

The following motions were approved by the FH subgroup with a 50 % approval rate and need approval from IEEE P802.11

Letter Ballot Motion

Motion 1:

The Mac should ensure that the CCA is clear before transmitting, except in the case of SIFS transmissions.

Background

During the March meeting the Frequency Hop group resolved many issues by a plurality of 75% or more. These issues are presented elsewhere in this letter ballot as part of major section of revised Section 10 text. Some issues were resolved by a plurality of less than 75%. As reported in the closing Plenary of the March IEEE802.11 meeting, these resolutions will be presented in the letter ballot as individual motions, so that a few controversial issues are not likely to upset the possibility of acceptance of the main body of work accomplished in the March meeting. One of those issues is the subject of this letter ballot motion.

Discussion;

Reference Paragraph number: 10.3.3.2.1

Commenter: Peter Chadwick

Peter reports that his written comment relative to this paragraph on the letter ballot of D1 was lost in the sorting and distribution process. The essence of Peter's comment is the following motion:

Move: The Mac should ensure that the CCA is clear before transmitting, except in the case of SIFS transmissions.

The vote in the Frequency Hop group for this motion was:

For:..... 3

Against:.....2

Abstaining:...6

No Corrective Text is provided

(Freq Hop Chair's note: The intent of this motion was to provide a means of formally requesting the Mac group to include this function. As such, this motion does not contain corrective text for paragraph 10.3.3.2.1. It is the chair's observation that the relatively large number of abstains reflected the option by some that this message is not necessary.)

Letter Ballot Motion

Motion2:

Accept the following corrected text for paragraph 12.6.12 in draft D1

12.6.12 ~~Transmit to Receive Switch Time~~

~~The time for a conformant PMD to switch the radio from the transmit state to the receive state must be done in such a period of time as to enable the reception of all control packets.~~

Background

During the March meeting the Frequency Hop group resolved many issues by a plurality of 75% or more. These issues are presented elsewhere in this letter ballot as part of major section of revised Section 10 text. Some issues were resolved by a plurality of less than 75%. As reported in the closing Plenary of the March IEEE802.11 meeting, these resolutions will be presented in the letter ballot as individual motions, so that a few controversial issues are not likely to upset the possibility of acceptance of the main body of work accomplished in the March meeting. One of those issues follows.

Discussion

Reference Paragraph number: 10.6.12

Commenters:

Michael Fisher

Jim Renfro

Bob O'Hara

After discussion of the three written comments, the following motion was passed in the Frequency Hop Group.

Move: Delete paragraph 10.6.12.

The vote in the Frequency Hop group was:

For:..... 8

Against:.....6

Abstaining:...1

(Freq Hop Chair's note: Two of the written comments suggested that a fixed time should be specified for Tx to Rx switching. The other written comment suggested that the functional definition would be satisfactory if the wording were revised. Verbal discussion pointed out that Tx to Rx switching could be much slower than Rx to Tx switching and that to make the two specifications the same would be an over specification of the Tx to Rx parameter.)

Letter Ballot Motion

MOTION 3:

Accept the following corrected text for the last sentence of paragraph 10.6.16

In addition, all conformant PMD implementations shall ~~be capable of transmitting a minimum of 1.0 mW.~~ support at least one power level with a minimum EIRP of 10 mW

Background

During the March meeting the Frequency Hop group resolved many issues by a plurality of 75% or more. These issues are presented elsewhere in this letter ballot as part of major section of revised Section 10 text. Some issues were resolved by a plurality of less than 75%. As reported in the closing Plenary of the March IEEE802.11 meeting, these resolutions will be presented in the letter ballot as individual motions, so that a few controversial issues are not likely to upset the possibility of acceptance of the main body of work accomplished in the March meeting. One of those issues follows.

Reference Paragraph number: 10.6.16

Commenter:
Jon Sonnenberg

The vote in the Frequency Hop group for the motion stated above was:

For:..... 4

Against:.....3

Abstaining:....3

(Freq Hop Chair's note: Jon's comment and the discussion of the group was on whether 1 mWatt of RF power was sufficient to assure the level of interoperability the standard would require to be acceptable in the market place. In addition, it was felt by some that EIRP was more appropriate than an RF power level with no requirement on the efficiency of the antenna. Others felt that the standard should not restrict manufactures from selling low power devices.)

Letter Ballot Motion

MOTION 4:

Accept the following corrected text for paragraph 10.6.5

10.6.5 Occupied Channel Bandwidth

The occupied channel bandwidth for the PMD is 1.0 MHz wide. This 1.0 MHz must contain 99% of the emitted energy. The FCC may impose a further restriction on transmitted bandwidth requiring the 20 dB bandwidth, as measured with a spectrum analyzer and referenced to the magnitude at the center of the transmitted bandwidth, to be less than 1 MHz.

The transmitter center frequency shall be within +/- 60KHz of one of the specified operating center frequencies listed in Section 10.6.4. The following diagram illustrates the relationship of the operating transmitter center frequency to the occupied channel bandwidth. shall meet all applicable requirements issued by the regulatory organizations for the geography of operation.

Background

During the March meeting the Frequency Hop group resolved many issues by a plurality of 75% or more. These issues are presented elsewhere in this letter ballot as part of major section of revised Section 10 text. Some issues were resolved by a plurality of less than 75%. As reported in the closing Plenary of the March IEEE802.11 meeting, these resolutions will be presented in the letter ballot as individual motions, so that a few controversial issues are not likely to upset the possibility of acceptance of the main body of work accomplished in the March meeting. One of those issues follows.

Discussion:

Reference Paragraph number: 10.6.16

Commenters:

Renfro, Mahany, Geiger, Furuya, O'Hara

The vote in the Frequency Hop group for the motion stated above was:

For:..... 8

Against:.....3

Abstaining:...1

(Freq Hop Chair's note: There was widespread objection to the original wording. While there is general acceptance in the Freq Hop Group of the motion passed, some opt for specification of measured bandwidth or deviation.)