Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 36

Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Myvallot #68, Maintained.

SuggestedRemedy

"it's meant to be a simplification" - how does the reader know that this normative section is jus
a "simplified" view of the normative requirements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This clause does not refer to the state machine in clause 5 in any
way. It does not introduce confusion to the reader, because the title of that clause is "Genera
Description". The state machine in 5.5 does not represent all of the requirements of an 802.1
compliant implementation, just as any other single figure or clause does not represent all of th
requirements.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 37

Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Myballot #42, Maintained.   While I sympathise with Tgma and the lack of volunteer effort, I a
not in a position to provide the information that would resolve the comment. However that doe
not invalidate the reasons for my vote.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The comment does not point out a normative problem with the Annex
C, only that the commenter is dissatisfied with the language or the manner in which the
requirements are described.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 35

Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Myballot #67, Maintained.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The rest of the sentence, not quoted in the original comment,
concludes the sentence with "upon receipt of an MLME-START.request", which indicates that
the action is controlled and begun by action outside the MLME, typically, the SME.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 33

Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Myballot #59. Our "clear and concise"s inhabit different realities.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The comment does not point out a normative problem with the text, or
that the commenter is dissatisfied with the language or the manner in which the requirements
are described.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 34

Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

Myballot #33. I'm still concerned that we assume we can only synchronize to 4 OFDM symbo
given that we can only synchronise to 4 1Msps symbols. Actually, OFDM timing accuracy wi
be ~400ns, and I suspect most of the orginal 4us related to PHY-MAC communication rather
than PHY accuracy. So to scale it up by PHY symbol size is misleading. I'm not going to
maintain a no vote on the basis of this comment.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. While an implementation may provide better accuracy than described
in this clause, the algorithm described is not guaranteed to do so. That is the purpose of the
explanation in 11.1.2.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 32

Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Myballot #57. Maintained.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. While use of physical carrier sense and virtual carrier sense are each
described, individually, elsewhere, this statement is a requirement that the MAC use both
mechanisms.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Page 1 of 25

7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM   *Cl* **00**   *SC* **0**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 31
Adrian, Stephens

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Myballot #51. Maintained.

SuggestedRemedy
    0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED REJECT. There is no prohibition against inclusion of normative requirements in clause 7.

Cl **00**   *SC* **10**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 141
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **11**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 142
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **12**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 143
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **13**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 109
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **14**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 110
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM

Page 2 of 25
Cl **00**   *SC* **14**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **15**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 111
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **16**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 112
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **16**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 26
Chaplin, Clint

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   This is a charming little PHY, rather presumptive in its primitiveness, but rather historical, and believe that there never was a commercial implementation shipped. Mantaining this clause is waste of time for the WG.

SuggestedRemedy
   Mark it historical and unmantained.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text changed in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard. In addition, the PAR for TGma does not include the ability to deprecate whole sections of the standard.

Cl **00**   *SC* **17**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 113
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **18**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 114
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **19**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 115
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM   Page 3 of 25   *Cl* **00**   *SC* **19**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **2**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 133

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **3**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 134

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **4**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 130

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

WDS is not defined in the standard; the existing references are very confusing and too limiting

SuggestedRemedy

remove the WDS item entirely

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This is an editorial comment, not technical, since clause 4 contains only acronyms. The standard does not limit the WDS, since it only specifies the frame format and not its use.

Cl **00**   *SC* **4**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 135

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **5**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 136

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **6**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 137

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM

Page 4 of 25
Cl **00**   *SC* **6**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **7**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 138
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **8**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 139
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **9**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 140
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex A**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 116
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex C**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 117
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex D**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 118
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
   After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
   Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM

Page 5 of 25
Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex D**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex E**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 119
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex F**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 120
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex G**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 121
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex H**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 122
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex I**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 123
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex J**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 124
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause a other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM

Page 6 of 25
Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex J**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex K**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 125
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause and other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex L**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 126
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause and other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex M**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 127
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause and other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **Annex N**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 128
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    After the combination of the base standard, the subsequent ammendments and more focused individual changes, there remain unresolved inconsistencies between the text in this clause and other clauses. This applies to this clause and all subclauses thereof.

SuggestedRemedy
    Resolve the inconsistencies.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **General**   *P* **ii**   *L* **38**   *MyBallot #* 108
McClellan, Kelly

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    In the front matter: "Interpretations and errata associated with amendment may be found at one of the followint Internet locaitons:" has typos.

SuggestedRemedy
    Replace with: "Interpretations and errata associated with this revised standard may be found at one of the following Internet locations:"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM

Page 7 of 25
Cl **00**   *SC* **General**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **00**   *SC* **M**   *P* **M.2**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 27

Chaplin, Clint

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

My comment "I forsee problems with this definition: "The mobile STAs are the STA entities that are ordinarily moving around, but may also be in a fixed location. The mobile adjective prefix often helps in visualizing the type of STA under discussion." There are already APs that move and with active meshing, the mobility of APs is going to increase." was, I think, misunderstood. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that a mobile AP exists (in fact, they do exist; refer to the wireless network on Africa where an AP with a file server is attached to the daily bus that travel through a region, and when the AP is in range of the MUs in various towns, email and data is exchanged). According to the current definitions of this clause, a mobile AP could fit into the definition of an "Infrastructure mode mobile STA", which is not the intent of this clause. This clause is attempting to make a distinction between an MU and an AP, but in my opinion they have not completely succeeded.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Infrastructure mode mobile STAs" to "Infrastructure mode STAs" in line 26
Change "Ad hoc mode mobile STAs" to "Ad hoc mode STAs" in line 27
Delete "The mobile STAs are the STA entities that are ordinarily moving around, but may also be in a fixed location. The mobile adjective prefix often helps in visualizing the type of STA under discussion." in line 31 and 32
Change "Infrastructure mobile STAs" to "Infrastructure mode STAs" in line 34
Change "infrastructure mode mobile STA" to "infrastructure mode STA" in line 35
Change "mobile STA" to "infrastructure mode STA" in line 36
Change both instances of "Ad hoc mobile STAs" to "Ad hoc STAs" in line 40

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This is not a technical comment, but an editorial one. The text in Annex M is informative, not normative. Making the suggested changes may cause as much confusion as the commenter believes already exists.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.121**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 129

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

WDS is not defined in the standard; the existing references are very confusing and too limiting WDS isn't defined; and the WDS term is very misleading bcus people sometimes think of it as a wireless DS, which it isn't. Also, the four address addressing mechanism can be used for things other than a wireless DS.

SuggestedRemedy

remove 3.121 entirely

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The specification of WDS in the standard is necessary, but not sufficient description of a wireless DS, which is outside the scope of the standard. The standard does not place any restrictions on the use of the four address frames, since no use is described.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.14**   *P* **5**   *L* **48**   *MyBallot #* 66

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

STAs don't use the JOIN primitives to establish a BSS - that's an internal interface. They establish a BSS by executing the synchronisation procedures, which describe the over the air procedure. The cause is the JOIN primitive, but the method is the synchronisation procedure Of course in an AP you don't even use JOIN at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Back out this change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is a problem with the definition. But it is not the one pointed out by the commenter. The use of JOIN is not the problem and is not an internal interface to 802.11. The service primitives are external interfaces.

The commenter does point out that the AP is different, not using the JOIN primitive. To address the problem with this definition:

add ", and one station that has used the START primitive" after "JOIN service primitives".

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:37:59 PM

Page 8 of 25
Cl **03**   *SC* **3.14**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.4**   *P* **5**   *L* **18**   *MyBallot #* 65
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
"used as venacular to refer to" - spelling and grammar

SuggestedRemedy
replace with "used as a vernacular term for"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.45**   *P* **8**   *L* **11**   *MyBallot #* 67
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
The removal of "integrated LANs" from the definition of ESS is a really bad idea. It breaks the architectural clarity of the DS, because suddenly you start distinguishing between remote STA that are connected using 802.11, and remote STAs connected using another technology, a distinction that should be invisible to the STAs connected to the local BSS. If you ever need t make that distinction, you've done something very, very wrong...

SuggestedRemedy
Reinstate integrated LANs to the ESS definition.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. There is no implication that the integrated LAN or any devices connected to it are not reachable from the ESS. The change to the definition is to remove the integrated LAN and any devices connected to it from being part of the ESS. Only those STAs in the set of BSSs are actually part of the ESS.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.72**   *P* **9**   *L* **47**   *MyBallot #* 6
Aboba, Bernard

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "that is not be reused" to "that is not to be reused"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.72**   *P* **9**   *L* **47**   *MyBallot #* 68
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
"A numerical value, used in cryptographic operations associated with a given cryptographic key," - how could a cryptographic operation not be associated with a key????

SuggestedRemedy
Rephrase as "A numerical value associated with a given cryptographic key, used in cryptographic operations,"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT. Also change "is not be reused" to "is not to be reused".

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.76**   *P* **10**   *L* **10**   *MyBallot #* 12
Marshall, Bill

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
In middle of line, "Anthenticator nonce (Anonce)", should be Authenticator

SuggestedRemedy
fix spelling

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.2.1**   *P* **45**   *L* **12**   *MyBallot #* 76
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**
"subsequant" - spelling

SuggestedRemedy
"subsequent"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required   ER/editorial required   GR/general required   T/technical   E/editorial   G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched   A/accepted   R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied   Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 9 of 25
Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.2.1**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.2.3**   *P* **46**   *L* **40**   *MyBallot #* 77

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

It's more consistent with other sections to talk about deleting the PTKSA rather than removing the PTK.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment. Similar for GTK/GTKSA

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. See resolution to comment #78.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.2.3**   *P* **46**   *L* **40**   *MyBallot #* 78

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

How can you block something that no longer exists? Why bother giving rules for how to encry MSDUs that you're not allowed to send?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace clause with "Disassociation initiated by either STA in an RSNA causes the deletion o the PTKSA at both ends. The GTKSA will also be deleted in a non-AP STA. The controlled and uncontrolled ports created for this association will be deleted."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace clause with "Disassociation initiated by either STA in an RSNA causes the deletion of the PTKSA at both ends and the deletion of the GTKSA in a non-AP STA. The controlled and uncontrolled ports created for this association will also be deleted."

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.3.1**   *P* **46**   *L* **53**   *MyBallot #* 79

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

It's not just the PTK that gets deleted - it's the associated information as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "to uninstall the PTK key" with "to cause deletion of the PTKSA".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.4**   *P* **48**   *L* **51**   *MyBallot #* 80

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

It's so rare to see "must" used correctly - this was one example. The original intent was that security is only possible if the following rules are observed - down-grading it to a "should" shouldn't be done without getting the security guys to re-review it.

SuggestedRemedy

Back out the change to "should".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.4**   *P* **48**   *L* **51**   *MyBallot #* 4

Aboba, Bernard

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**

There is no reason to replace "must" with "shoud"; mutual authentication is in fact a requirement, and the change has undesirable security effects.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave "must" in the spec.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.4**   *P* **48**   *L* **51**   *MyBallot #* 52

Raissinia, Ali

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Typo in the word "should"

SuggestedRemedy

Fix it

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 10 of 25
Cl **05**   *SC* **5.10.4**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **05** *SC* **5.10.4**   *P* **49** *L* **5** *MyBallot #* 7

Aboba, Bernard

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

There are missing packets in Figure 17 (no EAP-Response/Identity)

SuggestedRemedy

Add the EAP-Response/Identity, with an arrow from S1 to S2 in the upper conversation and from S2 to S1 in the lower conversation.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.2**   *P* **10** *L* **21** *MyBallot #* 69

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

In this section "membership of a BSS" has been changed to "membership in a BSS", while in 3.14 the opposite change has been made. If you're going to change either, consistency would be a good thing!

SuggestedRemedy

Don't really careà

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Reverse the replacement of "in" with "of" in 3.14.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.3**   *P* **22** *L* **27** *MyBallot #* 70

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Last time I read 802.1X any protocol could be an uncontrolled port protocol - it's not just limite to 802.1X frames (which I believe are technically not called 802.1X frames in any caseà), so t previous text was correct. The new text introduces all sorts of concerns about layer violations misuses "must" and may be misinterpreted as applying in an IBSS as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Back out the change.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace the last paragraph in 5.2.3 with the following:

"Data sent to the AP's STA address by one of the STAs associated with it are always received at the uncontrolled port for processing by the 802.1X port access entity. In addition, if the controlled port is authorized, these frames conceptually transit the DS."

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.3**   *P* **22** *L* **30** *MyBallot #* 5

Aboba, Bernard

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

While it is true that frames using the 802.1X Ethertype do not transit the DS, frames with the 802.1X pre-authentication Ethertype do transit the DS. More clarification is needed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "802.1X frames using the 802.1X Ethertypeà"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See resolution to comment #70. The resolution to comment #70 addresses the forwarding of frames, once the controlled port is authorized.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.3.1**   *P* **22** *L* **36** *MyBallot #* 71

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

As I've said previously, the new change to exclude integrated LANs from the ESS is shooting yourself in the foot architecturally - it's a pointless distinction that just makes life difficult for you - you have to start adding extra text like this for no other reason than because your architectural model is now muddled.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "An ESS is the union of the BSSs connected by a DS."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The added text does not muddle the architecture description. It simply brings the text in line with what the diagrams have described from the first printing of the standard.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.3.1**   *P* **22** *L* **37** *MyBallot #* 72

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

"The ESS does not include the DS." - while philosophically I have no problem with this statement, I can't help feeling it's of no practical interest to anyone who doesn't have a deep interest in their own navel. What would they get wrong if they misunderstood this - nothing...

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The sentence simply brings the text in line with the diagrams that have been in the standard from the first printing.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 11 of 25
Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.3.1**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.6**   *P* **37**   *L* **43**   *MyBallot #* **94**
Ptasinski, Henry

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

   The frame discard behavior specified in 8.4.10 interacting with the last sentence of clause 5.6
   creates a condition where a STA and AP that are out of synch cannot resynch. If a STA that
   has keys and thinks it's in State 3 sends frames to an AP that believes the STA is in State 1 (c
   has no info about the STA, e.g. if the AP restarted), the AP will silently discard the frames and
   the link will never recover. In the case where security is not used, the STA will get a deauth a
   the STA will return to State 1, so that the AP and STA will be back in agreement.

SuggestedRemedy

   Make the behavior consistent when security is enabled and disabled by e.g removing the last
   sentence of clause 5.6.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT. The behavior is consistent when RSN is invoked and when it is not.
   The SME is the entity that must invoke the deauthentication request at the MLME. When RSN
   is invoked and key synchronization is lost, the protected data frames are dropped, but not
   silently. When these frames are dropped MLME-PROTECTEDFRAMEDROPPED.indication
   is invoked. This allows the SME to invoke the deauthentication request.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.6**   *P* **37**   *L* **6**   *MyBallot #* **73**
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **D**

   If you've got "only" in a sentence, it's a dead cert. it can be parsed in multiple waysà

SuggestedRemedy

   Replace "Action frames are class 1 only within an IBSS." with "Within an IBSS Action frames
   are class 1 frames." - Similar change for ESS later on in the section.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT. Make the similar change for Class 3 Action frames in an infrastructure
   BSS, below.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.8**   *P* **39**   *L* **1**   *MyBallot #* **74**
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

   You've deleted this whole pointless sectionà.

SuggestedRemedy

   Buy yourselves a drink guys!

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9**   *P* **42**   *L* **25**   *MyBallot #* **75**
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

   Don't like the changed diagram at allà First of all, it now looks as if the 802.1X entity is the on
   thing above the MAC SAP, which is clearly wrong. Secondly, the TGi text was written to
   assume that the 802.1X PAE was part of the SME - if you move it you need to recheck all the
   TGi text... And thirdly, the separation from RSNA key management makes no sense.

SuggestedRemedy

   While the old diagram wasn't perfect, it was better than the new one - so back out the change

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

   PROPOSED REJECT. Everything from the MAC SAP goes through 802.1X, either its
   controlled port or uncontrolled port. There is no other data SAP from the 802.11 MAC. It is
   believed that the diagram causes no problems with the text integrated with 802.11i. The
   interface between the PAE and 802.11 is through the SME, as it always was.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.1.3.1.4**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* **131**
Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

   WDS is not defined in the standard; the existing references are very confusing and too limiting

SuggestedRemedy

   change meaning for ToDS=1, FromDS=1 from "Wireless distribution system (WDS) frame
   being distributed from one AP to another AP." to "A data frame that uses the four address
   addressing mechanism, where the source address (SA) is not equal to the transmitter addres
   (TA) and the destination address (DA) is not equal to the receiver address (RA)."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Incorporate the changes in document 05/777r0, and
   also replace "Port Authenticator Entity" with "Port Access Entity" in all occurrences in 05/777r

---

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 12 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.1.3.1.4**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.2**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 132

Engwer, Darwin

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

WDS is not defined in the standard; the existing references are very confusing and too limiting

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The RA field is the address of the STA contained in the AP in the WDS that is the next immediate intended recipient of the frame. The TA field is the address of the STA contained in the AP in the WDS that is transmitting the frame." to "The RA field is the address of the STA that is the intended receiver of frame or the address of the STAs that are the intended receivers of the frame. The TA field is the address of the STA transmitting the frame

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Incorporate the changes in document 05/777r0.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.2.2**   *P* **67**   *L* **46**   *MyBallot #* 61

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

"for which the receiving STA is a member." - "for which" is definitely wrong grammatically.

SuggestedRemedy

See previous discussion about "member of" or "member in" - I don't care whichà Same proble in 7.2.3

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Replace "for which the receiving STA is a member" with "of which the receiving STA is a member".

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3**   *P* **107**   *L* **30**   *MyBallot #* 95

Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with comment on how STA's that receive vendor-sepcific IE should behave. Reason - I not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This will not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement and changes in all frame formats where Vendor Specific IEs have bee added.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of informaiton element IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact w lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3**   *P* **107**   *L* **30**   *MyBallot #* 81

Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement and changes in all frame formats where Vendor Specific IEs have bee added.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of informaiton eleme IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.1**   *P* **108**   *L* **50**   *MyBallot #* 82

Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied   Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.1**   *P* **108**   *L* **50**   *MyBallot #* 96
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text changed in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.1**   *P* **70**   *L* **49**   *MyBallot #* 40
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.10**   *P* **113**   *L* **30**   *MyBallot #* 90
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.10**   *P* **113**   *L* **30**   *MyBallot #* 104
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.10**   *P* **75**   *L* **32**   *MyBallot #* 48
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 14 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.10**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.11**   *P* **114**   *L* **5**   *MyBallot #* 105

Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.11**   *P* **114**   *L* **5**   *MyBallot #* 91

Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.11**   *P* **76**   *L* **6**   *MyBallot #* 49

Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.12**   *P* **114**   *L* **20**   *MyBallot #* 92

Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.12**   *P* **114**   *L* **20**   *MyBallot #* 106

Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.12**   *P* **76**   *L* **20**   *MyBallot #* 50

Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.3**   *P* **109**   *L* **10**   *MyBallot #* 97

Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.3**   *P* **109**   *L* **10**   *MyBallot #* 83

Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.3**   *P* **71**   *L* **11**   *MyBallot #* 41

Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.4**   *P* **109**   *L* **40**   *MyBallot #* 98

Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.4**   *P* **109**   *L* **40**   *MyBallot #* 84

Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.4**   *P* **71**   *L* **43**   *MyBallot #* 42

Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 16 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.4**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.5**   *P* **110**   *L* **15**   *MyBallot #* 99
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is
appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi
not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary
implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-
interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.5**   *P* **110**   *L* **15**   *MyBallot #* 85
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia
vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while
claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.5**   *P* **72**   *L* **14**   *MyBallot #* 43
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause
widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.6**   *P* **110**   *L* **45**   *MyBallot #* 100
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is
appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi
not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary
implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-
interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.6**   *P* **110**   *L* **45**   *MyBallot #* 86
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia
vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while
claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.6**   *P* **72**   *L* **45**   *MyBallot #* 44
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause
widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM   Page 17 of 25   *Cl* **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.6**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.7**   *P* **111**   *L* **15**   *MyBallot #* 87
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.7**   *P* **111**   *L* **15**   *MyBallot #* 101
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.7**   *P* **73**   *L* **14**   *MyBallot #* 45
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.8**   *P* **111**   *L* **35**   *MyBallot #* 88
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.8**   *P* **111**   *L* **35**   *MyBallot #* 102
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.8**   *P* **73**   *L* **35**   *MyBallot #* 46
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 18 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.8**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.9**   *P* **113**   *L* **5**   *MyBallot #* 89
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

   Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia
   vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while
   claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

   Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
   in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
   standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.9**   *P* **113**   *L* **5**   *MyBallot #* 103
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

   Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in format. Reason - I do not believe it is
   appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi
   not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary
   implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-
   interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

   Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
   in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
   standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.2.3.9**   *P* **75**   *L* **5**   *MyBallot #* 47
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

   Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause
   widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

   Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED REJECT. The text did not change in this draft and is not affected by text change
   in this draft. The comment will be forwarded for consideration in a future revision of the
   standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3**   *P* **76**   *L* **25**   *MyBallot #* 62
Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

   What was wrong with fixed fields??? There's a number of occurences of "fixed field" that nee
   to be changed if you go ahead with this change.

SuggestedRemedy

   Back out the change - it's not worth the work to do the job properly.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED REJECT. Editor to replace "fixed field" with "field" wherever used in the draft.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.1.11**   *P* **83**   *L* **55**   *MyBallot #* 59
Black, Simon

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

   One of the issues with the action field was fixed by adoption of text that changed 'fixed fields'
   'fields not information elements' at the start of 7.3.1. However, there are still issues here à
   7.2.3.12 has an Action frame consisting of an Action field. An Action field is actually defined ir
   two places in clause 7 - the first is in 7.3.1.11 and the second is in each frame body descriptio
   in 7.4.1.x. Furthermore, 7.4.1.x specifies whole frame bodies and not just the Action Details
   field as the text at the start of 7.4.1 suggests.

SuggestedRemedy

   I'm not sure of the best way to fix this without major mayhem as groups have already built on
   this stuff (e.g. 11e). One possibility would be to eliminate the Action field in 7.3.1.11. This
   would enable the fields to be returned to 'fixed fields'. Then maybe the action frame format
   definition in 7.2.3.12 could just have an 'Action Details' that pointed directly at 7.4.1. This migh
   be difficult given the vendor IE addition. Another possibility would be to rename one of the
   Action fields and do nothing with the structure, e.g. call the 7.3.1.11 field 'Action Body'?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

   PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The "action" field inside the "action details" field will b
   renamed to "action value" field. All uses of the inner action field will be renamed, as well.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line
                                                                                     7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM
Page 19 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.1.11**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2**   *P* **123**   *L* **35**   *MyBallot #* 107
Andrade, Merwyn

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Issue with addition of "Vendor Specific" field in IE format. Reason - I do not believe it is appropriate for vendor specific IEs to be added to the 802.11 maintenance document. This wi not only cause undefined behavior in STAs but cause multiple classes of de-facto proprietary implementations to claim to now be standards based via this loophole and have non-interoperable behavior between them.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of informaiton eleme IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2**   *P* **123**   *L* **35**   *MyBallot #* 93
Narasimhan, Partha

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor-specific IEs create potential for non-interoperable implementations. They are potentia vehicles for creating de-facto implementations that are controlled by individual vendors while claiming to be standards compliant.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the Vendor Specific IEs change.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of informaiton eleme IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

Editor to correct values in the row for "Reserved" to be split "51-220, 222-255".

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2**   *P* **85**   *L* **37**   *MyBallot #* 11
Marshall, Bill

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Addition of "Vendor Specific" as value 221 conflicts with the value of 221 used for Key Data Encapsulations in section 8.5.2. Note that arbitrary information elements may appear in the K Data portion of a EAPOL-Key message (see p166 at line 33), and the KDE entries (defined or p166 line 42 and 48 as value 0xdd) need to be distinguished from these IEs. Allowing an IE to be type 221 makes the distinction impossible.

SuggestedRemedy

Change entry for 221 in Table 22 to be "Reserved for Key Data Encapsulation". Assign the "Vendor Specific" entry a new value.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This does not conflict, as the commenter suggests. The value used to identify Key Data Encapsulations is not in conflict with the vendor-specific IE value, as both specify exactly the same structure, the vendor-specific IE.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2**   *P* **85**   *L* **37**   *MyBallot #* 51
Berry, Don

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Vendor specific information elements added. This will fragment the market and cause widspread incompatibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove vendor specific information elements.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. To prevent vendors from usruping the limited set of informaiton eleme IDs, 802.11 has defined a single ID for use by vendors. Vendors will implement proprietary functions using information elements. This is a market reality. Ignoring that fact will lead to greater interoperability problems than providing a specific place for this to take place.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 20 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2.26**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 25
Chaplin, Clint

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

I'm glad to see that you accepted my comment in principal in this section. However, your modification to my proposed resolution is technically incorrect. I proposed that the range of n be described as 3 <= n <= 255, while the actual change was 3 < n <= 255. This is a subtle but important difference. Note that the last sentence of this clause states that the Vendor Specific Content can be 0 octets in length. If indeed the Vendor Specific Content is 0 octets in length, then n will be 3.

SuggestedRemedy

Please change this to be correct: 3 <= n <= 255. Thank you.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Change the inequality symbol in the text at line 36.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2.26**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 28
Chaplin, Clint

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Figure 80, the Vendor Specific Information Element Format has a mistake. The number of octets for the Vendor Specific Content is shown as "n". Since "n" is also used in the paragraph above to describe the bounds of the value of the Length field, this is very confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

If "n" is to be used in Figure 80, then it really should be "n - 3". Alternatively, perhaps a different variable name should be used.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Change "n" to "n-3" in the figure. Also delete "0 to" in line 39 of the text above the figure. Change "shall be" to "is" in lines 36 and 38. Leave the first "shall be" in line 37 alone and change the second to "is". (change only "shall be three octets" to "is three octets").

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2.26**   *P* **113**   *L* **36 an**   *MyBallot #* 1
Hillman, Garth

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Sorry to be so thick but this is a repeat of my previous comment which was 'sort of' addressed. My belief (confusion?) is that 'n' refers to the total number of Octets in OUI and Vendor Specific Fields (i.e., the Information Field of the Information Element)? If that is the case and OUI field always 3 Octets then the Vendor Specific Field will have a length of from 0 to n-3 Octets. This seems to be consistent with the text in line 38 on this page.

SuggestedRemedy

Text should read: The length of the information field shall be n. The OUI field shall be a public OUI assigned by the IEEE. It shall be three octets in length. The length of the vendor specific content shall be from 0 to n-3 Octets.   Also, in Figure 80 change 'n' to '0 to n-3'

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See resolution comment #28.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.4.7.4**   *P* **415**   *L* **44**   *MyBallot #* 2
Hillman, Garth

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

According to Japanese standards RCR-STD 33 and ARIB STD-T66 the spreading requirement for Barker is B90/2pi > 10 MHz while that for CCK is in fact 13.75 MHz which is the opposite to what you would expect.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to following paragraph to 15.4.7.4: Channel 14 is unique. Japanese standard RCR-STD 3 states that B90/2pi normalized to the 'transmission speed of modulation signal' shall be > 10. Therefore for channel 14, B90/2pi > 13.75 MHz for CCK spreading and >10.0 MHz for Barker spreading.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 21 of 25
Cl **07**   *SC* **7.4.7.4**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.4.10**   *P* **156**   *L* **10**   *MyBallot #* 63

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

A non-AP STA should delete an existing SA before executing the association, not after - otherwise you could get some very strange race conditions.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the deletion before making the request, not after getting the confirmation. Similarly in th AP the deletion should occur before invoking the response.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The order specified is what is intended. Deletion of the security associations before requesting association prevents a STA from returning to its old AP if the association request is not successful.

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.10**   *P* **234**   *L* **5**   *MyBallot #* 64

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

The new title suggests that this is a mechanism used by non-ERP receivers, when actually it's used by ERP transmitters.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Protection of non-ERP Receivers"???

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.2**   *P* **204**   *L* **23**   *MyBallot #* 60

Black, Simon

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

This new change in D2.0 seems to break the layer model. If I submit an MA-UNITDATA request at one MAC interface with no data, I'd still expect an MA-UNITDATA.ind at a peer MAC. The Null Function data subtype is different as this can be generated inside the MAC an therefore doesn't require a MA-UNITDATA.indication at the peer end. I'm wondering if this is what was intended here but not quite achieved - as the wording would also cover the Data fra with a zero length body as well as a null frame.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'ànot indicate an MA-UNITDATA.indication to LLC when the frame subtype is Null Function'.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The suggested remedy makes a techincal change to the specification from the original standard, where subtype was not to be considered in this decision. The only thing to be considered is the frame body, for both subtype data and subtype null function. Given that restriction and that null function frames are not indicated to LLC (see the SDL), this indicates that the absence of a frame body prevents indicating the frame to LLC.

