Collected comments on Section 9 of draft standard D1

9	Geiger	E	This section must be reworked to provide a more organized set of MIB variables and definitions that reflect the requirements of the PHY layers across all PHYs. Also, the actual PHY MIB should be done on a PHY specific basis rather than as a common set. Its okay to have a common area to define the MIB attributes but groups should be specific to a PHY	I believe that each PHY should document it own MIB table parameters using common MIB attributes.
9 (all), 10.9, 11 (missing)	bdobyns	T	Eliminate Section 10.9 FHSS PHY MIB, reconcile and merge content of 10.9 with 9.0 Fabricate content for DSSS PHY MIB and merge with 9.0	All three PHY should reference same MIB. Section 9 and Section 10.9 must be reconciled with each other, as well as with the DSSS PHY (section 11)
9.1.1.1	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	remove MPDU_Current_Maximum	Unnecessary complication in an already too complex protocol. The only use I know would be for Ph to know that its error rate is high so a smaller packet could get through better. But the MAC has responsibility for making this decision and MAC doesn't have to tell Ph it just sends smaller MPDU.
9.1.1.2	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Negative implications of optional multiple rate operation is a concern both for operational effects and implementation difficulties. Before the standard is approved multi-rate performance MUST be simulated.	The protocol's weakness is that efficient operation depends on STA hearing other STA to construct NAV, etc. Overlapping BSS good citizen operation also requires that each STA can understand the other. This is a perfect example of something that MUST be simulated before we proceed with it.
9.1.4	Jerry Loraine	T	delete section	I have philosophical difficulty in understanding why many of these attributes are specified. It cannot be tested. It makes the specification unnecessarily complex. We need to consider more the system aspects, rather than concentrating on a non exposed interface.
9.1.4.1	Renfro	E		Definition is for CCA fall time.
9.1.4.12	C. Thomas Baumgartner	e	Correct the definition to "The minimum count of alarms..."	Count is not defined as time.
9.1.4.13	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Change from hundreds of nanoseconds to tens of nanoseconds	Need to allow for short path lengths. For IR the time will not exceed about 50 nsecs for standard products and about 100 nsecs for future products.
9.1.4.14	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Delete this parameter	This parameter is redundant because variance is direct function of distance and distance is always variable from 0 to maximum distance so variance in transit time is always from 0 to maximum value of parameter above.
9.1.4.15	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute a set or single value?	Requires simulation results

9.1.4.15 9.1.4.16 9.1.4.17 9.1.4.18 9.1.4.19 9.1.4.20 9.1.4.21 9.1.4.22	bdobyns	T	Replace "The values of the numbers for the reception rates are defined by each PHY" with "Each rate is represented with a single octet whose value is the rate in units of 100 kbit/s (e.g. a 1Mbps rate is 0x0A). "	This is consistent with 4.4.26
9.1.4.16	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute a set or single value?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.17	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute a set or not required?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.18	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute a set or not required?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.19	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute a set or not required?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.2	Renfro	E		Definition is for CCA rise time.
9.1.4.20	bdobyns	T	Clarification needed PLCP rate may not be a meaningful concept - some PHY may transmit the PLCP using a combination of non-symbol and symbol data. The non-symbol data may precede the symbol data indicate a "gearshift" to a particular rate. Other PHY may have symbol data at one rate, a "gearshift" and then symbol data at another rate. In either case PLCP rate refers to the rate of the symbol data AFTER the "gearshift"	
9.1.4.20	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute required?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.21	Joe Kubler	E	in behavior, "reception rates" should be "transmission rates"	
9.1.4.21	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute required?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.22	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	Is attribute required?	Requires simulation results
9.1.4.24	Bob O'Hara	T	Make behaviour more explicit and clear	ambiguous
9.1.4.24	Fischer, Mike.	T	This attribute shall never be less than 256 for any 802.11 PHY	This constraint was part of the decision when fragmentation was adopted last summer.
9.1.4.24	Fischer, Mike.	T	This must be greater than or equal to 256 octets in any 802.11 PHY.	Include a lower bound that was part of the original fragmentation definition accepted by this group for inclusion in the draft.
9.1.4.25	C. Thomas Baumgartner	t	delete MPDU_Current_Maximum	Unnecessary complication in an already too complex protocol. The only use I know would be for Ph to know that its error rate is high so a smaller packet could get through better. But the MAC has responsibility for making this decision and MAC doesn't have to tell Ph it just sends smaller MPDU. In Section 5.1.4 attribute is called Fragmentation_Threshold.

9.1.4.3	Fischer, Mike.	T	This should be the time until "the earliest valid time for the MAC to generate a PHY_DATA.request(Start_of_Activity)"	Identify the proper ending event.
9.1.4.4	Fischer, Mike.	T	This should be the time between PHY_DATA.request(End_of_Data) and the earliest possible occurrence of PHY_DATA.indicate(Start_of_Activity)	Define a turnaround time useful to the MAC.
9.1.4.7	C. Thomas Baumgartner	e	parallel spelled incorrecty	typo
9.1.4.7	Joe Kubler	E	last sentence in behavior "paallel" should be "parallel"	
9.1.4.7	Renfro	E	Paallel should be parallel	
9.1.4.8	Fischer, Mike.	T	This should be the time between the PHY_DATA.request(Start_of_Activity) and the resulting PHY_DATA.confirm	Define a PLCP time useful to the MAC.
9.1.4.9	Renfro	T		State that watchdog timer refers to DS PHYs only.