

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 00 SC P L # 93  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Broken links to the bibliography part  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The IEEE-SA editor will ensure that the cross reference links work in the final published draft.

CI 00 SC P 7 L 28 # 92  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status R  
 The title is much wider than the actual scope, which is limited to coesxtence between 802.15.1 to 802.11b  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change title to: Coexistence of Wireless Personal Area Networks (802.15.1) with Wireless Local Access Networks (802.11b) Operating in the Unlicensed 2.4GHz Frequency Band.  
 Proposed Response Response Status U  
 REJECT.  
 Changing the title of the recommended practice requires another vote on the PAR, therefore no change will be made.

CI 00 SC 00 P L 2030 # 12  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The abstract seems overly vague and does not offer the reader a cogent abstract of what is inside the document. I understatnd the IEEE Standards Style Manual states ""Abstracts should be based on the scope and purpose of the standard as indicated on the PAR..."" BUT I should think we might want to state this is coexistence of IEEE Std 802.11b-1999 and IEEE Std 802.15.1-2002 \*somewhere\* on the title page.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest the abstract be rewritten as: ""This recommended practice addresses the issue of coexistence of wireless local area networks and wireless personal area networks. These wireless networks often operate in the same unlicensed band. This recommended practice describes coexistence mechanisms that can be used to facilitate coexistence of IEEE Std 802.11b-1999 and IEEE Std 802.15.1-2002."" or the paragraph ending could be ""...of WLAN i.e., IEEE Std 802.11b-1999 and WPAN i.e., IEEE Std 802.15.1-2002.""  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 Added "(i.e., IEEE Std 802.11b-1999)" and "(i.e., IEEE Std 802.15.1-2002)" to abstract.

CI 00 SC 00 P 00 L 00 # 3  
 Savoula Amanatidis IEEE  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 At the time of submission to the Board, or just prior to publication, you will need to supply a mailing address for each member of the Working Group that worked on this recommended practice. This will ensure that all members of the Working Group receive a complimentary copy of the published recommended practice.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 Either the TG2 chair or TG2 secretary should be able to provide the names of Task group participants, who should receive free copies.

CI 00 SC 00 P 00 L 00 # 1  
 Savoula Amanatidis IEEE  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 On the title page, please add the copyright year, 2003, to the copyright statement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 Changed "<current year>" to "2003" on the cover page.

CI 00 SC 00 P 00 L 00 # 2  
 Savoula Amanatidis IEEE  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 If any of the figures are derived or obtained from sources other than the Working Group itself, please obtain and supply permission from those sources. Please do the same if any tables have been obtained from other sources.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Sent email (3/18/03) requesting confirmation that none of the figures or tables are from copyright sources.  
 Emails received, indicate no copyrighted material

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl 00 SC 00 P 00 L 00 # 9  
 Nikolich, Paul consultant

Comment Type T Comment Status R

There are many instances where the document refers to "IEEE 802.11b" (strictly speaking, the 802.11 Higher Speed PHY Extension in the 2.4 GHz band) when it really means to call out the combination of the 802.11-1999 MAC and the 802.11b-1999 (for example the second sentence in section 1. Overview). Thus the nomenclature used is misleading and confusing and will become even more confusing when the specifications contained in the 802.11b-1999 ammendment is folded into a new edition of the 802.11 document. 802.11b will then no longer be a valid document, but the specification will remain valid, alive and well, a clause in the new edition. One way to eliminate confusion may be to call 802.11-1999 by a unique abbreviated name "802.11 WLAN MAC" and 802.11b-1999 by a unique abbreviated name "802.11 WLAN 2.4GHz Higher Speed PHY Extension" and an instantiation of the combination of the two a "802.11 WLAN 2.4GHz Higher Speed Data Link"---or something simillarly appropriate. I hope I am being clear.

What I am striving for is for the document to use a system of nomenclature that is unambiguous and clear, perhaps something similar to that used in 802.3, where it is clear from the naming conventions used that 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT are all different speed versions of a twisted pair PHY, that are independent of the arbitrary 802.3\* project name given to them at the time of their creation.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make it clear when you are referring to a 802.11 MAC/PHY Data Link implementation based on the 802.11-1997 and 802.11b-1999 specifications. My recommendation is you give this combination of specifications a unique name (as suggested above: 802.11 WLAN 2.4GHz Higher Speed Data Link) and clearly define it in the definitions section.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 This comment is out of scope, since we have no control over the naming of the 802.11 future standard. Currently, it is well understood that 802.11b implies the physical layer extension and the 802.11 MAC sublayer. Future proofing of this draft for another different future draft is not always possible. This problem was created by a failure to follow IEEE 802 procedure to renew the 802.11 draft when multiple ammendments were created.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it is referencing (an editorial matter) normative standards and future versions of it.

Cl 00 SC 00 P 1 L 1 # 11  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The frontmatter pagination is incorrect.

*SuggestedRemedy*

I suggest the Editor change the Frontmatter from numerical e.g., 1, 2, etc. to alpha/roman numerical e.g., i, ii, etc.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Page numbering for the frontmatter was changed to roman (i, ii, etc.)

