Title: **IEEE P802.16h/D12 Sponsor Ballot: Unresolved Disapprove Comments**

Document Number: C802.16-09/0025
Date Submitted: Nov. 19, 2009

Source:
   Chair of LE TG: Mariana Goldhamer   Voice:+972 3 645 6241   mariana.goldhamer@alvarion.com
   ALVARION
   21a HaBarzel Street, Tel Aviv, Israel

   Vice-Chair of LE TG: Harry Bims   Voice: 1 650 283 4174   harry.bims@me.com
   Bims Laboratories

Venue:
   Session #64, 16-19 November, 2009

Base Document:

Purpose:

Notice

Release:

Patent Policy:

Outstanding negative comments

	Circ.	Recirc.1	Recirc.2	Recirc.3	Recirc.4	Recirc.5 (D12)
Chindapol, Aik	0	0	4	0	0	0
Labs, Jonathan	(2)**	0	0	0	0	0
Murias, Ronald G	0	0	0	0	1	1
Myles, Andrew			Approve	0*	0	0
Piggin, Paul	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wang, Lei	0	1 + (1)**	0	0	0	2

- Confirmations of satisfied comments by e-mail:
  - Ron Murias has indicated his 4 remaining negative comments (E9, D4, D10, and C52) from a total of 42 negative comments; it was determined that the comments C52 and D4 were not submitted by Ron.
  - Andrew Miles has indicated satisfaction with his only negative comment (in Recirc. 3, marked with *)
- No e-mail contact was possible with Aik Chindapol – e-mail at NSN bounced
- Comments marked ** - see next slides

Comments 842 and 845 by Jonathan Labs

- – Refer to amending 802.16-Rev 2, now approved as 802.16-2009
- – The comments are ACCEPTED and FULLY IMPLEMENTED in 802.16h/D10 (first draft after 802.16-2009 was approved)

Comment A8 by Lei Wang

- The comment was addressed in two sessions
- In the first session was rejected, but in the 2nd session was ACCEPTED and FULLY IMPLEMENTED (section 15.3.5 was deleted)
  - Unfortunately the reason field was not cleared (by mistake) after acceptance

| Comment by: | Ronald G   Murias | Membership Status: | Member | Date: | 4-Nov-2009 |

| Comment # | E9 | Document under Review: | P802.16h/D12 | Ballot ID: | sb_16hR5 |

Comment   **Type** Technical   **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐   **Page** 96   **Line** 53   **Fig/Table#**   **Subclause** 15.3.5.2

I remain dissatisfied with the resolution to Comment C52 and Comment D10. I argued that the use of the "radio signature" is clearly a PHY mechanism and is out of scope of the amendment.

The changes adopted in C802.16h-09/0020 do little more than re-name the mechanism from "Radio Signature" to "Interference Evaluation Burst", but requirements remain, such as "A receiver shall listen to the media during the Interference Evaluation Burst slot and determine which interferers are the strongest." How does the receiver do this? What new mechanism (within the scope of the PAR) can be used to do this?

Regarding the scheduling of the interference evaluation burst, all transmitters shall transmit a "predefined signal". What predefined signal are they to transmit, and how is this within the scope of MAC enhancements?

Suggested Remedy

Remove all material related to the "Interference Evaluation Burst"

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group:**   **Principle**

Instruction to the Editor: Implement changes in the contribution C802.16h-09/0021r2

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This comment is a reiteration of the comments C52 and D10, as the author indicates.

We disagree that there is any PHY changes and we believe that the mechanism described 15.3.5.2. provides sufficient means to determine the strongest interferers. It is trivial for the receiver to measure the signal strength from these transmissions during interference-free slots. We provided a better explanatory text of the mechanism with the scope to better clarify its operation.

