

Cl **XX** SC P 0 L # **178**
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE

Cl **XX** SC P 0 L ? # **179**
 Stanley Reible MICRILOR, Inc
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**
 Introduction, Participants: Officer and participants names are not present.

SuggestedRemedy

Officer and participant names should be present in document so that voters can review entire document when they are casting their ballot.

Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, this will be done

Cl **XX** SC P 1 L # **180**
 Roger Marks NIST
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**
 Regarding the Participants:

"At the time of the making of this draft, the committee had the following members:"

Since the draft standard is in Sponsor Ballot, this information should be provided. Also, it should explicitly name the committee.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, this will be done on the final insertion into the whole document.

Cl **XX** SC 3
 David Bagby
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status

Review Comment 1: Technical Required
This reviewer does not accept the respor PHY draft (during internal 802.11 ballots) specious, sometimes factually incorrect. ballot (for the benefit of the sponsor ballo

To keep the review process productive, tl analogy arguments about options in other permissibility of options in this PHY. (The stories of a mother asking a child whethe friends were doing it.) The context within portions of the 802.11 standard do not cc extensions of the standard.

When 802.11 authorized the 802.11b wo that the group develop a single high-spee the intent of the wording of that motion (w intent) was to prevent the group from cre motivation was market driven – the marke single high-speed PHY that meets the inc From a market perspective, the phrase "s of options are implemented by different v two compliant pieces of equipment which This is the primary technical requirement order to acquire my yes vote.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the inclusi specification from meeting either the inter motion chartering the group. The respons developed arguments based on analogy : the core procedural, they are technical – interoperability problems.

Further comments will address specific p

SuggestedRemedy

Required change:
Remove options which create the possibi implemented by different venders, it becc pieces of equipment which may fail to int

Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, all association requre and rate. Therefore, while the associator has been rejected. All options are requir

Cl XX SC P multiple L # 291
David Bagby 3Com Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A
Review Comment 2: Editorial
Provide all future drafts for review in a format that may be saved, searched (across pages) and edited. The PDF file was apparently created without the ability for people to save the file to disk. This means that it has to be either read online or printed in hard copy. This makes the review process harder and significantly extended the ballot response time for this reviewer. An electronic ballot where the reviewer is forced to retype text to provide comment context is at best ironic.
The difficulty involved means that you did not get several editing corrections submitted (missing words, bad phrasing etc) as part of this ballot because it is not easy to cut and paste text into a comment. The use of the web page for voting is fine, the use of the web page for commenting is an idea that was extremely poorly executed. The web page form is a pain to use - it effectively prevents any submission of bulk commentary. As a sponsor reviewer it is not acceptable for the review response to be limited by the minimal capabilities of the web page. The goal should be the best industry review possible of a standard draft.

SuggestedRemedy
Provide a way to submit bulk comments via file attachments.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. accepted, this comment will be forwarded to the balloting service.

Cl XX SC 10.3.1 P L # 181
Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status A
PLME_start should be updated to reflect that more than one PHY parameter set may be present.
Additional information may be needed to declare the 'mandatory' status of the new options within the BSS.

SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. Accepted. Change "set" to "sets" in the Name and Description columns for the PHY Parameter Set.

Cl XX SC 10.3.2.2 P L # 182
Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status A
PLME_scan.confirm should be updated to reflect that more than one PHY parameter set may be present.
Additional information may be needed to declare the 'mandatory' status of the new options within the BSS.

SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. Accepted. Change "set" to "sets" in the Name and Description columns for the PHY Parameter Set.

Cl XX SC 10.3.2.2.2 P 8 L 14 # 303
Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom

Comment Type T Comment Status A
There needs to be an edit to this clause from the green book. All of the existing table remains the same except the description of the BSSBasicRateSet is as follows:

SuggestedRemedy
The set of data rates that must be supported by all STAs that desire to join this BSS. The STAs must be able to receive and transmit at each of the data rates listed in the set.
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. Accepted, this will be done on the final insertion into the whole document.

Cl XX SC 10.3.3.1 T
Mike Trompower

Comment Type T Comment Status
PLME_join should be updated to reflect t
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status
REJECT. Rejected. Them MLME_Join.r the CIF. It simply identifies the BSS des the bits in the CIF is described in 7.3.1.4

Cl XX SC 10.4.2 T
Mike Trompower

Comment Type T Comment Status
PLME_characteristic should be updated functionality
If the intent is to mix and match operation multiple plcp preamble lengths, multiple v
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status
REJECT. Rejected. The purpose of this calculate duration) is superceded by the l

Cl XX SC 10.4.4 T
Mike Trompower

Comment Type T Comment Status
PLME_DSSSTESTMODE should be up
The datarate range should include 5.5 an
What are the three data patterns defined
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status
ACCEPT. Accepted, the data rates will b options because of the new definition of c preamble length.

Cl XX SC 18 L
Vic Hayes

Comment Type E Comment Status
There is no way a reader understands th
SuggestedRemedy
Add in bold an italics "Insert new clause

Proposed Response Response Status
ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.1 P L # 188
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 Last paragraph of this section.
 We are under NO restrictions to make a high rate phy which interoperable with current FH PHY.
 This statement implies many characteristics which are not defined in the current text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the paragraph to the following:
 Capability for identifying a channel agile mode is also provided. However, management of this function is outside the scope of this standard.
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. This is an editorial comment. The referenced paragraph does not state that there is a restriction that there is an interoperable FH PHY. It is a statement of the existence of frequency agility, and a pointer to an annex that describes how to do it.

CI XX SC 18.1 P L # 187
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Second paragraph capitalization mistakes
 SuggestedRemedy
 6th line, capitalize ...Spread...
 last line, change BSSS to BSS
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.1 P 10 L 21-34 # 304
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Need to provide some justification for the options. I am suggesting some text below which may not be immediately acceptable to everyone. But remember people these options are now in the standard so let us try to put the best face forward and make it look like we agree and we know what we are doing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with following:
 In addition to providing higher speed extensions to the DSSS system, a number of optional features are described that will allow the performance of the Radio Frequency LAN system to be improved as technology allows the implementation of the options to become cost effective.
 An optional mode replacing the CCK modulation with Packet Binary Convolutional Coding (HR/DSSS/PBCC) is also provided. Use of this option should provide reduced error probabilities but at a significant increase in hardware cost.
 Another optional mode which allows data throughput at the higher rates (2, 5.5 and 11 Mbit/s) to be significantly, increased by using a shorter PLCP preamble, is also provided. This mode called HR/DSSS/short or HR/DSSS/PBCC/short will require a significant amount of additional hardware to implement. This short preamble mode can co-exist with DSSS, HR/DSSS, or HR/DSSS/PBCC under limited circumstances such as on different channels or with appropriate CCA mechanisms.
 An optional capability for channel agility is also provided. This option allows an implementation to overcome some inherent difficulty with static channel assignments (a tone jammer), without burdening all implementations with the added cost of this capability. This option also be used to implement 802.11 compliant systems that are interoperable between FH and DS modulations. See informative Annex F for more details.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Accepted, some suggested text incorporated

