Project: IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)

Submission Title: [Resolutions for the unsolved comments related to Subclause 6.2]

Date Submitted: [8th July, 2010]

Source: [Il Soon Jang, Sang-Kyu Lim, Dae Ho Kim, You Jin Kim, Tae-Gyu Kang] Company [ETRI]

Address [138 Gajeongno, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon, 305-700]

Voice:[+82-42-860-5424], FAX: [+82-42-860-5218], E-Mail:[isjang@etri.re.kr]

Re: [Response to LB50 comments]

Abstract: [This document describes the resolutions for the unsolved comments related to Subclause 6.2]

Purpose: [Proposal to resolve unsolved comments related to Subclause 6.2]

Notice: This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE P802.15. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

Release: The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution becomes the property of IEEE and may be made publicly available by P802.15.

Resolutions for the unsolved comments related to Subclause 6.2

II Soon Jang isjang@etri.re.kr

20 CIDs

- There are 31 CIDs associated with subclauses 6.2.
- We have already resolved 11 CIDs on previous CC.
- So, the remained 20 CIDs still open.
- I'll try to resolve these 20 CIDs associated with subclause 6.2.
- These 20 CIDs are classified into 3 categories.
 - 251, 253, 261, 262, 263, 273, 276
 - *–* 256, 279, 283, 284
 - 271, 277, 281, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 293

CID 251, 253

| | | Claus | Subclau | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------|-----------|------|------|------|---|--|
| CID | Name | е | se | Page | Line | Type | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
| 251 | James Gilb | 6 | 6.2.1.1 | 27 | 1 | Т | described in that primitive's definition. Not here. When it is done here, there is a duplication of normative information plus the silly back reference in 6.1.2.1 to | Move "When the PHY entity status of RX_ON or TRX_OFF, respectively." to 6.2.1.2, merging it with the text that was in the 6.2.1.2.2 subclause. This will prevent mistakes. (of course deleting the PD-SAP is a simpler and better idea.). Make that change here and in all the other primitives (essentially all have the reason codes defined in the .request instead of the .confirm.) |
| 253 | James Gilb | 6 | 6.2.1.2.2 | 27 | 38 | Т | reasons need to be defined | Delete here and in all other locations in the |

 We need to discuss where to write the description or definition for confirm primitive parameter.

- In our opinion, this comment is correct.
- We'd like to recommend that we accept this comment.

CID 251, 253: comment structure

CID 251, 253
Comment: The action of the .confirm primitive should be described in that primitive's definition.
So, move

6.2.x.1 xxx.request

 6.2.x.1.1 Semantics of the service primitive
 6.2.x.1.2 When generated
 6.2.x.1.3 Effect on receipt

 The full description or definition for confirm primitive parameters is described here.
 6.2.x.2 xxx.confirm

 6.2.x.2.1 Semantics of the service primitive
 6.2.x.2.2 When generated
 The full description or definition for confirm primitive parameters is described here.
 Need the full description or definition for confirm primitive parameters, but only refer to

- 6.2.x.2.3 Effect on receipt

The subclause which need the full description or the definition of confirm primitive parameters is this confirm subclauses, not request.

And the confirm subclause in D1 draft describes only reference of request subclause. So, the comments means that move the full description or definition for confirm primitive parameter into confirm subclause.

CID 261, 262

| CID | Name | Clause | Subclau se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|-----|-----------------|-----------|---------------|------|------|------|---------------------|---|
| 261 | David Cypher | 6 | 6.2.2.4.2 | 31 | 50 | Т | Wrong reference | Change 6.2.2.6.3 to 6.2.2.3.3 |
| 262 | R. Roberts | 6.2.2.4.2 | | 31 | | Т | Incorrect reference | I believe the reference at the end of the paragraph should be 6.2.2.4.3 and not 6.2.2.6.3 |

 These comments are tightly coupled with previous CID 251 and 253.

- In our opinion, these comments are correct.
- We'd like to recommend that we accept these comments (CID 261, 262) in principle.
- However, if we accept CID 251 and 253 in previous slide, we do not need these suggested remedy no longer because the description or definition of confirm primitive parameter in request primitive subclause is already moved into confirm primitive subclause.

CID 273, 276

| | | | Subclau | | | | | |
|--------|------------------|--------|-----------|------|------|------|---|---|
| CID | Name | Clause | se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
| 1 // 3 | David Cypher | 6 | 6.2.2.8.2 | 35 | 19 | Т | | Possibly wrong reference which should be 6.2.2.7.3 |
| 17/6 | Clint Chaplin | 6 | 6.2.2.8.2 | 35 | 17 | | (SY) "The reasons for these status values are fully described in subclause 6.2.2.8.3." Section 6.2.2.8.3 does not contain a full description. | Either change the reference to the subclause that does contain the full description, or add the full description to 6.2.2.8.3 |

 These comments are tightly coupled with previous CID 251 and 253.

- In our opinion, these comments are correct.
- We'd like to recommend that we accept these comments (CID 273, 276) in principle.
- However, if we accept CID 251 and 253 in previous slide, we do not need these suggested remedy no longer because the description or definition of confirm primitive parameter in request primitive subclause is already moved into confirm primitive subclause.

| | | Clau | Subclau | | | | | |
|-----|------------|------|-----------|------|------|------|-------------------------|--|
| CID | Name | se | se | Page | Line | Type | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
| | | | | | | | "If the state change | Change "PHY to change" -> "PHY to attempt to |
| | | | | | | | of the state of the | change" and delete "If the state change of the |
| 263 | James Gilb | 6 | 6.2.2.5.3 | 32 | 44 | T | PHY." should be in | state of the PHY" moving the information to |
| | | | | | | | the .confirm primitive, | 6.2.2.6. Make a similar change to all |
| | | | | | | | not in the request. | descriptions of the primitives. |

- 1st SuggestedRemedy
 - Change "PHY to change" to "PHY to attempt to change" (Page 32, line 43)
 - We need to discuss which one is better.
 - In our opinion, there is no difference between two expressions.
 - So we'd like to recommend that we accept this comment CID 263.
- 2nd SuggestedRemedy
 - Delete "If the state change ... of the state of the PHY"(Page 32, line 44) moving the information to 6.2.2.6
 - These comments are tightly coupled with previous CID 251 and 253.
 - In our opinion, this comment is correct.
 - We'd like to recommend that we accept this comment CID 263 in principle.
 - However, if we accept CID 251 and 253 in previous slide, we do not need this suggested remedy no longer because the description or definition of confirm primitive parameter in request primitive subclause is already moved into confirm primitive subclause.

CID 256, 279, 283, 284

| CID | Name | Claus e | Subclau se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|-----|------------|--------------|---------------|------|------|------|---|--|
| 256 | R. Roberts | 6.6.2 | Table 10 | 29 | | Т | Delete last row | There are two comments against clauses 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10 that indicate these two clauses should be deleted. |
| 279 | James Gilb | 6 | 6.2.2.9 | 35 | 28 | | | nd accomplished lising b / / / and b / / x |
| 283 | R. Roberts | 6.2.2.9 | | 35 | | | Delete all of section and all its sub-sections | Section 6.2.2.9 and all the sub-clauses associated with 6.2.2.9 are not needed because the accessing of the PIB is adequately covered by the mechanisms presented in clauses 6.2.2.3, 6.2.2.4, 6.2.2.7 and 6.2.2.8 |
| 284 | R. Roberts | 6.2.2.1 0 | | 35 | | | Delete all of section and all its sub-sections | Section 6.2.2.10 and all the sub-clauses associated with 6.2.2.10 are not needed because the accessing of the PIB is adequately covered by the mechanisms presented in clauses 6.2.2.3, 6.2.2.4, 6.2.2.7 and 6.2.2.8 |

CID 256, 279, 283, 284 (cont.)

6.2.2.9 PLME-DIMMER.request

The PLME-DIMMER.request primitive requests that the PLME perform the dimmer function as defined in 6.9.6.1.

