

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
2	5	Barr, John	1.2	1	36-37	E	Y	The sentence making the terms synonymous for the purposes of this document is not necessary now since distinction has been made by qualifying WPAN with 802.15.1 or Bluetooth when referring to a particular technology implementation. Leaving this sentence in now confuses the reader at various points in the following document.	Remove this sentence entirely.	The BRC accepts this comment.	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
3	7	Barr, John	6	19	6-8	E	Y	The sentence making the terms synonymous for the purposes of this document is not necessary now since distinction has been made by qualifying WPAN with 802.15.1 or Bluetooth when referring to a particular technology implementation. Leaving this sentence in now confuses the reader at various points in the following document.	Remove this sentence entirely.	The BRC accepts this comment.	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
4	6	Barr, John	2.4.1	3	47	e	Y	Superscript on item does not have a corresponding explanation at the bottom of the page.	Remove the superscript or add the appropriate explanation.	The BRC accepts this as a "smoothing" footnote comment. The 4th footnote can be found on the following page. We applied an editorial correction and the rationale/recommendation has been mitigated.	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
7	61	Gilb, James	6.1.1	20	0	e	N	The draft number on this page is 0.9.0 in the header rather than 0.9.1	Change master page, probably you have an override that should be removed.	The BRC accepts this comment.	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
1	8	Barr, John	0	0	0	E	Y	WPAN, a registered trademark, is used as a noun in many places. This usage will cause the IEEE to lose their trademark unless corrected and properly used.	Change phrases like "single example of a WPAN" to "single example of WPAN technology" or "single example of WPAN implementation". Or make a large note to the IEEE SA editor that usage of WPAN in this draft needs to be evaluated and corrected to ensure that our trademakr is not lost.	The BRC accepts this comment but after extensive (+25 edits) editing to resolve this Voters' issue we will now defer to the trademark holder, IEEE-SA and their experienced Project Editor. Also, we note that the (TM) term may have changed to (R); IEEE-SA is the owner and is the most motivated to address this comment correctly.	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/I/T/H)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
9	63	Gilb, James	7.1ff	28-1020	various	E	Y	<p>The word "must" is used where the word "shall" is required. According to the IEEE standards companion (page 20) "Traditionally, "must" is frowned upon in standards writing because its mandatory nature can be confused with "shall." ... Remember, "must" is not a defined standards verb in standards organizations. Therefore, the mandatory nature of a statement with "must" in a standard could be called into question in a court of law, and there would be no existing practice or rules to back up its meaning (keep in mind what was discussed earlier, the quasi-legal nature of standards and the need for a clear understanding of a standard's intent). For this reason, "must" should be avoided unless it is being used in a descriptive fashion (if it is raining, the sky must be gray). Stick to the defined standards verbs for the sake of clarity between you and the users of your standard."</p>	Change all occurrences of "must" to "shall" in the standard	<p>comment, however, the more authoritative IEEE source is the IEEE Standards Style Manual, May00:</p> <p>"The word shall is used to indicate mandatory requirements strictly to be followed in order to conform to the standard and from which no deviation is permitted (shall equals is required to). The use of the word must is deprecated and shall not be used when stating mandatory requirements; must is used only to describe unavoidable situations. The use of the word will is deprecated and shall not be used when stating mandatory requirements; will is only used in statements of fact."</p> <p>Project 802.15.1 has identified 262 occurrences of "must" or "MUST" in the Bluetooth derivative</p>	A	O	Editor Note: ICG the Editor-in-Chief will submit a comment in Sponsor Ballot and submit a Bluetooth errata too that explicitly identifies the word usage in question both in the Std and the Spec - using each organizations unique paragraph referencing in their source documents - the BRC will resolve this comment prior to the completion of the Sponsor Ballot phase.

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
11	58	Gilb, James	E.2.2	1105-1106	1	E	Y	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?	Try to convince this item to sit on just one page, preferably 1104.	indicates that this is a IEEE-SA Project Editor issue and we agree with the commenter.  <snip> To: <stds-802-15@ieee.org> Subject: RE: WPAN/ LB10 begins at noon, Monday April 9 From: "Tom Siep" <siep@ti.com> Date: Mon, 9 Apr 2001 15:43:33 -0500 Importance: Normal In-Reply-To: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/15/private/802-15list/msg00335.html> Sender: owner-stds-802-15@ieee.org  Potential voters please note:  Many of the needed editorial changes that were cited in LB8 (such as bad page breaks, etc) have yet to be fixed. We have done this on advice	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
12	1	Shellhammer, Steve	8.14.5.2	144	51-53	e		<p>19:51:31 2001 Date: Fri, 20 Apr 2001 16:48:39 -0400 From: Steve Shellhammer &lt;shell@symbol.com&gt; To: stds-802-15@ieee.org Cc: Gary Schneider &lt;Schneide.ENG-PO.ENG-DOM@symbol.com&gt; Subject: WPAN/ Error in IEEE 802.15.1 and Bluetooth Specifiction</p> <p>IEEE 802.15.1,</p> <p>I have been working on the Bluetooth Authentication and I found an error in the specification. On Page 163 of the IEEE 802.15.1 draft standard is Figure 82. The figure is correct. The caption of the figure includes the following text,</p> <p>"The permuation boxes show how input byte indices are mapped onto output byte indices. Thus, position 0 (leftmost) is mapped on position 8, position 1 is mapped on position 11, et cetera."</p> <p>This text says that the element in position 0 of the input array to the permutation box becomes the element in position 8 in the output</p>	The permutation box should take the element in position 8 of the input array and move it to position 0 in the output array.		A	O	Editor Note: ICG submitted 30Apr01an errata to the BSIG. ERRATA#2161

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
13	1	Gifford, Ian	9.3.12	167	7-15	e		<p>The paragraph starting "PDUs used for master-slave switch.If the slave initiates the master-slave switch it..." is incorrect. The first sentence is a Table Title the balance is the post table paragraph. Refer to v1.0B for intended flow. The problem ocured when (Erratum 1190) was added to the derivative source. IEEE imported it.</p>	<p>used for master-slave switch." &lt;-POSITION TABLE HERE This is the paragraph "If the slave initiates the master-slave switch it finalizes the transmission of the current ACL packet with L2CAP information, stops L2CAP transmission and sends LMP_slot_offset immediately followed by LMP_switch_req. If the master accepts the master-slave switch it finalizes the transmission of the current ACL packet with L2CAP information, stops L2CAP transmission and responds with LMP_accepted. When the master-slave switch has been completed on Baseband level (successfully or not) both units re-enable L2CAP transmission. If the master rejects the master-slave switch it responds with LMP_not_accepted and the slave re-enables L2CAP transmission. The transaction ID for all PDUs</p>	<p>Submit Bluetooth Errata, adding Table Number 3.12 to Vol 1, Part C, pg 208</p>	A	O	<p>Editor Note: ICG applied this obvious edit to D1.0.0. and submitted 29Apr01an errata to the BSIG. ERRATA#2160</p>

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
17	5	Gifford, Ian	8.14	124	50-51	e		Is the following sentence "Currently (1999) it seems that an encryption key size of 64 bits gives satisfying protection for most applications." still accurate?	If yes then I suggest to remedy this issue by revising the sentence as follows: "Currently (2001) it seems that an encryption key size of 64 bits gives satisfying protection for most applications."	Submit Bluetooth Errata, adding Table Number 3.12 to Vol 1, Part C, pg 208	A	O	Submit Bluetooth Errata
18	6	Gifford, Ian	8.14.5.1	143	52	e		Is the following footnote #1/sentence "It is presently one of the contenders for the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) submitted by Cylink, Corp, Sunnyvale, USA" still accurate?	If yes then I suggest to remedy this issue by revising the sentence as follows: "As of 2001, it is presently one of the contenders for the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) submitted by Cylink, Corp, Sunnyvale, USA"		A	O	Submit Bluetooth Errata

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
14	2	Gifford, Ian	0	I	42-43	e		Two (2) of the nine (9) Promoter Company names changed: Lucent Technologies, Inc. > Agere Systems, Inc. and Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson > Ericsson Technology Licensing, AB	# PROMOTER (CURRENT) 1 3Com Corporation, 2 IBM Corporation, 3 Intel Corporation, 4 Lucent Technologies, Inc., 5 Microsoft Corporation, 6 Motorola, Inc., 7 Nokia Mobile Phones, 8 Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, 9 Toshiba Corporation  # PROMOTER (SHOULD BE) 1 3Com Corporation, 2 Agere Systems, Inc., 3 Ericsson Technology Licensing, AB, 4 IBM Corporation, 5 Intel Corporation, 6 Microsoft Corporation, 7 Motorola, Inc., 8 Nokia Mobile Phones, 9 Toshiba Corporation		A	Z	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D0.9.1
15	3	Gifford, Ian	8.12.4.1	119	29	e		The derivative text refers to a "A digital CVSD encoded test signal is provided in a Test Signal file available on the website." Upon review this document has a revision: "CVSD encoded test signal, version 2.1 "	It is recommend that we post the v2.1 file on the IEEE Public Web Site as an archive and provide a launch HTML page for the Std going forward.		A	Z	Editor Note: ICG provided four (4) offsite links via: <a href="http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html">http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html</a> to download the Bluetooth Core, Profiles, and Assigned Numbers v1.1, dated 22Feb01 and the CVSD document. The PRD was removed and a URL was provided for the Bluetooth SIG, Inc. Qualification Program Website or <a href="http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Templates.cfm">http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Templates.cfm</a>



LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
16	4	Gifford, Ian	8.12.4.2	119	29	e		The derivative text refers to a "A set of reference input signals are encoded by the transmitter and sent through a reference decoder (available on the website)." Upon review this document has a revision: "CVSD encoded test signal, version 2.1 "	It is recommend that we post the v2.1 file on the IEEE Public Web Site as an archive and provide a launch HTML page for the Std going forward.		A	Z	Editor Note: ICG provided four (4) offsite links via: <a href="http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html">http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html</a> to download the Bluetooth Core, Profiles, and Assigned Numbers v1.1, dated 22Feb01 and the CVSD document. The PRD was removed and a URL was provided for the Bluetooth SIG, Inc. Qualification Program Website or <a href="http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Templates/cfm">http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Templates/cfm</a>
5	60	Gilb, James	2.4.3-2.4.6	4	6-30	t	Y	This section references 4 documents that are not publicly available. Bluetooth documents less than version 1.0 are not available to the general public. Neither the assigned numbers nor the CVSD document was not on the referenced web site either. The IEEE rule is that if a document is not easily available to the public, it cannot go into the references section. These documents can, however be put in the bibliography.	Move the four document references to the bibliography.	The BRC does not accept this comment. Per our BSIG-IEEE agreement we will post these BSIG documents to the IEEE Web Site prior to commencement of Sponsor Ballot. All four (4) will be posted per the following: <snip> Note that the above referenced Bluetooth documents ***will be*** archived on the IEEE website: <a href="http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/">http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/</a> </snip>	R	C	Editor Note: ICG provided four (4) offsite links via: <a href="http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html">http://ieee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html</a> to download the Bluetooth Core, Profiles, and Assigned Numbers v1.1, dated 22Feb01 and the CVSD document. The PRD was removed and a URL was provided for the Bluetooth SIG, Inc. Qualification Program Website or <a href="http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Templates/cfm">http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Templates/cfm</a>

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
6	4	Barr, John	2.4.3-2.4.6	4	6-30	t	Y	This section references 4 documents that are not publicly available. Bluetooth documents less than version 1.0 are not available to the general public. Neither the assigned numbers nor the CVSD document was not on the referenced web site either. The IEEE rule is that if a document is not easily available to the public, it cannot go into the references section. These documents can, however be put in the bibliography.	Move the four document references to the bibliography.	The BRC does not accept this comment. Per our BSIG-IEEE agreement we will post these BSIG documents to the IEEE Web Site prior to commencement of Sponsor Ballot. All four (4) will be posted per the following: <snip> Note that the above referenced Bluetooth documents ***will be*** archived on the IEEE website: <a href="http://iee802.org/15/Bluetooth/">http://iee802.org/15/Bluetooth/</a> </snip>	R	C	Editor Note: ICG provided four (4) offsite links via: <a href="http://iee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html">http://iee802.org/15/Bluetooth/index.html</a> to download the Bluetooth Core, Profiles, and Assigned Numbers v1.1, dated 22Feb01 and the CVSD document. The PRD was removed and a URL was provided for the Bluetooth SIG, Inc. Qualification Program Website or <a href="http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Template.cfm">http://qualweb.opengroup.org/Template.cfm</a>

LB10 Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Voters Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause number e.g., 8.10.2	Page number e.g., 1-1130, etc.	Line number e.g., 1-54	Type of comments (E/e/T/t)	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
10	19	Gilb, James	7.3.2.2	31	45	E	Y	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 must be specified.	Change "should" to "shall" to match the "shall" in the second sentence.	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.	R	O	Editor Note: ICG The latest v1.1 Bluetooth source says "The measured power should be measured in a 100 kHz bandwidth." IEEE Project 802.15.1 added "The out-of-band emission shall conform to the requirements found in Table 6." The IEEE Clause 7 Technical Editor needs to explain the reasoning here BEFORE we apply a shall vs. a should.  or per the IEEE source is the IEEE Standards Style Manual, May00:  "The word should is used to indicate that among several possibilities one is recommended as particularly suit-able, without mentioning or excluding others; or that a certain course of action is preferred but not necessar-ily required; or that (in the negative form) a certain course of action is deprecated but not prohibited (should equals is recommended that)."  Submit Bluetooth Erratta on word usage (see prior rebuttal to Comment #9)
8	62	Gilb, James	6.2.2	20	17	e	N	The parenthetical explanation is out of place.	Move the text in parentheses to be after the word "interference", i.e. "combat interference (i.e. it reduces ..."	The BRC disagrees we are trying to define the usage of combat in this Stds context, therefore, we reject this comment and it is now closed.	R	U	