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802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 10.3.1</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>Telxon Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type T Comment Status A

PLME_join should be updated to reflect the station's support for the new options.

SuggestedRemedy

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 10.3.2.2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>Telxon Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 10.3.2.2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment Type T Comment Status A

PLME_characteristic should be updated with additional information for 'short', 'pbcc', and 'agile' functionality.

PLME_DSSSTESTMODE should be updated to add switches for the new options.

PLME_TXTIME primitive defined in 802.11a.

REJECT. Rejected. The purpose of this primitive (to provide the information needed to calculate duration) is superceded by the I preamble length.

What are the three data patterns defined?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Accepted, the data rates will be added to the existing parameter (this will cover code options because of the new definition of data rate).

The datarate range should include 5.5 and 11 values.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 10.3.2.2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

Type: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
Comment Status: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected
Response Status: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
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Suggested Remedy

Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom

Proposed Response

RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written  C/closed   U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn


---

Suggested Remedy

Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation

Proposed Response

---

Suggested Remedy

Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation

Proposed Response

---

Suggested Remedy

Bob O’Hara

Proposed Response

---

Suggested Remedy

Valerie E. Zelenty

Proposed Response

---

-----
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### 802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>18.2.1</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>Telxon Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>18.2.1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Anil K. Sanwalka</td>
<td>Neesus Datacom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>18.2.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bob O'Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>18.2.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mark Webster</td>
<td>Harris Semiconductor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments and Resolutions:

**Cl 18.2.1 P 11 L 49 # 192**

**Mike Trompower**

**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!!

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Response**

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

---

**Cl 18.2.1 P 11 L 53 # 193**

**Bob O'Hara**

**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

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. accepted

---

**Cl 18.2.1 P 11 L 49 # 305**

**Anil K. Sanwalka**

**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

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. accepted

---

**Cl 18.2.2.2 P 11 L 49 # 305**

**Bob O'Hara**

**Comment Type:** T  
**Comment Status:** U  
Question: if the use of the short preamble results in non-interoperability with legacy DSSS PHY  
stations, would it be appropriate to require that Beacons and Probe Responses be transmitted with long  
preambles only?  
If not, should the flag defined in 7.3.1.4 indicate that all data in the BSS must be sent using the short  
preamble? Will some stations implement some kind of (adaptive?) algorithm to switch which  
preamble they use?

**Suggested Remedy**

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

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. accepted, stations that do active scanning will get a response even when the  
network is using short preambles. see #:
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#198 Cl 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

#199 Cl 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’

#200 Cl 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.

#201 Cl 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.

#202 Cl 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 XF3 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 patern with bit numbers and specifying which bit goes out first.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. change to a bit pattern

---

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause
RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
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802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.4</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;being&quot; is a non-compulsory term, where a compulsory term is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change &quot;being&quot; into &quot;shall be&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.5</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;should be exact&quot; to &quot;must be exact&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change &quot;should be exact&quot; to &quot;must be exact&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.5</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;must correspond to&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change &quot;must correspond to&quot; to &quot;must be exact&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.5</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "shortSFD seed is the bit reversed version of the longSFD seed."
| SuggestedRemedy |               |                |
| Change "shortSFD seed is the bit reversed version of the longSFD seed."
| Proposed Response |              |                |
| Response Status |              |                |
| ACCEPT.        |              |                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.7</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;MSB-1&quot; mean? Does it mean MSB is a 0? The shortSYNC seed is the MSB notation has been broken as if it were an English word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the hyphen and lock word-breaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.8</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The contents is not specified in the comment. Here the contents is described two in 2 ways. This commenter prefers the second way, but the figure will be changed to agree with the text and the bit significance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace the use of &quot;MSB&quot; and &quot;LSB&quot; will correct bit numberings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.8</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The contents is not specified in the comment. Here the contents is described two in 2 ways. This commenter prefers the second way, but the figure will be changed to agree with the text and the bit significance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the hyphen and lock word-breaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.8</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;shortSFD differs from the term in Figure 2. The contents is not specified in the comment. Here the contents is described two in 2 ways. This commenter prefers the second way, but the figure will be changed to agree with the text and the bit significance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace the use of &quot;MSB&quot; and &quot;LSB&quot; will correct bit numberings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.8</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;shortSFD differs from the term in Figure 2. The contents is not specified in the comment. Here the contents is described two in 2 ways. This commenter prefers the second way, but the figure will be changed to agree with the text and the bit significance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the hyphen and lock word-breaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC 18.2.3.8</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;shortSFD differs from the term in Figure 2. The contents is not specified in the comment. Here the contents is described two in 2 ways. This commenter prefers the second way, but the figure will be changed to agree with the text and the bit significance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the hyphen and lock word-breaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments and resolutions can be found in the provided document.
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802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.3.9</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Suggested Remedy

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.4</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Suggested Remedy

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.5</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Suggested Remedy

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.6</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bob O'Hara  
Informed Technology, I

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

Awkward word choice.