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 00 SC 00 P 2 L 154 # 10  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The fact that there were two (2) parallel IEEE Working Groups balloting this Draft I recommended that we identify both WG Memberships in the Front Matter. This can be done serially in the Participants subclause or we can identify 802.11 as major technical contributor listing the Voting Membership as of the RevCom submission date.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest that the Participants subclause the following sentence be changed from ""At the time this standard was completed, the working group had the following membership:"" to ""At the time this recommended practice was completed, we had two (2) working groups participating that had the following membership: Insert 802.11 roster here... Robert F. Heile, 802.15 Chair Ian C. Gifford, 802.15 Vice Chair James D. Allen, 802.15 Vice Chair Patrick Kinney, 802.15 Working Group Secretary Stephen J. Shellhammer, 802.15.2 Chair Nada Golmie, 802.15.2 Vice Chair David E. Cypfer, 802.15.2 Editor-in-Chief Arun Arunachalam, 802.15.2 Secretary Jim Lansford, 802.15.2 PHY Chair Nada Golmie, 802.15.2 MAC Chair Aiello, Roberto Akahane, Masaaki Alfvn, Richard Allen, James Arunachalam, Arun Askar, Naiel Bahl, Venkat Bailey, Daniel Bain, Jay Barr, John Batra, Anuj Blaney, Timothy J. Bottoms, Stan Bourgeois, Monique Brabenac, Chuck Callaway, Ed Chang, Soo-Young Chen, Hung Kun Chindapol, Aik Cypher, David Derby, Michael DuVal, Mary Dydyk, Michael Ellis, Jason Foerster, Jeff Gandolfo, Pierre Gifford, Ian Gilb, James Golmie, Nada Gorday, Paul Gutierrez, Jose Harada, Yasuo Heberling, Allen Heile, Robert Herold, Barry Huang, Bob Huckabee, Laura L. Iglar, Eran Ishii, Katsumi Jamieson, Phil Jong-Hun, Park Karaoguz, Jeyhan Kelly, Joy H. Kerry, Stuart J. Kim, Yongsuk Kinney, Patrick Kleindl, Gunter Kraemer, Bruce P. Lansford, Jim Leeper, David G. Li, Liang Liang, Jie Liu, Shawn T. Maa, Yeong-Chang Mason, Ralph McInnis, Michael D. Meyer, Jim Miller, Leonard Miura, Akira Morelli, Tony Moridi, Said Naeve, Marco Ngo, Chiu Y. Noble, Erwin R. Odman, Knut Pardee, Jack Pendergrass, Marcus Poor, Robert D. Rasor, Gregg Reede, Ivan Richards, Jim Roberts, William Roberts, Richard Rogers, Chris Rouzet, Philippe Rypinski, Chandos Santhoff, John Schrader, Mark Schuster, Tom Schylander, Erik Seals, Michael Shellhammer, Stephen J. Shepherd, Nick Shor, Gadi Shvodian, Bill Siep, Thomas Siwiak, Kazimierz Stevenson, Carl Struik, Rene Sugaya, Shigeru Takamura, Kazuhisa Takaoka, Katsumi Tan, Teik-Kheong Taylor, Larry van Houtum, Wim van Leeuwen, Hans Vishwakarma, Ritesh Walrant, Thierry Watanabe, Fujio Welborn, Matthew Wilson, Richard Wood, Stephen Woodrow, Edward G. Yamaguchi, Hirohisa Young, Song-Lin

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Supplied text added

CI 00 SC All P 0 L 0 # 45  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status R

There are way too many Annexes (Annexes?) in this draft. Please merge some of the ones that belong together to make the draft more readable.

SuggestedRemedy

Please change as indicated.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 There is no obvious way of combining annexes. There is no limit to the number of annexes. Please note that the large increase in the number of annexes was due to an IEEE-SA editor, who did not want to permit the use of marking subclauses as informative.

CI 01 SC 1.1 P 7 L 1 # 103  
 Pardee, John innov8rs LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status R

there is no b subscript in 802.11 ... reference

SuggestedRemedy

Add b subscript

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 The reference to IEEE Std 802.11-1999 on page 8, line 1 of clause 1.1 is to the main draft, not specifically to the 802.11b standard. This is consistent with the general case of 802.15 in the same sentence. The specific standards are listed and described in the second paragraph of clause 1.1.

CI 01 SC 1.1 P 7 L 51 # 46  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status R

While the Scope is derived from the PAR, it does not have to be copied verbatim (although you can).

SuggestedRemedy

I would suggest making the phrases in the Scope into sentences. For example, instead of ""To develop a recommended ..."" do ""The scope of this project is to develop a recommended ...""

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 To be consistent with resolution of similar prior working group letter ballot comments, no change will be made to the text that is exactly copied from the PAR.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 01 SC 1.2 P 8 L 15 # 94  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The documents refer only to WLAN's and does not include other 802 devices at all

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""selected other wirless devices"" to ""selected WLAN devices""

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The text to which you refer comes directly from the PAR. Since a change to the PAR requires another vote, no change will be made.

CI 01 SC 1.2 P 8 L 21 # 13  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

In deference to the IEEE Std 802.15.1-2003 and Bluetooth do we want to use a different word?

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest we change ""...user scenarios."" to ""...user profiles."" FWIW it is no big deal if you want to reject this comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Use of the term, profile, as used in the Bluetooth Specification is not proper when used here.

CI 01 SC 1.2 P 8 L 50 # 95  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The footnote mentions other 802 devices, but the document refers only to 802.11 and not to, for example, 802.16

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""Other 802 devices"" to ""802.11 WLAN devices""

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

IEEE 802.16 does not operate in the 2.4 GHz band, so that reference is not appropriate. The text to which you refer comes directly from the PAR. Since a change to the PAR requires another vote, no change will be made.

CI 04 SC 4.0 P L # 17  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

This paragraph ""This clause describes in general terms the issue that this recommended practice attempts to address, the coexistence mechanisms being recommended to reduce the problem, when to use each coexistence mechanism, the models used to evaluate the effects, and finally an overview to the structure of this recommended practice."" is very awkward to read.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the Editor reread it and in light of my other comment to move subclause 4.4 to 4.1 decide if it should be edited. Up to you.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Added numbers to correspond to the subclauses.

