

**IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs**

Comment on LMSC (Sponsor) Ballot on IEEE P802.11c

Date: May 6, 1998

Author: Victoria M. Poncini
The Boeing Company
P.O. Box 3707 M/S 7M-CA Seattle, WA 98124-2207
Phone: +1 (425) 865-5342
Fax: +1 (425) 957-5048
e-Mail: victoria.m.poncini@boeing.com

Abstract

Comments from
 pjr = John Pickens
 zjc = Johnny Zweig,
 smr = Mick Seaman, phone (408) 764-5941 FAX (408) 764-5003 E-mail mick_seaman@3com.com
 mgr = Gene Milligan, phone 405/324-3070 FAX 405/324-3794 E-mail gene_milligan@notes.seagate.com

1	N/A	Mgr	e		Although the ballot instructions are too complex and time consuming, they do not explain how to choose between the two choices for voter's ID. I chose mgr rather than mgc since it seems better to be a manager than being common. But I wonder if mgc will be counted as not returning the ballot.	List voters just once or explain the difference between the two choices.	This comment should more properly be directed to the IEEE Standards department, as it has absolutely nothing to do with the text being balloted.
2	N/A	Mgr	E		I will substitute EE for major editorial as Word automatically in this form changes e to E when the tab is hit. Also mgr changes to Mgr when tab is hit.	Change either the attributes of the table form or the codes used to account for the dummies like me or the dominance of Washington – depending upon whose to blame.	The commenter should better understand the tools that he uses. Please select "Tools Autocorrect" and delete the entry that changes "e" to "ee"
3	N/A	Mgr	E		The copyright diatribe does not fit in the box.	Edit it.	This will be taken care of by the IEEE editor.

4	N/A	Mgr	E		I think the title of the supplement is incorrect.	Change it from IS ISO/IEC 10038 to ISO/IEC 10038 or to International Standard ISO/IEC 10038. (Yes I know IS is the abbreviation for International Standard but IS is not used preceding ISO/IEC XXXX.	Not accepted. The title was changed due to a subsequent comment.
5	N/A	Mgr	EE	Y	The title for the ballot and the title for the document have a significant difference. The ballot is clearly titled as a IEEE standard. The title for the document appears to be an ISO/IEC standard.	<p>If this is an IEEE standard change the title so that it is clear that it is not an ISO/IEC standard even though it is just fine and preferable to reference IEC, ISO, and/or ISO/IEC standards.</p> <p>If this is and ISO/IEC standard recast the ballot to be clear that the ballot is on a recommended US ballot on IS/IEC 10038.</p>	Rejected, title needs to be equal to the title specified in the PAR. Incidentally, the document will be folded into the ISO version anyway.
6	14.4.2.1 .3	Mgr	EE		The callout of 9314 is incorrect. Is a part number needed?	Change ISO 9314 to ISO/IEC 9314. If a part number is needed, add it.	Accepted. The partnumber 2 has been added and the IEC has been added. Both changes were possible by a coordination effort with the editor of the target document.
1	6.5.7	smr	e		<p>The draft uses the phrase ‘may only’ which is imprecise and is not included within the list of verbal forms referred to by ISO Directives (I refer to Directives part 3, Second edition, 1989, Annex C (normative) pages 56 to 61, there will be a similar clause in more recent copies of the Directives). I believe this standard should conform to the directives to ease progression in ISO and understanding by non-English language speakers. According to the directives ‘may’ (which is allowed) means ‘is permitted’, ‘is allowed’, ‘is permissible’ and hence refers to an option – ‘a course of action which is permissible within the limits of the standard’. Representing ‘may only’ as the only permissible course of action is a stretch. What appears to be being said is that a bridge, if one is present ‘shall’ connect to an 802.11 Portal, and ‘shall not’ connect to some other places or interfaces which are not made explicit.</p>	<p>Replace ‘may only’ with ‘shall’.</p> <p>Consider adding a sentence to specify where a bridge ‘shall not’ connect.</p>	Accepted.