Suggested Remedy

Replace "for using" with "to use".

Proposed Response  
Response Status  C

ACCEPT. accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.5</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bob O'Hara  
Informed Technology, I

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

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

Suggested Remedy

Move this sentence to a more appropriate place.

Proposed Response  
Response Status  U

ACCEPT. Response Status  W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.6</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anil K. Sanwalka  
Neesus Datacom

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

The first PHY_Data.Req should follow immediately after PHY_TXSTART.confirm. The MAC has no way of knowing how long to wait. I confirm for the previous one, so the rest of the figure can stay the same.

Suggested Remedy

Move the PHY_Data.Req from line 25 to line 15.

Proposed Response  
Response Status  C

ACCEPT. accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.6</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anil K. Sanwalka  
Neesus Datacom

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

The transmit state machine Figure is incorrect. The correct number is 56 zeros

Suggested Remedy

The transmit state machine Figure is incorrect. The correct number is 56 zeros

Proposed Response  
Response Status  C

ACCEPT. accepted, it should be 56.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.6</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mike Trompower  
Telxon Corporation

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

The lines coming out of the blocks on the outputs from the blocks not inputs.

Suggested Remedy

Add a period to end of first paragraph

Proposed Response  
Response Status  C

ACCEPT. accepted, editor will fix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.6</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anil K. Sanwalka  
Neesus Datacom

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

The transmit state machine Figure is incorrect. The lines coming out of the blocks not inputs.

Suggested Remedy

The transmit state machine Figure is incorrect. The lines coming out of the blocks not inputs.

Proposed Response  
Response Status  C

ACCEPT. Editor will fix figure 10 with arr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.2.6</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mike Trompower  
Telxon Corporation

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  A

Awkward word choice.

Suggested Remedy

Replace "for using" with "to use".

Proposed Response  
Response Status  C

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.3.3</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>Telxon Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section also adds to the confusion about intended operation. Reporting a single value, implies that the intent is to have exclusive operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported values for Preamble Length, Cwmin and Cwmax should be changed to report all valid values in a &quot;mix and match&quot; environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the intent is to have &quot;mix and match&quot;, therefore, reporting Cwmin and Cwmax consistent with legacy systems is correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the hooks are added to allow for exclusive BSS use of some options, shortening of CwMin andMax would be OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also points out that statements ought to be added to the standard which specifies which values a station uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the station use values reported by its PHY, or should it adopt those values presented in the BEACON and PROBES frames.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;combo vendors&quot; will have to address.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. Accepted, the legacy values are to be used and the shorter values removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.3.3</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>313</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anil K. Sanwalka</td>
<td>Neesus Datacom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. Accepted, the proper reference is to the 1999 standard, not the green book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**May 1999**

Tuesday, May 18, 1999 16:28:49

802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.3.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anil K. Sanwalka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made this comment before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no way for aPreambleLength to be this as the value for long preamble. The structure only to provide compatibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change value to 144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. accepted, Its accepted to have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob O'Hara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For compatibility with the TGrev DSSS system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace &quot;shall be&quot; with &quot;is&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 'X' to table for PMD_CS.request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new section [18.4.5.xx] for PMD_CS threshold according to the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SuggestedRemedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. Accepted in principle, Change have a setting method.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolutions

May 1999

Tuesday, May 18, 1999 16:28:49

May 1999

#226
Cl 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

#227
Cl 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

#228
Cl 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 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. replace with 1 and 2 Mbps.

