015 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 6 Starting Line # 32 Fig/Table# Section 3.1.45

Starting with section 3.1.45, the definitions are no longer in alphabetical order. Since this appears to be a total re-write of the document (or at least this section), it would be nice to maintain the alphabetic order.

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 016 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 7 **Starting Line #** 15 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 3.2

Both BFWA and FBWA are defined. The seem to be used as synonyms in the document. If you look at section 6.7.1 on page 76, for instance, FBWA is used in the section title and BFWA is used in the paragraph text.

Suggested Remedy

Consistently use only one of these acronyms and get rid of the other one.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Make global change to BFWA
delete definition of FBWA on page 7

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
017	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Technical, Non-binding	9	12		

Suggested Remedy

In table 1, add the values 80 km and 6 km for 2-11 GHz and state that 60 and 12 km are for 10-66 GHz

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

In table 1, add the values 80 km and 6 km for 2-11 GHz and state that 60 and 12 km are for 10-66 GHz

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

I actually didn't do this. Instead I moved Table 1 to section 5.3, where it belongs (I compared the base standard). This also resolves the error on page 22, line 20-21, which went unnoticed. This makes for a more even spec, since Clause 7 already has such a list for 2-11 GHz, and the suggested additions would merely be duplicated.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
018	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 10 **Starting Line #** 1 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 4.1

Text in 4.1 through 4.3 is rather redundant.
I've tried to consolidate it a bit without changing the meaning of it.

Suggested Remedy

Replace 4.1 through 4.3 with 4.1 as shown in C802.16.2a-03_01

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Replace 4.1 through 4.3 with 4.1 as shown in C802.16.2a-03_01 with the following changes:
Change heading of 4.1.2 to MP-MP Systems
Change all occurrences of "fixed BWA " to "BFWA"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 019 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 12 **Starting Line #** 24 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 4.3.2

This line referes to base stations in a mesh system for 2-11 GHz, but page 11, line 51 said there are no base stations in 2-11 GHz mesh systems. Even though bases stations may look different in mesh, and some terminals may never directly talk with a base station, the rest of the document talks quite a bit about base stations in mesh systems, so I assume page 11 is wrong.

Suggested Remedy

Make the text on page 11 consistent with the rest of the document.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

After "Base stations" on line 24 add "(stations forming points of connection with core networks)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

This text has been replaced in comment 018, which captures the above.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
020	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 12 Starting Line # 61 Fig/Table# Section 4.4.1

missing space

Suggested Remedy

Change "signal.The" to "signal. The"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Text was replaced in comment 018

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 021 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 15 Starting Line # 56 Fig/Table# Section 4.4.3.1

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "Practice.With" to "Practice. With"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 022 **Comment submitted by:** Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Technical, Non-binding **Starting Page #** 17 **Starting Line #** 36 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

Actually, this statement is not true. It doesn't really matter for the scenario whether it's co- or adj. channel interference. The only difference is the adjacent channel rejection, which is just a number.

Suggested Remedy

Delete sentence.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 023 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 17 **Starting Line #** 45 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 4.4.3.3

SU is used here, but is not in the acronym list. SU and BSU are both used in the title for Figure 6 on page 18, but don't seem to be in the rest of the document. BS and SS should be used since they are what's used in the 802.16 standard.

Suggested Remedy

Change "SU" to "SS" and "BSU" to "BS".

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

Change "SU" to "SS" and "BSU" to "BS".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Also changed CS to BS and TS to SS, deleted appropriate abbreviations and corrected the channel separation abbrevation issue

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
024	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 18 **Starting Line #** 45 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

consistency
correct use of abbreviations

Suggested Remedy

change title to: Coexistence of FBWA systems in 23.5 - 43.5 GHz

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

change title to: Coexistence of BFWA systems in 23.5 - 43.5 GHz

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

BFWA was selected as the standard term throught the document

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
025	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	18	52		

This text is a repetition of the general introduction.

We now get a bit abruptly into the recommendations, but maybe we can come up with something more useful to say here.

Suggested Remedy

Delete lines 51 through 64

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Delete lines 51 through 64 and the title.
Renumber subsequent sections

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
026	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 19 Starting Line # 42 Fig/Table# Section

erroneous cross-reference

Suggested Remedy

change "Clause 7" to 5.6

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

change "Clause 7" to 5.6

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
027	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 22 Starting Line # 28 Fig/Table# Section 5.4

"Frequency Ranges 1-3 (10-66 GHz)" contradicts itself given the new definition of range 1.

