

**IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs**

Comment received on Letter Ballot 18 for 802.11b

Date: March 30, 1999

Author: Vic Hayes,
Lucent Technologies
Zadelstede 1-10
3431 JZ Nieuwegein, the Netherlands
Phone: +31 30 609 7528
Fax: +31 30 609 7556
e-Mail: vichayes@lucent.com

We received comments from:
Allen haberling ah
Bob O'hara bo
Vic Hayes vh
Hitoshi takanashi ht

Vic's comments are provided in a separate document 99/95

Seq. #	Clause number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
--------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------

1	18.2.3.6	Ah	T	No	Inconsistent specification of bit streams between this section and section 18.2.3.3. In section 18.2.3.3 bit patterns are indicated as msb to lsb. However, in section 18.2.3.6 bit pattern is specified as being transmitted left most to right most. I can represent this bit stream in either of two hexadecimal values: EADA Hex or 5B57 Hex. Same bit patterns but different representations. I can appreciate Bob O'Hara's intent but I think it has introduced unnecessary confusion.	I strongly recommend that the msb to lsb nomenclature be retained or a hexadecimal representation be added to section 18.2.3.6.	This is editorial, not technical since this section is the same as the corresponding subclause in clause 15. The commenter is right that this is not clear and the editor will take care of it for clause 18. Change to bit numbering where appropriate and specify which numbered bit is transmitted first in 18.2.3.6. Remove definitions MSB and LSB from figure 4. Voter agreed with the change
2	18.4.5.1 3.2	Ah	E	No	The description column of the table in this section is incomplete the last sentence of the description column is truncated at line 25.	Please include rest of the line.	accepted
1	P.7 l.41	ht	e		PLME-.request primitive	PLME-TXTIME.request primitive	fixed
1.	Resolutions tp No-Votes	vh	e	n	The reasons why 802.11 could not accept some of the NO-Comments are very lengthy. Some voters provided adjusted comments after the resolution meeting. The Sponsor balloter is not aware of the relation between the various letter ballots and the actual process.	Re-edit the reasons why 802.11 could not accept the no-comments by adding notes, updating the comments and deleting parts of the resolution to the last part of the document. See the proposal in document 99/095	Accepted with the exception that the last two paragraphs are to be retained (just one to be deleted) and the instruction to the writer to add the voting history as done with the other two votes
2.	Annex F	bo	e	n	Upon rereading the minutes from the January meeting and documents 99/35 and 99/37, the changes I requested by motion in the March meeting were incorrect. This resulted in a change of text that should be normative to become informative.	No resolution is requested at this time. I will submit an appropriate comment in the first round of the sponsor ballot.	accepted