#229
Cl 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 X0F’ 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 make 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 - 0xFF: 5.5 Mbit/s bytes 0x00 - 0xFF: 11 Mbit/s

#230
Cl 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

Cl XX SC 18.4.5.11.1
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 "Th the PMD to provide the received signal st
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. accepted

Cl XX SC 18.4.5.11.3
Bob O’Hara Informed Technology, I
Comment Type E Comment Status A
Since this is optional, the use of "shall" is
SuggestedRemedy
Replace "shall" with "may" in two location
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. accepted, shall was replaced

Cl XX SC 18.4.5.12.1
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 "Th the PMD to provide an indication of the si Rate PHY PN code correlation to the PLC
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. accepted

Cl XX SC 18.4.5.12.3
Bob O’Hara Informed Technology, I
Comment Type E Comment Status A
Since this is optional, the use of "shall" is
SuggestedRemedy
Replace "shall" with "may" in two location
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. accepted in principle

Cl XX SC 18.4.5.13.3
Bob O’Hara Informed Technology, I
Comment Type E Comment Status A
This is generated by the PMD, not PHY.
SuggestedRemedy
Replace "PHY" with "PMD".
Proposed Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. accepted


Comment and Resolutions, 802.11b/D5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.14.1</th>
<th>P 39</th>
<th>L 53-54</th>
<th># 236</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob O’Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State this in the proper &quot;standard&quot; way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete the sentence and replace with &quot;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.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.14.3</th>
<th>P 40</th>
<th>L 31</th>
<th># 237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob O’Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since this is optional, the use of &quot;shall&quot; is not appropriate, here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace &quot;shall&quot; with &quot;may&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.15.1</th>
<th>P 40</th>
<th>L 45-46</th>
<th># 238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob O’Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State this in the proper &quot;standard&quot; way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete the sentence and replace with &quot;This primitive may be generated by the PLCP to set a value for the energy detect ED THRESHOLD.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.15.2</th>
<th>P 41</th>
<th>L 8-9</th>
<th># 239</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob O’Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This clause indicates that the primitive is generated by the PLCP. This conflicts with the description of the primitive that claims to set a value for the threshold.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct this conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.2.2</th>
<th>P 31</th>
<th>L 44-48</th>
<th># 240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hayes</td>
<td>Lucent Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same comments as for 18.4.5.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same remedy as for 18.4.5.1.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.3.2</th>
<th>P 40</th>
<th>L 31</th>
<th># 237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob O’Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same comments as for 18.4.5.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same remedy as for 18.4.5.1.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>18.4.5.7.2</th>
<th>P 31</th>
<th>L 44-48</th>
<th># 240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hayes</td>
<td>Lucent Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since this primitive has no parameters, s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete the sentence and replace with &quot;Th parameters.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPT. accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment and Resolutions, 802.11b/D5**


May 1999

Tuesday, May 18, 1999 16:28:51

\`802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>LLCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>18.4.5.9.2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>18.4.6.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Trompower</td>
<td>18.4.6.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hayes</td>
<td>18.4.6.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Heberling</td>
<td>18.4.6.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Webster</td>
<td>18.4.6.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob O'Hara</td>
<td>18.4.6.5.2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob O'Hara</td>
<td>18.4.6.5.2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob O'Hara</td>
<td>18.4.6.5.2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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

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.

SuggestedRemedy

Make this mode required for a standard implementation.

Proposed Response

REJECT. Rejected, CCK has been adopted as a mandatory modulation with well documented performance. PBCC has been added as an option for certain environments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 18.4.6.7</th>
<th>P 48</th>
<th>L 32</th>
<th># 257</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean Kawaguchi</td>
<td>Symbol Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Suggested Remedy**

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

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. Accepted. The content of F.4 was not moved, due to other comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 18.4.6.7</th>
<th>P 48</th>
<th>L 34</th>
<th># 259</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hayes</td>
<td>Lucent Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. Commenters fear 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 know 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".

**Suggested Remedy**

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

**Proposed Response**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC 18.4.6.7</th>
<th>P 48</th>
<th>L 34</th>
<th># 258</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vic Hayes</td>
<td>Lucent Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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".

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace "interoperability" into "co-existence".

**Proposed Response**

REJECT. Rejected. The wording expresses the correct intent.

**Comment Type** TR  **Comment Status** A

Sorry guys but this one is important.

Firstly:

Channel agility does not enable FH interoperability simply allows an implementer to build a "i" and FH BSS. My understanding of the result of the last meeting was that we would put in frequency agility as an option without any knowledge that a "smart" implementer could co between DS and FH modes.

I feel that frequency agility may be a useful interoperability.

Secondly:

Here it says that the hop sequences shall not be cited. Annex F is informative. I don't think you can have it both ways.

My feeling is that for there to be any kind of interoperability.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove references to FH interoperability. Define Hop sequences and make them normative.

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. Hop sequences added to clause 18.

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** A

My feeling is that frequency agility may be a useful interoperability.

This standard also specifies operation in Japan. The relevant document is now).

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the Japanese citation.

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. Accepted, editor will fix.

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** A

Why is a minimum transmit power specified? Is it the intent to disallow very low power operation, i.e., personal area networks?

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove this requirement.

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT. See above

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** A

Why is a minimum transmit power specified? Is it the intent to disallow very low power operation, i.e., personal area?

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove this requirement.

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT.

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** A

Why is a minimum transmit power specified? Is it the intent to disallow very low power operation, i.e., personal area?

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove this requirement.

**Proposed Response**

ACCEPT.
**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
REJECT. Rejected. The generic requirement allows 8 levels, but the specific PHY as well as the low rate DS PHY only use 4 levels.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.

---

**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status**  
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.
5.0. Comments and Resolutions:

**Cl 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.

**Cl XX SC 7.2.3.1 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

**Cl XX SC 7.3.1.4 P 5 L 18 # 273**
Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation
Comment Type E Comment Status A

SuggestedRemedy
Make change in two new paragraphs for short preamble and PBCC

Proposed Response Response Status C ACCEPT. accepted

**Cl 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

**Cl XX SC 7.3.1.9**
Mike Trompower T
Comment Type TR Comment Status A
The three new reason codes are not supp (1997) standard. The existing products, "should" ignore the 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 interpret codes, there is no way for them to determine Section 18 states that the long preamble and short are used together. Section 18, management decision and implies packet is the intended operation. Section 18 states that these new capabilities new capabilities, implies that these feature packet basis. If the intent is to define the use of these r BSS when enabled, then the station must 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 receive failure of association. See clauses 10.3.1

**Cl XX SC 7.3.2.2**
Anil K. Sanwalka
Comment Type E Comment Status A

SuggestedRemedy
The struck word "station" should be "STA"

Proposed Response Response Status REJECT. Rejected, the standard to be r
Cl 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

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl XX SC 7.3.2.2, et. al. P 6 L 29 # 174
Valerie E. Zeleny 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

Cl XX SC 9.6
Mike Trompower T

Comment Type T Comment Status C
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.

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

Cl XX SC 9.6
Anil K. Sanwalka

Comment Type E Comment Status A
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 A
ACCEPT. accepted

Cl XX SC 9.6
Johnny Zweig

Comment Type T Comment Status C
It doesn't make sense for different PHYs to implement different PLME primitives.

SuggestedRemedy

Add PLME-TXTIME.request and PLME-TXTIME.confirm primitives to all of the other PHYs.

Proposed Response Response Status C
REJECT. Rejected, we do not have a charter to do that.

Cl XX SC A.4.9
Bob O'Hara

Comment Type T Comment Status C
There is no PICS entry for channel set

SuggestedRemedy

Add the appropriate entry for channel set

Proposed Response Response Status A
ACCEPT. Accepted in principle, the char
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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 uses 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.

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

Status: REJECT. Rejected by a vote. 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.

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: C

Proposed Response
- Try 2472 MHz.

Status: ACCEPT. accepted

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: A

Proposed Response
- The channel frequency of 247 MHz must be the trick entry. (Are we looking)

Status: ACCEPT. accepted

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: C

Proposed Response
- My concern here is the existence of too many options: 1) for the high-rate PHY there are 11- and 5.5-Mbps rates using either CCK or PBCC; 2) the long and short PLCP Headers; and 3) Operating Channel...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>PICs</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob O'Hara</td>
<td>Informed Technology, I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>There are no officers, WG members or sponsor pool members listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bagby</td>
<td>3Com Corporation</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Review Comment 6: Technical Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

**Case 1: A's equipment always sends short headers, B can never talk to him.** Result: non-interoperability.

**Case 2: B can't talk to C.** Result: non-interoperability.

**Case 3: C can't talk to C!** Result: non-interoperability.

### Review Comment 4: Technical Required

**Prior to Sponsor ballot I had requested the removal 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**

REJECT. REJECT.

### 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**

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.
May 1999

Tuesday, May 18, 1999 16:28:56

802.11b Draft 5.0. Comments and Resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>various</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Many</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>various</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Suggested Remedy

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

Proposed Response: C
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>various</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Many</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>various</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Suggested Remedy

- Delete all occurrences of “IEEE 802.11” in clause titles, field definitions and descriptions.

Proposed Response: C
Response Status: C

ACCEPT. accepted