Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 5
MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

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

In previous ballots, I requested the removal of IBSS DFS functionality on the following basis "The DFS channel changing facilities for IBSS represent a very complex set protocols that have little value in the vast majority of cases and will not work in many circumstances. There is no know implementation of this feature. In a response to the same comment in the last ballot, TGma asked me to justify my assertions. I believe that they are justified by a quote from 11.10.7.2 that states, "The potential for hidden nodes within an IBSS means that the IBSS channel switch protocol is best effort. All members of an IBSS shall have an individual responsibility to cease transmission on a particular channel in the presence of radar."   This text effectivley says that the IBSS channel switch protocol cannot be relied upon and that individual STAs need to do radar dedection anyway. It is almost certain that regulators will have a similar view. This removes the primary advantage cited in 06/220. The other advantages cited in 06/220 for the IBSS DFS protocol can be achieved without any special over the air protocol."   This comment was rejected with the following response: "The mechanism does not cause any harm, without regard to it usefulness. The mechanism is adequate to cause some STAs in an IBSS to change channels, though it may not be sufficient to cause all STAs to do so." I object to the rejection because: * The response admits the mechanism does not achieve its goals and yet there is no recommendation to remove the functionality * It is not true that no harm is caused because it bloats the standard with useless and deceptive material; something we need to avoid in fulfilling our responsibilities as standards developers.

SuggestedRemedy

I would prefer that this functionality was removed using the editing instructions previously provided. However, a reasonable compromise is to add a statement at the appropriate places in the draft stating something like, " The following functionality, including associated IE's and frames, may be removed during the next maintenance cycle unless it can be shown the functionality has some use."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 2
MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

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

In previous ballots, I requested the removal of Measurement Request and Report functionality (see 11.6.6)   I made this request on the basis that: * The function is not required by spectrum management regulations, which is why it was originally included in the 802.11h * There was no known use of the function in its current form for other useful purposes.   * A syntactically and semantically different version is being developed by 802.11 TGk   The request was accepted and the commenter was directed to provide a set of instructions for the editor. The scope of the changes, and the difficulty the might cause 802.11 TGk, subsequently caused the commenter to suggest that: * the removal of the functionality be delayed until 802.11TGk complete their work   * in the meantime, implementors should be discouraged from implementing the functionality by the inclusion of a note at the appropriate place stating that the functionality, including associated IE's and frames, would be removed in a furture maintence cycle (or possibly by 802.11 TGk)   Unfortunately, it was too late for the suggestion to be considered by 802.11 TGma.

SuggestedRemedy

Implement the suggestion in the comment to flag the future removal of this functionality

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 4
MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

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

It appears the reference in N.6 to Annex L should actually be to Annex M

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 1 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 1
MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

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

In previous ballots, I requested the removal of: * Tx Power Capability functionality (see 11.5.1) * Adaption of Tx Power functionality (see 11.5.3) * Supported Channels functionality (see 11.6.1) I made this request on the basis that: * The functions are not required by spectrum management regulations, which is why they were originally included in the 802.11h * There was no known use of the functions for other useful purposes. The requests were rejected on the basis: * Leaving them in the standard does no harm * There may be implementations of which I am unaware. I accept that there are implementations of this functionality of which I am unaware. However, I claim there is harm in leaving unnecessary and useless functionality in the standard in the long term because it will bloat the standard making it harder to understand and maintain. It may also confuse equipment vendors into thinking they need to implement the functionality.

SuggestedRemedy

A reasonable compromise is to add a statement at the appropriate places in the draft stating something like, " The following functionality, including associated IE's and frames, may be removed during the next maintenance cycle unless it can be shown the functionality has some use."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 37
CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Followup to comment #73 of previous ballot. 11e made a big mistake by defining the notion of a QSTA being somehow different than a STA. A STA is a STA. Some STAs are capable of additional functions, and advertises those additional capabilities. This change unfortunately set a precedent for later amendments - 11r D1.0 defined a TSTA and TAP, and 11n D1.0 defined a HT-STA and HT-AP. Don't set the precedent for future amendments to do this again.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed resolution given in the previous recirculation was rejected, and commentor agrees that several of the QoS modifiers can't be simply deleted. Request that the editor incorporate the changes given in 11-06-0897-xx-000m-q-removal (latest revision), which give instructions for the proper modification for every occurrence of QSTA, QAP, QBSS, QIBSS, nQSTA, nQAP, nQBSS, and nQIBSS.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 20
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

