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

Responses to LMSC Ballot on Draft Standard 802.11 D5.0
Resolutions for Comments on Clause 10

Seq. #	Clause number	your voter's ID code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
1	10 6.1.3 7.1.3.1. 9.8	MT	T		**ref: MT_14** **The strictly order service class does not accomplish the necessary goals. The current definition allows for a STA only to order its transmitted packets. The requirement is that the received packets maintain order. What is needed is a method for a station to identify to all other stations of this requirement.** **See also MT_15**	**During the AUTHENTICATION process (since authentication is common among infrastructure and IBSS networks, and association is not), additional information such as capability and requirements should be exchanged. At this time, a STA requiring that its incoming frames be in order, would identify this requirement. In this way, all frames from each communicating station will be in order.**	**Author withdrew comment after discussion.**
2	10.3.2, 11.1.3	SB	t	N	Clause 11.1.3 states that: *A station performs scanning when it has aScanState equal True. aDesiredSSID indicates the SSID which is to be scanned for, together with whether Infrastructure BSSs, Independent BSSs, or both, are to be included in the scan.* Now 10.3.2.1 defines the MLMESCAN.request primitive which initiates a scan (this cannot be done by a MLMESET.request on aScanState since this is GET only). MLMESCAN.request includes several parameters that define the nature of the scan (some of these have corresponding MIB attributes such as aScanMode). So the intended activities on receipt of a MLMESCAN.request would seem to be to set certain	Probably the easiest thing to do is to add the text to the 'effect of receipt'. This request shall update aDesiredSSID and aScanMode, and set aScanState true initiate the scan process when the current transmission/reception is completed. Some clarification changes might also be made to 11.1.3 to make the role of MIB attributes and MLME primitives clearer	comment is withdrawn (w.r.t. clause 10) by discussion with the author of this comment, MIB variables are not to be described or referenced in clause 10.

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
					MIB attributes and then change scan state. The problem is it doesn't actually say this anywhere. Either 10.3.2.1 should make reference to the scan related MIB attributes, or 11.1.3 should say that scanning is initiated by the receipt of a MLMESCAN.request.		
3	10.3.2.2	TLP	e, t		A requirement is under-specified — as originally worded, any combination of elements in any order could be returned. The resulting MIB entry would not be suitable for the MLMEJOIN.request primitive.	Change to read "The BSSDescriptionSet is returned ... It is a set containing zero or more instances of aBSSDescription , each of which consists of the following elements:"	**comment is accepted**

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
4	10.3.4	TLP	E, t	Yes	The conceptualization and wording of the four primitives MLMEAUTHENTICATE and MLMEDEAUTHENTI CATE .request and .confirm is unbelievably sloppy. These primitives are across management boundaries within a single STA, not between stations. Were the latter the case, you would need .indication and .response primitives, which are not specified. Therefore, since these are local primitives, the terms Local and Remote are inconsistent, and the effect on receipt is the effect on the local operational entity on receipt of the local management request — there is no "remote" entity at all. This entire portion of the Layer Management clause must be rewritten to conform to accepted OSI practice, and to clearly convey whatever was intended by the authors. I made a number of attempted corrections in this sub-subsection before concluding that the entire process was hopeless; they remain in the submitted revision-marked files but should be taken only as indicative of the enormous confusion engendered by this inadequate explication. For greater clarity on the required primitives and perspectives, see *ISO/TR 8509:1987, Information processing systems — Open systems interconnection — Service conventions* and *ISO/IEC 10731:1992, Information technology — Open systems interconnection — Conventions* for the definition of, and proper form for documenting, OSI services.	This entire portion of the Layer Management clause must be rewritten to conform to accepted OSI practice, and to clearly convey whatever was intended by the authors. The annotations in the submitted revision-marked files are indicative of the extreme confusion in conceptualization found within the documentation of these four primitives.	**comment is accepted** The descriptions for these primitives have been rewritten to more accurately convey the desired intentions. Also, .indicate primitives were added where needed.

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
5	10.3.4.2 10.3.5.2 10.3.8.2	TLP	e, t		Is there any constraint on the address(es) returned by .confirm primitives? In particular, must they have some relationship to address(es) on corresponding request primitives?	State any required relationships, using verbs such as "shall".	**comment is accepted** The parameter descriptions for the cited primitives have been expanded to include the required constraints on the address value that is returned. Note that there is no such requirement for 10.3.8.2 since a STA can only be associated with a single AP.
6	10.3.6.1	TLP	E, t		As with the Authenticate primitives, the receiver of a "layer" management request is the local operational entity; there is no "Remote" entity to discuss. Were the operational entity to convey the request to a remote entity, then it would be delivered to that remote entity by a .indicate primitive, as required by the previously-cited OSI standards.	Correct the referents; remove the word "remote" and substitute appropriate descriptive terminology.	**comment is accepted** The descriptions for these primitives have been rewritten to more accurately convey the desired intentions. Also, .indicate primitives were added where needed.
7	10.3.7.1	TLP	e		All layer management primitives are local. To state so is more than redundant; it implies that a remote primitive is possible, which it is not, given your lack of use of the .indicate and .response primitives. If a primitive causes the local entity to initiate some network activity, then say so. But receipt of a primitive within the STA by the local operational entity does not inevitably result in successful communication, let alone remote action.	Remove the terms "Local" and "Remote".	**comment is accepted** The descriptions for these primitives have been rewritten to more accurately convey the desired intentions. Also, .indicate primitives were added where needed.

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
8	10.3.8.1	TLP	t		The function of this primitive is actually the obverse of that described. This primitive acts locally, but is described as if its actions were remote.	Change to read "This primitive requests that the local STA disassociate itself from the specified remote STA. "	**comment is accepted** Also changed 'STAaddress" to "RemoteSTAAddress". The RemoteSTAAddress parameter (DA) shall specify the individual AP address for the AP with which the STA is currently associated.
9	10.3.8.1	TLP	e, t		The effect of receipt of this local primitive is described as being remote from the only physical entity which is cognizant of the primitive. This is ludicrous. However, the primitive may, but is not guaranteed to, have some remotely-visible consequences, and those should be documented as "possible but not guaranteed".	Change the text to read "The effect of the receipt of this primitive is to change the internal state of the local STA or AP to correspond to having no current association, and to generate an MLMEDISASSOCIATE.confirm primitive. It may also cause the internal state of the peer STA or AP with which the association existed to reflect the disassociation."	**comment is accepted** The descriptions for these primitives have been rewritten to more accurately convey the desired intentions. Also, .indicate primitives were added where needed.
10	10.3.all	TLP	E		Throughout the earlier clauses of this document, names formed by concatenating many words and/or acronyms have the first letter of each constituent word, or all the letters of each constituent acronym, capitalized. This policy assists those readers for whom English is not their first language by assisting the reader's separation of the constructed name into its constituent parts. This policy must be continued throughout this clause.	Change words formed from concatenation, as appropriate. (The submitted revision-marked files contains such corrections.)	**comment is accepted**
11	10.4	TLP	e		The word "above" is a gravitational reference which is not correct. It is unlikely to be higher on the same page, unless the entire clause is printed on a scroll.	Replace "above" with "previously".	**comment is accepted** Words have many meanings. Common usage of the word "above" includes the meaning of "previously", as if the document *had* been printed on a continuous "virtual" scroll. Nevertheless, the recommended change is accepted.