

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **11****Comment Rationale**

The standard refers to Bluetooth rather than 802.15.1. While these are said to be synonymous in the introduction, the IEEE designation should be used throughout unless something is specifically Bluetooth and not 802.15.1

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **186**Clause number **7.2****Recommended change**

Change "Bluetooth" to 802.15.1 at this location and throughout the standard except where the reference is to Bluetooth and not 802.15.1. I still feel that an IEEE standard should refer to itself, not to another document.

Page number **28**Line number **43**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**Part of NO vote **Y**

Clauses 1 and 6 set forth the disclaimer about the nomenclature. We have determined that it is best to leave the term "Bluetooth" intact in the Normative sections so that one-to-one correspondence can be more easily maintained. The BRC is still firm on this resolution due to the to-date extensive editing of text in the Front matter, Clause 1, Clause 5 & Clause 6 to appease this commentary. Additionally, the BRC believes based on a thorough understanding of the derivative license agreement (the WG has a copy) between BSIG and IEEE the marketability of the Std for IEEE-SA would be diminished. We reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**LB11 Comment Number **16****Comment Rationale**

The RBW is specified as a "should" instead of a "shall". In order to uniquely define the spurious power, both the bandwidth and the power levels need to be specified.

LB10 Comment Number **10**

LB8 Comment Number

Clause number **7.3.2.2****Recommended change**

Change "should" to "shall" to match the "shall" in the second sentence.

Page number **31**Line number **45**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**Part of NO vote **Y**

It serves the same purpose as the reference to table 3.2 in the BSIG document. It's the first sentence of the paragraph 3.2.1, 7.3.2 and 7.3.2.1 respectively for the IEEE Std. The BRC does not accept this comment, however, we will verify our interpretation and compare by similarity approach with the BSIG.
We agree the IEEE build on BSIG v1.1, Vol. 1, Page 24, 3.2.2 is confusing. We therefore, will revert back to the original source text:

BSIG v1.1, Vol. 1, Page 24, 3.2.2 says:
"3.2.2 Out-of-Band Spurious Emission
The measured power should be measured in a 100 kHz bandwidth.
[Table 3.3]
Table 3.3: Out-of-band spurious emission requirement"

IEEE D0.9.2 says:
"7.3.2.2 Out-of-band spurious emission
The power should be measured in a 100 kHz bandwidth. The out-of-band emission shall conform to the requirements found in Table 6."

IEEE D1.0.0 will say:
"7.3.2.2 Out-of-band spurious emission
The power should be measured in a 100 kHz bandwidth. The out-of-band spurious emission requirement is in Table 6."

COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **C****Editor Notes**

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments

LB11 Comment Number **17****Comment Rationale**

Fc is not defined.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **202**Clause number **7.3.3****Recommended change**

Change "from Fc" to "from the required channel center frequency" or define Fc. Although this comment was supposed to be accepted, the change in the document does not match my suggestion. In fact, the change that was made does not make sense. Fc is not the "transmitted initial center frequency", it is the required channel center frequency. The sub-clause currently states that Fc shall be within +/- 75 kHz of Fc, which is always true by definition. The comment listed as accepted, but the change has not been made. The comment should be listed as rejected unless the edit is made by the TG1 editors.

Page number **31**Line number **50**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

The BRC agrees with the comment BUT we forgot to apply the edit. We promise to add into 802.15.1/D1.0.1 Editor Note: ICG forgot to add into IEEE Draft P802.15.1/D1.0.0; We promise to add into 802.15.1/D1.0.1. We will also submit a Bluetooth errata.

Part of NO vote **Y**

D0.8.0 Was:
The transmitted initial center frequency accuracy must be ± 75 kHz from Fc.

D0.9.2 Is Now:
The transmitted initial center frequency (Fc) accuracy shall be ± 75 kHz maximum from Fc.

COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **C****Editor Notes**LB11 Comment Number **20****Comment Rationale**

The paragraph beginning with "To measure ..." describes MAC, not PHY functionality and does not belong in this section. In addition, a loopback facility is not required for BER measurements in general, it is simply that BSIg has chosen this method.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **187**Clause number **7.4****Recommended change**

Delete the paragraph. The reason for rejecting this comment is that it is too difficult to modify the document. I think that is a bad reason. This paragraph can cause confusion because loopback at the PHY level is different than the loopback that the standard is referring to. That could lead to problems in understanding the standard. Deleting the paragraph will not affect the correspondence with the Bluetooth documents.

