

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

Results of LMSC Ballot on Draft Standard 802.11 D5.0 -

Resolutions for Comments on Clauses 12-16

	12.3.2	PMK	e		"...is seperated into to sublayers:..."	"is separated into two sublayers:"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.3	KC	T		It would be better layering if the standard included a section here such as "(3) Service primitives that support timekeeping." and all timers moved out of the MAC layer and into the PHY clause 12 as services. This would allow an implementation of the entire MAC layer as an object that could be completely tested at this boundary with simulated events.		postponed for full working group plenary full plenary motion to reject the comment (Wim/Anil) this change will be somewhat widesweeping and will certainly cause delays in producing the draft. (this comment is rejected by 20-0-7 vote)
	12.3.3	TLP	e		Change first sentence to be literate English.	Change to read "The primitives associated with communication between the 802.11 MAC Sublayer and the 802.11 Physical Layer fall into two basic categories:"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.4.3	TLP	e		Put the two primitives PHYDATA.request and PHYDATA.indicate on separate lines within a single table entry (as shown in the submitted revision-marked files).	Change column title to "Associated Primitive" and make a two-line entry in the first data row, second column.	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.5.1.2	TLP	E	Yes	Other portions of this standard use the syntax 0xNN for the hexadecimal number NN. This section uses 00 through FFh. Either syntax is acceptable, though the 0xNN syntax is more self-explanatory. But whichever, is used, please be consistent throughout the entire standard.	Use hexadecimal nomenclature consistent with the rest of this draft standard.	postponed for full working group plenary a vote in the full plenary approved using xxh nomenclature throughout the standard as this method more formally matches the use of SI units elsewhere in the draft. WG vote (14-3-13)

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

	12.3.5.10.2	TLP	e		poor conceptualization and wording. For example, a "channel assessment" process should observe a "channel", not a "medium".	Change second indented paragraph to read "The STATE parameter can be one of two values: BUSY or IDLE. The parameter value shall be BUSY if the channel assessment by the PHY sublayer determines that the channel is not available. Otherwise the value of the parameter shall be IDLE."	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.5.10.3	TLP	e		Use of undefined term.	Change "clear" to "idle" twice.	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.5.10.2 14.3.3.2.2 9.2.5.2,	SB	t	N	<p>Clause 14.3.3.2.2 says:</p> <p>The appropriate CS/CCA indication shall be generated prior to the end of each 50 μs slot time with the performance specified in subclause 14.6 (PMD).</p> <p>(The CS/CCA indication is by PHYCCA.indicate as in figure 68)</p> <p>While clause 12.3.5.10.2 says about PHYCCA.indicate:</p> <p>This primitive shall be generated every time the status of the channel changes from channel clear to channel busy or from channel busy to channel clear.</p> <p>Clearly there is some conflict here - one says that the primitive is issued on a time basis once per slot time even if the channel state has not changed, the other on a physical event (a change of channel state) irrespective of time. If I look at the PHY chapters the FH chapter (Figure 68) would seem to follow 14.3.3.2.2 and the DS (Figure 83) follows 12.3.5.10.2</p> <p><i>Actually this is pretty important for compliance given the rules that define when the back-off timer may, or may not be decremented in 9.2.5.2</i></p>	<p>Correct conflict one way or the other - do I get a regular PHY CCA indication per slot time, or only when the channel state changes.</p> <p>(It also occurs to me that the first two sentences of clause 14.3.3.2.2 are duplicated in the immediately previous clause.)</p>	<p>Clause 14.3.3.2.2 will be changed "shall be available ..."</p> <p>clause 12 will be left unchanged</p> <p>the MAC (9.2.5.2 and 9.2.4) backoff in whole slot increments, and as long as the phy reports changes in CCA state accordingly, not a problem. Taken as whole, the PHYs will report PHYCCA.indicate at the specified times and can appear as continuous to the MAC</p> <p>FG vote (9-0-3)</p>

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

	12.3.5.12.2	TLP	e		State machines do not "think". Please avoid anthropomorphizing equipment and software.	Change first two sentences of second indented paragraph to read "The RXERROR parameter can convey one or more of the following values: NoError, FormatViolation, CarrierLost, or UnsupportedRate. A number of error conditions may occur after the PLCP's receive state machine has detected what appeared to be a valid preamble and start frame delimiter."	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.5.12.2	TLP	e		Use of inappropriate word.	Change last word from "encountered" to "detected"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.3.5.8.4	TLP	e	Yes	The word "packet" (a network layer concept) is used where "frame" is appropriate. Please use the appropriate OSI Basic Reference Model terminology.	Change "packet" to "frame".	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.all	TLP	e		Use of undefined jargon	Replace "node" with "station" (or "STA") everywhere	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC
	12.all 5.1.1.2 (c) 5.2.4.1 5.4 9.2.1 14.all 15.some 16.all	TLP	e	Yes	The wireless medium is definitely singular (unless there is an alternate universe with multiple "ethers"), or unless P802.11 is extending its charter to acoustic modes of transmission.	change "edia" to "edium" everywhere except when referring to wired media.	for clauses 12 and 15 accepted as result of accepting REVSEC9.DOC and REVSEC12.DOC
	13.1.1.1	TLP	e		The attribute name for slot time needs to be spelled consistently with earlier uses in the standard.	Change to "aSlotTime" everywhere in this section	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.1.1	TLP	e		The A in CCA already stands for Assessment. You can't have Clear Channel Assessment Assessment Time. Even MS-Word flags it as redundant.	Change to "aCCATime" everywhere in this section	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.1.1	TLP	e		Missing paragraph mark after "aMACPrcDelay"	Add end-of-paragraph mark after corrected "aMACProcessingDelay"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Comment type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	13.1.1.3	TLP	t		The concept of antenna appears, from all its occurrences, to be thought of within this standard as only relevant to RF. However, it could also apply to IR transmit/receive apparatus	This applicability to IR should be pointed out somewhere within the text, perhaps in one of the first antenna-related attribute definitions.	rejected There is no desire by the IR group to provide for multiple antennas (Francois Lopez/Jan Boer) (9-0-2)
	13.1.2	WD	t		Management objects are now defined twice: in the std body (section 13.1) and in Annex D. There is no added value in this double definition. Suggest to remove the definitions in the std body (13.1) , if there is also a formal definitions in Annex D which has precedence anyway. However the use of this MIB is primarily by the local MAC entity itself, and its use is not relevant for Network Management purposes This could be a good reason to specifically not place them in Annex D, but indeed specify them in section 13.1 The definitions per PHY as given in sections 14.8.2, 15.3.4 and 16.4 are considered very relevant, because they define the values for the attributes per PHY.	Suggest to use only one definition in the standard, which is to be normative, and remove the other definitions. One possibility is to remove the definition in the std body (13.1), and to correct Annex D as applicable. However a summary of the relevant MIB parameters and their GET-REPLACE characteristics, like provided in section 13.1.2 can be functional here, and could be maintained in section 13. A more clear alternative would be to maintain the section 13.1 definitions, and remove them from Annex D, since these parameters are only of interest to the local MAC entity.	postpone for full working group plenary motion in full plenary to delete ANNEX D Annex D removed by unanimous vote
	13.1.4.	RM	e		In the followingsubclauses, use consistent units should be in microseconds	13.1.4.12 RxRFDelay 13.1.4.13 aRxPLCPDelay 13.1.4.15 aTxRampOffTime 13.1.4.42 aHopTime 13.1.4.44 aMaxDwellTime 13.1.4.45 aCurrentDwellTime	comment accepted in part. Refer to comment resolution of same comment in 14.8.2
	13.1.4.11 13.1.4.15	TLP	t		The time specified is an estimation of an actual future interval, and cannot be known exactly.	Change "The time in ..." to "The nominal time in ...".	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC will also add reference to 9.2.3.1 for tolerance specifications FG vote (11-0-1)
	13.1.4.14	RM	T	Y	aMACPrcDelay is critical parameter, without a defined value. Section 14.8.2.14 assumes a 2 usec value.	13.1.4.14 aMACPrcDelay MACPrcDelay ATTRIBUTE WITH	comment withdrawn by submitter