CI XX SC 18.1 etc II
 Valerie E. Zelenty
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 You refer to IEEE Std 802.11-1997.
 When this supplement is published, show references be changed to ISO/IEC 8802-
 SuggestedRemedy
 If so,add an editorial instruction to this eff
 This is purely editorial and can be chang
 IEEE editor at time of publication.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.1.1 F
 Satoshi Obara
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 "supplement" is wrong word.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The "supplement" should be change "cla
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted,

CI XX SC 18.1.2 T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type TR Comment Status
 Strike the last sentence.
 The sentence creates many ambiguities -
 times, etc. default to those provided in th
 aware of those currently used by the FH
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the last sentence
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. The MAC and MAC managem
 comment is rejected. There is no ambig
 elsewhere in clause 18

CI XX SC 18.1.2 N
 Anil K. Sanwalka
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 These two sentences seem to be contrac
 an inexperienced reader will be able to de
 sentences.
 I don't have any specific ideas.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, delete the last sent

CI XX SC 18.1.2 Ir
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 The last two sentences of this paragraph
 is enabled. One say that the PHY is both
 is FH.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct this conflict.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.Accepted, the last s

CI XX SC 18.2.1 P L # 192
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 This section creates ambiguity. It says that the long preamble is mandatory. Which means that it must always be supported. It then implies that the short preamble is intended for exclusive use; ie. a BSS will use only the short preamble.
 In order to have the exclusive case, additional parameters must be added to the MIB and MAC which allow this mode.
 If exclusivity is the intent of the PBCC and agility as well, then variables must be added for these as well.
 In other words, will the PHY chips be created so that they can recognize on the fly which preamble is being used, or will they operate in one mode (long or short) only in order to demodulate the packet?
 Will the PHY chips be created so that they can recognize on the fly whether or not PBCC is used and correctly demodulate the packet?
 Likewise with the other combinations !!
 SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. This is an editorial comment and rejected. The short preamble is properly supported through the changes in clauses 7 and 9.

CI XX SC 18.2.1 P 11 L 49 # 306
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 This convergence procedure also applies to 2 Mbit/s when using the short preamble option. The simplest fix may be to say 2, 5.5 and 11 Mbit/s
 SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.1 P 11 L 53 # 193
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Some words are missing in this sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "and" between "IEEE Std 802.11-1997," and "an optional short preamble and header."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.1 N
 Johnny Zweig
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 Question: if the use of the short preamble stations, would it be appropriate to require that BSS preambles only? If not, should the flag defined in 7.3.1.4 in short preamble? Will some stations implement preamble they use?

SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify the extent to which using the short interoperability and whether it makes sense BSS traffic be sent with the same preamble

Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, stations that do not use network is using short preambles. see #:

CI XX SC 18.2.2.2 Ir
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 Use the proper standard language to define

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the first sentence. Replace "can"

Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI XX SC 18.2.2.2 Ir
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 Use the proper standard language to define
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "must" with "shall".

Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI XX SC 18.2.3.1 Ir
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 This field has no numeric value and, thus bit significance.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the use of "MSB" and "LSB" with correct bit numberings.

Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT. Accepted, the number

CI XX SC 18.2.3.1 F
 Mark Webster
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 What does "MSB-1" mean? Does it mean
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.3.10 P L # 198
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Change numbering to a), b), c)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted, the numbering will be changed from aab to abc

CI XX SC 18.2.3.10 P 18 L 47 # 199
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 This clause talks about the field identifying the modulation used, but assigns data rates to the values of the field.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either say it defines the data rates or assign modulations to the values.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. change 'modulation' to 'data rate'

CI XX SC 18.2.3.10 P 18 L 52-54 # 200
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The hexadecimal notation is not elegant
 SuggestedRemedy
 Adopt the method for commenters comment on 18.2.3.9.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Rejected, this one is an actual number.

CI XX SC 18.2.3.10 P 18 L 52-55 # 201
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 This field has no numeric value and, thus, can not be described using bit significance.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the use of "MSB" and "LSB" with bit numberings. Define the correct bit numberings.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. add the explanation that this is a number in 0.1 MHz increments representing the data rate.

CI XX SC 18.2.3.2 P 13 L 49 # 202
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The specification of the contents of the field is ambiguous. Is it meant to describe that the 16 bit field should be sent LSB to MSB first?
 Or that first the X'F3' with its LSB first is to be transmitted like we do with the MAC protocol data unit?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change into an unambiguous manner, like showing the bit pattern with bit numbers and specifying which bit goes out first.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. change to a bit pattern

CI XX SC 18.2.3.3 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 Bad break between pages.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Ensure that "kbit/s" does not break between
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.3.3 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 Bad break between pages.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Ensure that "kbit/s" does not break between
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.3.3 L
 Vic Hayes
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 Are the bits in hexadecimal notation have without a weight.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change into a bitsequence with bit numbers
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. the bits do have a numeric significance

CI XX SC 18.2.3.4 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 This field has no numeric value and, thus bit significance.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the use of "MSB" and "LSB" with correct bit numberings.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. remove MSB/LSB notation.

CI XX SC 18.2.3.4 L
 Vic Hayes
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 It is unclear what the meaning is of Lock
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "not" into "not locked"
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted in principle, the work

CI XX SC 18.2.3.4 P 14 L 35 # 208
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 "being" is a non-compulsory term, where a compulsory term is needed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "being" into "shall be"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT. Accepted in principle, new text added to clarify.

CI XX SC 18.2.3.5 P L # 209
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Capitalize the last sentence, next to last paragraph and grammar
 SuggestedRemedy
 Capitalize and Change "is" to "in".
 The length in microseconds ...
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.3.5 P 15 L 15 # 308
 Johnny Zweig Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 This line should not be in boldface type.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Set in normal stroke weight.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.3.5 P 16 L 15 # 310
 Johnny Zweig Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 This is grammatically, punctuationally and technically incorrect as stands.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "the length is microseconds should at least cover" to "The length field is defined in units of microseconds, and must correspond to" and change "should be exact" to "must be exact".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted, see 309

CI XX SC 18.2.3.5 P 16 L 15 # 309
 Johnny Zweig Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 This is grammatically, punctuationally and technically incorrect as stands.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "the length is microseconds should at least cover" to "The length field is defined in units of microseconds, and must correspond to" and change "should be exact" to "must be exact".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.2.3.7 L
 Vic Hayes
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 A Term has been broken as if it were an
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the hyphen and lock word-break
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted, editor will attempt to

CI XX SC 18.2.3.8 Lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 This field has no numeric value and, thus bit significance.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the use of "MSB" and "LSB" with correct bit numberings.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. replace with bit notations.

