

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:06

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

CI **XX** SC **P General** L # **336**
 Rich Seifert Networks & Communic Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

I add my support for outstanding comment 332 from Mr. Bagby. I agree with him that the inclusion of options that can cause two standards-conformant devices to be unable to interoperate both violates the requirements of the PAR, and is inappropriate for an industry standard document.

Suggested Remedy

Remove options which create the possibility that if different combinations of options are implemented by different vendors, it becomes possible for a customer to buy two compliant pieces of equipment which may fail to interoperate.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC **P General** L # **337**
 Rich Seifert Networks & Communic Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

I wish to add my support to outstanding comment 297 from Mr. Bagby. I agree that the changes to the MAC in 802.11b both go beyond the scope of the PAR, and will likely create interoperability problems with existing MAC implementations. Changes to the semantics of MAC-related fields either: (a) require a change to the version number of the MAC/frame format, or (b) must have been specifically anticipated in the earlier version. For example, it is possible to future-proof a protocol somewhat by specifying certain fields or values as "reserved", to be transmitted as zero and ignored on receipt. In this way, future versions can both detect field usage by an earlier version, and the earlier version will ignore the future usage. However, this behavior must have been explicitly stated in the ORIGINAL specification; it cannot be added later on and still ensure interoperability

Suggested Remedy

Adopt the changes proposed by Mr. Bagby to eliminate the need for any of the changes proposed to the 802.11 MAC specification; and then delete the corresponding MAC changes.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC **P multiple** L # **332**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Review Comment 1: Technical Required

This reviewer does not accept the responses to previous comments I submitted re the 802.11b PHY draft (during internal 802.11 ballots) prior to the sponsor ballot. The responses were specious, sometimes factually incorrect. Therefore most prior positions will be reiterated for this ballot (for the benefit of the sponsor ballot reviewers).

To keep the review process productive, this reviewer asks that the 802.11 group refrain from analogy arguments about options in other portion of the 802.11 standard as an argument for the permissibility of options in this PHY. (The analogy arguments given bring to mind the typical stories of a mother asking a child whether they would jump off a cliff just because all their friends were doing it.) The context within which any given decision was made for previous portions of the 802.11 standard do not constitute out of context precedence for any later extensions of the standard.

When 802.11 authorized the 802.11b working group it was by a specific motion that required that the group develop a single high-speed PHY for the 2.4GHz band. In this reviewer's view the intent of the wording of that motion (which I made, so I believe I am qualified to speak to the intent) was to prevent the group from creating multiple (FH and/or DS) high-speed PHYs. The motivation was market driven – the market requirement for wider adoption of 802.11 is for a single high-speed PHY that meets the industry/market psychological need for at least 10Mbps. From a market perspective, the phrase "single PHY" means that no matter what combinations of options are implemented by different vendors, it shall be impossible for a customer to buy two compliant pieces of equipment which, under any circumstances, may fail to interoperate. This is the primary technical requirement that the 802.11b PHY specification must meet in order to acquire my yes vote.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the inclusion of several options within 802.11b D5.0 prevents the specification from meeting either the intended goal or the specific restrictions imposed by the motion chartering the group. The response of the group gives (in this reviewer's opinion) poorly developed arguments based on analogy and procedural arguments. The problems are not at the core procedural, they are technical – the included options, as specified, create interoperability problems.

Further comments will address specific problems in more detail.

Suggested Remedy

Required change:

Remove options which create the possibility that if different combinations of options are implemented by different vendors, it becomes possible for a customer to buy two compliant pieces of equipment which may fail to interoperate.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT. Rejected, all association requests must be responded with the same type of header and rate. Therefore, while the association may be denied, the station will be able to know that it has been rejected. All options are required to carry the basic

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line
 RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn Vote: E/ExCom VD/Disapprove VAC/Approve with Comments

CI **XX** SC

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:07

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

CI **XX** SC # **297** P # **297** L # **297** # **339**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 297 response as of 6-16-99: Disapprove
 The committee response appears to have been to ignore the issue raised. I went to some trouble to point out the interaction combinations that needed to be investigated. The response of the committee does not even address the interactions of old/new mac Implementations vs. header versions. If the committee refuses to even respond to the concerns expressed, then I have no choice but to hold the vote at disapprove until such time as the committee bothers to write up a response that addresses the technical issue raised. If the committee believes that the interactions I questioned are not a technical problem, then it at least needs to write up its reasoning and submit that as part of the response. If the logic and explanation are sufficient, I will change my position on this issue, but I can not do so based on essentially nill amount of the information contained in the comment response.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC # **297** P # **297** L # **297** # **338**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 297 response as of 6-16-99: Dissapprove
 The committee response appears to have been to ignore the issue raised. I went to some trouble to point out the interaction combinations that needed to be investigated. The response of the committee does not even address the interactions of old/new mac Implementations vs. header versions. If the committee refuses to even respond to the concerns expressed, then I have no choice but to hold the vote at disapprove until such time as the committee bothers to write up a response that addresses the technical issue raised. If the committee believes that the interactions I questioned are not a technical problem, then it at least needs to write up its reasoning and submit that as part of the response. If the logic and explanation are sufficient, I will change my position on this issue, but I can not do so based on essentially nill amount of the information contained in the comment response.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC # **299** P # **299** L # **299** # **340**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 299 response as of 6-16-99: Disapprove
 Simply saying "reject" without any supporting text as to why is not much motivation to change my vote in this subject.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC # **300** P # **300** L # **300** # **341**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 300 response as of 6-16-99: Approve.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC # **301** P # **301** L # **301** # **342**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 301 response as of 6-16-99: Disapprove
 I am not sure what to make of the committee's response on this issue. Is channel agility option included in the proposed spec or not? Please clarify for me.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:07

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

CI **XX** SC # **302** P # **302** L # **302** # **343**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 302 response as of 6-16-99: Disapprove
 I really wanted to make this one an "approve" but the response of the committee only addressed a part of the submitted comment. Coupling use of the short preamble between RX and TX will improve the situation. However, that only takes care of case 3 in the comment. How about cases 1 and 2? I think they still fail. The suggested remedy offered two choices (numbered a and b in the comment) and neither were adopted – therefore I can not agree, in spite of how the response is labeled, that the comment was accepted. The problems still remain. Please either accept one of the suggested solutions or take the time to explain in detail why the other cases cited are not a problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC # **332** P # **332** L # **332** # **344**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 332 response as of 6-16-99: Dissapprove
 This response is not acceptable as is. The ballot comment raised the question of charter and the technical problems that result from the proposed options in the specification. The response simply says that since the group did not opt to take the suggested remedy that they reject the comment. That is not a sufficient response as it totally ignores, and does not address the charter issues or the technical problems created by the existence of the options. Additionally, the response sent to me appears to be incomplete as it ends with a partial sentence: "All options are required to carry the basic". This ballot comment therefore must remain "disapprove" until the committee actually responds to the issues cited.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **XX** SC **18.1** P L # **188**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Last paragraph of this section.

 We are under NO restrictions to make a high rate phy which interoperable with current FH PHY.

 This statement implies many characteristics which are not defined in the current text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the paragraph to the following:

Capability for identifying a channel agile mode is also provided. However, management of this function is outside the scope of this standard.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT. This is an editorial comment. The referenced paragraph does not state that there is a restriction that there is an interoperable FH PHY. It is a statement of the existence of frequency agility, and a pointer to an annex that describes how to do it.

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:08

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

CI **XX** SC **18.4.6.7** P **48** L **34-35** # **316**
 Anil K. Sanwalka Neesus Datacom Vote VD

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

Sorry guys but this one is important.

Firstly:

Channel agility does not enable FH interoperability as it is claimed here and in Appendix F. It simply allows an implementer to build a "dual-mode" radio that can be used to colocate a DS 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 specific claim for FH interoperability, with the knowledge that a "smart" implementer could create a system with radios that could switch between DS and FH modes.

I feel that frequency agility may be a useful thing in and of itself without any reference to FH interoperability.

Secondly:

Here it says that the hop sequences shall be as described in Annex F. In other places it says that 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 the hop sequences have to be normative.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove references to FH interoperability from clause 18.
 Define Hop sequences and make them mandatory in clause 18.
 Include Appendix F as an informative annex describing FH interoperability (I think that is what it is now).

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT. Hop sequences added to clause 18, but references to FH interoperability not removed.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.8.4** P L # **270**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Remove the reference to a timer in CCA mode 2.
 The mode says report busy upon detection of signal by carrier sense, therefore, the timer is not necessary.

I take this to mean that a high rate PHY must recognize and determine carrier sense for BOTH barker and CCK modulation.
 This means that a high rate PHY which does not implement or recognize the

SuggestedRemedy

Delete reference to timer in mode 2.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT. Rejected, the timer insures coexistence by making sure that a long preamble only station can defer enough time on a short preamble transmission and also protects the system when the header is corrupted.

CI **XX** SC **18.4.8.4** P L # **269**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

If the timer is not removed, then
 The algorithms for CCA should have different numbering from those used in section 15.
 The MIB should reflect the additional modes as well.
 The algorithms using a timer are not the same as those which do not.

SuggestedRemedy

Mode 2 should become new mode 4
 Mode 3 should become new mode 5

Change in 18.4.8.4 and in PICS HRDS11

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT. Rejected, the specifications for the high rate PHY stand alone. They may be like the low rate PHY, but do not need to be numbered in sequence with the CCA modes of that PHY.

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:09

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

Cl XX **SC 7.3.1.9** **P** **L** **# 276**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **R**

The three new reason codes are not supported by stations which are compliant to the current (1997) standard.
 The existing products, "should" ignore the three new capabilities bit definitions established in 7.3.1.4, however, the 1997 spec says they are defined to be always zero - it does not say what is proper course to take when a '1' bit is received.
 Since the current systems cannot interpret these bits and are not aware of these new reason codes, there is no way for them to determine the reason for denied association.

Section 18 states that the long preamble is MANDATORY. Section 18.2.3.9 implies that long and short are used together. Section 18.2.5 states that the decision for using long or short is a management decision and implies packet by packet basis. To me this means "mix and match" is the intended operation.

Section 18 states that these new capabilities are optional. Section 7.3.1.4, when defining these new capabilities, implies that these features may be used (or not) on an individual packet by packet basis.

If the intent is to define the use of these new options as exclusive use and mandatory to join a BSS when enabled, then the station must know in advance (PHY bits) how to decode the frame and whether to recognize the short preamble.

SuggestedRemedy

I believe the intent was to allow mix and match operation. Therefore, no station can be denied access to the BSS based on non-support and these reason codes will never be used and should be deleted.

If the intent is to give a vendor the ability to selectively discriminate against stations not supporting a particular optional mode, additional MIB parameters should be defined which allow configuration of the use as mandatory or optional within a BSS. - then the reason codes can be kept, although only recognized by stations compliant to this newer version of the draft.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **U**

REJECT. Rejected, reason codes received that are other than 'successful' will still indicate a failure of association. See clauses 10.3.6.2 and 11.3.1.

Cl XX **SC Annex A4.3** **P** **L** **# 281**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **R**

If the timer is not removed, then
 The algorithms for CCA should have different numbering from those used in section 15.
 The MIB should reflect the additional modes as well.
 The algorithms using a timer are not the same as those which do not.

SuggestedRemedy

Mode 2 should become new mode 4
 Mode 3 should become new mode 5

Change in 18.4.8.4 and in PICS HRDS11

Proposed Response **Response Status** **U**

REJECT. Rejected. This is a new PHY with 4 rates. There is no coupling between the numbering of clause 15 and clause 18.

Cl XX **SC Annex F** **P** **L** **# 284**
 Mike Trompower Telxon Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **R**

Delete this entire annex and all references to it. The information in this annex is outside the scope of 802.

This information (and many pointers to it in the text) alludes to the creation of a NEW PHY. This phy must be capable of receiving both FH and DS preambles. AS A SPECIFIC REFERENCE, the first sentence of annex f states that this option creates an "INTEROPERABLE" FH and DS PHY. This new PHY is not a part of the PAR.

If you attempt to use two radio devices, the mechanism for transferring the information between the two radios is not defined (and is outside the scope of 802) and will likely NOT Result in an "interoperable" solution as stated.

Further, the CCA mechanism which is referenced, is new functionality, not part of the main spec. no provisions have been provided in other parts of the spec (MIB and PICS)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this entire annex - do not any of this information into section 18.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **U**

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. This is not a new PHY, but extended capabilities of one PHY, providing some FH interoperability

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:09

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

Cl **XX** SC **Annex F** P **60** L # **296**
 John H. Cafarella MICRILOR, Inc. Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

I believe the frequency-agility option violates our single-PHY PAR restriction. It perpetuates the dual-PHY situation into the future. It will work against acceptance of this already complex standard. Uncoordinated users (i.e., SOHO environment) may cause/experience disruption when this option is employed, and they will not understand why.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Annex F, and all related cross-referencing from the main body of the standard.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

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.

Cl **XX** SC **ballot comment #** P # **345**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

Position of author on Ballot comment # 332 response as of 6-16-99: Dissapprove
 This response is not acceptable as is. The ballot comment raised the question of charter and the technical problems that result from the proposed options in the specification. The response simply says that since the group did not opt to take the suggested remedy that they reject the comment. That is not a sufficient response as it totally ignores, and does not address the charter issues or the technical problems created by the existence of the options. Additionally, the response sent to me appears to be incomplete as it ends with a partial sentence: "All options are required to carry the basic". This ballot comment therefore must remain "disapprove" until the committee actually responds to the issues cited.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **XX** SC **MAC changes to suppo** P **multiple** L # **297**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Review Comment 7: Technical Required
 Essentially all the proposed changes to the MAC portions of the 802.11 standard are present to support the options addressed in previous review comments (1 thru 6). I think there are additional problems that are created by the proposed MAC changes.

New bits have been defined in the capability information field. However, the MAC header version has not been updated. How is a station supposed to know how to parse the information? If you change the version level then only new implementation (presumably those that come with an 802.11b implementation) will understand the new capability bits. That would of course also prevent the long PHY header interoperability capability since the old version MACs will not understand the new version mac info.

If you don't change the version information, then what problems may occur? What will a new MAC implementation do when it gets an old MAC capability frame? Will it take action based on the values of the newly defined bits? Will the action be correct? What will happen if an old MAC gets a new MAC header with information in bits that were specified as reserved.

I believe these problems arise because the 802.11b draft proposes putting PHY capabilities into the MAC capability field. The MAC Capabilities field is for MAC capabilities. Mixing PHY info into the MAC capability field makes the MAC version dependent upon the PHY being used. That violates one of the prime design goals of 802.11: A single MAC for multiple PHYs. How should the bits be set in a new MAC header when it's running some other PHY (802.11a or a later developed PHY...)?

I also note that the charter of 802.11b was to create a PHY specification. It was not to change the MAC. Personally, I would accept minor changes to the MAC that do not cause any issues with existing 802.11 MAC implementations – but the changes proposed in 802.11b probably fail that test. Until an analysis of all possible combinations of interactions between "old" and "new" MAC implementations containing the proposed changes is done, presented and circulated for review, and deemed not to contain any problems, I will have to vote no on the 802.11b draft.

Please note that there is an easy way out of the problem: Adopt all the other 802.11b PHY changes requested in my review comments. That would eliminate the PHY options that are the source of the problems; there would be no need for any of the changes proposed to the 802.11 MAC specification, and without the proposed changes, this particular set of issues disappears.

SuggestedRemedy

Required change:
 Adopt all the other 802.11b PHY changes requested in my review comments; eliminating the need for any of the changes proposed to the 802.11 MAC specification; and then delete the corresponding MAC changes.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT. Rejected, we did not acopt all of the other changes needed to adopt this resolution.

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:10

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

CI **XX** SC **many** P **many** L # **298**
 John H. Cafarella MICRILOR, Inc. Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

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) the frequency-agility option. This standard is all on paper, and is a design by committee. Unlike the adoption of 802.3 and the original 802.11, where there was considerable experience before the standards, there is no practical experience with this complex collection of stuff.

SuggestedRemedy

- 1) Keep CCK or PBCC, not both (prefer keep PBCC);
- 2) Keep long or short header (prefer short);
- 3) Eliminate frequency agility.

Make the standard simpler to implement and EASIER TO USE.

Proposed Response Response Status **U**

REJECT. 3. Rejected by a vote. Each of the three options mentioned in this comment provide distinct advantages, either in implementation or performance, without threatening interoperability.

CI **XX** SC **PBCC related text** P **multiple** L # **299**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Review Comment 6: Technical Required
 Prior to Sponsor ballot I had requested the deletion 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 Response Status **U**

REJECT. REJECT.

CI **XX** SC **PICs HRDS3** P **56** L # **301**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

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 Response Status **U**

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

Thursday, July 29, 1999 12:13:10

P802.11b Draft D6.1 Unresolved Comments and Resolutions

CI **XX** SC **PICs HRDS3&6** P **56** L # **302**
 David Bagby 3Com Corporation Vote VD

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

Review Comment 3: Technical Required

I had previously requested that the use of the short preamble be either deleted or made mandatory. The 802.11b group prior to sponsor ballot declined the request. The problems caused by the option specifications remain.

Please refer to the PICs in draft 5.0:

Item HRDS3 (page 56) is shown as optional and refers to section 18.2.

Item HRDS6 (page 56 - short preamble process on RX) is shown as optional and refers to section 18.2.6.

Neither the PICs nor the referenced text sections tie the two options together.

From what I've read that the following are possible compliant implementations:

Vender A: Implements Short header on TX and RX (both options).

Vender B: does not implement any short header options (neither Option)

Vender C: Implements short header on TX option, but not the RX option.

Once the use of short headers is turned on at a sending station here are some of the bad cases possible given the current draft:

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

Suggested Remedy

Required change:

Here is what is required:

1) RX short header processing must be mandatory if the Tx short header option is implemented. That will prevent case 3 above.

2) The purpose of the short header is to provide performance (as the long header limits throughput). The purpose of the long header is antenna to antenna interoperability between 1 and 2 Mbps 802.11 DS PHYs (the FH is now irrelevant due to the removal of the FH compatibility stuff in D5.0) and an 802.11b PHY.

The use of an option is an attempt to have both. The option approach fails because it causes interoperability issues, effectively providing neither benefit.

Either

a) Delete the short header (effectively deciding that old PHY interoperability is more important than performance) or

b) Make the use of the short header mandatory (making performance more important than old PHY compatibility).

I can accept either choice a) or b).

My preference is that the standard take choice b) as there are other ways to achieve data interoperability between 1-2 Mbps DS PHYs and the proposed 802.11b PHY. It can be accomplished by multiple APs and let the interoperability occur in the DS; it is not necessary to have antenna to antenna interoperability between the various PHY specifications (this is how

one moves data from a current FH PHY station and a DS PHY station). This gives the 802.11b system both data interoperability (the real user requirement) and performance.

Proposed Response

Response Status **U**

ACCEPT. Accepted, the use of the short preamble is coupled between RX and TX by changing the HRDS6 dependent on HRDS3

TYPE: TR/technical required T/technical E/editorial COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line
 RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn Vote: E/ExCom VD/Disapprove VAC/Approve with Comments

CI **XX**

SC **PICs HRDS3&6**