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.3.16.2.2**   *P* **286**   *L* **20**   *MyBallot #* 57

Black, Simon

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

This commenters LB74 comment (#352) regarding the ResultCode parameter descriptive text not matching 10.3.16..2.4 though marked as 'accepted' in 05/0482r2 does not seem to have been fixed. Original comment: The description column of the Resultcode parameter doesn't match the remainder of the text in this section. It reports the outcome of the request to send th frame and not the actual TPC adaptation procedure as 10.3.16.2.4 suggests.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct Description column in table to match remainder of section.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. (again) Add two rows to the table in 10.3.16.2.2. The first new row is Transmit Power | Integer | -127 to 127 | Value of the Transmit Power field of the TPR Report element of the TPC Report frame.

The second new row is:
Link Margin | Integer | -127 to 127 | Value of the Link Margin field of the TPC Report element the TPC Report frame.

Add Transmit Power and Link Margin to the parameter list in 10.3.16.2.2.

Also change "TCP" to "TPC" in 10.3.16.2.4.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 22 of 25
Cl **10**   *SC* **10.3.16.2.2**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.3.20.1.1**   *P* **293**   *L* **33**   *MyBallot #* 10

Marshall, Bill

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

This section is about sending EAPOL frames, not Michael MIC failures.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to: This primitive is generated by the SME when the SME has an 802.1X EAPOL-Key frame to send

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.3.20.1.1**   *P* **293**   *L* **7**   *MyBallot #* 9

Marshall, Bill

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**

This section is about sending EAPOL frames. It should not make references to Michael MIC failures (which was section 10.3.19). The text in this section is apparently a goof in 11i, which was accurately incorporated into the 11ma drafts.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to: This primitive is used to transfer an 802.1X EAPOL-Key frame.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.1.2**   *P* **309**   *L* **39**   *MyBallot #* 8

Adachi, Tomoko

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**

"... that the data symbol *continuing* the first ..."
This was corrected from "contining" in D2.0. But isn't "containing" better than "continuing"? The original sentence in 802.11-1999 was specifying the first bit of the timestamp. My understanding was that in OFDM, the OFDM symbol is used and one cannot specify the "bit" so the expression was changed to specify the symbol where the first bit of the timestamp is contained.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "continuing" to "containing".

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.1.2**   *P* **309**   *L* **43**   *MyBallot #* 53

Raissinia, Ali

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

The TSF timer uncertainty of 4 symbols seems rather large. The 16us uncertainty causes Power Save client STAs to wake up sooner than they need to which impacts their power save performance target.

SuggestedRemedy

The TSF timer synchronization inaccuracy is caused by two mechanisms 1) the clock inaccuracy 2) the variation in the delivery mechanism. The clocks inaccuracy of +/-20ppm lead to a maximum of 4us uncertainty (as specified before) with the update rate of 2sec. The latency variation is implementation dependent but can be limited to a single OFDM symbol or depending on implementation, it can be nullified.

Change 4 symbols to two.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. While an implementation may provide better accuracy than described in this clause, the algorithm described is not guaranteed to do so. That is the purpose of the explanation in 11.1.2.

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.1.2.4**   *P* **311**   *L* **34**   *MyBallot #* 54

Raissinia, Ali

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

TSF timer inaccuracy of 0.01% (+/-100ppm)

SuggestedRemedy

Since there is no concept of "MAC clock" thus any source of timing must be synchronous to the symbol clock which is +/-20ppm?

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The TSF timer is defined to have a 1 microsecond resolution. The specified accuracy can be obtained using the symbol clock in an implementation. However, the symbol clock does not exist in the MAC.

TYPE: TR/technical required   ER/editorial required   GR/general required   T/technical   E/editorial   G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched   A/accepted   R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied   Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   7/21/2005   5:38:00 PM

Page 23 of 25
Cl **11**   *SC* **11.1.2.4**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.2.2.1**   *P* **320**   *L* **29**   *MyBallot #* 21
Tagiri, Hirokazu

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
 The description named dot11ATIMWindow is in P320 but there is no description concerning dot11ATIMWindow in the description of MIB.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add the description of dot11ATIMWindow to Annex D.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The ATIM Window value is defined in the MLME-START.request service primitive, not in the MIB. Change "dot11ATIMWindow" in line 29 to "the value of the ATIM Window parameter in the IBSS Parameter Set supplied to the MLME-START.request primitive".

Cl **18**   *SC* **18.4.6.2**   *P* **510**   *L* **20**   *MyBallot #* 38
LEMBERGER, URIEL

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
 Table 126 is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct the table content, for example , FCC allows Ch 12,13 with mask restrictions, France is part of ETSI.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT. This table reflects the allowed channels for the specified regulatory domain values as defined by the standard, not as allowed by the regulations.

 Editor to change "Ching" to "China" in Table 126.

Cl **19**   *SC* **19.1.1**   *P* **527**   *L* **11**   *MyBallot #* 29
Palm, Stephen

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
 If an implementor wished to implement an 802.11g or 802.11a only product, this document provides no guidance as to which clauses and phrases are relevant.

SuggestedRemedy
 Clearly indicate which clauses and phrases are applicable to the individual amendments of 802.11a through 802.11j

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT. 802.11g and 802.11j are designations of particular amendments to the base 802.11 standard. Upon approval of this revision, those designations cease to exist and are replaced by a new base standard.

Cl **19**   *SC* **19.1.2**   *P* **528**   *L* **2**   *MyBallot #* 55
Raissinia, Ali

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**
 The frequency accuracy (see 17.3.9.4 and 17.3.9.5) is +/-25 PPM.

SuggestedRemedy
 Shouldn't this be +/-20ppm?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT. This is a list of exceptions to the similar sections of the OFDM PHY.

Cl **19**   *SC* **19.4.7.3**   *P* **541**   *L* **38**   *MyBallot #* 56
Raissinia, Ali

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**
 The symbol clock frequency tolerance shall be ▨ 25 PPM maximum.

SuggestedRemedy
 Shouldn't this be +/-20ppm?

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT. This is one of the exceptions to the similar parameters in the OFDM PHY.

Cl **19**   *SC* **19.7.2.6**   *P* **553**   *L* **24**   *MyBallot #* 30
Palm, Stephen

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
 The term 802.11g was deleted, when it was my hope that the term be defined

SuggestedRemedy
 Provide a definition for 802.11g and for all of the other 802.11a through 802.11j amendments.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT. 802.11g is the name of an amendment to the 802.11 standard. Upon acceptance of this revision, the term will cease to exist.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied   Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **19**   *SC* **19.8.4**   *P* **558**   *L* **27**   *MyBallot #* 58

Black, Simon

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **D**

No aPHY-RX-START-Delay specified for ERP-DSSS/CCK. Should be 192us following clause 18 (it seems the group chose a fixed value rather than one depending on DSSS preamble length).

SuggestedRemedy

Add value for ERP-DSSS/CCK.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Add "192us for ERP-DSSS/CCK with long preamble, 96us for ERP-DSSS/CCK with short preamble".

Also, in 18.3.3, Table 121, add "and 96us for ERP-DSSS/CCK with short preamble".

Cl **C**   *SC* **C.3**   *P* **733**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 22

Tagiri, Hirokazu

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

The condition of "(mBssId=addr2(yrdu)) and (mSsId=getElem(eSsId,yrdu))" in the flow of Join_Wait_Bcn contradicts the text. In the text, in the case of InfrastructureBSS it compare with BSSID, in the case of IBSS it compare with SSID.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to
in the case of IBSS
  mSsId=getElem(eSsId,yrdu)
in the case of InfrastructureBss
  mBssId=addr2(yrdu)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The MLME-JOIN.request requires that both SSID and BSSID match.

Cl **C**   *SC* **C.3**   *P* **734**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 23

Tagiri, Hirokazu

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

The description that corresponds to the condition of "(mBssId=addr2(yrdu)) and (mSsId=getElem(eSsId,yrdu)) " in the flow of Beacon is not in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The complete description of the 802.11 MAC requires reading of both the SDL and the text. Neither is complete without the other.

Cl **C**   *SC* **C.3**   *P* **734**   *L* **0**   *MyBallot #* 24

Tagiri, Hirokazu

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

The description that corresponds to the condition of "(mSsId=getElem(eSsId,yrdu))" in the flow of Beacon is not in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The complete description of the 802.11 MAC requires reading of both the SDL and the text. Neither is complete without the other.

Cl **J**   *SC* **Table J.1**   *P* **966**   *L* **40**   *MyBallot #* 39

LEMBERGER, URIEL

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

Regulatory class for Ch 100-140 and ch 165 in the US are missing

SuggestedRemedy

Add these channels to the table

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The description for channels 100-140 is in the table. Channel 165 will be added.

Cl **M**   *SC* **M.2**   *P* **984**   *L* **1,2 a**   *MyBallot #* 3

Hillman, Garth

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **D**

Duplicate lines 1,2 and 15,16

SuggestedRemedy

Remove lines 15,16

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is an editorial mistake here. The paragraph beginning on line 46 of the previous page is a duplicate of the paragraph marked with change bars. The editor will remove the duplicate paragraph beginning at line 44 of page 983.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied   Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

7/21/2005 5:38:00 PM

Page 25 of 25
Cl **M**   *SC* **M.2**

Submission   Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems