

# P802.16.1b to RevCom: Report for Conditional Approval

20 July 2012

# Rules: OM (2012-06-04) Clause 13

motions requesting conditional approval to forward when the prior ballot has closed shall be accompanied by:

- Date the ballot closed
- Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes
- Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and Working Group responses.
- Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.

# Date the ballot closed

⌘

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Open</b>	<b>Close</b>
WG Sponsor Ballot	07 February	08 March
EC Conditional Approval	16 March	
WG Sponsor Ballot Recirc #1	05 April	03 May
WG Sponsor Ballot Recirc #2	04 June	19 June

# Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes

114 Approve (98%)

- 2 Disapprove with comment
- 2 Abstain
- Return ratio requirement met: 89%

# Comment resolution

:"

	Disapprove Comments	Disapprove Comments in ballot round not yet satisfied	Disapprove Voters with comment in ballot round	Disapprove Voters with comment (total)
SB	8	1	1	1
SB recirc #1	20	20	2	2
SB recirc #2	8	8	1	2

# Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and Working Group responses

- See Following:

24

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
i-1	Murias, Ronald	Disapprove	Technical	69	6.3.8.4.4	50	Rejected
<b>Comment</b>							
In the baseline document, 6.3.8.4.4, "If AMS does not receive a response, it may increase its power level by PIR, Step and may send a new initial ranging code, where PIR, Step is the step size to ramp up, which is 2 dB. AMS could further increase the power until maximum transmit power is reached. "The large number of devices involved dramatically increase the likelihood of collision and therefore unnecessary power increase on re-transmission. The SS/MS/AMS needs to know whether the failure was due to lack of power or to collisions so that it only increases transmit power on retries when absolutely necessary.							
<b>Proposed Change</b>							
Include a broadcast message from the BS indicating that a collision has occurred. This will allow MSs to perform backoff without adjusting transmit power.							
<b>Disposition Detail</b>							
Reason: No complete remedy is provided.							

:"

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line
r01-1	Murias, Ronald	Disapprove	Technical	69	6.3.8.4.4	50

**Comment**

**Disposition Status**

I am dissatisfied with the resolution to comment i-1. The comment was rejected for lack of proposed remedy. A proposed remedy is included with this comment. In the baseline document, 6.3.8.4.4, "If AMS does not receive a response, it may increase its power level by PIR, Step and may send a new initial ranging code, where PIR, Step is the step size to ramp up, which is 2 dB. AMS could further increase the power until maximum transmit power is reached. "The large number of devices involved dramatically increase the likelihood of collision and therefore unnecessary power increase on re-transmission. The SS/MS/AMS needs to know whether the failure was due to lack of power or to collisions so that it only increases transmit power on retries when absolutely necessary.

Rejected

**Proposed Change**

Include a broadcast message from the BS indicating that it has detected energy but was unable to decode a message. This will allow MSs to perform backoff without adjusting transmit power.

Proposed text: If the SS does not receive a ranging response from the BS and it detects a broadcast message from the BS indicating that a collision has occurred on the same ranging opportunity as the SS last used, it may assume that its ranging code has collided with ranging codes from one or more other SSs. In this case, the SS randomly selects a new code and ranging opportunity and it may decide not to increase transmit power. If the SS does not receive a RNG-RSP from the BS and it does not receive the broadcast RNG-NAK message, the SS may decide not to increase power if that SS has knowledge that it is a fixed location device.

Proposed message: AAI-RNG-NAK

```

+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Syntax          | Size |          Notes          |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
RNG-NAK_Message_Format() {
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Frame          | 4   | Frame that contained the detected collision(s) |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Ranging Opportunity | ?? | Ranging opportunity in the frame that
|                   |    | contained the collisions
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| }
+-----+-----+-----+-----+

```

**Disposition Detail**

- Reason: The receiver has two thresholds. One is detection threshold (above noise floor) and Second is decoding threshold (this is higher than the detection threshold).
- Case 1:- If there is collision and both the signals are received below the decoding threshold then also receiver cannot be sure of whether it was collision or was it a single signal
  - Case 2:- If there is collision and both signals are received above the decoding threshold and then the receiver applies correlation to separate the received signals and the signal levels after correlation is below the decoding threshold then the receiver can deduce that collision has occurred but cannot apply the proposed algorithm as transmission power needs to be increased
  - Case 3:- If there is collision and both signals are received above the decoding threshold and then the receiver applies correlation to separate the received signals and the signal levels after correlation is also above the decoding threshold. This is addressed by existing ranging procedure.

