

## **IEEE P802.22 - Draft Standard for Wireless Regional Area Networks Clause 14 Report on Procedure for Conditional Approval to Forward a Draft Standard**

The following is the Clause 14 report; 'Procedure for Conditional Approval to Forward a Draft Standard' for the IEEE P802.22-D3 Draft Standard, Part 22: Cognitive Wireless RAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) specifications: Policies and procedures for operation in the TV Bands

The P802.22 received conditional approval to proceed to RevCom submittal at the March 2011 IEEE 802 Plenary meeting. The conditional approval package can be found at

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.22/dcn/11/22-11-0042-03-0000-motion-march-2011-ec-meeting.ppt>

***a) Recirculation ballot is completed. Generally, the recirculation ballot and resolution should occur in accordance with the schedule presented at the time of conditional approval.***

Comments were resolved during the March 2011 Plenary Meeting and P802.22-D3 was issued by Monday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011.

The schedule presented at the March 2011 Closing IEEE 802 EC meeting when requesting conditional approval for the Second SB Re-circ was:

PROPOSED BALLOT OPEN: 24th March 2011

PROPOSED BALLOT CLOSE: 7th April 2011

ACTUAL BALLOT OPEN: Friday, 25<sup>th</sup> March 2011

ACTUAL BALLOT CLOSE: Saturday, 9th April 2011, 11:59 p.m. EDT

The delay in opening of the Sponsor Ballot Re-circ was because of illness to the IEEE-SA supporting staff.

There were a total of six comments received from two voters during the Sponsor Ballot Re-circ #2. Out of six, one comment was editorial and five of them were technical. **None of the comments had 'Must be Satisfied' condition on them, and both the Voters had registered their vote as APPROVE.**

The Comment Resolution Committee (CRC) met on Monday, April 11<sup>th</sup> at 8.00 p.m. ET via telecon to address and resolve the comments. The comment resolutions can be found on MyBallot as well as Mentor at

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.22/dcn/11/22-11-0047-00-0000-p802-22-d3-sponsor-ballot-comments-database.xls>

**The recirculation and resolution occurred essentially in accordance with the plan presented. A delay of one day in launching the 2<sup>nd</sup> Sponsor Ballot Re-circ was due to illness to the IEEE-SA supporting staff.**

***b) After resolution of the recirculation ballot is completed, the approval percentage is at least 75% and there are no new DISAPPROVE votes.***

At the end of the Sponsor Ballot Re-circ, the statistics were as follows:

### **RESPONSE RATE**

**This ballot has met the 75% returned ballot requirement.**

155 eligible people in this ballot group.

121 Affirmative votes

3 Negative votes with comments – No new negative comments were received during this round

0 Negative votes without comments

15 Abstention votes: (Lack of expertise: 1, Lack of time: 12, Other: 2)

139 Votes received = 89% returned  
10% abstention

### **APPROVAL RATE**

**The 75% affirmation requirement is being met.**

121 Affirmative votes

3 Negative votes with comments

124 votes = 97% affirmative

**At the end of the Sponsor Ballot Re-circ #2,**

- 1. The Approval rate increased from 94% to 97%. So the Approval Rate was greater than 75% and**
- 2. None of the new comments had ‘Must be Satisfied’ conditions on them. Both the commenters had registered their vote as APPROVE. So there were no new negative DISAPPROVE votes.**

***c) No technical changes, as determined by the WG Chair, were made as a result of the recirculation ballot.***

During the SB Re-circ #2, we received 6 comments. One was Editorial and 5 of them were Technical. None of the comments had 'Must be Satisfied' condition on them. Both the balloters have registered their vote as APPROVE.

The commenter (Mr. Gregory Gillooly) was invited for a telecon to discuss the resolutions to his comments on Tuesday, April 12<sup>th</sup> 2011. After the discussions, the commenter agreed with all the resolutions as contained in the document and confirmed that via an e-mail which can be found at the end of this report.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.22/dcn/11/22-11-0047-00-0000-p802-22-d3-sponsor-ballot-comments-database.xls>

Summary for the resolution of technical comments:

Out of the 5 Technical comments,

1. The CRC Disagreed with two comments.
2. There were three other technical comments that were Editorial rather than Technical since they were related to inconsistencies in the format of the two tables in the draft. The comments were suggesting to make the two tables consistent. The commenter (Mr. Gregory Gillooly) confirmed this through his e-mail that these comments should be treated as Editorial rather than Technical. The 802.22 CRC asked for an opinion from the Chair of 802, Mr. Paul Nikolich as well as the IEEE SA Sr. Program Manager, Document Development (Michelle Turner) and Ms. Tricia Gerdon. All of them agree that these comments can be addressed and resolved editorially by the IEEE-SA staff prior to publication. Hence no technical changes have been made.

**No technical changes have been made.**

***d) No new valid DISAPPROVE comments on new issues that are not resolved to the satisfaction of the submitter from existing DISAPPROVE voters.***

**There were no new valid DISAPPROVE comments.**

***e) If the WG Chair determines that there is a new invalid DISAPPROVE comment or vote, the WG Chair shall promptly provide details to the EC.***

**There were no new invalid DISAPPROVE comments.**

*f) The WG Chair shall immediately report the results of the ballot to the EC including: the date the ballot closed, vote tally and comments associated with any remaining disapproves (valid and invalid), the WG responses and the rationale for ruling any vote invalid.*

**Please see above.**

## References: E-mail Exchange for Comment Resolution

---

From: m.d.turner@ieee.org [mailto:m.d.turner@ieee.org]

Sent: Friday, April 15, 2011 3:34 PM

To: Mody, Apurva (US SSA)

Cc: gerald.chouinard@crc.ca; M.Kipness@ieee.org; p.gerdon@ieee.org p.nikolich@ieee.org

Subject: Re: Michelle, Tricia, April 12th e-mail, we need your advice: Editorial Changes for Consideration Before Publication: IEEE 802.22 Standard - Re-circulation Results

Importance: High

Hello Apurva,

Patricia contacted me to give me some insight on why Table 16 and Table 196 should be identical. I pulled up the draft and yes after getting a better understanding, this is considered an editorial change. So, YES, all of the suggested changes you sent in your previous email can be addressed editorially.

Thanks.

\*\*\*\*\*

Michelle Turner

Sr. Program Manager, Document Development

IEEE Standards Activities

e-mail: m.d.turner@ieee.org

PH: +1 732 562 3825; FAX: +1 732 562 1571

---

From: Mody, Apurva (US SSA)

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 6:06 PM

To: 'm.d.turner@ieee.org'; 'p.gerdon@ieee.org'

Cc: gerald.chouinard@crc.ca

Subject: Editorial Changes for Consideration Before Publication: IEEE 802.22 Standard - Re-circulation Results

Dear Michelle, Tricia,

Please see the e-mail trail below. Paul agrees that we can forward the 802.22-D3 to RevCom.

The SB Re-rirculation for P802.22-D3 was completed on April 9th 2011. Our return ratio is 84%. Our Approval ratio has gone up from 94% to 97%.

There were no new Disapproves comments. During the SB Re-circ #2, we received 6 comments. One was Editorial and 5 of them were Technical. None of the comments had a Must be Satisfied condition on them. Out of the 5 Technical comments, we Disagree with two of them and the commenter is okay with our resolution. There are three other technical comments that are Editorial rather than Technical. The commenter agrees with this assessment. Please see the e-mail below. We would like to request the IEEE-SA staff to consider implementing the resolution to these comments editorially before this goes for publication.

I will send this to you as a separate document, but please let us know if you are comfortable incorporating these comments into the Draft.

Editorial Changes for Consideration:

1. Change the name of the participant: Charles Einold to be changed to Charles Einolf
2. In Table 16 move the row containing the "Padding" field to be before the row containing the "Signature" field.
3. In Table 196, change the "Size" of "Signature" field from current 32 bytes to "Variable"
4. in Table 17 move the row containing the "Padding" field to be before the row containing the "Public Key Reconstruction Data" field.

Please let us know at your earliest convenience so that we can incorporate this into the comment resolutions and upload.

Cheers

Apurva

---

From: Paul Nikolich [mailto:paul.nikolich@att.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 5:27 PM  
To: Mody, Apurva (US SSA); p.nikolich@ieee.org  
Cc: gerald.chouinard@crc.ca  
Subject: Re: IEEE 802.22 Standard - Re-circulation Results

Apurva,

My only comment is that you should get feedback from Michelle Turner and Tricia Gerdon regarding incorporating the changes as editorial or whether to wait and incorporate them as corrigenda.

I'm OK with your preference--i.e., incorporate the changes as editorial.

Regards,

--Paul

---

From: Gillooly, Greg [mailto:GGillooly@aclara.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 2:42 PM

To: Mody, Apurva (US SSA)

Cc: Gerald Chouinard; Ranga Reddy

Subject: RE: Tuesday, April 12th, 2.00 p.m. ET Telecon Instructions: your comments on the IEEE 802.22 Standard

Apurva and Gerald,

Thank you for taking the time to involve me in a teleconference to discuss resolutions to the comments I posted in response to the IEEE 802.22 ballot.

The purpose of this e-mail is to summarize the outcome of our discussions, and to express my support for the standard to proceed to RevCom as you see fit.

I posted five comments and proposed resolutions. You have responded to all of these comments in a way I can agree with.

Comments 2, 3, 4 in the comment database were regarding the format (not the content) of two interface structures. You have agreed in principle and suggested that these really could be considered Editorial rather than Technical since the content is not in dispute. These comments can be resolved in the Editorial process or included in a later corrigendum, whichever you prefer. I agree with this resolution.

Comments 5 and 6 relate to the size of a field in a message being explicitly set rather than variable as similar fields are in other messages. You have satisfactorily explained the rationale for this approach in this particular message, and have chosen to disagree with the comments. I accept this resolution.

I appreciate your taking the time and effort to respond to my comments. This kind of collaborative approach illustrates the best of the IEEE.

Thanks for the opportunity to work with you, and again I support proceeding to RevCom as you see fit.

Best Regards,

-greg.