IEEE P802.11 Wireless LANs

	802.11REV-ma	a ballot report for condi	itional approva	1
		Date: 2005-09-20		
Author(s):	Compony	Address	Dhono	amail
Name	Company	Address	Flione	eman
Bob O'Hara	Cisco Systems	170 W. Tasman Dr. San Jose, CA	+1 408 853 5513	bob.ohara@cisco.com

Abstract

This is the report to be submitted to the 802 Executive Committee, documenting that the recirculation ballot on 802.11REV-ma draft 4.0 meets all the requirements of conditional approval to forward to sponsor ballot.

Notice: This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.11. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

Release: The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.11.

Patent Policy and Procedures: The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802 Patent Policy and Procedures <<u>http://ieee802.org/guides/bylaws/sb-bylaws.pdf</u>>, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard." Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair <<u>stuart.kerry@philips.com</u>> as early as possible, in written or electronic form, if patented technology (or technology under patent application) might be incorporated into a draft standard being developed within the IEEE 802.11 Working Group. **If you have questions, contact the IEEE Patent Committee Administrator at** <<u>patcom@ieee.org</u>>.

This report to the 802 Executive Committee documents the conditions in Clause 21, as they apply to the final working group recirculation ballot on draft 4.0 of 802.11REV-ma.

The ballot closed at 11:59 pm EDT, on 20 September 2005. The final vote tally is:

411 Approve

- 14 Disapprove
- <u>19</u> Abstain
- 444 Total

The approval rate is 96%. The return rate is 82% of 542 voting members. The abstention rate is 4%.

There are no new disapproving voters or new technical comments. The two technical comments received from a negative voter are resubmittals of comments resolved in prior recirculation ballots. No additional voters have supported these comments in any of the three recirculation ballots. No changes to the draft were made as a result of processing the comments received.

	LB 74	LB 75	LB 76	LB 77
Approve	348	387	397	411
Disapprove	36	26	20	14
Abstain	23	19	21	19
Approval ratio	91%	94%	95%	96%
Abstain ratio	7%	5%	5%	4%
Return rate	75%	80%	81%	82%

The balloting history of 802.11REV-ma is show in the following table.

No votes have been ruled invalid. The 14 remaining disapprove voters have 109 unsatisfied comments between them. The distribution of unsatisfied comments among the disapprove balloters is shown in the following table.

Name	LB 74	LB 75	LB 76	LB 77	Total
Bernard Aboba	2				2
Merwyn Andrade		13			13
David Bagby	1				1
Don Berry		1			1
Wotaru Gohda	9				9
Thomas Kuehnel	8				8
Uriel Lemberger	1	1			2
Mike Moreton	19	8	3		30
Andrew Myles	3				3
Partha Narasimhan		13			13
Stephen Palm	2	2	2	2	8
Henry Ptasinski			1		1
Anil Sanwalka	3		4		7
Adrian Stephens	6	5			11
Total					109

Of the 109 unsatisfied comments, 36 are on a single topic, the addition of a standard format and identifier for a vendor-specific information element. These 36 comments are from 6 voters. The remaining comments are on various topics with little correlation. The working group responses to all of these unsatisfied comments are on the following pages

Commenter:		Abo	ba, Bernard				
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus	
	1	6 07	7.2.3.10, pp.	TR	D	U	
	Com IEEE	ment 802.11i al	lready added a	uthentication exter	nsibility; there	efore vendor-specific authentication mechanisms are not needed.	
	Sug	gestedRe	emedy	e :1: m11 1	2		
	Res _i PRO	oonse POSED RH	EJECT. 802.1	li added extensibil	ity in a specif	fic direction. This did not limit the use of the Authentication frame	
Commenter:		Abo	ba, Bernard	Type	Status	PosponsoStatus	
				тр	D		
	Com Add	ment Appendix (O on "EAP Me	ethod Requirement	ts for WLAN"	'.	
	Sug	gestedRe	emedy		1017		
	Add .	Appendix (O containing n	naterial from RFC	4017.		
	PRO	POSED RI	EJECT. We ha	ve accepted your p	proposal on R	FC 4017 in comment #6. See comment #6 for editorial resolution.	
Submission						Page 1 of 43	Bob O'Hara, Cisco System

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Bag	by, David			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	109	07	7.2.3.* & 7.3	TR	D	U

Comment

I oppose the introduction of vender specific elements. If a specific function is sufficiently useful to the industry as to be needed, it should be standardized and included. This is an attempt to have a standard encourage non-standard operation û a very bad idea in the opinion of this reviewer. This reviewer will not vote to approve the draft until all the added vendor specific related changes are removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all vendor specific element additions

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The definition of a standard vendor-specific information element is preferable to vendors independently choosing random values to carry their proprietary information. This, at least, allows standard implementations to operate correctly along side of implementations with vendor-specific extensions.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Goh	ida, Wataru			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		21 09	9.2.5.4	TR	D	U
	Con	nment				
	No r	eason to ke	ep aPHY-RX-	STARTDelay. Se	e my commen	ts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	Sug	gestedRe	emedy			

Remove aPHY-RX-START-Delay from the paragraph

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The equation is correct. The actual values for this parameter in some of the PHYs are not be correct. This parameter accounts for the length of the preamble and PLCP header.

nmenter:		Goh	da, Wataru			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		22 09	9.2.5.7	TR	D	U
	Co	omment				
	The	e paragraph s	tarting with "A	After transmit	ting an RTS frame	e," is very problematic.
	For 481 ma	r example, in us:PLCPHeac kes no sense.	case of succes ler) after PHY	sful sequence -TXEND.con	e of 11b, PHY-RX firm while CTSTi	START.indication will occur after 202us (=10us:aSIFSTime + 144us:preamble + imeout = 30us. This means that CTSTimeout will be expired even for successful case and it
	For and	r OFDM PHY d there could	<i>I</i> s, I don't under be the case the	erstand where at another STA	24us comes from A rather than send	n for aPHY-RX-START-Delay. It looks like CTSTimeout is too long (almost CTS frame length) ling/receiving STA might interrupt this sequence.
	Aft - C - N - al	ter careful co TSTimeout v lo reason to k RXTXTurnar	nsideration bas vill be expired eep aPHY-RX roundTime/aM	sed on above if a PHY-CC -START-Del ACProccessin	observation, the p A.indication(busy ay. ngDelay should be	point of my suggestions are follows. y) does not occuer. e taken into account for precise calculation.
	Su	IggestedRe	medy			
	Rej aM	place "a valu IACProccessi	e of aSIFSTim ingDelay"	e + aSlotTim	e + aPHY-RX-ST	ART-Delay" with "a value of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime - aRXTXTurnaroundTime -
	Rej	place "If a PH	HY-RXSTART	Cindication de	oes not occur" wit	th "If a PHY-CCA.indication(busy) does not occur".
	Rej	place "If a PH	IY-RXSTART	Cindication d	oes occur" with "I	If a PHY-CCA.indication(busy) does occur"
	Rej wa	place "the ST it for the corr	A shall wait for sponding PH	or the corresp Y-RXSTART	onding PHY-RXE	END.indication to determine whether the RTS transmission was successful." with "the STA shal HY-RXEND.indication to determine whether the RTS transmission was successful."
	Re	sponse				
	PR	OPOSED RE	EJECT. The va	alue for the P	HY-RXSTART-D	Delay is not correct for the 11b PHY. It will be corrected.
mission						Bob O'Hara Cisco S

nter:		Goh	ida, Wataru			
10)	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	2	3 09	9.2.8	TR	D	U
с	om	ment				
T	he p	aragraph s	starting with "A	After transmitti	ing an MPDU tha	at requires an ACK frame as a response" is very problematic.
Fe 48 m	or ex 8us:1 nake	cample, in PLCPHead s no sense	case of succes der) after PHY	sful sequence -TXEND.conf	of 11b, PHY-RX irm while ACKT	START.indication will occur after 202us (=10us:aSIFSTime + 144us:preamble + 'imeout = 30us. This means that ACKTimeout will be expired even for successful case and it
Fo	or O ength	FDM PH	Ys, I don't under e could be the	erstand where case that anothere	24us comes from her STA rather th	a for aPHY-RX-START-Delay. It looks like ACKTimeout is too long (almost ACK frame aan sending/receiving STA might interrupt this sequence.
A - 1 - :	fter ACH No 1 aRX	careful co KTimeout reason to k TXTurnar	nsideration bas will be expired keep aPHY-RX roundTime/aM	sed on above c l if a PHY-CC -START-Dela ACProccessin	bservation, the p A.indication(bus y. gDelay should be	oint of my suggestions are follows. y) does not occuer. e taken into account for precise calculation.
S	ugg	jestedRe	emedy			
R al	epla MA(ce "a valu CProccess	e of aSIFSTim ingDelay"	e + aSlotTime	+ aPHY-RX-ST	ART-Delay" with "a value of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime - aRXTXTurnaroundTime -
R	epla	ce "If a Pl	HY-RXSTART	.indication do	es not occur" wit	th "If a PHY-CCA.indication(busy) does not occur".
R	epla	ce "If a Pl	HY-RXSTART	.indication do	es occur" with "I	f a PHY-CCA.indication(busy) does occur"
R sh	epla hall v	ce "the ST wait for th	TA shall wait for e corresponding	or the correspo g PHY-RXST	nding PHY-RXE ART.indication a	END.indication to determine whether the MPDU transmission was successful." with "the STA and PHY-RXEND.indication to determine whether the MPDU transmission was successful."
R	esp	onse				
P	ROF	OSED RI	EJECT. See re	solution to con	nment 22.	