CI XX SC 18.2.3.8 L
 Vic Hayes
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 MSB in capitals, where msb is used in ot
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use the method as given in subclause 1E
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the MSB notation h

CI XX SC 18.2.3.8 T
 Mark Webster
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 What does "MSB-1" mean? Does it mea MSB is a 0. The shortSYNC seed is the
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the hex notation ha

CI XX SC 18.2.3.8 L
 Vic Hayes
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 "shortSFD" differs from the term in Figur The contents is not specified in the comp Here the contents is described two in 2 w then written in a figure.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "shortSFD" by SHORT SFD fiel Replace the description of the contents o The SHORT SFD field shall contain the j Insert the figure:
 b16 b15 b14 b13 b12 b11 b10 b9 b8 b7
 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 0 0 1
 bit b1 is transmitted first
 and use this convention throughout the d
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted in part. the figure w notation put inot the text.

CI **XX** SC **18.2.3.9** P L # **215**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 Confusion added - as stated in previous comments --
 This section says ..."A receiver not configured to receive the high rate signals will not detect this SFD."
 The implication is that the high rate PHY will be able automatically detect (at all times) between long and short preamble usage.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify that this statement is correct or that the intended use is one or the other (long or short preamble) per BSS.
 Proposed Response Response Status **U**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, clarify that a station not configured to receive the short preamble will not detect this SFD.

CI **XX** SC **18.2.3.9** P **18** L **39-43** # **216**
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 This field has no numeric value and, thus, can not be described using bit significance.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the use of "MSB" and "LSB" with bit numberings. Define the correct bit numberings.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. replace with bit notations.

CI **XX** SC **18.2.4** P **18** L **36-39** # **217**
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 For the long preamble, the initialization is done double, for the short preamble the initialization is only in the not-preferred method.
 Also, the contents is already specified in two other subclause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the paragraph along the following lines:
 "The scrambler shall be initialized as specified in subclause 18.2.3.8 for the short PLCP and subclause 18.2.3.1 for the long PLCP."
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI **XX** SC **18.2.5** P **20** L **24** # **218**
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**
 Awkward word choice.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "for using" with "to use".
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **18.2.5** Ir
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 Is the PLCP procedural definition the plan recommendation?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move this sentence to a more appropriate location.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, the PLCP does generate a recommendation. This is an abstract description

CI **XX** SC **18.2.5** N
 Anil K. Sanwalka
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 The first PHY_Data.Req should follow the previous one, so the rest of the PHY_Data.Req should follow it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the PHY_Data.Req from line 25 to line 24.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **18.2.6** T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 The transmit state machine Figure incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The correct number is 56 zeros.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, it should be 56.

CI **XX** SC **18.2.6** T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 Add a period to end of first paragraph.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a period to end of first paragraph.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted, editor will fix

CI **XX** SC **18.2.6** N
 Anil K. Sanwalka
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 The lines coming out of the blocks on the outputs from the blocks not inputs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The lines coming out of the blocks on the outputs from the blocks not inputs.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Editor will fix figure 10 with arrangement

CI **XX** SC **18.3.2** P **28** L **13** # **292**
 Allen Heberling Eastman Kodak Co.
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 Currently the Table 4 entry for dot11PhyType for High Rate-2.4 is TBD.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Provide specific value or range of values.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the PHY type is HRDSS=X05'

CI **XX** SC **18.3.3** P L # **222**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 This section also adds to the confusion about intended operation. Reporting a single value, implies that the intent is to have exclusive operation.
 Reported values for Preamble Length, Cwmin and Cwmax should be changed to report all valid values in a "mix and match" environment.
 The fact that a mix and match mode MAC will be UNDULY BIASED towards stations using short preamble - better access because of shorter Cwmin, suggests that the intent is to have exclusive operation
 SuggestedRemedy
 I believe the intent is to have "mix and match", therefore, reporting Cwmin and Cwmax consistent with legacy systems is correct.
 If the hooks are added to allow for exclusive BSS use of some options, shortening of CWMin andMax would be OK
 This points out that there is a hole in the system, which says that the BSS ought to report the current Cwmin and Cwmax times in the BEACON and PROBE frames.
 Also points out that statements ought to be added to the standard which specifies which values a station uses.
 Should the station use values reported by its PHY, or should it adopt those values presented in the BEACON and PROBES
 Or remove all doubt, the high rate PHY uses same values as legacyDS PHY, regardless of mode of operation. However, this leaves a bias towards DS vs FH which "combo vendors" will have to address.
 Proposed Response Response Status **U**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the legacy values are to be used and the shorter values removed.

CI **XX** SC **18.3.3** P **27** L **17** # **313**
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 This is another place where the reference is to 802.11-1997 but the actual text is from TGrev. In this case the green book has no PLME-Characteristics primitive in 10.4.3.
 My guess is that this and many of my editorial comments will go away if the reference is changed to TGrev. Otherwise all the changes made in TGrev to appropriate sections will have to copied here.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the proper reference is to the 1999 standard, not the green book.

CI **XX** SC **18.3.3**
 Anil K. Sanwalka N
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status
 I have made this comment before.
 There is no way for aPreambleLength to l this as the value for long preamble. The l the structure only to provide compatibility
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change value to 144
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, Its accepted to have

CI **XX** SC **18.3.3**
 Anil K. Sanwalka N
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 aPreambleLength should not be referenced PHY characteristic.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change name to PreambleLength
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, they do not matter for PHY in response to the PLMETXtime.rec

CI **XX** SC **18.4.2**
 Bob O'Hara Ir
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 This is not specifying a normative require capability.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "shall be" with "is".
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **18.4.2**
 Bob O'Hara Ir
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 Doesn't the previous sentence already de the last sentence in this paragraph at all?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the last sentence.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. rejected

CI **XX** SC **18.4.4.2**
 Mike Trompower T
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status
 Add 'X' to table for PMD_CS.request
 Add new section (18.4.5.xx) for PMD_CS CS_THRESHOLD according to the text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted in principle, Change have a setting method.

