LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
8	5	Gilb, James	3	5	36-37	e	N	The Bluetooth HCI, L2CAP, LMP and Radio are not a documents, they are a part of a document, actually two documents. The HCI is an interface, the L2CAP and LMP are an protocols, and the Radio is, well a radio.	Delete the sentence beginning with "A document that …" from the first three, for the last (Radio), change the first sentence to "A transciever that operates in the 2.4 GHz ISM band and complies with the 802.15.1 standard." *All but the HCI have been deleted. However, the HCI is still an interface, not a document, so the first sentence should be deleted.*	*Oops.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
10	7	Gilb, James	3	7	4, 10	e	N	Extra wording, "(Erratum 1040)"	Delete "(Erratum 1040)" *This was supposed to be accepted, but the error is still in d0.9.1.*	*Oops.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
11	8	Gilb, James	3	7	22	e	N	Extra wording, "(State Variable)"	Delete "(State Variable)" *If this is to be distinguised from the page state, then there should be a sentence that says this. As it stands now, the words "(State Variable)" do not explain anything to the reader. The document has not defined what is meant by words in parentheses in a definition.*	This definition is for the Page State. Used to distinguish from page definition. *The background for this definition is that the Bluetooth Volume 2 Generic Access Profile v1.1 Part K:1, page 53 has a List of Definitions used in the specification. IEEE has adopted in their entirety Bluetooth definitions in a Part and or in a Volume, however, we failed to carry over the following definitional text to the IEEE single clause approach. The following is found at the top of Vol 2, Part K:1, page 53: "In the following, terms written with capital letters refer to states." We have added this notation and the comment is now accepted and is now closed.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
29	10	Gilb, James	5.2	15	44	e	N	Words "also" and "is" flipped in "Annex A is also a derived text"	Change to "Annex A is also a derived text" *This comment was listed as accepted, but the change has not been made.*	*Oops.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
64	3	Gilb, James	1-Annex H	all	page #	e	N	The page numbers appear on the wrong side of the pages (I suspect left and right pages are messed up).	Change master pages and master page usage so that odd page numbers appear on the right hand side of the right hand pages. *Appears to be corrected in d09 except for page x and page 20 is on the wrong side, probably need to change its page master.*		A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
78	16	Gilb, James	7.3.1	30	50	e	N	1 Ms/s can be confused, should be either 1 Mbaud or 1 Msymbol/s	Change "1 Ms/s" to "1 Mbaud" *Changed to 1Msymbol/s but no space between 1 and M*	Msymbol/s *1 Msymbol/s*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
137	30	Gilb, James	8.9.1	74	16	e	N	"behaviour" it the English spelling, the proper American spelling is "behavior".	Change spelling as indicated. *Only one dictionary should be used to write the standard. If UK-English spellings are to be used, then they should be use throughout. Otherwise American English spellings should be used.*	IEEE creates international standards. It is in our dictionary *behavior*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
183	11	Gilb, James	6.3	25	14	E	N	Figure 4 is referenced, but it should be Figure 5. Also, a new paragraph should be started following the reference.	Change "Figure 4" to "Figure 5" and start a new paragraph with the sentence "The rest of this subclause ..." *This comment was listed as accepted, but the change has not been made.*	*Oops.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
191	28	Gilb, James	8.6	66	50-52	E	Y	Three errors, the sentence ends with "is carried by the SCO link only;" which should end in a period. Then, there is a carriage return (or something) such that the line is not completed and then the next sentence "the UA and UI .." does not begin with a capital.	Change to "... is carried by the SCO link only. The UA and UI ..." and fix the problem with the justification. *This comment was marked accepted, but not all the changes have been made. Remove the semicolon and start a new sentence as indicated.*	*Oops.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
199	18	Gilb, James	7.3.2.1	31	16	E	Y	The sentence beginning with "In addition to the FCC ..." is confusing and does not correctly state what is intended	Change this sentence to the one in BT v1.1 on page 9, line 133 that begins with "In addition to the FCC ..." *This sentence is still very confusing, even with the edit I suggested, which was marked as accepted but has not been applied. The sentence should read: "In addition to the FCC requirement, an adjacent channel power is defined for channels with a difference in channel number of two or greater."*	*The BRC agrees with the comment, we added: "In addition to the FCC requirement, an adjacent channel power is defined for channels with a difference in channel number of two or greater."*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatsified Z/withdrawn	Notes
263	59	Gilb, James	H	922	all	E	Y	The bibliography is blank	Delete the annex or fill it with references. *I approve of the reference added to the bibliography, the reader will certainly need a guide to get through the SIG's organization. However, [B2] and [B3] should probably be deleted since they are blank.*	*The BRC agrees with the comment and we applied the edit and added a crossref in Clause 5 to entry in Annex H.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D1.0.0.
317	29	Gilb, James	8.7	67	38-40	T	Y	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.	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.*	Editorial changes made to correct the shorthand used in this clause. *Read it again.*	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D0.9.1.
37	12	Gilb, James	6.3	25	1-22	e	N	Figure 4 overlaps the text for section 6.3, but it belongs with section 6.2.3.3. In addition, the text wrapping around the figure is difficult to read since the lines are too long.	Force Figure 4 to be a full-page width float that follows section 6.2.3.3. *This comment was listed as accepted, but the change has not been made.*	*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 of our publisher, who is responsible for smoothing the final document.* *Examples of unapplied edits include:* *-Standardization of cross-references (some places say "see section x on page y", others say "refer to section x")* *-Page flow problems* *-Figure placement problems* *-Caption errors* *Please do not consider these kinds of "errors" in your evaluation unless it will, in your opion, prevent a "reasonable implementer" from creating an interoperable device through misunderstanding.* *IEEE publishing is responible for the look and feel of the Standard, ...* *Thanks,* *Tom*	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
169	56	Gilb, James	C.2.2.2	837	48	e	N	The paragraph says "In the table above" but it should be a figure reference.	Change text to say "In figure C.1" *Close, but the crossreference has a dangling -- at the end, e.g. Table C.1--*	*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 of our publisher, who is responsible for smoothing the final document.* *Examples of unapplied edits include:* *-Standardization of cross-references (some places say "see section x on page y", others say "refer to section x")* *-Page flow problems* *-Figure placement problems* *-Caption errors* *Please do not consider these kinds of "errors" in your evaluation unless it will, in your opion, prevent a "reasonable implementer" from creating an interoperable device through misunderstanding.* *IEEE publishing is responsible for the look and feel of the Standard,* *Thanks,* *Tom*	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
188	23	Gilb, James	8	48	various	E	Y	The table format in this clause is not consistent with the rest of the document.	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.*	*The following summary 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 of our publisher, who is responsible for smoothing the final document.* *Examples of unapplied edits include:* *-Standardization of cross-references (some places say "see section x on page y", others say "refer to section x")* *-Page flow problems* *-Figure placement problems* *-Caption errors* *Please do not consider these kinds of "errors" in your evaluation unless it will, in your opion, prevent a "reasonable implementer" from creating an interoperable device through misunderstanding.*	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
190	25	Gilb, James	8.1	39	49	E	Y	The cross reference to the Physical layer section does not include a clause number or page number	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"*	be sent to BSIG Errata DB. *The following summary 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 of our publisher, who is responsible for smoothing the final document.* *Examples of unapplied edits include:* *-Standardization of cross-references (some places say "see section x on page y", others say "refer to section x")* *-Page flow problems* *-Figure placement problems* *-Caption errors* *Please do not consider these kinds of "errors" in your evaluation unless it will, in your opion, prevent a "reasonable implementer" fro* *Thanks,* *Tom*	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
202	20	Gilb, James	7.3.3	31	50	E	Y	Fc is not defined.	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 BRC agrees with the comment BUT we forgot to apply the edit. We promise to add into 802.15.1/D1.0.1*	A	O	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 erratta.
209	43	Gilb, James	8.10.6.2	83	39	E	Y	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.	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.*	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	A	O	Editor Note: ICG sent 27Apr01 e-mail to TomS to follow-up on erratta.

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) / LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) / Rebuttal 2 (3May01)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
217	52	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	88	38	E	Y	The nomenclature for the timing parameter here, *pagerespTO* differes from earlier timing, e.g. Tw page scan.	Select one method (T_parameter is best) and keep it consistent throughout for all timing paramters (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.*	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	A	O	Editor Note: ICG sent 27Apr01 e-mail to TomS to follow-up on erratta.
219	55	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.2	89	33-35	E	Y	The end of the paragraph beginning with "The channel hopping ..." is redundant, having been adequately explained earlier in the clause.	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 BRC agrees with the comment BUT we forgot to apply the edit. We promise to add into 802.15.1/D1.0.1*	A	O	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 erratta.