ommenter.		Gohd	la, Wataru			
	ID C	lause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	24	4	14.9	TR	D	U
	Comme	nt				
	No reaso	n to kee	p aPHY-RX-	STARTDelay.	See my commer	nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	Sugges	tedRer	nedy			
	Remove	aPHY-F	RX-START-D	Delay from table	e 79.	
	Respon	se				
	delay fro	ED RE.	JECT. Chang art of the prea	ge the "Ous" to " amble to the iss	"128us" for the v uance of the RX	Value of aPHY-RX-START-Delay in Table 79. Also add the description to the same row: "The Z-START.indicate by the PHY." This value is required for certain MAC timeouts. Editor
	menuded	in draft	1.1 in 14.9.			
ommenter:	menuded	in draft Gohd	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru			
mmenter:	ID C	Gohd	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
mmenter:	ID C	Gohd	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U
mmenter:	ID C 25 1 Comme	Gohd Gohd Iause : .5	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U
mmenter:	ID C 25 1 Comme No reaso	Gohd Gohd Jause 5 nt n to kee	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3 p aPHY-RX-	Type TR STARTDelay. S	Status D See my commer	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
ommenter:	ID C 25 1 Comme No reaso Sugges	Gohd Iause : 5 nt n to kee tedRer	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3 p aPHY-RX- nedy	Type TR STARTDelay. S	Status D See my commer	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
ommenter:	ID C 25 I Comme No reaso Sugges Remove	Gohd Gohd 5 nt n to kee tedRen aPHY-R	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3 p aPHY-RX- nedy RX-START-D	Type TR STARTDelay. S Delay from table	See my commer	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
ommenter:	ID C 25 I Comme No reaso Sugges Remove Respon	Gohd Gohd 5 nt n to kee tedRen aPHY-F se	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3 p aPHY-RX- nedy RX-START-D	Type TR STARTDelay. S Delay from table	See my commer	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
ommenter:	ID C 25 I Comme No reaso Sugges Remove Respon PROPOS	Gohd Iause 3 5 nt n to kee tedRen aPHY-F se ED RE.	1.1 in 14.9. la, Wataru Subclause 15.3.3 p aPHY-RX- nedy RX-START-D JECT. Duplia	Type TR STARTDelay. S Delay from table cate with #256.	See my comments and the set of th	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8. #256 for editorial resolution.

Commenter:		Gob	ıda, Wataru				
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus	
		26 16	16.4	TR	D	U	
	Cor No 1	nment eason to ke	ep aPHY-RX-	STARTDelay. Se	e my commen	ents on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.	
	Sug Rem	IgestedRe nove aPHY-	e medy •RX-START-D	Delay from table 9	8.		
	Res PRC	ponse)POSED RI	EJECT. Chang	ge the "Ous" to "57	7us" for the va	value of aPHY-RX-START-Delay in Table 98." See #530 for editorial resolution.	
Commenter:		Gob	ıda, Wataru				
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus	
		27 17	17.4.4	TR	D	U	
	Cor	nment					
	No 1	eason to ke	ep aPHY-RX-	STARTDelay. Se	e my commen	ents on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.	
	Sug	gestedRe	emedy				
	Rem	ove aPHY-	RX-START-D	elay from table 1	13.		
	Res	ponse					
	PRC	POSED RI	EJECT. This v	alue is required for	or correct ope	eration of certain MAC timeouts.	
Submission						Page 7 of 43 Bob O'Har	a, Cisco Syste

		Goh	da, Wataru			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		28 18	18.3.3	TR	D	U
	Con	nment				
	No r	eason to ke	ep aPHY-RX-	STARTDelay. See	e my commen	nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	Sug	gestedRe	medy			
	Rem	ove aPHY-	RX-START-D	elay from table 12	21.	
	Res	ponse				
	PRO	POSED RE	EIECT This v	alue is required fo	r correct one	ration of certain MAC timeouts
montori		Gab	da Watam			
memer.		UUII	ua, watafu			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	ID	Clause 29 19	Subclause 19.8.4	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U
	ID Con	Clause 29 19 nment	Subclause 19.8.4	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U
	ID Con No r	Clause 29 19 ment eason to ke	Subclause 19.8.4 ep aPHY-RX-	Type TR STARTDelay. See	Status D	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	ID Con No r Sug	Clause 29 19 ment eason to ke gestedRe	Subclause 19.8.4 ep aPHY-RX- medy	Type TR STARTDelay. See	Status D e my commen	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	ID Con No r Sug Rem	Clause 29 19 mment eason to ke gestedRe ove aPHY-	Subclause 19.8.4 ep aPHY-RX- medy RX-START-D	Type TR STARTDelay. See Delay from table 14	Status D e my commen 14.	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	ID Con No r Sug Rem Res	Clause 29 19 mment eason to ke gestedRe ove aPHY- ponse	Subclause 19.8.4 ep aPHY-RX- medy RX-START-D	Type TR STARTDelay. See Delay from table 14	Status D my commen 14.	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8.
	ID Con No r Sug Rem Res PRO	Clause 29 19 ment eason to ke gestedRe ove aPHY- ponse POSED RE	Subclause 19.8.4 ep aPHY-RX- medy RX-START-D EJECT. This v	Type TR STARTDelay. See Delay from table 14 value is required fo	Status D my commen 14.	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8. ration of certain MAC timeouts.
	ID Con No r Sug Rem Res PRO	Clause 29 19 ment eason to ke gestedRe ove aPHY- ponse POSED RE	Subclause 19.8.4 ep aPHY-RX- medy RX-START-D EJECT. This v	Type TR STARTDelay. See Delay from table 14 value is required fo	Status D e my commen 14. r correct open	ResponseStatus U nts on section 9.2.5.7 and 9.2.8. ration of certain MAC timeouts.

nmenter:		Kueh	nel, Thomas			
10	D C	lause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
_	175 ()7	7.3.1.9, pp. 8	TR	D	U
c	Comme	ent				
Ν	No text s	pecifyir	ig when a ver	dor-specific Stat	tus code can be	e sent, or how it is interpretted.
s	Sugges	tedRer	nedy			
A S'	Add sent STA rece	ence to eiving a	7.3.1.9: "A ve vendor-specf	endor-specific sta iic IE it does not	atus code shall understand sh	only be sent if a corresponding vendor-specific IE was included in the requested operation. A all interpret it as though it had received a Status Code of 1 (Unspecified failure)."
R	Respon	se				
R P	Respon PROPOS	i se Sed Ac	CEPT IN PR	INCIPLE. This s	status code has	been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86
R P fc	Respon PROPOS for editor	se SED AC rial reso	CEPT IN PR	INCIPLE. This	status code has	been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86
R P fc	Respon PROPOS for editor	SED AC rial reso	CEPT IN PR	INCIPLE. This s	status code has	been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86
R P fo	Respon PROPOS for editor	SED AC SED AC rial reso Kueh	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas	INCIPLE. This s	status code has	been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86
R P fo nmenter:	Respon PROPOS for editor	SED AC Fial reso Kueh	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause	INCIPLE. This s	status code has	been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus
R P fo nmenter:	Respon PROPOS for editor D C 176 (SED AC rial reso Kueh Clause	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.12, pp.	INCIPLE. This s Type TR	status code has Status D	s been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus U
R P fo nmenter:	Respon PROPOS for editor D C 176 (Comme	SED AC rial reso Kueh Clause	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.12, pp.	INCIPLE. This s Type TR	status code has Status D	s been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus U
R P fo nmenter: II C N	Respon PROPOS for editor D C 176 (Comme No text s	SED AC GED AC rial reso Kueh Clause 07 ent	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.12, pp.	INCIPLE. This s Type TR pr of a STA or A	status code has Status D P receiving a v	s been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus U rendor-specific IE it does not understand.
R P fo nmenter: II C N S	Respon PROPOS for editor D C 176 (Comme No text s Sugges	SED AC Fial reso Kueh Clause 07 ent pecifyir tedRer	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.12, pp. ag the behavio nedy	INCIPLE. This s Type TR Dr of a STA or A	status code has Status D P receiving a v	s been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus U vendor-specific IE it does not understand.
R P fo nmenter: II C N S A	Respon PROPOS for editor D C 176 (Comme No text s Sugges Add sent	SED AC rial reso Kueh Clause 07 ent pecifyir tedRer ence to	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.12, pp. og the behavio nedy 7.2.3.12: "A S	INCIPLE. This s Type TR or of a STA or A STA receiving ar	status code has Status D P receiving a v n Action frame	s been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus U vendor-specific IE it does not understand.
R P fo nmenter: II C N S A	Respon PROPOS for editor D C 176 (Comme No text s Sugges Add sent	SED AC rial reso Kueh Clause 07 ent pecifyir tedRer ence to	CEPT IN PR lution. nel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.12, pp. ag the behavio nedy 7.2.3.12: "A S	INCIPLE. This s Type TR or of a STA or Al STA receiving ar	Status code has D P receiving a v n Action frame	s been deleted as a result of resolving other comments. Duplicate of comment id #19. See #86 ResponseStatus U vendor-specific IE it does not understand. • containing a vendor-specific IE it does not understand shall ignore the vendor-specific IE."

