

**IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs**

---

**Proposed Reply Comments of IEEE 802 on FCC Docket 99-231  
on Modifying the Rules for Spread Spectrum Devices**

**Date:** November 10, 1999

**Author:** Regulatory Ad-Hoc Study Group of p802.11

---

**Summary**

Attached is a proposal for reply comments to the FCC in NPRM, OET Docket 99-231. The document is intended as a reply referencing comments received by the FCC in the first phase of the proceeding.

The text was generated by the 802.11 regulatory ad-hoc group, based on submissions and discussions held at the November, 1999 802 plenary meeting.

Sept 13, 1999

Magalie R. Salas, Esquire  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th St. SW  
Washington DC 20554

Re: Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules for Spread Spectrum Devices, ET  
Docket No. 99-231

Dear Ms. Salas:

The Local and Metropolitan Area Networks Standards Committee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE-LMSC) submitted comments opposing the proposed Part 15 rule changes to increase the maximum bandwidth allowed for frequency hopping devices in response to the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking regarding unlicensed spread spectrum devices. IEEE-LMSC agreed that the existing rules for direct sequence systems are adequate, with the additional requirement as proposed by the Commission that a processing gain calculation be included for systems which have fewer than 10 chips per symbol. IEEE-LMSC also advised the Commission of our concerns regarding the alternative Gaussian noise test as proposed.

IEEE-LMSC provided extensive analysis showing that the proposed rules change permitting widebandwidth frequency hopping systems would result in increased interference to systems complying with the current rules even with the lowered power level restraints proposed. A number of commenters asserted that there would be no increase in interference<sup>1</sup> while a number agreed with IEEE LMSC that there would be an increase in interference<sup>2</sup>. Intersil and Nokia supplied analysis in addition to that of the IEEE-LMSC showing increased interference. There was no analysis presented supporting the claim that the proposal would not increase interference.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example, the comments of Proxim, HomeRF and Breezecom.

<sup>2</sup> See for example, the comments of Nokia, Intersil and Aeronet.

Most commenters agreed that the CW jammer test requirement was sufficient to qualify direct sequence systems. However, some commenters proposed that only a gaussian noise qualification test is sufficient for direct sequence systems with fewer than 10 chips per symbol<sup>3</sup>. The commenters in favor of such a test did not address the complexities of such a test that IEEE-LMSC described. IEEE LMSC continues to assert that the CW jammer test provides sufficient assurance that a direct sequence system meets the spreading rules indicated by the calculation and declaration. IEEE-LMSC believes that the proposed alternative Gaussian noise jamming test should be excluded, until a detailed test procedure specifically designed for evaluating processing gain is developed. Inclusion of this test even as an option without an accompanying test procedure invites inaccurate and widely variable test results.

In summary the IEEE-LMSC found no comments which effectively disputed it's claim of increased interference if wideband frequency hopping is permitted, nor any compelling evidence that the CW jammer test in conjunction with a mathematical declaration was insufficient for demonstrating direct sequence processing gain. The IEEE-LMSC thus urges the Commission to reject the proposed increase in frequency hopping bandwidth and not to impose the gaussian noise test requirement on direct sequence systems.

Respectfully,

James T. Carlo (jcarlo@ti.com)  
Chair, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards  
Texas Instruments  
9208 Heatherdale Drive  
Dallas TX 75234

Vic Hayes (vichayes@lucent.com)  
Chair, IEEE 802.11, Wireless LANs  
Lucent Technology  
Zadelstede 1-10  
3431 JZ Nieuwegein, the Netherlands

cc:

Chairman William E. Kennard  
Commissioner Susan Ness  
Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth  
Commissioner Michael K. Powell  
Commissioner Gloria Tristani  
Dale Hatfield  
Julius P. Knapp  
Neal L. McNeil

---

<sup>3</sup> See the comments of Aironet and Proxim.

Karen Rackley  
John A. Reed  
Anthony Serafin



