

**IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs**

**Report of Ballot on IEEE P802.11 D4
AFTER Resolutions**

Date: July 24, 1996

Author: Vic Hayes, Chair IEEE P802.11
Lucent Technologies WCND
Zadelstede 1-10
Phone: +31 30 609 7528
Fax: +31 30 609 7555
e-Mail: v.hayes@ieee.org

The statement:

“I approve the IEEE P802.11 proposed draft standard P802.11/D4 (sorry the form said “D3”, only Johnny marked it up) to be forwarded for sponsor ballot”

was **approved** with the following result:

Ballot result (before resolution)

Of the voting members and nearly voting members the result is 54 approving and 5 not approving. That is a support of 91.5 % (75 % is needed).

The complete result is as follows:

Memembr type	Do not approve	Approve	Abstain	Belated approve	Grand Total
Aspirant members	0	2			2
Nearly Voting members	2	1		1	4
lost voter status.	0	1			1
Voting members	3	53	1		57
Grand Total	5	57	1		64

The ballot is valid because 75 % of the voting members (we had 76 voting members at the beginning of the ballot) returned their ballot. (50 % is required)

The abstain was due to “lack of expertise”. one nearly member voted for approve after the closinure of the ballot. Ron Mahany reported problems with his computer while on the road. He would reconstruct the comments, but was not able to submit it this morning.

Ballot Result after resolution:

58 approving, 1 not approving and 1 abstaining.

Comments

I have made the best effort to consolidate the comments into a set of documents with document numbers consisting of the number and a sequence number. This document is -1, -2 is the general comment, comment on the foreword, title pages and so on and on the annexes. -3 is on clauses 5-9 (MAC), -4 is on clauses 10 and 11 (management), -5 is on clauses 12-16 (PHY).

The comments have been sorted on section number. I have included the Sequence number, but made a mistake in the MAC series (61 skipped).

Responses of NO voters after resolution meeting

Mack Sullivan:

July 2, 1996

Vic,

Although I do have minor technical concerns as expressed in my "no" vote, in the interest of helping to move the standard forward to its most rapid completion, I am prepared to change my vote to a "yes", without delay. This is for your information, and for anyone else who is interested.

Thanks, and congratulations!

Mack

John Biddick

July 11, 1996

Vic:

After learning more about the current patent policies of IEEE and how they apply to the 802.11 working group, I hereby change my no vote on D4.0 to yes.

Sincerely,

John Biddick.

Anil Sanwalka

July 10, 1996

Dear Simon,

I agree to change my "NO" vote to "YES".

Sincerely

Anil K. Sanwalka

Joe Kubler

July 10, 1996

I accept the changes made to the text to clarify the operation of non-CF pollable stations during contention free period and thereby change my vote to a yes vote.

Joe Kubler

Eran Shpak

Thursday, July 11, 1996

From Eran Shpak

Vic, Naftali,

Thank yo for informing me the voting results regarding my D4.0 draft standard reservations.

I apologize for not attending the July meeting due to prior business engagements.

I have reconsidered my position in view of the committee's arguments. Enclosed is my response:

My colleagues have also gone through extensive comparative analyses and simulations of different modulation schemes. In our view the linear modulation scheme (1.6 Mb/s QPSK, 3.2 Mb/s 16QAM, 4.8 Mb/s 64QAM) we have tested, may be employed "without throwing away five years of work by 802.11". It seems today's technology renders the above scheme publicly accessible and marketable.

I could arrange for a presentation of the modulation scheme before the committee.

In my view, my suggestion a presentation makes my position a valid NO vote since I come forward with a constructive action before the committee.

I am aware that this was reviewed in the past by the committee. In view of our success in thoroughly examining the above scheme it may be prudent to reconsider this resolution.

I wish to reaffirm my position that, IMHO, approval of 1/2 Mb/s PHY may impeded the natural utilization of the scarce global bandwidth allocation in the 2.4 GHz ISM band in time, assuming the P802.11 becomes prevalent.

Regards,

Eran Shpak

WaveAccess (formerly AirAccess) LTD

Tables with votes and with initials

The tables have been updated to reflect the changed votes.

The remainder of this document shows the vote per individual. I have also provided a list with the initials used in the tables for the source of comments, both sorted on last name and on initials.

Please let me know if your comments were not correctly represented in this document.

Legend:

w is the voter status: m is voting member, nm is nearly voting member (participated in 2 meetings), am is aspirant member (participated in 1 meeting)

vote: y is approve, yl is belated approve, n is do not approves, a is abstain

comments: y is comments included