mmenter:		Kue	hnel, Thomas								
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	1	77 07	7.2.3.11, pp.	TR	D	U					
	Con	nment									
	No text specifying the behavior of a STA or AP receiving a vendor-specific IE it does not understand.										
	Sug	gestedRe	medy								
	Add IE."	sentence to	7.2.3.11: "A S	TA receiving a De	eauthenticatio	on frame containing a vendor-specific IE it does not understand shall ignore the vendor-specific					
	Res PRO	ponse Posed A	CCEPT IN PRI	NCIPLE. See the	resolution to	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.					
mmenter:		Kue	hnel, Thomas								
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	1	78 07	7.2.3.3, pp. 7	TR	D	U					
	Con	nment									
	No te	ext specify	ing what a STA	should do if it end	counters a Dis	ssassociation frame including a vendor-specific IE it does not understand.					
	Sug	gestedRe	medy								
	Add	sentence to	7.2.3.3: "A ST	A receiving a ven	dor-specific I	E that it does not support shall ignore the vendor-specific IE."					
	Res	ponse									
	PRO mana	POSED A	CCEPT IN PRI ames, not just tl	NCIPLE. Add the ne disassociation fr	proposed ser rame. Editor i	ntence to the penultimate paragraph of 7.2.3. This makes the statement applicable to all included in draft 1.1 in 7.2.3.					

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Kue	hnel, Thomas			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	17	79 07	7.2.3.4, pp.7	TR	D	U

Comment

No text specifying how an AP should behave if it encounters an Association-Request frame including a vendor-specific IE it does not understand, or that does not include a vendor specific IE.

SuggestedRemedy

Add sentence to 7.2.3.4: "An AP receiving an Association Request frame including a vendor-specific IE it does not understand shall ignore the vendor-specific IE. An AP shall not fail to process an Association Request frame due to lack of a vendor-specific IE."

Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See the resolution to comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

nmenter:		Kue	hnel, Thomas								
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	18	0 07	7.2.3.5, pp. 7	TR	D	U					
	Comment										
	No tex	kt specifyi	ng when a ven	dor-specific I	E can be sent with	hin an Association Response.					
	Sugg	estedRe	medy								
	SuggestedRemedy Add sentence to 7.2.3.5: "A STA receiving an Association Response frame including a vendor-specific IE it does not understand shall ignore the vendor- specific IE. An AP shall not send a vendor-specific IE within an Association Response unless a corresponding vendor-specific IE is included within the Association Request										
	Assoc										
	Assoc Resp	onse	10051.								
	Assoc Resp PROP	onse OSED AG	CCEPT IN PRI	NCIPLE. See	e the resolution to	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.					
	Assoc Resp PROP	onse OSED AG	CCEPT IN PRI	INCIPLE. See	e the resolution to	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP	onse OSED AG	CCEPT IN PRI	NCIPLE. See	e the resolution to	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP	onse OSED AG Kue Clause	CCEPT IN PRI hnel, Thomas Subclause	INCIPLE. See	e the resolution to Status	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP	onse POSED AG Kue Clause	CCEPT IN PRI hnel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.9, pp. 7	INCIPLE. See Type TR	e the resolution to Status D	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP	onse OSED AG Kue Clause 1 07 ment	CCEPT IN PRI hnel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.9, pp. 7	INCIPLE. See Type TR	e the resolution to Status D	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP ID 18 Comi No tes	onse OSED AG Kue Clause 1 07 ment ct specifyi	CCEPT IN PRI hnel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.9, pp. 7 ng when a ven	INCIPLE. See Type TR dor-specific II	e the resolution to Status D E can be sent with	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U hin a Probe Response or how it is interpretted by the STA.					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP ID 18 Comi No ter Sugg	onse OSED AG Clause 1 07 ment kt specifyi	CCEPT IN PRI hnel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.9, pp. 7 ng when a ven medy	INCIPLE. See Type TR dor-specific II	e the resolution to Status D E can be sent with	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U hin a Probe Response or how it is interpretted by the STA.					
nmenter:	Assoc Resp PROP ID 18 Comm No ter Sugg Add s	onse OSED AG Kue Clause 1 07 ment kt specifyi estedRe entence to	CCEPT IN PRI hnel, Thomas Subclause 7.2.3.9, pp. 7 ng when a ven medy 9.7.2.3.9: "A ST	INCIPLE. See Type TR dor-specific II	e the resolution to Status D E can be sent with a Probe Response	o comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U hin a Probe Response or how it is interpretted by the STA. e frame including a vendor-specific IE it does not understand shall ignore the vendor-specific IE."					

Submission

mmenter:		Kue	Kuehnel, Thomas									
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus						
	182	2 07	7.2.3.8, pp. 7	TR	D	U						
	Comment											
	No tex	t specifyi	ng the behavio	or of an AP re-	ceiving a vendor-s	specific IE it does not understand.						
	Sugg	estedRe	medy									
	Add s	entence to	7.2.3.8: "An A	AP receiving a	a Probe Request fi	rame including a vendor-specific IE it does not understand shall ignore the vendor-specific IE."						
	The solution of the solution o											
	Resp	onse	Response									
	Resp PROP	onse OSED A(CCEPT IN PR	NCIPLE. Se	e the resolution to	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.						
	Resp PROP	onse OSED AG	CCEPT IN PR	NCIPLE. Se	e the resolution to	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.						
nmenter:	Resp PROP	onse OSED AC LEN	CCEPT IN PRI 1BERGER, UI	NCIPLE. Se RIEL	ee the resolution to	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution.						
nmenter:	Resp PROP	onse OSED AG LEN Clause	CCEPT IN PRI 1BERGER, UI Subclause	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type	ee the resolution to Status	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus						
nmenter:	Resp PROP ID	OSED AC LEN Clause 3 18	CCEPT IN PRI MBERGER, UN Subclause 18.4.6.2	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR	the resolution to Status D	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U						
nmenter:	Resp PROP ID 395 Com	onse OSED AG LEN Clause 3 18 nent	CCEPT IN PRI IBERGER, UI Subclause 18.4.6.2	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR	the resolution to Status D	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U						
nmenter:	Resp PROP ID 393 Comi Table	OSED AC LEN Clause 3 18 nent 126 is inc	CCEPT IN PR MBERGER, UI Subclause 18.4.6.2 orrect.	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR	the resolution to Status D	comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U						
nmenter:	Resp PROP ID 399 Comi Table	OSED AC LEN Clause 3 18 nent 126 is inc estedRe	CCEPT IN PRI 4BERGER, UI Subclause 18.4.6.2 orrect. medy	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR	the resolution to Status D	e comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U						
nmenter:	Resp PROP ID 393 Comu Table Sugg Correc	OSED AC LEN Clause 3 18 nent 126 is inc estedRe et the table	CCEPT IN PR ABERGER, UI Subclause 18.4.6.2 orrect. medy e content, for e	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR xample , FCC	e the resolution to Status D C allows Ch 12,13	e comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U with mask restrictions, France is part of ETSI.						
nmenter:	Resp PROP ID 392 Comi Table Sugg Correc	OSED AC LEN Clause 3 18 nent 126 is inc estedRe et the table	CCEPT IN PR MBERGER, UN Subclause 18.4.6.2 orrect. medy e content, for e	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR xample , FCC	e the resolution to Status D C allows Ch 12,13	e comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U with mask restrictions, France is part of ETSI.						
mmenter:	Resp PROP ID 399 Comi Table Sugg Correc Resp	OSED AC LEN Clause 3 18 nent 126 is inc estedRe ct the table	CCEPT IN PRI ABERGER, UI Subclause 18.4.6.2 orrect. medy e content, for e	NCIPLE. Se RIEL Type TR xample , FCC	E the resolution to Status D C allows Ch 12,13	e comment 178. See comment #178 for editorial resolution. ResponseStatus U with mask restrictions, France is part of ETSI. bla channels for each domain (or identified by the value at the head of each column), but only						

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

commenter:	Mike, Moreton									
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus				
	189	03	3.122	TR	D	U				
	Comr	nent								
	"the A	P's statior	n (STA) and po	ortal entities." is	difficult to para	se. Is it the AP's (STA and portal) or the (AP's STA) and portal?				
	SuggestedRemedy									
	replace with "portal entities and the AP's station(STA)									

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. See comment #191 for alternate resolution.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	19	8 07	7.3.2.14	TR	D	U

Comment

Placing basic rates in the extended supported rates element is very dangerous because not all recipients will understand it, and may continually try to associate with APs that will continuously reject them. (I made this comment in 11g, but it was ignored *sigh*).