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
						APPROPRIATE SYNTAX integer; BEHAVIOR DEFINED AS "The nominal time in microseconds the MAC uses to process a frame and prepare a response to the frame"; <u>aMACPrcDelay = 2usecs</u> REGISTERED AS { iso(1) member-body(2) us(840) ieee802dot11(10036)phy(3) attribute(7)MACPrcDelay(14) };	
	13.1.4.15	TLP	e		Single occurrence of unknown unneeded acronym.	Change "PA" to "Power Amplifier"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.18	TLP	e		Inappropriate euphemism used, needlessly precludes use of this standard in space.	Change "over the air" to "through the wireless medium"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.19	TLP	T, E	Yes	This attribute is not a scalar, but a vector indexed by SID of all the other stations in the local BSS.	Please clarify your intent, or rewrite, or delete, or make this a structure with the MAC address or SID of the remote peer STA kept in the structure along with the inter-station propagation time.	comment rejected there is currently no means to measure the propagation time. The full WG voted in a 1usec fixed value some time ago (see also comment by MT in general comment section) FG vote (11-0-2)
	13.1.4.19	TLP	t		The time is anticipated, not known. This should be stated.	Change to "The anticipated time it ..."	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.2	TLP			The reader is unlikely to be familiar with the entire set of listed agencies. The countries corresponding to the agencies might be shown parenthetically. The list terminator needs to be added to this set of values. Some formatting of the list, at least so that it commences on a new line, would be useful.	Change to read "..the PLCP and PMD support in this implementation. Currently defined values and their corresponding Regulatory Domains are: FCC (USA) = 10h, IC (Canada) = 20h, ETSI (most of Europe) = 30h, Spain = 31h, France = 32h, MKK (Japan) = 40h, list terminator = 00h";".	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	13.1.4.20	TLP	T		The attribute is under-defined; it's coding (other than intenger) is not specified and implementors from different countries would naturally make incompatible choices. For example, is this coded as the minimum temperature of designed-for operation in milli-degrees Kelvin?	Add a specification of the attributes coding, either as a table of corresponding ranges	accepted text will be added to elaborate on the temperature ranges of Type 1 (0-40 deg C) Type 2 (-20 - 55 deg C) Type 3 (-30 - 70 deg C) corresponding changes will also be made to clauses 14, 15, and 16 PG vote (10-0-3)
	13.1.4.25	TLP	e		(1) It is unclear what is being measured or characterized by this parameter. Is it a transmit FIFO and pipeline depth, or the number of bits per PHY symbol, or the payload of an on-the-medium transmission unit, or what? (2) The existing text is illiterate.	Clarify intent within the committee and rewrite appropriately, in literate English. For example, the existing text should be rewritten to read "The maximum number of octets of an MPDU that can be conveyed by a PLCPDU"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.27 13.1.4.28 13.1.4.30	TLP	e		Failure in conceptualization. Surely antennae are not defined by integers. At least, not according to Webster's definition of "defined".	Rewrite each sub-sub-sub-section to a literate form, such as "Each antenna is represented by an integer, starting with antenna 1, and through antenna N, where $N \leq 255$;"	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.29	TLP	e		Poor exposition	Rewrite as "This implementation's support for diversity, encoded as: 01h — diversity is available and is performed over the fixed list of antennas defined in aDiversitySelectionRx. 02h — diversity is not supported. 03h — diversity is supported and control of diversity is also available, in which case the attribute aDiversitySelectionRx can be dynamically modified by the LME."	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.4	WD	E		"Behaviour" not same as "Description" in Annex D.	Suggest to remove the definitions in the std body (13.1), and to correct Annex D as applicable.	comment acted on in reverse! as a result of WG motion to delete ANNEX D
	13.1.4.4 4,	SB	t	N	Dwell time related MIB attributes are a complete mess in terms of units.	Please can we have some order here. It would be nice if the aMaxDwellTime	defer to FH group for resolution