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Comment by:	Lei Wang	Membership Status: Member	Date: 5-Nov-2009

Comment # E11	Document under Review: P802.16h/D12	Ballot ID: sb_16hR5

Comment   Type Technical   Part of Dis ☒ Satisfied ☐   Page 87   Line 27   Fig/Table#   Subclause 15.3.4.1.1

Comment 577 in Sponsor Ballot database 802.16-08/047 provides important direction on PAR scope issues within the amendment. There are a number of mechanisms in IEEE P802.16h/D12 that violate the PAR's scope. The feature defined in subclause 15.3.4.1.1 entitled 'DL timing adjustment for Coexistence Signalling' introduces enhancements to physical layer specification. MAC layer specification is permitted in the PAR scope while physical layer changes are not. Subclause 15.3.4.1.1 introduces an On-Off Keying signaling scheme. This fact is noted on page 87, line 42 of IEEE P802.16h/D12. This is a new PHY concept with a new modulation scheme added to the standard and is therefore out of scope. Furthermore there is no specification of nature of the signals in the On-Off Keying scheme. It is not possible to implement this feature based on the specification provided; making inter-operability impossible.

Suggested Remedy

PHY features introduced in IEEE P802.16h/D12 are out of scope of the PAR and should be removed from the draft specification. Therefore remove subclause 15.3.4.1.1 and align the remaining specification accordingly.

GroupResolution   Decision of Group: **Disagree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This comment is a reiteration of comment A7 in Recirc. 1 and comment D7 in Recirc. 4.
CSI is driven by MAC level scheduling and is not a PHY mechanism. In addition, we note that in the 802.16 Standard, the MAC layer adjusts the timing of transmissions, whether in the downlink or in the uplink. The new feature in 15.3.4 is based on the MAC usage of the current PHY scheme in the existing standard.

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

| Comment by: | Lei Wang | Membership Status: | Member | Date: 5-Nov-2009 |

| Comment # E12 | Document under Review: P802.16h/D12 | Ballot ID: sb_16hR5 |

Comment Type Technical   Part of Dis ☒ Satisfied ☐   Page 99   Line 44   Fig/Table#   Subclause 15.4

Resolution of Comment 577 in Sponsor Ballot database 802.16-08/047r4 modified section 15.4 (of IEEE P802.16h/D7a) together with other sections by means of contribution IEEE C8021.16h-08/042. Furthermore resolution to Comment 696 consolidated section 6.4.1.3.4 (of IEEE P802.16h/D7a) by means of contribution IEEE C8021.16h-08/043. The motivation for these comments and subsequent resolutions was centered on PAR scope issues related to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. The 802.16h amendment still contains features and references pertaining to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. Comment 577 has therefore not been completely addressed. Using the argument that there is an implicit assumption that the amendment needs to coexist with other systems is not valid; in this case the amendment is clearly targeting inappropriate band. The amendment IEEE P802.16h/D12 contains 9 references to 'bursty systems'. 'Bursty systems' within the sense of the amendment are defined and exemplified by the term Wireless LANs. Furthermore there is 1 references '802.11'. Coexistence with these or other systems is out of scope and therefore any specification should be removed. Specification of coexistence with 'bursty systems' is focused in section 15.4.1 and its sub sections specifically 15.4.1.4.1, and uses the feature name of 'CX-CBP'. Section 15.4.1.4 makes specific mention of coexistence with systems other than 802.16 systems.

Suggested Remedy

Delete section 15.4.1 and its subsections to remove specification of coexistence with 'bursty systems'. Remove other coexistence features related to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. Remove all references to 'bursty systems' throughout the draft and align the remaining specification accordingly. Remove all references to explicit coexistence with '802.11' systems throughout the draft and align the remaining specification accordingly. In light of these far reaching and extensive changes the document may have to be sent back to the Working Group for redrafting.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group: Disagree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

This comment is a reiteration of comment A9 in Recirc. 1.
The 802.16h PAR Scope includes "facilitate the coexistence of such systems with primary users", where "such systems" refer to 802.16-based systems and primary users belong to systems which are based on non-802.16 technologies. Such primary users are the Radio LANs, also called "Wireless LANs". Radio LANs were identified by ITU-R Resolution 229 (WRC-03) as part of the PRIMARY WAS (Wireless Access Systems) in 5GHz.
The text in the Resolution 229 says:
"The World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2003), considering
a)   that this Conference has allocated the bands 5 150-5 350 MHz and 5 470-5 725 MHz on a PRIMARY basis to the mobile service for the implementation of wireless access systems (WAS), including radio local area networks (RLANs);"
With no doubt the coexistence with wireless LANs and 802.11, having a "primary" status in 5GHz, is in the scope of the 802.16h PAR.
The standard defines coexistence mechanisms, but there is no linkage between a specific mechanism and a frequency band. The IEEE

802.16-2009 standard also defines generic PHY/MAC protocols, not linked to a specigfic frequency band.

