23 **E / A / W**

The xref format "(See 6.3.1.1 on Page 28)" is non standard.

144 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.1 **TR / D / W** Breen, Greg

145 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.6.2.6 **T / R / W** Breen, Greg

The pulse shape specification seems to be incorrect because it shall produce an irregular waveform.

181 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.8.8 **T / A / W** Carmeli, Boaz

The mapling between the integer and the energy level shell be defined.

182 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.8.9 **T / A / W** Carmeli, Boaz

The mapling between the integer and the link cuality level shell be defined.

193 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 16 (6.5 **T / A / W** Carmeli, Boaz

Why the phyMaxPacketSize is so small? is it really only 58 bytes for the 2.4 GHz phy? If so - why the 900 MHz phy has longer packet size

195 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.8.10 **T / A / W** Carmeli, Boaz

The CCA mode 4 is not clear to me (sorry). What do we gain from listening to the channel for max PPDU size. it seems more important to w

199 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 6.9 **T / X / W** Chen, Hung-Kun

The section of coexistence for 802.15.4 does not address all other IEEE devices using 2.4 GHz band, such as 802.15.1, 802.15.3. Also it on

201 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.8.10 **E / A / W** Chen, Hung-Kun

CCA mode 4: The timer is set to the max PPDU size. What should happen if the PPDU length information is decoded? Does the CCA keep

205 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 6.9 **TR / X / W** Chen, Kwang-Cheng

The section of coexistence for 802.15.4 does not address all other IEEE devices using 2.4 GHz band, such as 802.15.1, 802.15.3. Also it on

240 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.9.2 **TR / A / W** CYPHER, DAVID

Is CSMA/CCA mechanism different from CSMA/CA, CSMA-CA, or what is it?

263 **Cl** 06 *MAC TECH* **SC** 6.3.1.3.3 **T / X / W** CYPHER, DAVID

This clause states that, "The effect on receipt of this primitive by the MAC sublayer is unspecified." Is this statement made because there is

266 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.5 Table 16 **TR / A / W** CYPHER, DAVID

There is currently no default or mimimum required number of channels that must be supported. However, at least one channel must be sup

267 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.5 table 16 **TR / R / W** CYPHER, DAVID

No default/initial/minimum value is given for the Clear Channel Assessment Mode. Clause 6.8.10 states that the 802.15.4 Phy shall provide

T / A / W

Tx-to-RX turnaround time and Rx-to-Tx turnaround time, as currently specified, do not guarantee handshake operation.

301 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 17 **T / A / W** Gorday, Paul

The new PN sequence is suboptimum for multipath performance.

302 **Cl** 06 *Phy EDIT* **SC** Table 16 **E / A / W** Gorday, Paul

The PIB objects phyCurrentChannel and phyNumChannelsSupported are not referenced in any of the sections.

303 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 16 **T / A / W** Gorday, Paul

The spec lists no restrictions on phyNumChannelsSupported? For example, must a compliant device support all channels within a given bar

305 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.7 **T / A / W** Gorday, Paul

The 2.4 GHz PHY specifies a Transmit PSD mask, but the 868/915 PHY does not.

Comment Status
CommentType | Response Status

310 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** **E / A / W** Gorday, Paul
General comment regarding PHY chapter. Is there a reference to a test document that describes how various spcefications are verified? F

312 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 15 **T / A / W** Gorday, Paul
Should the Data Start-of-Packet delimiter be changed such that there is a hamming distance of 4 between it and the preamble?

361 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 4.1.2 **TR / A / W** GUBBI, RAJUGOPAL
This is the first place where a bit tx rule is mentioned. Why is this only for one field? Isn't this a common rule for all fields?

362 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 4.1.3 **TR / A / W** GUBBI, RAJUGOPAL
Is this field bit-0 or bit-7 of PHY-Header-octet? What is the use of this bit? nowhere in this doc, except for the mentioning of this bit in 6.4.1.3

363 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 4.1.4 **/** GUBBI, RAJUGOPAL
what is the length of this field?

364 **TR / R / W**
If this has to be a low-cost implementation, there has to be one simple, reliable scheme for CCA. How can an high end system support five

365 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 9 **TR / X / W** GUBBI, RAJUGOPAL
I haven't seen any supporting evidence that the 802.15.4 devices will take less than 1% duty cycle? How was this derived? Please add jus

422 **Cl** 06 *MAC TECH* **SC** 6.3.1.1 **T / X / W** Gutierrez, Jose
What happens when a PD-Data.request is done with a MPDU whose length makes the overall phyPacketsize greater than the phyMaxPacke

424 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 4 **T / A / W** Gutierrez, Jose
What happens when the length of a received packet is greater thah phyMaxPacketSize?

428 **Cl** 06 *Phy EDIT* **SC** Table 14 **E / A / W** Gutierrez, Jose
On table 14 there is an inconsistency between what this table states and the explanation in section 5.4.4. On 5.4.4 the sync header, beaco

432 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 16 **T / A / W** Gutierrez, Jose
We have a phyNumChannelsSupported in the PIB but this may not be enough since we have 2 PHY's!

435 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 6.9 **T / X / W** Gutierrez, Jose
Section 6.9 needs to be expanded. Not enough information

577 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 16 **T / A / W** Jamieson, Phil
The description of the PIB entry phyMaxPacketSize is not quite worded correctly and is also restrictive for a 2.4GHz PHY implementation tha

579 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 2.5.3 **TR / A / W** Kinney, Patrick
A sensitivity of -85 dBm is not good enough for the 868/928 PHY. The major reason for this device over the 2.4 GHz device is range. The e

581 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.3.1 **TR / A / W** Kinney, Patrick
The limits for transmit PSD are unclear as to whether they are averages or peak limits

582 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** table 19 **T / A / W** Kinney, Patrick
what should be limits are stated as desired levels, eg adj chan rej = 0 dB

583 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** .7 **TR / D / W** Kinney, Patrick
The method proposed for 868/928 has not been validated with published analyses or test results for sensitivity, BER vs interference, multip

585 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 9.2 **T / X / W** Kinney, Patrick
The following verbage isn't strong enough:<CR><CR>The 802.15.4 devices have several characteristics that improves its coexistence with

586 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 7.3.3 **T / A / W** Kinney, Patrick
what should be limits are stated as desired levels, eg adj chan rej = 0 dB

595 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 8.5 **TR / D / W** Kinney, Patrick

Power shutback is required for this standard but is not addressed as to when it should be used or not used. Spefically: "A compliant transr

596 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 00 **TR / R / W** Lansford, Jim

This specification describes a physical layer that, at the RF interface, is not interoperable, and does not coexist with other IEEE adopted or p

597 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 6.9 **TR / X / W** Liu, Shawn

The section of coexistence for 802.15.4 does not address all other IEEE devices using 2.4 GHz band, such as 802.15.1, 802.15.3. Also it on

600 **Cl** 06 *Coexistence Team* **SC** 6.9 **TR / X / W** Maa, Yeong-Chang

The section of coexistence for 802.15.4 does not address all other IEEE devices using 2.4 GHz band, such as 802.15.1, 802.15.3. Also it on

604 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 6.7.3.3 **TI / A / W** Martin, Fred

Spec is too tight, making LO noise and phase modulator accuracy into difficult design tasks. The spec could be relaxed to as much as 40%

610 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 00 **TI / D / W** Moridi, Said

The range of the 2.4 PHY (around 10m) seems too short for applications like home automation. This will prevent the 2.4 GHz (the only glob

615 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 16 **TI / A / W** Roberts, Richard

In description of the phyNumChannelsSupported

622 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 4 **ED / A / W** Shepherd, Nick

What is the algorithm for deriving the value of ppduLinkQuality?<CR><CR>Is "0" good or bad?

623 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 7 **ED / A / W** Shepherd, Nick

What is the algorithm for defining the value of Energy Level?<CR><CR>Is "0" high or low?<CR><CR>How do this figure relate to the energy

626 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** Table 16 **TI / A / W** Shepherd, Nick

phyNumChannelsSupported: the description for this is not complete. For instance, a value of 1 indicates that, presumably, the PHY can han

628 **Cl** 06 *Phy TECH* **SC** 8.10 **TI / R / W** Shepherd, Nick

This section is very complex for a lightweight implementation.