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

KANDALA, SRINIVAS   Individual

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

Future standardized waveforms use 40MHz (see 802.11n draft). These waveforms provide interoperability and coexistence only when channel centers are defined with 20MHz separation. There should be a requirement for new devices to have channel occupancy separated by 20MHz in 2.4 GHz. To minimize adjacent and co-channel interference, it would be best if the devices are centered in Channels 1, 6 or 11.

SuggestedRemedy

Restrict new devices to be centered on channels 1, 6 or 11.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment is out of scope for the current ballot. There has been no change in the channellization of any PHY in the 2.4 GHz band. The comment will be forwarded to the 802.11 Working Group for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # 9

MYLES, ANDREW F   Individual

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

In a previous ballots, I requested the removal of Annex N because I believed it had no value. This comment is a repeat of those comments

This request was previously rejected with, "The consensus of the working group is that the material in Annex N is useful. Inclusion of Annex N was approved unanimously in March 2005 (document 05/205r0, motion #7). This text was developed in response to requests from 802.11 members and external SDOs for additional description of AP functionality. Annex N describes the functions of an AP using a UML-based syntax to clarify AP function versus common implementations of AP devices. The burden of proving that Annex N is not useful is on the commenter.."

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. They have failed to do so on multiple occasions

I would also note that it is somewhat misleading to believe the majority of the WG believes the material is useful based on a motion held in TGm . The most that can be said is that it was approved by those self selected individuals in the room at the time. The minutes do not record how many people voted in the affirmative but based on the previous motion it was probably less than 13 and possibly less than 7. I suspect the vast majority of WG members have no clue Annex N exists.

What I can say is that Annex N 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. I assert the majority of knowledgable WG members would not recognise the description.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Annex N

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The consensus of the task group, working group, and the sponsor group is that the material in Annex N is useful, as there has been no material support for its removal in any ballot. The duty of the working group is to continue to move in the direction of consensus when resolving comments. Annex N describes the functions of an AP using a UML-based syntax to clarify AP function versus common implementations of AP devices.

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 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 10
COORDINATION, EDITORIAL

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **D**

Please look at Clause 2 carefully. You have updated to the new IEEE introductory paragraph that states:
The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments or corrigenda) applies. However, all of your references are still dated. Do you want users to update to the most recent edition? If so, you need to remove the dates while the draft is still being recirculated.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove dates of those references you would like to be automatically updated to the most recent edition.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Delete ":1997" from the reference to 3166-1.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 11
COORDINATION, EDITORIAL

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

As per IEEE style, the bibliography should always fall at the end or the beginning of the series of annexes. Currently, the bibliography falls right in the middle. I suggest moving it to the beginning since new annexes will continue to be added in the future.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest moving bibliography to first or last annex.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Move the bibliography to the last annex. Leave Annex E empty to avoid renumbering the subsequent annexes and all the references thereto.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 12
COORDINATION, EDITORIAL

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

Figures in IEEE standards are printed in black ink only. Figure 4 is colored. Please make sure this figure will maintain its integrity when printed as black ink.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The figure has been printed in two prior versions of the standard without difficulty.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.1** *P* **47** *L* **5** # 38
PALM, STEPHEN R Individual

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

STAs and APs are plain now. No need to reference Quality of Service

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Quality of Service (QoS)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard. Only the acronym was removed.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.118** *P* **12** *L* **51** # 22
CHAPLIN, CLINT F Individual

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

Wrong article

SuggestedRemedy

Change "an non-QoS AP" to "a non-QoS AP"

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

Cl **03**
SC **3.118**

Page 2 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **03** *SC* **3.118**	*P* **54**	*L* **49**	# 29

PALM, STEPHEN R Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
The definition no longer needed since we are doing away with "Q"

SuggestedRemedy
Delete entire definition

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

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard. Only the acronym was removed.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.119**	*P* **54**	*L* **54**	# 30

PALM, STEPHEN R Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
The definition no longer needed since we are doing away with "Q"

SuggestedRemedy
Delete definition entirely

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

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard. Only the acronym was removed.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.121**	*P* **55**	*L* **4**	# 31

PALM, STEPHEN R Individual

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **D**
The definition no longer needed since we are doing away with "Q"

SuggestedRemedy
Delete definition entirely

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

The definition is still needed, as the term "QoS IBSS" is used elsewhere in the document. Only the acronym was deleted, not the term.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.122**	*P* **13**	*L* **8**	# 23

CHAPLIN, CLINT F Individual

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Wrong article

SuggestedRemedy
Change "an non-QoS STA" to "a non-QoS STA"

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

Cl **03** *SC* **3.122**	*P* **55**	*L* **7**	# 32

PALM, STEPHEN R Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
The definition no longer needed since we are doing away with "Q"

SuggestedRemedy
Delete definition entirely

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

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard. Only the acronym was removed.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.131**	*P* **55**	*L* **40**	# 33

PALM, STEPHEN R Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
We agreed to remove "Q" and related

SuggestedRemedy
Delete: "Qualiy of Service (qos)"

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

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard. Only the acronym was removed.

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 **3.131**

Page 3 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.135**   *P* **55**   *L* **55**   # 34

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

We agreed to remove "Q" and related.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Quality of Service (QoS)"
Use "STA" (not "station') consistantly.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard.
Only the acronym was removed.

Editor to change "station" to "STA".

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.34**   *P* **49**   *L* **13**   # 26

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

Renoving the "Q" was not done correctly here (and seveal other places). There are just
APs and STA, not QoS APs nor QoS STAs.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Quality of Service (qoS)"
Replace "QoS Station" with STA

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard.
Only the acronym was removed.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.36**   *P* **49**   *L* **21**   # 27

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

Removal of "Q" artifacts handled inccorrecly

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Quality of Service (QoS)".
Delete "QoS" twice.
consistantly only use "AP" and "STA", not the full words.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard.
Only the acronym was removed.

Editor to change the definition to read:
A bidirectional link from one non-AP quality of service (QoS) STA to another non-AP QoS
STA operating in the same infrastructure QoS basic service set that does not pass through
a QoS AP. Once a direct link has been set up, all frames between the two non-AP QoS
STAs are exchanged directly.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.51**   *P* **50**   *L* **21**   # 28

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

Here as in several other places, "Q" removal was handled incorrectly.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "quality of Service (QoS)"
Delete "QoS" twice
Use "STA" and "AP" consistantly

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The term QoS, when combined with BSS, IBSS, AP, or STA, is still used in the standard.
Only the acronym was removed.

The editor is to revise the definition as follows:
The prioritized carrier sense multiple access with collision avoidance (CSMA/CA) access
mechanism used by QoS STAs in a QoS basic service set. This access mechanism is also
used by the QoS AP and operates concurrently with hybrid coordination function (HCF)
controlled channel access (HCCA).

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 **3.51**

Page 4 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.65**   *P* **9**   *L* **21**   # 1
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    one instance of non-QSTA is still there

SuggestedRemedy
    Change from "non-QSTA" to "non-QoS STA"

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

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.65**   *P* **9**   *L* **21**   # 21
CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    One last QSTA that was missed

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "non-QSTAs" to "non-QoS STAs"

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

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.2.6**   *P* **31**   *L* **27**   # 24
CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Wrong article

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "a AP" to "an AP"

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

Cl **06**   *SC* **6.1.1**   *P* **93**   *L* **17**   # 39
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Was "QoS STA" an attempt to shorthand a "STA with QoS Facility". The shorthand is confusing and just a varient of "QSTA" that we agreed to get rid of the "Q" and just have "STA"s.

SuggestedRemedy
    Replace "QoS STA" with "STA with QoS Facility" in many places throughout the document.

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

    The term "QoS STA" is defined in 3.122 as " a STA that implements the QoS facility". This allows consistent and unambiguous use of the term in the rest of the standard.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.1.3.5.7**   *P* **70**   *L* **28**   # 2
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Figure 21 includes a QAP

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "QAP" to "AP in Figure 21

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

Cl **07**
SC **7.1.3.5.7**

Page 5 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.3.2.2**   *P* **145**   *L* **23**   # 35

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

The current revisions are an improvement, but it seems that still more could be done to clarify. A few sentences later, a reference to a tbale of encodings is used. That seems better than using the current revised text which is not strictly logically coorect.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the two data rate sentences consistant by using the later reference to the table in 10.4.4.2.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The table in 10.4.4.2 is not complete and cannot serve as the sole reference for encoding these values.