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

| Comment by: | Murias Ronald G | Membership Status: | Member | Date: | 9/20/2009 |

| Comment # | D10 | Document under Review: | P802.16h/D11 | Ballot ID: | sb_16h4 |

| Comment | Type Technical | Part of Dis ☒ Satisfied ☐ | Page | Line | Fig/Table# | Subclause 15.3.5.2 |

I am dissatisfied with the resolution of comment c52 in 802.16-09/0046r3. The use of the "radio signature" is clearly a PHY mechanism and is out of scope of the amendment.
- "radio signature" measurement done in the "master subframe"
- measurement includes "relative spectral density", which is a PHY level measurement not currently mandated
- "radio signatures" may be RSBSn (BS) or RSSSn (SS)
- 15.3.5.2 P75L64: "send data in a way to represent power density characteristics of cumulative radio signatures"?

Suggested Remedy

Remove 15.3.5.2 and all other material referring to "Radio Signature".

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group: Disagree**

Instructions to Editor:
1. Delete 3.166
2. Implement the text changes in C802.16h-09/0020.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The previously named "Radio signature" mechanism (according to the contribution C802.16-09/0020 will be called "Interference Evaluation Burst") is actually a scheduling mechanisms allowing the evaluation of the interference created by a certain radio transmitter belonging to another system. The text in C802.16-09/0020 was improved, removing the un-used "relative spectral density". Multiple regular data transmissions may be scheduled in the same time, allowing the receiver to evaluate the aggregate interference.
There is no PHY change in this mechanism.

Group's Notes

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

<u>Comment by:</u>	Aik Chindapol	<u>Membership Status:</u> Member	<u>Date:</u> 25-Apr-2009

<u>Comment #</u> **B52**	<u>Document under Review:</u> **P802.16h/D9**	<u>Ballot ID:</u> **sb_16hR2**

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Type</u> Technical	<u>Part of Dis</u> ☒ <u>Satisfied</u> ☐	<u>Page</u> 72	<u>Line</u> 15	<u>Fig/Table#</u>	<u>Subclause</u> 11.3

[The page/sub-clause number refers to the D9-D8 markup version P80216h_D9delta.pdf]
I do not agree with this change (adding the use of IP address for inter-network coordination) as implemented in D9.
The use of the BS's IP address to coordinate interference cannot be implemented in its current form. It is not clear what this address should be (i.e., proxy). Besides Figure 402 (page 120), there is no normative text anywhere describing how to specify the IP address or how the mechanism actually works In addition, the IP address may be local (unlike BSID which is globally unique) and the mechanism then will not work with another system that belongs to another local IP address.

<u>Suggested Remedy</u>

Delete entries related to the use of IP address for interference coordination in Table 612b (BS_NURBC TLV), sub-clause 11.1.13 and modify Fig 402 to remove IP address.

<u>GroupResolution</u>   **<u>Decision of Group:</u>   Principle**

Replace "BS IP Address" with "Network address of Source BS".   Replace "IPv4" with "for example "IPv4". Replace "IPv6" with "for example IPv6"

<u>Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution</u>

The change is editorial only, no new text was added: the tables which were previously on page 121 of the same document and were moved to page 72

<u>Group's Notes</u>

<u>Editor's Notes</u>   **<u>Editor's Actions</u>**   a) done

in 11.30
Bits 95:64 - Network address of Source BS(e.g.IPv4)
Bits 191:64 - Network address of Source BS(e.g.IPv6)

| Comment by: | Aik Chindapol | | Membership Status: | Member | | Date: | 24-Apr-2009 |

| Comment # | **B48** | | | Document under Review: | **P802.16h/D9** | | Ballot ID: | **sb_16hR2** |

| Comment | **Type** Technical | **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐ | **Page** 33 | **Line** 13 | **Fig/Table#** | **Subclause** 6.4.1.2 |

[The page/sub-clause number refers to the D9-D8 markup version P80216h_D9delta.pdf]
I do not agree with this change (deletion of downlink-listen-before-talk) as implemented in D9. When co-existing with non-SSU, non-802.16 systems, the downlink-listen-before-talk mechanism needs to be in place in order to avoid collisions.