Suggested Remedy

Fix the definition of frequency ranges.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Superceded

Superceded by resolution of comment #2

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 028 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 27 **Starting Line #** 38 **Fig/Table#** 7 **Section** 5.5.1.4

The asterisk after CS is not explained here. I seem to remember something much earlier in the document warning about the dual definition of CS in the document. The meaning here is adequately explained in the figure, so the asterisk just makes people search for a footnote that doesn't exist.

Suggested Remedy

delete the asterisk here and in the title for figure 8

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The "source" statement defines the meaning of CS in these ETSI diagrams.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Removed the Central Station meaning of CS, so it's now a global abbreviation

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
029	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 29 **Starting Line #** 20 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 5.5.2.2.1

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "conditions.In" to "conditions. In"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 030 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 29 **Starting Line #** 34 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 5.5.2.2.1.1

While I generally agree that it's good to perform linear interpolation between pints (albeit a bit nerdly), the politically correct recommended practice would be to perform linear interpolation between "points".

Suggested Remedy

change "pint" to "points".

Do the same on page 34, line 10-11.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 031 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 34 Starting Line # 10 Fig/Table# Section 5.5.2.3.1

missing space.

Suggested Remedy

change "used.The" to "used. The"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
032	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 34 **Starting Line #** 11 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 5.5.2.3.1

typo

Suggested Remedy

change "and f BS" to "and BS"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 033 **Comment submitted by:** Bruce Barrow Other 2003-01-08

Comment Type Coordination **Starting Page #** 37 **Starting Line #** **Fig/Table#** **Section** 5.5.2.4.1

Symbol "km/hr" is not correct.

Suggested Remedy

Use "km/h" to conform to international and IEEE standards on unit symbols.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

Use "km/h" to conform to international and IEEE standards on unit symbols (Note multiple occurrences)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

2 occurences corrected

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 034 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 43 **Starting Line #** 27 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 5.6.3

missing punctuation

Suggested Remedy

change "C/N This" to "C/N. This"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 035 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 44 **Starting Line #** 1 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 5/7

Too many capital letters.

Suggested Remedy

Change "INterference" to "Interference".

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
036	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 44 Starting Line # 1 Fig/Table# Section 5.7

capitalization

Suggested Remedy

change "INterference" to "Interference"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 037 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 44 Starting Line # 19 Fig/Table# Section 5.7.1.1

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "systems.The" to "systems. The"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 038 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 44 Starting Line # 44 Fig/Table# Section 5.7.1.2

spelling

Suggested Remedy

change "interferwence" to "interference"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 039 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 47 Starting Line # 25 Fig/Table# Section 5.7.1.10.1

spelling

Suggested Remedy

change "interferes" to "interferers"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 040 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 47 Starting Line # 31 Fig/Table# Section 5.7.1.10.1

punctuation - there appears to be a space between co- and channel.

Suggested Remedy

change "co- channel" to "co-channel"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 041 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 54 Starting Line # 3 Fig/Table# Section 6.1.4

The "1-8" in this sentence referes to recommendation 1-8, not the set of recommendations 1 through 8.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Recommendations 1-8 highlight" to "Recommndation 1-8 highlights"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 042 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 54 Starting Line # 24 Fig/Table# Section 6.1.7

extra space

Suggested Remedy

change "block ," to "block,"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 043 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 55 Starting Line # 59 Fig/Table# Section 6.3

extra space

Suggested Remedy

change "inter- cell" to "inter-cell"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 044 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 57 **Starting Line #** 36 **Fig/Table#** 16 **Section** 6.3.3

Sometimes GHz is separated from the number by a space (28 GHz) and sometimes it is not (28GHz). This inconsistency is true for other units. Look at dBi in lines 60 and 63. Once I noticed it I realized that this happens all throughout the document for almost all units attached to number (km, dB, MHz, etc.).

Suggested Remedy

Be consistent throughout the document as to whether to use a space between numbers and their units.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Check all occurrences of xx GHz and other units to ensure that there is always a space after the number

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

verified for *Hz, dB* and km.
Some others found by chance.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 045 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 68 Starting Line # 46 Fig/Table# Section 6.4.2

"link systems" is undefined. I think what is meant here is "multipoint systems" as defined in section 3, but I'm not sure. What could be meant is the, also undefined, "multi-link system" used later in section 6.4.2 and section 6.5 to refer to a system that is a collection of PTP links.

Suggested Remedy

Properly define the various types of systems referred to and use the nomenclature consistently.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

On page 68 line 46 add after "link systems" the following "(systems comprising a number of point to point links)"
Change beginning of sentence to "In this Clause..."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Also changed almost all occurences of "point to point" and "point-to-point" to "PTP"

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 046 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 68 **Starting Line #** 54 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 6.4.2.1

"point point- to- link station" is obviously a typo, but I can't figure out what it should be replaced with.