The IEEE-SA style guide does not allow hanging subclauses. There are many occurances of this (5.9, 5.9.2, 5.9.3, 6.1.1, 6.1.1.1, 7, 7.1, 7.2.1, 7.4, 7.4.1, 8.1&)

SuggestedRemedy

Beseech the editor to insert new subclauses to contain introductory material, or material common to subsequent subclauses.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 21
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**

Seen in 9.5, but may be elsewhere. Look for a directed(strikeout)individually addressed (underline). After removal of the editing instructions, we will get "a individually addressed"

SuggestedRemedy

Correct as specified globally

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 2 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**		*P*	*L*	# 32	*Proposed Response*	*Response Status* **O**

KERRY, STUART J   Individual

Comment Type   **G**   *Comment Status* **X**

*** Comment submitted with the file 2428300024-11-06-0579-01-0000-identification-ip-issues-wrt-to-802-11-drafts.doc attached ***

Below is a comment that is being submitted by me as the 802.11 WG Chair under my membership of this Sponsor Ballot membership from Dave Bagby. This being received today 07/10/06 via email, with an accomponing attachment: +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++ "David Bagby" <dave@calypsoventures.com> 07/10/2006 09:51 AM Please respond to <dave@calypsoventures.com> To Stuart Kerry/SVL/SC/PHILIPS@PHILIPS cc Subject request for Sponsor ballot Recirc comment for 11ma via the .11 chair. Classification Stuart - As you know I have raised several issues with Intellectual property and the 802.11 standards. The issues and concerns are documented in 802.11 paper 06/597R1 (a copy of which is attached). While the paper was driven by the TGn WG LB review, the issues are equally applicable to all 802 projects. I had expected that IEEE would address the issues identified. Unfortunately, the only response I have had from IEEE was indirect via you as Chair. At first I was asked "to wait until PATCOM meets" for a response. I understand that PATCOM met last month, but that no action or position was taken with respect to the issues identified. This lack of response creates some serious concern with respect to the 802.11ma draft. I raised this concern in a recent 802.11 plenary session - at that time I noted that I had hoped to avoid the need for raising this issue as part of the .11ma process. However, the total lack of response from IEEE 802 and/or PATCOM leaves the concerns unresolved. I fell that the IP issues need to be raised it formally as part of the .11ma recirculation ballot. The sponsor pools deserves to be aware of the issues and should choose to approve the .11ma draft (or not) after considering the impact of the IP situation. While all the issues in doc 06/579R1 apply to .11ma to differing extents, I am particularly concerned over issue #4 in the paper re the status of historical LOAs and .11ma. I understand that 802.11ma is formally a replacement of the prior 802.11 standard and it's amendments. Therefore it's is possible that NONE of the LOAs filed to date for 802.11 would apply to 802.11ma. I feel certain that this is NOT the assumption being made by members of the sponsor pool. Since I am not part of the ballot pool for .11ma, I am asking you as Chairman of 802.11 to submit this email along with paper 06/579R1 as a new negative comment for the current 802.11 recirc ballot. Sincerely, _____ David Bagby President Calypso Ventures, Inc. office: (650) 637-7741 email: Dave@CalypsoVentures.com +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

SuggestedRemedy

"Please see comments included in "comments" section above, contained within the received email from Dave Bagby section"

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 **00**   Page 3 of 18
SC **0**   7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 31
KERRY, STUART J   Individual

Comment Type   **G**   *Comment Status*   **X**

*** Comment submitted with the file 2428200024-11-06-0579-01-0000-identification-ip-
issues-wrt-to-802.11-drafts.doc attached ***