CI XX SC 18.4.5.1.2 P 31 L 11 # 226
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 This is describing a parameter upon which the PMD acts.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "PHY" with "PMD" in the Description column.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.1.2 P 31 L 14 # 227
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 It is unconventional to specify mandatory items into primitives and their parameters.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the "shall" in the description and make sure the spreading is unambiguously specified in the formatting or protocol specification of the draft.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. all shalls in this section replaced with is's

CI XX SC 18.4.5.1.2 P 31 L 8-11 # 228
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Why are two of the value combinations represented as modulations and tow others as data rates?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the representation of the values consistent, either all modulations or all data rates.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. replace with 1 and 2 Mbps.

CI XX SC 18.4.5.1.2 P 31 L 9-11 # 229
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 1. We use 2 methods for specifying the contents: first bitstrings, the hexadecimal strings.
 2. The hexadecimal strings are specified in a new way (with and h) rather than the method with 'X' ".
 3. It is unclear what is meant by the notation for 5.5 and 11 Mbit/s. apparently one os free to pick a value between X'00" and X'0F' for 5.5 Mbit/s and between X'00" to X'FF" for 11 Mbit/s.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use the bit string method for specification and ,ake sure the range of values is unambiguously specified.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Accepted, text changed to: bits 0,1: 1 Mbit/s
 dibits
 00,01,11,10:2 Mbit/s
 nibbles
 0x00 - 0x0F: 5.5 Mbit/s
 bytes
 0x00 - 0xFF: 11 Mbit/s

CI XX SC 18.4.5.10.2 P 37 L 8-11 # 230
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Why do two of the rates also have modulations attached?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the modulations.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.11.1
 Bob O'Hara lr
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 State this in the proper "standard" way.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence and replace with "Th the PMD to provide the received signal st
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.11.3
 Bob O'Hara lr
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 Since this is optional, the use of "shall" is
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "shall" with "may" in two location
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, shall was repalced

CI XX SC 18.4.5.12.1
 Bob O'Hara lr
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 State this in the proper "standard" way.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence and replace with "Th the PMD to provide an indication of the si Rate PHY PN code correlation to the PLC
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.12.3
 Bob O'Hara lr
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 Since this is optional, the use of "shall" is
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "shall" with "may" in two location
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted in principle

CI XX SC 18.4.5.13.3
 Bob O'Hara lr
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 This is generated by the PMD, not PHY.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "PHY" with "PMD".
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.14.1 P 39 L 53-54 # 236
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 State this in the proper "standard" way.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence and replace with "This primitive may be generated by the PMD to provide an indication that the receiver has detected RF energy indicated by the PMD_RSSI primitive that is above a predefined threshold."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.14.3 P 40 L 31 # 237
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Since this is optional, the use of "shall" is not appropriate, here.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "shall" with "may".
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.15.1 P 40 L 45-46 # 238
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 State this in the proper "standard" way.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence and replace with "This primitive may be generated by the PLCP to set a set a value for the energy detect ED THRESHOLD."
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.15.2 P 41 L 8-9 # 239
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The values stated for the parameter appear to enable or disable the use of ED. This conflicts with the description of the primitive that claims to set a value for the threshold.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct this conflict.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI XX SC 18.4.5.2.2 P 31 L 44-48 # 240
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Why are two of the value combinations represented as modulations and two others as data rates?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the representation of the values consistent, either all modulations or all data rates.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. change to 1 Mbit/s and 2 Mbit/s.

CI XX SC 18.4.5.2.2 L
 Vic Hayes
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 Same comments as for 18.4.5.1.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Same remedy as for 18.4.5.1.2.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI XX SC 18.4.5.3.2 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 This primitive allows only PBCC or CCK methods. Yet, the PMD_Data.request primitive combinations to be passed to the PM modulation methods chosen?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add DBPSK and DQPSK as selectable r
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. the interface needs to state w the ambiguity when 5.5 or 11 Mbps can t 11CCK , 5.5PBCC or 11PBCC)

CI XX SC 18.4.5.4.4 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 This clause indicates that the primitive is previous clause clearly states that it is ge
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct this conflict.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. the PMD statement is deleted.

CI XX SC 18.4.5.6.2 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 Since this primitive has no parameters, s
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence and replace with "Th parameters."
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 18.4.5.7.2 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 Since this primitive has no parameters, s
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence and replace with "Th parameters."
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **18.4.5.9.2** P L # **246**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **R**
 Why does this section state a maximum of 4 levels? The mib 18.3.2 states that 8 levels are allowed. The parameter dot11NumbersupportedPowerLevels is declared implementation dependent and can be set by vendors to 4 should that be a restriction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the limit of 4 from these two sections
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 REJECT. Rejected,The generic requirement allows 8 levels, but the specific PHY as well as the low rate DS PHY only use 4 levels.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.12** P L # **247**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 The TBD must be resolved.
 More accurately, this section ought to specify an exact hop time.
 If one system hops in 100usec and begins transmitting, the 224usec station (while compliant) is at a disadvantage or worse the two won't interoperate.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Resolve the TBD
 Specify an exact hop time specification or put a statement that no transmission will occur until after the time specified here.
 Proposed Response Response Status **U**
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the TBD is resolved by removing the specification of settling rate. The hop time statement will be added by editor.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.12** P **48** L **17** # **248**
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
 This subclause contains a "TBD". It supports commenters view (subclause 18.4.6.7) that the whole frequency agility option is not tested nor simulated.
 By the time a draft is in sponsor ballot this type of specification should not occur
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the channel agility option by removing subclauses 18.4.6.7, 18.4.6.12 and the annex F.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. we will remove the TBD kHz/us requirement altogether.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.12** P **49** L **17** # **293**
 Allen Heberling Eastman Kodak Co.
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 ...and the rate of change has settled to within TBDkHz/us.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please provide specific value for this TBD.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. Partially accepted, text removed.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.12** P **49** L **18** # **249**
 Mark Webster Harris Semiconductor
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 A TBD is present.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the TBD with a quantity.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. we will remove the TBD kHz/us requirement altogether.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.14** T
 Mike Trompower T
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status
 The PICS (Annex A4.3) references two t
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 18.4.6.14 to reflect two temperat
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Current TGrev has two types.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.5** Ir
 Bob O'Hara Ir
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status
 The complex chips do not have a numeri
 chips can not have "significance".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Eliminate the use of msb and lsb through
 with a clearly described and/or illustrated
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. the lsb is replaced by c0 etc.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.5.2** Ir
 Mark Webster Ir
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 The FONT is wrong on jw.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The w in jw should be cast as the SYMB
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.5.2** Ir
 Bob O'Hara Ir
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 The PSDU does not have symbols, but o
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "PSDU" with the correct term.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, change to symbols

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.5.2** Ir
 Bob O'Hara Ir
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status
 The complex chips do not have a numeri
 chips can not have "significance".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Eliminate the use of msb and lsb through
 with a clearly described and/or illustrated
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.6 P L # 334

Ephraim Zehavi Via Link

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The current PCBB supports only 11 Mbps and 5.5 Mbps. If a station is not able to communicate with rate 5.5 Mbps (coded, then it is unlikely that it will be able to communicate at the low data rate of 1 and 2 Mbps. Since the low data rates are not coded.