Suggested Remedy

Re-instate the last sentence (line 13-15) and sub-clause 6.4.1.4.5.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group:** **Disagree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The "listen before Talk" functionallity, pointed by the deleted text, exists in 15.4.1.4, part of the Coordinated coexistence. Clause 6.4.1.4.5 was deleted because the WirelessMAN-UCP provides un-coordinated coexistence mechanisms, limited to coexistence between 802.16-systems only. This clause actually had a reference to the CX-CPB protocol, which supports the coexistence with non-SSU, and which belongs to the Coordinated Coexistence in 15.4.1.4.
The lines 13-15 were deleted as result of the of the deletion of sub-clause 6.4.1.4.5.
The clause indicated by the deleted lines still exists.

Group's Notes

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

Comment by:	Aik Chindapol		**Membership Status:**	Member	**Date:** 24-Apr-2009

Comment # **B47**   **Document under Review:** **P802.16h/D9**   **Ballot ID:** **sb_16hR2**

Comment   **Type** Technical   **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐   **Page** 31   **Line** 48   **Fig/Table#**   **Subclause** 6.3.7.5.3

[The page/sub-clause number refers to the D9-D8 markup version P80216h_D9delta.pdf]
I do not agree with this change (changing the definition of the MAP relevance for the allocation start time) as implemented in D9. There should not be any ambiguity regarding the MAP relevance. The text in D9 changes the term "shall" to "should" and implies that the MAP relevance for the allocation start time is no longer normative. It causes confusion to the terminals and may cause the terminals to miss the MAP messages.

Suggested Remedy

Change the term "should" back to "shall"

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group:** **Disagree**

See the resolution and its reason for comment B58. Instruction to Editor: Add on page 23 after Allocation End time <8*Tf" the following sentence: "The MAP relevance supported by a SS/MS is indicated in SBC-REQ/RSP messages".

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

1. The use of word "should" implies a recommendation;
2. There is no confusion, as one of the bits in the SBC-REQ/RSP (see 11.8) idicate which MAP relevance is supported by a device;
3. The text at 6.3.2.3.23 and 6.3.2.3.24 indicate the proper TLVs to be used; 4. Changing to "shall" will make 802.16h incompatible with the existing devices.

Group's Notes

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

<u>Comment by:</u>	Aik Chindapol	<u>Membership Status:</u> Member	<u>Date:</u> 24-Apr-2009

<u>Comment #</u> **B46**   <u>Document under Review:</u> **P802.16h/D9**   <u>Ballot ID:</u> **sb_16hR2**

<u>Comment</u>   <u>Type</u> Technical   <u>Part of Dis</u> ☒ Satisfied ☐   <u>Page</u> 20   <u>Line</u> 25   <u>Fig/Table#</u>   <u>Subclause</u> 6.3.2.3.64

[The page/sub-clause number refers to the D9-D8 markup version P80216h_D9delta.pdf]
I could not find any comment in the previous resolution of Sponsor Ballot's recirculation
http://ieee802.org/16/docs/08/80216-08_065r5.pdf that suggests addition of this new sub-clause on coexistence Forward Acknowledge
Message. It looks like this is out of scope of the recirculation.
Technically, the use of CX-FWG-ACK is redundant and causes additional delay. The exchange sequence of CX-FWD-REQ and
CX-FWD-RSP is consistent with many other management messages involving REQ and RSP messages. In addition, management
messages are typically transmitted with a robust MCS and the ACK message does not add additional value in this case.

Suggested Remedy

Delete sub-clause 6.3.2.3.64 and relevant statements referring to this sub-clause.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group: Principle**

Agree that applying this messages to all the responses will introduce not necessary delay. Instruction to Editor: insert at page 17, line
25, the following text: "This message will be transmitted after receiving one of the CX-FWD-RSP messages with the Action Code as
described at 15.5.3.4, 15.5.3.6, 15.5.3.9, 15.5.3.17, 15.5.3.19, 15.5.3.21, 15.5.3.23, 15.5.3.25, 15.5.3.27, 15.5.3.29, 15.5.3.31."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

1. The comment was introduced and accepted in the WG data-base IEEE 802.16-09/0012, as response to the additional comments
from the WG;
2. Technically the message is necessary because some of the Action Codes of the CX-FWD-RSP may indicate a choice or a different
behaviour from the requested one. This is the case of the Action Codes described in 15.5.3.4, 15.5.3.6, 15.5.3.9, 15.5.3.17, 15.5.3.19,
15.5.3.21, 15.5.3.23, 15.5.3.25, 15.5.3.27, 15.5.3.29, 15.5.3.31.
3. The resolution addresses the technical need but in a different way, therefore was marked as "principle".

Group's Notes

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

| Comment by: | Paul Piggin | Membership Status: | Member | Date: | 24-Dec-2008 |

| Comment # A9 | Document under Review: P802.16Rev2/D8 | Ballot ID: sb_16hR1 |

| Comment | Type Technical | Part of Dis ☒ Satisfied ☐ | Page 101 | Line 49 | Fig/Table# | Subclause 15.4 |

Resolution of Comment 577 in Sponsor Ballot database 802.16-08/047r4 modified section 15.4 together with other sections by means of contribution IEEE C8021.16h-08/042. Furthermore resolution to Comment 696 consolidated section 6.4.1.3.4 by means of contribution IEEE C8021.16h-08/043. The motivation for these comments and subsequent resolutions was centered on PAR scope issues related to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. The 802.16h amendment still contains features and references pertaining to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. Comment 577 has therefore not been completely addressed. Using the argument that there is an implicit assumption that the amendment needs to coexist with other systems is not valid; in this case the amendment is clearly targeting inappropriate band. The amendment IEEE P802.16h/D8 contains 39 references to 'bursty systems'. 'Bursty systems' within the sense of the amendment are defined and exemplified by the term Wireless LANs. Furthermore there are 4 references to '802.11'. Coexistence with these or other systems is out of scope and therefore any specification should be removed. Specification of coexistence with 'bursty systems' is focused in section 15.4.1 and its sub sections specifically 15.4.1.4.1, and uses the feature name of 'CX-CBP'. Section 15.4.1.4 makes specific mention of coexistence with systems other than 802.16 systems.

Suggested Remedy

Delete section 15.4.1 and its subsections to remove specification of coexistence with 'bursty systems'. Remove other coexistence features related to coexistence with systems other than 802.16. Remove all references to 'bursty systems' throughout the draft and align the remaining specification accordingly. Remove all references to explicit coexistence with '802.11' systems throughout the draft and align the remaining specification accordingly. In light of these far reaching and extensive changes the document may have to be sent back to the Working Group for redrafting.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group: Disagree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

1. The group disagrees that the coexistence with systems, like 802.11, is out of the PAR scope. We bring as argument the ITU-R allocations in the document RR-2008 Vol.1, where the systems providing MOBILE services are included in primary services in 2.4GHz and 5GHz. The coexistence with these systems is within the PAR scope "to facilitate the coexistence of such systems with primary users.".

2. The group disagrees with the proposed solution to comment A9, which targets to delete the clause 15.4.1, including the basic 802.16h coexistence approach between 802.16-based systems, based on the Coexistence Frame. On this approach resides the Coexistence between 802.16 based-systems, Coexistence Control Channel, Master Frame optimization, Token protocol, Message relaying, etc.

3. The group agrees that the word "bursty" should not be extensively used, and in many comments addressing the same issue we have deleted many appearences of this word.

Comment by: Lei Wang   **Membership Status:**   Member   **Date:** 24-Dec-2008

Comment # A8   **Document under Review:** **P802.16Rev2/D8**   **Ballot ID:** **sb_16hR1**

Comment   **Type** Technical   **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐   **Page** 94   **Line** 58   **Fig/Table#**   **Subclause** 15.3.5

Comment 577 in Sponsor Ballot database 802.16-08/047 provides important direction on PAR scope issues within IEEE P802.16h/D8. There are a number of mechanisms in IEEE P802.16h/D8 that violate the PAR's scope. The feature defined in subclause 15.3.5 entitled Mechanisms based on energy keying in the frequency domain introduces enhancements to physical layer specification. MAC layer specification is permitted in the PAR scope while physical layer changes are not. Subclause 15.3.5 introduces an On-Off Keying signaling scheme. This is a new PHY concept with a new modulation scheme added to the standard and is therefore out of scope. Furthermore there is no specification of nature of the signals in the On-Off Keying scheme. It is not possible to implement this feature based on the specification provided; making inter-operability impossible.

Suggested Remedy

PHY features introduced in IEEE P802.16h/D8 are out of scope of the PAR and should be removed from the draft specification. Therefore remove subclause 15.3.5 and align the remaining specification accordingly.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group:**   **Agree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

The principle of this comment is accepted but not the suggested remedy.
Elements of the solution are covered by resolution of comment A137.

Group's Notes

Editor's Notes   **Editor's Actions**

Comment by:	Lei Wang	**Membership Status:** Member	**Date:** 24-Dec-2008

Comment # A7	**Document under Review:** P802.16Rev2/D8	**Ballot ID:** sb_16hR1

Comment   **Type** Technical   **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐   **Page** 84   **Line** 28   **Fig/Table#**   **Subclause** 15.3.4.1.1

Comment 577 in Sponsor Ballot database 802.16-08/047 provides important direction on PAR scope issues within IEEE P802.16h/D8. There are a number of mechanisms in IEEE P802.16h/D8 that violate the PAR's scope. The feature defined in subclause 15.3.4.1.1 entitled Energy keying in time domain introduces enhancements to physical layer specification. MAC layer specification is permitted in the PAR scope while physical layer changes are not. Subclause 15.3.4.1.1 introduces an On-Off Keying signaling scheme. This fact is admitted to page 84, line 48 of IEEE P802.16h/D8. This is a new PHY concept with a new modulation scheme added to the standard and is therefore out of scope. Furthermore there is no specification of nature of the signals in the On-Off Keying scheme. It is not possible to implement this feature based on the specification provided; making inter-operability impossible.

Suggested Remedy

PHY features introduced in IEEE P802.16h/D8 are out of scope of the PAR and should be removed from the draft specification. Therefore remove subclause 15.3.4.1.1 and align the remaining specification accordingly.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group:** **Disagree**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

-The signaling in 15.3.4.1.1 is not defining a new PHY, because it is using for transmission elements and formats already existing in 802.16 PHY specifications.
-subclause 15.3.4 addresses a problem that different 802.16 systems have different PHY profiles. In order to enable coexistence between such systems, all systems must share a common coexistence signaling mechanism. This is a policy in the standard. The CSI is an example of such a common coexistence signaling mechanism.

Group's Notes

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

Comment by:	Labs, Jonathan	Membership Status:	Date: 5-Sep-2008

Comment # 845   **Document under Review: P802.16h/D7a**   **Ballot ID: 802.16h**

Comment   **Type** General   **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐   **Page** 48   **Line** 43   **Fig/Table#**   **Subclause** 8.4.4.2

Table 277a exists in 802.16e-2005 but newly assigned codes are used in Rev2. And there are not enough reserved codes left to support both Rev2 and 802.16h changes.

Suggested Remedy

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group: Principle**

See resolution to comment 663

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

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

change to Extended-3 DIUC (table 326)

Comment by:	Labs, Jonathan	Membership Status:	Date: 5-Sep-2008

Comment # 842   **Document under Review: P802.16h/D7a**   **Ballot ID: 802.16h**

Comment   **Type** Editorial   **Part of Dis** ☒ **Satisfied** ☐   **Page** 1   **Line** 37   **Fig/Table#**   **Subclause** 6.3.2.3

Changes need to be against P802.16/Rev2 not 802.16-2004 or 802.16e-2005.

Suggested Remedy
Update all change language to amend P802.16/Rev2.

GroupResolution   **Decision of Group: Agree**

See resolution to comment 814.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

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

C80216h-04/044r1