Suggested Remedy

Correct the erroneous text.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Change "point point- to- link station" to "a single point-to-point link station"
Delete "PTP" from same sentence

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

changed the second part to "multiple such stations"

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
047	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 71 Starting Line # 1 Fig/Table# 25 Section 6.6.3.1

The word "continued" in the table header got chopped off.

Suggested Remedy

fix the table header.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Complete table header ".....(continued)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 048 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 71 Starting Line # 34 Fig/Table# Section 6.6.3.1

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "30below" to "30 below"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 049 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 79 Starting Line # 19 Fig/Table# Section 6.7.6.4

extra space

Suggested Remedy

change "multi- link" to "mutli-link" (assuming multi-link was properly defined earlier per a previous comment.)

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

change "multi- link" to "mutli-link" (assuming multi-link was properly defined earlier per a previous comment.)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

replaced multi-link (PTP) system with "system with multiple PTP links"
also replaced all occurrences of PP with PTP where applicable

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 050 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 80 Starting Line # 52 Fig/Table# Section 6.8

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "co- channel" to "co-channel"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

change "co- channel" to "co-channel"
(extra space, not missing space)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 051 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 81 Starting Line # 7 Fig/Table# Section 6.8.1

What is a "multi-link PMP system"? Or is the more appropriate question: "Are there single-link PMP systems?"

Suggested Remedy

Figure out which type of system is being referred to here and use the proerly defined nomencalture to state it.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Replace "PMP" with "PTP"
The multi-link PTP system is one made up of a number of PTP links

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 052 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 83 **Starting Line #** 2 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.1

I don't see an annex M in either this amendment or in the original 802.16.2.

Suggested Remedy

Change "Annex M" to "Annex D"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

Change "Annex M" to "Annex A3"
(Annex D contains summarises of the various input contributions, whereas A3 is the list of actual references)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
053	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 83 Starting Line # 3 Fig/Table# Section

erroneous cross-reference

Suggested Remedy

Replace M with A.3

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Replace M with A.3

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 054 Comment submitted by: Nico van Waes Member Comment Date 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 83 Starting Line # 40 Fig/Table# Section

Suggested Remedy

correct cross-references B39 and B40

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

Change sentence to ".....Industry Canada are available in sections B.4.2 and B.6."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 055 **Comment submitted by:** Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 83 **Starting Line #** 58 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

Suggested Remedy

Correct reference to rec. 1-6 to the appropriate 3-x rec.
idem in rec 3-2 (also correct the reference to 5.6) there.
idem in rec 3-5, change 1-2 to 3-2
idem in rec 3-6, change 1-5 to 3-5

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

On page 83 line 57 , delete "(see Recommendation 1-6 in 5.2.6)"
In Recommendation 3-2 change "Recommendation 1-5" to "Recommendation 3-5" and change "Recommendation 1-6" to "Recommendation 3-6". and change "Clause 5.6 " to "Clause 7.6.1.2"
in rec 3-5, change 1-2 to 3-2
in rec 3-6, change 1-5 to 3-5

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
056	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	84	41		

where is "below" ?

Suggested Remedy

add a more clear reference

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

change "below" to "in the following Recommendations3-4 through 3-7"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 057 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 85 **Starting Line #** 6 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.2.5

grammar - The word "that" is associated with the second instance of the word "values" in the sentence beginning on line 6. But, "values" is plural, so "that" should be "those"

Suggested Remedy

Change "that power spectral flux density values which," to "those power spectral flux density values which,"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Change "that power spectral flux density values which," to "the power spectral flux density values which,"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 058 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Technical, Non-binding **Starting Page #** 85 **Starting Line #** 18 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.2.7

There might be some confusion if the reader is referred to the triggers of recommendation 1-5. Recommendation 3-55 is, in my opinion, more appropriate. In addtion to that, annex B.5, B.6 and B.7 might be relevant, although they refer to the higher band.

Suggested Remedy

change "Recommendation 1-5" to "Recommendation 3-5".
Add:
"Three existing coordination procedures are described in Annexes B.4, B.5, and B.6."
at the end of the paragraph

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

change "Recommendation 1-5" to "Recommendation 3-5".
Add:
"Three existing coordination procedures are described in Annexes B.4, B.5, and B.6. It should be noted that these procedures were originally developed for use at higher frequencies in the range 23.5 to 43.5 GHz."
at the end of the paragraph

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 059 **Comment submitted by:** Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 85 **Starting Line #** 53 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

This subclause doesn't provide what is claimed in the first 4 lines. This text is the same as that on page 94, where it is more appropriate.

