

---

**IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs**

---

**Tentative Minutes of Task Group B**

**Date:** November 8-13, 1998

**Author:** Stanley Reible  
MICRILOR, Inc.  
607 North Ave., Wakefield, MA 01880  
Phone: 781-246-0103  
Fax: 781-246-0157  
e-Mail: Reible@compuserve.com

---

IEEE 802.11 - Task Group B Minutes  
November 9-14, Albuquerque, NM

**Tuesday, November 10, 1998**

Chair: John Fakatselis

Secretary: Stan Reible

**Call To Order at 8:30 am.**

Chair's Comments:

The goal is to address all comments from Letter Ballot 15 and to go to recirculation or to a new letter ballot.

Poll of voters present in opening session: 17

**Approval of Agenda:**

**Proposed Agenda.**

**Call to order.**

**Secretary appointment**

**Approval of agenda.**

**Approval of September 1998 minutes.**

**Procedural**

**Parliamentarian(s) appointment**

**Selective procedural rules overview.**

**TGb background / Schedule.**

**Call for papers:**

Short preamble for TGb (Carl A.) /(30 min).  
Notes on FH comments (Dean K.) /(20 min).  
270 r1 WLAN IP statement (Hatim Zaghoul)/(5 min).  
366 Short preamble for TGb (Matthew Shoemake) /(20 min).  
367 Replacement description of CCK (Matt S.) /(10 min).  
PBCC / FCC comments (Matt S.)/(10 min).

**Comment Resolution Process.**

**Presentation of General papers.**

**Comment Resolution (Tues., Wed., and Thurs.).**

**Draft changes; recommendations to plenary.**

**Adjournment.**

**No objections were voiced to Agenda.**

**Agenda was approved.**

Approval of minutes was postponed to Wednesday.

Appointment of parliamentarians: Stuart Kerry, Vic Hayes.

## **PROCEDURAL NOTES:**

### **OPERATING RULES OF IEEE 802 LAN MAN STANDARDS COMMITTEE (LMSC).**

#### **5.1.3.4 Rights**

**The rights of the Working Group members include the following:**

- a) **To receive a notice of the next meeting.**
- b) **To receive a copy of the minutes.**
- c) **To vote at the meeting if and only present.**
- d) **To vote by mail on drafts to be submitted to the sponsor ballot group.**
- e) **To examine all Working draft documents.**
- f) **To lodge complaints about working group operations with the Executive Committee.**
- g) **To petition the Executive committee in writing. (A petition signed by two-thirds of the combined voting members of all Working Group forces the Executive Committee to implement the resolution).**

#### **5.1.4.4 Working Group Chair's Authority.**

To carry out the responsibilities cited in 0 5.1.4.3 Working Group Chair's Responsibilities, the Working Group Chair has the authority to:

- a) Call meetings and issue meeting minutes.
- b) Decide which issues are technical and which are procedural.
- c) Establish Working Group rules beyond the Working Group rules set down by the Executive Committee. These rules must be written and all Working Group members must be aware of them.
- d) Assign/unassign subtasks and task leaders or executors, e.g. secretary, subgroup chair, etc.
- e) Determine if the Working Group is dominated by an organization, and, if so, treat that organisations' vote as one (with the approval of the Executive Committee).
- f) Make final determination if and how negative letter ballots are to be resolved when a draft standard, recommended practice, or guideline, is to be sent to the Executive Committee for approval for Sponsor Ballot Group voting.
- g) Collect fees to meet Working Group expenses.

Chair reviewed the following sections of Robert's Rules

Point of Order

Improper Motions

Parliamentary Inquiry

Point of Information

### **ACCEPTING RESOLUTIONS (TECHNICAL CHANGES)**

In accordance to Robert's Rules a motion to rescind is required to change a motion previously adopted.

To accelerate the process of modifying the Draft we will follow the process below:

THE CHAIR WILL ASK THE GROUP IF THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION IS ACCEPTED. IF THERE IS NO OBJECTION THE CHANGE WILL BE CONSIDERED RATIFIED.

IF THERE IS AT LEAST ONE OBJECTION THEN A COMBINED MOTION TO RESCIND AND TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION WILL BE ACCEPTABLE. (75% APPROVAL REQUIREMENT)

A MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION (RESCIND AND THEN ACCEPT RESOLUTION) WILL BE IN ORDER IF A MEMBER FEELS IT IS NECESSARY.