CI 04 SC 4.1 P 12 L 34 # 96  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi

Comment Type E Comment Status R

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""effect"" to ""affect""

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This appears to be a English grammer problem that can only be solved by the final decision of the IEEE-SA editor who will be reviewing the draft to conform to its style. The English style guide that I use permits the use effect for both positions. I recognize the difference (effect = noun & affect = verb), which has been deprecated.

CI 04 SC 4.1 P 12 L 53 # 14  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The words ""...5.5and..."" are incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest ""...5.5 and...""; add a space.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Added space as suggested to separate 5.5 and.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 04 SC 4.1 P 12 L 54 # 47  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The sentence does not read well.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'is standardized to be named' to be 'is named'

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The current wording was added to address a previous working group letter ballot, so no change will be made.

CI 04 SC 4.1 P 13 L 78 # 15  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The sentence ""The master polling the slaves for data, controls medium access and uses scheduled periodic transmission for voice packets."" seems gramatically awkward.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the Editor review the sentence and if he determines no trouble found then I withdraw this comment.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Reorderred sentence and added the preposition, by.

CI 04 SC 4.1.1 P 13 L 16-18 # 104  
 Pardee, John innov8rs LLC

Comment Type T Comment Status A

if only the maximum rate is specified - no guarantee that it won't be lower and create prolonged interference

SuggestedRemedy

recommend that designers keep hop rates near upper end of range

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The statement "... maximum hopping rate of 1600 hops/s " relates to the design of the 802.15.1 system to transmit data at the mandatory data rate and packet type. Useage of another optional packet type will dictate a lower hopping rate. This trade-off between hopping rate and packet type is the contents of the recommended practice in Clause 9 (adaptive packet selection). Commenter is advised to read this clause to see why the suggested remedy is not always a good choice.

CI 04 SC 4.1.2 P 13 L 46 # 48  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The word 'since' indicates that time has elapsed whereas in this sentence, the author is trying to show that one event is the result of another. In this case, the word should be 'because'.

SuggestedRemedy

Review all occurances of the word 'since' and change to 'because' or other appropriate words/phrases if it is not used correctly. Alternately, please provide me with an authoritative reference that indicates that 'since' is appropriate here so I can go tell off the person who has been bugging me about it in TG3.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Authority is based upon the ruling body (i.e., king, dictator, or in this case every body that comments on the document.) Using a dictionary alone, since refers to time. Because refers to reason, not result. However using "Advanced English Grammar" by Kittredge and Farley, by Ginn and Company; page 158, item 366 The chief subordinate conjunctions are: - since (= because). Thus if this was the ruling English grammar book, then there is no distinction between the two, in fact this book considers them equal. Within the IEEE-SA multiple styles of writing are present, you just have to hope that your style matches that of the person assigned to review your writing.

CI 04 SC 4.1.4 P 14 L 34 # 49  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Awkward sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the beginning to read ""An IEEE 802.11b STA is used because it represents ...""

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

It is not just an IEEE 802.11b STA but also the AP. Therefore we just use IEEE 802.11b. This clause refers to the reason for using 802.11b over 802.11 FH.

CI 04 SC 4.2 P 14 L 53 # 50  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

I think 'recommended practice' sound better than 'document'

SuggestedRemedy

This is no ordinary document, it is an IEEE (draft) Recommended Practice. In a standard you say ""In this standard ..."" so I think you should use ""... described in this recommended practice are ...""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl 04 SC 4.2 P 15 L 22 # 51  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 AFAIK all entries in a table have the first letter of the first word capitalized, (according to the IEEE style guide, I think.)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Please capitalize the first letter of the first word in each cell (perhaps not 'yes' and 'no', but I leave that up to you.

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 IEEE Standards Style Manual September 20, 2001 15.2 page 19 fourth paragraph and unnumbered bullets.  
 The two columns containing the "yes" and "no" have been removed. The other tables have been examined and changed to conform to the IEEE Standards Style Manual in regards to this matter.

Cl 04 SC 4.2 P 15 L 27 # 52  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A  
 The notch filters do not require a modification to either the 802.15.1 nor the 802.11 standard, they are allowed within the current definition of the standard because they are an implementation detail that does not affect interoperability.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 'yes' to 'no' for the 802.11b column of 'Deterministic interference suppression' and 'Adaptive interference suppression.'

Proposed Response Response Status U  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The commenter is correct no technical change is required, since it is an implementation option that exists within the current standard.  
 Remove columns (802.11b & 802.15.1) and related text.

Cl 04 SC 4.2.1 P 15 L 45 # 105  
 Pardee, John innov8rs LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The three collaborative coexistence mechanism defined in this recommended practice consists of two MAC sublayer techniques (See Clause 5. and 6.) and one PHY layer technique (See Clause 7.). (delete the underlined s)

SuggestedRemedy  
 change tense to make mechanism plural and change consist to plural

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 04 SC 4.2.1 P 15 L 46 # 16  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The sentence "... (See Clauses 5. and 6.) and one PHY layer technique (See Clause 7.)." is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest the Editor change the or create a new xref format in FM so you can drop the period after each clause xref'ed. For example the sentence should read "... (See Clauses 5 and 6) and one PHY layer technique (See Clause 7).". Please make this change globally.

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 Created new crossreference, clause which contains "Clause <\$paranumonly>"

Cl 04 SC 4.4 P 19 L 1329 # 20  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 I applaud and really like the latest Clause 4 text, however, I was wondering if subclause 4.4 Overview of the recommended practice should be move to the front of the clause vs. the back.

SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest the Editor consider moving subclasue 4.4 to 4.1 and make the current subclause 4.1 into 4.2, etc.