SuggestedRemedy

in this element only, the "basic rate bit" should be changed to be the "mandatory rate bit" and should be used to indicate rates that must be supported by STAs that support the PHY type in question. There is currently no way of signalling what these rates are, and they are required for correct operation of the 11g changes.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. While it is possible to do what the commenter describes, there are methods fully compliant with the current standard to avoid this problem. It requires only that at least one rate not supported by PHYs requiring support of the Extended Supported Rates element be marked as a Basic Rate in the original Supported Rates element.

nmenter:		M1k	e, Moreton							
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus				
	20	3 09	9.2.4	TR	D	U				
	Com	ment								
	I seem to remember there was an interpretation that described the CW having a double peak with default values - maybe it would be a good idea for the diagram to show this?									
	Sugg	jestedRe	emedy							
	See c	omment								
	Resr	onse								
	PROF	POSED RI	EJECT. It is no	ot at all clear what	the comment	ter is requesting. If there is an interpretation request or response on this issue, please cite it.				
		0022 10								
enter:		Mik	e, Moreton							
mmenter:										
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus				
	ID 20	Clause	Subclause 9.2.5.7	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U				
	ID 20 Com	Clause 8 09 ment	9.2.5.7	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U				
	ID 20 Com PHY-	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAI	9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem	Type TR as to increase the c	Status D hance of mis-	ResponseStatus U -aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions.				
	<u>ID</u> 20 Сот РНҮ-	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAI	9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem	Type TR as to increase the c	Status D hance of mis-	ResponseStatus U ealigned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions.				
	ID 200 Com PHY- Sugg Requi	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAI jestedRe	Subclause 9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem emedy X-START-De	Type TR as to increase the c	Status D hance of mis- to a whole nu	ResponseStatus U •aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions. •umber of slot times. (maybe simplest would be to change the units from time to slots)				
	ID 20 Com PHY- Sugg Requi	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAI jestedRe re PHY-R	9.2.5.7 9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem emedy RX-START-De	Type TR as to increase the c	Status D hance of mis- to a whole nu	ResponseStatus U •aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions. umber of slot times. (maybe simplest would be to change the units from time to slots)				
	ID 20 Com PHY- Sugg Requi	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAF JestedRe re PHY-R	9.2.5.7 9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem emedy RX-START-De	Type TR as to increase the c	Status D hance of mis- to a whole nu	ResponseStatus U •aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions. •umber of slot times. (maybe simplest would be to change the units from time to slots)				
	ID 20 Com PHY- Sugg Requi Resp PROF persis	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAI gestedRe re PHY-R oonse POSED RI ts.	9.2.5.7 9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem emedy RX-START-De EJECT. The vi	Type TR as to increase the c day to rounded up alues for the PHY-	Status D hance of mis- to a whole nu RXSTART-E	ResponseStatus U •aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions. •umber of slot times. (maybe simplest would be to change the units from time to slots) Delay are being corrected. Please renew this comment if you continue to believe this problem				
	ID 20 Com PHY- Sugg Requi Resp PROF persis	Clause 8 09 ment RX-STAI jestedRe re PHY-R oonse POSED RI ts.	9.2.5.7 9.2.5.7 RT-Delay seem emedy RX-START-De EJECT. The va	Type TR as to increase the c day to rounded up alues for the PHY-	Status D hance of mis- to a whole nu RXSTART-D	ResponseStatus U •aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions. •umber of slot times. (maybe simplest would be to change the units from time to slots) Delay are being corrected. Please renew this comment if you continue to believe this problem				

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	20	9 09	9.2.8	TR	D	U

Comment

PHY-RX-START-Delay seems to increase the chance of mis-aligned slots for OFDM phys, and hence will increase the number of collisions.

SuggestedRemedy

Require PHY-RX-START-Delay to rounded up to a whole number of slot times. (maybe simplest would be to change the units from time to slots)

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This is not likely to cause the problem described by the commenter. If the ACK is lost and there are no other STAs transmitting, synchronizing to slot boundaries is not required. If another STA does transmit while the STA that did not receive the expected ACK is in backoff, that other STA's transmission will provide slot resynchronization. If the problem did exist, rounding to slots would only make the collision probability greater, not lesser, than the specified behavior.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	211	l 09	9.4	TR	D	U

Comment

The whole MSDU/MPDU/MMPDU is a conceptual mess (a search for MMPDU will show that in a huge number of cases it's preceded by "MPDU or" which alone is evidence that something has gone wrong) - it's not clear whether MMPDU is more like an MSDU or an MPDU which makes the whole thing very confused.

SuggestedRemedy

Given it's unlikely anyone has the time to really sort this out, I actually prefer the original text about fragmentation in this section, so back out the changes.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The text is clear and accurate. The commenter is solicited to describe the ways in which the text is not correct.

enter:		Mik	ke, Moreton								
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	2	15 10	10.3.4.3	TR	D	U					
	Con	ment									
	Note doub	that the ch t it's worth	nanges make th a anyone going	to the effort o	onsistent with 11. of changing the ot	3.2 (at least). Same problem with 10.3.4.3. While I don't mind either way about this change, I her sections it impacts.					
	Sug	gestedRe	emedy								
	Rem	ove change	es to 10.3.4.3 a	and 10.3.4.4							
	Res	oonse									
	Res PRO	<mark>Donse</mark> Posed Ri	EJECT. The r	evised service	primitives provid	le the indented and correct mechanism.					
	Res PRO	Donse POSED R	EJECT. The r	evised service	primitives provid	le the indented and correct mechanism.					
enter:	Res PRO	Donse POSED Ri Mik	EJECT. The re	evised service	primitives provid	le the indented and correct mechanism.					
enter:	Res PRO	POSED R Mik	EJECT. The reaction the second second	evised service	primitives provid	le the indented and correct mechanism.					
enter:	Res PRO	Donse POSED R Mik Clause	EJECT. The reaction the subclause	Type	primitives provid	the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus					
enter:	Res PRO	POSED R Mik Clause	EJECT. The re se, Moreton Subclause 10.3.6.4.2	evised service Type TR	primitives provid Status D	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U					
enter:	Res PRO ID 2 Con	POSED R Mik Clause 20 10	EJECT. The reaction Moreton Subclause 10.3.6.4.2	evised service Type TR	primitives provid Status D	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U					
enter:	Res PRO ID 2 Con I dor	POSED R Mik Clause 20 10 ment 't think "R	EJECT. The re ce, Moreton 2 Subclause 10.3.6.4.2 EFUSED_BA	evised service Type TR SIC_RATES_	primitives provid Status D MISMATCH" sh	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U iould be a possible result code - the MAC should do this itself. Also 10.3.7.4.2					
enter:	Res PRO ID 2 Con I dor	POSED R Mik Clause 20 10 ment 't think "R	EJECT. The reaction Subclause 10.3.6.4.2	evised service Type TR SIC_RATES_	primitives provid Status D MISMATCH" sh	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U nould be a possible result code - the MAC should do this itself. Also 10.3.7.4.2					
enter:	Res PRO ID 2 Con I dor Sug	Donse POSED R Mik Clause 20 10 ment 't think "R gestedRe	EJECT. The reaction the second	Type TR SIC_RATES_	primitives provid Status D MISMATCH" sh	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U nould be a possible result code - the MAC should do this itself. Also 10.3.7.4.2					
enter:	Res PRO ID 2 Con I dor Sug Rem	POSED R Mik Clause 20 10 't think "R gestedRe ove "REFU	EJECT. The reaction Subclause 10.3.6.4.2 EFUSED_BASIC	evised service Type TR SIC_RATES_ _RATES_MIS	primitives provid Status D MISMATCH" sh	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U nould be a possible result code - the MAC should do this itself. Also 10.3.7.4.2 10.3.7.4.2 and 10.3.6.4.2					
enter:	Res PRO ID 2 Con I dor Sug Rem Res	Donse POSED R Mik Clause 20 10 ment 't think "R gestedRe Dove "REFU	EJECT. The rate, Moreton Subclause 10.3.6.4.2 EFUSED_BAA Semedy USED_BASIC	Type TR TR SIC_RATES_ _RATES_MIS	primitives provid Status D MISMATCH" sh SMATCH" from 1	le the indented and correct mechanism. ResponseStatus U nould be a possible result code - the MAC should do this itself. Also 10.3.7.4.2 10.3.7.4.2 and 10.3.6.4.2					

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	224	4 11	11.1.3.4	TR	D	U

Comment

The resulting clause is still a mess, and it would probably be better to leave it alone rather than just add to the confusion. For example, the service primitive implies you can use a probe request, but the description says you must wait for a beacon. How does data transfer apply to joined/not joined state? When does the state change to join during this process? Why are you no longer allowed to join based on parameters stored from the scan?

SuggestedRemedy

Either write a more complete, more structured definition, or leave it as it was.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The original description is inadequate. The new text provides clarification and is a result of processing interpretation requests.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	,	226 11	11.2.1.6	TR	D	U
	Co	mment				

bullet (a): Saying that something happens after a time corresponding to the end of an interval is different to saying that it happens after the interval - it's the difference between an inclusive and exclusive limit. I doubt this change was deliberate! Overall I think the new text is at best no better than what it's replacing.

SuggestedRemedy

Revert to the old bullet (a).