Below is a comment that is being submitted by me as the 802.11 WG Chair under my
membership of this Sponsor Ballot membership from Dave Bagby. This being received
today 07/10/06 via email, with an accomponing
attachment: +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++ "David Bagby"
<dave@calypsoventures.com> 07/10/2006 09:51 AM Please respond
to <dave@calypsoventures.com> To Stuart
Kerry/SVL/SC/PHILIPS@PHILIPS cc Subject request for Sponsor ballot Recirc
comment for 11ma via the .11 chair. Classification Stuart - As you know I have raised
several issues with Intellectual property and the 802.11 standards. The issues and
concerns are documented in 802.11 paper 06/597R1 (a copy of which is attached). While
the paper was driven by the TGn WG LB review, the issues are equally applicable to all
802 projects. I had expected that IEEE would address the issues identified. Unfortunately,
the only response I have had from IEEE was indirect via you as Chair. At first I was asked
"to wait until PATCOM meets" for a response. I understand that PATCOM met last month,
but that no action or position was taken with respect to the issues identified. This lack of
response creates some serious concern with respect to the 802.11ma draft. I raised this
concern in a recent 802.11 plenary session - at that time I noted that I had hoped to avoid
the need for raising this issue as part of the .11ma process. However, the total lack of
response from IEEE 802 and/or PATCOM leaves the concerns unresolved. I fell that the
IP issues need to be raised it formally as part of the .11ma recirculation ballot. The sponsor
pools deserves to be aware of the issues and should choose to approve the .11ma draft (or
not) after considering the impact of the IP situation. While all the issues in doc 06/579R1
apply to .11ma to differing extents, I am particularly concerned over issue #4 in the paper
re the status of historical LOAs and .11ma. I understand that 802.11ma is formally a
replacement of the prior 802.11 standard and it's amendments. Therefore it's is possible
that NONE of the LOAs filed to date for 802.11 would apply to 802.11ma. I feel certain that
this is NOT the assumption being made by members of the sponsor pool. Since I am not
part of the ballot pool for .11ma, I am asking you as Chairman of 802.11 to submit this
email along with paper 06/579R1 as a new negative comment for the current 802.11 recirc
ballot. Sincerely, _____ David Bagby President Calypso Ventures,
Inc. office: (650) 637-7741 email:
Dave@CalypsoVentures.com +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

SuggestedRemedy

"Please see comments included in "comments" section above, contained with the received
email from Dave Bagby"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 3
MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

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

In a previous ballots, I requested the removal of Annex N because I believed it had no
value   This request was rejected with, "The consensus of the working group is that the
material is useful. The burden of proving it not useful is on the commenter. A simple
assertion that it is not useful is insufficient justification to remove the annex."   This
response is unreasonable because it is impossible to prove no value. Given this is new
material, I strongly believe that it is incumbent on the authors to describe what value is
provided.   What I can say is that it attempts to describe the functions of an AP using a
abstract form, new terminology (eg mobile STAs) and a new language (eg based on UML).
The majority of the annex is used to describe the new terminology and language.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Annex N

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **160**   *L* **2**   # 53
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**

"PeerKey specification" seems to imply that there is a separate document; not needed

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the phrase beginning with "However such communications&PeerKey Protocol" and
replace with "In this case, the PeerKey protocol is not used."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 4 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **176** *L* **13** # 54
STANLEY, DOROTHY V Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
Either define the applicable countermeasures that apply to DLS, or delete the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete the sentence beginning "Some TKIP countermeasures"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **190** *L* **29** # 57
STANLEY, DOROTHY V Individual

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**
Inconsistent article usage

SuggestedRemedy
Change from "An SMKSA" to "The SMKSA"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **190** *L* **33** # 56
STANLEY, DOROTHY V Individual

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**
non-specific language

SuggestedRemedy
Change from "their lifetimes" to "the SMK Lifetime"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **199** *L* **26** # 58
STANLEY, DOROTHY V Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**
Could not find the definition of an STSL "Teardown". Clause 8.5.9.2 refers to both the STSL Teardown procedure and to an STSL Teardown Message, neither of which are defined. Believe that these references should refer to e.g. DLS teardown - the application that uses the STSL. Also in 8.5.3.5. Also, capitalization on STLS "Teardown" vs "teardown" is not consistent. Pick one.

SuggestedRemedy
Change all instances of "STSL teardown xxx" to a single term, such as "STSL application Teardown procedure" and indicate that one example is the MLME-DLSTeardown.request.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **205** *L* **54** # 59
STANLEY, DOROTHY V Individual

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**
Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy
Change from "to deliver SMK" to "to deliver the SMK"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **208** *L* **20** # 60
STANLEY, DOROTHY V Individual

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**
Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy
Change from "The STAs where SMK handshakeis not implemented&" to "If the SMKHandshake is not supported, the STA shall set the SMK message bit to 0 and&.."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 5 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **214**	*L* **8**	# 61