Page number **32**Line number **28**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

We have determined that it is best to leave the structure of the Bluetooth-derived intact in the Normative sections so that one-to-one correspondence can be more easily maintained. We agree it would have been best to have this text elsewhere in the document, but lacking an appropriate target location, we cannot do so. We do not believe that the presence of this paragraph inhibits proper interpretation of the Standard.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **21****Comment Rationale**

The table format in this clause is not consistent with the rest of the document.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **188**Clause number **8****Recommended change**

Change the table formats to be consistent with the rest of the standard. Looks good overall, however Table 13, sub-clause 8.4.4, page 48 still needs to be converted. Also, table 67 starting on page 185, table G.1 on page 1138. The comment listed as accepted, but the change will not be made by TG1, instead is left for IEEE-SA editor. The comment should be listed as rejected unless the edit is made by the TG1 editors.

Page number **48**Line number **various**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

This edit will be provided by the IEEE-SA Project Editor. The BRC has ACCEPTED this comment but the Voter is UNSATISFIED with our resolution.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

LB11 Comment Number **22****Comment Rationale**

The section refers to Bluetooth systems when it should refer to 802.15.1 systems

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **189**Clause number **8.1****Recommended change**

Change Bluetooth to 802.15.1 throughout the clause except where Bluetooth specific items are being referred to. I still feel that an IEEE standard should refer to itself, not to another document.

Page number **39**Line number **32ff**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

Clauses 1 and 6 set forth the disclaimer about the nomenclature. We have determined that it is best to leave the term "Bluetooth" intact in the Normative sections so that one-to-one correspondence can be more easily maintained. The BRC is still firm on this resolution due to the to-date extensive editing of text in the Front matter, Clause 1, Clause 5 & Clause 6 to appease this commentary. Additionally, the BRC believes based on a thorough understanding of the derivative license agreement (the WG has a copy) between BSI and IEEE the marketability of the Std for IEEE-SA would be diminished. We reject this comment and it is now closed.

The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number 23

Comment Rationale

The cross reference to the Physical layer section does not include a clause number or page number

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 190

Clause number 8.1

Recommended change

Change cross references through out this clause to include either the clause number, the page number or preferably both. Upon further review, it would be sufficient to cross reference it with "Clause 7, Physical Layer". The comment listed as accepted, but the change will not be made by TG1, instead is left for IEEE-SA editor. The comment should be listed as rejected unless the edit is made by the TG1 editors.

Page number 39

Line number 49

Type of comment E

Disposition Rebuttal

This edit will be provided by the IEEE-SA Project Editor. The BRC has ACCEPTED this comment but the Voter is UNSATISFIED with our resolution.

Part of NO vote Y

COMMENT STATUS A

RESPONSE STATUS U

Editor Notes

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

LB11 Comment Number 24

Comment Rationale

The sentence beginning with "If a packet occupies ..." repeats information from earlier in the paragraph.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 222

Clause number 8.2.2

Recommended change

Delete the sentence. The sentence should be deleted since it needlessly repeats information, making the standard more difficult to maintain.

Page number 41

Line number 31

Type of comment E

Disposition Rebuttal

Current paragraph makes sense the way it is and does not prevent the implementor of a system from creating interoperable devices.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote Y

COMMENT STATUS R

RESPONSE STATUS U

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **27****Comment Rationale**

"Each RX and TX transmission is at a different hop frequency," does not clearly describe what is happening. A master TX and slave RX are at the same hop. For a given 802.15.1 device, it RX and TX are at a different hop frequency. In any event, this sentence and the sentence that follows are another repetition (not even the first) of this information.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **227**Clause number **8.9.2****Recommended change**

Delete this sentence and the next one as they are repetitious, not clear and not relevant to the discussion in 8.9.2. That RX and TX may be implicitly in the same device does not change the fact that the sentence is an unnecessary repetition of the information and does not clearly define what is happening.

Page number **74**Line number **23**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

This paragraph talks about a single Bluetooth transceiver, thus RX and TX are implicitly on the same device. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number **28****Comment Rationale**

The sentence "In figure 9.1 through 9.6 ... page response sequence frequencies" is in the wrong place (i.e. it discusses page hopping rather than connection) and refers to the wrong figure numbers.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **228**Clause number **8.9.2****Recommended change**

Delete the sentence, it really confuses the discussion. The text here is clearly a mistake in the document and should be fixed. The editors have given no reason why this comment has not been accepted.

Page number **75**Line number **21-23**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number 31

Comment Rationale

Since the return from hold, park wake-up and sniff wake-up use the same search window, they should be described in the same section. The repeat of some (but not all) of the information in this subclause is confusing and incomplete in its description. (The capitalization in the title is wrong too and there is a space missing between sniff and modes in the first sentence, but the whole thing should be deleted anyway).