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The text reflects the corresponding behavior of the AP discarding of frames due to being older than ListenInterval.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
i	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
_	228	3 11	11.2.2.1	ER	D	U

Comment

A preposition is a word you shouldn't end a sentence with.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "If a station changes to the PS mode, it shall assume that all other stations are in the PS mode also." to "If a station changes to the PS mode, it shall assume that all other stations are also in the PS mode."

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. Also functions as an adverb in the cited sentence.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	231	l L	L.	TR	D	U

Comment

The title and introduction to this annex are incorrect. It does not describe the integration function or portal - it describes the 802.1H selective translation. While a portal may include an 802.1H translation function there is no need for it to do so, and 802.1H selective translations may also take place in STAs.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all references to integration and portal in this annex with "IEEE Std. 802.1H-1997 (ISO/IECTR11802-5:1997) translation function"

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The commenter is mistaken. The purpose of the annex is to recommend the behavior of a Portal. A STA need not translate MSDUs at all. It would be advisable to represent their format in the same way as a Portal would, but this is not a requirement. Moreover, this Recommended Practice does not simply recommend 802.1H, as most vendors use an 802.11-specific STT, rather than the one suggested in Annex A of 802.1H.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	23	2 L	L.2	TR	D	U

Comment

These changes are not specific to 802.11 - they are generally applicable to all 802.1H implementations. If the changes are left in this document readers will not know which document to select for details of 802.1H - 802.1H itself or (bizarrly) 802.11. These changes are an infringement of TGma's PAR.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete clause L.2 and forward it as a liaison to 802.1.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This recommended practice differs from 802.1H because it uses a different STT. This Annex recommends a widespread practice already implemented by many 802.11 implementations. The use of a different STT, together with the translation rules for using that table defined in 802.1H is completely unambiguous in the format presented here.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mi	ke, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		233 L	L.3	TR	D	U

Comment

There is no 802.11 specific information in this clause - it is purely an example of how to implement 802.1H and so should be in that document.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete clause L.3 and forward it as a liaison to 802.1.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. A Portal is not an 802.1D bridge, because (a) the DS is not itself an 802 LAN, (b) it is permissible for a conformant 802.11 ESS to be transparent to Bridge PDUs, and (c) the portal abstraction deliberately hides the details of reassociation from a bridge. Requiring a Portal to be a bridge would render many systems non-compliant for no readily-evident reason.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mike	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	234	4 M	M.	TR	D	U

Comment

While I appreciate a lot of hard work went into this annex, I don't really understand the point. It seems to be saying "For those of you who didn't understand section 5, how about we invent a whole new set of terminology and explain it again." and all that's likely to do is to increase the confusion.

SuggestedRemedy

If there are valuable new concepts in this annex then incorporate them into clause 5, and delete the rest of this annex.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT.

Annex M is completely informative material.

The APF description is intended (only) as an abstract model to help in "systems" level

work when thinking of or working with 802.11 technology.

The value is helping people to formulate and hold in their mind a clear and consistent model

of the functions of an 802.11 device (in general) and esp. an AP, including the entities usually found in typical device implementations.

Annex M is the primary result of the work of the AP Functionality (APF) chair's ad hoc cmtee.

The APF cmtee was formed as a result of requests from several others groups (both within 802 and outside 802) to clarify the AP functionality. Refer to submissions 11-04-0544-00-0wng-ap-functional-needs-capwap.ppt and 11-04-0481-03-0wng-thoughts-on-ap-functional-descriptions.ppt and 11-04-0540-01-0wng-need-ap-functional-descriptions.ppt and 11-04-0604-00-0wng-ap-functional-descriptions-update.ppt which articulate the need for the APF group and the results it will generate.

Anticipated users of the new descriptive material are: IETF CAPWAP, 802.1X, 802.11 TGs and 802.21.

The purpose of Annex M is to add clarity to the standard in the form of addition informative

descriptions. In reviewing the APF output document (11-05-0120-09) with various parties everyone's understanding of the 802.11 architecture was improved. Annex M thus succeeds in providing a clearer mental mode for people to better understand 802.11. Note that due to an editoral compilation error, Annex M does not reflect the actual and full contents of the approved submission 11-05-0120-09.

All of the terms used in annex M except for ACM_STA, MU, and AU are terms that are defined in the existing standard. The usage of those terms is completely consisten with their definitions and meaning. What Annex M does is to clarify those terms with respect to each other. Even though ACM_STA and MU are new terms they do not define anything new. They just give a name to existing modes of STA operation that then allow those modes to be easily and concisely referenced. The new term AU is cited only in passing as an example product instantiation, only in order to provide a basis for the abstract

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

descriptions.

Commenter: Mike, Moreton

ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
23	5 N	N.	TR	D	U

Comment

This annex should be part of section 6 (just like the interface to LLC)

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The DS SAP is not like the LLC interface. The commentor is referred to the original submission (doc 5/262r2) and 802.11REV-ma-D1.1 to see where the DS SAP fits into the architecture. The material is here in an annex because 802.11 does not define the DS, and hence this informative information belongs in an informative annex.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mik	e, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	238	8 N	N.2.1.1	TR	D	U

Comment

As described, a received MSDU can be routed to LLC (via the MA-UNITDATA.indication primitive) or to the DS (via the DS-UNITDATA.request primitive). I think having "request" for one and "indication" for the other is inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Swap the request and indication.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. DS-UNITDATA.request sends an SDU to the DS. DS-UNITDATA.indication accepts an SDU from the DS. All 802.11 SDUs that come out of the ACM_STA (via the MAC_SAP) use the MA-UNITDATA.indication to get the SDU to the AP. The AP then uses DS-UNITDATA.request to forward the SDU to the DS.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mi	ke, Moreton			
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		239 N	N.2.1.1.2	TR	D	U

Comment

Something of type "802.11 MSDU" does not contain (almost by definition) the parameters that accompany an MSDU when passed over another interface.

SuggestedRemedy

List all the parameters.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The DS carries 802.11 MSDUs. Rather than respecify that here we point to clause 6.2.1.1.2 for the complete definition there. If that definition changes this descriptions remains intact. Since the DS SAP connects to the MAC SAP through the AP they both have exactly the same parameters available.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mil	ke, Moreton			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	24	42 N	N.	TR	D	U

Comment

This interface can perfectly well be described in terms of the standard 802.1 M-UNITDATA primitives and the 802.11 MLME primitives. Why pick an incompatible API for no reason?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text in this annex to re-use the indicated interfaces, or delete it entirely.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The DS SAP is unlike 802.1 M-UNITDATA or 802.11 MLME. The commentor is referred to the original submission (doc 5/262r2) and 802.11 REV-ma--D1.1 to see where the DS SAP fits into the architecture.

mmenter:		My	les, Andrew			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	1	36 M	M.	TR	D	U
	Cor	nment				
	This	annex prov	vides very limi	ted value given	the large numbe	er of new terms and the semi-formal specification language
	Sug	gestedRe	emedy			
	Rem	nove entire	annex			
	Res	ponse				
	The worl The of th Ann The subr 11-C 11-C whice Anti The desc impu error to th	APF descri k when thin value is he he functions ex M is the APF cmtee nissions W4-0540-01- ch articulate cipated use purpose of riptions. In roved. Ann r, Annex M he changes (ipiterly information is intended ipition is intended liping people to s of an 802.11 c primary result e was formed as -0wng-ap-funct -0wng-need-ap e the need for the res of the new d Annex M is to n reviewing the nex M thus succ I does not reflect (other than corr	ed (only) as an king with 802.1 formulate and levice (in gener of the work of s a result of requ- ional-needs-cap- functional-desche APF group a escriptive mate add clarity to t APF output do ceeds in providi ct the actual and plete removal)	abstract model to 1 technology. hold in their min al) and esp. an A the AP Function uests from severa owap.ppt and 11- criptions.ppt and nd the results it rial are: IETF C. he standard in th cument (11-05-C ng a clearer mer d full contents of that would be a	o help in "systems" level AP, including the entities usually found in typical device implementations. hality (APF) chair's ad hoc cmtee. al others groups (both within 802 and outside 802) to clarify the AP functionality. Refer to -04-0481-03-0wng-thoughts-on-ap-functional-descriptions.ppt and d 11-04-0604-00-0wng-ap-functional-descriptions-update.ppt will generate. APWAP, 802.1X, 802.11 TGs and 802.21. he form of additional informative D120-09) with various parties, everyone's understanding of the 802.11 architecture was ntal model for people to better understand 802.11. Note that due to an editorial compilation f the approved submission 11-05-0120-09. The commenter is solicited to provide more detail as acceptable to the annex.

ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
45	54 M	М.	TR	D	U
Com	ment				
This	annex pro	vides very limi	ted value give	en the large number	er of new terms and the semi-formal specification language
Sug	gestedR	emedy			
Remo	ove entire	annex			
Resp	oonse				
PRO	POSED R	EJECT.			
			A 3373 T 1 - 41		

שו	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
4	58 N	N.	TR	R	U
Con	ment				
Ther	e is little o	bvious value in	n this annex		
Sug	gestedR	emedy			
Rem	ove entire	annex			
Res	oonse				
doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Comment

The term "802.11g" is used without being defined or referenced.