Suggested Remedy

Leave only the last two sentences of this paragraph
put the word "Overview" in the 7.3 header.
In fact, I think it would be more logical to move 7.3 after 7.6 and make it the introduction (7.7.1) of 7.7, which would then have the current 7.7 and 7.8 as subsections 7.7.2 and 7.7.3

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Delete first two sentences of 7.3
In 7.7. change "of part 3 of this Recommended Practice" to "of subclause 7.3"
Copy text of 7.7 to 7.8
Delete 7.7.1
Edit section 5 in a similar fashion to the above

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 060 **Comment submitted by:** Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Technical, Satisfied (was completeness **Starting Page #** 86 **Starting Line #** 10 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

Suggested Remedy

add to table 29

Mesh cell to PMP BS	3.5 GHz; adjacent area, same channel	Spacing to at least 6 km needed.
Mesh cell to Mesh cell	3.5 GHz; adjacent area, same channel	Spacing to at least the cell-radius needed
Mesh cell to mesh cell	3.5 GHz; adjacent area, adjacent channel	Spacing to a few hundred meters suffices.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

add to table 29

Mesh cell to PMP BS	3.5 GHz; adjacent area, same channel	Spacing to at least 6 km needed.
Mesh cell to Mesh cell	3.5 GHz; adjacent area, same channel	Spacing to at least the cell-radius needed
Mesh cell to mesh cell	3.5 GHz; adjacent area, adjacent channel	Spacing to a few hundred meters suffices.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Per implementation of other (binding) comments, the first line would result in an inconsistency (and be demonstratably wrong anyway). Since this is my own comment and own accepted mistake, I've not included this line.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
061	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	86	31		

spelling error

Suggested Remedy

interfrence -> interference

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
062	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 86 **Starting Line #** 35 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

This subclause is redundant with 4.3

Suggested Remedy

Delete 7.4 entirely

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Delete 7.4 entirely
Renumber accordingly

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 063 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 86 **Starting Line #** 41 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.4

what does "greater than around 1.5 Mbits/s" mean? Does it mean "greater than 1.5 Mbits/s", or not? Relative to Gigabit Ethernet, 64 kbps could be considered "around 1.5 Mbits/s", but I certainly wouldn't call it broadband.

Suggested Remedy

Delete the word "around".

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

text on page 86 superceded by resolution of comment # 62
Similar text on page 9 - delete "around"
On page 8 line 39 add "generally" after "transmission"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 064 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 86 **Starting Line #** 41 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.4

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "significantlyhigher" to "significantly higher"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Superceded**

superceded by resolution of comment # 62

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 065 Comment submitted by: Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 88 Starting Line # 1 Fig/Table# Section

I thought we had agreed to change Table 30 and 32 to the format of 31 to avoid the confusion between receiver and transmitter parameters

Suggested Remedy

update tables to better distinguish deployment, Rx and Tx parameters as done in Table 31.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

update tables to better distinguish deployment, Rx and Tx parameters as done in Table 31.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
066	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 88 Starting Line # 5 Fig/Table# 30 Section 7.5.1

use proper superscripting of exponents as is done in table 31 on line 14 of page 89.

Suggested Remedy

replace "d^4" with properly superscripted exponent

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

replace "d^4" with properly superscripted exponent

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
067	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	90	61		

completeness

Suggested Remedy

change 30 and 31 to Table 30, Table 31 and Table 32.
make those proper cross-references.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

change 30 and 31 to Table 30, Table 31 and Table 32.
make those proper cross-references.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 068 Comment submitted by: Avraham Freedman Member Comment Date 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 91 Starting Line # 8 Fig/Table# Section 7.5.3

Part 1 no longer exists

Suggested Remedy

Replace "Part 1" with "Clause 5"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate

See resolution of comment # 69

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
069	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	91	8		

accuracy

Suggested Remedy

replace line 8 with: The interference scenarios described in subclause 4.4 are applicable.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

replace line 8 with: The interference scenarios described in subclause 4.4 are applicable.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
070	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 91 Starting Line # 37 Fig/Table# Section 7.6.1.1

missing space(s).

Suggested Remedy

replace "80km.The" with "80km. The" (another comment covers having a space before "km".)

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

replace "80km.The" with "80km. The" (another comment covers having a space before "km".)