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 229

Clause number 8.9.4

Page number 76

Line number 28-34

Type of comment E

Part of NO vote Y

Recommended change

Delete 8.9.4 and add to 8.9.3 that the discussion applies to park and sniff modes wake-up. The repetition of information in this section does not add any new information and does not clarify the discussion. Instead it makes it more difficult to maintain the standard and more confusing to implement. If the wakeup sequence is the same for the three modes, then it would be the same state machine, saving MAC complexity.

Disposition Rebuttal

The functions are defined separately to maintain focus of description. This discussion is appropriate within its context. Capital letter changes made.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

COMMENT STATUS R

RESPONSE STATUS U

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number 32

Comment Rationale

The lost text from page 77 has found a home (see comment 90). There is no description of the differences between $f(k)$ and $f'(k)$ in this paragraph.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 231

Clause number 8.9.6

Page number 77

Line number 29

Type of comment E

Part of NO vote Y

Recommended change

Move the sentence describing $f(k)$ and $f'(k)$, with corrected figure references, to this paragraph, possibly after the sentence ending "... the slave received," on line 29. Of course this is defined earlier, I said that in the comment. However, it should be defined where it is used, not 4 sections earlier.

Disposition Rebuttal

The usage of these terms are defined earlier in the clause (see 8.9.2)
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

COMMENT STATUS R

RESPONSE STATUS U

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **33****Comment Rationale**

There are two hopping sequences used in the page/page response scenario, but the text in the paragraph only uses the term "hop frequency" without distinguishing which sequence is used.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **232**Clause number **8.9.6****Recommended change**

For each reference of "hop frequency" change it to indicate if it is the "page hop frequency" or "page response hop frequency" as appropriate. The wording should assist in the understanding of the section, not hinder it. Changing to page hop or page response hop will clarify the discussion.

Page number **77**Line number **34-40**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

Terms f(k) and f'(k) are clearly defined and implicitly indicate the hopping sequence in use. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes
LB11 Comment Number **34****Comment Rationale**

This subclause repeats information that has been mentioned many times before in the standard and adds absolutely no new information.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **234**Clause number **8.9.7****Recommended change**

Delete the subclause, possibly moving the figure to an earlier subclause where this description first appears. Just because the repetition was intentional does not make it right. The disclaimer in the first sentence doesn't change the zero information content of the sub-clause. The sub-clause adds zero information and should be deleted.

Page number **79**Line number **5-38**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

Repetition of this subclause is intentional as is stated in the first sentence. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number 35

Comment Rationale

There is no reason to indicate that a crystal oscillator is used for timing reference as this is implementation dependent and not relevant to the link control. Likewise, the LPO is not required, it could be an HPO (high power oscillator).

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 204

Clause number 8.10.3

Recommended change

Change "... native clock is driven by the reference crystal oscillator with a worst case ..." to "... native clock has a worst case ..." and change "... clock may be driven by a low power oscillator (LPO) with relaxed accuracy ..." to "... clock may have a relaxed accuracy ...". The comment was partially accepted, but no changes have been made. The LPO reference should be deleted as well for the reasons stated.

Page number 80

Line number 50-54

Type of comment E

Disposition Rebuttal

Changed reference to "crystal" as suggested. Reference to LPO is associated with "MAY" and is therefore informative. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote Y

COMMENT STATUS R

RESPONSE STATUS U

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number 36

Comment Rationale

The clock accuracy requirement is repeated here instead of referencing one of the two other locations where it is defined (of course the definitions are different, so you can pick which ever one you want). Likewise the LPO accuracy is referenced here, but should be specified where the symbol accuracy is defined.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 205

Clause number 8.10.3

Recommended change

Change the listing of a +/- ppm number to a cross reference where the clock accuracy is defined. The previous timing references refer to both protocol and hardware clocks. This is now the third timing reference. The ppm discussion is repetitious and not necessary and therefore should be deleted.

Page number 80

Line number 50-54

Type of comment E

Disposition Rebuttal

Previous timing accuracy references refer to protocol interchanges. This reference is a suggestion about the hardware clock. These concepts are related, but not interchangeable. The reference is therefore inappropriate. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote Y

COMMENT STATUS R

RESPONSE STATUS U

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **37****Comment Rationale**

The sentence refers to the "LPO" accuracy rather than providing a cross-reference to where the accuracy is defined.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **206**Clause number **8.10.5****Recommended change**

Change "... running at the accuracy of the LPO (or better)," to "...running, potentially at a reduced accuracy as defined in ???." No reason given for rejection, the comment was partially applied, however. Please remove reference to LPO as indicated.

Page number **82**Line number **44**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**LB11 Comment Number **38****Comment Rationale**

This paragraph is an unnecessary repeat of earlier information.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **207**Clause number **8.10.6.1****Recommended change**

Delete paragraph as it does not add any useful information to the discussion. The information in the paragraph is not even relevant to the discussion in this section. It should be deleted.