6.2.2.9.1 Semantics of the service primitive

The semantics of the PLME-DIMMER.request primitive is as

PLME-DIMMER.request (
PIBAttribute
PIBAttributeValue

follows:

6.2.2.7 PLME-SET.request

The PLME-SET.request primitive attempts to set the indicated PHY PIB attribute to the given value.

6.2.2.7.1 Semantics of the service primitive

The semantics of the PLME-SET.request primitive is as follows:

PLME-SET.request (
PIBAttribute
PIBAttributeValue
)

These comments means that these primitives are copies of the PIB set.

6.2.2.10 PLME-DIMMER.confirm

The PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive reports the results of a dimming request.

6.2.2.10.1 Semantics of the service primitive

The semantics of the PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive is as follows:

PLME-DIMMER.confirm (status

6.2.2.8 PLME-SET.confirm

The PLME-SET.confirm primitive reports the results of the attempt to set a PIB attribute.

6.2.2.8.1 Semantics of the service primitive

The semantics of the PLME-SET.confirm primitive is as follows:

PLME-SET.confirm (status, PIBAttribute

TG7 VLC Submission Slide 10 Il Soon Jang, ETRI

CID 256, 279, 283, 284 (cont.)

CID 256 means that delete the last row in table 10

Table 10—PLME-SAP primitives

| PLME-SAP primitive | Request | Confirm |
|--------------------|---------|----------|
| PLME-CCA | 6.2.2.1 | 6.2.2.2 |
| PLME-GET | 6.2.2.3 | 6.2.2.4 |
| PLME-SET-TRX-STATE | 6.2.2.5 | 6.2.2.6 |
| PLME-SET | 6.2.2.7 | 6.2.2.8 |
| PLME-DIMMER | 6.2.2.9 | 6.2.2.10 |

CID 256, 279, 283, 284 (cont.)

- These suggested remedies which are related to CID 279, 283 and 284 mean that delete all of PLME-DIMMER primitives text because it can be accomplished using PLME-SET primitive and PLME-GET primitive.
- We also think that PLME-DIMMER primitive can be accomplished using PLME-SET primitive and PLME-GET primitive.
- If we accept these comments, CID 279, 283 and 284, we do not need the last low in table 10 any more, so CID 256 is resolved automatically
- Recommendation/Instruction to editor
 - We'd like to recommend that we accept CID 256, 279, 283 and 284.

| С | D Name | Clau se | Subclau se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|---|---------------|------------|---------------|------|------|------|---|---------------------|
| 2 | 31 James Gilb | 6 | 6.2.2.9.1 | 35 | 50 | Т | Change "Attribute specific" to be "As defined in Table x" with the correct cross reference. | Change as indicated |

- This comment is related to table 18, PLME-DIMMER.request parameters.
- The suggested remedy means that change 'table x' in table 18 into 'table 25'.
- Recommendation/Instruction to editor
 - The suggested remedy is correct.
 - However, we do not need to change the table x into table 25 because we have accept the previous CID 256 etc.
 - CID 256 etc means that delete all of 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10.
 - So, we'd like to recommend that we accept CID 281 in principle but we need not to do as suggested remedy.

CID 281 (cont.)

Table 18—PLME-DIMMER.request parameters

| Name | Туре | Valid range | Description |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|---|
| PIBAttribute | Enumeration | See Table X | The identifier of the PIB attribute to set. |
| PIBAttributeValue | Various | Attribute specific | The value of the indicated PIB attri- bute to set. |

CID 286, 288

| | | Clau | Subclau | | | _ | _ | |
|-----|---|------|------------|------|------|------|--|------------------------------------|
| CID | Name | se | se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
| 286 | Billy Verso, (affiliation DecaWave) | 6 | 6.2.2.10.1 | 36 | 31 | | Dimmer confirm parameter description says it is result of a CCA? | Needs correct text inserted. |
| 288 | David Cypher | 6 | 6.2.2.10.1 | 36 | 31 | Т | Table 19: Description is about CCA not dimmer | replace CCA with DIMMER.request |

- These comments are related to table 19, PLME-DIMMER.confirm parameters.
- The suggested remedy means that change 'CCA' in table 19 into 'PLME-DIMMER.request'.
- Recommendation/Instruction to editor
 - The suggested remedies are correct.
 - However, we do not need to change the 'CCA' into 'PLME-DIMMER.request' because we have accept the previous CID 256 etc.
 - CID 256 etc means that delete all of 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10.
 - So, we'd like to recommend that we accept CID 286, 288 in principle but we need
 not to do as suggested remedies.