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE ACCEPTED RESOLUTIONS AS A GROUP AT THE END OF THE SESSION WILL BE IN ORDER TO RATIFY THE RESOLUTIONS AS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLENARY.

Chair presented and reviewed the following tentative schedule for Standard's Approval Process.

**Schedule**

**Jan. 98**

**March 98**

Beginning of proposal down selection process.

**May 98**

Evaluation of proposals.

**July 98**

Approval of baseline proposal.

**Sept. 98**

Draft (preliminary).

**Nov. 98**

Draft complete, Submit working group ballot (1).

**Jan. 99**

Submit working group ballot (2), if required.

**March 99**

WG ballot resolution meeting, submit to working group confirmation ballot.

**May 99**

Motion to submit Sponsor Ballot.

**July 99**

Sponsor Ballot resolution meeting, Submit sponsor confirmation Ballot.

**Sept. 99**

Sponsor confirmation ballot resolution meeting, submit to Standards Board.

**Nov. 99**

Submittal for Standards board approval.

**Dec. 99**

Standards Board approval OR Sponsor confirmation Ballot backup and submit to ExCom e-mail ballot for submittal to standards board.

**Jan. 2000**

TBD open issues meeting.

**Mar. 2000**

Approval

**Call for papers.**

Short Preamble 802.11 2.4 GHz LANs (Carl Andren) 30 min.

Notes of FH comments (Dean Kawaguchi) 15 min.

270 - r1 WLAN IP statement (They no longer feel that they have any IP related to standard) 5 min.

366 - Short preamble for TGb (Matthew Shoemake) 20 min.

367 - Replacement description of CCK (Matthew Shoemake) 10 min.

PBCC/FCC comments (Matthew Shoemake); 10 min./later in the week.

**COMMENT RESOLUTION TEAMS**

About 300 comments were received; Chair proposed to break up the reviewing of the comments into groups as listed below:

Group A: Short preamble/Interoperability/PBCC Comments.

Tom Tsoulogiannis (Chair), Matt Shoemake., Kent Rollins., Carl Andren.  
Stan Ling, Tim Godfrey, Don .

Group B: FH option Comments.

Dean Kawaguchi (Chair), Naftali Chayat, Al Petrick,  
Hatim Z., Leo Wiltz, Phil Belanger

Group C: PICS/MIB Comments.

Greg Ennis (Chair), Carl Andren., Anil Sanwalka, Bob O'Hara

Group D: Editorial Team 1

Stuart Kerry (Chair), Jim Baker, Stan Reible,

**Presentation of Papers Related to Comments.**

Paper 366: The Selection of Short Preamble for TGb/Chris Heegard, Stan Ling.

Chris Heegard of Alantro presented 3 improved options for the short preamble and suggested that the group choose one of the three as the allowable option.

**Recessed at 9:55 for 10 minutes.**

Presentation of Paper: Short Preamble for 802.11 2.4 GHz WLAN/Carl Andren.

Alantro proposes to modulate the header portion of the short preamble with 2 Mbps instead of 5.5 Mbps. Energy detection is basically useless with S/N ratios of 7 dB or less; it takes fairly large S/N ratios for it to become useful, but it still isn't clear for what.

Chair: We want to give the small groups an opportunity to come to some sort of consensus.

The floor has decided not to allow motions at the present level of discussion; Carl's proposal is out of order.

Presentation of Paper: Notes on FH comments - Dean Kawaguchi.

There is as mixture of creative comments for improvements for implementing the FH option mixed in with comments to delete the whole FH thing. Blue Tooth/Home RF has brought the price goals for FH products down by a factor of at least 2. We need to allow low-cost devices to be mixed in with high-rate devices. There is not much of a cost with regards to the RF front end and the size of the digital processor to implement the FH option. Everyone, including MICRILOR, agreed to include the FH features. IEEE 802.11 did a good job of creating a (existing) standard that works.

Report on meeting with FCC with regards to PBCC - Matthew Shoemake:

Note from Greg Cuzmac: Based on the information provided we see no problem with your proposed "DS" implementation. Final approval will depend upon test results with your working equipment.