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 The ordering is as is so that the reader must first understand the problem in general terms before jumping into the details.

Cl 04 SC 4.4 P 19 L 16 # 18  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The sentence "...individual clause or informative Annex for..." is inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest "...individual clause or informative annex for..."; meaning either use a lower case "a" for annex or capitalize "c" for Clause. I think the IEEE Standards Style Manual gives the answer.

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 Changed Annex to lower case.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 04 SC 4.4 P 19 L 17 # 106  
 Pardee, John innov8rs LLC  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 19 line 17 - each coexistence mechanisms  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change mechanisms to singular mechanism  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 04 SC 4.4 P 19 L 23 # 53  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 The second paragraph is unnecessary here, the Table of Contents has a list of all of the Annexes (Annecies?). Everytime you update the draft, e.g. add a new Annex or merger two or more Annecies into one, you will have to update the paragraph. It will be a pain to maintain, IMHO.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this paragraph.  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 This paragraph states the outline of the recommended practice.  
 When it was not there, another commenter at working group ballot wanted it in.

CI 04 SC table 1 P 15 L 20 # 97  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Wrong column heading  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change ""802.151"" to ""802.15.1""  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI 04 SC Table 1 P 15 L 20 # 19  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 In Table 1, column title 4 there is a typo ""802.151"".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest you change to ""802.15.1"".  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.  
 But this column was deleted, so the comment is no longer applicable.

CI 05 SC P 19 L # 99  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi  
 Comment Type T Comment Status A  
 It is not clear to me how a STA in 802.11, co-located with a 802.15.1 master can control the timing of the AP. Sorry for my ignorance  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Perhaps, a more detailed explanation ?  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The text on page 19 states that more information on the issue of AP synchronization is given in Clause 5.1. As explained in Clause 5.1 AP synchronization is not required. However, if a vendor chooses to implement it there are some benefits, as described in Clause 5.1.  
 How AP's are synchronized is outside the scope of this document. It is an implementation issue. One way it can be done is to have one device on the wired network to send global timing information to all the AP's. It works reasonably well and AP's can be synchronized to within a few milliseconds.

CI 05 SC 5 P 20 L 5 # 54  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 This is the first use of MSE in the recommended practice, so it should probably be spelled out.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to ""medium sharing element (MSE)"" at this location. Also, delete the extra blank lines below line 48.  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 The first occurrence of MSE is expanded, it occurs before the one commenter found.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl 05 SC 5.0 P 21 L 13 # 21  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The xref to ""Annex I"" does not work.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest repairing the xref in FM. Please review all D8 xrefs and make the change globally.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Fixed error in cross-reference.  
 IEEE-SA staff will ensure that the cross-references work.

Cl 05 SC 5.2 P 22 L 23 # 98  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Doesn't ""Clause 5"" mean ""this clause"", or is it clause 5 of another document?

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""Clause 5"" to ""this clause"" or to ""above"" or specify the subclause the sentence refers to

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 Clause 5 is referring to the clause where this information is found. It is not found in any subclause of Clause 5. It is found in Clause 5 (i.e., the text in 5.0).  
 When the text was this clause, a previous working group letter ballot commenter wanted a cross refernce to the place where the information was given and not just the entire clause 5. This is the reason for the current text and why reverting back to suggested remedy does not work.

Cl 05 SC 5.2.2 P 23 L 18 # 56  
 Gilb, James Appairant Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The valid range, according to Table 2 on page 21 should be as follows: WLANInterval: Integer values between 0 and 32, inclusive. WPANInterval: Integer values between 0 and 32, inclusive. WGUARDInterval: Integer values between 0 and 10, inclusive.

SuggestedRemedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 Cannot limit WLANInterval to 0 to 32, or it will not work.  
 The other values are already as indicated.  
 Aligned WPANInterval to include 0 in both tables.

Cl 05 SC 5.2.2 P 23 L 9 # 55  
 Gilb, James Appairant Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The word description is the subject of the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

It is either ""The descriptions of these parameters are"" or ""The description of these parameters is""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Used plural option.

Cl 05 SC 5.2.2.1 P 23 L 32 # 57  
 Gilb, James Appairant Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Because the draft is discussing 802.11b, it should use the same nomenclature.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'station managment entity' to be 'station managment entity (SME)', change 'station' to be 'STA' here and throughout, and change other occurances of 'station managment entity' to be just 'SME'. (e.g. page 24, lines 47-53.)

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 Spelled out terms are easiler to understand than acronyms.

Cl 05 SC 5.3 P 28 L 44 # 58  
 Gilb, James Appairant Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The two sentences are too short and really belong togehter.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to '... is 0.625 us and so the SCO ...'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Combined the sentences by changing so to and.



P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl 06 SC 6.1 P 30 L 8-9 # 107

Pardee, John innov8rs LLC

Comment Type E Comment Status R

"they effect the probability of a collision. (Should be affect)

SuggestedRemedy

check usage of effect vs affect

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This appears to be a English grammer problem that can only be solved by the final decision of the IEEE-SA editor who will be reviewing the draft to conform to its style. The English style guide that I use permits the use effect for both positions. I recognize the difference (effect = noun & affect = verb), which has been deprecated.

Cl 06 SC 6.3 P 31 L 43 # 59

Gilb, James Appairtent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The information really doesn't follow, it is just described in Table 13.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'following'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 06 SC 6.5 P 34 L 6 # 60

Gilb, James Appairtent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Font foo in the table, which usually happens when you paste text from the body of the draft into a table. It keeps its old font size. Just reapplying 'Cell Body' format to the cell won't work.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the paragraph format to 'Code' and then change it back to 'Cell body', that should fix it.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Did as instructed because I did not see the problem that the commenter did.