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	13.1.4.4 5,7.3.2.3, 11.1.5, 14.8.2				13.1.4.4 defines aMaxDwellTime and aCurrentDwellTime in nanoseconds (!), the default values in 14.8.2 are in milliseconds and the comparison to a TSF timer value in 11.1.5 is to a time in microseconds. Lastly the value for the dwell time in the FH Parameter set element (7.3.2.3) is in Kmicroseconds.	and aCurrentDwellTime were in Kus since this is what a number of other MAC attributes such as aBeaconPeriod is in. It also ties up with the FH parameter set. It also makes the TSF time comparison easy (hence the beacon stuff). So: aMAXDwellTime should be in Kus and be a default value of 390 (399.360ms) aCurrentDwellTime should be in Kus and be a default value of 20.	REFER to comment resolution of same comment in 14.8.2
	13.1.4.55	TLP	e		Illeterate, perhaps partially due to typographic errors	Rewrite as "This parameter, together with CCAWatchdogCountMax, determines when energy detected in the channel can be ignored."	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.56	TLP	e		Illeterate, perhaps partially due to typographic errors	Rewrite as "This parameter, together with CCAWatchdogTimerMax, determines when energy detected in the channel can be ignored."	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC
	13.1.4.all	TLP	e		Many minor corrections are appropriate, as shown in the accompanying revision-marked files.	Change as shown in the accompanying revision-marked files.	accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	13.all	TLP	E	Yes	<p>Please take pity on non-native English speakers and use names that they have some slight chance of understanding. Mis-pronounceable subsets of English words, such as "suprt" for "supported", are not even close to acceptable. Similarly, what does "Asmnt" mean? How about "Lvls"?</p> <p>"Ths dcmnt is nt prntd fr clmns up." That tried to say "This document is not printed four columns up." Why are vowels so scarce that you can't use them? Please turn these names into something suitable for human consumption. This clause is not acceptable as it stands. I am balloting NO on it, for gross inconsideration of the intended readers.</p> <p>To simplify the task of fixing this clause, I have applied global transforms to produce more intelligible attribute names. See the submitted revision-marked files.</p>	<p>Use all of the letters in each constituent word unless the resulting word length is really impractical.</p> <p>See the submitted revision-marked files for an acceptable set of MIB names.</p>	<p>accepted as result of accepting REVSEC10.DOC</p>
	13.all 14.all	TLP	E	Yes	<p>IEEE and ISO/IEC editing rules require use of SI units and proper nomenclature. That includes capitalizing a unit derived from a person's name, and using the unit (W), not the name. It also includes using a non-break space between the amount and the unit, so that line-wrap cannot split the amount from the unit</p>	<p>Follow the IEEE and ISO/IEC editng rules with regard to units; there is no reason not to do so.</p>	<p>will use Kus instead of ms and will use SI units throughout the draft</p>
	14.	JMZ	E		<p>There are a number of uses of "is" that should be reworded as "shall" in the normative text of a standard.</p>	<p>Convert FH PHY English to IEEE Standardese through clause 14.</p>	<p>comment accepted</p>
	14.2.2	RM	T	Y	<p>Clarify the supported data rates do not include all possible rates in the TXvector.</p>	<p>4.2.2 TXVECTOR Parameters The following parameters are defined as part of the TXVECTOR parameter list in the PHY_TXSTART.request service primitive. <u>The 1MBPS and 2MBS are the only rates currently supported. Other indicated data rates are for possible future use.</u></p>	<p>adopt text changes (6-0-1)</p>
	14.2.2.1	TLP	t		<p>A value of zero is non-sensical. How can the PHY be asked to transmit nothing. The OSI Basic Reference Model does not permit null SDU transmissions, and there seems to be no reason for null PDU transmissions either.</p>	<p>Change minimum length from "0" to "1".</p>	<p>comment accepted changed table to be consistent (5-0-1)</p>
	14.2.2.2	vh	e		<p>The FHSS MIB variable BSSBaicRate and the MIB</p>	<p>Remove the last two sentences of the</p>	<p>comment accepted.</p>

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Comnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
					variable CurrentHighSRate are mentioned here but are not defined in the respective clauses	clause and insert: BASIC rate is 1. HIGHSPEED is either 0 if not supported or 2 if the optional 2 Mbit/s PMD is implemented.	see resolution of comment by RM below
	14.2.2.2	RM	t	Y	This section refers to undefined MIB variables	14.2.2.2 TXVECTOR PLCP_BITRATE The PLCP_BITRATE parameter is an optional parameter. Its value describes the bit rate the PLCP should use to transmit the PLCP_PDU. Its value can be BASIC or HIGHSPEED. The BASIC rate is defined as the BSSBasicRate in the FHSS PHY MIB. The HIGHSPEED rate is defined by the CurrentHighSRate in the MIB.	Change text to read: The PLCP_BITRATE parameter describes the bit rate at which the PLCP should transmit the PLCPPDU. Its value can be any of the rates as defined in Error! Reference source not found. , and supported by the conformant FH PHY. Naftali/Ron 7-0-0
	14.3.1.1	TLP	e		The heading is missing all of its text.	Add text to the heading line, or remove the heading.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.3.1.1	TLP	e		“Function” is probably the maximally wrong word here. FSM (finite state machine), procedure, automaton, etc. come to mind. But since function has a connotation of no or minimal side effects, it is probably not the best word to use. I don’t know what would be; perhaps the committee can make that determination.	Choose a better word to convey the intended concept.	OPEN: FH editor to talk to commentor
	14.3.1.1 2nd ¶	TLP	e		Arrows have orientation, and thus convey information which should be specified here.	Change to read “Each permissible transition between the states of a function is represented graphically by an arrow from the initial to the terminal state. A transition ...”	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.3.2.1.1	TLP	e		poor English	Change to read “... to detect a potentially-receivable signal, select ...”	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	14.3.2.1.2	TLP	E	Yes	Either the transmitted objects are "packets", in which case this should be a "Start Packet Delimiter", or they are "frames", in which case the word "packet" should be replaced by "frame" everywhere within this clause. Use "packet" only if it refers to a PHY concept which must be distinguished from an 802.11 Data Link MAC PDU (which latter is correctly called a "frame").	Use consistent nomenclature. Avoid the use of the term "packet" if possible, because its primary meaning of "packet" is that of an OSI network-layer PDU, and IEEE 802 has agreed to respect the OSI Basic Reference Model, including its nomenclature.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.3.2.2.1	TLP	e		(1) A value of zero is non-sensical. How can the PHY be asked to transmit nothing. The OSI Basic Reference Model does not permit null SDU transmissions, and there seems to be no reason for null PDU transmissions either (2).LSB means Least Significant Byte, lsb means least significant bit. Its been this way for at least two decades.	Change to read "The PLCPPDU Length Word (PLW) is passed from the MAC as a parameter within the PHYTXSTART.request primitive. The PLW specifies the number of octets contained in the MPDU packet. Its valid values are 001h - FFFh, representing counts of one to 4095 octets. The PLW is transmitted lsb first and msb last. The PLW is used by the receiving station, in combination with the 32/33 coding algorithm specified in this clause, to determine the last bit in the packet."	accepted by previous motion 14.2.2.1
	14.3.2.2.2	TLP	e		(1) The table format should be corrected to fit within the column and avoid breaking the parameter name across two lines. (2) With regard to the spelled-out units, with one entry per line, clarity in this area might be worth more than the paper saved.	See the submitted revision-marked files for the necessary corrections	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.3.2.2.3	TLP	T	Yes	This polynomial works only when the modulation avoids differential coding, which has the effect of creating double-bit errors on decoding. Otherwise two errors 22 bits apart can go undetected, as can many other low-weight short error bursts, since the power of the CCITT code is biased heavily toward detecting odd numbers of bits in error.	If differential decoding is required, then change to a CRC polynomial which does not contain (1 + X) as a factor, so that the CRC polynomial is not compromised by the differential decoding process. No change needed otherwise.	indeed the coding is not differential, so we do not have to change.