Page number **83**Line number **11-13**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**This paragraph is in the introductory part of the clause. Information is repeated advisedly.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments

<p>LB11 Comment Number 39</p> <p>LB10 Comment Number</p> <p>LB8 Comment Number 209</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Clause number 8.10.6.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Page number 83</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Line number 39</p> <p>Type of comment E</p> <p>Part of NO vote Y</p> <p>COMMENT STATUS R</p> <p>RESPONSE STATUS U</p>	<p>Comment Rationale</p> <p>There is an inconsistent use of all-caps for system states. The state of page scan, page, etc. are lower cased while STANDBY and CONNECTION are upper cased.</p> <p>Recommended change</p> <p>Change all state indications to either lower case or upper case. Submitting this as errata is nice, but it does not resolve the comment, which was directed at this document. Comment remains unresolved.</p> <p>Disposition Rebuttal</p> <p>We agree that it is preferable to maintain a consistent case on system attributes. We will submit an official Bluetooth erratum to call out this deficit. We do not believe that this problem will prevent the proper implementation of a system based on this Standard. ERRATA# 2144 The BRC disagrees with our original rebuttal; we now reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.</p>
--	---

Editor Notes

<p>LB11 Comment Number 42</p> <p>LB10 Comment Number</p> <p>LB8 Comment Number 210</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Clause number 8.10.6.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Page number 84</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Line number 41-42</p> <p>Type of comment E</p> <p>Part of NO vote Y</p> <p>COMMENT STATUS R</p> <p>RESPONSE STATUS U</p>	<p>Comment Rationale</p> <p>The information in the sentence "Since the page ... the synthesizer" has already been presented in this clause. In addition, this information is not relevant to the present discussion.</p> <p>Recommended change</p> <p>Delete the sentence. The sentence is not simply parenthetical, it is redundant, confusing and not relevant to the present discussion.</p> <p>Disposition Rebuttal</p> <p>The sentence is, indeed, parenthetical. The appropriate punctuation has been added. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. We APPLIED AN EDIT but we REJECT THE SUGGESTED REMEDY FROM THE VOTER "Delete the sentence.", however we cut this, we agreed that an edit was appropriate. The BRC disagrees with the EXPLICIT suggestion, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.</p>
---	--

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **43****Comment Rationale**

Change the sentence "... the receiver ... for ID packet." to "... the receiver that issued the page ... for the ID packet."

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 211

Clause number 8.10.6.3

Page number 84

Line number 42-43

Type of comment **E**Part of NO vote **Y****Recommended change**

Change as indicated. The sentence is ambiguous and should be changed.

Disposition Rebuttal

There is no ambiguity in this sentence.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number **44****Comment Rationale**

The sentence "The synthesizer hop ..." is redundant, having been adequately addressed elsewhere.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number 212

Clause number 8.10.6.3

Page number 84

Line number 47

Type of comment **E**Part of NO vote **Y****Recommended change**

Delete the sentence. The sentence does not improve the readability, only the redundancy.

Disposition Rebuttal

This information is provided for the convenience of the reader to improve readability.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **45****Comment Rationale**

This table repeats some of the information from table 23.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **213**Clause number **8.10.6.3****Recommended change**

Delete the column Npage from Table 23 and reference Table 23 here and Table 24 in the description for Table 23. Adding the redundant information does not improve the clarity of the section.

Page number **85**Line number **Table 24**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**These tables are different. Both are necessary.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.Part of NO vote **Y****COMMENT STATUS R****RESPONSE STATUS U****Editor Notes**LB11 Comment Number **46****Comment Rationale**

The usage of page_response (thanks for pointing that out) here is not consistent with page scan and page scan elsewhere in this clause. Here we have page_response, which is good, but page scan elsewhere instead of page_scan. The naming needs to be consistent and there should be an explanation of the nomenclature in this clause.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **214**Clause number **8.10.6.4****Recommended change**

The best would be to use PAGE_SCAN throughout the clause (likewise for INQUIRY_SCAN and other states), otherwise page_scan without bold formatting should be used. page_response is a sub-state, it corresponds to slave response. The naming and formatting of the states and sub-states in this section are very confusing, not consistent and not well-defined. As a minimum, change the substates to words separated by underscores, e.g. page_scan instead of page scan.

Page number **86**Line number **53**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**Term page_response does not refer to a state or sub-state.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.Part of NO vote **Y****COMMENT STATUS R****RESPONSE STATUS U****Editor Notes**

IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments

LB11 Comment Number **48****Comment Rationale**

This is the best definition of the page response state. Very little new information is given in 8.9.6 and the presentation in two different sections is confusing.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **216**Clause number **8.10.6.4.1****Recommended change**

Delete section 8.9.6 and its accompanying figures (which are redundant), merge any missing ideas into section 8.10.6.4.1. Delete the sentence that begins "More details about the ..." on line 35. The two sections do describe the same thing. This clause, in particular, suffers most from one of the defects of the Bluetooth specification; that the information required to implement any piece of it is spread out throughout the document. Deleting 8.9.6 would help the document.

Page number **88**Line number **24-52**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

8.9.6 is a general description; it must precede the subsequent usage explanation. The two sections, although related, they do not describe the same thing. One describes the use of the FHS packet, the other describes the behavior in that particular sub-state. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**LB11 Comment Number **49****Comment Rationale**

The nomenclature for the timing parameter here, pagerespTO differs from earlier timing, e.g. Tw page scan. It appears that pagerespTO is a timer rather than a time (as it is used here). This should be a timing parameter, e.g. Tw page resp

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **217**Clause number **8.10.6.4.1****Recommended change**

Select one method (T_parameter is best) and keep it consistent throughout for all timing parameters (e.g. newconnectionTO). Link all of the usages of the word with cross references to where the numeric definition can be found. Submitting this as errata is nice, but it does not resolve the comment, which was directed at this document. Comment remains unresolved.

Page number **88**Line number **38**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

We agree that it is preferable to maintain a consistent nomenclature. We will submit an official Bluetooth erratum to call out this deficit. We do not believe that this problem will prevent the proper implementation of a system based on this Standard. ERRATA# 2135
The BRC disagrees with our original rebuttal; we now reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **52****Comment Rationale**

The end of the paragraph beginning with "The channel hopping ..." is redundant, having been adequately explained earlier in the clause.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **219**Clause number **8.10.6.4.2****Recommended change**

Delete the last three sentences. The last two were deleted, however, the one remaining is still redundant and addresses only the 79 channel case. The edit still has not been applied, comment remains unresolved.

Page number **89**Line number **33-34**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

The BRC agrees with the comment BUT we forgot to apply the edit. We promise to add into 802.15.1/D1.0.1 Oops. The Editor note still holds true the D1.0.0 or next draft will delete the sentence "The channel hopping sequence uses all 79 hop channels in a (pseudo) random fashion, see also Section 8.11.3.6 on page 114."

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **C****Editor Notes**

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

LB11 Comment Number **54****Comment Rationale**

Pages 259 and 260 are blank

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number

Clause number **10.8.5****Recommended change**

Delete the pages

Page number **259-260**Line number **All**Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

This edit will be provided by the IEEE-SA Project Editor. The BRC has ACCEPTED this NEW comment but the Voter is UNSATISFIED with our resolution.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments

LB11 Comment Number **55****Comment Rationale**

Table 108 doesn't have a title. I suspect it is not supposed to be a table, but rather should be formatted like the rest of the commands in this section.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number

Clause number 11.2.5.2

Recommended change

Change the format of table 108 (and delete the table title for 109) to match the rest of the tables in this clause.

Page number 274

Line number 31-40

Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

This edit will be provided by the IEEE-SA Project Editor. The BRC has ACCEPTED this NEW comment but the Voter is UNSATISFIED with our resolution.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

LB11 Comment Number **60****Comment Rationale**

The last item of the dashed list on page 1104 is spread out over pages 1105 and 1106. Is it that important that it needs to take up two full pages?

LB10 Comment Number 11

LB8 Comment Number

Clause number E.2.2

Recommended change

Try to convince this item to sit on just one page, preferably 1104. Possibly there needs to be a carriage return after the last item to separate it from the following figure.

Page number 1105-1106

Line number 1

Type of comment **E****Disposition Rebuttal**

This edit will be provided by the IEEE-SA Project Editor. The BRC has ACCEPTED this comment but the Voter is UNSATISFIED with our resolution.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **A**RESPONSE STATUS **U****Editor Notes**

This document will be forwarded to the IEEE-SA Project Editor w/ this comment flagged.

