
**IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs**

Minutes for TGb, May 1999, Chiba, Japan

Date: July 7, 1999

Author: Tim Godfrey, John Fakatselis
CHOICE Microsystems
4242-3 Medical Drive
San Antonio, TX 78229
Phone: +1-210-614-4096
Fax: +1-210-614-8192
tgodfrey@choicemicro.com

1. 802.11 TGb, 1999 May Interim, Chiba Japan

1.1. Monday AM – TGb

1.1.1. Call to order

1.1.2. Approval of minutes of March Meeting

1.1.2.1. *Motion to approve – Moved Harry Worstel, 2nd Al Petrick, Approved 18:0:0*

1.1.3. Proposed Agenda

- 1.1.3.1. *Policies overview*
- 1.1.3.2. *Schedule*
- 1.1.3.3. *Call for Papers*
- 1.1.3.4. *Comment Compilation Review*
- 1.1.3.5. *Comment Resolution Process*
- 1.1.3.6. *Comment Resolution closure*
- 1.1.3.7. *Presentation to Plenary*

1.1.4. Agenda approved with no objections

1.1.5. Policies review

- 1.1.5.1. *Voting rights – voting members only*
- 1.1.5.2. *Debates may be open to non-voters as a courtesy*
- 1.1.5.3. *Key motions – representing your rights during this assembly*
 - 1.1.5.3.1. *Point of order – issue with proceedings, called from floor, ruled upon by chair. Chair may be appealed*
 - 1.1.5.3.2. *Point of Information – if you are called to vote, and you are not clear on a key point, you may ask for a point of information. It must be a question, asked of the chair.*
 - 1.1.5.3.3. *Parliamentary inquiry – if you are not sure of the rules or procedure. Asked of the chair.*
- 1.1.5.4. *Show of hands – any new participants to TGb*
 - 1.1.5.4.1. *One person*

1.1.6. Historical and Schedule overview

1.1.6.1. *TGb started 1.5 years ago for 2.4Ghz high rate PHY. Key restriction – PHY must work with the existing MAC. We have generated a draft, and approved at the working group level. Final WG approval at teleconference after March plenary. Draft forwarded to Sponsor Ballot. This is the first meeting to review comments on the Sponsor Ballot. We have scheduled a recirculation ballot after this meeting. We are on the path to complete this work and publish by the end of the year. We expect to meet that objective.*

1.1.7. Call for Papers

1.1.7.1. *No new papers*

1.1.8. Comment Compilation

1.1.8.1. *Access is needed to access comment database.*

1.1.9. 10 minute recess.**1.1.10. Editor to review comments of the No voters as they are presented in the Sponsor Ballot.**

In the March meeting there was an informal change to move some requirements into an informative annex. We put a statement into the main text regarding FH interoperability. The result is awkward. Optional requirements are in the main standard in 802.11 itself. The requested resolution is to move the requirements from clauses F.1-4 back into 18.4.6.7.

The issue of normative vs. informative text regarding the FH option was thoroughly discussed.

1.1.11. Adjourn - until 3:30PM**1.2. Monday Afternoon, TGb****1.2.1. Announcements**

1.2.1.1. – *regarding long lines for lunch, we can make a reservation for lunch at 11:30 at the conference center. Hitoshi to make sign up list and post on white board.*

1.2.1.2. – *TGa informal meeting in small room at 4:00*

1.2.2. TGb continuation

1.2.2.1.1. *FH interoperability discussion – The group concentrated in discussions relative to the FH interoperability, Agility option and CCA issues.*

1.2.3. Adjourn until tomorrow 10:30AM**1.3. Tuesday Morning – TGb****1.3.1. General FH interoperability issues continued.**

1.3.1.1. Motion 1 – to have as normative text in the draft the following requirements: Frequency Agility and Settling Time, Frequency Hop Sequence Set, CCA Algorithm

1.3.1.1.1. *Moved by Bob O'Hara*

1.3.1.1.2. – *Friendly amendment - wants to add text to move sections F1-4*

1.3.1.1.3. *Bob O – Insert this text: “to implement this, move F.1 – F.4 into clause 18.4.6.7.”*

- 1.3.1.1.4. *Seconded by Dean*
- 1.3.1.1.5. *Vote (technical) 9-4-8 fails*
- 1.3.1.2. – *Motion to change 18.4.6.7 delete the phrase “and the hop sequences described in Annex F.” Move by Jan Seconded Vic Hayes.*
- 1.3.1.2.1. *Vote (technical) 3-11-7 fails*
- 1.3.1.3. *Motion – To move clause F1, F2, and F3 into clause 18.4.6.7. Moved by Peter*
- 1.3.1.3.1. *This motion ruled out of order by the chair.*
- 1.3.1.4. *Motion – to reconsider motion 1 as stated above. Moved Peter E, Seconded Darwin E.*
- 1.3.1.4.1. *Vote – motion passes 10-3-7*
- 1.3.1.4.2. *Return to motion 1:*
- 1.3.1.5. *Motion 1 – to have as normative text in the draft the following requirements: Frequency Agility and Settling Time, Frequency Hop Sequence Set, CCA Algorithm*
- 1.3.1.5.1. *Peter – moves to divide the motion into two parts. One part moving F1, F2, and F3 to 18.4.6.7, and the other part to move F4 to 18.4.6.7. Seconded Bob O'hara.*
- 1.3.1.5.2. *Vote : motion passes 10-2-5*
- 1.3.1.6. *Motion 1A - to have as normative requirement clauses F1, F2, and F3 into clause 18.4.6.7.*
- 1.3.1.7. *Motion 1B - to have as normative requirement clauses F4 into clause 18.4.6.7.*
- 1.3.1.7.1. *Naftali –calls for point of order.*
- 1.3.1.7.2. *Chair – rules that it is procedural*
- 1.3.1.7.3. *Jan B – appeals, Vic H - Seconds*
- 1.3.1.7.4. *Vote (Yes is to support the chair, that is procedural) Passes 7-5-8*
- 1.3.1.7.5. *Back to main motions*
- 1.3.1.8. *Motion 1A - to have as normative requirement clauses F1, F2, and F3 into clause 18.4.6.7.*
- 1.3.1.8.1. *Vote : motion passes 10-3-6*
- 1.3.1.8.2. *Noted that this is 75% so it would pass if it was considered a technical motion.*
- 1.3.1.9. *Motion 1B - to have as normative requirement clauses F4 into clause 18.4.6.7.*
- 1.3.1.9.1. *Vote: (technical) 8:4:4 Fails*
- 1.3.1.10. *As it stands, anything regarding CCA is informative, anything from F1, F2, and F3 is normative.*

1.3.2. Comment Resolution

- 1.3.2.1. *Updates on ballot*

- 1.3.2.1.1. *received another Yes with comments from Johnny, and a No with comments from Anil. 22 additional comments. One TR from Anil.*
- 1.3.2.1.2. *TGb has 90% return ratio, 9 disapprove 88% approval ratio*
- 1.3.2.2. *Comment 222, Mike T, 18.3.3*
 - .
- 1.3.2.3. *Comment 225, Mike T, 18.4.4.2*
 - 1.3.2.3.1. *Response – Accepted: change CS_THRESHOLD to ED_THRESHOLD which does have a setting method.*
 - 1.3.2.3.2. *Adopted with no objection.*
- 1.3.2.4. *Comment 255, Mike T, 18.4.6.7*
 - 1.3.2.4.1. *Rejected – the requirements for hinh parameters are to be included in clause 18.4.6.7 by moving them from annex F1 through F3. The sequence of hopping must be specified in order for all stations to operate on the same channel.*
- 1.3.2.5. *Comment 294, Jeff Fischer, 18.4.6.6*
 - 1.3.2.5.1. *This comment was dealt with in earlier ballots.*
- 1.3.2.6. *Comment 300, Dave Bagby, PICS CF6*
 - 1.3.2.6.1. *Accepted – remove CF6*
- 1.3.2.7. *Comment 199, Bob O, 18.2.3.10*
 - 1.3.2.7.1. *Change “modulation” to “rate” in first sentence.*
 - 1.3.2.7.2. *No objections, resolution accepted*
- 1.3.2.8. *Comment 201, Bob O, 18.2.3.10*
- 1.3.2.9. *Comments 206, 211, 216, Bob O*
 - 1.3.2.9.1. *Resolution – accepted, no objections*
- 1.3.2.10. *Comment 228, 240, Bob O, 18.4.5.1.2 and 2.2*
 - 1.3.2.10.1. *Resolution, change the first two values to 1 and 2 Mb/s. Accepted, no objections*
- 1.3.2.11. *Comment 242, Bob O, 18.4.5.3.2*
 - 1.3.2.11.1. *Accepted – the interface needs to state when the modulation is to be used. IE only for the ambiguity at 5.5 and 11Mb/s rates that can be CCK or PBCC.*
 - 1.3.2.11.2. *Past time - Meeting is adjourned*

1.4. Wednesday Morning, TGb

1.4.1. Discussion

- 1.4.1.1. *Bob O’Hara and Carl have been editing the FH related comments*
- 1.4.1.2. *John F – request from rest of group to help with editing comments. Hopefully tomorrow we can close all remaining comments*
- 1.4.1.3. *Report from Bob O – I have resolutions written for all FH related comments, based on our decisions yesterday. There are more than a dozen.*

1.4.1.4. *Report from Carl A – I have been working on other editorial comments. Roughly half the comments have been addressed. There are some remaining technical comments for this group.*

1.4.1.4.1.

1.4.1.5. Comment resolution teams

1.4.1.5.1. *clauses 7 – 10: Bob O, Darwin E*

1.4.1.5.2. *Clauses 18.0 to 18.3 (intro, PLCP, MIB entries, PLME) Al P, Dean K, Tim G*

1.4.1.5.3. *Clause 18.4 (PMD and PHY specs) Carl A, Jan B, Matt S, Harry W*

1.4.1.5.4. *Annex A (PICS), Annex D (ASN1 code for MIB) Harry W*

1.4.1.6. *Start at 9:00PM*

1.4.1.7. *Tomorrow we approve the resolutions to the comments.*

1.4.2. Comment Resolution

1.4.2.1. *Comment 259, Vic Hayes*

1.4.2.1.1. *Agility option has not been tested. Asks to remove the option*

1.4.2.1.2. *Resolution – Rejected by a vote. We have moved F1 – F3 into the normative text. F4 remains informative in the annex.*

1.4.2.1.3. *Any objection to accept? No objection, resolution approved*

1.4.2.2. *Comment by John Caferella*

1.4.2.2.1. *Asking form removal of agility option on the basis that it violates the letter of the PAR*

1.4.2.2.2. *Resolution – Rejected by a vote (same as previous)*

1.4.2.3. *Comment 284, Mike Trompower*

1.4.2.3.1. *Wants to delete Annex F and not move into section 18, on the assertion that this makes a second PHY.*

1.4.2.3.2. *Resolution – Rejected by a vote. This is not a new phy, but extends the capabilities of the one PHY being standardized.*

1.4.2.3.3. *Any objection to accept? No objection, resolution approved*

1.4.2.4. *Comment 285, Stan Reible*

1.4.2.4.1. *He would like to discourage the use of channel agility by striking it from the standard, with all related text.*

1.4.2.4.2. *Resolution – Rejected by vote. Frequency agility is a valuable capability.*

1.4.2.4.3. *Any objection to accept? No objection, resolution approved*

1.4.2.5. *Comment 274, Stan Reible*

1.4.2.5.1. *Objecting to the number of options in the standard, asking for removal of Frequency agility*

1.4.2.5.2. *Resolution – Rejected by vote. Frequency agility is a valuable capability.*

1.4.2.5.3. *Any objection to accept? No objection, resolution approved*

1.4.2.6. *Comment 272, Bob Ward*

1.4.2.6.1. *FH interoperability should be normative, not informative*

- 1.4.2.6.2. *Accepted*
- 1.4.2.6.3. *No objection*

1.4.3. Comments from No Voters

- 1.4.3.1. *Comment 188 Mike Trompower*
 - 1.4.3.1.1. *PLME_start should be updated to reflect that more than one PHY parameter set.*
 - 1.4.3.1.2. *Resolution – it is an editorial comment, and resolved with the changes to the agility mode*
 - 1.4.3.1.3. *Approved, no objections*
- 1.4.3.2. *Comment 190, Mike Trompower*
 - 1.4.3.2.1. *Resolution – Rejected*
 - 1.4.3.2.2. *Approved, no objections*
- 1.4.3.3. *Comment 192,*
 - 1.4.3.3.1. *This says the long preamble is mandatory*
 - 1.4.3.3.2. *Adopted, no objections*
 - 1.4.3.3.3.
- 1.4.3.4. *Comment 215, Mike T*
 - 1.4.3.4.1. *Accepted, no objections*
- 1.4.3.5. *Comment 222, Mike T*
 - 1.4.3.5.1. *Legacy values CWMIN*
 - 1.4.3.5.2. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.4.3.6. *Comment 225, Mike T*
 - 1.4.3.6.1. *CS)threshold*
 - 1.4.3.6.2. *Accepted in principle*
 - 1.4.3.6.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.4.3.7. *Comment 249, Mark Webster*
 - 1.4.3.7.1. *TBD*
 - 1.4.3.7.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.4.3.7.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.4.3.8. *Comment 248, Vic Hayes*
 - 1.4.3.8.1. *TBD*
 - 1.4.3.8.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.4.3.8.3. *Adopted, no objections*
 - 1.4.3.8.4.
- 1.4.3.9. *Comment 247, Mike T*
 - 1.4.3.9.1. *TBD in section 18.4.6.1 , asking for*
 - 1.4.3.9.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.4.3.9.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.4.3.10. *Comment 250, Allen Heberling*
 - 1.4.3.10.1. *Temperature Types different between PICS and Annex a4.3.*

1.4.3.10.2. *We need to determine if we have two temperature types or three.*

By accepting the comment we would eliminate one temperature types.

1.4.3.10.3.

1.4.3.11. *Adjourn*

1.5. Thursday Morning, TGb

1.5.1. Review from comment resolution teams

1.5.1.1. *Clauses 7-10 – all resolved*

1.5.1.2. *Clauses 18.0-3 – all resolved*

1.5.1.3. *Clause 18.4 – all resolved*

1.5.1.4. *Annexes – Need MIB expert for 2 comments*

1.5.2. Comment Resolution

1.5.2.1. *Comment 275, 7.3.1.4*

1.5.2.1.1. *Internal indication of agility*

1.5.2.1.2. *Accepted*

1.5.2.1.3. *Adopted, no objection*

1.5.2.2. *Comment 277,*

1.5.2.2.1. *The intent of the comment was that give the number of options, it is possible to have configurations that cannot communicate.*

1.5.2.2.2. *The fix is in the Multirate section, where the control response frame is sent using the same characteristics.*

1.5.2.2.3. *The same rule for management response frames was missing, and was added as the resolution.*

1.5.2.2.4. *Adopted, no objections*

1.5.2.3. *Comment 181, Mike T, 10.3.10.1*

1.5.2.3.1. *Commenter says the HR PHY needs both DS and FH parameter sets*

1.5.2.3.2. *The PLME_start should be updated. Accepted, Change Set to Sets*

1.5.2.3.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.5.2.4. *Comment 182*

1.5.2.4.1. *Same issue as 181, but for MLME_scan confirm*

1.5.2.4.2. *Adopted, no objections*

1.5.2.5. *Comment 183, Mike T*

1.5.2.5.1. *MLME_join needs to be updated for new options.*

1.5.2.5.2. *This is not the mechanism for setting the capabilities information field in the MAC. The purpose of this primitive is for identifying which BSS the station wants to join.*

1.5.2.5.3. *Rejected*

1.5.2.5.4. *Adopted, no objections*

1.5.2.6. *Comment 184, Mike T*

1.5.2.6.1. *PLME_characteristics need to be updated for options*

- 1.5.2.6.2. *The purpose of this primitive is for duration, and will not be used in this PHY*
- 1.5.2.6.3. *Rejected,*
- 1.5.2.6.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.7. *Comment 185, Mike T*
 - 1.5.2.7.1. *Wants to update PLME_DSSStestmode for the new rates and options.*
 - 1.5.2.7.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.7.2.1. *Additional question – what are the three data patterns defined in DATA_TYPE. The do not exist even in the existing standard. We cannot answer this question*
 - 1.5.2.7.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.8. *Comment 191, 18.1.2*
 - 1.5.2.8.1. *Conflict in FH / DS usage*
 - 1.5.2.8.2. *Deleted the last sentence that was redundant*
 - 1.5.2.8.3. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.8.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.9. *Comment 307, Johnny Z*
 - 1.5.2.9.1. *Use of short preambles for beacons and probe responses.*
 - 1.5.2.9.2. *Resolution – rejected ; the change in comment 277 and changes to clause 9.6 to respond in kind to management frames will insure stations that use active scanning will get a response even when the network is using short preambles.*
 - 1.5.2.9.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.10. *Comment 195, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.10.1. *Replace must with shall 18.2.2.2*
 - 1.5.2.10.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.10.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.11. *Comment 200, Vic*
 - 1.5.2.11.1. *Hexadecimal notation*
 - 1.5.2.11.2. *Hex numbering has been corrected where appropriate. This particular number is an actual number, and thus may be weighted.*
 - 1.5.2.11.3. *Rejected*
 - 1.5.2.11.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.12. *Comment 201, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.12.1. *MSB LSB usage*
 - 1.5.2.12.2. *This is a number*
 - 1.5.2.12.3. *Rejected*
 - 1.5.2.12.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.13. *Comment 202, Vic*
 - 1.5.2.13.1. *Bit pattern, not a number (SFD)*
 - 1.5.2.13.2. *Accepted*

- 1.5.2.13.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.14. *Comment 205, Vic 18.2.3.3*
 - 1.5.2.14.1. *Hex numbers*
 - 1.5.2.14.2. *The rates are really a number*
 - 1.5.2.14.3. *Rejected*
 - 1.5.2.14.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.15. *Comment 206, 18.2.3.4*
 - 1.5.2.15.1. *Numbering of service field*
 - 1.5.2.15.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.15.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.16. *Comment 207, Vic, 18.2.3.4*
 - 1.5.2.16.1. *Wording from Not to Not Locked*
 - 1.5.2.16.2. *Accepted in principle, the wording has been changed*
 - 1.5.2.16.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.17. *Comment 208, Vic 18.2.3.4*
 - 1.5.2.17.1. *Wording change "being 0" to "shall be"*
 - 1.5.2.17.2. *Accepted in principle (wording changed)*
 - 1.5.2.17.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.18. *Comment 211, Bob O, 18.2.3.8*
 - 1.5.2.18.1. *MSB LSB*
 - 1.5.2.18.2. *Replaced with bit numberings*
 - 1.5.2.18.3. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.18.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.19. *Comment 214, Vic*
 - 1.5.2.19.1. *ShortSFD notation*
 - 1.5.2.19.2. *Accepted by changing figure to agree*
 - 1.5.2.19.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.20. *Comment 216, 18.2.3.9*
 - 1.5.2.20.1. *Numeric field MSB LSB*
 - 1.5.2.20.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.20.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.21. *Comment 217, Vic*
 - 1.5.2.21.1. *Long preamble init is "done double"*
 - 1.5.2.21.2. *Accepted, reword sentence*
 - 1.5.2.21.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.22. *Comment 0, Allen H*
 - 1.5.2.22.1. *Dot11phytype*
 - 1.5.2.22.2. *Accepted, the phy type is HRDSS=X05*
 - 1.5.2.22.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.23. *Comment 313, Anil*

- 1.5.2.23.1. *Relative to 1997 green book, or TGrev*
- 1.5.2.23.2. *Accepted, the proper standard to reference is the 1999 standard.*
- 1.5.2.23.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.24. *Comment 314, Anil*
 - 1.5.2.24.1. *18.3.3 aPreambleLength two values*
 - 1.5.2.24.2. *Rejected – it is acceptable to have a dynamic value for this*
 - 1.5.2.24.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.25. *Comment 227 Vic*
 - 1.5.2.25.1. *Unconventional to specify mandatory items into primitives and parameters*
 - 1.5.2.25.2. *Accepted, all shalls in this section changed to Is's.*
 - 1.5.2.25.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.26. *Comment 228, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.26.1. *DATA.indicate coding – bits, dibits, nibbles, bytes*
 - 1.5.2.26.2. *Accepted, edit table*
 - 1.5.2.26.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.27. *Comment 229, Vic*
 - 1.5.2.27.1. *Representations of rates vs modulations consistency*
 - 1.5.2.27.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.27.2.1. *Discussion on the use of bits, nibbles, bytes. Take out the words*
 - 1.5.2.27.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.28. *Comment 239, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.28.1. *Conflict in 18.4.5.15.2 value of ED_THRESHOLD*
 - 1.5.2.28.2. *The value should be ED_THRESHOLD, not 0 or 1*
 - 1.5.2.28.3. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.28.4. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.29. *Comment 240, 241, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.29.1. *Dibit values for rates*
 - 1.5.2.29.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.5.2.29.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.30. *Comment 242, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.30.1. *Primitive allows only PBCC or CCK how are DBPSK and DQPSK modulations chosen?*
 - 1.5.2.30.1.1. *Bob – the PMD has no memory, and must be told in every service primitive what modulation to use.*
 - 1.5.2.30.2. *Accepted – add barker, PBCC, and CCK PMD_MODULATION.request and .indicate.*
 - 1.5.2.30.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.31. *Comment 243, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.31.1. *PMD vs PLCP*
 - 1.5.2.31.2. *Accepted, delete PMD*

- 1.5.2.31.3. *Adopted, no objection*
- 1.5.2.32. *Comment 246, Mike T*
 - 1.5.2.32.1. *Power Levels – 4 vs 8*
 - 1.5.2.32.2. *Rejected, the generic requirement is 8, but the particular PHY uses 4.*
 - 1.5.2.32.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.33. *Comment 0, Allen H*
 - 1.5.2.33.1. *Settling rate TBD uS*
 - 1.5.2.33.2. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.34. *Comment 251, 254, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.34.1. *Accepted, replace chips with C0*
 - 1.5.2.34.2. *Adopted no objections*
- 1.5.2.35. *Comment 261, 262, Bob O*
 - 1.5.2.35.1. *Why is minimum Xmit power specified*
 - 1.5.2.35.2. *Accepted – removed requirement for minimum power level*
 - 1.5.2.35.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.36. *Comment 263, Mike T*
 - 1.5.2.36.1. *4 power levels*
 - 1.5.2.36.2. *See 246*
- 1.5.2.37. *Comment 267, Stan Reible*
 - 1.5.2.37.1. *Wants better receive sensitivities*
 - 1.5.2.37.2. *Rejected – this is a minimum requirement on implementations and allows low cost*
 - 1.5.2.37.3. *Adopted, no objections*
- 1.5.2.38. *Comment 271, Stan R*
 - 1.5.2.38.1. *CCA threshold higher for higher data rates*
 - 1.5.2.38.2. *Rejected – this scheme was to allow low power limited range cells*
 - 1.5.2.38.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.5.3. Closing – adjourn until afternoon

1.6. Thursday Afternoon, TGb

1.6.1. Information

- 1.6.1.1. *we did not count Stan Reible's no vote. The total no voter count is 10.*

1.6.2. Comment resolution

- 1.6.2.1. *Comment 303, Anil*
 - 1.6.2.1.1. *Tables in BSS basic rate set needs update*
 - 1.6.2.1.2. *Accepted*
 - 1.6.2.1.3. *Adopted, no objection*

1.6.2.2. Comment 324, Johnny

1.6.2.2.1. *Wants to add PLME_TXTIME. Primitives to all other PHYs.*

1.6.2.2.2. *Rejected – we do not have a charter to change other PHYs*

1.6.2.2.3. *Adopted, no objection*

1.6.2.3. Comment 282, Bob O

1.6.2.3.1. *In annex D there are no additions to the compliance groups for the additional attributes*

1.6.2.3.2. *Accepted, the editor will add the text*

1.6.2.3.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.2.4. Comment 283, Bob O

1.6.2.4.1. *There are more MIB entries than are listed in this addition to annex D.*

1.6.2.4.2. *Accepted, editor will get text of the current standard, and align with TGrev (1999)*

1.6.2.4.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.2.5. Comment 334, Ephraim Z

1.6.2.5.1. *Suggests that the 1 and 2 rates are coded with PBCC or some other coding*

1.6.2.5.2. *Rejected – the purpose of those lower rates are for interoperability, not range extension.*

1.6.2.5.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.3. Editorial Comments**1.6.3.1. Comment 219, Bob O**

1.6.3.1.1. *Is the PLCP procedural definition the place for a PMD implementation recommendation?*

1.6.3.1.2. *It was rejected*

1.6.3.2. Comment 315, Anil

1.6.3.2.1. *PreambleLength*

1.6.3.2.2. *The PHY characteristics are not normative. These values may be dynamic variables. This is accounted for by the TXTIME*

1.6.3.2.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.3.3. Comment 225, Mike T

1.6.3.3.1. *PMD_CS.request*

1.6.3.3.2. *Accepted in principle – change CS_threshold to correlation threshold which does not have a setting method.*

1.6.3.3.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.3.4. Comment 245, Bob O

1.6.3.4.1. *The primitive has no parameters 18.4.5.7.2*

1.6.3.4.2. *Accepted*

1.6.3.4.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.3.5. Comment 0, Jeff Fischer 18.4.6.6

1.6.3.5.1. *Wants PBCC mode mandatory*

1.6.3.5.2. *Rejected*

1.6.3.6. *Comment 316, Anil*

1.6.3.6.1. *Channel agility does not enable FH interoperability as it is claimed here and in Appendix F.*

1.6.3.6.2. *Accepted – hop sequences added to clause 18. Accepted suggestion for text in clause 18.1*

1.6.3.6.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.3.7. *Comment 322, Anil*

1.6.3.7.1. *Text matching green book*

1.6.3.7.2. *Rejected – the text is to match 802.11-1999*

1.6.3.7.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.3.8. *Comment 287, Bob O*

1.6.3.8.1. *Requests for lists of WG members*

1.6.3.8.1.1. *Vic – there is no objection to put this in now. Will be provided to Editor.*

1.6.3.8.2. *Accepted*

1.6.3.8.3. *Adopted, no objections*

1.6.4. Release comment resolution spreadsheet as document 130.

1.6.4.1. *Document will be formatted and distributed*

1.6.4.2. *Recess until 2:30*

1.6.4.3. *Approve the resolutions, forward the recommendation to the Plenary*

1.6.5. Editorial comments

1.6.5.1. *Update of text for response to Jeff Fischer.*

1.6.5.1.1. *Accepted with no objections*

1.6.5.1.2. *Editing error in preliminary draft*

1.6.6. Draft 5.1 (preliminary) review

Modified text for 18.4.6.7 is shown

1.6.7. Output documents

1.6.7.1. *Change of document 130 to document 130r1*

1.6.7.2. Motion to approve the resolutions given in document doc:99/130r1 and to empower the comment resolution teleconference planned for May 28, 1999 to resolve any additional comments from balloters that have not yet submitted their votes.

1.6.7.3. *Moved Vic Hayes, Seconded Tim Godfrey*

1.6.7.4. *No discussion*

1.6.7.5. Vote passes 10:0:1 (technical)

1.6.7.6. Motion to submit the draft 802.11b to sponsor recirculation ballot after incorporating the comment resolutions in doc:99/130r1

and any changes decide upon by the comment resolution teleconference planned for May 28, 1999. This is subject to approval by the participants of the teleconference WG members. There is no quorum required. The comment resolution teleconference shall only resolve any additional comments from balloters that have not yet submitted their votes

1.6.7.7. *Moved Dean K, Seconded Al P*

1.6.7.8. Vote Passes 11:0:1

1.6.8. Conclusion of TGb business for the week

1.6.9. Adjourn