Cl 06 SC 6.9 P 37 L 5 # 61

Gilb, James Appairtent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The word 'may' indicates that it is optional

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the word 'optionally'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 06 SC Table 10 P 30 L 16 # 22

Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The column headings in Table 10 (and Table 11) are not standard format (see IEEE Standards Style Manual pg 20, Table 2.).

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the column headings in Table 10 be (1) reformated to have bold or whatever the FM default is and that both of the column 2 headings be centered. Please make the change globally.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Changed text from Cellbody to CellHeading.

Cl 07 SC 7 P 37 L 20 # 63

Gilb, James Appairtent Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

All of the MAC collaboration methods can be used with this PHY method.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'with the PTA MAC sublayer solution.' to be 'with other MAC sublayer solutions.'

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Not applicable to AWMA, since this solution never transmits at the same time.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 07 SC 7 P 37 L 20 # 62  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Various editorial.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'physical layer' to 'PHY', delete 'and the results for the 1 Mbps/ IEEE 802.11b DSSS System.' On line 25 'Note that between the' to 'Note that in Figure 10 between the'

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

-PHY stands for physical, not physical layer, so this change would not be correct, if accepted.

-Delete end of sentence.

-Added figure 10 crossreference.

CI 07 SC Figures 10 and 11 P 38 L 140 # 23  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The Figures are not standard format see IEEE Standards Style Manual pg 21 and review the other figures in D8.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest resaving the Figures with borders or delete the borders. The Editor may just have to diddle w/ the Anchored Frame cmd in FM. Please make the change globally.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 08 SC P 40 L 17 # 64  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Missing word 'in'. Also, the word 'can' is used on line 18, it should be 'may'

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'shown in Annex C in Figure C.6 and ...', change 'can' to 'may' or rewrite the sentence so that it doesn't use 'can'.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Added the word, "in", but did not change "can" to "may", since can means to be able which is the correct term. May implies permitted, there is no permission required to design a receiver. (See IEEE Standards Style Manual September 20, 2001 Clause 13 page 15)

CI 08 SC P 41 L 10 # 65  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Delete 'for information'

SuggestedRemedy

Change as indicated.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete for before information and add on after.

CI 08 SC 8 P 40 L 3 # 71  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Extra period in 'in Clause 7. requires'

SuggestedRemedy

Delete period.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 08 SC 8 P 41 L 3 # 100  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Missing space in ""with (lambda) = 1corresponding to infinite memory"

SuggestedRemedy

Insert space between ""1"" and ""corresponding

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 08 SC 8.0 P 41 L 3 # 24  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The sentence "...1 corresponding to infinite..." is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest "...1 corresponding to infinite..."; which adds a space after the ""1"" that appears to be missing in the PDF version.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl 09 SC 9.2 P 43 L 1 # 66  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Missing articles and change one word.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to 'HV1' to be 'The HV1 packet' for HV1, HV2 and HV3 on lines 1 and 2 as well as on line 15. Also, change 'demonstrated' to be 'illustrates' on line 10.  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 09 SC 9.2 P 43 L 67 # 25  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The sentence "...such as IEEE 802.11b network." is incorrect  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest "...such as an IEEE 802.11b network."; adding "an".  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 09 SC 9.2 P 44 L 27 # 67  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Badly formed sentence.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "On the other hand, when the system is interference limited, the 802.15.1 device should reduce the number of bits transmitted by choosing more bandwidth efficient packet format such as DH1, DH3 or DH5."  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 10 SC 10 P 44 L 42 # 68  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Extra period following 'Clause 11.' and 'Figure 16..' (page 45, line 2)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please delete extra periods.  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 10 SC 10.0 P 44 L 3452 # 26  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 The sentences "This scheduling mechanism consists of two components. These two components are channel classification and master delay policy." led me to think I was going to see an ordered or unordered list.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest the Editor consider adding an ordered list for the two components e.g., a), b) or 1), 2). Up to you.  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 Adding an ordered list would violate IEEE style manual of only one list per (sub)clause. (See IEEE Standards Style Manual September 20, 2001 11.2 page 14)

Cl 11 SC 11 P 45 L 50 # 69  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Missing articles.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 'Interference free' to be 'An interference free' and change 'while interference laden' to be 'while an interference laden'  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.0 P 45 L 5254 # 27  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The first part of the following sentence "Channel classification information..." makes an assumption.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest the sentence introduction be rewritten as "IEEE Std 802.15.1-2002 Channel classification information..." or something else that helps the reader know that this clause is talking about 802.15.1 not 802.11b.  
 Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Added IEEE Std 802.15.1-2002 to end of first sentence in the clause.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI 11 SC 11.2 P 47 L 27 # 70  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Various editorial

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 'instances' to 'describes' on line 27. Change 'The transmission of slave's calssification data should by via LMP commands.' to 'The slave's classification data should be transmitted via LMP commands.' on line 35 and 36. Change 'weights to what the master itselfv observes' to be 'weights on the data collected by the master.' on line 43. Change 'discusses how the' to be 'discusses the method by which the' on line 47.

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Most of the changes in the suggested remedy were accepted, but not entirely as written.

CI A SC A.1 P 51 L 2528 # 28  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 The alpha ordered list is confusing with regards to this annex.

SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest the use of an unordered list of dashes vs. a, b, c, etc. Please make the change globally in the annexes (see Annex B, pg55).

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 Do not see the confusion when an ordered list is used in an annex.

CI A SC A.1 P 51 L 30 # 72  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 Missing articles.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to 'between an HV3 packet and an EV3 packet.'"

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT.