Replace "bits 6 through 0 are set to the data rate, rounded up to the next 500kb/s (e.g., a 1 Mb/s rate contained in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter is encoded as X'82')."

with "bits 6 through 0 are set to the data rate, if necessary rounded up to the next 500kb/s, in units of 500 kb/s. For example, a 2.25 Mb/s rate contained in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter is encoded as X'85'."

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.4.5**   *P* **152**   *L* **48**   # 19

STEPHENS, ADRIAN P   Individual

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

The change highlights the question of what can go into or follow the vendor specific content. The implication of figure 118 is that the vendor specific content is of variable length and unconstrained (except through the MPDU length limits).
However this is not true - there is an additional constraint, that the vendor specific content internally define its length. The reason for this is that the action frame format shown in Table 19, permits one or more vendor specific information elements to follow the action field. Without the Action field being able to determine its own length internally, it is not possible to parse the vendor-specific information elements.

SuggestedRemedy

In 7.2.3.12, after: "One or more... all other information elements" add: ", except this shall be absent in the case of the Vendor Specific action frame."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The vendor-specific content field of the vendor-specific action frame is totally unconstrained and forbidding the inclusion of vendor-specific information elements is not consistent with this.

The commenter is correct that, without knowledge of the structure of the vendor-specific action frame, it will be impossible to parse. It is not intended that all STAs be able to parse any portion of the vendor-specific content. Only those STAs that have a priori knowledge of the structure will be able to parse the frame.

Cl **07**   *SC* **7.4.5**   *P* **194**   *L* **47**   # 37

PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

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

This is an imrovement on previous, howevr, "fields" implies it must be more than one.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "the vendor specific fields" with "vendor specifc field(s)"

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

Cl **07**
SC **7.4.5**

Page 6 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.1.4**   *P* **156**   *L* **53**   # 3

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

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

    Typo

SuggestedRemedy

    Change "mastery" to "master"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.5.3.5**   *P* **217**   *L* **32**   # 4

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

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

    Incorrect grammar

SuggestedRemedy

    Change from "SMKSA and their initiate" to "the SMKSA and initiate"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

    PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.5.5**   *P* **223**   *L* **39**   # 7

STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

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

    Simplify wording and add missing article

SuggestedRemedy

    Change from "At this point the Supplicant also enters PEERKEYINIT state" to
    "The Supplicant enters the PEERKEYINIT state"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

    PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

    1. In clause 8.5.5 paragraph 1
    Replace the sentence beginning "At this point" with the following sentence
    "A Supplicant enters the STAKEYSTART state on receiving an EAPOL-Key frame from the
    Authenticator"
    This reinstates the original text from 802.11i.

    2. In figure 153, delete the arrow coming downwards out of the STAKEYSTART state and
    the "PeerKeyInit" text label

    3. Move the following variable definitions from 8.5.5.2 to a new section, 8.5.5.5 "Supplicant
    PeerKey state machine variables":
    PeerKeyInit
    TimeoutEvt
    TimeoutCtr
    MICVerified - note-not the first one in the list, the second one
    SMKMesgNo
    STKMesgNo
    STA_P
    STA_I
    STKKey

    4. Duplicate the following variable definition from clause 8.5.5.2 and insert them into 8.5.5.5:
    EAPOLKeyReceived

    5. Change the name of clause 8.5.5.4 from Supplicant PeerKey state machine
    procedures to Supplicant PeerKey state machine states

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 **8.5.5**

Page 7 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.1.3.2**   *P* **298**   *L* **14**   # 40
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**
    HCCA has turned out to be irrelevant, unimplemented and confusing to industry.

SuggestedRemedy
    Delete HCCA funcionality and all references to it.

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

    The comment is out of scope for the current ballot. The text regarding HCCA has not
    changed. The comment will be forwarded to the 802.11 Working Group for consideration in
    a future revision of the standard.