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
071	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	91	37		

thought we agreed to fix this before

Suggested Remedy

change "80 km" to "the co-ordination trigger (see 7.6.1.2)"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

change "80 km" to "the co-ordination trigger (see 7.6.1.2)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 072 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 91 Starting Line # 49 Fig/Table# Section 7.6.1.1

spelling

Suggested Remedy

change "horion" to "horizon"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
073	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 92 Starting Line # 31 Fig/Table# Section

correct cross-reference

Suggested Remedy

replace Table 32 with a proper cross-reference to table 33

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

replace Table 32 with a proper cross-reference to table 33

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 074 Comment submitted by: Avraham Freedman Member Comment Date 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 92 Starting Line # 32 Fig/Table# Section 7.6.1.1

The psfds are specified in table 33 and not in table 32

Suggested Remedy

Change "Table 32" to "Table 33"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
075	Avraham	Freedman	Member	2002-12-17

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	93	4		7.6.1.2.1

The "k" should be inside the square root

Suggested Remedy

Change "sqrt(R_e) k" to "sqrt(R_ek)"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Change "sqrt(R_e) k" to "sqrt(R_ek)"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 076 Comment submitted by: Avraham Freedman Member Comment Date 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 93 Starting Line # 31 Fig/Table# Section 7.6.1.2.1

typo

Suggested Remedy

Change "ares" to "are"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

change "ares" to "are"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 077 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 93 Starting Line # 31 Fig/Table# Section 7.6.1.2.1

spelling

Suggested Remedy

change "ares" to "are"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate

see comment # 76

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 078 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 93 **Starting Line #** 39 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.6.1.2.2

According to 7.4.1, the term multipoint includes point-to-multipoint (PMP) and multipoint-to-multipoint (MP-MP), while this section refers only to mesh.

Suggested Remedy

Change title "MP" to "MP-MP"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
079	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	93	39		

MP means both PMP and MP-MP, this piece only addresses MP-MP

Suggested Remedy

change MP in the section header and right below it (twice) to MP-MP

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

see also #78 which partly duplicates this comment

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
080	Avraham	Freedman	Member	2002-12-17

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 93 **Starting Line #** 42 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.6.1.2.2

This paragraph (which is completely new in D3) introduces a trigger distance to a MP-MP system, which is inconsistent with the distance given for PMP. It does not use the psfd as a measure, but rather the path loss for the mesh system itself. Thus it does not cover the case of a PMP victim.
According to my calculations, the psfd for a single mesh node at 6 km is -121 dbW/m^2/MHz, which is 4 dB above the trigger for PMP. For the worst case scenario of 100 nodes (it seems to me that the calculation in 7.6.1.2.2 is based on a single node), the psfd would be -101 dbW/m^2/MHz. In order to reach the trigger value the coordination the trigger distance should be 25km rather than 6km.

Suggested Remedy

Change the coordination trigger distance to 25km:
In page 94 l.12
In page 84 line 46 (recommendation 3-4)

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add the following text on page 94 line 12 after "6 km" the following "for mesh to mesh interference"
Add similar explanatory notes to the mesh guidelines in tables 1 and 29

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Apparently, the assumptions for Rx sensitivity used for PMP do not match those for mesh. The mesh values were adopted from P802.16a. As differences in sensitivity are not considered for inter-PMP interference and inter-mesh interference, it would be awkward to consider them for interference between mesh and PMP, particularly since both systems can use the same PHY implementation. When in the simulations the sensitivity is changed by x dB the power control will ensure that the power also changes by x dB. As such the interference from mesh to PMP would not change compared to mesh to mesh interference as a result of any change in Rx sensitivity. Changing the Rx sensitivity in fact does not have any impact on the distance because of the power control.

It should be noted however, that the calculation of 7.6.1 only concerns mesh to mesh. For mesh to PMP, numbers will be different, due to the larger antenna gain of the PMP BS and SS and different propagation characteristics.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 081 **Comment submitted by:** Ron Murias Member 2003-01-09

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 93 **Starting Line #** 59 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.6.1.2.2

Gtx = Grx = Antenna gain (Tx/Rx) implies the receive and transmit antennas have the same gain.

Suggested Remedy

Use a comma to separate Gtx and Grx or put Grx on a separate line.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

In the specific example provided, the gains are equal, but in general this might not always be the case.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 082 Comment submitted by: Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 94 Starting Line # 33 Fig/Table# Section

grammar

Suggested Remedy

Change "This subclause indicates some of the models, simulations, and analysis used in the preparation of Part 3 of this Recommended Practice."
to
"This subclause indicates some of the models, simulations, and analysis used in the derivation of the Recommendations described in 7.2."

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

Change "This subclause indicates some of the models, simulations, and analysis used in the preparation of Part 3 of this Recommended Practice."
to
"This subclause indicates some of the models, simulations, and analysis used in the derivation of the Recommendations described in 7.2 and the guidelines in 7.3"

Make similar changes to clauses 5, 6 and 7.8

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 083 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 94 **Starting Line #** 34 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.7

Part 3 no longer exists

Suggested Remedy

Change "Part 3" to "Clause 7"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

see # 82

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
084	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 94 Starting Line # 51 Fig/Table# Section

I think it's rather pointless to say what you're not doing. Besides, it's getting rather repetitive.

Suggested Remedy

Delete first paragraph and "Thus, " and "here." from the next paragraph.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 085 **Comment submitted by:** Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 95 **Starting Line #** 48 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

grammar
Fairly useless section, but anyway.

Suggested Remedy

change paragraph to:
Two possible other methods, which are not used in this Clause, are the Interference Area (IA) method (see 5.7.1.5) and the ISOP (Interference scenario occurrence probability) method (5.7.1.6).

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

change paragraph to:
Two possible other methods, which are not used in this Clause, are the Interference Area (IA) method (see 5.7.1.5) and the ISOP (Interference scenario occurrence probability) method (5.7.1.6).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354 Comment Date

Comment # 086 Comment submitted by: Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 95 Starting Line # 50 Fig/Table# Section 7.7.5

Part 1 no longer exists

Suggested Remedy

Change "Part 1" to "Clause 5"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Superceded

see # 85

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
087	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	95	57		

grammar

Suggested Remedy

change first sentence to: Table 34 summarizes the scenarios analysed.
This table actually should fit on one page if you don't break the paragraph halfway

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

change first sentence to: Table 34 summarizes the scenarios analysed.
This table actually should fit on one page if you don't break the paragraph halfway

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 088 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 95 **Starting Line #** 60 **Fig/Table#** 34 **Section** 7.7.6

The table should contain the simulations presented in Clause 7.8. Guidelines are accroding to the next two comments

Suggested Remedy

Add the following rows to the table:

mesh node to mesh node	3.5GHz	Adjacent area, same channel	At least 12.5 km distance is needed	Monte Carlo analysis
mesh node to mesh node	3.5GHz	Same area, adjacent channel	2 guard channels are required	Monte Carlo analysis

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Rejected

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Table 34 is associated with the PMP analysis. The mesh section is intended to be stand - alone, since it is relatively short and has only one set of results.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 089 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 97 **Starting Line #** 1 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.8

The new section 7.8 describes the simulations used for mesh systems. It should not be part of the main text, as all other simulations are not part of the main text.

Suggested Remedy

Move section 7.8 to Annex as section D.2.7

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Rejected

Because the mesh analysis consists of only one set of results and is short, it was decided to include the whole section in the main text. This avoids unnecessary repetition and cross- referencing.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
090	Ron	Murias	Member	2003-01-09

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 97 **Starting Line #** 30 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.8.1

Typo.

Suggested Remedy

Remove the period (.) following the first comma in the sentence.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Remove the period (.) following the first comma in the sentence.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 091 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 97 Starting Line # 30 Fig/Table# Section 7.8.1

extra punctuation

Suggested Remedy

change "strategy,." to "strategy,"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate

see #90

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
092	Ron	Murias	Member	2003-01-09

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	97	33		7.8.1

Typo.

Suggested Remedy

Change "leas" to "leads".

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Change "leas" to "leads".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment # 093 Comment submitted by: Kenneth Stanwood Member Comment Date 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 97 Starting Line # 34 Fig/Table# Section 7.8.1

spelling

Suggested Remedy

change "leas" to "leads"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Duplicate

see # 92

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
094	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	97	34		

typo

Suggested Remedy

leas -> leads

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Duplicate**

see # 92

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 095 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 99 **Starting Line #** 34 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.8.1

The result of the analysis shows that the probability of interference to a mesh node located at a re-use factor of 2, two cells away is 0.6% -2.5%. This is a very large number compared to the 99.9% availability requirement given in table 32, and even more so for a PMP system requiring 99.99% availability. The presented analysis does not include an analysis for a co-channel PMP BS or SS victim, which is too bad, however one cannot use but the contributed result.
In any case, assuming the interfered with node is a node of a victim mesh system, it is clear that in order to get the required 99.9% availability, the distance to the victim node should be increased. According to my rough calculation it should be increased to 8500m if minimum energy per bit minization is used and to 12.5km if hop minimzation routing is used. As a trigger the worst result should be taken - 12.5 km

Suggested Remedy

Insert in the "Guideline Spacing" column in table 34 for the entry describing this simulation:
"A distance of at least 12.5km is needed"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

In table 31 change the parameters in "availability" to read as follows:

99% link availability approximately equal to 99.9% system availability

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Although the comment is true if a link availabitiy of 99.9% is desired, this is not in fact needed. The numbers as derived relate to link availability. For PMP, link availability equals service availability. The inherent redundancy of mesh links ensures that a 99% link availability results in a far higher service availability, which is for the customer the only relevant number.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 096 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 99 **Starting Line #** 52 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.8.2

missing space

Suggested Remedy

change "linkbudget" to "link budget"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

change "linkbudget" to "link budget"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 097 **Comment submitted by:** Avraham Freedman Member 2002-12-17

Comment Type Technical, Binding **Starting Page #** 100 **Starting Line #** 1 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.8.3

The result of the analysis shows that the probability of interference to a mesh node in adjacent channel/ same area scenario is 0.5% -0.2%. This is still a large number compared to the 99.9% availability requirement given in table 32, and even more so for a PMP system requiring 99.99% availability.
Assuming the interfered with node is a node of a victim mesh system, it is clear that in order to get the required 99.9% availability, the channel separations between the nodes should be increased. I believe that two guard channels would do the job.

Suggested Remedy

Insert in the "Guideline Spacing" column in table 34 for the entry describing this simulation:
"Two guard cahnnels are required"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Clarified**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This issue is accurately captured in 7.8.5. The isolation required varies substantially based on the assumption of minimum separation between nodes. Given a realistic minimum node separation of the order of 20m, the single guard channel as indicated in 7.8.5 should be sufficient.for limited but acceptable probability of interference. A 2 channel guard band would only be needed to eliminate the last small proportion of interference cases.

See also resolution of comment # 95

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
098	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 100 **Starting Line #** 55 **Fig/Table#** **Section** 7.9

AA is not in the acronym list

Suggested Remedy

Put it in the acronym list or spell out its 5 occurrances.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add to abbreviation list AA = adaptive antenna

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
099	Roger	Marks	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 101 **Starting Line #** 29 **Fig/Table#** **Section** A

References are not formatted consistently.

Suggested Remedy

Format inconsistently throughout all annexes, following IEEE Manual <http://standards.ieee.org/resources/glance_at_writing_new.html>.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Format inconsistently throughout all annexes, following IEEE Manual <http://standards.ieee.org/resources/glance_at_writing_new.html>.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
100	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	101	29		

Clean up references (hard to find the trees through the forest etc..).

Suggested Remedy

Delete or find appropriate reference points for:
[H1.3]
[H1.17]
Alternatively, move em below what is now [H1.26]
Remove the number [H1.26]. This is not a reference.
Critically look at which references after H1.26 are really useful, get rid of the rest.

Delete or find appropriate reference points for :
[H2.6]
[H2.7]
[H2.8]
[H2.10]
[H2.11]
[H2.13]
[H2.15]
[H2.16]
[H2.17]
[H2.18]
[H2.20]
[H2.24]
[H2.25]
[H2.26]
[H3.1]
[H3.2]
[H3.9]
[H3.12]
[H3.15]
[H3.16]
[H3.18]
[H3.19]
[H3.20]
[H3.21]

[H3.22]

Replace the reference [H3.25] in Table 31 with [H3.26]
Remove the bracket from [H3.27]
Insert reference [H3.29] after "network" on first line of 7.8.1

Make sure the format of the references is consistent and ensure that all info is present without extra banter.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Move [H1.3] below what is now [H1.26]
Delete [H1.17]
Remove the number [H1.26]. This is not a reference.
After H1.26 delete the following:
[H1.29]
[H1.47]
[H1.48]
[H1.50]
[H1.52]
[H1.53]
[H1.54]
[H1.56]
[H1.57]
[H1.58]
[H1.59]
[H1.62]
[H1.64]
[H1.65]
[H1.66]

[H1.66]
[H1.67]
[H1.68]
[H1.69]
[H1.70]
[H1.71]
[H1.72]
[H1.73]
[H1.75]
[H1.76]
[H1.78]
[H1.79]
Delete the following:
[H2.6]
[H2.7]
[H2.8]
[H2.10]
[H2.11]
[H2.13]

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

did not delete H3.2 and H3.9 due to obvious conflict

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
101	Roger	Marks	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	101	32		A

The reference numbers should begin with "B" in accordance with IEEE style.

Suggested Remedy

Renumber references to begin with "B" instead of "H".

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Renumber references to begin with "B" instead of "H".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
102	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 101 Starting Line # 32 Fig/Table# Section

consistency

Suggested Remedy

change [H#.#] to [A#.#]

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

change [H#.#] to [B#.#] otherwise duplicates comment # 101

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 103 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 102 **Starting Line #** 53 **Fig/Table#** **Section** A

Reference [H1.26] ("The following documents, while not directly referenced in the text, are related and may be helpful to the reader:") makes no sense. It is not a reference. It is not logically arranged so as to apply to the subsequent references, And there is no reason that the subsequent references need to be identified this way in any case.

Suggested Remedy

Delete [H1.26] .

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

delete reference but retain text
see also comment # 100

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 104 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 103 **Starting Line #** 33 **Fig/Table#** **Section** A

The references to 802.16 contributions are formatted inconsistently.

Suggested Remedy

Format inconsistently throughout all annexes. Include "IEEE" as part of the document number. Make sure the date is unambigous and complete. Include the first two digits of the year in the date.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Format inconsistently throughout all annexes. Include "IEEE" as part of the document number. Make sure the date is unambigous and complete. Include the first two digits of the year in the date.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 105 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 103 **Starting Line #** 42 **Fig/Table#** **Section** A

In [H1.43] , "[Presentation 802.16.2p-00/19]" and "[Rev. 0: 00/08/16]" are irrelevant to the reference.

Suggested Remedy

In [H1.43] , delete "[Presentation 802.16.2p-00/19]" and "[Rev. 0: 00/08/16]".

The same goes for bracketed material in other references (H1.46, H1.57, H1.58, H1.74, H1.78, H3.13, H3.14, and possibly more).

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

In [H1.43] , delete "[Presentation 802.16.2p-00/19]" and "[Rev. 0: 00/08/16]".

The same goes for bracketed material in other references (H1.46, H1.57, H1.58, H1.74, H1.78, H3.13, H3.14, and possibly more).

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 106 **Comment submitted by:** Roger Marks Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 104 **Starting Line #** 57 **Fig/Table#** **Section** A

Reference is numbered twice ([H1.67] [H1.30])/

Suggested Remedy

Fix.

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

delete "[H1.30]"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 107 **Comment submitted by:** Kenneth Stanwood Member 2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial **Starting Page #** 108 **Starting Line #** 41 **Fig/Table#** **Section** A.3

missing closing parenthesis

Suggested Remedy

change "(Nico van Waes, 02/09/04." to "(Nico van Waes, 02/09/04)"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
108	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 145 Starting Line # 56 Fig/Table# Section C.2.1.2

capitalization

Suggested Remedy

change "interferer, A large" to "interferer, a large"

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

change "interferer, A large" to "interferer, a large"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
109	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	157	41		

wrong reference
grammar

Suggested Remedy

replace "B" with the right cross reference B.2
remove "3.5 GHz -" from header D1.2
replace B3 with cross-reference B.3 and replace "Annex B of Part 1" with B.2.1

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted**

replace "B" with the right cross reference B.2
remove "3.5 GHz -" from header D1.2
replace B3 with cross-reference B.3 and replace "Annex B of Part 1" with B.2.1

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354 **Comment Date**

Comment # 110 **Comment submitted by:** Nico van Waes Member 2003-01-11

Comment Type Technical, Non-binding **Starting Page #** 158 **Starting Line #** 18 **Fig/Table#** **Section**

It seems odd to me, that given Table 30 and Table 32, there's another table and text here that's probably partially redundant and/or conflicting.

Suggested Remedy

Harmonize

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** **Accepted-Modified**

Add the following text to page 158 line 20 after "...bands." the followong "The values in table D.1 vary partly from the initial assumptions made in tables 30 and 32. "
In table D1 in the line headed SS/BS Antenna RPE, change the entry for 3.5 GHz to "as specified in [H3.13]" and ichange the entry for 10.5 GHz to "as specified in [H3.14]"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Although the table may be partly redundant, the final parameters chosen for this set of simulations were slightly different. This arose because analysis showed the initial assumptions to be sub - optimal. The differences shown in table D1 therefore need to be documented.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 **Ballot Number:** 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
111	Nico	van Waes	Member	2003-01-11

Comment Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
Editorial	162	48		

They're a bit more elliptical than was the intention. They're easy to stretch up though.
If needed, I can do it.

Suggested Remedy

slightly stretch out the drawings D.1 through D.4 and D.7vertically

Proposed Resolution **Recommendation:** **Recommendation by**

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group **Decision of Group:** Accepted

slightly stretch out the drawings D.1 through D.4 and D.7vertically

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes **Editor's Actions** k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D3-2002 Ballot Number: 0000354

Comment #	Comment submitted by:			Comment Date
112	Kenneth	Stanwood	Member	2002-12-23

Comment Type Editorial Starting Page # 165 Starting Line # 51 Fig/Table# Section D.2.6

polarizations should be plural, not plural possessive.

Suggested Remedy

delete the apostrophe following "two polarizations"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

delete the apostrophe following "two polarizations"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions k) done

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items