CI B SC B.0 P 55 L 1112 # 29  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R  
 The sentence ""This information is included for historical reference to the numerous attempts to harmonize this mechanism with the Bluetooth SIG."" seems to have negative implications.

SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest rewriting or deletion.

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 REJECT.  
 This statement is true and represents the frustration over the IEEE's the adoption of the Bluetooth specification as an IEEE 802 standard, but yet the IEEE is not permitted to change any of the IEEE 802.15.1-2002 contents in order to establish a recommended practice when it is used.

CI B SC B.1 P 57 L 4 # 101  
 Freedman, Avraham Hexagon System Engi

Comment Type T Comment Status R  
 The equations are not clear. There is no definition of NG and NBK.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Clarify, or simply move the first part of B.1.1 before figure B.1

Proposed Response Response Status U  
 REJECT.  
 As the commenter suggests, these are defintions and thus are contained in the defintions clause, 3. The definitions of NG and NBK are listed under subclause 3.3. Therefore no change is necessary.

CI C SC C.0 P 67 L 812 # 30  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
 The use of subclause in introductory paragraph ""Subclause C.1 introduces..." is not necessary.

SuggestedRemedy  
 I suggest deleting the word subclause and using ""C.1"".

Proposed Response Response Status C  
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Changed all of the other uses of subclause within that paragraph, so it is consistent.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl C SC C.11 P 85 L # 6  
 O'Farrell, Timothy University of Leeds

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The x-axis in Figure c.11 of Appendix C states an Eb/No (dB) scale. The scale should be SIR (dB).

Also, there is no mention that the results are presented for an AWGN channel as in the earlier figures of this Appendix.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The x-axis scale should be SIR (dB).

The type of channel applicable (i.e. AWGN) should be clearly mentioned in the figure caption.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Figure C.11 x-axis changed "Eb/N0 [dB]" to "SIR (db)"  
 The text preceeding the Figure C.11 clearly states AWGN, so no change to figure title is necessary.

Cl C SC C.12 P 86 L # 7  
 O'Farrell, Timothy University of Leeds

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The type of channel for which the results apply is not indicated.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The results were obtained for an AWGN channel and this should be clearly indicated in the figure caption of C.12

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 "AWGN channel." added to the figure caption.

Cl C SC C.3.5 P 71 L 38 # 73  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The draft does not specify the method that was used to determine either the TX or RX numbers in Table C.4.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a short description for the TX attenuation numbers, e.g. ""The transmit attenuation numbers come from the transmit power spectral density requirements of their respective standards. Typical implemenations will achieve better performance so these numbers can be considered as 'worst case' numbers."" For the RX numbers, it appears to be the jamming requirements plus the SNR required at those measurements (which is a good way to calculate them). If that is the case, then state this in the paragraph on line 34 (with the comments on the TX attenuation) and give an example, e.g. ""For example, the 802.15.1 standard requires 30 dB blocking performance at an offset of 2 MHz. If the SIR that is required is 11 dB, then the total attenuation is 11+30 = 41 dB.""

Proposed Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Added TX text as a footnote to the table.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex and the result is an informative footnote to a table.

Cl C SC C.3.5 P 72 L 1 # 74  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The text says that a mysterious extra 8 dB of coding gain is added when analyzing 5.5 and 11 Mb/s 802.11b. However, the coding gain is already included in the BER calculations for 802.11b. Furthermore, this extra 8 dB of coding is included in Annex D, but it isn't used anywhere in that file. I know that in order to meet the old FCC rules, implementer had to claim 10 dB of processing gain, even though that is not possible with the CCK mode. It is possible to construct a receiver that passes the jamming margin test (i.e. one with an adaptive notch filter) that also has much less than 10 dB of coding/spreading gain.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the sentence. Alternatively, find where this fictitious number was used and re-run the simulations without this fudge factor.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Delete sentence

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl C SC C.3.6.1 P 72 L 31 # 75  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The equation is beginning to make more sense now, however we are still missing a definition of rho. It is in the range 0 to 1, both inclusive, but what value do we choose? It seems that this should be dependent on the modulation index. If the new equation is for orthogonal FSK, then the draft could have kept the old equation. In fact, the old equation is still what shows up in Annex D. It is probably the equation that was used for all of the simulations.

SuggestedRemedy

1) Define how the value of rho is selected. 2) Either add back in the old equation and note that Annex D and the simulations use this equation or update Annex D to use the new equation and update all of the results.

Proposed Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

One can select Rho as one pleases (it is best to choose one that provides the best fit) that is the reason for the range as indicated in the draft, and claim that the code in annex D is an approximation.

Cl C SC C.3.6.2 P 72 L 51 # 4  
 Shipp, Neil Commsonic

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Differential modulation schemes don't double the effective noise power - that would be caused by a true differential demodulator. However, most systems (certainly Intersil Prism) will use a coherent demod and only suffer a doubling of BER caused by the differential modulation - at moderate BERs this is <1dB loss and not 3dB.

SuggestedRemedy

Ideally remove the statement and correct the calculation - however this will mean other figures like C.4 need to be re-calculated to move the 1 and 2Mbit/s curves about 2.5dB to the left.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

We have used 3dB as a conservative figure, as stated in footnote 1.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

Cl C SC C.3.6.3 P 74 L 9 # 5  
 Shipp, Neil Commsonic

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Gray coding does mean one bit error per symbol error but there are twice as many bits as symbols for QPSK and hence the SER will be twice the BER. Also owing to the differential decoding a single bit error will always result in a second bit error on the next symbol.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the statement and also check its impact on the following calculations and BER curves.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Since the adjacent dibits (symbol) are only one bit different, if an error occurs in decoding a symbol only one bit is in error.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

Cl C SC C.3.6.4 P 74 L 15 # 76  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The SER can be evaluated as a block code, but only for relatively large values of the SNR. For example, equation 19 has a value of 4 as the SIR gets smaller while equation 22 approaches a value of 64 as the SIR gets smaller.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a note to line 16 that indicates that these formulas are not accurate for small values of the SIR. Also add a similar note to C.3.6.5.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl C SC C.3.6.7 P 75 L 24 # 77  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Forcing the BER to 0.5 below the lower limit does take care of the problem with equations 19 and 22 losing accuracy for small values of the SIR. However, it would help the reader if this reason was pointed out at this location. (note that the Barker code equations do approach the correct value of the BER for small SIR).

