

IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

<http://WirelessMAN.org>



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

Dear IEEE-SA RevCom:

This submittal is an application for approval of IEEE P802.16-2004/Cor1/D5 ("Draft Corrigendum to IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks – Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed Broadband Wireless Access Systems").

Attached to this letter, please find the following:

Page 2-5: IEEE-SA Standards Board Form for Submittal of Proposed Standards

Page 6-7: Coordination comments and responses

The final 15-day recirculation closed on 27 September. According to my copies of the submitted ballots, the final voting result is 168 Approve, 2 Disapprove, and 6 Abstain, for an approval ratio of 98.8%.

Please note that this submittal letter is an update of the previous version IEEE 802.16-05/070 (submitted on 16 September, during the final recirc) and includes some changes to the data in the submittal form. Also, page 7 is added here.

Sincerely,

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

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

1. PROJECT NUMBER: P802.16-2004/Cor1/D5

2. DATE: 27 September 2005

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

4. SPONSOR (Full name of society/committee): Computer Society/LMSC + Microwave Theory & Techniques Society

5. BALLOTING COMMITTEE: IEEE 802.16 Working Group + Microwave Theory and Techniques Society

6. NAME OF WORKING GROUP: IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

7. NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER

Roger B. Marks
NIST
325 Broadway, MC 818.00
Boulder, CO 80305
USA

Telephone: +1 303 497 7837

Fax:

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

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

☒ New

☐ Revision

☐ Reaffirmation

☐ Withdrawal

☐ Standard

☐ Recommended Practice

☐ Guide

☒ Amendment/Corrigenda to an existing

standard (Indicate number and year) 802.16-2004

☒ Full Use (5-year life cycle)

☐ Trial Use (2-year life cycle)

8A. REAFFIRMATION ONLY:

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

9. BALLOT INFORMATION

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

User	73	Producer	93	General Interest	51	Government	3
Interest Category	No.	Interest Category	No.	Interest Category	No.	Interest Category	No.

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBLE BALLOTS

	INITIAL BALLOT		RECIRCULATION BALLOT (if applicable)	
	Draft D3 Number	Date Closed: 2005-07-10 Percentage	Draft D5 Number	Date Closed: in progress Percentage
Eligible Balloters	<u>220</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>100%</u>
Ballots Returned	<u>168</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>80.0</u>
Affirmatives	<u>135</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>98.8</u>
Total Negatives	<u>26</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Abstentions	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>03</u>
Reasons for abstentions:	Lack of time = <u>5</u>		Lack of expertise = <u>0</u>	
			Other = <u>1</u>	

10. RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS AND NEGATIVE VOTES

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

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

11. COORDINATION ACTIVITY (Not required for reaffirmation)

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

R = Received

R/C = Received with comment

NR = Not received

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

Indicate below any unresolved problems from coordination activities.

None.

12. PATENT/COPYRIGHT and REGISTRATION ISSUES

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

13. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ACTIVITIES (Not required for reaffirmation)

- Is this document intended to be the basis of or included in an international standard? ☒ Yes (Explain) ☐ No
- This document is relevant to Recommendations under development in ITU-R Working Parties 8A and 9B.

14. UNIT OF MEASUREMENT (check one)

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

15. Source Materials Submitted to IEEE Standards Department

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

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

	Submission Package Item	List URL if online
X	This submittal form	http://ieee802.org/16/docs/05/80216-05_070r1.pdf
X	Ballot summary form(s) (1 per ballot cycle)	provided to RevCom Admin
X	Copies of unresolved negatives & rebuttals	http://ieee802.org/16/docs/05/80216-05_061r3.pdf
X	PAR and PAR approval letter	http://ieee802.org/16/docs/04/80216-04_41r2.pdf
X	Coordination comments and responses	http://ieee802.org/16/docs/05/80216-05_070r1.pdf
X	.pdf of final balloted draft #D5	http://ieee802.org/16/private/drafts/maint/P80216_Cor1_D5.zip
N/A	Permissions & copyright releases	

PROJECT NUMBER: IEEE P802.16-2004/Cor1/D5

DATE: 2005-09-27

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

Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group

Signature of Submitter

Title (role in Sponsor)

=====

FOR STANDARDS DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

Signature of IEEE-SA Officer

IEEE-SA Standards Board Chair

Title

Date

Return to:

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

Coordination Comments and Responses**(1) Editorial**

From: *Michelle Turner*

Document under Review: *P802.16-2004/Cor1/D*

Starting Page: *10*

Suggested Remedy:

SECTION III: Recommended changes

• *In 5.2.3.2 please correct the following sentence to read as follows: Replace Figure 11 with the following Figure:*

Decision of Group: *Accepted*

(2) SCC14

Document under Review: *P802.16-2004/Cor1/D3*

SCC14 Coordination Comments on P802.16-2004/Cor 1: Corrigendum to IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: AirInterface for Fixed Broadband Wireless Access Systems Very little in this long standard raises any concerns from SCC14. Here are a couple of picky points: 1) The decibel, dB, is of course a permitted unit (although, oddly, it is not SI). Likewise, the dBm is well-enough understood to be permitted also. But I'd like to see a definition (that is, the reference level) of dBi when it first appears (in subclause 8.3.10). The "m" and the "i" would be better as subscripts. 2) A little more care needs to be taken to ensure that all quantity symbols are set, as they should be, in italic. Note that k and K appear interchangeably in 8.4.4.5 2) (k is correct). The integer counting symbol n or N occasionally appears incorrectly as roman. 3) Note that the unit symbol for "second" is "s" and that for "millisecond" is "ms." In Table 342 I find the incorrect "msec," which is specifically not permitted. That's all ... For IEEE SCC14 John T. Scott 21 June 2005

Decision of Group: *Accepted-Modified*

Editor's Actions:

1) *In section 4, I have included the following abbreviations:*

"dBm Decibels relative to one milliwatt

dBi Decibels of gain relative to the zero dB gain of a free-space isotropic radiator"

[Note that dBm is taken from the IEEE Dictionary (IEEE Std 100-1996); dBi is taken from

<<http://ntia.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1037/fs-1037c.htm>>]

Regarding subscripting the "m" or the "i", note that the IEEE Dictionary does not subscript the "m" in dBm.

Nor does the baseline document IEEE Std 802.16-2004 subscript the "m" or the "i" in dBm or dBi, so I do not want the Corrigendum to be inconsistent with that document. Making such a change would be in the authority of the IEEE staff editor, however.

2) *I have reviewed and try to identify quantity symbols through out the document and to edit them to be italic, although I might have missed some instances, anyway the IEEE technical editor will fix such instances as well.*

3) *I have changed every instance of "msec" to "ms".*

This response was accepted by SCC14, as noted by this recirculation comment from John T. Scott:

No problems for SCC14.

(3) Additional coordination comment related to SCC14, received during second recirculation

Document under Review: *P802.16-2004/Cor1/D5*

Coordination Comment from: *James R. Frysinger*

Comment: I do see a definition of "dBm" here under "Abbreviations and Acronyms" (though "dBm" is a unit symbol and neither of these).

Is FED-STD-1037C going to be added to the list of references or to the bibliography? This relates to my comment on P802.16e a few moments ago.

Suggested Remedy: Add FED-STD-1037C to the list of references or to the bibliography.

Response:

The Working Group has already responded to an SCC14 Coordination Comment from John T. Scott on this issue, and he has accepted our response.

Mr. Frysinger is following up on an an SCC14 Coordination Comment that he submitted previously in a different ballot (P802.16e). In that case, the 802.16 Working Group suggested that the issue would best be handled in the P802.16-2004/Cor1 ballot; it also provided Mr. Frysinger with the explicit response to Mr. Scott's comment. Mr. Frysinger responded with a rather detailed note accepting this resolution [see IEEE 802.16-05/059r2 <http://ieee802.org/16/docs/05/80216-05_059r2.pdf>, pages 8-10].

In Mr. Frysinger's detailed note in the P802.16e ballot, he mentioned that "I must trust that the baseline document includes the citation in its bibliography or references." This item was not previously submitted in or transmitted to the P802.16-2004/Cor1 ballot process for consideration.

At this time, Mr. Frysinger is suggesting that we "Add FED-STD-1037C to the list of references or to the bibliography." We accept the comment. However, we do not believe that this response warrants another recirculation. We would be happy to communicate to the IEEE-SA editorial staff a request for the implementation of the following editorial instruction:

In Annex A [Bibliography], Insert new reference and renumber the remaining references as needed:

**Federal Standard 1037C, Telecommunications: Glossary of Telecommunication Terms, August 1996
<<http://ntia.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1037/fs-1037c.htm>>*