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

<p>LB11 Comment Number 1</p> <p>LB10 Comment Number</p> <p>LB8 Comment Number 356</p> <p>Clause number Introduction</p> <p>Page number iii</p> <p>Line number 23-28</p> <p>Type of comment T</p> <p>Part of NO vote Y</p> <p>COMMENT STATUS A</p> <p>RESPONSE STATUS U</p>	<p>Comment Rationale</p> <p>The paragraph indicates that conformance to the standard is determined only by the Bluetooth qualification group rather than the standard itself. Products that conform to this open standard are those which meet the requirements contained in this document, not in other closed documents determined by closed entities. Furthermore, the wording of this section allows the BT SIG to change the conformance requirements without the review of the IEEE.</p> <p>Recommended change</p> <p>Remove the paragraph or change it so that conformance is determined by the standard, rather than by a closed organization and closed document. If the paragraph is not normative, then it can and should be removed. The referenced compliance document has 1) not been reviewed by the IEEE, 2) is not publicly available, and 3) is not yet completed.</p> <p>Disposition Rebuttal</p> <p>This paragraph was changed based on the LB8 Reply Comment #356 and the Voters comment and recommended change are inconsistent with the revision now found in 802.15.1/D0.9.2. There is no document but rather a Web Site is referenced. The BRC has ACCEPTED this original comment but the Voter is UNSATISFIED with our resolution and applied edit. (also see -01/117r14)</p>
--	--

Editor Notes

<p>LB11 Comment Number 12</p> <p>LB10 Comment Number</p> <p>LB8 Comment Number 315</p> <p>Clause number 7.3</p> <p>Page number 30</p> <p>Line number 13-14</p> <p>Type of comment T</p> <p>Part of NO vote Y</p> <p>COMMENT STATUS R</p> <p>RESPONSE STATUS U</p>	<p>Comment Rationale</p> <p>This paragraph states that all page and inquiry transmission should be done at less than +4 dBm TX power. However, this negates the ability of a piconet to operate at a class 1 power level since page and inquiry are required to set up all connections. If the master scales back his power for these critical link operations, then the effective range of the piconet will be reduced to be as if the master was only Power class 2 or 3.</p> <p>Recommended change</p> <p>Either delete the Power class 1 or state that Power class 1 devices shall use the Pmax in inquiry or page. This is one of the worst technical errors in this standard (right after a 4 bit preamble and the 1/3 code). If a conformant device implements this recommended practice, it will decrease the range of the piconet. If it does not, it will saturate nearby receivers. Either way, the standard is broken as written and this recommendation simply points it out.</p> <p>Disposition Rebuttal</p> <p>The word, should, indicates that this paragraph contains informative text, therefore it is not binding on other sections of the specification.</p> <p>I do not agree with James's solution of eliminating power class 1, as the problem is so easy to get around.</p> <p>My specific response on comment number 315 is that the only "requirement" in that paragraph is that a class 1 device NOT use class 1 power levels unless it is sure that the receiving device supports the power control messages. The paragraph does not PROHIBIT a device from doing paging or inquiry above +4dBm, but only serves to remind the implementer that doing so may prevent class 2-3 devices from responding correctly, due to excessive receive power levels.</p> <p>Let's say that node A pages/inquires only at below +4dBm. As James points out the range of the piconet is effectively reduced because of the power limit. Node B, which is a class 2 device that is 1 meter away will respond correctly. Node C, which is a class 2 device that is 15 meters away will not respond.</p> <p>Now let's say that node A pages/inquires at +20 dBm. Now Node C will respond correctly, but node B fails due to excessive power levels at his receiver.</p> <p>Finally, let's say that Node C is a class 2-3 device in the last scenario. In this case, it will receive the page/inquiry, but node C's response is lost due to the distance between nodes A and C. Thus, neither node B nor C responds to the sender.</p>
---	---

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **13****Comment Rationale**

The symbol timing accuracy is specified, but it's measurement is not. How is it measured? Is it +/- 20 ppm of ideal zero crossings of a 0101 sequence? Is it measured at the peaks? Is it +/- 20 ppm of the 1 Mbaud rate? Note that the definition of timing later in the standard (section 8.9) specifies that the +/- 20 ppm is relative to 625 us rather than the symbol rate of 1 us. This is almost 3 orders of magnitude difference in the meaning of the timing accuracy.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **324**Clause number **7.3.1****Recommended change**

Provide a defined method to measure the accuracy of the symbol timing and insure that it matches with the definition in section 8.9. All standards specify test specifications. The standard must or it cannot specify interoperable devices. For examples of test specifications, see sub-clauses 7.4.2 through 7.4.4 and Annex E (normative) of the current document for examples or sub-clause 18.4.7.8 of IEEE Std 802.11b-1999. This requirement needs a proper definition.

Page number **30**Line number **20**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

The comment and the suggested remedy are not consistent. The symbol timing accuracy & the slot timing accuracy are well defined but unrelated. The standard does not recommend measurement methods. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number **15****Comment Rationale**

The -20 dBc requirement is for frequency offsets greater than +/- 550 kHz

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **325**Clause number **7.3.2.1****Recommended change**

Change "+/- 550 kHz" to "> +/- 550 kHz" The specification has changed to +/- 500 kHz now (it should be +/- 550 kHz) and it is still applicable for all frequencies greater than 550 kHz offset. The paragraph also states that the FCC definition is stated below, but the definition is not in the document (line 1 of Table 5 does not give the FCC requirement).

Page number **31**Line number **29**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

The preceding text specifies a 100 KHz band around the stated frequency offset. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **19****Comment Rationale**

The maximum drift rate is not well defined. In an FSK system, the frequency is, by definition, always changing. The center frequency can only be inferred by observing a number of symbols and cannot be calculated instantaneously. I would like to point out that the latest Bluetooth test documents have changed the frequency drift measurement because the original one couldn't differentiate between the normal variations in the FM and actual drift. The number required in the table does not have a unique measurement associated with it and so it is not possible to verify compliance with the information given here.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **326**Clause number **7.3.3****Recommended change**

Provide a well defined method to measure the maximum drift rate or remove the requirement from the standard. All standards specify test specifications. The standard must or it cannot specify interoperable devices. For examples of test specifications, see sub-clauses 7.4.2 through 7.4.4 and Annex E (normative) of the current document or sub-clause 18.4.7.8 of IEEE Std 802.11b-1999. This requirement needs a proper definition.

Page number **32**Line number **25**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

This clause does not attempt to set test specifications
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number **25****Comment Rationale**

The paragraph states that the ACL link is a point-to-multipoint link, it is not, rather it is a point-to-point link. Only broadcast packets are point-multipoint and are, by definition, not links.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **332**Clause number **8.3.1****Recommended change**

Change the sentence from "... is a point-to-multipoint link between the master and all the slaves ..." to "... is a point-to-point link between the master and one of the slaves ...". The fact still remains that an ACL link is NOT a point-to-multipoint link. The change should be made as indicated.

Page number **42**Line number **35**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

The statement is true in the general sense. Point to point ACL links are specified in the next sentence.
The exception to the rule is the broadcast message which makes the ACL Link look like a P-MP link. BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **26****Comment Rationale**

The whitening process does not minimize DC bias in a packet. In order to prevent DC bias, the message length must be expanded by the whitener, which it is not in 802.15.1. The whitener has no effect on the probability of achieving a certain DC bias based on random input data.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **317**Clause number **8.7****Recommended change**

Remove the text that says "and to minimize DC bias in the packet." This comment was marked accepted, but the changes have not been made. The changes still has not been made, comment remains unresolved.

Page number **67**Line number **38-40**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

Editorial changes made to correct the shorthand used in this clause.
Read it again.

Part of NO vote **Y**

The BRC applied the following edit replacing minimize w/ reduce:

D0.8.0 Was:

Before transmission, both the header and the payload are scrambled with a data whitening word in order to randomize the data from highly redundant patterns and to minimize DC bias in the packet."

D0.9.2 Is Now:

Before transmission, both the header and the payload are scrambled with a data whitening word in order to randomize the data from highly redundant patterns and to reduce DC bias in the packet.

COMMENT STATUS **A**

We believe this is sufficient. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we accept this comment and it is ACCEPTED/CLOSED.

RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

LB11 Comment Number **29****Comment Rationale**

The sentence "If a trigger event ..." is true only for the Master. A slave needs to hear the packet header, but may ignore the rest of the packet if it is not addressed to it. In the case of the Master RX, the packet should be addressed to the Master (if it isn't, there is a fault in the slave) and so it can be presumed that it should listen to the entire packet.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **335**Clause number **8.9.2****Recommended change**

Change the sentence to indicate that it applies to the Master's RX and that the slave (as specified elsewhere) can go to sleep if it does not see either the broadcast address or its address in the packet header. No confusion with the CAC. If a slave hears the CAC and finds that the AM_ADDR in the header that follows the CAC is not theirs, the slave should be able to ignore the rest of the packet. The current text does not allow this power saving mode.

Page number **75**Line number **30-31**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

Comment confuses CAC with AM_ADDR.

Part of NO vote **Y**

From david.cypher@nist.gov Thu May 3 15:01:43 2001

IEEE response still stands and is correct. The preceding sentence before the on in question, "If no trigger ..." states that "... the access correlator searches for the correct channel access code ..." Therefore the trigger is the CAC and if the CAC is not found by the MASTER, the MASTER's receiver can sleep as currently stated. The commenter is thinking the trigger is the AM_ADDR. If the trigger was the AM_ADDR then the commenter would be correct. That the MASTER could not sleep in its RX slot since the packet is destined to it.

COMMENT STATUS **R**

The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.

