| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | 0 |
| **Subclause** | |
| **Page** | |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The entire document is not sufficiently complete to consider the contents of the letter ballot any further |

**SuggestedRemedy**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E1 |
| **Page** | 70 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | Out of date reference |

| | |
|---|---|
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Should update 802.15.1-2002 to 802.15.1-2005 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.1.2 |
| **Page** | 70 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | There are two 802.15.4a CSS 1 Mb/s with different receiver sensitivities. Why is this? Something is wrong, but not enough information is present to determine a suggestion. Clause 6.5a.5.3 states -80dBm or better. There is no mention of a<br>-87 dBm receiver sensitivity in the main text, so where does it come from? If the mistake was one of the 1 Mb/s CSS should be a 250 kb/s CSS, then there is still no supporting text within the main text that makes this differentiation |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | |
| **Page** | 70 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The new procedure was established by the Executive Committee not the TAG |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Change ""IEEE 802.19 TAG established some new procedures in 2005 which include the requirement for a Coexistence Assurance document from any IEEE 802 WG or TG drafting a new standard."" to ""The IEEE Executive Committee established a new procedure in November 2004 which include the requirement for a Coexistence Assurance document from any IEEE 802 working group drafting a new standard for unlicensed operation."" |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.1 |
| **Page** | 71 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | There is no statement on what is assumed in terms of duty cycle or typical packet duration for the various standards. Those parameters have a significant effect on PER. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add statement on what is the typical packet duration and |
| **Response** | Transmission duty cycle for the various |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.1.1 |
| **Page** | 71 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | Empty Clause |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add text for this clause |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.1.6 |
| **Page** | 71 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | Empty Clause |

| | |
|---|---|
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add text for this clause |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.1.7 |
| **Page** | 71 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | Empty Clause |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add text for this clause |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.2 |
| **Page** | 72 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The text states that the calculations are based in clauses 5.3.2 and 5.3.6 of IEEE 802.15.2. However, that standard does not include those clause numbers. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Fix the references |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.2 |
| **Page** | 73 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The plot showing the BER for CSS does not correspond to the equation for BER given in E3.1.8. The SNR required to get a 10^-4 BER using the formula is greater than 12 dB, while in the figure the SNR required for such a BER is only around -7 dB. This is a difference of 19 dB. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Fix the figure |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 75 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The PER plot does not specify what the 802.11b packet duration or duty cycle. Both of those parameters significantly affect PER |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Specify the 802.11 packet duration and duty cycle |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 75 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The dimensions of Foffset is not specified. Assumingly it is in MHz |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Specify dimensions |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 75 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The only PER curve with 802.11b interference is with 20 MHz offset. There needs to be a co-channel PER plot or an explanation for why that will not occur. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add figure for co-channel 802.11b interference |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 76 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The 802.11b PER curve assumes 1% CSS duty cycle. That is quite low. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Explain why you use only 1% duty cycle or supply a curve with higher duty cycle. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 76 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The 802.11b PER curve is only supplied with 20 MHz offset. There needs to be a co-channel curve. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add co-channel curve. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 77 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The CSS with BT interference curve states that it does not take into account spreading gain. Why is that? Needs to be fixed. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Modify curve to include spreading gain. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 78 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The BT PER curve with CSS interference assumes only 1% duty cycle. Needs to be higher or and explanation is required. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Change duty cycle or explain why you use only 1% duty cycle. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.3 |
| **Page** | 79 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | Once again 1% duty cycle is assumed. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Increase duty cycle or explain why 1% is reasonable. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E6-10 |
| **Page** | 80-81 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | There is no analysis for the UWB PHY. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add results for UWB PHY. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.3.1.2 |
| **Page** | 71 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The receiver sensitivity for 15.4a is listed twice, at 1 Mb/s, with different values. Clearly this is incorrect. My guess is that one of these is for 250 kb/s. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Fix receiver sensitivity values. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E.1 |
| **Page** | 70 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | This document considers coexistence with 802.11b but does not consider coexistence with 802.11g. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add analysis of coexistence with 802.11g. |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E3.2 |
| **Page** | 72 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | There is a reference to TG2 recommended practices document, however this should be more specific to the section number |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Add references to clauses in 802.15.2 |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E3.1.9 |
| **Page** | 72 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The PER curves for the 802.11b, Bluetooth depend on the frame size considered. The document states that 32 bytes are chosen for 15.4a CCS. But nowhere is the size specified for the ""other"" technologies considered. |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Specify the packet sizes for the other technologies |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | E3.3 |
| **Page** | 77-78 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | When hopping and adaptive hopping is considered, does it mean that the probability of packet collision include hopping and adaptive hopping? |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Clarity |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | |
| **Page** | 70-81 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | overall more information and description of the process would be helpful |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Expand the description of the process |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | |
| **Page** | 70-81 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The TBDs need to be filled in |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Fill in the TBDs |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |

| | |
|---|---|
| **CommentID** | 0 |
| **CommenterName** | TAG, 802.19 |
| **CommenterEmail** | shellhammer@ieee.org |
| **CommenterPhone** | 858-658-1874 |
| **CommenterFax** | 858-354-1694 |
| **CommenterCo** | IEEE |
| **Clause** | E |
| **Subclause** | |
| **Page** | 70-81 |
| **Line** | |
| **CommentType** | T |
| **Comment** | The BER-curves need to be checked |
| **SuggestedRemedy** | Verify the BER curves |
| **Response** | |
| **CommentStatus** | X |
| **ResponseStatus** | O |