IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

http://WirelessMAN.org

Roger B. Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group
NextWave Broadband Inc.
r.b.marks@ieee.org
9 August 2007

Dear RevCom:

I have submitted an application for the approval of P802.16g/D9 and wish to have it considered at your meeting of 26 September 2007. My application is identical to the one I submitted on 26 April, except for the change of date.

Recall that, when my earlier application was rejected in June, I was given three instructions. Here is a summary of the actions I have taken:

1) The Sponsor must conduct a recirculation ballot to show all unresolved comments associated with negative votes, and their responses, to the ballot group.
I have today opened a recirculation, closing 18 August. The recirculation includes all unresolved comments, and their responses, associated with the two negative votes.

2) The Sponsor is encouraged to input all comments and responses into the myBallot system for ease of submittal package review by RevCom.
I entered all of the comments, and responses, from (1) individually into myBallot. Some of these had already been individually entered into myBallot by the voter; others had been submitted directly to the Working Group during earlier balloting and had not previously been individually entered into myBallot. The recirculation cover letter (attached) notes that, in some cases, comments had been provided to the Working Group in formatted text that cannot be rendered in myBallot. The cover letter explains the coding used to convey this formatting; it also cites a URL to a document that displays the formatted comments.

3) The Sponsor shall inform the ballot group that the myBallot system must be used as the mechanism for ballot comment submission.
The recirc cover letter provides this information. It also refers to the position that, for any additional comment to be considered as a valid element of a Disapprove vote, it must be entered into the myBallot database by the voter.

I am attaching a record of a planning meeting of 18 July organized by Geoff Thompson, RevCom's assigned mentor.

Note that, per IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, Subclause 8.1.2, "Up to three amendments can be approved before the standard shall be revised, unless the base standard has been approved or reaffirmed within the past three years... If, for any extenuating circumstances, an exception to these rules is required, the Sponsor shall take its request for a two-year extension to RevCom." While the three-year interval ended in June, only two amendments to IEEE Std 802.16-2004 have been approved. Therefore, it appears that no extension request is necessary. However, since a corrigendum was also approved, RevCom may find the request necessary. If so, then please consider this as such a request. Note that we had anticipated RevCom approval in June, during the three-year window. Also note that a revision project is in development at this time.

Sincerely,

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

IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

http://WirelessMAN.org

Roger B. Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group
NextWave Broadband Inc.
r.b.marks@ieee.org
8 August 2007

Dear P802.16g Balloting Group:

Thank you for your participation in the Sponsor Ballot Recirculation of P802.16g/D9, which ran from 11-26 April 2007. The numerical results stand at 136 Approve, 2 Disapprove, and 14 Abstain. This satisfies the numerical conditions for approval. No comments or votes were received in the latest recirculation. Subsequently, an approval application was submitted to RevCom. RevCom denied the application due to procedural concerns related to the recirculation of comments that were submitted directly to the Working Group rather than through the IEEE's myBallot system.

The IEEE-SA Standards Board has requested an additional recirculation with the unresolved Disapprove comments and responses individually entered into the myBallot system "for ease of submittal package review by RevCom." This information has been entered into the system for your review. Please note that, in some cases, comments were provided to the Working Group in formatted text that cannot be rendered in myBallot. Therefore, we have used the following conventions:

<u>text</u> represents <u>text</u>
text represents **text**
text represents *text*
<strike>text</strike> represents ~~text~~

For reference, the formatted comments are available at this URL: <http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_027.pdf>.

I am hereby requesting that IEEE initiate Recirculation #4. No additional draft is included, since the previously-recirculated draft P802.16g/D9 remains current.

Since this is a recirculation ballot, you need respond only if you wish to change your vote. If you do not respond to this recirculation ballot, your last vote will be carried forward. Also, as this is a recirculation ballot, a change to "do not approve" (i.e., a negative vote) with comments shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted document, clauses affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted document that are the subject of the unresolved negative votes.

Please note that the myBallot system must be used as the mechanism for ballot comment submission. To my understanding, it is the RevCom position that, for any additional comment to be considered as a valid element of a Disapprove vote, that comment must be entered into the myBallot database by the voter.

Sincerely,

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

From: "Geoff Thompson" <gthompso@nortel.com>
Subject: **Outcome of mentoring session**
Date: July 18, 2007 01:43:31 PM MDT
To: stds-revcom@ieee.org
Cc: "Geoff Thompson" <gthompso@nortel.com>, r.b.marks@ieee.org, c.camp@ieee.org, m.kipnes@ieee.org

---

Colleagues-

I met with Roger, Mike, Clyde and a few others to mentor the advancement and resubmission of P802.16g. The meeting took place during the 802 Plenary in San Francisco.

