1. Why joint sponsorship with MTT is a good idea into the PAR).

2. Would you please explain to me (i.e., the project committee) the intent of the answer was to suggest that the project is dependent on a new revision of the base standard. However, the response is not clear on this point.

3. Before answering directly, we agree to adding a note as suggested. This project request was initiated mainly by new participants from outside IEEE 802.16 who are engaged in designing or using equipment based on IEEE 802.16 and are interested in adapting it for different radio spectrum opportunities. These participants are primarily representative of critical infrastructure industries, notably electrical power. In the past, many have been users, rather than developers, of IEEE 802.16. However, in the current environment in which 802.16 activity is at a nadir, they have recognized that their direct participation is required to specify the necessary new contributions.

4. Among the parties motivated to develop this standard and actively engaged in the development work to this point have been silicon developers eager to develop these assets, electrical power utilities seeking interoperable standards-conformant equipment, utility communications gear vendors wishing to support a new market niche, and trade associations representing the electrical power utility industry and telecommunications for that industry. All of these groups have participated in the 19 January tutorial on the proposed project, sponsored by the IEEE 802.16-TG and attended by about 50 people.

5. Individuals affiliated with five equipment vendors and at least one silicon developer have participated in 802.16 meetings arranged for the discussion and preparation of this proposal. Some of these vendors have multiple individual participants, and we anticipate their continued involvement. In addition, some spectrum owners have also been actively involved in the project planning. Utilities have expressed interest in the development of this standard, and would likely participate, in the requirements stage and in draft review if not at the contribution stage. Utilities also influence vendors toward standardization through their RFP process; this may result in additional vendors becoming involved, and provide an incentive to all participants to support a successful completion of this project.

6. As to the development of the draft, we do not believe that the co-chair sponsorship arrangement will have any direct impact. Under the arrangements made with the MTT Society the co-chair, the MTT Society participants receive an invitation to Sponsor Ballot. Other than that, we have no obligation to that co-chair. Under §5.1.2.2, "the administrative committee (AdCom) or the executive committee (ExCom) of each co-sponsored project shall have access to pre-Sponsor-ballot drafts," which we hope will encourage broader participation in the project.

In order to avoid confusion, we propose adding a note.
2016-03-15 James Gilb 5.2.b Present tense, change "will target" to "targets"  
Agreed  
In 5.2.b, change "will target" to "targets". Likewise, change "will also support" to "also supports".

2016-03-15 James Gilb 5.2.b There is now at least one specific band (700 MHz, but no bandwidth), and VHF and UHF are listed, but no other specific frequencies are indicated. Please specify the frequency range that is in scope. The ITU defines the frequency range for VHF/UHF to be 30 MHz to 3 GHz. Is the entire VHF/UHF range really the target of this amendment?  
Agreed  
In 5.2.b, change "will target" to "targets". Likewise, change "will also support" to "also supports".

2016-03-15 James Gilb 5.2.b The scope does not provide guidance on the required data rates or ranges, yet these are critical in developing the standard. In addition, it is not possible to assess the technical feasibility of the proposed standard without these numbers. Please provide numerical ranges for data rate and range in the scope of the standard.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.

2016-03-15 James Gilb General While this is an 802.16 amendment, most of the expertise from 802.16 is no longer participating in the WG. I think that to encourage wider input and to avoid dominance issues that are sometimes present in very small voting populations, this project should be done in the 802.15 WG. My recommendation to the EC, if this PAR is to be forwarded to RevCom for IEEE SASB approval is that this work be assigned to 802.15.  
Agreed  
Because the project would be a profile amendment, rather than a new radio interface, the data rates or ranges are not critical in driving the design of the standard but, for the most part, result from the existing standard, given the channel bandwidth and carrier frequency available to deploy it, along with other deployment parameters unspecified in the standard.