P802.16n to Sponsor Ballot: Conditional Approval Request

20 July 2012

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.
Dates the ballots closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WG Letter Ballot #37</td>
<td>5 Feb</td>
<td>6 Mar 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Recirc #37a</td>
<td>5 Apr</td>
<td>4 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Recirc #37b</td>
<td>8 Jun</td>
<td>9 Jul 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes

42 Approve (97.7%)
- 1 Disapprove with comment
- 0 Disapprove without comment
- 5 Abstain
- Return ratio requirement met (55%)
Comment resolution

Disapprove comment status

Working Group Letter Ballot #37

  1 disapprove comment. Member changed vote to approve in LB #37a

Working Group Recirculation Letter Ballot #37a

  5 disapprove comments by one member. Member did not submit a new vote on LB 37b

Working Group Recirculation Letter Ballot #37b

  0 disapprove comments.
## Disapprove Comment Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Text</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Resolution Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The definition of Coexistence is not clear. 1) The definition says: &quot;... same radio frequency channel ...&quot;. Is it intended that several systems in a same vicinity sharing a same radio frequency are not coexistent if they use different channels? 2) What is the extent of a communications system? The definition 3.237 (Self-coexistence) references &quot;coexistence of multiple HR cells&quot;. Is a HR cell a system? Or is &quot;coexistence of multiple HR cells something different? If so, what? 3) The &quot;mother&quot; standard 802.16Rev3 already defines coexistence. Are the two consistent? Can one be deleted in favor of the other? What happens when this amendment is merged into the standard 802.16; will the two definitions be able to coexist (pun intended)?</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Superceded</td>
<td>Superceded - affected parts have been removed by 101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The definition of Self-coexistence is not clear. What does &quot;coexistence of multiple HR cells&quot; mean? What about non-HR-cells?</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Superceded</td>
<td>Self-Coex not in 16n draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The definite article (&quot;the&quot;) or the indefinite article (&quot;a&quot; or &quot;an&quot;) is missing in many, many places; too many to mention them all and too many to be acceptable for a publication.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Reason: Incomplete Remedy  Note: The editors will implement clean-up for next draft revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit 5 is already taken by 802.16Rev3, as shown in Clause 6.3.2.3.5, although Clause 11.5 fails to show it. Bits 5-7 are also taken by P802.16p.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Superceded</td>
<td>Superceded by 105  After discussion with M2M TG, it is decided that: Bit 5 is already used in Rev3, Bit 6 will be used for 16n for ranging request, and bit 7 will be used by 16p for power down reporting. The contribution 300r1 (part of comment 105) is correct as submitted, and resolves this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This clause is too terse. It does not specify which messages are exchanged, whether there are any timers involved, what happens if one HR-MS receives the message from the HR-BS and the other does not, or if the HR-BS does not receive a response from one of the HR-MS. Furthermore, what does: &quot;The HR-MS shall reply with reasons to HR-BS when it receives the link deletion request from HR-BS.&quot; mean? Which TLV or field does &quot;reasons&quot; refer to?</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>No remedy was provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule for recirculation ballot

• Ballot Group formation is completed
• 15 day WG Confirmation Ballot (approximately 27 July 2012 to 11 August 2012)
• if conditions met:
  – 30-day Sponsor Ballot (approximately 13 Aug – 10 Sept 2012)
• else
  – Comment resolution followed by recirc
802.16 WG Motion

802.16 Closing Plenary: 2012-07-19

Motion: “To request EC Conditional approval to forward Draft P802.16n/D4 to Sponsor Ballot”

• Proposed: Tim Godfrey
• Seconded: Eunkyung Kim
• Approved 14-0-0
LMSC Motion

• To grant conditional approval, per Clause 13 of the IEEE 802 Operations Manual, to forward P802.16n for Sponsor Ballot

• Moved:
• Seconded:
• Approve:
• Disapprove:
• Abstain: