

IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access

<http://WirelessMAN.org>



Roger B. Marks
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group
r.b.marks@ieee.org
21 February 2009

To: RevCom
Re: P802.16j Submittal

I have submitted an application for the approval of draft P802.16j/D9 under the P802.16j amendment PAR. The review is on the agenda for the RevCom meeting of 18 March 2009.

When the application was filed on 6 February, the third recirculation was still open. Following its closure on 20 February, I would like to provide updated results. During the recirculation, one of the Disapprove voters switched to Approve. We received no new Disapprove votes or Disapprove comments. The result is 160 Disapprove, 2 Disapprove, and 12 Abstain. We did receive editorial comments from one Approve voter; these will be forwarded to the editorial staff for consideration.

Each of the two remaining Disapprove voters submitted a single comment during the course of the ballot. One of these came during the initial ballot, was marked "Principle," and was included in the first recirculation. The other came in the second recirculation, was marked "Out of Scope," and was reviewed in the third recirculation. The two comments and responses were provided as a link on the original RevCom application. That link remains current. In addition, I have attached to this letter the text of followup correspondence with the submitter of the latter (Out of Scope) comment.

I would also like to bring to your attention the matter of the relationship of this document to the P802.16Rev2/D9 draft, which is itself the basis of a submittal (under the P802.16 revision PAR) to the 18 March RevCom meeting. The P802.16j draft is being submitted as an amendment to the 802.16 revision as it will exist following the approval of P802.16Rev2/D9. In conjunction with this issue, I would like to note the following points:

- P802.16Rev2/D9, per the P802.16 revision PAR, is based on a consolidation of IEEE Std 802.16-2004 along with the amendments 802.16e, 802.16f, and 802.16g. Per the 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." Consequently, P802.16j has been developed as an amendment to the new P802.16 revision.
- During each Sponsor Ballot recirculation, the voters have been notified of the situation and provided the most current P802.16Rev2 draft. For example, in the second recirculation, the cover letter stated the following: "As an additional reference, we are providing the draft P802.16Rev2/D8. This document, not an approved IEEE standard but currently in separate Sponsor Ballot, is intended as the baseline for 802.16j to amend."
- During the last Sponsor Ballot recirculation, the voters were provided with P802.16Rev2/D9 (which has since been submitted to RevCom). The P802.16j Ballot Group was explicitly notified, both in the cover letter and in

the ballot announcement, of the 802.16 Working Group's expectation that P802.16Rev2/D9 would be the final draft of P802.16Rev2. In particular, the cover letter and the ballot announcement stated the following:

A revision of the base 802.16 standard is progressing in parallel with this amendment project. P802.16j/D9 is based on and will amend this new revision. Although the current draft of the base standard (P802.16Rev2/D9, included in the ballot package) is not yet approved, it is currently in what the 802.16 Working Group expects will be its final Sponsor Ballot recirculation. Provided that the P802.16Rev2/D9 recirculation concludes successfully, P802.16Rev2/D9 will be on the RevCom 18 March 2009 agenda and could be approved the following day by the IEEE-SA Standards Board as the latest revision of IEEE Std 802.16. The Working Group has worked diligently to ensure that the content of P802.16j/D9 is fully aligned with the content of P802.16Rev2/D9.

- We are aware that the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, Subclause 8.1.2, states that "Sponsor ballots of amendments and corrigenda shall also include access to the approved base standard and any approved amendments and corrigenda in order to provide sufficient information to the ballot group." We are confident that we have met the spirit of this requirement. Furthermore, if our P802.16Rev2/D9 submittal application is approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board, then we will be able to state affirmatively (although retroactively) that the ballot group was afforded access to the approved base standard, so that we will have met the letter as well as the spirit of the rules.

We therefore request RevCom's recommendation that P802.16j/D9 be approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board on 19 March. Under the circumstances, it would be appropriate for P802.16j/D9 approval be specifically contingent on the approval of P802.16Rev2/D9.

Sincerely,

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

Attachments:

P802.16 RevCom Application, dated 2009-02-06
Correspondence with submitter of comment ruled "Out of Scope" and recirculated

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

1. PROJECT NUMBER: P802.16j

2. DATE: 2009-02-06 (updt'd 2009-02-24)

3. TITLE: Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 16: Air Interface for Fixed and Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Systems - Amendment: Multihop Relay Specification

4. SPONSOR (Full name of society/committee): IEEE Computer Society/Local & Metropolitan Networks Committee +

5. BALLOTING COMMITTEE: C/LM/WG802.16 and MTT/SCC

6. NAME OF WORKING GROUP: IEEE 802.16 Working Group

7. NAME AND ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER

Roger B. Marks
WiMAX Forum
4040 Montview Blvd
Denver, CO 80207
United States

Telephone: +1 619 393 1913

Fax:

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

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

New

Revision

Reaffirmation

Stabilization

Withdrawal

Standard

Recommended Practice

Guide

Amendment/Corrigenda to an existing

standard (Indicate number and year) P802.16

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.