Paper 367: Replacement Description of CCK - Matthew Shoemake.

Described operation of Alantro's proposed implementation.

Paper 270 r1 - Revised WiLAN IP Statement:

In July WiLAN submitted an IP statement with regard to the proposed IEEE802.11b standard. We no longer feel that WiLAN IP position applies to the proposed 802.11b standard. However, these comments do not apply to the proposed 802.11a standard.

Chair: The small groups will work on their individual tasks this afternoon in this room. TGb will reconvene as an entire group at 8:00 pm this evening.

**Adjourned at 12:00 Noon.**

**Tuesday – November 10, 1998****Called to order at 8:10 pm.****Comment Reports from Resolution Teams:**

Group D: Editorial Comments/Stuart Kerry.

Group D reviewed 40 out of the 140 editorial comments. About 130 of the comments that the Editing committee received were technical in content, and should be handled by the small groups handling the technical concerns.

Group C: PICs and MIP Comments/Greg Ennis.

Comments dealing with PICs and MIPs were fairly editorial in nature. The PICs as covered in the draft standard were fairly incomplete or non-existent.

Group B: FH Comments/Dean Kawaguchi.

Group B addressed the general issue of FH Interoperability. General consensus was that this feature was within the PAR.

Went through FH comments/No major feedback from the group at the present time.

A large number of the comments related to the large number of options, which exist.

Several voiced opinions that the inclusion of the FH extension does not conform to the spirit of the PAR. Furthermore, some felt that the FH extension goes into the territory of another standard(s). He also feels that the proposed approach would not be conforming to the rules of FH.

An opposing view was voiced that the group accepted that the FH mode with the requirement that it be pointed out that the proposed approach does not conform to the standard rules of a FH system. The group did feel that if the standard was left with the various multiple options, that the approach might exceed the boundaries of the PAR. The approach that sticks out the most was the option of having 2 different modulations. One member spoke strongly against restarting the process to settle the FH compatibility issue.

Straw Pole was carried on many attendees feel that maintaining FH mode violates PAR:

Yes: 4

No: 19

Straw poll was carried on how many feel that maintaining FH mode will cause them to vote No on next letter ballot for approval of standard.

Yes: 1

Group A: Short Preamble/Interoperability/PBCC Comments – Chair Tom Tsoulogiannis.

The group Chair stated that they came up on resolutions concerning the major issues covered by the comments.

Comments 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 198, and 211.

**Resolution 1:** Reject comments and leave short preamble as an option.

No objections voiced, resolution 1 is accepted

Comments 48, 151, 152, and 154

**Resolution 2:** Accept 2 MBps QPSK rate as the short preamble header rate (option 2 in paper 366)

Objections were voiced and resolved; Resolution 2 was accepted.

**Point of Order:** Parliamentarian stated that we should not refer to company opinions in our discussions.

Comments 44, 45: To use carrier sense as a mechanism for keeping channel quiet for a specified period. It was felt that the mechanism was not reliable and that the comments be rejected. It was felt that there was no requirement for coexistence.

**Resolution 3:** Reject comments on the grounds that the proposed mechanism for CCA is not considered reliable. There is no Interoperability issue by definition since there is not coexistence between short preamble and PHYs that only implement long preambles.

No further objections voiced, resolution 3 accepted.

Comment 39 accepted.

**Resolution 4:** Accepted preamble rates is at 1 Mbps.

No objection to comment; Resolution 4 is accepted.

Comments 52, 79, 215.

It was not clear what could coexist with what.

**Resolution 5:** Accepted comments. Will add a co-existence table.

No objection voiced, resolution 5 accepted.

Comment 94: It was not clear what the SFD was. Comment was rejected as it is defined in the existing standards.

**Resolution 6:** Comment was not correct and there was no suggestion given by the commentator.

No objection voiced, resolution 6 is accepted.

Comment 123.

Comment stated that there is no reason for extra byte. This extra byte is actually required

**Resolution 7:** Rejected, PBCC needs a known pattern to finish the decoding of the data.

No objection voiced; resolution 7 to reject comment is accepted.

Comment 127.

Objection to the wording if PHY decides channel is clear.

**Resolution 8:** Accepted, the MAC decides on the clear channel assessment.

No objection voiced; resolution 8 accepted.