SuggestedRemedy

Clearly provide references for all of the 802.11a through 802.11j amendments.

Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. In the first sentence below Figure 248, change "in the 802.11g header" to "in the header". All of the amendments (and their titles) cease to exist after the approval of the revision to the standard. Editor included in draft 1.1 in 19.7.2.6.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Palı	n, Stephen			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		244 00	General	TR	D	U

Comment

If an implementor wished to implement an 802.11g or 802.11a only product, this document provides no guidance as to which clauses and phrases are relevant.

SuggestedRemedy

Clearly indicate which clauses and phrsases are applicable to the individual amendments of 802.11a through 802.11j

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. Once 802.11REV-2005 is published, IEEE rules require that the individual amendments (802.11a-j) disappear. These distinctions are not indicated in the revision of the standard.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

ommenter:	Sanwalka, Anil										
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	32	8 09	9.2.10	TR	D	U					
	Comment										
	The new value of EIFS is not the same as the old value for legacy 11 and 11b MACs. Since the use of EIFS is required (shall) the new equation must resolve to the old value for legacy radios.										
	SuggestedRemedy										
	Remove the DIFS from the equation.										
mmenter:	Resp PROF	oonse POSED RE Sanv	EJECT. The no	ew equation for EI	FS resolves to	o exactly the same value for the legacy .11 and the .11b PHYS as the original equation.					
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	ID 33	Clause 0 09	Subclause 9.4	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U					
	1D 33 Com	Clause 0 09 ment	Subclause 9.4	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U					
	33 Com In the	Clause 0 09 ment second pa	Subclause 9.4 aragraph the ch	Type TR nange from fragme	Status D nt to MPDU i	ResponseStatus U is incorrect and confusing.					
	ID 33 Com In the Sugg	Clause 0 09 ment second pa	Subclause 9.4 tragraph the ch medy	Type TR nange from fragme	Status D nt to MPDU i	ResponseStatus U is incorrect and confusing.					
	ID 33 Com In the Sugg Rejec	Clause 0 09 ment second pa gestedRe t the chang	Subclause 9.4 tragraph the ch medy ges from fragn	Type TR nange from fragme nent to MPDU.	Status D nt to MPDU i	ResponseStatus U is incorrect and confusing.					
	ID 33 Com In the Sugg Rejec Resp	Clause 0 09 ment second pa gestedRe t the chang	Subclause 9.4 tragraph the ch medy ges from fragn	Type TR nange from fragment nent to MPDU.	Status D nt to MPDU i	ResponseStatus U is incorrect and confusing.					
	ID 33 Com In the Sugg Rejec Resp PROF	Clause 0 09 ment second pa gestedRe t the chang ponse POSED RE	Subclause 9.4 aragraph the ch medy ges from fragm EJECT. The te	Type TR nange from fragme nent to MPDU.	Status D nt to MPDU i	ResponseStatus U is incorrect and confusing. ommenter is solicited to describe the ways in which the text is not correct.					
	ID 33 Comi In the Sugg Rejec Resp PROF	Clause 0 09 ment second pa jestedRe t the chang oonse POSED RE	Subclause 9.4 aragraph the ch medy ges from fragm EJECT. The te	Type TR nange from fragme nent to MPDU.	Status D nt to MPDU i	ResponseStatus U is incorrect and confusing. ommenter is solicited to describe the ways in which the text is not correct.					

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		San	walka, Anil					
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus		
	33	2 09	9.7	TR	D	U		

Comment

In Table 38, removing the indicated sequence disallows sending frames to third parties during the CFP. This was previously allowed and could make legacy equipment non-compliant. I don't see the need to do this.

SuggestedRemedy

Reject the change to table 38.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This row in the table conflicted with other parts of the standard. The deletion from the table corrects this.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ster	phens, Adrian			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	4	42 C	C.	TR	D	U

Comment

The SDL is a maintenance nightmare and is practically useless.

Few task groups have the means to maintain this model. The model itself contains some very questionable use of SDL (such as extensive sharing of variables), structuring of the model does not match the architecture presented in the body text, and it has not been updated to reflect the changes approved in 802.11i.

Those who have seriously tried to use the model (I have) descover that it has a very blinkered view of 802.11 - yet it is somehow "normative".

SuggestedRemedy

Firstly scan Annex C for normative behaviour not defined elsewhere and move to appropriate sections in the body text (there should be none).

Remove Annex C. Alternatively mark is as "Informative - historic interest only".

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. There is still normative behavior described only in the SDL. Deleting the annex would also delete these normative behaviors. The commenter is solicited to provide the text for the normative behaviors to add to the other clauses of the standard, so that the annex might then be removed.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ste	phens, Adrian			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	4	5 05	5.	TR	D	U

Comment

This section, and particularly section 5.2 creates a number of fictions that have created problems in understanding the system for implementers since the first approved version. These fictions will hopefully be addressed by future activities seeking to clarify architecture.

Specifically, an architecture consists of entities for which behaviour is defined connected by interfaces. If the interfaces are exposed to the outside world, they need to be concrete rather than abstract.

But we have a distribution service that provides an abstract description of communication between APs and portals. Unless the only implementations of the entire DS reside within a single physical realization or system from a single manufacturer, the interfaces between the AP and portals are exposed and need to be standardised.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend that this section (and particularly 5.2) carry a disclaimer such as: "don't believe this, it will confuse the heck out of you", or alternatively: "the architectural description is under review by study group xxx".

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This standard describes the MAC and PHY and the air interface. It also describes the place of the MAC and PHY in a larger architecture. Describing the entire architecture in a normative fashion is beyond the scope of this standard. Clause 5 has the purpose of describing this architecture in a general fashion and not in a restrictive fashion, to allow future activities to extend this architecture.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ster	phens, Adrian			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		57 09	9.2	TR	D	U

Comment

"CS shall be performed by both physical and virtual mechanisms".

Sigh, Sigh, Sigh.

Shall is supposed to introduce a normative requirement, and it is as clear a mud what this is introducing. It sounds more like a normative requirement on the writers of the protocol to include destails to support both physical and virtual mechanisms.

SuggestedRemedy

Turn this into an informative note.

This is also a general problem. I just happened to light on this and it exceeded my intertia threshold. I recommend scanning for "shall" and replacing with "is" where it clearly describes normative behaviour introduced elsewhere in the document. Ideally each use of the word shall (and there are 2000+) should relate to an entry in the PICS.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This is a normative requirement on the implementation of the MAC. It is requiring that the MAC operate using both the physical carrier sense indication from the PHY and the NAV virtual carrier sense mechanism.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ste	phens, Adrian			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		59 09	9.2.3.4	TR	D	U

Comment

This single para is symptomatic of "specification by normative verbosity" (that's the PC version of the expression). The problem is we're trying to say something complex, and we heap normative sentence on normative sentence. What we actually need is some diagrammatic representation (such as a state machine) that is normative. This makes life a lot easier for the non-native English speakers, and makes interpretation less error-prone.

SuggestedRemedy

Let's have a nice block diagram or state machine showing how the various counters and timers relate. (The SDL in the Annexes is not adequate for this purpose, although SDL would be one valid representation of a state machine that could be used at this point (but It wouldn't be my first choice)).

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The text is clear and concise. The commenter is solicited to provide a diagram or other formal description that improves upon the text.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Stephens, Adrian										
	ID	D Clause Subclause		Туре	Status	ResponseStatus						
	(67 11 1	11.1.3	TR	D	U						
	Com	ment										
	"If a STAÆs scanning does not result in finding a BSS with the desired SSID and of the desired type, or does not result in finding any BSS, the STA may start an IBSS"											
	SuggestedRemedy											
	Move to the SME.											
	Res PRO	DONSE POSED RE	EJECT. The s	tatement is co	prrect and relevant	in its current location.						

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ste	phens, Adrian			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		68 11	11.1.3.4	TR	D	U

Comment

This section highlights that the state machine described in 5.5 is an over simplification. There should be states to reflect that it is not synchronized (i.e. cannot exchange class 1 frames), is synchronized (can exchange class 1 frames), authenticated (can exchange class 2 frames) and associated (can exchange class 3 frames).

SuggestedRemedy

Add a state to the state diagram to show the process of transitioning from idle to synchronized and related to the procedures of this section.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The diagram in 5.5 is intended to be a very simple description and not to include all of the protocol complexity.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

mmenter:		Adr	rian, Stephens								
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
		32 00 0		ER	D	U					
	Со	mment									
	Myballot #57. Maintained.										
	SuggestedRemedy 0										
	Response PROPOSED REJECT. While use of physical carrier sense and virtual carrier sense are each described, individually, elsewhere, this statement is a requirement that the MAC use both mechanisms.										
nmenter:		Adr	rian, Stephens								
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
		33 00	0	TR	D	U					
	Co My	mment ballot #59.	Our "clear and	concise"s inhabit c	lifferent realit	ties.					
	Sug	ggestedRe	emedy								
	0										
	Res PR(mar	sponse DPOSED RI mer in whic	EJECT. The co	omment does not po ents are described.	oint out a norm	native problem with the text, only that the commenter is dissatisfied with the language or the					

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

mmenter:	Adrian, Stephens										
	ID	Clause Subclause		Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
		35 00	0	TR	D	U					
	Comment										
	Myballot #67, Maintained.										
	SuggestedRemedy										
	0										

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The rest of the sentence, not quoted in the original comment, concludes the sentence with "upon receipt of an MLME-START.request", which indicates that the action is controlled and begun by action outside the MLME, typically, the SME.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:	iter: Adrian, Stephens									
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus				
		36 00	0	TR	D	U				
	Comment									
	Myv	vallot #68,	Maintained.							