Which case the proposal is meant for is not clear.



21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-2	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	1	0	31	

**Comment**  
Not clear what this amendment is amending. I believe this requires updating: "NOTE-The editing instructions contained in this amendment define how to merge the material contained herein into the existing base standard IEEE Std 802.16-2009 as amended by IEEE Std 802.16j, IEEE Std 802.16h, and IEEE 802.16m"  
**Disposition Status**  
Revised

**Proposed Change**

Verify that this the correct description or update as needed.

**Disposition Detail**

Resolution: Change texts on page 1, line 31 as follows]NOTE-The editing instructions contained herein into the existing base standard <delete>IEEE Std 802.16-2009 as amended by IEEE Std 802.16j, IEEE Std 802.16h, and IEEE 802.16m</delete> <insert>IEEE Std 802.16</insert>. The editing instructions are shown in bold italic. Four editing instructions are used: change, delete, insert, and replace. Change is used to make small corrections in existing text or tables. The editing instruction specifies the location of the change and describes what is being changed by using strike through (to remove old material) and underscore (to add new material). Delete removes existing material. Insert adds new material without disturbing the existing material. Insertions may require renumbering. If so, renumbering instructions are given in the editing instruction. Replace is used to make large changes in existing text, subclauses, tables, or figures by removing existing material and replacing it with new material. Editorial notes will not be carried over into future editions because the changes will be incorporated into the base standard.<insert>Editor's note: The baseline of the draft amendment is P802.16.1/D6 (April 2012). When published, the baseline should be updated to reflect the numbering of the current approved version.</insert>

⌵

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-3	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	2	1	7	

"add" is not a valid editing instruction. According to what is on page 1 the choices are "change, delete, insert, and replace".

Revised

This occurs a lot throughout the document. PLEASE FIX ALL INCORRECT EDITING INSTRUCTIONS.

### Proposed Change

Use correct editing instructions.

### Disposition Detail

- Resolution: Remove the underscore in texts from page 2, line 10 to page 6, line 6.
- Remove the underscore in texts from page 6, line 48 to page 8, line 54.
- Replace the editing instruction on page 35, line 26 by 'Insert the following text at the end of subclause 6.2.3.47.1'
- Remove the underscore in texts from page 35, line 28 to page 40, line 17.
- Replace the editing instruction on page 37, line 37 by 'Change Table 86 as indicated'
- Replace the editing instruction on page 38, line 16 by 'Change Table 87 as indicated'
- Remove the underscore in texts from page 41, line 26 to page 47, line 58.
- Remove the underscore in texts from page 48, line 23 to page 59, line 36.
- Remove the underscore in texts from page 63, line 14 to page 63, line 16.
- Remove the underscore in texts from page 65, line 23 to page 69, line 15.

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-4	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	2	1	12	Revised
<b>Comment</b>							
If by "add" you mean "insert" which would be appropriate for a new subclause, you will note that according to what you include on Page 1 the newly inserted subclause should not be underlined. This error is repeated all over the document.							

### Proposed Change

Use correct editing instructions.

### Disposition Detail

Resolution:

Remove the underscore in texts from page 2, line 10 to page 6, line 6.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 6, line 48 to page 8, line 54.

Replace the editing instruction on page 35, line 26 by 'Insert the following text at the end of subclause 6.2.3.47.1'

Remove the underscore in texts from page 35, line 28 to page 40, line 17.

Replace the editing instruction on page 37, line 37 by 'Change Table 86 as indicated'

Replace the editing instruction on page 38, line 16 by 'Change Table 87 as indicated'

Remove the underscore in texts from page 41, line 26 to page 47, line 58.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 48, line 23 to page 59, line 36.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 63, line 14 to page 63, line 16.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 65, line 23 to page 69, line 15.

≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Disposition Status</b>
r01-5	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	3	3.151	19	Accepted
<b>Comment</b>							
Defintion is STILL wrong. Should not contain explanatory text or requirements. "One or more features may be needed to support an application." is obviously not part of the definition.							

**Proposed Change**

Delete "One or more features may be needed to support an application."

**Disposition Detail**

⌵

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-6	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	3	3.15	16	Revised
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
Definition is STILL wrong. "The M2M server runs M2M applications and provides M2M specific services for one or more M2M devices." is not part of the definition but sounds like a normative requirement.							Revised

### Proposed Change

Delete "The M2M server runs M2M applications and provides M2M specific services for one or more M2M devices." from definition and move to appropriate normative clause

### Disposition Detail

Resolution:

<delete>3.152</delete><insert>3.54</insert> Machine-to-Machine (M2M) communication: Information exchange between user devices through a Base Station, or between a device and a server in the core network through a Base Station that may be carried out without any human interaction.

<delete>3.152</delete><insert>3.55</insert> M2M ASN: An Access Service Network that supports M2M service

<delete>3.152</delete><insert>3.56</insert> M2M device: An MS that is capable of providing M2M communication

<delete>3.150 M2M server: An entity that communicates with M2M devices. The M2M server runs M2M applications and provides M2M specific services for one or more M2M devices.

</delete><delete>3.151</delete><insert>3.57</insert> M2M feature: A unique characteristic of an M2M application. One or more features may be needed to support an application.

<delete>3.152</delete><insert>3.58</insert> M2M device group: A group of M2M devices that share one or more features in common

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-7	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Editorial	4	6.2.1.2.1	17	Revised

**Comment**

As stated on Page 1, when INSERT is the instruction (rather than change), the new text is not underlined.

**Proposed Change**

Do what you said you were going to do. The new text fallong the "change" instruction is not underlined.,

**Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Remove the underscore in texts from page 2, line 10 to page 6, line 6.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 6, line 48 to page 8, line 54.

Replace the editing instruction on page 35, line 26 by 'Insert the following text at the end of subcluse 6.2.3.47.1'

Remove the underscore in texts from page 35, line 28 to page 40, line 17.

Replace the editing instruction on page 37, line 37 by 'Chage Table 86 as indicated'

Replace the editing instruction on page 38, line 16 by 'Chage Table 87 as indicated'

Remove the underscore in texts from page 41, line 26 to page 47, line 58.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 48, line 23 to page 59, line 36.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 63, line 14 to page 63, line 16.

Remove the underscore in texts from page 65, line 23 to page 69, line 15.

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-8	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	4	6	1	Revised
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
All throught this caluse the editing instructions are wrong.							Revised

### Proposed Change

Fix editing instructions THROUGHOUT the document.

### Disposition Detail

Resolution:

Resolution: Remove the underscore in texts from page 2, line 10 to page 6, line 6. Remove the underscore in texts from page 6, line 48 to page 8, line 54. Replace the editing instruction on page 35, line 26 by 'Insert the following text at the end of subcluase 6.2.3.47.1' Remove the underscore in texts from page 35, line 28 to page 40, line 17. Replace the editing instruction on page 37, line 37 by 'Chage Table 86 as indicated' Replace the editing instruction on page 38, line 16 by 'Chage Table 87 as indicated' Remove the underscore in texts from page 41, line 26 to page 47, line 58. Remove the underscore in texts from page 48, line 23 to page 59, line 36. Remove the underscore in texts from page 63, line 14 to page 63, line 16. Remove the underscore in texts from page 65, line 23 to page 69, line 15.

≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r01-9	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	8	6.2.3	60	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
"Modify" is not one of the editing instructions listed on Page 1. This error occurs in many places in the document. My *guess* is that "Change" is meant.							Revised

#### **Proposed Change**

Fix editing instructions EVERYWHERE.

#### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Change 'Add' in all editing instructions to 'Insert' throughout the draft.

Change 'Modify' in all editing instructions to 'Change' throughout the draft



≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r01-10	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	11	6.2.3.1	31	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
Bandwidth Request Size condition is given as "Optional". Under what conditions is it included?							Revised

#### **Proposed Change**

Complete the specification of condition.

#### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Adopt remedies proposed in IEEE 802.16-12-0356-01-010b <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.16/dcn/12/16-12-0356-01.docx>>

≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r01-11	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	14	6.2.3.8	51	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
"as needed" is not a very obvious condition. Is this meant that the field is SET as needed, or it is PRESENT as needed?							Revised

#### **Proposed Change**

Replace with valid normative text.

#### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Adopt remedies proposed in IEEE 802.16-12-0356-01-010b <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.16/dcn/12/16-12-0356-01.docx>>

≡

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-12	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	14	6.2.3.8	51	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
"as needed" is not a very obvious condition. Is this meant that the field is SET as needed, or it is PRESENT as needed?							Revised

#### Proposed Change

Replace with valid normative text.

#### Disposition Detail

Resolution:

Adopt remedies proposed in IEEE 802.16-12-0356-01-010b <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.16/dcn/12/16-12-0356-01.docx>>

≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>
r01-13	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	13		14
<b>Comment</b>						<b>Disposition Status</b>
"as needed" is not a very obvious condition. Is this meant that the field is SET as needed, or it is PRESENT as needed?						Revised

### **Proposed Change**

Clarify

### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Adopt remedies proposed in IEEE 802.16-12-0356-01-010b <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.16/dcn/12/16-12-0356-01.docx>>

≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Disposition Status</b>
r01-14	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	15	6.2.3.9	40	Revised
<b>Comment</b>							
Another "as needed".							

#### **Proposed Change**

Specify when the field is needed.

#### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Adopt remedies proposed in IEEE 802.16-12-0356-01-010b <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.16/dcn/12/16-12-0356-01.docx>>

24

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r01-15	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	27	6.2.3.23	25	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
Field length is TBD.							Revised

#### **Proposed Change**

Complete specification of field.

#### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Set the value of the following 2 parameters in AAI-PAG-ADV message to 8 bits. - "Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer" in AAI-PAG-ADV message (i.e., page 27, line 25)- "Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer" in AAI-PAG-ADV message (i.e., page 29, line 49)

24

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r01-16	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	29	6.2.3.23	49	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
Field size is TBD. Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer.							Revised

### **Proposed Change**

Complete specification of field.

### **Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Set the value of the following 2 parameters in AAI-PAG-ADV message to 8 bits. - "Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer" in AAI-PAG-ADV message (i.e., page 27, line 25)- "Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer" in AAI-PAG-ADV message (i.e., page 29, line 49)

≡

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r01-17	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	39	6.2.3.65	62	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
Another TBD.							Revised

**Proposed Change**

Specify missing value.

**Disposition Detail**

Resolution:  
Replace 'TBD' by '4'



≡

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	
r01-18	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Editorial	65	6.3.5.5.2.4.14.1	33	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>

"The MSB 4" incorrect language. MSB is generally known to mean Most Significant Bit. Spell it out as "most significant 4 bits" or "4 most significant bits" if that is what you mean. If you mean something else then change the comment category to "Technical" and clarify,

Revised

### Proposed Change

See comment

### Disposition Detail

Resolution:

The fixed M2M device with FMDID shall apply the 16-bit CRC mask with masking prefix = 0b0, message type indicator = 0b011, and masking code = ~~LSB~~ least significant 12 bits of FMDID to decode the assignment A-MAP IE. The ~~MSB~~ most significant 4 bits of FMDID ~~is~~ are included in Fixed M2M Ranging Assignment A-MAP IE. The fixed M2M device with DID shall apply the 16-bit CRC mask with masking prefix = 0b0, message type indicator = 0b011, and masking code = ~~LSB~~ least significant 12 bits of DID to decode the assignment A-MAP IE. The ~~MSB~~ most significant 6 bits of DID and paging cycle are included in Fixed M2M Ranging Assignment A-MAP IE.

21

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Disposition Status</b>
r01-19	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	0	6	0	
<b>Comment</b>							
This draft does not comply with the 2012 IEEE Standards Style Manual. Refer to 12. Numbering the clauses and subclauses of a standard "Five numbers separated by decimal points is the maximum acceptable subdivision (e.g., 5.1.1.1.1). If necessary, the material should be reorganized to avoid subdivisions beyond this point."							Rejected

**Proposed Change**

Reorganize the material to avoid subdivisions beyond the 5 levels allowed for IEEE-SA standards.

**Disposition Detail**

Reason:

The numbering system in the amendment is devised to match that of the baseline standard(802.16m-2011, now 802.16.1/D6), which was itself developed in accordance with IEEE editorial staff. The baseline standard has been reviewed by IEEE editorial staff during editorial coordination.

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r01-20	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	0	0	0	

**Comment**

You have an amendment being balloted that amends a standard also being balloted. Thd makes it very difficult to review completely. To compound the challenge, this draft seems to be amending an earlier draft of 802.16.1. Further, As it stands it is not possible to determine what the resulting, amended standard actually contains. This is further compounded by the fact this draft is not technically complete (contains TBDs). T

Revised

**Proposed Change**

Suspend the balloting of the amendment until the thing being amended is complete, and the WG has a technically complete draft (without TBDs) to provide to the voters for review.

**Disposition Detail**

Resolution:

Set the value of the following 2 parameters in AAI-PAG-ADV message to 8 bits. - "Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer" in AAI-PAG-ADV message (i.e., page 27, line 25)- "Dedicated Channel Allocation Timer" in AAI-PAG-ADV message (i.e., page 29, line 49)

Reason:

We agree that any issues of incompleteness need to be addressed. We believe that the new draft is technically complete. We do not agree with the need to defer balloting until the baseline standard is complete. The baseline standard is mature and stable. With each ballot round, the current draft of the baseline is available to the ballot group.

21

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r02-1	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	0	0	0	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>

The resolution to comment r01-20 is not complete. The balloted draft still appears to be referenced to a prior version of the draft of the base standard being amended and it remains impossible to complete a review of the resulting standard with the information available from the working group

Rejected

#### **Proposed Change**

Fully implement the proposed resolution to r01-20 from prior ballot.

#### **Disposition Detail**

Reason:

As noted on Page 1, "The baseline of the draft amendment is P802.16.1/D6 (April 2012). When published, the baseline should be updated to reflect the numbering of the current approved version." This baseline P802.16.1/D6 was provided to the ballot group and has been approved as IEEE Std 802.16.1 by the IEEE-SA Standards Board on 8 June 2012.

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r02-2	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	0	6	0	

**Comment**  
The resolution to r01-19 is, to be polite, absurd and insulting to the sponsor balloters. The argument is that an unapproved draft, which has comments submitted pointing out that it is not in compliance with IEEE-SA Standards requirements, is the rationalization for this draft being not in compliance with the IEEE-SA requirements.

**Disposition Status**

Rejected

**Proposed Change**

Suspend balloting of this amendment until a valid base standard that conforms to IEEE-SA requirements to amend.

**Disposition Detail**

Reason:

The comment refers to r01-19, which addressed the clause numbering system. The numbering system in the amendment is consistent with that of the baseline (P802.16.1/D6) which was approved as IEEE Std 802.16.1 by the IEEE-SA Standards Board on 8 June 2012. If we change the numbering system in this amendment, then there will be inconsistency between this amendment and the approved baseline standard.

21

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Disposition Status</b>
r02-3	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	0	6	0	Rejected
<b>Comment</b>							
Editing instructions are still well screwed up many places. Page 1 explains to the user of the amendment how to apply the content to the base standard. As it stands, the editing instructions being wrong, the draft is not technically complete as normative requirements are not clearly stated many places. This should not be balloted until it is presented as a valid amendment							
<b>Proposed Change</b>							
Correct editing instructiosn so as to be consistent with the description on page 1 and comply with the IEEE-SA 2012 Standard Style Manual or withdraw draft from ballot ans start again. when it is ready							
<b>Disposition Detail</b>							
Reason: We believe that the editing instructions are clear and consistent.							

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r02-4	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	17	6.2.3.2	40	

"needs to be updated" is not a complete specification of when the field is present. Perhaps a cross reference will help, if in fact there is normative text that explains when the MGID needs to be updated. You use this same phrase several places. A valid condition would be for example presence of another field, or determined by the value of a MIB attribute, or perhaps by some other normative condition described elsewhere in the text (such as when included as part of a specific procedure) in which case an xref can help.

**Disposition Status**

Revised

**Proposed Change**

Specify the conditions as if you expect someone to attempt to implement the standard. See comment for suggestions,.

**Disposition Detail**

Remedy #1: Change the condition for 'M2M-Group-Zone-Index' in Table 31 (page 12, line 55) as follows:

Shall be present when MGID needs to be updated during location update or network reentry <insert>(see 6.2.1.3.1) </insert> if ABS is part of more than one M2M Group Zone

Remedy #2: Change the condition for MGID-related parameters in Table 31 (page 13, line 5) as follows:

Shall be present if MGID needs to be updated <insert>(see 6.2.1.3.1) </insert>

Remedy #3: Change the condition for MGID in Table 89 (page 39, line 40) as follows:

Shall be included by an ABS if MGID needs to be changed <insert>(see 6.2.1.3.1) </insert>

21

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Subclause</b>	<b>Line</b>	
r02-5	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	25	6.2.3.22	17	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
"Values 0x08-0x10 may shall be applied to M2M devices only." is a null statement and thus not a valid normative requirement. See 3.56 and 3.54 - any device may be an M2M device.							Revised

**Proposed Change**

Delete condition.

**Disposition Detail**

Remedy #1: Delete the content of 'Condition' column for 'Paging cycle' row in Table 51 (page 19, line 12)

Remedy #2: Delete the content of 'Condition' column for 'Paging cycle' row in Table 51 (page 21, line 15)



≡

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r02-6	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	25	6.2.3.22	40	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
Seems like soem words are missing: "and an ABS sets a value longer than 2048 superframe to paging offset of an M2M device".							Revised

### Proposed Change

Not sure because i can't even make a good guess at what that means.

### Disposition Detail

Remedy:

Change the content of the 'Condition' column for the 'M2M paging offset' row in Table 51 (page 19, line 33) as follows:

Shall be present when the Paging cycle value is set to 0x08, 0x09, or 0x10 and <insert>the paging offset of an M2M device is set to </insert><delete>an ABS sets</delete> a value longer than 2048 superframe<insert>s</insert> <delete>to paging offset of an M2M device</delete>.

2'

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r02-7	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	General	27	6.2.3.22	60	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
"Shall be present when the ABS assigns additional paging offset to the M2M device" seems to be repeating the field description.							Revised

### Proposed Change

clarify

### Disposition Detail

Remedy: Change content of the 'Condition' column for the 'Second paging offset' row in Table 51 (page 21, line 37) as follows:

Shall be present when the<delete>ABS assigns additional</delete><insert>second</insert> paging offset<insert>is assigned</insert> to the M2M device  
<insert>(see 6.2.18.7.1)</insert>

21

Comment #	Name	Vote	Category	Page	Subclause	Line	Disposition Status
r02-8	Rolfe, Benjamin	Disapprove	Technical	28	6.2.3.22	5	
<b>Comment</b>							<b>Disposition Status</b>
"and the ABS sets a value longer than 2048 superframe to paging offset of an M2M device" again.							Revised

### Proposed Change

Complete specification of the condition

### Disposition Detail

Remedy: Change content of the 'Condition' column for the 'M2M paging offset' row in Table 51 (page 21, line 42) as follows:

Shall be present when the Paging cycle value is set to 0x08, 0x09, or 0x10 and <insert>the paging offset of an M2M device is set to </insert><delete>an ABS sets</delete> a value longer than 2048 superframe <delete>to paging offset of an M2M device</delete>

# Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting

- Recirculation #3: 15 day, started 17 July 2012
- Comment Resolution Teleconference: 6 August 2012 (if necessary)
- Confirmation Ballot (if necessary): 15 day, beginning approximately August 13, 2012

# 802.16 WG Motion

802.16 Opening Plenary: 2012-07-16

Motion: To request Conditional Approval from the IEEE  
802 Executive Committee to forward the IEEE  
P802.16.1b Draft to RevCom

- Moved by Jaesun Cha
- Seconded: Hyunjeong Kang
- Result: 21 / 0 / 0

# LMSC Motion

- To grant conditional approval, per Clause 13 of the IEEE 802 Operations Manual, to forward P802.16.1b to RevCom
- Moved:
- Seconded:
- Approve:
- Disapprove:
- Abstain: