

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 MyBallot # 5

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

I'm maintaining my no vote mainly on the basis of previous comments - (a) the removal of integrated LANs from the definition of ESS, (b) the presence of annex L which should be in 802.1H not 802.11, and (c) the presence of Annex M which uses different terminology to the rest of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

See previous comments

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. These comments were dealt with in previous ballots, where individual reponses were provided.

Cl 07 SC 7.2.3 P65 L45 MyBallot # 3

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"Gaps may exist in the ordering of fields [à] within frames. The order that remains shall be ascending." This appears to be saying that a transmitter may actually omit fixed fields (adding the "fixed" makes it clear that I'm not talking about IEs. Good idea, huh?) as long as the remaining ones are in order, which is clearly wrong. The alternative interpretation is that the "shall" is a requierement on future ammendments to the specification, and so shouldn't be a "shall".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall" to "will"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment does not address material that is the subject of this recirculation ballot. It will be forwarded to the working group for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl 07 SC 7.3.2 P81 L35 MyBallot # 6

Sanwalka, Anil

Comment Type E Comment Status D

221 is specified as a vendor specific element and is in the list of reserved element ids

SuggestedRemedy

split the list of reserved element IDs

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 08 SC 8.4.10 P153 L0 MyBallot # 11

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 (or 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 and the STA will return to State 1, so that the AP and STA will be back in agreement. The PROPOSED RESPONSE from LB 75 claims that the SME could use MLME-PROTECTEDFRAMEDROPPED.indication to send a deauthentication and resynchronize, but clause 10.3.23.1.4 (and every other mention of this indication in the spec) only discusses the behavior in IBSS.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the behavior consistent when security is enabled and disabled by e.g removing the last sentence of clause 5.6, or clarify the SME behavior on receipt of MLME-PROTECTEDFRAMEDROPPED.indication in a BSS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment does not address material that is the subject of this recirculation ballot. It will be forwarded to the working group for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl 09 SC 9.2.5.7 P209 L33 MyBallot # 7

Sanwalka, Anil

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment rejected from ballot 74: Specifying a required (shall) value for CTSTimeout is problematic now. There are a number of implementation in existence that probably wait a shorter period than aPHY-RX-START-Delay (no medium busy in 2 slots or no SFD in 150us) before declaring a timeout. This would make them non-compliant. The reason for rejecting this comment is not valid since the text requires the MAC to start the backoff procedure (shall) when the ctsTimeout expires.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the reponse was provided.

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 09 SC 9.2.8 P210 L33 MyBallot # 8

Sanwalka, Anil

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment rejected from ballot 74: Specifying a required (shall) value for ACKTimeout is problematic now. There are a number of implementation in existence that probably wait a shorter period than aPHY-RX-START-Delay (no medium busy in 2 slots or no SFD in 150us) before declaring a timeout. This would make them non-compliant. The reason for rejecting this comment is not valid since the text requires the MAC to start the backoff procedure (shall) when the ctsTimeout expires.

SuggestedRemedy

0

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the reponse was provided.

Cl 09 SC 9.3.2.1 P216 L26 MyBallot # 9

Sanwalka, Anil

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment rejected from ballot 74: This change again potentially make legacy compliant radios non-compliant. In this case I don't know that there are implementations that do not do this. Either the change is being made to force the PC to transmit after SIFS or it is not necessary (used to say "at least one SIFS period"). You can't have it both ways.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the shall to a should or revert back to the original text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the reponse was provided.

Cl 09 SC 9.4 P221 L21 MyBallot # 10

Sanwalka, Anil

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Comment rejected from ballot 74: In the second paragraph the change from fragment to MPDU is incorrect and confusing. Fragments are pieces of MSDUs or MMPDUs while MPDUs are any MAC protocol data unit, including control frames, see 7.1.1. The sentences just don't make sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Reject the changes from fragment to MPDU.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the reponse was provided.

Cl 10 SC 10.3.20.1.1 P289 L2 MyBallot # 4

Moreton, Mike

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The use of the MLME interface to send a Michael MIC Failure Report is a horrible hack (to be honest I only suggested in the hope that it would cause everyone else to accept that the MIC Failure architecture was broken) and I'm strongly against it being extended to all EAPOL frames, which should continue to use the MA-Unitdata primitives.

SuggestedRemedy

Back out the change.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT. Accepting the suggested remedy and the change implied in the comment (sending all EAPOL frames, including non-MIC-failure EAPOL key frames through the MA-Unitdata primitives) would lead to potential ambiguity about which primitive to use. The current text does not have this potential. The current text also corresponds to the text in the MLME-EAPOL.confirm primitive.

Cl 19 SC 19.1.1 P 527 L 11 MyBallot # 2

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. The PROPOSED RESOLUTION indicated "Upon approval of this revision, those designations cease to exist and are replaced by a new base standard." While that may be a nicety for IEEE procedures, it does a disservice to the industry (manufacturers, consumers, press) who actively use the designations.

SuggestedRemedy

Clearly indicate which clauses and phrases are applicable to the individual amendments of 802.11a through 802.11j. At the very least, there should be an informative section to explain 802.11a through 802.11j.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the response was provided. Even the informative section suggested "at the very least" would require nearly all the text of each of the separate amendments.

Cl 19 SC 19.7.2.6 P 553 L 24 MyBallot # 1

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. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the response was provided. A definition of the 802.11a through 802.11j amendments would require nearly all the text of each of the separate amendments.

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

8/24/2005 4:55:26 PM Page 3 of 3
Cl 19 SC 19.7.2.6