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	14.3.2.3	TLP	t		The bit order must be specified, as well as the byte order.	Change to read "... stream LSB and lsb first and MSB and msb last."	Accepted change to msb/lb. Deleted MSB/LSB since MAC determines octet ordering. Naftali/Ron Unanimous
	14.3.3	TLP	e		Poor terminology.	Change the last two sentences to read "Execution of the PLCP state machines normally is initiated by the FH PLME state machine and begins at the CS/CCA state machine. The PLCP returns to the FH PLME state machine upon interrupt to service a PLME service request, such as PLMESET, PLMERESSET, etc."	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.3.3.1.1	TLP	T	Yes	In the Data Whitener Decoding Algorithm, the comment /***** Calculate bias in header for format error checking *****/ implies that there should be error checking. Where is it?	Add the necessary error checking procedure and any supporting text.	Deleted the reference to format error checking. Ron/Carl 7-0-0
	14.3.3.2.1	SB	t	N	In Figure 67 two timers are defined; count_down timer and CS/CCA timer. In this text/state machine CCA/CS timer has no actions other than 'maintain' - but there is no definition of what 'maintain' actually means. The accompanying text makes explicit reference to the purpose and actions on cown_down timer but only makes rather vague references to 'all relevant CCA/CS timers' - there is only one such timer hinted at in the state machine. I could clearly take some sensible guesses here - but that does not make a good standard !	Make it clear what CCA/CS timers are required for compliance with the standard (the comment author appreciates that much of the CCA stuff is outside the scope of the standard). Now bring the state machine and text into line and describe what the requirements and actions on the CS/CCA timer are.	Change CS/CCA text to read: If a PHYCCARST.request is received, the PLCP shall reset the CS/CCA state machine to the state appropriate for the end of a complete received frame. Delete other references to "CS/CCA timers". Carl/Ron 6-0-0
	14.3.3.2.1	SB	t	N	Clause 14.3.3.2.1 says: However, if the CS/CCA procedure indicates the start of a new frame within the countdown timer period, it is possible to transition to the receive procedure prior to the end of the countdown timer period. When a non-zero countdown timer reaches zero, the PLCP shall reset all relevant CS/CCA assessment timers to the state appropriate for the end of a complete received frame and	Make intent clear in standard.	Add statement: If the PHY transitions to receive under these conditions, the countdown timer shall be reset to the longer of (1) the remaining time of the current frame and (2) the length of the new frame. Carl/Ron 5-0-1

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
					<p>the CS/CCA indication shall reflect the state of the channel.</p> <p>This says that if I transition to a new frame within the countdown timer period then I keep the countdown timer running from the previous frame and CCA locked busy until the countdown timer reaches zero (or is updated).</p> <p>Was it the intent to have the countdown timer run and either expire during the new receive - or have an error in the new receive restart the timer. Alternatively, was the intent to actually reset the countdown timer on entry into the new receive.</p>		
	14.3.3.2.1 5th ¶	TLP	e		The wording "to the end as positively indicated" is very confusing; I can't even figure out how it might be parsed to make sense.	Rephrase to make the meaning clear.	comment accepted by acceptance of REVSEC11.DOC
	14.3.3.2.1 5th ¶	TLP	e, t		The wording "it is possible" is permissive as stated. If you wish to require such a transition, use "shall".	Consider whether to make a requirement.	Comment accepted. Intended to be permissive rather than required. Carl/Nathan 6-0-1
	14.3.3.2 .2 9.2.5.2, 12.3.5.1 0.2	SB	t	N	<p>Clause 14.3.3.2.2 says:</p> <p>The appropriate CS/CCA indication shall be generated prior to the end of each 50 µs slot time with the performance specified in subclause 14.6 (PMD).</p> <p>(The CS/CCA indication is by PHYCCA.indicate as in figure 68)</p> <p>While clause 12.3.5.10.2 says about PHYCCA.indicate:</p> <p>This primitive shall be generated every time the status of the channel changes from channel clear to channel busy or from channel busy to channel clear.</p> <p>Clearly there is some conflict here - one says that the</p>	<p>Correct conflict one way or the other - do I get a regular PHY CCA indication per slot time, or only when the channel state changes.</p> <p>(It also occurs to me that the first two sentences of clause 14.3.3.2.2 are duplicated in the immediately previous clause.)</p>	Addressed same comment in 12.3.5.10.2 in full PHY. Resolved by changing "generated" to "available" in 14.3.3.2.2.

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

					primitive is issued on a time basis once per slot time even if the channel state has not changed, the other on a physical event (a change of channel state) irrespective of time. If I look at the PHY chapters the FH chapter (Figure 68) would seem to follow 14.3.3.2.2 and the DS (Figure 83) follows 12.3.5.10.2 <i>Actually this is pretty important for compliance given the rules that define when the back-off timer may, or may not be decremented in 9.2.5.2</i>		
	14.3.3.2.2 1st ¶	TLP	T		It is not clear what “within a slot time including the PIFS and DIFS windows” means. Does this mean that the slot time includes the PIFS and DIFS windows, or does it mean a slot time plus a PIFS or DIFS window? Note the substantial difference in meaning depending on the way it is actually worded.	Please clarify.	Deleted reference to PIFS and DIFS window
	14.3.3.2.2 2nd ¶	TLP	e		BRAVO!!! The word “perceived” is a great word choice. It conveys the ambiguity nicely.	None	NONE
	14.5.4.2	TLP	e		Last line of table. The word management is abbreviated as “mgmt”, not “mngt”. The latter is an abbreviation for “magnet”.	Change “PMD_PWRMGNT” to “PMD_PWRMGNT”, with any other case and underscore changes as appropriate to match section 13.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.5.4.3	RM	t	Y	This section is inconsistent with 14.5.5.1 and 14.5.5.2. These sections already make provisions for support both data rates using a common convention. If desired the 14.5.5.1 and 14.5.5.2 could be modified to allow passing the BASIC and HIGHSPEED primitive within TXD_UNIT and RXD_UNIT.	TXD_UNIT PMD_DATA.request 1 Mbit/s: 0, 1 2 Mbit/s: 0, 1, 2, 3 RXD_UNIT PMD_DATA.indicate 1 Mbit/s: 0, 1 Mbit/s: 0, 1, 2, 3	comment withdrawn by commenter
	14.5.5.4	TLP	e		This would be better titled “PA_RAMP”, rather than “PARAMP”. The first three times I read the word it parsed par-amp, rather than p-a-ramp. Non-native English speakers will have even more difficulty.	Change “PMD_PARAMP” to “PMD_PA_RAMP”, with any other case and underscore changes as appropriate to match section 13.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.5.5.9	TLP	e		The term “power-saving” is used elsewhere in the standard for the function that is here referred to as “low-power”.	Use the same terminology throughout the document; either choice is OK.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	14.6.10	TLP	E		MS Word superscript and subscript font attributes produce unacceptable results.	<p>Do not use MS-Word subscripting or superscripting; MS-Word makes the resulting text TOO SMALL. Instead, select the characters to become the subscript or superscript and use Format/Font/Font/Size/8 and Format/Font/Character Spacing/Position/Lowered and Format/Font/Character Spacing/By/2 for a subscript, and Format/Font/Font/Size/8 and Format/Font/Character Spacing/Position/Raised and Format/Font/Character Spacing/By/3 for a superscript.</p> <p>(This is corrected in the submitted revision-marked files.)</p>	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.6.14.4 last ¶	TLP	T		Unclear relaxation of requirements. I believe that I know what is meant, but the existing wording would not stand up under legal scrutiny as a meaningful requirement, and thus can't be used as the basis for a conformance/nonconformance decision.	Please clarify this paragraph.	Change wording to: An exception occurs when the total energy within a given 1 MHz channel as defined by 14.6.5 exceeds the levels specified above. Carl/Ron 4-0-2
	14.6.15.5	RM	T	Y	The definition of Imp specifies that the desired signal amplitude is larger than the undesired. This makes no sense as the specification is in + dB	Intermodulation protection (Imp) is defined as the ratio of the <u>minimum amplitude of one of two equal interfering signals to the desired signal amplitude, where the interfering signals are spaced 4 and 8 MHz removed from the center frequency of the desired signal both on the same side of the center frequency.</u> desired signal strength to the minimum amplitude of one of two equal interfering signals at 4 and 8 MHz removed from center frequency, both on the same side of center frequency, that <u>The Imp protection ratio is established at the interfering signal level that</u> causes the FER of the receiver to be increased to 3% for MPDUs of 400 octets	Comment accepted. Carl/Ron 6-0-0