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "PeerKeyHandshake uses..section 8.5.9"" to "PeerKeyHandshake Messages use EAPOL-Key frames as defined in 8.5.9."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **217**	*L* **42**	# 62

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "as follows" to "is as follows"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **217**	*L* **53**	# 63

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "as follows" to "is as follows"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **220**	*L* **51**	# 64

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Convention is to capitalize "H" in Handshake"

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "handshake" to "Handshake"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **222**	*L* **13**	# 66

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Incorrect article use

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "the" prior to "4-Way handshake" and prior to "STK"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **222**	*L* **13**	# 65

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Convention is to capitalize "H" in Handshake"

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "handshake" to "Handshake"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 6 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00** *SC* **0**	*P* **231**	*L* **27**	# 67	

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
Convention is to capitalize the state names

SuggestedRemedy
Change from "PeerKeyInit" to "PEERKEYINIT"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0**	*P* **233**	*L* **5**	# 68	

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "out" and "other" from the first sentence.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0**	*P* **233**	*L* **13**	# 69	

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
Not sure "will be" is the right verb here

SuggestedRemedy
Change "will be" to "are"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0**	*P* **233**	*L* **15**	# 70	

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy
Change "is provided" to "are provided"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0**	*P* **233**	*L* **19**	# 71	

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy
Insert "the" prior to "MAC Address", "Peer STA" and "PeerKey"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0**	*P* **233**	*L* **20**	# 72	

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy
Insert "the" prior to "MAC Address", "Initiator STA" and "PeerKey"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 7 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **233**	*L* **21**	# 73

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Missing articles

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "The" and "the" prior to the "STK" occurrences

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **235**	*L* **47**	# 74

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Missing punctuation

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a period following "machine"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **235**	*L* **48**	# 75

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Duplicate punctuation

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the period after the :

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **235**	*L* **50**	# 76

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

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

Reference to direct link application not needed

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence beginning "This state can be repeated multiple.."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **237**	*L* **1**	# 77

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

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

Lines 1-20 seem to be missing text, and has many missing articles, and sentence fragments. For example, the first definition should probably say "is received by" the Initiator STA

SuggestedRemedy

Add complete descriptions

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **243**	*L* **48**	# 78

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Missing article

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "the" prior to "PeerKey"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 8 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **243**	*L* **49**	#	79

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Incorrect article use

SuggestedRemedy
   Change "This" to "The"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **243**	*L* **53**	#	80

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Missing article

SuggestedRemedy
   Insert "the" prior to "first"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **243**	*L* **54**	#	81

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Grammar error

SuggestedRemedy
   Change from "on receiving of first" to "upon receipt of the first"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **244**	*L* **1**	#	82

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Grammar error

SuggestedRemedy
   Change from "the STAs" to "each STA" and change from "message arrived for that session" to "messaged received for that session"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **244**	*L* **1**	#	83

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   "states" is not specific

SuggestedRemedy
   Change from "Peerkey hanshake states" to "STKSA and SMKSA"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **244**	*L* **4**	#	84

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   Missing article

SuggestedRemedy
   Insert "the" prior to PeerKey

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 9 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:35 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **244**   *L* **13**   # 85
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Grammar error

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "whom" to "which" and insert "the" prior to STA_I

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **244**   *L* **20**   # 86
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Grammar error

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "complete handshake has two parts" to "The PeerKey Handshake has two components:"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **244**   *L* **23**   # 87
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Missing article

SuggestedRemedy
    Insert "the" prior to "SMKSA" and prior to "PTK"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **244**   *L* **25**   # 88
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    missing puncuation, article

SuggestedRemedy
    Change from "SMKSA Initiator STA" to "SMKSA, the Initiator STA" and change from "initiates 4-way handshake" to "initiates the 4-Way Handshake" and insert "the" prior to both occurrances of STKSA.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **244**   *L* **47**   # 89
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    not standards terminology

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "by filling the" to "including the". Insert "the" before group in the second sentence, change "fill this field with any value and on the other side STA"" to "include any value in this field and the receiving STA

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **251**   *L* **46**   # 90
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    missing article

SuggestedRemedy
    Insert "the" prior to "STA"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 10 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **454**	*L*	# 17

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

On behalf of Peter Ecclesine: Changebars are present in g) and h), but no insertions or deletions are visible in text.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to mark insertions and deletions

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **491**	*L* **31**	# 12

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

On behalf of Peter Ecclesine: Title of Table 85 incorrect, has extraneous Table xx

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to delete extraneous text

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **752**	*L* **52**	# 14

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

On behalf of Peter Ecclesine: There is a missing OF3.2.6, 5.725-5.85 GHz, Reference 17.3.8.3, Status O.1, Support Y, N, N/A that corresponds to OF3.3.6

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to add OF3.2.6 with text from comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **755**	*L* **21**	# 15

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

On behalf of Peter Ecclesine: There is an extraneous "in Europe" that should be struckthrough

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to delete extraneous text

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **1047**	*L* **19**	# 16

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

On behalf of Peter Ecclesine: There is an extraneous 2 at the end of dot11PhyFHSSComplianceGroup

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to delete extraneous text

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P* **1158**	*L* **17**	# 13

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**

On behalf of Peter Ecclesine: Channel set for ISM operation is incorrect, missing 149, 153, 157, 161

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to add channels 149, 153, 157, 161

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 11 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.125**   *P* **57**   *L* **9**   # 41
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    The deleted sentence changes the definition.

SuggestedRemedy
    Return deleted sentnce. Reword if necessary

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.137**   *P* **57**   *L* **16**   # 42
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Isn't this standard full of things it defines???. Is there only a single one or multiple ones?

SuggestedRemedy
    Delete "defined by this standard". Then the sentence needs more techncal detail to be provided by the contributors

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.147**   *P* **58**   *L* **6**   # 43
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Is the last sentence a requirement? How is it fulfilled?

SuggestedRemedy
    Delete or define what will qualify in the future.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.34**   *P* **50**   *L* **13**   # 39
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Revised definition is more confusing. Recommend same defination as in WMM

SuggestedRemedy
    An AC for a specific STA, to deliver traffic in that STA specific AC using APSD when an Unscheduled Service Period (USP) is triggered by that STA.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.36**   *P* **8**   *L* **21**   # 24
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    (On behalf of Shlomo Ovadia) The definition of direct link is inconsistent with DLS handshake in Clause 11.7

SuggestedRemedy
    Proposed text "Direct Link: A bidirectional link from one non-access point (non-AP) quality of service (QoS) station (QSTA) to another non-AP QSTA operating in the same infrastructure QoS basic service set (QBSS) that does not pass through a QoS access point (QAP). Once a direct link has been set up, all data frames between the two non-AP QSTAs are exchanged directly."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.57**   *P* **51**   *L* **46**   # 40
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
    Isn't this standard full of things it defines???. Is there only a single one or multiple ones?

SuggestedRemedy
    Delete "defined by this standard". Then the sentence needs more techncal detail to be provided by the contributors

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **03**
SC **3.57**

Page 12 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **07**	*SC* **7.2.2**	*P* **81**	*L* **25**	# 33
CHAPLIN, CLINT F		Individual		

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
     incorrect English, plural noun, singular verb

SuggestedRemedy
     Change "QSTAs uses QoS" to "QSTAs use QoS"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **07**	*SC* **7.3.2.2**	*P* **148**	*L* **23**	# 45
PALM, STEPHEN R		Individual		

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
     What is "rounded up"? The encosing or the value? The example is confusing since the encoding should be 0x02

SuggestedRemedy
     clarify

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **07**	*SC* **7.3.2.2**	*P* **148**	*L* **23**	# 44
PALM, STEPHEN R		Individual		

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
     What is "Kbps"? The metric standard for 1000 is lower case "k". Is the intent 1024 or 1000? This needs a definition

SuggestedRemedy
     kbit/s

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **07**	*SC* **7.4.5.**	*P* **198**	*L* **4**	# 46
PALM, STEPHEN R		Individual		

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
     Are the Vendor specific contents rely defined in the standard?

SuggestedRemedy
     reword to clarify intent

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.1.4**	*P* **201**	*L* **47**	# 47
PALM, STEPHEN R		Individual		

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
     Much of this clause reads like a proposal not a standard. " is provided", "it is the intent&", "common"

SuggestedRemedy
     Clarify

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.1.4**	*P* **201**	*L* **52**	# 48
PALM, STEPHEN R		Individual		

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
     "STA shall ensure" sounds like the STA should set instead of read the value

SuggestedRemedy
     Calrify intent

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **08**
SC **8.1.4**

Page 13 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.3.2.4**	*P* **176**	*L* **13**	# 19

STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

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

"Some TKIP countermeasures are applicable for secure DLS data frame exchange as well." Either some was intended, in which case the applicable cases should be listed, or (as is thought to be the case) it was intended to be "the same".

SuggestedRemedy

At the start of this sentence, replace "Some" with "The same".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.3.2.4**	*P* **218**	*L* **13**	# 49

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

The new statement is vague and content free.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete or add some substance or reference

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.4.1.1.4**	*P* **190**	*L* **31**	# 55

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

Duplicate text

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence beginning "In other words&"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.4.1.1.4**	*P* **232**	*L* **33**	# 50

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

"SMKSAs are cached for up to their lifetimes." Are SMKSAs required to be cached?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify that it is not an imlementation detail

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.5.1.4**	*P* **247**	*L* **1**	# 51

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

Are these assumptions or requirements?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **08**	*SC* **8.5.7**	*P* **238**	*L* **16**	# 34

CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

An accepted comment in a previous letter ballot changed "AAA Key" to "MSK" throughout. But one place in Figure 157 was missed.

SuggestedRemedy

Page 238, line 16 (middle of Figure 157), Change "AAA Key" to "MSK"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **08**
SC **8.5.7**

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **09**	*SC* **9.12**	*P*	*L*	*#* 23

STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **X**

During the TGn ballot (LB84), multiple editorial errors were reported in their version of 9.12 (which was derived from the same text which appears as new text in 9.12 here). The editorial changes that appear in the TGn version should be propagated into the REVma baseline.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that the 802.11 editor and 802.11n editor (who has a change-marked version of this section available in FrameMaker format) get together and propagate the fixes in this section.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **09**	*SC* **9.12**	*P* **323**	*L* **28**	*#* 22

STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

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

My comment in an earlier ballot was not adquately addressed. I proposed replacement of existing tables and figures with a new syntax. The alternative resolution adopted leaves the figures in place. The reason for my original change still stands - the figures are not maintainable. For example, TGn would have no option but to add a disclaimer to the tables (similar to the SDL in Annex C) "this does not apply to the HT feature". I've asked around and nobody really cares about this subclause anyway.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the text and figures from 323 line 28 until the end of the subclause. Alternatively remove the whole subclause.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **09**	*SC* **9.2.6**	*P* **316**	*L*	*#* 52

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

"indivudally addressed" does not seem to be defined. "directed" was defined in 3.35

SuggestedRemedy

Define

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **09**	*SC* **9.6**	*P* **287**	*L* **54**	*#* 18

STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

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

(On behalf of Solomon Trainin) To be complete with the rule "The BlockAck control frame shall be sent at the same rate as the BlockAckReq frame" the spec has to say that the BlockAckReq shall be sent at the rate that both STA can receive and transmit. Only rates from BSSBasicRate set parameter are appropriate. This needs to be specified.

SuggestedRemedy

The resolution is to transmit both BAR and BA at the basic rate still following the rule of same rate. The following edits (in 9.6) achieve this: 1. Insert at the end of "When the control frame is a BlockAckReq or BlockAck frame" the following: " of a delayed Block Ack agreement". 2. Insert after "All other data, BlockAckReq, and BlockAck frames" the following "of a delayed Block Ack agreement" 3. Insert after "... the rate chosen to transmit ... ACK frame is intended." the following: "A STA requesting an immediate BlockAck response shall transmit the BlockAckReq frame at the highest rate in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter that is less than or equal to the rate of the previous Data frame sent to the same destination and that is of the same modulation class. If no rate in the basic rate set contained in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter meets these conditions then the BlockAckReq frame shall be sent at the highest mandatory rate of the PHY that is less than or equal to the rate of the previous Data frame sent to the same destination and that is of the same modulation class."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **9.6**

Page 15 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.3**   *P*   *L*   # 30
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
(On behalf of Emily Qi) MLME SAP Interface for Vendor Specific Action Frame is missing

SuggestedRemedy
Add new sub-clauses in 10.3 to specify MLME-VENDORSPECIFIC.request, MLME-VENDORSPECIFIC.confirm, and MLME-VENDORSPECIFIC.indication. (Emily Qi volunteers to provide normative text consistent with this recommended change if so approved). Also consider whether clause 9/11 text is necessary to describe its use.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.10.6**   *P* **491**   *L* **31**   # 6
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**
Title of Table 85 incorrect, has extraneous Table xx

SuggestedRemedy
Editor to delete extraneous text

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.2.1.5**   *P* **454**   *L*   # 11
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**
Changebars are present in g) and h), but no insertions or deletions are visible in text.

