

Name	Comment Number	Vote	Page	Sub-clause	Line Number	Type of Comment	Comment	Proposed Change	Resolution	Accept/ Reject/ Counter
Moreton, Mike	14	Negative	17	7.3.2.13	26	Technical	There is no need to add the term "Barker" to the short and long preamble terms as this has never been done before in the MAC, and will only confuse the reader.	Remove the "Barker" prefix when talking about preamble length in the MAC sections.	reject - The need to add Barker is predicated by the fact that there could be confusion between the barker short preamble and the OFDM preamble, which is a "short" preamble. An explicit indication of the fact that it is indeed barker short preamble is required to avoid this possible confusion.	Reject
Cole, Terry	4	Negative	17	7.3.2.13	29	Technical	The sentence: Recommended behavior for setting the USE_PROTECTION bit are contained in Annex H. -- is now a bit awkward, since some normative behavior is now described in this clause	Move the cited sentence from its current location to be placed just after the new second paragraph, while adding the word additional, so that the second paragraph reads: "If one or more NonERP STAs are associated in the BSS, the Use_Protection bit shall be set. Additional, recommended behavior for setting the Use_Protection bit are contained in Annex H."	counter - accept the change as noted, with the exception that the verb "are" needs to be "is" in the sentence which is being moved.	Counter

Monteban, Leo	7	Neg	17	7.3.2.13	31	Technical	The rule for setting the Use_Protection bit given here is too tight. It does not allow for intelligent algorithms that analyze the actual NonERP traffic flows to make an assessment whether it is worthwhile to use protection or not. While it can be argued that leaving this too relaxed compromises the requirement to have backwards compatibility built in, there are alternative ways to achieve that. Furthermore, implementations that make bad decisions in their setting of Use_Protection will result in bad performing systems, causing such implementations to disappear quickly from the market.	Turn things around w.r.t. the setting rules for the Non_ERP_Present and Use_Protection bits. Require that the Non-ERP-Present bit be set when at least one NonERP station is associated (and an equivalent for IBSS), and make the setting of the Use_Protection bit more relaxed (and cover it again in annex H pretty much the same as before) and potentially more intelligent. Keep the rules for the station on behavior when the bits are ON/OFF the same, but include in the informative annex a story on possible STA implementation that can decide to use protection based on the Non_ERP_Present bit being ON even if the Use_Protection bit is OFF.	counter - accept the change to require that NonERP_Present be set to one when NonERP STA are associated, but do not relax the current rules on the setting of the use_protection bit. See row 23 - Michele Gammel comment 1	Counter
Cole, Terry	3	Negative	17	7.3.2.13	35	Technical	In 7.3.2.13, the third paragraph specifies a condition which "may" set the NonERP_Present bit. In contrast to that the next paragraph specifies a condition which "shall" clear this bit. The current meaning of the bit when set is not exactly opposite the meaning when clear.	To keep the consistency it is suggest to use "shall" in both. Consider making the text descriptions of the bit when 1 and 0 opposites.	reject - the group does not wish to limit the flexibility in the use of the nonERP_Present bit for conveying information which can be used by receivers as one of many possible inputs to make local decisions regarding the use of protection mechanisms	Reject
Cole, Terry	9	Negative	17	7.3.2.13	37	Technical	In 7.3.2.13: what about USE_PROTECTION for IBSS cases?	Determine what to do for the IBSS case in setting the USE_PROTECTION. One possibility: Add the following text to paragraph two of the clause: If a member of an IBSS detects one or more NonERP STAs which are members of the same IBSS, then the Use_Protection bit shall be set in the ERP Information Element of transmitted Beacon and Probe Response frames. Another: disallow use in IBSS.	counter - add the sentence as shown, except that the verb "shall" must be replaced with the verb "should" - this allows the IBSS maximum flexibility in determining whether protection should be used based on a number of inputs from many member STA of the IBSS	Counter

Cole, