IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs
Comment received on Letter Ballot 18 for 802.11b

Date: March 30, 1999

Author: Vic Hayes,
Lucent Technologies
Zadelstede 1-10
3431 JZ Niewegein, the Netherlands
Phone: +31 30 609 7528
Fax: +31 30 609 7556
e-Mail: vichayes@lucent.com

We received comments from:

Allen haberling   ah
Bob O'hara   bo
Vic Hayes   vh
Hitoshi takanashi   ht

Vic's comments are provided in a separate document 99/95

| 1 | 18.2.3.6 | Ah | T | No | Inconsistent specification of bit streams between this section and section 18.2.3.3. In section 18.2.3.3 bit patterns are indicated as msb to lsb. However, in section 18.2.3.6 bit pattern is specified as being trasmitted left most to right most. I can represent this bit stream in either of two hexidecimal values:

EADA Hex or
5B57 Hex. Same bit patterns but different representations. I can appreciate Bob O'Hara's intent but I think it has introduced unnecessary confusion. | I strongly recommend that the msb to lsb nomenclature be retained or a hexadecimal representation be added to section 18.2.3.6. | |
| 2 | 18.4.5.1 3.2 | Ah | E | No | The description column of the table in this section is incomplete the last sentence of the description column is truncated at line 25. | Please include rest of the line. | |

3	18.4.6.1 2	Ah	T	No	When will the TBD khz/us be specified in line 18?		
1	P.7 l.41	ht	e		PLME-.request primitive	PLME-TXTIME.request primitive	
1.	Resolut ions tp No- Votes	vh	e	n	The reasons why 802.11 could not accept some of the NO-Comments are very lengthy. Some voters provided adjusted comments after the resolution meeting. The Sponsor balloter is not aware of the relation between the various letter ballots and the actual process.	Re-edit the reasons why 802.11 could not accept the no-comments by adding notes, updating the comments and deleting parts of the resolution to the last part of the document. See the proposal in document 99/095	
2.	Annex F	bo	e	n	Upon rereading the minutes from the January meeting and documents 99/35 and 99/37, the changes I requested by motion in the March meeting were incorrect. This resulted in a change of text that should be normative to become informative.	No resolution is requested at this time. I will submit an appropriate comment in the first round of the sponsor ballot.	