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Comment type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
						generated with pseudo random data, when the desired signal is -7dBm. Each interfering signal is modulated with the FH PMD modulation uncorrelated in time to each other or the desired signal. The PMD shall have the M _p for the interfering signal at 4 and 8 MHz be greater than or equal to 30 dB.	
	14.6.15.6	PMK	e		FER used the clauses but not defined	Insert in Clause 4: FER=Frame Error Rate (Vic Hayes: Ratio)	Comment accepted. Defined it at first appearance.
	14.6.4	JMZ	t		By removing channel 47 from the Spain hop-sequences, it would be possible to come up with a single unified Spain/France table. I think it would be better to reduce the (potentially large) number of different regulatory domains that must be supported than to use all the possible frequencies in France.	Combine Spain/France into a single regulatory-domain.	Comment withdrawn by commentor. There are additional country specific regulatory requirements outside the scope of this standard.
	14.6.8	JMZ	t		The mathematics behind the pseudo-random sequences should be explained so that (if one exists) a reverse-mapping function can be implemented. Trying to calculate what position in a hop-sequence a device is currently at requires a rather lengthy TSFTimer calculation or a sequential-search through the appropriate table. This makes predicting what frequency a STA will be on in the future (for Reassociation, for example) unnecessarily complex.	Explain the formula used to determine the hopping tables, or switch a formula with better mathematical properties (a number of academic articles on optimal patterns that pass regulatory muster have been published).	Commenter withdraws comment. He agrees that a statement in the informative annex explaining that the core patterns are generated by a random number generator and filtered by an algorithm as described in 95/246r1.
	14.6.8	TLP	t		Specifications for France and Spain are made elsewhere, and need to be included here.	Change to read "p = number of frequency channels in hopping pattern (79 for North America/most of Europe, 23 for Japan, 11 for France, 9 for Spain)"	Accepted with changes: France is 27 and Spain is 35 channels. Naftali/Stuart Unanimous
	14.6.8	TLP	E		The line formatting in this region leads to a difficult-to-read document, and the electronic version is very sensitive to the software set (OS, MS Word revision, font revision, selected printer, etc.) used for viewing. This sensitivity to the reader's environment is unnecessary.	Use the changed paragraph formatting provided in the submitted revision-marked files— don't just put in line breaks and manually wrap the lines. In other words, use MSWord the way professionals do, not just as a flat-text program editor.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Comnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	14.6.all	TLP	T		In many places, specifications are made for Europe, and differently for France and Spain. The last time I checked, France and Spain were in Europe. So all such specifications do not apply to "Europe" as claimed, but only to "most of Europe".	Change "Europe" to "most of Europe" wherever different specifications apply to France or Spain.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.7.2	RM	e		Missing "4"	14.7.2 <u>4</u> Level GFSK Modulation	comment accepted
	14.7.2	TLP	e		Table 45 has incorrect title	Change "Division" to "Deviation"	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.8.2 7.3.2.3, 11.1.5, 13.1.4.4 4, 13.1.4.4 5,	SB	t	N	Dwell time related MIB attributes are a complete mess in terms of units. 13.1.4.4 defines aMaxDwellTime and aCurrentDwellTime in nanoseconds (!), the default values in 14.8.2 are in milliseconds and the comparison to a TSF timer value in 11.1.5 is to a time in microseconds. Lastly the value for the dwell time in the FH Parameter set element (7.3.2.3) is in Kmicroseconds.	Please can we have some order here. It would be nice if the aMaxDwellTime and aCurrentDwellTime were in Kus since this is what a number of other MAC attributes such as aBeaconPeriod is in. It also ties up with the FH parameter set. It also makes the TSF time comparison easy (hence the beacon stuff). So: aMAXDwellTime should be in Kus and be a default value of 390 (399.360ms) aCurrentDwellTime should be in Kus and be a default value of 20.	Use SI units in all PHY parameters. The minimum unit of time will be μ s. Stuart/Carl FH PHY: 5-0-1 Plenery motion: Use Kus rather than ms. WG: Bob/Johnny Passes with 1 opposing Change 400 ms to 390 Kus and 20 ms to 19 Kus in 14.8.2 and 14.8.2.1.37 and 14.8.2.1.38. FH: Ron/George 5-0-1
	14.8.2	RM	t	N	The default values forCwmin andCwmax are incorrect.	aCWmin 15 decima aCWmax 1023 decima	Comment accepted. Ron/Carl 3-0-0
	14.8.2	TLP	E		Use of term "Dep" in final column. If you wish to use a shortened form that fits on a single line, then choose one that is meaningful to non-native-English speaking readers and explain it in the Notes which follow the table, as in "where Implementation means that the behavior is dependent on the specific implementation".	Use an appropriate legitimate word, or add an explanatory note to the table.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	14.8.2.1.18	TLP	e		The Symbol font contains a multiply character "×"; use it, rather than the letter "x".	Use the correct character for multiplication.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.8.2.1.2	TLP	E	Yes	The reader is unlikely to be familiar with the entire set of listed agencies. The countries corresponding to the agencies should be shown.	Add a third column to the table specifying the region/countries to which each code point applies. (This is shown in the submitted revision-marked files.)	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC
	14.8.2.1.4	TLP	t or e		The value assigned to the attribute is not equal to the value computed from the formula which defines the attribute. The formula gives $27 + 20 + 1 = 48$, not the claimed 50. If you intend that the number should be rounded up by including a safety factor, then say so. Wording such as that found in the definition of aSIFSTime would be acceptable. But claiming equality without making the sums match is not acceptable.	Correct something.	Change equation in 14.8.2.1.4 to be: $aCCATime + aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + aMACProcessingDelay$ to be consistent with 9.2.9. Change to MAC figure in 9.2.9 to subtract $aRxRFDelay$ and $aRxPLCPDelay$ from $aCCADelay$ to $= aCCATime$. Leave $aSlotTime$ at 50 us. Add clarification in 13.1.4.5 that $aCCATime$ includes $aRxRFDelay$ and $aRxPLCPDelay$. FH: Carl/Ron 7-0-0 PHY: Carl/Al 6-0-3
	14.all	TLP	E		The earlier clauses in the document do not use an underscore after the prefix PHY or PLCP, or PLME, even though that might aid readability. So this clause should not either. The necessary corrections have been included in the submitted revision-marked files, but the figures have not been corrected.	Be consistent throughout the draft standard – either use hyphens or underscores, which would improve readability, or don't. But do so consistently.	change accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	14.all	TLP	E	Yes	<p>Please take pity on non-native English speakers and use names that they have some slight chance of understanding. Mis-pronounceable subsets of English words, such as "suprt" for "supported", are not even close to acceptable. Similarly, what does "Asmnt" mean? How about "Lvls"?</p> <p>"Ths dcmnt is nt prntd fr clmns up." That tried to say "This document is not printed four columns up." Why are vowels so scarce that you can't use them? Please turn these names into something suitable for human consumption. This clause is not acceptable as it stands. I am balloting NO on it, for gross inconsideration of the intended readers.</p> <p>To simplify the task of fixing this clause, I have applied global transforms to produce more intelligible attribute names. See the submitted revision-marked files.</p>	<p>Make names consistent with the name changes made in section 13 as a result of the similar comment for section 13</p> <p>Also update the figures, which I was not able to do in the submitted revision-marked files.</p>	<p>change accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC</p>
	14.all 5.1.1.2 (c) 5.2.4.1 5.4 9.2.1 12.all 15.some 16.all	TLP	e	Yes	<p>The wireless medium is definitely singular (unless there is an alternate universe with multiple "ethers"), or unless P802.11 is extending its charter to acoustic modes of transmission.</p>	<p>change "edia" to "edium" everywhere except when referring to wired media.</p>	<p>accepted with acceptance of REVSEC10.DOC and REVSEC12.DOC</p>
	15	MT	E		<p>in order to maintain consistency with other sections, the DSSS section should have added the France and Spain regulatory domains.</p> <p>Updates to 15.4.6.2, 15.3.2, 15.3.3.3, DSSS PICS, MIB description.</p> <p>Other editorial fix-ups provided in separate file</p>	<p>This text was provided in a previous comment. France allows operation from 2.4465 to 2.4835 GHz (4 channels possible). Spain allows operation from 2.445 to 2.475 GHz (2 channels).</p> <p>Two additional channels could be added to the DSSS channel plan for ETSI and France (2467 and 2472)</p>	<p>accepted with SEC12.DOC as editorial changes</p> <p>accepted add upper two channels as well as lower two channels to ETSI and upper two channels to France</p>