CID 286, 288 (cont.)

Table 19—PLME-DIMMER.confirm parameters

| Name | Type | Valid range | Description |
|--------|-------------|--|---|
| status | Enumeration | SUCCESS, UNSUPPORTED_ATTRIBUTE, or INVALID_PARAMETER | The result of the request to perform a CCA. |

| | 0.0 | | | Subclau | | | _ | | |
|-----|-----|-----------------|----|------------|------|------|------|--|---------------------------|
| - (| CID | Name | se | se | Page | Line | Type | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
| : | 287 | David Cypher | 6 | 6.2.2.10.1 | 36 | 31 | | Table 19: Valid range of enumerated values is not thoses used in 6.2.2.9.3 | Replace all with COMPLETE |

This CID 287 means that replace all of these valid range in table 19 with COMPLETE because valid range of enumerated values in table 19 is not those used in 6.2.2.9.3

6.2.2.9.3 Effect on receipt

If the transmitter is enabled on receipt of the PLME-DIMMER.request primitive, the PLME will cause the PHY to perform the required dimming function. When the PHY has completed the required dimming, the PLME will issue the PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive with the status of COMPLETE.

Table 19—PLME-DIMMER.confirm parameters

| Name | Туре | Valid range | Description |
|--------|-------------|--|---|
| status | Enumeration | SUCCESS, UNSUPPORTED_ATTRIBUTE, or INVALID_PARAMETER | The result of the request to perform a CCA. |

CID 287 (cont.)

- We think that we'd better add the description of unexplained enumerated values in table 19 to 6.2.2.9.3 than replace all with COMPLETE.
- We'd like to recommend that we accept this comment (CID 287) in principle.
- However, we do not need these suggested remedy or our recommendation no longer if we have accept the CID 256 etc in slide #12.
- CID 256 etc means that delete all of 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10.

| CID | Name | Clau se | Subclau se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|-----|-----------------|------------|---------------|------|------|------|---|--|
| 289 | David Cypher | 6 | 6.2.2.10.2 | 36 | 40 | Т | described in 6.2.2.10.3 for it only contains SUCCESS. But this is | It looks like no one knows what the dimmer is for and what it does and the text does not help another to learn either. Remove both 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10. |

- This CID 289 is associated with subclause 6.2.2.10.3 and table 19.
- 1st comment that the statement is not true about fully described in 6.2.2.10.3 because it only contains SUCCESS is correct.
- We can't make sense of 2nd comment that this is contradicts what is stated in 6.2.2.9.3.

6.2.2.10.3 Effect on receipt

On receipt of the PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive, the MLME is notified of the results of the dimming.

If the DIMMER attempt was successful, the status parameter is set to SUCCESS. Otherwise, the status parameter will indicate the error.

Table 19—PLME-DIMMER.confirm parameters

| Name | Туре | Valid range | Description | |
|--------|-------------|--|---|--|
| status | Enumeration | SUCCESS, UNSUPPORTED_ATTRIBUTE, or INVALID_PARAMETER | The result of the request to perform a CCA. | |

CID 289 (cont.)

- Recommendation/Instruction to editor
 - We do not need these suggested remedy no longer if we have accept the CID 256 etc in slide #12.
 - CID 256 etc means that delete all of 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10.

| CIE | Name | Clau se | Subclau se | Page | Line | Type | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|-----|---------------|------------|---------------|-------|-------|------|--|--|
| OIL | INAITIC | 30 | 30 | i aye | LIIIC | Type | Comment | Suggesteurtemeuy |
| 290 | Clint Chaplin | 6 | 6.2.2.10.2 | 36 | 40 | Т | values are fully described in subclause 6.2.2.10.3." Section 6.2.2.10.3 does | Either change the reference to the subclause that does contain the full description, or add the full description to 6.2.2.10.3 |

- This CID 290 is associated with subclauses 6.2.2.10.2 and 6.2.2.10.3.
- This comment means that "The reason for these status values are fully described in 6.2.2.10.3" but actually subclause 6.2.2.10.3 does not have fully description.
- So the suggested remedy means that either change the reference to the subclause that does contain the full description, or add the full description to 6.2.2.10.3

6.2.2.10.2 When generated

The PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive is generated by the PLME and issued to its MLME in response to a

PLME-DIMMER.request primitive. The PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive will return a status of SUCCESS,

indicating a successful dimming. The reasons for these status values are fully described in 6.2.2.10.3.

6.2.2.10.3 Effect on receipt

On receipt of the PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive, the MLME is notified of the results of the dimming. If the DIMMER attempt was successful, the status parameter is set to SUCCESS. Otherwise, the status parameter will indicate the error.

CID 290 (cont.)

- Recommendation/Instruction to editor
 - We think that CID 290 is correct.
 - However, we do not need these suggested remedy no longer if we have accept the CID 256 etc in slide #12.
 - CID 256 etc means that delete all of 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10.

| C | ID | Name | Clau se | Subclau se | Page | Line | Type | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|---|----|-----------------|------------|---------------|------|------|------|--|-----------------------|
| 2 | 93 | David Cypher | 6 | 6.2.3 | 37 | 30 | | Table 20: missing COMPLETE as stated in 6.2.2.9.3 page 36, line 10 | Add row with COMPLETE |

- We think that CID 293 is correct.
- However, we do not need COMPLETE enumeration value in table 20 no longer if we have accept the CID 256 etc in slide #12.
- CID 256 etc means that delete all of 6.2.2.9 and 6.2.2.10.

CID 293 (cont.)

- This CID 293 is associated with table 20 in clause 6.2.3 and subclause 6.2.2.9.3.
- This comment means that COMPLETE is shown in subclause 6.2.2.9.3 but enumeration in table 20 does not include COMPLETE.
- So the suggested remedy means that add enumeration value of COMPLETE to table 20.

Table 20—PHY enumerations description

6.2.2.9.3 Effect on receipt

If the transmitter is enabled on receipt of the PLME-DIMMER.request primitive, the PLME will cause the PHY to perform the required dimming function. When the PHY has completed the required dimming, the PLME will issue the PLME-DIMMER.confirm primitive with the status of COMPLETE.

| Enumeration | Value | Description |
|-----------------------|-------|--|
| BUSY | 0x00 | THe CCA attempt has detected a busy channel. |
| BUSY_RX | 0x01 | The transceiver is asked to change its state while receiving. |
| BUSY_TX | 0x02 | The transceiver is asked to change its state while transmitting. |
| FORCE_TRX_OFF | 0x03 | The transceiver is to be switched off. |
| IDLE | 0x04 | The CCA attempt has detected an idel channel. |
| INVALID_PARAMETER | 0x05 | A SET/GET request was issued with a parameter in the primitive that is out of the valid range. |
| RX_ON | 0x06 | The transceiver is in, or is to be configured into, the receiver enabled state. |
| SUCCESS | 0x07 | A SET/GET, an ED operation, or a transceiver state change was successful. |
| TRX_OFF | 0x08 | The transceiver is in, or is to be configured into, the transceiver disabled state. |
| TX_ON | 0x09 | The transceiver is in, or is to be configured into, the transmitter enabled state. |
| UNSUPPORTED_ATTRIBUTE | 0x0a | A SET/GET request was issued with the identifier of an attribute that is not supported. |

| (| CID | Name | Clau se | Subclau se | Page | Line | Туре | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
|---|-----|---|------------|---------------|------|------|------|------------------------------|---|
| 2 | 271 | Billy Verso, (affiliation DecaWave) | 6 | 6.2.2.9.1 | 35 | 35 | Т | narameters are illst conv of | Define parameter(s) to select the required dimming. |

Recommendation/Instruction to editor

 So we'd like to recommend that we reject this CID 271 because DIMMER parameter is already shown in table 25.

CID 271 (cont.)

This CID 271 is associated with the text and table 18 in 6.2.2.9.1 and table 25 in 6.5.2.

This comment means that add dimmer parameter(s) to select the required dimming to table 18 and 6.2.2.9.1, but actually these parameters are already shown in table 25.

6.2.2.9.1 Semantics of the service primitive

The semantics of the PLME-DIMMER.request primitive is as follows:
PLME-DIMMER.request (
PIBAttribute
PIBAttributeValue
)

Table 18—PLME-DIMMER.request parameters

| Name | Туре | Valid range | Description | |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|---|--|
| PIBAttribute | Enumeration | See Table X | The identifier of the PIB attribute to set. | |
| PIBAttributeValue | Various | Attribute specific | The value of the indicated PIB attri- bute to set. | |

Table 25—PHY PIB attributes

| | Attribute | Identifier | Type | Range | Description |
|---|---------------------------|------------|---------|-----------------|--|
| | phyCurrentChannel | 0x00 | Integer | 0-26 | The RF channel to use for all following transmissions and receptions (see 6.1.4). |
| | phyChannelsSup- ported | 0x01 | Bitmap | See description | The 5 most significant bits (MSBs) (b27,, b31) of phyChannelsSupported shall be reserved and set to 0, and the 27 LSBs (b0, b1, b26) shall indicate the status (1=available, 0=unavailable) for each of the 27 valid channels (bk shall indicate the status of channel k as in 6.1.2). |
| | phyCCAMode | 0x02 | Integer | 1-3 | The CCA mode (see 6.9.5) |
| _ | phyDim | 0x03 | Integer | 0-100 | 0 is fully dimmed and 100 is no dimming |

| | | Clau | Subclau | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|------|-----------|------|------|------|--|-----------------|
| CID | Name | se | se | Page | Line | Type | Comment | SuggestedRemedy |
| 277 | Clint Chaplin | 6 | 6.2.2.9.1 | 35 | 35 | | (SY) The parameters given here in this subclause are not the correct parameters for this primitive. Both the function prototype and Table 18 are incorrect | |

Recommendation/Instruction to editor

 So we'd like to recommend that we reject this CID 277 because DIMMER parameter is already shown in table 25.

CID 277 (cont.)

This CID 277 is associated with the text and table 18 in 6.2.2.9.1 and table 25 in 6.5.2.

The comment means that the parameters given in this subclause 6.2.2.9.1 are not the correct parameters for this dimmer request primitive. Both the function prototype and Table 18 are incorrect However, actually dimmer parameter is shown in PIBAttribute parameter in table 25 so we don't need modification of the function prototype and table 18.

6.2.2.9.1 Semantics of the service primitive

The semantics of the PLME-DIMMER.request primitive is as follows:
PLME-DIMMER.request (
PIBAttribute
PIBAttributeValue
)

Table 18—PLME-DIMMER.request parameters

| Name | Туре | Valid range | Description | |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|--|--|
| PIBAttribute | Enumeration | See Table X | The identifier of the PIB attribute to set. | |
| PIBAttributeValue | Various | Attribute specific | The value of the indicated PIB attribute to set. | |

Table 25—PHY PIB attributes

| Attribute | Identifier | Type | Range | Description |
|---------------------------|------------|---------|-----------------|--|
| phyCurrentChannel | 0x00 | Integer | 0-26 | The RF channel to use for all following transmissions and receptions (see 6.1.4). |
| phyChannelsSup- ported | 0x01 | Bitmap | See description | The 5 most significant bits (MSBs) (b27,, b31) of phyChannelsSupported shall be reserved and set to 0, and the 27 LSBs (b0, b1, b26) shall indicate the status (1=available, 0=unavailable) for each of the 27 valid channels (bk shall indicate the status of channel k as in 6.1.2). |
| phyCCAMode | 0x02 | Integer | 1-3 | The CCA mode (see 6.9.5) |
| phyDim | 0x03 | Integer | 0-100 | 0 is fully dimmed and 100 is no dimming |