Comments 276, 116, 179, 127.

The interface between the MAC and the PHY is not defined.



**Resolution 9:** Accept comments by adding an element to the MAC and add fields. Have to add associated PHY parameters.

It was pointed out this PAR states that current MAC shouldn't be modified. Others pointed out that some changes have to be made to MAC to support short preamble and FH mode. It was further pointed that to change the MAC you have to go back to Standards Board, which takes 1-4 months. The group has to come up a PHY, which requires no changes to MAC, or propose the equivalent of a new MAC. It was suggested that we have to phrase a request and forward the request to the executive committee.

Further discussion on the issue was postponed, until an appropriate resolution can be formulated.

Comment 210.

**Resolution 10:** Accepts comment 210 and text will be modified in 18.2.7  
No objections voiced; resolution 10 is accepted.

For Wednesday's Agenda: Review FH and Editorial Comments.

**Motion 11:** Moved to adjourn/Harry Worstell/Matthew Shoemake.

No objections voiced to adjournment.

**Meeting Adjourned at 10:34 pm.**

---

**Wednesday – November 11, 1998**

**Called to order at 8:37 am.**

Voting Members Present: 25

Chair reported on Wednesday evening results.

Review of agenda.

No objection voiced today's agenda.

Does PAR allow for small extensions to support High Rate PHY issues?

Yes - How to get the additions we need to make into the standard.

No - Implementation required hooks using existing Supported Rates interface.

Mixing Short and Long Preambles.

Straw poll of having both modes existing at the same time: Yes 14, No 5.

Comments 116, 179, 187, 188, and 227.

Suggested changes: Comment accepted by adding an element to the MAC management frames. As a minimum a byte will be added to identify the options used by the PHY. MI5 parameters will also be added. Parameters for code selection and header. Choice will be added to the TX vector and the RCS vector. Change PHY characteristic primitives' table.

**Motion 12:** Moved by subgroup to accept changes based on comments 116,179,187,188, and 227.

Discussion of motion.

**Motion 12 passed:** 23/2/4.

Chair will be meet with Vic Hayes to explore bringing resolution to plenary meeting.

**Motion 13:** Moved to define a 2 Mbps rate together with 5.5 and 11 Mbps rates for the short preamble. This is a change from 5.5 and 11 Mbps rates in the present draft/Carl A. /Matthew Shoemake.

Discussion of motion

**Motion 13 passed:** 21/0/3.

Comment 9: We are missing a PIC Performa for 5.5 Mbps.

**Resolution 14:** Accept comments 9 and add a MIPs table.

No objection voiced, resolution 14 accepted.

Comment 23:

**Resolution 15:** Accept wording change as per comment 23.

No objection voiced, resolution 15 accepted.

Comment 24.

**Resolution 16:** Accept modifications in text provided by comment 24.

No objections, resolution 16 accepted.

Comment 25.

The FH system cannot operate with the HR system because of rate difference.

**Resolution 17:** Comment 25 accepted in principle. The editor needs to address the wording change.

No objections, resolution 17 accepted.

Comment 49; there is no mechanism for sending.

**Resolution 18:** Add two, new managed objects.

Resolution approved by subcommittee.

Comment 50: Commenter proposes adding text.

**Resolution 19:** Have editor add appropriate text.

No objection voice to acceptance, resolution 16 is accepted.

Comment 54: Replace “shall” with “will be” in overview.

**Resolution 20:** Comment 54 accepted.

No objection voiced, resolution 20 is accepted.

Comment 57.

Fill in values for “TBD” in the paragraph

Referred to comment 58.

Comment 82: Gap in figure fixed.

**Resolution 21:** Comment 82 accepted.

No objection voiced, resolution 21 accepted.

Comment 90.

No resolution proposed for comment 90 at this time.

Comment 91: The clauses and subclasses use MSB/LSB nomenclature.

**Resolution 22:** Reject comment as confusing relative to clause 15 from existing standard.

No objections voiced, resolution 22 is accepted.

Comment 95: Comment stated that 4 mandatory rates and 2 optional rates are supported. There are no longer 2 optional rates.

**Resolution 23:** Accept comment and delete reference to 2 optional rates.

No objections voiced to change, resolution 23 accepted.

Comments 97, 99, 100, 101.

Same (resolution 23) as for comment 95.

Comment 104

**Resolution 24:** Reject the first part and accept the second part of comment 104, via reference to comment 95.

No objections voiced to acceptance, resolution 24 accepted.

Comment 105; refer to resolution 23 for comment 95.

Comment 110: Change code modulation. Reserve means that it need to be transmitted a 1 and ignored at receiver.

**Resolution 25:** To accept comment 110 since it already is this way.

No objections voiced , resolution 25 is accepted.

**Recessed at 10:03 am for 10 min.**

**Meeting Called to order at 10:23.**

Floor given to Group B, Dean Kawaguchi, for review of comments.

A lot of comments addressed the lack of clarity for the FH PHY option. Dean presented proposed text to deal with objections. The comments dealt with are listed below:

Comment 58, 59, 60, 62; All refer to TBDs, which have been filled in.

Comment 63; Accept comment to delete sentence.

Comment 64; Return to this one later

Comment 65;

Comment 67;

Comment 68; clearer definition of FH mode.

Comment 87; FHSS and SS.

Deferred: Comments 64, 78, 87.

Comments 47, 49, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 77, 85, 86.

**Resolution 26:** To accept the resolutions as presented by Dean K. as a group.

No objections voiced. Resolution 26 accepted.

Draft Text: An optional FH interoperable PLCP Frame format is defined to allow the 1 and 2 Mbit/s FHSS ....

**Motion:** Moved from subgroup to accept draft text submitted on screen by Dean K.

**Motion postponed.**

Comment 87: The FHSS option should differ to the DSSS

**Resolution 27:** The commenter is correct but there is no clear way to implement his suggestion.

It may be possible to use an energy detection option.

No objections voiced, resolution 27 accepted.

Comment 116: The point of adding to mode was to accommodate the legacy system. What is needed to complete this option is to add the MIPs function.

This issue is referred back to small working group.

Comment 282.

It is not intended that the system be certified as a hybrid system but a dual rate radio

**Resolution 28:** Accept comment 282.

No objections voiced, resolution 28 is accepted.

Comment 286.

Confused as to how the FHSS mode would operate with all the other modes. Clarify how the MAC would operate with all the various options.

**Resolution 29:** To accept comment 286.

No objection voiced, resolution 29 is accepted.

Comment 287: Comment referred to Carl Andren's group for further consideration.

**Motion 30:** Moved by Dean's K. subgroup to approve the text shown by Dean on the screen relating to the above resolutions.

It was suggested that issue of control frames be added to the text. It was then decided that this subject might belong elsewhere.

**Motion 30 Passed:** 19/2/6.

Comment 113.

Some of the bits reserved in the bit field should be reserved for expansion of the length field.

**Resolution 31:** Reject comment 113.

No objection voiced; resolution 31 passed.

Comment 115: CCK and PPPC are reserved.

Same as comment 110; Rejected comment 115.

Comment 122: Fix text in 18.23.5 to not refer to the MAC MPDU length.

**Resolution 32:** Accept comment 122, and fix text in 18.23.5 and table 6 in 18.33.

No objections voiced, resolution 32 accepted.

Editorial comments from Stuart Kerry and the Editor's comments from Carl Andren will be placed on the server by 6:00 pm.

Group C, Greg E. will be walking through their comments this afternoon.

**Motion 33:** Moved by Naftali Chayat/Seconded by Greg to accept the September 1998 minutes from the Westford Meeting for TGb.

No discussion on motion.

**Motion 33 passed:** 15/0/4.

No objection voiced to adjournment.

**Meeting adjourned at 12:12 pm.**

---

**Thursday - November 13, 1998****Call to Order at 8:50 am.**

Chair's Comments:

- 1) We will continue the comment review process this morning.
- 2) As a group we will need to establish if we want to submit a recirculation ballot an entirely new letter ballot to the voting members. The chair of 802.11 favours a new ballot, I favour a recirculation ballot.
- 3) We will have a half-hour recess near midmorning to allow members to review responses (and revisions as a result) to the comments especially the member's own comments.

It was pointed out that having 2 high-rate modulations seems out of line with what was stated in the PAR. We should continue with the review process of the various options, which was started yesterday.

**Point of Order:** Dean K. asked for the chair's interpretation of the optional PBCC modulation as to whether it falls within the TGb PAR. He stated that the very first sentence in the PAR may rule out the existence of 2 high-speed modulations. He wants to continue the selection process, which was started yesterday with regards to members choosing by vote to continue to include the various options.

Chair suggested a half-hour recess.

No objections were voice to having a half-hour recess.

Chair granted a half-hour recess at 9:08 for the assembly to go into executive session.

**Recessed at 9:08 am.****Chair's Response with Regards to Point of Order:****Background:**

The TGb parliamentarians and I consulted with the 802 chair (Jim Carlos) in regard to the point of order. Jim stated that the scope of the PAR is a guideline to the group of how to proceed. The real question is whether the option is within the spirit of the PAR or not. Jim discouraged to discount any appropriate proposals based purely on the scope defined in the PAR. He suggested that if the group feels that the PAR needs to be modified in order to accommodate such proposals, then 802.11 needs to forward the request for modifying the PAR. H suggested we do that before the sponsor Ballot when all such required modifications will have surfaced. Further more he indicated that he does not foresee any schedule delay for such modification. He felt that ExCom could respond timely so the Sponsor Ballot will not be impacted.

**Chair's Ruling:**

Since the question of the point of order is based on the “Spirit” of the PAR rather than on a concrete unambiguous decision or rule, the chair is in doubt whether his personal opinion reflects that of the group’s on this matter. As a result and in accordance to Robert Rules on this highly subjective matter **the Chair opens the Point of order to the assembly to be debated under the rules governing an appear.**

### **Floor Discussion of the Point of Order:**

Indication that there is flexibility in the standards proposal with respect to the PAR. If there are major changes, which would change the PAR, it should be resubmitted before the Sponsor’s Ballot.

**Motion 34:** The point of order, which has been raised, is being submitted to the floor for their review and further discussion.

Summary of discussion: The main thing is that there are 2 high rate modulations, which achieve the same data rate. There may not be adequate justification for the 2 modulations. This does not match our original intentions. Given that I believe that it’s not within what we originally intended. The PBCC option is interoperable with the CCK modulation. This is one high speed PAR, both use the same header, the same PSK modulation, etc. There is only one minor difference in operation. There is one PHY, which is fully interoperable. However, they look very different in the way that they transmit data over the network. The customers will be confused, which will lead to an unsuccessful product.

Chairs Comments: A simple majority is required.

Yes, means that PBCC falls with the spirit of the PAR and we maintain PBCC.

No, means we reject PBCC

### **Procedural Notes:**

If vote is yes, we will continue on the present path.

If vote is no, we are striking out the PBCC option from draft. Then someone may move that we discuss the spirit of the PAR. If the group votes that we don’t want to change the spirit of the PAR that ends it. Otherwise people can bring new technical proposals with regards to the PBCC, or other technical changes.

**Motion 34 to Appeal Passed (Yes wins):** 11/9/7

### **Return to Review of Comments by Group Chairs:**

Tom Tsoulogiannis: After our small group debate we going to some changes to the capability field in the MAC. We are adding 4 paragraphs to 18.7.3.14 section. Two variables are going to be added to implement the PBCC and short preamble options. There will be several additional sentences added to deal with the short preamble option. (Secretary’s comments: In the ensuing discussions it was clear that all the changes were needed, and their form have not been resolved by the small group working on the MAC comments).

Editor: Discussion of modes when a one station is at a distant range. Everyone may need to operate at same mode.



The question was voiced how do you get these characteristics at the PHY/MAC interface? Do you just declare 3 different PHY modes?

Due to much discussion, Chair ruled that these MAC issues should be returned to small group.

Comment 160: How the legacy units defer to the high rate modes. Concerns were voiced on how legacy low rate cards would know to defer to high rate extensions. There is a legacy 4 Mbps rate FH mode can be used to as a way to implement a procedure to defer to the higher rate modes provided by the high-rate PHY.

Chair: Due to conflicting opinions, we should vote on comment resolution.

**Motion 35:** Moved to accept resolution for comment 160 as displayed on screen.

**Motion 36:** Moved to amend resolution 33 on screen/Naftali/

No objection voiced to amendment.