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.12**   *P* **310**   *L* **13**   # 5
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
    QAP in table

SuggestedRemedy
    Change to AP

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

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.12**   *P* **312**   *L* **46**   # 6
STANLEY, DOROTHY V   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
    QAP term used

SuggestedRemedy
    Change from "QAP" to "AP"

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

Cl **11**   *SC* **11.2.1.4**   *P* **486**   *L* **42**   # 41
PALM, STEPHEN R   Individual

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**
    This cluase contains numerous technical errors.

SuggestedRemedy
    Recommend that text be compared to WMM Specification and updated to correct technical
    errors.

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

    The comment is out of scope of the current ballot. There are no technical changes to the
    text regarding APSD operation. The comment will be forwarded to the 802.11 Working
    Group for consideration in a future revision of the standard.

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.5.4.3**   *P* **636**   *L* **29**   # 20
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**
    Heading of right column missing '5' in MHz channel spacing

SuggestedRemedy
    Editor to insert 5

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

Cl **A**   *SC* **A**   *P* **749**   *L* **52**   # 13
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type   **G**   *Comment Status*   **D**
    OF3.8.1 Status should be CF11, not CF10, as it applies to 4.9 GHz

SuggestedRemedy
    Make Status use CF11

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

Cl **A**
SC **A**

Page 8 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **A**   *SC* **A**   *P* **750**   *L* **5**   # 14
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type **G**   *Comment Status* **D**
    OF3.8.2 Status should be CF11, not CF10, as it applies to 4.9 GHz

SuggestedRemedy
    Make Status use CF11

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

Cl **A**   *SC* **A**   *P* **750**   *L* **8**   # 15
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type **G**   *Comment Status* **D**
    OF3.8.3 Status should be CF11, not CF10, as it applies to 4.9 GHz

SuggestedRemedy
    Make Status use CF11

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

Cl **D**   *SC* **D**   *P* **999**   *L* **7**   # 25
CHAPLIN, CLINT F   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Wrong article

SuggestedRemedy
    Change "an non-QoS BSS" to "a non-QoS BSS"

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

Cl **I**   *SC* **I**   *P* **1148**   *L* **13**   # 17
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Text and Figure Title refer to H.2, but should be I.1

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **I**   *SC* **I**   *P* **1149**   *L* **44**   # 16
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Figure I.6 on p1149 has a title in BLUE instead of BLACK, and is titled Figure H.3 on l22

SuggestedRemedy
    Redraw figure to Style Guide req'ts and correctly title it (I.2)

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

    Also change reference to figure I.6 in line 22 to be I.2.

Cl **J**   *SC* **J.3**   *P* **1154**   *L* **29**   # 18
ECCLESINE, PETER   Individual

Comment Type **G**   *Comment Status* **D**
    Table J.3 does not show 5.25-5.35 GHz, which is available in Japan. See comment #297 on REV-MA D5.0 (06/91r2 p6). In Table J.3, insert Regulatory Class 30, Channel starting frequency 5, Channel spacing 20, Channel set 52, 56, 60, 64, Transmit power limit 22, Emissions limits set 1, Behavior limits set 1, 2, 6; and specify Regulatory classes 31-255 Reserved

SuggestedRemedy
    Editor to add Regulatory Class 30 with text from comment.

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

    This comment is out of scope for this recirculation ballot. No text in Annex J has changed. The comment will be forwarded to the 802.11 working group 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

Cl **J**   Page 9 of 10
SC **J.3**   9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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

Cl **N**　　*SC* **N**　　　　*P* **1217**　　*L* **1**　　　# 36

PALM, STEPHEN R　　　　　　Individual

Comment Type　**GR**　　*Comment Status*　**D**

Annex N attempts to redefine AP functionality. It's inclusion in the satndard causes confusion

SuggestedRemedy

Dellete Annex N. If desired, the contents may be contained in a seperate document or contribution.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment is out of scope for this recirculation ballot. The comment will be forwarded to the 802.11 Working Group 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

Cl **N**
SC **N**

Page 10 of 10
9/17/2006 11:42:14 PM

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