Comments received on proposed 802.16j PAR

Roger Marks (2006-03-02)

Proposed Editorial Update to 802.16j PAR Proposal (Roger B. Marks; 2006-03-02)
   IEEE C802.16mmr-06/016
Proposed Changes to Draft 802.16j PAR (Roger B. Marks; 2006-03-02)
   IEEE C802.16mmr-06/017

Matthew Sherman (2006-03-07)

Please accept the attached contribution as comments on the MMR PAR.
   IEEE C802.16mmr-06/019

802.19 TAG (2006-03-07)

In reviewing the 802.16j PAR in the TAG meeting we identified several concerns regarding the 802.16j PAR.

1.   In Item 6 of the PAR selects both "New Document" and "Amendment to and Existing Document." I don't think it can be both.

2.   In Item 12h of the PAR selects both "Yes" and "No" while I don't think this is an extension to a previous PAR.

Patrick Kinney (2006-03-07)

I have the following issues:

12h: both the yes and no boxes are checked, is it yes or no?

17 it is indicated that there is another document or project with a similar scope which requires an explanation. No explanation is provided.

Finally it has been shown that the 802.16 signal is extremely vulnerable to any interference such as UWB or even thermal noise. I do not believe that we should encourage deployment of this standard until this deficiency is repaired.

Darwin Engwer (2006-03-07)

Clause 17 of the 802.16j PAR acknowledges that there are other documents/ projects with a similar scope, but does not provide the required details.

Recognizing that 802.16j does NOT intend to create a full mesh topology there are still aspects of 802.16j that are "mesh-like" and hence warrant collaboration with 802.11s and 802.15.5.
These aspects include but are not limited to relay station discovery, path selection and relayed access control/ authentication.

If 802.16j intends to limit itself to a single hop perhaps 802.16 should consider changing the task group name from "Mobile Multihop Relay" (MMR) to something more appropriate, and also change the text in the actual PAR to reflect the single hop nature of the ammendment.