The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

<p>LB11 Comment Number 30</p> <p>LB10 Comment Number</p> <p>LB8 Comment Number 334</p> <p>Clause number 8.9.2</p> <p>Page number 75</p> <p>Line number 38-39</p> <p>Type of comment T</p> <p>Part of NO vote Y</p> <p>COMMENT STATUS R</p> <p>RESPONSE STATUS U</p>	<p>Comment Rationale</p> <p>The variable N is used in the sentence, but not defined. (i.e. N is an even positive integer). This paragraph (like much of 8.9.2) repeats information found in 8.9.1 without adding any new information.</p> <p>Recommended change</p> <p>Either delete the paragraph because it adds no new information (preferred) or define N in same way it was been defined (at least twice) before when this same concept was explained. N is used consistently, M, however is not and is not defined in the previous paragraph. In any event, the paragraph is redundant and should be deleted.</p> <p>Disposition Rebuttal</p> <p>The use of N is consistent throughout this sub-clause. May have mis-understood the slave RX burst* which is the same slot as Master TX. The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.</p>
---	--

Editor Notes

<p>LB11 Comment Number 40</p> <p>LB10 Comment Number</p> <p>LB8 Comment Number 328</p> <p>Clause number 8.10.6.2</p> <p>Page number 83</p> <p>Line number 47-48</p> <p>Type of comment T</p> <p>Part of NO vote Y</p> <p>COMMENT STATUS R</p> <p>RESPONSE STATUS U</p>	<p>Comment Rationale</p> <p>The scan windows should be required, not recommended. As it is, Bluetooth is very slow in responding to new devices, allowing devices to use smaller scan windows would make it much worse. Furthermore, it has not been shown that a smaller scan window will still allow devices to find each other. (The first page trains had a lock up condition that only came out under review. Shorter scan windows have not been analyzed).</p> <p>Recommended change</p> <p>Change recommended to required. This is an interoperability issue. If a device use a page scan window that is too small, it may never acquire the network. The minimum window should be required to insure that the system works.</p> <p>Disposition Rebuttal</p> <p>The text should remain as is. The choice of the page scan window size is up to the implementation, and is not appropriate to be included in the standard. The existing text makes a recommendation, which the implementer may or may not use. The end result affects the performance of the implementation, not the interoperability. That was confusing. The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED. Any question please feel free to call +1 978 815 8182.</p>
--	--

Editor Notes

**IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments**

LB11 Comment Number **50****Comment Rationale**

is CLKN restarted when the slave is listening for the FHS packet. As clarified on the email discussion, the description of this state (which is scattered over a few sub-clauses) does not tell when the hop sequence is unfrozen.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **329**Clause number **8.10.6.4.1****Recommended change**

This needs to be clarified with text at the end of the paragraph ending on line 43. Clarification, are the values of CLKN16-12 unfrozen when the slave is listening for the FHS packet? What values are they set to? Of course, if you freeze CLKN16-12 you freeze CLKN as well. This is what needs to be clarified.

Page number **88**Line number **43**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

CLKN is the native clock and is not frozen. The values in CLKN16-12 are frozen so that they are fixed when calculating the hop frequencies.

Part of NO vote **Y**

From david.cypher@nist.gov Thu May 3 15:01:43 2001
The CLKN as per IEEE reference 8.10.3 is the free-running native clock ... From this I conclude that the CLKN is not restarted, because it was never stopped. He cannot introduce a new comment based on an old one that was resolved.

COMMENT STATUS **R**

The BRC disagrees, your Reply Comment is not a comment on an outstanding change. This comment is invalid. However, the TC1 Editor points out that this comment was hotly debated on the WG Private Reflector; bottom line is you need to read the whole Std to understand this Bluetooth Radio System. We reject this comment and it is now closed.

RESPONSE STATUS **U**

The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Editor Notes
LB11 Comment Number **51****Comment Rationale**

Here it seems that CLKN is restarted, but it is not clear when.

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number **330**Clause number **8.10.6.4.2****Recommended change**

Clarify when CLKN is restarted, what is state is and synchronize with explanation in section 8.10.6.4.1 (see comment 118) Here the inputs to CLKN16-12 appear to have been unfrozen, so what state do they assume? When exactly are they unfrozen? This is important for interoperability and is poorly defined.

Page number **89**Line number **27**Type of comment **T****Disposition Rebuttal**

CLKN is the native clock and is not stopped.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.
The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttals still stand; we reject this comment and it is REJECTED/UNSATISFIED.

Part of NO vote **Y**COMMENT STATUS **R**RESPONSE STATUS **U**

Editor Notes

IEEE P802.15 Working Group For WPANs
Letter Ballot #11
IEEE P802.15.1/D0.9.2 Comments

LB11 Comment Number **Comment Rationale**

LB10 Comment Number

LB8 Comment Number

Clause number **Recommended change**

Page number

Line number

Type of comment **Disposition Rebuttal**

Part of NO vote

COMMENT STATUS

RESPONSE STATUS

Editor Notes