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	15.1.1 last ¶	TLP	e		This paragraph is inappropriate as worded. It sound more like instructions to a standards-writing committee than the finished output of that committee. Either remove it or restate it as accomplished fact, rather than hypothetical necessity. Also, there is only one PMD sublayer in your mode, so there can be only one in this clause (perhaps with variations). So what does the first sentence mean? This is just sloppy writing, in my opinion.	Clean up this paragraph or remove it.	Accepted as result of accepting REVSEC12.DOC
	15.1.3	PMK	e		Additional subsets of acronyms are introduced	Consolidate 15.1.3 with 4 to have just one table of acronyms	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.1.3 4	MT	e		add the abbreviations from clause 15 (DSSS PHY) this maintains consistency among clauses	add abbreviations from clause 15 and delete from clause 15	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.2.3.6	DSM	t		I do not see how a 32 byte MPDU can be transmitted in 192 microseconds(assuming a transmission rate of 1 Mbps)	Change to 256 microseconds	point taken resolution will be to change the 32 byte reference to 24 bytes - this is treated as an editorial change
	15.2.6	PMK	e		“PLCP transmit procedure is shown in figure 6”.	“procedures is shown in figure 81”.	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.3.4	PMK	e		“...specific values defined in Table 3.”	“defined in Table 58”.	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.3.1	PMK	e		“Table 1 lists this primitives....”	“Table 56 lists the primitives”	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.3.4	SB	e	N	It says here ‘All DSSS PHY Layer MIB attributes are defined in clause 12 with specific values defined in table 3’ Table 3 is Duration/ID Field Encoding - this should be a reference to the following table (Table 58 in D5). The title on Figure 58 is ‘MIB Variable Parameters’ whereas I believe it should more accurately be titled ‘MIB Attribute Default Values/Ranges’	Correct reference and title as suggested. The text that appears underneath Table 47 (FHSS PHY Attributes) relating to the meaning of static/dynamic could also be reproduced here for clarity.	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.3.4 p.243	WD	e		Reference to “clause 12” should be “clause 13.” The contents of this table does not match the contents	Suggest to remove the definitions in the std body (13.1), and to correct Annex D as applicable.	editorial reference correction accepted ANNEX D deleted by WG

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

					and sequence of the applicable groups as defined in Annex D, and or section 13.1.2		motion
	15.4.6.2	AK	T	Yes	Reduce the number of defined channels for FCC and ETSI domains.	Channels can not be used in the same area because they (heavily) overlap. Adjacent channel rejection is 35 dB with 30 MHz spacing (15.4.8.3). Definition of this many channels does not improve network performance but makes channel allocation and channel acquisition (handover/roaming/start up) more complex. Define only 3 channels: preferably 2422, 2444 and 2466 for both FCC and ETSI and adapt table 63 (and appendix A.4.6) accordingly. Adapt table 63 accordingly. (also appendix A.4.6 is to be adapted)	<p>comment rejected</p> <p>The proposed channel plan reduces the interference avoidance capabilities of the DS PHY. Further, there are ample ways to determine the operational frequency by utilizing a management function which operates above the MAC layer. The draft does not support DS channel mobility and therefore the 'auto' channel recognition capability described is currently beyond the scope of the standard.</p> <p>In terms of making the channel acquisition more difficult, with the addition of DSSS PHY elements in the beacons (which are proposed in other comments) the acquisition uncertainty becomes a non-issue entirely.</p> <p>(6-0-0)</p>
	15.4.6.2	AK	T	Yes	Make channel 1 and 2 optional for FCC and IC	With the current channel definition it is not possible to manufacture a product that is FCC/IC compliant and ETSI compliant and IEEE compliant (three labels on the same device). With channel 1 and 2 optional such a device is possible (if it actually does not support channel 1 and 2). Advantage: same product for both	<p>comment rejected</p> <p>allowing for optional channels gives way to interoperability issues</p> <p>The addition of two lower channels to the ETSI domain were added to match the FCC</p>

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
						American and European market. Disadvantage: in a network in FCC domain operating on channel 1 or 2 an ETSI/FCC device can not have a connection.	domain. However, the addition of two upper channels were also added to the ETSI domain which does not allow for the resolution of this comment for this causes the same situation. It is felt that the additional spectrum is more worthwhile than the striving for a common product. motion to accept this resolution approved by (5-0-1)
	15.4.6.4	PMK	e		"DBPSK encoder is specified in Table 9".	"is specified in Table 64"	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.4.6.4	PMK	e		"DQPSK encoder is specified in Table 10".	"is specified in Table 65".	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.4.7.1	PMK	e		"regulatory bodies is shown in Table 11".	"is shown in Table 66".	comment accepted as result of accepting SEC12.DOC
	15.all	TLP	E	Yes	Please take pity on non-native English speakers and use names that they have some slight chance of understanding. Mis-pronounceable subsets of English words, such as "suprt" for "supported", are not even close to acceptable. Similarly, what does "Asmnt" mean? How about "Lvls"? "Ths dcmnt is nt prntd fr clmns up." That tried to say "This document is not printed four columns up." Why are vowels so scarce that you can't use them? Please turn these names into something suitable for human consumption. This clause is not acceptable as it stands. I am balloting NO on it, for gross inconsideration of the intended readers.	Make names consistent with the name changes made in section 13 as a result of the similar comment for section 13. Also update the figures.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC12.DOC