The information provided to them in their rejection letter was:

> 1) The Sponsor must conduct a recirculation ballot to show all unresolved comments associated with negative votes, and their responses, to the ballot group.
>
> 2) The Sponsor is encouraged to input all comments and responses into the myBallot system for ease of submittal package review by RevCom.
>
> 3) The Sponsor shall inform the ballot group that the myBallot system must be used as the mechanism for ballot comment submission.

The outcome of the meeting was:

> Item #1: The WG Chair agreed to do this.
>
> Item #2 The WG Chair will input all outstanding DISAPPROVE comments into myBallot before the recirculation mentioned in item 1. The WG Chair will provide a cover letter for the recirculation. Included in the cover letter will be a pointer to a PDF in the 802.16 WG web space that provides all comments and responses in easy-to-read format.
>
> Clyde and Mike facilitated things so that staff will assist Roger in the mechanics of getting the additional comments into the system.
>
> Item #3 The WG Chair agreed to do this. But the WG Chair asserted that it is not possible to back this assertion up with text from the P&P. The chair further agreed to inform the ballot group that it is the RevCom position that "For any comment to be considered as a valid element of a DISAPPROVE VOTE, the comment must be entered into the myBallot database by the voter. (In this instance only, Roger will enter the necessary negative comments into the myBallot system.)

I offered an assertion (for them to quote) that it was the position of RevCom that:

> a) All comments must be considered
> b) "For any comment to be considered as a valid element of a DISAPPROVE VOTE, the comment must be entered into the myBallot database by the voter.

My belief is that the P&P is not completely explicit about item b) but I believe that it is the intent of the current P&P and the action of the SA-SB that makes the use of myBallot mandatory.

It is my wish that we make item b) the policy of RevCom until we can get it explicitly stated in the P&P.

Best regards,

Geoff Thompson
(and Clyde agrees with me)

IEEE-SA STANDARDS BOARD
FORM FOR SUBMITTAL OF PROPOSED STANDARDS

1. PROJECT NUMBER: P802.16g **2. DATE:** 2007-08-08

3. TITLE: Amendment to IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed and Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Systems - Management Plane Procedures and Services

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 Marks
NextWave Broadband, Inc.
4040 Montview Blvd
Denver, CO 80207
United States

Telephone: 1 303 725 4626 Fax: E-Mail: r.b.marks@ieee.org

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

☒ New	□ Standard	☒ Full Use (5-year life cycle)
□ Revision	□ Recommended Practice	□ Trial Use (2-year life cycle)
□ Reaffirmation	□ Guide	
□ Withdrawal	☒ Amendment/Corrigenda to an existing standard (Indicate number and year) 802.16-2004	

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.

(see report)

Interest Category No.	Interest Category No.	Interest Category No.	Interest Category No.

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBLE BALLOTS

	INITIAL BALLOT Draft D6 Date Closed: 2007-01-12		RECIRCULATION BALLOT (if applicable) Draft D9 Date Closed: 2007-04-26	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Eligible Balloters	195	100%	195	100%
Ballots Returned	147	75	152	78
Affirmatives	123	93	136	99
Total Negatives	11	N/A	02	N/A
Abstentions	13	09	14	09

Reasons for abstentions: Lack of time = 6 Lack of expertise = 6 Other = 2

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)	NR		
IEEE Standards Editorial Staff	NR		
IEEE Registration Authority Committee (RAC)	NR		

Indicate below any unresolved problems from coordination activities.

none

12. PATENT/COPYRIGHT and REGISTRATION ISSUES

A. Any patent letters of assurance (LoAs) received by the Sponsor are to be forwarded to the PatCom Administrator [Fax: + 1 732 875 0524].

B. Is there any copyrighted material in the proposed standard? If yes, include copyright release(s). ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

The base standard is recommended in ITU-R Rec. F.1763 and ITU-R Rec. M.1801. It would be appropriate to include this amendment when these recommendations are revised, but no revision schedule has been set.

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	
X	Ballot summary form(s) (1 per ballot cycle)	See myBallot
X	Copies of unresolved negatives & rebuttals	http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_027.pdf
X	PAR and PAR approval letter	http://standards.ieee.org/board/nes/projects/802-16g.pdf
N/A	Coordination comments and responses	
X	.pdf of final balloted draft #D9	http://ieee802.org/16/pubs/80216g.html
N/A	Permissions & copyright releases	

PROJECT NUMBER: _____ **DATE:** _____

This draft standard has been developed in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Sponsor and I am authorized by those policies and procedures to make this submittal.	
Signature of Submitter	**Title (role in Sponsor)**

==========

FOR STANDARDS DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

	IEEE-SA Standards Board Chair	
Signature of IEEE-SA Officer	**Title**	**Date**

Return to:

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