SuggestedRemedy

In order to allow graceful degradation in the performance it is recommended that the PCBB will be extended to support lower data rate using a convolution code followed by a repetition code with puncturing.

Examples:

- Data Rate: 1 Mbps
- Coded Rate: 2 Mbps
- Repetition (6): 12 Msps
- Puncturing (11/12): 11 Msps
- Data Rate: 2 Mbps
- Coded Rate: 4 Mbps
- Repetition (3): 12 Msps
- Puncturing (11/12): 11 Msps
- Data Rate: 1 Mbps
- Coded Rate: 2 Mbps
- Repetition (3): 6 Msps
- Puncturing (11/12): 5.5 Msps
- Data Rate: 2 Mbps
- Coded Rate: 4 Mbps
- Repetition (3): 6 Msps
- Puncturing (11/12): 11 Msps

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. Rejected, the purpose of the basic rate and long preamble are to insure interoperability which would be violated if the low rates are coded.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.6 P 45 L 48 # 294

Jeff Fischer MICRILOR, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The PBCC (i.e. coded) mode should be required, not optional. This issue is not related to the debate of having "options" in the standard, but to needing the PBCC mode because it is the only way the standard can be generally useful to the industry. The CCK modulation is inherently very weak by today's communications standards. If the PBCC is not used then the only way to make this waveform useful is with a severe measure of equalization. Therefore the only way to make this standard a useful one depends on a companies implementation, not on the standard waveform itself. By making the PBCC a requirement then the standard waveform itself will have inherent utility. The argument that there are commercial reasons to make a poor link is not a good one. Commercially speaking, the equalizer is a more complex, more costly, more power consumptive circuit to implement than the PBCC circuits.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this mode required for a standard implementation.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT. REJECT. Rejected, CCK has been adopted as a mandatory modulation with well documented performance. PBCC has been added as an option for certain environments.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7 T

Mike Trompower

Comment Type TR Comment Status

We are under NO restrictions to make a PHY.

The agility option enables a form of tolerance current FH physy.

The statement referencing "shall meet requirements as described above.

SuggestedRemedy

Change text to following:

The channel agility option gives a high rate band. The management (determination) scope of this standard. When the channel use of both FH and DS parameter sets is

Proposed Response Response Status

REJECT. Rejected, the requirements for 18.4.6.7 by moving them from F1 through order for all stations to operate on the same

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7 Ir

Bob O'Hara

Comment Type T Comment Status

There is not enough normative information to be built upon the HR PHY.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the following from Annex F to this clause: F.1, F.2, F.3, and F.4.

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. The content of F.1, F.2, and F.4 remains in dispute and will remain

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7 S

Dean Kawaguchi

Comment Type TR Comment Status

This is a repeat comment with a change in

The editorial change at the last meeting changed requirements from this section into the in problems. First, the editorial change was technical resolution made in the January requirements are now placed in an informal awkward and undesirable way of specifying numerous instances of optional requirements 802.11 main standard so there should be requirements cannot be included within clause

SuggestedRemedy

Move the requirements from clauses F.1, into 18.4.6.7.

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. voted to move F1, F2, and F3

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7 P 48 L 32 # 257
 Dean Kawaguchi Symbol Technologies, I

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The editorial change at the last meeting of moving the requirements from this section into the informative annex had two problems. First, the editorial change was contrary to the technical resolution made in the January 1999 meeting. Second, requirements are now placed in an informative annex. This is an awkward and undesirable way of specifying requirements. There are numerous instances of optional requirements within the approved 802.11 main standard so there should be no reason optional requirements cannot be included within clause 18.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the requirements from clauses F.1, F.2, F.3, and F.4 back into 18.4.6.7.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Accepted. F.1, F.2, and F.3 have been moved to 18.4.6.7. The content of F.4 was not moved, due to other comments.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7 P 48 L 34 # 259
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

1. The channel agility option is a method that has not been tested.
2. The committee has not seen any simulations of how this option would behave.
3. Commenter fears that this option, when implemented in a carefully planned system will disrupt the whole operation because it would confuse the whole carefully planned frequency plan.
4. From feedback from the field, commenters knows that the option confuses the whole market.
5. The present subclause makes an informal annex all of a sudden a formal one by the use of the word "shall" and supports commenters view that the option has not been simulated nor tested by stating "the expected behaviour".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the channel agility option by removing subclauses 18.4.6.7, 18.4.6.12 and the annex F.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT. Rejected by a vote. The content of F.1, F.2, and F.3 will be moved to clause 18. The technical content of F.4 remains in dispute and will remain in the annex. The committee is aware of these concerns and believes the benefits are superior.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7 P 48 L 34 # 258
 Vic Hayes Lucent Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The word "interoperability" is misused here. A 5.5 or 11 Mbit/s can not interoperate with a 1 or 2 Mbit/s system. Apparently the writer meant to say here "co-existence".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "interoperability" into "co-existence".

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. Rejected. The wording expresses the correct intent.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.7
 Anil K. Sanwalka N

Comment Type TR Comment Status

Sorry guys but this one is important.

Firstly:

Channel agility does not enable FH interc simply allows an implementer to build a "i and FH BSS. My understanding of the re frequency agility as an option without any knowledge that a "smart" implementer co between DS and FH modes.

I feel that frequency agility may be a usef interoperability.

Secondly:

Here it says that the hop sequences shal that Annex F is informative. I don't think y

My feeling is that for there to be any kind normative.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove references to FH interoperability Define Hop sequences and make them n Include Appendix F as an informative anr is now).

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. Hop sequences added to clau removed.

CI XX SC 18.4.6.8
 Bob O'Hara Ir

Comment Type E Comment Status

This standard also specifies operation in for Japan should also be cited.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the Japanese citation.

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. Accepted, editor will fix.

CI XX SC 18.4.7.2
 Bob O'Hara Ir

Comment Type T Comment Status

Why is a minimum transmit power specif very low power operation, i.e., personal a

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this requirement.

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. See above

CI XX SC 18.4.7.2
 Bob O'Hara Ir

Comment Type T Comment Status

Why is a minimum transmit power specif very low power operation, i.e., personal a

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this requirement.

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

CI XX SC 18.4.7.3 P L # 263
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Why does this section state a maximum of 4 levels? The mib 18.3.2 states that 8 levels are allowed. The parameter dot11NumbersupportedPowerLevels is declared implementation dependent and can be set by vendors to 4 should that be a restriction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the limit of 4 from these two sections
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT. Rejected, The generic requirement allows 8 levels, but the specific PHY as well as the low rate DS PHY only use 4 levels.

CI XX SC 18.4.7.6 P 50 L 40 # 264
 Mark Webster Harris Semiconductor
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The wording could be improved regarding the derivation of the symbol-rate clock and carrier-frequency clock from the same reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The wording is paragraph 18.2.3.4 is somewhat clearer.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted in spirit

CI XX SC 18.4.8.1 P L # 266
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 These sections should specify as to whether this performance is achieved with or without or regardless of the "LOCKED" bit.
 If different performance expectations are anticipated, so state.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. Rejected, the specification apply whether or not the locked bit is set. There is no mention of the Locked bit in any of these sections.

CI XX SC 18.4.8.1 P L # 265
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 These sections should specify as to whether this performance is achieved with or without or regardless of the "LOCKED" bit.
 If different performance expectations are anticipated, so state.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. Rejected, the specification apply whether or not the locked bit is set. There is no mention of the Locked bit in any of these sections.

CI XX SC 18.4.8.1 P 54 L 16 # 267
 Stan Reible MICRILOR, Inc
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 We need to select a transmit modulation approach which can provide better receiver input level sensitivities in fielded equipment.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Place a tighter sensitivity constaints on the equipment (and emerging chip designs)implementing the proposed standard.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT. Rejected, this is a minimum requirement on implementations and allows low cost.

CI XX SC 18.4.8.2 T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type TR Comment Status
 These sections should specify as to whe regardless of the "LOCKED" bit.
 If different performance expectations are
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Sta
 REJECT. Rejected, the specification app mention of the Locked bit in any of these

CI XX SC 18.4.8.4 T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type TR Comment Sta
 If the timer is not removed, then
 The algorithms for CCA should have diffe
 The MIB should reflect the additional mo
 The algorithms using a timer are not the :
 SuggestedRemedy
 Mode 2 should become new mode 4
 Mode 3 should become new mode 5

Change in 18.4.8.4 and in PICS HRDS1
 Proposed Response Response Sta
 REJECT. Rejected, the specifications fo low rate PHY, but do not need to be numl

CI XX SC 18.4.8.4 T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type TR Comment Sta
 Remove the reference to a timer in CCA
 The mode says report busy upon detectic necessary.

I take this to mean that a high rate PHY n barker and CCK modulation.
 This means that a high rate PHY which c
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete reference to timer in mode 2.
 Proposed Response Response Sta
 REJECT. Rejected, the timer insures co station can defer enough time on a short when the header is corrupted.

CI XX SC 18.4.8.4 N
 Stan Reible
 Comment Type T Comment Sta
 While lower-transmit-level equipment is li energy detection threshold levels for such justifiable.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider a 4-6 dB lowering of the energy equipment.
 Proposed Response Response Sta
 REJECT. Rejected, this scheme was to :

CI XX SC 184.6.7 & Annex F P L # 272
 Bob Ward
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 FH interoperability requirements, should be specified as requirements rather than in an "informative" annex. "Informative" would suggest being not required.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Include FH requirements in main body of Spec.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Voted to move F1, F2, and F3 back into clause 18.4.6.7.

CI XX SC 7.3.3.1 P 4 L 14 # 317
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove lines around "Notes"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 7.3.1.4 P L # 273
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Wording should be APs (as well as STAs in IBSSs) shall ...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make change in two new paragraphs for short preamble and PBCC
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 7.3.1.4 P 5 L 18 # 274
 Stanley Reible MICRILOR, Inc
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Channel Agility is not a requirement for high rate DS nor does it insure backward compatibility with devices implementing the existing standard. The options of short preamble, PBCC, and channel agility will combine to introduce a Multi-Standand Product
 SuggestedRemedy
 Eliminate the option for channel agility. Greatly shorten the long preamble to eliminate a need for the optional short preamble.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 REJECT. Rejected. Frequency agility provides valuable capabilities for both interoperability with FH systems and or use in uncoordinated systems where interference is a great problem.

CI XX SC 7.3.1.4 P 5 L 33, 49 # 318
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the word "then"
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC 7.3.1.4 lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 What is the internal indication that chann seems to be no way to determine how to
 SuggestedRemedy
 Include appropriate MIB attributes or SAF this bit shall be set.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted. Replace the text "cdot11ChannelAgilityEnabled is true".

CI XX SC 7.3.1.9 T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type TR Comment Status
 The three new reason codes are not supp (1997) standard.
 The existing products, "should" ignore th 7.3.1.4, however, the 1997 spec says the is proper course to take when a '1' bit is r Since the current systems cannot interpr codes, there is no way for them to determ

Section 18 states that the long preamble and short are used together. Section 18. management decision and implies packe is the intended operation.

Section 18 states that these new capabili new capabilities, implies that these featur packet basis.

If the intent is to define the use of these r BSS when enabled, then the station mus and whether to recognize the short prean

SuggestedRemedy
 I believe the intent was to allow mix and n access to the BSS based on non-support should be deleted.

IF the intent is to give a vendor the ability supporting a particular optional mode, ad configuration of the use as mandatory or kept, although only recognized by station:

Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, reason codes receiv failure of association. See clauses 10.3.1

CI XX SC 7.3.2.2 N
 Anil K. Sanwalka
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 SuggestedRemedy
 The struck word "station" should be "ST/
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, the standard to be r

CI **XX** SC **7.3.2.2** P **6** L **30-46** # **320**
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **R**
 The original text that is modified here is not from "802.11-1997". I believe I originated these edits and I had used the output from TGrev.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 REJECT. rejected,, see 319

CI **XX** SC **9.6** T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status
 Follow on comment #2 above.
 This section should be expanded to include use during certain frame exchanges.
 This becomes simpler if the intended use
 SuggestedRemedy
 I believe the intent of the new phy options section should be updated.