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Cmnt type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
	15.some 5.1.1.2 (c) 5.2.4.1 5.4 9.2.1 12.all 14.all 16.all	TLP	e	Yes	The wireless medium is definitely singular (unless there is an alternate universe with multiple "ethers"), or unless P802.11 is extending its charter to acoustic modes of transmission.	change "edia" to "edium" everywhere except when referring to wired media.	comment accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC REVSEC12.DOC and manual change to clause 16
	16.1.1 last ¶	TLP	e		This paragraph is inappropriate as worded. It sound more like instructions to a standards-writing committee than the finished output of that committee. Either remove it or restate it as accomplished fact, rather than hypothetical necessity. Also, there is only one PMD sublayer in your mode, so there can be only one in this clause (perhaps with variations). So what does the first sentence mean? This is just sloppy writing, in my opinion.	Clean up this paragraph or remove it.	comment accepted paragraph removed
	16.2.1	PMK	e		prepended if an English word is a rare and obscure one	"a PLCP Preamble and PLCP Header are added to the MPDU..."	comment accepted
	16.2.4.1 2nd ¶	TLP	e, t		The phrase "transitions in L-PPM slots which would otherwise constitute an illegal symbol" which ends this paragraph has not been defined.	Either describe here what you mean, or add a forward reference to the (sub)^N-clause where these concepts are described.	Comment rejected. Legal symbols are defined in tables 67 and 68
	16.2.4.2 16.2.4.3 16.2.4.4	PMK	e		"The SFD field is not modulated using 4-PPM but instead consists of transitional in 4-PPM slots which would otherwise constitute an illegal symbol". This is completely incomprehensible. what is the otherwise illegal symbol?		Comment rejected. Legal symbols are defined in tables 67 and 68
	16.2.4.5	TLP	e		(1) The normal computer convention is "lsb" and "msb" refer to bits, "LSB" and "MSB" refer to Bytes. (2) If the qualifier "in time" is needed here, then it is needed at all earlier occurrences of "shall be transmitted first". "in time" seems redundant. How can it be transmitted first, yet not be first in time?	Change to read "The lsb (least significant bit) shall be transmitted first."	comment accepted
	16.2.4.6	PMK	e		Is the ones compliment of the remainder.	Is the ones complement of the	comment accepted

Seq. #	Section number	your voter's id code	Comment type E, e, T, t	Part of NO vote	Comment/Rationale	Recommended change	Disposition/Rebuttal
						remainder.	
	16.2.5 .all	TLP	e			Use "shall" rather than "will" when the intent is legislative. See the submitted revision-marked files.	comment accepted
	16.2.5.2	TLP	e, t			Specify the range of application of the data rate. See the submitted revision-marked files.	comment accepted
	16.2.5.3	TLP	e, t			Specify that reception is the relevant process. See the submitted revision-marked files.	comment accepted
	16.3	TLP	t		to ??? To what is the PHYSAP presented?	Add the missing destination.	comment rejected PHYSAP is defined in 12.2
	16.3.2.1	TLP	e, t		Inadequate lead-in to table 67	Change last sentence of first paragraph to read "Transmission order of the symbol slots is from left to right, as shown below, where a 1 indicates in-band energy in the slot, and a 0 indicates the absence of in-band energy in the slot"	comment accepted
	16.3.3.1 table 69	PMK	e		Column Heading= Peak Optical Power (averaged over the pulse width) Is it peak power or average power?	Peak Optical Power (over the pulse width) if this is what is meant	comment accepted "peak value" is used
	16.3.3.2	TLP	e		If you prefer the "xx than or equal to" form of expression, then use "less", not "lower", since numeric comparison, and not height in a gravitation field, is being discussed.	Correct the text to reflect intended meaning.	comment accepted
	16.3.3.2 and following	TLP	E	Yes	IEEE and ISO/IEC editing rules require use of SI units and proper nomenclature. That includes capitalizing a unit derived from a person's name, and using the unit (W), not the name. It also includes using a non-break space between the amount and the unit, so that line-wrap cannot split the amount from the unit	Follow the IEEE and ISO/IEC editing rules with regard to units, including time units (s, ms, μs, ns, ps, fs, etc.) ; there is no reason not to do so.	comment accepted
	16.3.3.3	TLP	e		Correct the formatting of Table 71 as shown in the submitted revision-marked files.	Make the table less than the full column, with the heading Bold as in the previous table, as shown.	comment accepted
	16.3.3.3	TLP	e		The statement "may be added at a future time" is not acceptable in a standard.	Replace with "are for future study"	comment 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
	16.3.5.1	TLP	E		Neither CS or ED have been described to this point, nor have any mechanisms or models of operation been proposed by which a reader could infer what CS and ED imply. And the generic names CarrierDetect and EnergyDetect do not convey enough information about the nature of the detection process or the implied hardware to permit the reader to continue attempting to understand this clause.	Please propose a model of receiver operation before referring to the behavior of the model's constituent parts. <addendum after reading the CS and ED descriptions> I strongly recommend that this ordering problem be remedied by describing ED first, then CS, and then CCA. Had this been done in the draft, this comment would never have existed.	comment accepted
	16.3.5.2	TLP	e		The second sentence is redundant; it is better placed where it occurs later in the sub-sub-sub-clause, at the end.	Remove the second sentence; it is 100% redundant.	comment accepted
	16.4	TLP	e		Table 73, rows for aMPDUMaxLengthXX. Section 10 lists a single attribute aMPDUMaxLength, not a number of data-rate-dependent attributes. One of these lines needs to be struck, as shown in the submitted revision-marked files.	Delete the data rate from one label, and the second row with the same label prefix.	comment accepted
	16.all	TLP	E	Yes	Please take pity on non-native English speakers and use names that they have some slight chance of understanding. Mis-pronounceable subsets of English words, such as "suprt" for "supported", are not even close to acceptable. Similarly, what does "Asmnt" mean? How about "Lvls"? "Ths demnt is nt prntd fr clmns up." That tried to say "This document is not printed four columns up." Why are vowels so scarce that you can't use them? Please turn these names into something suitable for human consumption. This clause is not acceptable as it stands. I am balloting NO on it, for gross inconsideration of the intended readers. To simplify the task of fixing this clause, I have applied global transforms to produce more intelligible attribute names. See the submitted revision-marked files.	Make names consistent with the name changes made in section 13 as a result of the similar comment for section 13. Also update the figures, which I was not able to do in the submitted revision-marked files.	comment 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
	16.all	TLP	e		The wrong prefix is used with PDU and SDU.	Replace PPDU and PSDU with PLCPDU and PLCSDU as appropriate. (Replacements made in submitted revision-marked files.)	comment accepted
	16.all 5.1.1.2 (c) 5.2.4.1 5.4 9.2.1 12.all 14.all 15.some	TLP	e	Yes	The wireless medium is definitely singular (unless there is an alternate universe with multiple "ethers"), or unless P802.11 is extending its charter to acoustic modes of transmission.	change "edia" to "edium" everywhere except when referring to wired media.	for clause 14 ,15,16 accepted as result of accepting REVSEC11.DOC and REVSEC12.DOC and correction made to clause 16
	Figure 84	DSM	t		There are state transition lines in the figure that go nowhere.	Add connections to the lines so that the two floating lines at the lower right of the figure connect with the line in the upper right.	