SuggestedRemedy

Add a short note here that the lower limit handles the problems with equations 19 and 22.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

Cl C SC C.4.1 P 76 L 52 # 78  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The reduced number of hopping channels (23) is introduced without explanation.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a short note to this sentence that the number of hopping channels in 802.15.1 are determined by the regulatory limits in some countries.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
 No mention is deemed necessary, since knowledge of the normative references is required for understanding this recommended practice.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

Cl C SC C.4.1 P 77 L 20 # 79  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Equation 12 is concerned with adaptive hopping, not interfering signals at the center frequency.

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps this is a reference to a figure somewhere? Otherwise, delete the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Deleted sentence.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

Cl C SC C.4.1.1 P 78 L 22 # 80  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The sentence implies that when a GFSK signal has a BT=0.5, a single data bit is spread over two consecutive symbols. This is not true, the Gaussian wave form has no limit in time, it is up the implementer to choose a truncation point in their implementation, if it is digital, or an approximation to the Gaussian filter, if the implementatin is analog.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to read ""In the simulations presented here, a single data bit is spread only over two consecutive symbols, i.e. L=2. However, the actual number of symbols that the bit is spread over will vary among different implementations.""

Proposed Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add approximately

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

Cl C SC C.4.2 P 79 L 26 # 81  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The 2 Mb/s mode is missing and the first sentence does not read well.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first sentence to read ""The PHY system models for the 1, 2, 5.5 and 11 Mb/s modes of IEEE 802.11b standard are described in this subclause."" Also, try to get the Mbit/s to sit on one line at line 28, page 79.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

Cl C SC C.4.2.4 P 82 L 48 # 82  
 Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Table C.7 has a format error, it says p instead of pi

SuggestedRemedy

Change the font to Symbol.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI C SC C.4.2.4 P 83 L 1 # 83  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The second sentence is incorrect, the figure does show an interferer as well as the noise.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence or change the figure.

Proposed Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Only AWGN is considered for the n(t) channel.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

CI C SC Figure C.1 P 67 L 2746 # 31  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The use of shading in the figure makes it harder to read the text.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest deleting the shading. Also, the periodicity text (bottom of the figure) font size is very small. Can you make it bigger? Or you can delete the repetitive "period of stationarity" and place it at the bottom as an axis title.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Removed the shading and increased outline of packets and frames.  
 The use of "period of stationarity" was done to remove the commenter's previous comment about using "POS" being confused with personal operating space.

CI D SC P 89 L # 8  
 O'Farrell, Timothy University of Leeds

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The source code of Appendix D is provided without a flow diagram schematic. To enhance understanding and accessibility of the program material a flow diagram schematic is required.

SuggestedRemedy

Include a flow diagram schematic of the source code presented in Appendix D.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 The BRC does not know of any requirements to supply a flow diagram for code, therefore one will not be created and included.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

CI D SC D.0 P 89 L 5 # 32  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The Annex title ""Source code for the physical analytical model"" could be more specific.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest the Editor consider changing to ""Source code for the physical layer analytical model""; adding ""layer"". Up to you.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI E SC E.0 P 97 L 10 # 33  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The word ""models"" is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

I reading Annex C I suggest that this word be changed to ""model""; or the singular case. Up to you.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 There are two physical layer models: one for 802.11b and one for 802.15.1.

CI E SC E.2 P 97 L 5054 # 34  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The use of ""BluetoothÖ1"" with the footnote in Annex E is correct but in the wrong location.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest moving the footnote to the first occurrence of Bluetooth. Page 16 (2x in footnote), Page 55 (intro), etc.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Moved to page 55 reference, since adding a footnote to a footnote (on page 16) does not seem possible in FrameMaker.



P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

**Cl F**      **SC F.0**                      **P 101**      **L 11**                      # **35**

Gifford, Ian                                      XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

The sentence ""computed according to"" appears to be incomplete.

**SuggestedRemedy**

I suggest ""computed according to:""; adding a colon or "":"". Up to you, I might be wrong.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

**Cl G**      **SC G.0**                      **P 103**      **L 6**                      # **36**

Gifford, Ian                                      XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

The Annex title ""Performance metrics"" could be more specific.

**SuggestedRemedy**

I suggest the Editor consider changing to ""802.15.1 performance metrics""; adding ""802.15.1"". Up to you.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

**Cl H**      **SC H.0**                      **P 105**      **L 89**                      # **37**

Gifford, Ian                                      XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

The intro sentence ""The simulation results to evaluate the performance of IEEE 802.15.1 in the presence of WLAN interference and vice versa are presented."" seems awkward.

**SuggestedRemedy**

I suggest ""This annex describes results of simulations that evaluate the performance of IEEE 802.15.1 in the presence of IEEE 802.11b interference and vice versa."" or something else that the Editor prefers. Up to you.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Cl H**      **SC H.1**                      **P 107**      **L 28**                      # **84**

Gilb, James                                      Appairant Technologie

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **R**

Figures H.2, H.6, H7. and H.10 would be much easier to see and understand if the scale for the y-axis was expanded. For example, in Figure H.2, set the top of the y-axis to be 0.2.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change as indicated.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.

