

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D4-2003

Ballot Number: 0000462

Comment Date

Comment # 113

Comment submitted by: Avraham Freedman

2003/02/04

Comment

Type Technical, Satisfied

Starting Page # 81

Starting Line # 56

Fig/Table#

Section 7.2.4

this is my response to the rsolution of my comment 80 of IEEE 80216-03_03r2

I believe that avoiding to define trigger values to mesh-to-PMP scenarios, makes the document incomplete and reduces its value. I also think that according to the simulations presented, 25km can be set as such a value (see my comment 80 of IEEE 80216-03_03r2)

However, if, according to the Ballot resolution committee there is not enough evidence for that, then the worst case of 80km should be stated for that case, and the fact that 6km refers only to mesh-to-mesh should be emphasized

Suggested Remedy

Change "Mesh Systems" to "mesh-to-mesh interference"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted-Modified

Recommendation by PW

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

On page 81, starting at line 56, delete the first sentence and replace with the following:

"No coordination between PMP systems is needed in a given direction if a transmitter is at a distance of greater than 80 km from either the service area boundary or the neighbor's boundary (if known) in that direction. No coordination between Mesh systems is needed in a given direction if a transmitter is at a distance of greater than 6 km from either the service area boundary or the neighbor's boundary (if known) in that direction. No coordination between a PMP system and a mesh system is needed in a given direction if a transmitter is at a distance of greater than 50 km from either the service area boundary or the neighbor's boundary (if known) in that direction."

Add new reference [next number xx] after the last sentence, to refer to new contribution IEEE C802.16.2a-03/02 and include in bibliography. This document provides an analysis of the mesh to PMP co-ordination distance and concludes that a 50 km value is satisfactory.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Separates the 3 possible cases and provides a coordination distance for each case, derived from simulations.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D4-2003

Ballot Number: 0000462

Comment Date

Comment # 114

Comment submitted by: Avraham Freedman

2003/02/04

Comment

Type Technical, Non-binding

Starting Page # 85

Starting Line # 20

Fig/Table# 28

Section 7.4.1

This is my response to the resolution of my technically binding comments 95 and 97 of IEEE 802.16-03_03r2. 99.9 % service availability can be achieved by 97% link availability (if at least 2 links can be made to a subscriber). Changing the target link availability to 97% will reconcile the contradiction of the target and the mesh simulation results.

Suggested Remedy

Change "99%" to "97%"

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Accepted-Modified

Recommendation by PW

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

In table 12, page 85, starting line 20, replace text in second column of "availability" with "97% link availability, approximately equal to 99.9% system availability (for 90% cell area coverage)"

Add reference to a new note, immediately following the above text.

Add new note below table 28 with the following text "System availability is greater than link availability, based on the assumption of at least two link paths between mesh nodes."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16.2a/D4-2003		Ballot Number: 0000462		Comment Date	
Comment # 115	Comment submitted by: Bruce	Barrow	Other	2003/02/08	
Comment	Type Coordination	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section

SCC14 Comments on P802.16.2a/D4
LAN/MAN amendment – coexistence of fixed broadband wireless access systems
February 8, 2003

dBW/MHz. I know that "dBW/MHz" is well entrenched in the jargon, but that does not make it correct. If it were correct mathematical notation, then we would have

-138 dBW/MHz = -276 dBW/(2 MHz)

How about using phrases like, "The receiver thermal noise is –138 dBW in 1 MHz"?

Equation 2. *Italic I.*

Table 12. In right column, "Up to 5 per square kilometer"

Bruce B. Barrow
Chair, SCC14
b.barrow@ieee.org

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted Recommendation by PW

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted

Make global change: change occurrences of "dBW/ MHz" to "dBW in 1MHz"
Make other changes as proposed

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items