SuggestedRemedy

"it's meant to be a simplification" - how does the reader know that this normative section is just a "simplified" view of the normative requirements.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This clause does not refer to the state machine in clause 5 in any way. It does not introduce confusion to the reader, because the title of that clause is "General Description". The state machine in 5.5 does not represent all of the requirements of an 802.11 compliant implementation, just as any other single figure or clause does not represent all of the requirements.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Adı	rian, Stephens			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		37 00	0	TR	D	U

Comment

Myballot #42, Maintained. While I sympathise with Tgma and the lack of volunteer effort, I am not in a position to provide the information that would resolve the comment. However that does not invalidate the reasons for my vote.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The comment does not point out a normative problem with the Annex C, only that the commenter is dissatisfied with the language or the manner in which the requirements are described.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	lrade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause Subclause Ty		Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	9	95 07	7.2.3	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with comment on how STA's that receive vendor-sepcific IE should behave. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement and changes in all frame formats where Vendor Specific IEs have been added.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of information element IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		An	drade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
-		96 07	7.2.3.1	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		An	drade, Merwyn	1		
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		97 07	7.2.3.3	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	drade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		98 07	7.2.3.4	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		An	drade, Merwyn	1		
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		99 07	7.2.3.5	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	rade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	10	0 07	7.2.3.6	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	lrade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	10	1 07	7.2.3.7	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	rade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	10	2 07	7.2.3.8	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	rade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	10	3 07	7.2.3.9	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	lrade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	1(04 07	7.2.3.10	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	lrade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	10)5 07	7.2.3.11	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	rade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	106	5 07	7.2.3.12	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		And	lrade, Merwyn			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	1(07 07	7.3.2	TR	D	U

Comment

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in IE format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of information element IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ber	ry, Don			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		51 07	7.3.2	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of information element IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

menter:	LEMBERGER, URIEL										
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
	3	8 18	18.4.6.2	TR	D	U					
	Comment										
1	Table 126 is incorrect.										
	SuggestedRemedy										
	Correct the table content, for example, FCC allows Ch 12,13 with mask restrictions, France is part of ETSI.										
	Response										
	PROF regula	PROPOSED REJECT. This table reflects the allowed channels for the specified regulatory domain values as defined by the standard, not as allowed by the regulations.									
	U										

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

nenter:		Moreton, Mike									
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
		62 07	7.3	TR	D	U					
	Comment										
	Wh	at was wro	ng with fixed fi	elds??? There's a	number of oc	curences of "fixed field" that need to be changed if you go ahead with this change.					
	Su	ggestedR	emedy								
	Back out the change - it's not worth the work to do the job properly.										
	Response PROPOSED REJECT. Editor to replace "fixed field" with "field" wherever used in the draft.										
enter:		Mo	oreton, Mike	Turne	Status	PeopeneoStatua					
nenter:	ID	Mo Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
enter:	ID	Mc Clause 63 08	e Subclause	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U					
enter:	ID Co	Mo Clause 63 08 mment	e Subclause 8.4.10	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U					
enter:	ID Co A n	Mo Clause 63 08 mment on-AP STA	e Subclause 8.4.10	Type TR an existing SA bef	Status D	ResponseStatus U g the association, not after - otherwise you could get some very strange race conditions.					
enter:	ID Co A n Su	Mc Clause 63 08 mment on-AP STA ggestedR	e Subclause 8.4.10 A should delete emedy	Type TR an existing SA bef	Status D	ResponseStatus U g the association, not after - otherwise you could get some very strange race conditions.					
enter:	ID Co A n Su Mo	Mo Clause 63 08 mment on-AP STA ggestedR ve the delet	e Subclause 8.4.10 A should delete emedy tion before mak	Type TR an existing SA bef	Status D Fore executing	ResponseStatus U g the association, not after - otherwise you could get some very strange race conditions. g the confirmation. Similarly in the AP the deletion should occur before invoking the response					
enter:	ID Co A n Su Mo Re	Ma Clause 63 08 mment on-AP STA ggestedR ve the delet sponse	e Subclause 8.4.10 A should delete emedy tion before mak	Type TR an existing SA bef ing the request, no	Status D Fore executing t after getting	ResponseStatus U g the association, not after - otherwise you could get some very strange race conditions. g the confirmation. Similarly in the AP the deletion should occur before invoking the response					

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Мо	reton, Mike			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		66.03	3 14	TR	D	II

Comment

STAs don't use the JOIN primitives to establish a BSS - that's an internal interface. They establish a BSS by executing the synchronisation procedures, which describe the over the air procedure. The cause is the JOIN primitive, but the method is the synchronisation procedure. Of course in an AP you don't even use JOIN at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Back out this change.

Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is a problem with the definition. But it is not the one pointed out by the commenter. The use of JOIN is not the problem and is not an internal interface to 802.11. The service primitives are external interfaces.

The commenter does point out that the AP is different, not using the JOIN primitive. To address the problem with this definition:

add ", and one station that has used the START primitive" after "JOIN service primitives".

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Moi	reton, Mike			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		67 03	3.45	TR	D	U

Comment

The removal of "integrated LANs" from the definition of ESS is a really bad idea. It breaks the architectural clarity of the DS, because suddenly you start distinguishing between remote STAs that are connected using 802.11, and remote STAs connected using another technology, a distinction that should be invisible to the STAs connected to the local BSS. If you ever need to make that distinction, you've done something very, very wrong...

SuggestedRemedy

Reinstate integrated LANs to the ESS definition.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. There is no implication that the integrated LAN or any devices connected to it are not reachable from the ESS. The change to the definition is to remove the integrated LAN and any devices connected to it from being part of the ESS. Only those STAs in the set of BSSs are actually part of the ESS.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mo	oreton, Mike			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		71 05	5.2.3.1	TR	D	U

Comment

As I've said previously, the new change to exclude integrated LANs from the ESS is shooting yourself in the foot architecturally - it's a pointless distinction that just makes life difficult for you - you have to start adding extra text like this for no other reason than because your architectural model is now muddled.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "An ESS is the union of the BSSs connected by a DS."

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. The added text does not muddle the architecture description. It simply brings the text in line with what the diagrams have described from the first printing of the standard.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mo	eton, Mike			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		75 05	5.9	TR	D	U

Comment

Don't like the changed diagram at allà First of all, it now looks as if the 802.1X entity is the only thing above the MAC SAP, which is clearly wrong. Secondly, the TGi text was written to assume that the 802.1X PAE was part of the SME - if you move it you need to recheck all the TGi text... And thirdly, the separation from RSNA key management makes no sense.

SuggestedRemedy

While the old diagram wasn't perfect, it was better than the new one - so back out the change.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. Everything from the MAC SAP goes through 802.1X, either its controlled port or uncontrolled port. There is no other data SAP from the 802.11 MAC. It is believed that the diagram causes no problems with the text integrated with 802.11i. The interface between the PAE and 802.11 is through the SME, as it always was.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

ommontor:		Mo	roton Miko								
ommenter.		MO	leton, white								
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
		77 05	5.10.2.3	TR	D	U					
	Comment										
	It's	more consis	tent with other	sections to talk ab	out deleting the	he PTKSA rather than removing the PTK.					
	SuggestedRemedy										
	See comment. Similar for GTK/GTKSA										
]	Response										
	PROPOSED REJECT. See resolution to comment #78.										
ommenter:		Mor	reton, Mike								
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus					
		78 05	5.10.2.3	TR	D	U					
	Со	mment									
	Hov	w can you b	lock something	g that no longer exi	sts? Why bot	ther giving rules for how to encrypt MSDUs that you're not allowed to send?					
	SuggestedRemedy										
	Suggesteakerneay Replace clause with "Disassociation initiated by either STA in an RSNA causes the deletion of the PTKSA at both ends. The GTKSA will also be deleted in a non-AP STA. The controlled and uncontrolled ports created for this association will be deleted."										

Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace clause with "Disassociation initiated by either STA in an RSNA causes the deletion of the PTKSA at both ends and the deletion of the GTKSA in a non-AP STA. The controlled and uncontrolled ports created for this association will also be deleted."

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	ia		
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		81 07	7.2.3	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement and changes in all frame formats where Vendor Specific IEs have been added.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of information element IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.
doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Narasimhan, Partha				
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		82 07	7.2.3.1	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	a		
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		83 07	7.2.3.3	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	a		
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		84 07	7.2.3.4	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	a		
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		85 07	7.2.3.5	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Nai	rasimhan, Parth	ia		
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		86 07	7.2.3.6	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Narasimhan, Partha				
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		87 07	7.2.3.7	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	ia		
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		88 07	7.2.3.8	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Nar	asimhan, Parth	a		
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		89 07	7.2.3.9	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	ia		
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		90 07	7.2.3.10	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Nai	rasimhan, Parth	a		
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		91 07	7.2.3.11	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Na	rasimhan, Parth	ia		
	ID	Claus	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		92 07	7.2.3.12	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Nar	asimhan, Parth	a		
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		93 07	7.3.2	TR	D	U

Comment

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potential vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of information element IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

Editor to correct values in the row for "Reserved" to be split "51-220, 222-255".

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

		Palr	n, Stephen			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	29	19	19.1.1	TR	D	U
	Comm	nent				
	If an in relevan	nplement it.	tor wished to in	mplement an 802.	.11g or 802.11	a only product, this document provides no guidance as to which clauses and phrases are
	Sugge	estedRe	emedy			
	Clearly	indicate	which clauses	s and phrases are	applicable to the	he individual amendments of 802.11a through 802.11j
	PROPC designa	OSED RI ations cea	EJECT. 802.11 ase to exist and	g and 802.11j are l are replaced by	e designations of a new base sta	of particular amendments to the base 802.11 standard. Upon approval of this revision, those ndard.
menter:		Palr	n, Stephen			
imenter:	ID	Palr Clause	n, Stephen Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
imenter:	ID 30	Palr Clause	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U
imenter:	ID 30 Comm	Palr Clause 19 nent	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6	Type TR	Status D	ResponseStatus U
imenter:	ID 30 Comm The ter	Palr Clause 19 nent m 802.1	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6 1g was deleted	Type TR , when it was my	Status D hope that the	ResponseStatus U term be defined
nmenter:	ID 30 Comm The ter Sugge	Palr Clause 19 ment m 802.1 estedRe	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6 1g was deleted emedy	Type TR , when it was my	Status D hope that the	ResponseStatus U term be defined
imenter:	ID 30 Comm The ter Sugge Provide	Palr Clause 19 nent m 802.1 estedRe e a defini	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6 Ig was deleted medy ition for 802.11	Type TR , when it was my lg and for all of th	Status D hope that the the other 802.1	ResponseStatus U term be defined 1a through 802.11j amendments.
imenter:	ID 30 Comm The ter Sugge Provide Respo	Palr Clause 19 ment m 802.1 estedRe e a defini	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6 Ig was deleted medy ition for 802.1	Type TR , when it was my Ig and for all of th	Status D hope that the t he other 802.1	ResponseStatus U term be defined 1a through 802.11j amendments.
imenter:	ID 30 Comm The ter Sugge Provide Responder	Palr Clause 19 ment m 802.1 estedRe e a defini onse DSED RI	n, Stephen Subclause 19.7.2.6 1g was deleted medy ition for 802.11 EJECT. 802.11	Type TR , when it was my 1g and for all of th g is the name of a	Status D hope that the the other 802.1	ResponseStatus U term be defined 1a through 802.11j amendments. to the 802.11 standard. Upon acceptance of this revision, the term will cease to exist.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mo	reton, Mike			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		3 07	7.2.3	TR	D	U

Comment

"Gaps may exist in the ordering of fields [à] within frames. The order that remains shall be ascending." This appears to be saying that a transmitter may actually omit fixed fields (adding the "fixed" makes it clear that I'm not talking about IEs. Good idea, huh?) as long as the remaining ones are in order, which is clearly wrong. The alternative interpretation is that the "shall" is a requriement on future ammendments to the specification, and so shouldn't be a "shall".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall" to "will"

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment does not address material that is the subject of this recirculation ballot. It will be forwarded to the working group for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Мо	reton, Mike				
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus	
		4 10	10.3.20.1.1	TR	D	U	

Comment

The use of the MLME interface to send a Michael MIC Failure Report is a horrible hack (to be honest I only suggested in the hope that it would cause everyone else to accept that the MIC Failure architecture was brokenà) and I'm strongly against it being extended to all EAPOL frames, which should continue to use the MA-Unitdata primitives.

SuggestedRemedy

Back out the change.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. Accepting the suggested remedy and the change implied in the comment (sending all EAPOL frames, including non-MIC-failure EAPOL key frames through the MA-Unitdata primitives) would lead to potential ambiguity about which primitive to use. The current text does not have this potential. The current text also corresponds to the text in the MLME-EAPOL.confirm primitive.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Mor	eton, Mike									
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus						
		5 00	0	TR	D	U						
	Cor	nment										
	I'm maintaining my no vote mainly on the basis of previous comments - (a) the removal of integrated LANs from the definition of ESS, (b) the presence of annex L which should be in 802.1H not 802.11, and (c) the presence of Annex M which uses different terminology to the rest of the standard.											
	SuggestedRemedy											
	See	previous co	omments									
	Res	ponse										
	PRC	PROPOSED REJECT. These comments were dealt with in previous ballots, where individual reponses were provided.										
Commenter:		Paln	n, Stephen									
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus						
		1 19	19.7.2.6	TR	D	U						
	Cor	nment										
	The term 802.11g was deleted, when it was my hope that the term be defined											
	Suc	nastadRa	medv									
	Prov	vide a defini	ition for 802.11	g and for all of the	other 802.11	a through 802.11j amendments.						
	Res	sponse										
	PRC ame	POSED RE	EJECT. This co ould require ne	omment was dealt was arly all the text of e	with in a prev each of the se	ious ballot, where the reponse was provided. A definition of the 802.11a through 802.11j parate amendments.						

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Palm, Stephen			
	ID	Clause Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		2 19 19.1.1	TR	D	U

Comment

If an implementor wished to implement an 802.11g or 802.11a only product, this document provides no guidance as to which clauses and phrases are relevant. The PROPOSED RESOLUTION indicated "Upon approval of this revision, those designations cease to exist and are replaced by a new base standard." While that may be a nictey for IEEE procedures, it does a disservice to the industry (manufacturers, consumers, press) who actively use the designations.

SuggestedRemedy

Clearly indicate which clauses and phrases are applicable to the individual amendments of 802.11a through 802.11j. At the very least, there should be an informative section to explain 802.11a through 802.11jà

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the reponse was provided. Even the informative section suggested "at the very least" would require nearly all the text of each of the separate amendments.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Ptas	inski, Henry			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
	1	1 08	8.4.10	TR	D	U

Comment

The frame discard behavior specified in 8.4.10 interacting with the last sentence of clause 5.6 creates a condition where a STA and AP that are out of synch cannot resynch. If a STA that has keys and thinks it's in State 3 sends frames to an AP that believes the STA is in State 1 (or has no info about the STA, e.g. if the AP restarted), the AP will silently discard the frames and the link will never recover. In the case where security is not used, the STA will get a deauth and the STA will return to State 1, so that the AP and STA will be back in agreement. The PROPOSED RESPONSE from LB 75 claims that the SME could use MLME-PROTECTEDFRAMEDROPPED.indication to send a deauthentication and resynchronize, but clause 10.3.23.1.4 (and every other mention of this indication in the spec) only discusses the behavior in IBSS.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the behavior consistent when security is enabled and disabled by e.g removing the last sentence of clause 5.6, or clarify the SME behavior on receipt of MLME-PROTECTEDFRAMEDROPPED.indication in a BSS.

Response

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment does not address material that is the subject of this recirculation ballot. It will be forwarded to the working group for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		San	walka, Anil			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		7 09	9.2.5.7	TR	D	U

Comment

Comment rejected from ballot 74: Specifying a required (shall) value for CTSTimeout is problematic now. There are a number of implementation in existence that probably wait a shorter period than aPHY-RX-START-Delay (no medium busy in 2 slots or no SFD in 150us) before declaring a timeout. This would make them non-compliant. The reason for rejecting this comment is not valid since the text requires the MAC to start the backoff procedure (shall) when the ctsTimeout expires.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		San	walka, Anil			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		8 09	9.2.8	TR	D	U

Comment

Comment rejected from ballot 74: Specifying a required (shall) value for ACKTimeout is problematic now. There are a number of implementation in existence that probably wait a shorter period than aPHY-RX-START-Delay (no medium busy in 2 slots or no SFD in 150us) before declaring a timeout. This would make them non-compliant. The reason for rejecting this comment is not valid since the text requires the MAC to start the backoff procedure (shall) when the ctsTimeout expires.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		Sanv	walka, Anil			
	ID	Clause	Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		9 09	9.3.2.1	TR	D	U

Comment

Comment rejected from ballot 74: This change again potentially make legacy compliant radios non-compliant. In this case I don't know that there are implementations that do not do this. Either the change is being made to force the PC to transmit after SIFS or it is not necessary (used to say "at least one SIFS period"). You can't have it both ways.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the shall to a should or revert back to the original text.

Response

doc: IEEE 802.11-05/0926r0

Commenter:		San	walka, Anil			
	ID	Clause	e Subclause	Туре	Status	ResponseStatus
		10 09	9.4	TR	D	U

Comment

Comment rejected from ballot 74: In the second paragraph the change from fragment to MPDU is incorrect and confusing. Fragments are pieces of MSDUs or MMPDUs while MPDUs are any MAC protocol data unit, including control frames, see 7.1.1. The sentences just don't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Reject the changes from fragment to MPDU.

Response