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-------|
| Academic | 13 | General Interest | 53 | Gov't/Military | 5 | Producer/User | 94/36 |
| Interest Category | No. | Interest Category | No. | Interest Category | No. | Interest Category | No. |

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBLE BALLOTS

| | INITIAL BALLOT | | RECIRCULATION BALLOT (if applicable) | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | Draft 6a Number | Date Closed: 10 Sept. 2008 Percentage | Draft 9 Number | Date Closed: 20 Feb. 2009 Percentage |
| Eligible Balloters | 201 | 100% | 201 | 100% |
| Ballots Returned | 155 | 77 | 174 | 86 |
| Affirmatives | 130 | 90 | 160 | 98 |
| Negatives with Comments | 14 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
| Negatives without Comments | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Abstentions | 11 | 7 | 12 | 6 |
| Reasons for abstentions: | Lack of time = 8 Lack of expertise = 3 Conflict of Interest = Other = 1 | | | |

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? 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)

A. If any of the following statements apply, please check the box accordingly:

- It is intended to submit this document to ISO or ISO/IEC JTC1 via their Fast-Track method.
 It is intended to submit this document to IEC for adoption as an IEC/IEEE Dual Logo document.
 This document is a revision to a document previously adopted by either ISO, IEC or ISO/IEC JTC1.
 This document was jointly developed with another organization.
 This document will form the basis of, or be included in, another organization's standard.

B. For the boxes checked above, please indicate the organization, technical committee name/number and contact information.

Organization: ISO IEC ISO/IEC JTC1 ITU Other

Name of the organization, if Other:

Technical Committee/Subcommittee Number:

Technical Committee/Subcommittee Name:

Contact Information for the Person Responsible for Coordinating this Project:

Name: José Costa
 Phone Number: 1-613-763-7574
 Email Address: costa@nortel.com

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) | |
| X | Copies of unresolved negatives & rebuttals | http://iee802.org/16/docs/09/80216-09_0006.pdf |
| X | PAR and PAR approval letter | |
| N/A | Coordination comments and responses | |
| X | .pdf of final balloted draft #D9 | |
| N/A | Permissions & copyright releases | |

PROJECT NUMBER: P802.16j

DATE: 2009-02-06

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

From: Dan Lubar
Subject: Re: P802.16j/D8 Sponsor Ballot recirc comment
Date: 9 February 2009 10:46:32 AM MST
To: "Roger B. Marks"
Cc: Jonathan Labs, Mitsuo Nohara

Roger.. I wanted to thank you and your SB colleagues for this response to my SB submission--despite the SB not really being the place for this.

I also wanted to say that, besides, appreciating the SB group taking the time to acknowledge my comment, that you also for forwarding the comment on to the working group where it belongs.

Respectfully,

Dan Lubar
RelayServices
303-847-4114 desk
303-817-2222 mobile

From: "Roger B. Marks" <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Subject: P802.16j/D8 Sponsor Ballot recirc comment
Date: 8 February 2009 5:51:30 PM MST
To: Dan Lubar
Cc: Jonathan Labs, Mitsuo Nohara

Dan,

In the P802.16j/D8 Sponsor Ballot recirc, you wrote:

In Rev2 D8, despite the the fact that the Bibliography presented in Annex A is informative, I would urge that amendment j's TG work to update the references for the sake of quality/accuracy. A specific example is the reference to the 802.11 Standard [B28] which still points at the 1997 baseline. FYI the current 802.11 baseline is really a 2008 document.
I would guess that some of the IETF & ITU documents are also in need of a refresh too.

The 802.16 Working Group has responded:

Response: This comment is out of scope of the ballot. The P802.16j Sponsor Ballot Group is not authorized to develop amendments to the underlying base standard.

Remedy: Since the base standard is currently under revision and in ballot, the comment has been forwarded to the Ballot Resolution Committee for that revision project. According to our understanding, that Committee has agreed to address the comment and will communicate its response to the voter. The P802.16j Sponsor Ballot Group will be provided with the base document and can therefore confirm any resultant changes.

Therefore, I'd like to inform you that your comment was forwarded to the P802.16Rev2 Sponsor Ballot resolution committee. The WG response was "Agree".

Regards,

Roger

Roger B. Marks <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Broadband Wireless Access <<http://WirelessMAN.org>>