The BRC thinks that it is better to have consistent values, to more easily see changes.

**Cl H**      **SC H.1**                      **P 108**      **L 10**                      # **85**

Gilb, James                                      Appairant Technologie

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

The units are missing from the y-axis of figures H.3, H.5, H.7, H.9, H.11 and H.13. It is in the figure title, but it really needs to be in the figure itself.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Please add the units (seconds) to the y-axis titles in figures H.3, H.5, H.7, H.9, H.11 and H.13.

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

Add seconds to axis and deleted (seconds) from figure title.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex. It also does not consider it technical, but rather editorial since it only requires a movement of the text.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI H SC H.1 P 108 L 26 # 86

Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The reader is left hanging here, why does the voice connection cause more problems than the data connection?

SuggestedRemedy

Please add an explanation. The most likely reason that the performance is better with data is that the effective hopping rate is only 320 hops/s (DH5 frames) and the frames are closer to the length of an 802.11 frame.

Proposed Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A voice connection is constantly sending a packet every 625 microsecond and using a different hopping frequency (1600hops/s), while the data connection may not be transmitting every 625 microseconds nor hopping at the same rate (<= 1600hops/s). The length of the frame being close to the 802.11 frame size has little to do with it.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

CI H SC H.2 P 109 L 39 # 87

Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Please add some analysis here to explain why there is a difference. Most likely, the degradation is due to the fact that the SIR requirements for 11 Mb/s CCK are greater than those for 1 Mb/s Barker.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.

It is better to present the data/results and let others draw their own conclusions. We do not dispute the conclusions that you have drawn, since this is what is explained in Annex C, which presents the analytical results.

CI H SC H.2 P 111 L 2 # 88

Gilb, James Appairnt Technologie

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

A comparison of the relative frame sizes, in us, of the HV1, DH5, 1 Mb/s and 11 Mb/s frames would help the reader to understand some the effects that are being presented here. The longer that the 802.11b becomes in time and the faster that 802.15.1 hops, the more likely that the two will collide. A simple table would describe this.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add a comparison of the relative lengths of the frames, in time, used in these simulations. Perhaps at the beginning of Clause H?

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.

No more explanation is deemed necessary.

BRC does not consider this a technical comment on the draft, since it relates to a informative annex.

CI I SC I.0 P 115 L 29 # 38

Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The sentence "...from probability theory." begs the question which reference?

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest adding a cross reference to the Annex N Bibliography and adding a suggested source.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT.

No reference is implied, except for the general understanding of probability.

CI J SC J.0 P 117 L 8 # 39

Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The intro sentence "Two figures are presented here." seems awkward.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest "This annex provides two figures that depict PTA 802.11b performance results." or something else that the Editor prefers. Up to you.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

P802.15.2 Draft 6 Comments

CI K SC K.0 P 119 L 8 # 40  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The xref to ""Figure C.9"" does not work and having it not work in Annex K is awkward especially in the introductory sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest repairing the xref in FM. Again, please review all D8 xrefs and make the change globally.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Fixed Figure C.9 crossreference  
 IEEE-SA staff will ensure all crossreferences work.

CI L SC L.0 P 121 L 14 # 41  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The parenthetical ""...(for the 1 Mbit/s DSSS)..."" is confusing in this paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest ""...(for the 802.11b 1 Mbit/s DSSS)..."".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI M SC M P 125 L 8 # 89  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The first sentence needs help.

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps ""This annex presents the simuations of the scheduling policy proposed in Clause 10.""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI M SC M P 126 L 40 # 90  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The Figure crossreference breaks across lines.

SuggestedRemedy

If you have a format defined for cross references, simply replace the regular space with a non-breaking space (ctrl-space, as I recall) and then import the cross-reference formats to every book in the draft. That way, cross references like Table 20 and Figure 10 won't be broken across lines, or even worse, across pages.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI M SC M P 127 L 3 # 91  
 Gilb, James Appairent Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The figure would look better after the paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Please move Figure M.3 so that it occurs after ""... signal is too weak.""

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI M SC M.0 P 125 L 8 # 42  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The xref ""clause10"" works but it is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest ""Clause 10""; adding a space and capitalizing the ""C"".

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.  
 Corrected cross reference.

CI N SC N.3.1 P 130 L 19 # 43  
 Gifford, Ian XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The sentence ""...November 1999"" is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest ""...November 1999.""; adding the period.

Proposed Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

**C/ N**      **SC N.3.3**                      **P 130**      **L 44**      # **44**  
 Gifford, Ian                                  XtremeSpectrum, Inc.

*Comment Type*    **E**                      *Comment Status*    **A**

The sentence "...to appear in Proceeding of IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference, September 2002." is referring to a future event but it is in the past.

*SuggestedRemedy*

I suggest confirming publication and if yes change to the past tense "...appeared in Proceeding of IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference, September 2002."

*Proposed Response*                      *Response Status*    **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 It was published as indicated in the previous subclause, but editor forgot to remove it from this subclause.

**C/ N**      **SC N.3.3**                      **P 130**      **L 44**      # **102**  
 Freedman, Avraham                      Hexagon System Engi

*Comment Type*    **E**                      *Comment Status*    **A**

The last reference does not appear in IEEE trans. on VT, sept. 2002.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Check and complete the reference

*Proposed Response*                      *Response Status*    **C**

ACCEPT.  
 The paper does not appear in IEEE trans. on VT sept 2002 as commentor stated, but then the draft does not state that it would either. It states in the proceedings of IEEE VT Conference September 2002, which is listed in N.3.2. This is a duplicate entry and subclause N.3.3 and its reference have been removed.