

Comment Status Report

| CommenterName | CommentType | CommentID | Clause | Subclause | Page | Line |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-----------|------|------|
| Nikolich, Paul | T | | 9 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |

Comment

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

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.

Response

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 amendments 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.

Comment Status Report

| CommenterName | CommentType | CommentID | Clause | Subclause | Page | Line |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-----------|------|------|
| O'Farrell, Timothy | T | | 8 D | | 89 | |

Comment

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.

Response

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.