CI **XX** SC **7.3.2.2** P **6** L **33** # **321**
 Johnny Zweig Nortel Networks
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**
 I'm afraid the knife has cut too deeply, in getting rid of "in units of 500 kbit/s" all over the place. I no longer see any text that specifies that the low-order 7 bits of each rate is, in fact, a rate in units of 500 kbps.
 If the intent of the change is to remove the semantics of 500 kbit/s units, I heartily object to having 128 random values encoded in the Supported Rates field. I assume the change is merely to clarify the fact that the low-order 7 bits are a rate and the high-order bit is a flag, without rewriting the definitions the "right" way (by rewording it so each octet is a two-subfield entity).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Put back in enough instances of "500 kbit/s" to ensure that the format of the Supported Rates element is unambiguously defined as having a high-order bit indicating that it is in the Basic Rate Set and 7 low-order bits that convey a data rate in units of 500 kbit/s.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. ACCEPT.

Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. In line 37, insert "and Manage "frame" to "frames".

CI **XX** SC **9.6** N
 Anil K. Sanwalka
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status
 Again the original text is not what is in the green book then this needs to be fixed. T
 In particular, there was another paragraph
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "" around RA.
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **7.3.2.2** P **6** L **50-52** # **322**
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **R**
 The original text does not match what is in the green book. Some edits are incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The final text should read:
 The medium access protocol allows for STAs to support different sets of data rates. All STAs shall be able to receive and transmit at all the data rates in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter as described in the MLME_Join.request and MLME_Start.request primitives.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 REJECT. Rejected, the proper text to use is from TGrev, not 1997 green book.

CI **XX** SC **9.6** N
 Johnny Zweig
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status
 It doesn't make sense for different PHYs
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add PLME-TXTIME.request and PLME-
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected, we do not have a ch:

CI **XX** SC **7.3.2.2, et. al.** P **6** L **29** # **177**
 Valerie E. Zelenty IEEE Standards Dept.
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**
 There are no editorial instructions for subclause 7.3.2.2 on page 6,nor for Clause 18 on page 10.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add editorial instructions.
 Proposed Response Response Status **C**
 ACCEPT. accepted

CI **XX** SC **A.4.9** Ir
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status
 There is no PICS entry for channel settlir
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the appropriate entry for channel set
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted in principle, the cha

CI XX SC all area P all area L # 279
 Satoshi Obara Fujitsu
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 All figure numbers and table numbers should be adjusted to base document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 If possible, it should be "clause number - figure(table) number". For example, if it is figure 1 in clause 18, it is "Figure 18-1".
 (Similarly, the change of base document may be needed ?)
 In case of existing many figures and tables, it is easy for readers to understand the 802.11.
 And, other 802 standards use the above format.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Accepted in principle. All figure numbers will be adjusted at the final inclusion in the document. To do it now would cause a problem if clause TGa adds a figure.

CI XX SC Annex A.4 P L # 280
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 HRDS8 - states that hop sequences are MANDATORY when agility is present. First, this line item is not given a text reference.
 Second, this feature falls outside the scope of 802.11. It must be controlled by an outside management entity, and therefore is outside the bounds of 802.
 There are many 'desirable' methods which could be employed to decide when and where to hop. Unless ALL methods are provided for (and defined) this spec should not define a specific method. Besides, it is 'legally' outside the scope of 802.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete this check box from the spec.
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. Rejected, the hop sequences are moved back into the normative part of the text. Therefore the check box is needed.

CI XX SC Annex A4.3 P L # 281
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 If the timer is not removed, then
 The algorithms for CCA should have different numbering from those used in section 15.
 The MIB should reflect the additional modes as well.
 The algorithms using a timer are not the same as those which do not.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Mode 2 should become new mode 4
 Mode 3 should become new mode 5
 Change in 18.4.8.4 and in PICS HRDS11
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. Rejected. This is a new PHY with 4 rates. There is no coupling between the numbering of clause 15 and clause 18.

CI XX SC Annex D P 60 L 4 # 282
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 There are no additions to the PHY compliance groups to cover the additional attributes.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Expand the compliance groups to include the additional attributes.
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Accepted, editor will add text to compliance groups.

CI XX SC Annex D lr
 Bob O'Hara
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 It seems that there are more MIB entries addition to the Annex D, since the two att registration numbers 6 and 7. Also the v not defined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either number the attributes from 1 or ins precede these two. Also define the value
 Proposed Response Response Status
 ACCEPT. Accepted, editor will get text or make sure that this section is aligned with attributes.

CI XX SC Annex F T
 Mike Trompower
 Comment Type TR Comment Status
 Delete this entire annex and all reference scope of 802.
 This information (and many pointers to it This phy must be capable of receiving bc REFERENCE, the first sentence of anne "INTEROPERABLE" FH and DS PHY.
 If you attempt to use two radio devices, th the two radios is not defined (and is outsi "interoperable" solution as stated.
 Further, the CCA mechanism which is re spec. no provisions have been provided
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete this entire annex - do not any of th
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected by a vote. The conte technical content of F.4 remains in dispu PHY, but extended capabilities of one PH

CI XX SC Annex F M
 John H. Cafarella
 Comment Type T Comment Status
 I believe the frequency-agility option viola dual-PHY situation into the future. It will standard. Uncoordinated users (i.e., SO when this option is employed, and they w
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove Annex F, and all related cross-re
 Proposed Response Response Status
 REJECT. Rejected by a vote. The conte technical content of F.4 remains in dispu

CI XX SC Annex F - Frequency H P 60 L 51 # 285 Stanley Reible MICRILOR, Inc

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The option for FH interoperability introduces unnecessary system complexity without enhancing high data system capability. The ability for users to readily switch operating channels will make it very difficult for high rate DS users to find and effectively use any clear channels in environments such as office and industrial parks. In such environments there can be many small company users, each with different equipment and widely varying MIS and networking management approaches. This will be made more serious by the fact that some of these small companies will have multiple offices and sites within the same office parks which need connectivity. Yet this is exactly the environment where wireless data links may be most needed.

SuggestedRemedy

Discourage the use of the channel agility option by striking it from the high rate standard.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. Rejected by a vote. The content of F.1, F.2, and F.3 will be moved to clause 18. The technical content of F.4 remains in dispute and will remain in the annex. This is not a new PHY, but extended capabilities of one PHY, providing some FH interoperability.

CI XX SC F.2 Operating Channel P 63 L 7 # 286 Stanley Reible MICRILOR, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The channel frequency of 247 MHz must be the correct entry. (Are we looking)

SuggestedRemedy

Try 247.2 MHz

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. accepted

CI XX SC MAC changes to support David Bagby 3

Comment Type TR Comment Status

Review Comment 7: Technical Required Essentially all the proposed changes to support the options addressed in previous additional problems that are created by them.