253	57	Gilb, James	D.1	868	16ff	E	N	The paging scheme 1 (or I) reference uses the wrong font and emphasis	Change the font and emphasis to match the rest of the paragraph on this line and all other occurances in the annex. *It is not clear what point the author is trying to make by having a huge I to designate the paging scheme. Is it that the author wants to annoy the audience? That he or she wants to break with normal conventions in writing a document? The font sizing is silly and annoying, change it to match the rest of the annex.*	the author's point. *The following summary 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 of our publisher, who is responsible for smoothing the final document.* *Examples of unapplied edits include:* *-Standardization of cross-references (some places say "see section x on page y", others say "refer to section x")* *-Page flow problems* *-Figure placement problems* *-Caption errors* *Please do not consider these kinds of "errors" in your evaluation unless it will, in your opion, prevent a "reasonable implementer" fro* *Thanks,*	A	O	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
204	39	Gilb, James	8.10.3	80	50-54	E	Y	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).	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.*	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.*	A	U	
210	46	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	84	41-42	E	Y	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.	Delete the sentence. *The sentence is not simply parenthetical, it is redundant, confusing and not relevant to the present discussion.*	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.*	A	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
312	1	Gilb, James	Document	all		T	Y	A careful review of less than 10% of the document turned up an average of more than 1 error per page of the document. It is as if no one had even scanned the document before it was sent out. A quick scan of the document turns up at least 2 errors per clause. The multitude of errors in the document make a good technical evaluation very difficult. This document is not ready for review, let alone ready for sponsor ballot. It seems as if the document was sent out to make a deadline rather than being published when it was ready for review.	The document needs careful review and editing before it is sent for a working group ballot. After it is corrected for the numerous spelling, formatting and cross-reference errors, it would be ready for a technical evaluation by the working group. It its current form it is not ready for techical evaluation. *Still not addressed, the group needs more than a 10 day recirculation to adequately review the document.*	Changed to Editorial *The BRC disagrees with the comment because the Voter did not follow the ballot instructions -99/112r6 "In general we need to have very specific comments in order to be able to understand and address all issues." there is NOTHING specific to address - therefore it is invalid. Also, the following summary indicates that this is a minority position and we respectfully disagree with the Voter.* *<snip>* *LB10 Summary (FINAL)* *There were 74 Voting members. 58 submitted their vote (LB8 or LB10).* *The return ratio is 58/74 = 78 % (50 % is required) and the abstention rate was less than 30% of those voting. The ballot is valid.* *Motion passed with 55/2/1 or 96 %. 16 failed to vote.* *</snip>* *Again TG1 offers the following to ALL WG Voting Members:* *For those of you that are not members of the Sponsor Ballot pool for this project, We will make the "Chair's standard offer" to submit any comments you may have on this draft on your behalf as part of my own ballot response.*	R	C	
329	53	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	88	43	T	Y	Is CLKN restarted when the slave is listening for the FHS packet.	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.*	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. *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.* *The BRC disagrees, your Reply Comment is not a comment on an outstanding change. This comment is invalid. However, the TG1 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.*	R	C	Editor Note: ICG DavidC provided an e-mail thread he had with the Voter (see embedded comment in - 01/117r12 - this cell).
2	4	Gilb, James	1.1	1	24-25	e	N	The phrase "To define PHY ..." is not a complete sentence.	Make a complete sentence, perhaps adding "This scope of this standard is to define PHY ..." *I have discussed this with our IEEE editor (J. C. Longman) and she said that we need to have the information from the PAR but not necessarily the exact wording. This should still be changed as I have noted.*	Paragraph 1.1 is the PAR scope. *I have discussed this with our IEEE 802.15 Chair (R.F. Heile) and he said that the TG1 PAR edits (included this and many more edits) were not necessary and that only the authorization to change our PAR Number Change from 802.15 to 802.15.1 was valid. On 16May00 our corrigendum PAR was approved by the SEC - Results: Approve - 7, Do Not Approve -0, Abstain -1, Did Not Vote - 3 it was subsequently approved by NesCom in Jun00 too. The BRC understands the comment but we still reject it based on the fact it is the official 802.15.1 PAR Scope statement and that TG1 has tried, via corrigendum, to apply changes and we were rebuffed by the Chair. The comment remains rejected and is now closed.*	R	U	
9	6	Gilb, James	3	6	47	e	N	Extra wording, "(ACL link)"	Delete "(ACL link)" *The words add confusion and should be deleted. If the editor wants to indicate that the ACL link is the only one that supports isochronous user channel, then those words should be added to the definition.*	The ACL link is the only link that supports isochronous user channel. It is definitional that the ACL link is the only link that supports isochronous user channel. The "e"ditorial comment in an IEEE Clause is noted but the comment remains rejected and is now closed.	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
12	9	Gilb, James	3	7	50	e	N	Extra wording "(RFCOMM server)"	Delete "(RFCOMM server)" *If the RFCOMM server is the "another application" then replace "another application" with "the RFCOMM server" and delete "(RFCOMM server)"*	RFCOMM server is the "another application" *The IEEE has adopted in their entirety definitions in a Part and or in a Volume. The "e"ditorial comment in an IEEE Clause is noted but the comment remains rejected and is now closed.*	R	U	
100	45	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	84	33	e	N	"With the CLKE of the slave's ..." should be "With the CLKE estimate of the slave's ..."	Change as indicated *I agree that "CLKE estimate" is redundant. However, so is "estimate CLKE of the slave's Bluetooth clock" since CLKE is the estimate of the slave's Bluetooth clcok. New suggestion, delete CLKE, the sentence reads better and makes sense.*	CLKE means Clock Estimate: this would have resulted in a duplication of the term *The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
186	13	Gilb, James	7.2	28	43	E	Y	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	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.*	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 apease this commentary. Additionally, the BRC believes based on a through 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 deminished. We reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
186	14	Barr, John	7.2	28	43	E	Y	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	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.*	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 apease this commentary. Additionally, the BRC believes based on a through 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 deminished. We reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
187	22	Gilb, James	7.4	32	28	E	Y	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 measurments in general, it is simply that BSIG has chosen this method.	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 that 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.*	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.*	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
189	24	Gilb, James	8.1	39	32ff	E	Y	The section refers to Bluetooth systems when it should refer to 802.15.1 systems	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.*	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 apease this commentary. Additionally, the BRC believes based on a through 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 deminished. We reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
189	3	Barr, John	8.1	39	32ff	E	Y	The section refers to Bluetooth systems when it should refer to 802.15.1 systems	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.*	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 Frontmatter, Clause 1, Clause 5 & Clause 6 to apease this commentary. Additionally, the BRC believes based on a through 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 deminished. We reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
205	40	Gilb, James	8.10.3	80	50-54	E	Y	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.	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.*	Previous timing accuracy references refer to protocol interchanges. This referece is a suggestion about the hardware clock. These concepts are related, but not interchangable. The reference is therefor inappropriate. *The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
206	41	Gilb, James	8.10.5	82	44	E	Y	The sentence refers to the "LPO" accuracy rather than providing a cross-reference to where the accuracy is defined.	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.*	*The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
207	42	Gilb, James	8.10.6.1	83	11-13	E	Y	This paragraph is an unneccessary repeat of earlier information.	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.*	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.*	R	U	
211	47	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	84	42-43	E	Y	Change the sentence "... the receiver ... for ID packet." to "... the receiver that issued the page ... for the ID packet."	Change as indicated *The sentence is ambiguous and should be changed.*	There is no ambiguity in this sentence. *The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
212	48	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	84	47	E	Y	The sentence "The synthesizer hop ..." is redundant, having been adequately adressed elsewhere.	Delete the sentence. *The sentence does not improve the readability, only the redundancy.*	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.*	R	U	
213	49	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	85	Table 13	E	Y	This table repeats some of the information from table 12.	Delete the column Npage from Table 12 and reference Table 12 here and Table 13 in the description for Table 12. *Adding the redundant information does not improve the clarity of the section.*	These tables are different. Both are necessary. *The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
214	50	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4	86	45	E	Y	The usage of page_response (thanks for pointing that out) here is not consistent with page scan and **page scan** elsewhere in this clause.	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.*	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.*	R	U	
216	51	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	88	24-52	E	Y	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.	Delete section 8.9.6 and its accompanying figures (which are redundant), merge any missing ideas into section 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.*	8.9.6 Is a general description; it must preceed 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.*	R	U	
222	26	Gilb, James	8.2.2	41	31	E	Y	The sentence beginning with "If a packet occupies ..." repeats information from earlier in the paragraph.	Delete the sentence. *The sentence should be deleted since it needlessly repeats information, making the standard more difficult to maintain.*	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.*	R	U	
227	31	Gilb, James	8.9.2	74	23	E	Y	"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.	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 implictly 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.*	This paragraph talks about a single Bluetooth transceiver, thus RX and TX are implicitily on the same device. *The BRC disagrees, our original rebuttal still stands; we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
228	32	Gilb, James	8.9.2	75	21-23	E	Y	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.	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.*	*The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	
229	35	Gilb, James	8.9.4	76	28-34	E	Y	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 and there is a space missing between sniff and modes in the first sentence, but the whole thing should be deleted anyway).	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.*	The functions are defined seperately 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.*	R	U	
231	36	Gilb, James	8.9.6	77	29	E	Y	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.	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.*	The useage 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.*	R	U	
232	37	Gilb, James	8.9.6	77	34-40	E	Y	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 distinguising which sequence is used.	For each reference of "hop frequency" change it to to indicate if it is the "page hop freequency" 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.*	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.*	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
234	38	Gilb, James	8.9.7	79	5-38	E	Y	This subclause repeats information that has been mentioned many times before in the standard and adds absolutely no new information.	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.*	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.*	R	U	
315	14	Gilb, James	7.3	30	13-14	T	Y	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.	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 recievers. Either way, the standard is broken as written and this recommendation simply points it out.*	The word, should, indicates that this paragraph contains informative text, therefore it is not binding on other sections of the specification. *I do not agree with James's solution of eliminating power class 1, as the problem is so easy to get around. 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. 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.*	R	U	
324	15	Gilb, James	7.3.1	30	20	T	Y	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	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*	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.*	R	U	
325	17	Gilb, James	7.3.2.1	31	29	T	Y	The -20 dBc requirement is for frequency offsets greater than +/- 550 kHz	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 state below, but the definition is not in the document (line 1 of Table 5 does not give the FCC requirement).*	The preceding text specifiles 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.*	R	U	
326	21	Gilb, James	7.3.3	32	25	T	Y	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.	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.*	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.*	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
330	54	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.2	89	27	T	Y	Here it seems that CLKN is restarted, but it is not clear when.	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.*	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.*	R	U	Editor Note: ICG DavidC provided an e-mail thread he had with the Voter (see embedded comment in - 01/117r12).
332	27	Gilb, James	8.3.1	42	35	T	Y	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.	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.*	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.*	R	U	
334	34	Gilb, James	8.9.2	75	38-39	T	Y	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.	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.*	The use of N is consistent througout 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.*	R	U	
335	33	Gilb, James	8.9.2	75	30-31	T	Y	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.	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.*	Comment confuses CAC with AM_ADDR. *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.* *The BRC disagrees and we reject this comment and it is now closed.*	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
356	2	Gilb, James	Introduction	iii	23-28	T	Y	The paragraph indicates that conformance to the standard is determined only by the Bluetooth qualifcation 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.	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.*	comment does not apply. The paragraph sighted is not normative. *The following summary indicates that this is a minority position and we respectfully disagree with the commenter.* *http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/15/private/802-15list/msg00340.html or* *Additional BRC input on Comment #356 [JPKG002]:* *From siep@ti.com Tue Apr 17 23:58:56 2001: In terms of the comment about conformance testing: 802 Standards do not include conformance testing. The informational material presented on page iii provides useful information (i.e. informative) for the reader. It is information that is NOT REQUIRED by 802 conventions about procedures that are NOT REQUIRED in 802 Standards.* *When James wrote:* *> > "The paragraph indicates that conformance to the standard is determined > only by the Bluetooth qualifcation 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 word*	R	U	
356	1	Barr, John	Introduction	iii	23-28	T	Y	The paragraph indicates that conformance to the standard is determined only by the Bluetooth qualifcation 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.	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.*	comment does not apply. The paragraph sighted is not normative. *The following summary indicates that this is a minority position and we respectfully disagree with the commenter.* *http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/15/private/802-15list/msg00340.html or* *Additional BRC input on Comment #356 [JPKG002]:* *From siep@ti.com Tue Apr 17 23:58:56 2001: In terms of the comment about conformance testing: 802 Standards do not include conformance testing. The informational material presented on page iii provides useful information (i.e. informative) for the reader. It is information that is NOT REQUIRED by 802 conventions about procedures that are NOT REQUIRED in 802 Standards.* *When James wrote:* *> > "The paragraph indicates that conformance to the standard is determined > only by the Bluetooth qualifcation 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 word*	R	U	

LB8 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.) LB8 Comment (11Mar01) *LB8 Reply Comment. (19Apr01)*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.) Rebuttal 1 (15Mar01) *Rebuttal 2 (3May01)*	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Notes
328	44	Gilb, James	8.10.6.2	83	47-48	T	Y	The scan windows should be required, not recommened. 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).	Change recommended to required. *This is an interoperability issue. If a device use a page scan window that is too small, it may never aquire the network. The minimum window should be required to insure that the system works.* *James Gilb writes: "I agree with the rejection for two of my comments, the ones numbered 83 [[51]] (8.6, p. 68, lines 51-52) and 106 [[328]] (8.10.6.2, p. 85 line 50)"*	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.	R	Z	