SuggestedRemedy
Editor to mark insertions and deletions

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.5.1**   *P* **476**   *L* **9**   # 35
CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type   **ER**   *Comment Status*   **X**
Unresolved cross reference

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Editor's Note" to "11.5.1.1"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.7**   *P* **481**   *L* **5**   # 29
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
(On behalf of Shlomo Ovadia) "for the duration of the direct stream as long as there is an active DLS between the two STAs" is redundant and unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "for the duration of the direct stream"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.7**   *P* **481**   *L* **24**   # 27
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **X**
(On behalf of Shlomo Ovadia) Not clear what "intends to exchange frames" means

SuggestedRemedy
Proposed text "A STA, QSTA-1, that initiates a direct link with another non-AP STA, sends a DLS request frame to the QAP (step 1a in Figure 210)."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **11**
SC **11.7**

Page 16 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.7**   *P* **481**   *L* **32**   # 28
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
    (On behalf of Shlomo Ovadia) "direct stream" is undefined here and in other occurances

SuggestedRemedy
    Proposed change "direct stream"->"direct link", global search and replace

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.7**   *P* **481**   *L* **49**   # 36
CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
    Comment #148 of previous recirculation left inconsistent text in 11.7. The resulting text in
    D7.0 gives a normative cross reference to the teardown procedures (pointing to 11.7.4),
    then follows it with a "Note" that says that the DLS cannot be torn down. The first sentence
    of this pair was inserted by Comment #148 in the previous recirculation, and second
    sentence ("Note:") reasonably followed the text that was replaced by comment #148.
    Resolution to comment #148 in previous recirculation should have instructed the editor to
    include the "Note" in the text being replaced.

SuggestedRemedy
    Delete the sentence at line #49 of this page, "Note in this case the DLS cannot be torn
    down because a teardown message cannot be sent because the QSTAs are not on the
    same QAP."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.7.1**   *P* **480**   *L* **49**   # 25
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
    Title "DLS" is too generic and does not match the clause content

SuggestedRemedy
    Change 11.7.1 title to "DLS procedure at QSTA and QAP"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.7.3.2**   *P* **485**   *L* **13**   # 26
STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
    STAKEY_MISMATCH does not match the Reason Code in Table 84

SuggestedRemedy
    Proposed text "The only applicable values of the ReasonCode are PeerKey_MISMATCH
    and QSTA_ LEAVING. Their encoding to Reason Code field values are defined in Table
    84."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **A**   *SC* **A.4.4.1**   *P* **733**   *L* **49**   # 38
O'HARA, ROBERT   Individual

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **X**
    With the main text showing that WEP is deprecated, that same fact should be represented
    here.

SuggestedRemedy
    Add the following text after "Wired equivalent privacy (WEP) algorithm" in the "Protocol
    Capability column: "Deprecated (applicable only to systems that are backward compatible)"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **A**   *SC* **A.4.8**   *P* **752**   *L* **52**   # 8
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
    There is a missing OF3.2.6, 5.725-5.85 GHz, Reference 17.3.8.3, Status O.1, Support Y,
    N, N/A that corresponds to OF3.3.6

SuggestedRemedy
    Editor to add OF3.2.6 with text from comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

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 **A**
SC **A.4.8**

Page 17 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**

Cl **A**   *SC* **A.4.8**   *P* **755**   *L* **21**   # 9
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**
     There is an extraneous "in Europe" that should be struckthrough

SuggestedRemedy
     Editor to delete extraneous text

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **D**   *SC* **D Compliance**   *P* **1047**   *L* **19**   # 10
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**
     There is an extraneous 2 at the end of dot11PhyFHSSComplianceGroup

SuggestedRemedy
     Editor to delete extraneous text

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **J**   *SC* **J.1**   *P* **1158**   *L* **17**   # 7
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **X**
     Channel set for ISM operation is incorrect, missing 149, 153, 157, 161

SuggestedRemedy
     Editor to add channels 149, 153, 157, 161

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

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 **J**
SC **J.1**

Page 18 of 18
7/12/2006 10:17:36 AM

Submission   **Bob O'Hara, Cisco Systems**