New bits have been defined in the capability version has not been updated. How is a new version? If you change the version level that come with an 802.11b implementation of course also prevent the long PHY header MACs will not understand the new version.

If you don't change the version information MAC implementation do when it gets a new header the values of the newly defined bits? Will it get a new MAC header with information?

I believe these problems arise because of the MAC capability field. The MAC Capability into the MAC capability field makes the PHY. That violates one of the prime design goals should the bits be set in a new MAC header later developed PHY...)?

I also note that the charter of 802.11b was the MAC. Personally, I would accept minimum with existing 802.11 MAC implementation that test. Until an analysis of all possible MAC implementations containing the proposed review, and deemed not to contain any problems.

Please note that there is an easy way out changes requested in my review comment source of the problems; there would be a new MAC specification, and without the proposed changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Required change: Adopt all the other 802.11b PHY changes; need for any of the changes proposed to corresponding MAC changes.

Proposed Response Response Status

REJECT. Rejected, we did not accept all changes.

CI XX SC many John H. Cafarella M

Comment Type T Comment Status

My concern here is the existence of too many and 5.5-Mbps rates using either CCK or the frequency-agility option. This standard. Unlike the adoption of 802.3 and the original before the standards, there is no practicality.

SuggestedRemedy

- 1) Keep CCK or PBCC, not both (prefer CCK)
2) Keep long or short header (prefer short)
3) Eliminate frequency agility.

Make the standard simpler to implement.

Proposed Response Response Status

ACCEPT. 3. Rejected by a vote. Each of the distinct advantages, either in implementation or interoperability.

CI XX SC Participants P 1 L - # 287
 Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 There are no officers, WG members or sponsor pool members listed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the correct lists
 Proposed Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. Accepted, Vic will supply the list to the editor..

CI XX SC PBCC related text P multiple L # 299
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 Review Comment 6: Technical Required
 Prior to Sponsor ballot I had requested the deletion of the PBCC option. I again make the request as part of my sponsor ballot. The utility provided by the option is insufficient (in this reviewer's opinion) to merit the complexity involved. In my (informal) sampling of people planning to implement the 802.11b PHY, I did not find anyone that planned to implement the option. The option exists due to political deals made in earlier meetings. It's time to be pragmatic and clean up the side effects of past politics - delete the option that (I believe) will not be used. If this is done it makes the resolution to the next comment (#7) easier as a positive benefit.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Required change:
 Delete PBCC option.
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. REJECT.

CI XX SC PICs CF6 P 55 L # 300
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 Review Comment 4: Technical Required
 Item CF6 in the PICs (page 55) is OFDM PHY for the 5GHz band. Delete this line from the 802.11b PICs. It has no business existing in the 802.11b PHY draft (it should exist in the 802.11a draft instead).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Required change:
 Delete item CF6 in the PICs (page 55) for the OFDM PHY for the 5GHz band.
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 ACCEPT. line will be removed.

CI XX SC PICs HRDS3 P 56 L # 301
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 Review Comment 5: Technical Required
 Prior to the sponsor ballot I had requested during internal 802.11 ballots that the FH interoperability option be made mandatory. The group responded to that request by saying "Partially accepted, the FH PLCP frame format option has been deleted". Doing exactly the opposite of what was requested is really stretching the meaning of the phrase "partially accepted"...

However, my primary concern was that the option created interoperability issues. The deletion of the option does remedy my concern. I accept the change in draft 5.0. Please complete the deletion by making the following edit:

Delete PICs item HRDS3 page 56 "Channel Agility Option". Section 18.2 no longer has the option so the PICs can't reference it.

SuggestedRemedy
 Required change:
 Delete PICs item HRDS3 page 56 "Channel Agility Option".
 Proposed Response Response Status U
 REJECT. REJECT. Rejected, the channel agility option is in 18.3.2 and is not deleted, so a PICs item is necessary. The reference in the PICs will be corrected from 18.2 to 18.3.2

CI XX SC PICs HRDS3&6 3
 David Bagby
 Comment Type TR Comment Status
 Review Comment 3: Technical Required
 I had previously requested that the use of mandatory. The 802.11b group prior to s caused by the option specifications rema
 Please refer to the PICs in draft 5.0:
 Item HRDS3 (page 56) is shown as optic
 Item HRDS6 (page 56 - short preamble p section 18.2.6.
 Neither the PICs nor the referenced text :

From what I've read that the following are
 Vender A: Implements Short header on T
 Vender B: does not implement any short
 Vender C: Implements short header on T

Once the use of short headers is turned i possible given the current draft:
 Case 1: A's equipment always sends shc interoperability.
 Case 2: B can't talk to C. Result: non-inte
 Case 3: C can't talk to C! Result: non-inte

SuggestedRemedy
 Required change:
 Here is what is required:
 1) RX short header processing must be r implemented. That will prevent case 3 ab
 2) The purpose of the short header is to g thruptut). The purpose of the long header Mbps 802.11 DS PHYs (the FH is now ir in D5.0) and an 802.11b PHY.
 The use of an option is an attempt to hav interoperability issues, effectively providir
 Either
 a) Delete the short header (effectively dex than performance) or
 b) Make the use of the short header man PHY compatibility).

I can accept either choice a) or b).
 My preference is that the standard take c interoperability between 1-2 Mbps DS PF accomplished by multiple APs and let the have antenna to antenna interoperability t one moves data from a current FH PHY s system both data interoperability (the real
 Proposed Response Response Sta
 ACCEPT. Accepted, the use of the short the HRDS6 dependent on HRDS3

CI XX SC various
 Bob O'Hara I
 Comment Type E Comment Status
 The wrong version of the standard is cite
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace all occurrences of "802.11-1997"
 Proposed Response Response Sta
 ACCEPT. accepted

Cl XX SC various P Many L various # 289

Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I

Comment Type E Comment Status A

All table and figure numbers are incorrect for placement into the standard in proper order.

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber all tables and figures for proper ordering in the standard.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Accepted, this will be done on the final insertion into the whole document. To do it now will cause a problem when a new figure is added to clause 17. Using a different numbering system here would make the main document non compliant.

Cl XX SC various P Many L various # 290

Bob O'Hara Informed Technology, I

Comment Type E Comment Status A

There is no need for "IEEE 802.11" to be used throughout the document when referring to fields and other items. What else would we be talking about? See clauses 18.2.2.1, 18.2.3.3, 18.2.3.4

SuggestedRemedy

Delete all occurrences of "IEEE 802.11" in clause titels, field definitions and descriptions.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. accepted