

1) Proposed PAR P802.16q

- a. 5.2.b. Scope of the project: This amendment specifies mechanisms for cooperation among base stations in **multi-tier networks** to enhance interference mitigation, mobility management, and base station power management. The applicable management entities are amended.

The term “multi-tier networks” is used in several places in the PAR and 5 criteria, but it is never defined. In my mind it is an ambiguous term, that needs definition. Only after sitting through Harry Bim’s presentation at the tutorial last night, I think I understand what is meant by “multi-tier networks”, but am not 100% sure, therefore cannot offer a suggested definition, therefore I suggest the WG craft and add a definition for “multi-tier networks” in 8.1 Additional Explanatory Notes. Perhaps the term is defined in the 802.16 base standard, if so, I suggest you reference that definition.

- b. Joint Sponsor question. If MTT/SCC is not actively participating in the development of this amendment project, does it make sense to continue to keep them on the PAR form as a joint sponsor?

2) Proposed PAR P802.16.3

- a. Joint Sponsor observation: I notice MTT/SCC is not included in this PAR as a Joint Sponsor, which caused me to pose the question in 1b above
- b. 5.2 Scope: This standard specifies procedures for characterizing the performance of **deployed mobile broadband networks** from a user perspective. It specifies metrics and test procedures as well as communication protocols and data formats allowing a network-based server to coordinate and manage test operation and data collection.

Firstly, let me say I support this proposed project; however I’m concerned the long term implications to 802 have not been sufficiently socialized across the 802 community yet. Let me explain.

The scope uses the term “deployed mobile broadband networks”. I think this is a good general term, that implies networks well beyond 802.16 networks are within the scope of this project (e.g., 802.11, 802.15, 802.22, etc.). Since this work should result in a useful standard which has applicability across multiple 802 technologies (even the wireline technologies), did the WG consider the possibility of this work outgrowing the 802.16WG and eventually result in the establishment of a separate WG continue to refine, extend and develop this

work across all 802 (and non-802) network technologies? Beyond circulating the proposed PAR prior to the July plenary session, what has the WG done to socialize the proposed project?

Once again, I support this project and I think it is reasonable to start the work in the 802.16 WG, but I want to ensure the 802 community understands that it may expand to cover multiple 802 technologies (which would be a good development)—hence my questions and comments

3) Proposed PAR 802.3bn

- a. I am in support of this proposed project, however, I have some concerns. In my opinion, the scope of the project is quite broad (e.g., lack of operating frequency limits, lack of distance limits, symmetric and/or asymmetric operation, etc.). Projects with a broad scope tend to take longer to complete than ones with a narrow scope—placing the projected completion date of 08/2014 in jeopardy. I don't presume to have any greater insight as to what an appropriate scope or duration for this project should be—unquestioningly; the WG members are the experts in this regard. Never-the-less, I would like to ask if the WG at least considered opportunities to narrow the scope and potentially reduce the development time, and what was the rationale for settling on the current scope?

4) Proposed PARs 802.bm, 802.11aj

- a. No comments