2	6.5.7	smr	e		The draft says “An instance of an 802.11 Distribution System may be implemented from 802 LAN Components.It is not clear to me whether ‘may’ is being used correctly here. If it is, this sentence means that it is an option within the standard to so implement an 802.11 Distribution System and that other options are specified. Further it means that we have here an item which should be representable in a PICS. (No such item appears).If ‘may’ is not being used correctly, this sentence means that it is a fact that it is possible for the user of the standard to construct an 802.11 Distribution System from 802 LAN Components, but that this standard (802.1D with this supplement) has no more to say on the subject other than to flag this possibility to the reader	If ‘may’ is being used incorrectly, replace it with ‘can’.	Accepted.
3	6.5.7	smr	e		The draft says “Bridging to an 802.11 Independent BSS is not permitted.” The verbal form ‘is not permitted’ is recognized as an equivalent expression to ‘shall not’ by the ISO Directives. However the Directives say (in Clause 4.1.2 of my copy) “Clear rules for the use of verbal forms ... are therefore essential. ...The equivalent expressions ... shall be used only in exceptional cases when [the preferred form] cannot be used for linguistic reasons.I believe it is good practice to heed this advice.Further I am not sure in a strict sense what is meant by the phrase “Bridging to an 802.11 Independent BSS”. I presume what is being said here is “A Bridge shall not connect to an independent BSS.”	Rewrite using ‘shall not’ and a specific description of connection or non-connection of two interfaces. I suggest “A Bridge shall not connect to an independent BSS.” if that is what is meant.	Accepted.
4	6.5.7	smr	e		The ISO directives outlaw the use of ‘must’. While that word has a defined meaning in the ‘IETF’, 802 has always followed ISO rules in the past I believe.	Replace ‘must’ with ‘shall’ in the various places it occurs.	Accepted.
5	6.5.7	smr	e		The draft say “The user_priority parameter .. always takes ..”. Doesn’t this just mean “shall take” with no exception. This appears to be a constraint on the user of the standard and should therefore take a verbal form which clearly identifies it as a conformance requirement.	Replace ‘always takes’ with ‘shall take’.	Accepted.

1	6.5.7	Zjc	T		The third and fourth paragraph refer to "the MAC frame", but in 802.11 each MSDU corresponds to a number of MAC frames that depend on fragmentation threshold, RTS threshold, and retries. Further, the seventh through twelfth paragraphs all use "the MAC frame" in cases where the MSDU in question may be spread across multiple MPDUs. I think the third and fourth paragraphs need to have the MSDU/frame thing clarified, and the other paragraphs need to say "each MAC frame" instead of "the MAC frame"	In the third paragraph replace "and transmits a MAC frame," with "and passes a MAC Service Data Unit to the MAC data service for transmission,". In the fourth paragraph replace "receipt of a valid MAC frame" with "receipt of a valid MAC Service Data Unit from the MAC data service". In paragraphs 7,8,9,10,11,12 replace "the MAC frame" with "each MAC frame" (and fix typo in paragraph 7 by striking "of" from "in of the").	Accepted.
2	6.5.7	Zjc	E		The section would fit into 802.1D better if it began with the paragraph "The wireless LAN access method..." the way all the other sections of 6.5 begin.	Swap first and second paragraphs.	Accepted.
1	N/A		E		In the Title, on pages 1 and 2 ---change "IS ISO/IEC 10038" to "ISO/IEC 10038" to remove a source of possible ambiguity.		Declined. Removed reference to IS ISO/IEC 10038 due to earlier comment resolution action.
2	6.5.7		E		In the newly added subclause ---change "M_UNITDATA" to "MA_UNITDATA" three times, as needed, to attain consistency with ISO/IEC 10039 --- MAC Service Definition		Declined. The Bridge interface (M_Unitdata) adds three parameters to the MAC service interface (MA_Unitdata) and is properly used in context here.
3	6.5.7		e		In the newly added subclause 6.5.7, 10 th paragraph, 1 st sentence ---- change "MAC Frame" to "MAC frame" to correct a typographical error.		Accepted. Change incorporated with earlier comment resolution action.
1	6	pjr	T	NO	802.1Q adds a 4 byte tag for frames tagged with VLAN ID and/or Priority. The maximum frame size is thus reduced (or expanded) by 4 bytes.	Change maximum frame size from 2304 to 2308 with comment as to rationale for supporting optional 802.1Q tag field.	Declined, with the consent of the balloter. This is not properly a comment on the revision of 802.11.