**Motion 36 for amendment accepted.**

**Motion 35 passed:** 18/0/4

#### **Review of editorial comments.**

Issue: Semi-technical comments were referred to editor.

Issue: Paragraph 18.1 removing regulatory standards can be met.

Neither of the modulation approaches have been approved by the relevant regulatory agencies.

#### **Presenter went through all the semi-technical editorial comments**

Comment 11:

**Resolution 37** to accept comment.

No objection voiced, resolution 37 accepted.

Comment 36: Should say something about different modulations and rates.

**Resolution 38:** Will accept comments.

No objection voiced , resolution 38 accepted.

Comment 51: Accepted.

**Resolution 39:** Accept.

No objection voiced, resolution 39 accepted.

Comment 53 Accepted.

**Resolution 40:** Accept comment.

No objection voiced, resolution 40 accepted.

Comment 55 accepted and resolved through comment 58

No objection voiced.

Comment 56 Resolved in same way as comment 58.  
No objection voiced.

Comment 62 Resolved in same way as comment 58.  
No objection voiced.

Comment 168  
**Resolution 41:** Comment accepted, editor will modify.  
No objection voiced, resolution 41 accepted.

Comment 169 needs a subclause to be added.  
**Resolution 42:** Accept comment.  
No objection voiced, resolution 42 accepted.

Comment 181: Need to power down before modulation is halted.  
**Resolution 43:** Comment Accepted  
No objections voiced, resolution 43 accepted.

Comment 189  
**Resolution 44:** Editorial change accepted.  
No objection voiced, resolution 44 accepted.

Comment 224: Need a separate data rates table and a separate supported data rates table.  
Comment accepted by editor.  
No objection voiced to the editor's resolution

Comment :Comment accepted by editor.  
No objection voiced to accepting editor's resolution

Comment 260: Add strange characters.  
Accepted by editor.

Comment 264.  
Rejected by editor, as new description seems to be more confusing.  
No objection voiced to rejection of comment 264 by editor.

Comment 294: Add a scope.  
Accepted by editor.

Comment 296: Update annex c.  
Accepted by editor.

Comment 297: Update annex d.  
Accepted by editor.

Comments 6, 7, 195 with regards to "no" PICs.  
Proposed PICs and review discussion provided in document. 98/295.  
Comments solved by small group dealing with MAC issues.

Accepted small group resolution.  
After spelling correction, no further objections voiced.

**Discussion on comments reviewed by group C/Anil Sanwalka:**

Comments 49 & 50

The short preamble group may need to revise these changes.

Comment 124

That really isn't a resolution. Will include in the draft round down.

Comment 137

It still talks about symbols which are really only in the PND interface.  
Group will take another look at this. Need to say modulation and "not" code

Comment 141

Doesn't have a resolution requirement. Use is same as for 140.

Comment 204

Discussing modality. Strike "at a time" and reject "modality"  
No objection voiced to change.

Comment 227

MIPs; We may have different MIPs; Referred to editor  
No objection voiced to change.

Comment 232

Resolution has PPD in it; Suggested numbers are much shorter than existing numbers. With the 2 Mbps header changes, these numbers may not be practical.

Floor given to Stan Ling to address Comment 29

**Motion:** Moved to Adjourn at 12:25/Naftali Chayat/

Objection voiced to fixing time at 12:25.

**Motion to Adjourn at 12:25 Passed:** 8/3/3

Floor returned to Stan Ling:

Suggests that Editor should either draft a new sentence or remove current reference to PBCC. No objection voiced to comment resolution formulated on screen, resolution accepted.

Chair asked if there were any more questions on any of the comments. No further questions were voiced from the floor.

**Motion:** Moved to accept the comment resolution on their entirety as reviewed and/or presented and agreed upon and forward them to the Plenary for approval as document 98/405.

**Motion:** Moved for the Editor to include the resolutions to the draft text and deliver the updated draft for Letter Ballot.

Chair requested members to reconvene at 1:00 in this same room.

**Session Adjourned at 12:25 pm.**

**Post Session Ruling:** The 802.11 Chair ruled that a 802.11b afternoon (pm) meeting had not been properly scheduled and announced in advance for 1:00 pm, and would, therefore, be out of order.

**Attendance List**

See minutes of the full working group.

**Future Meetings**

See minutes of the full working group.

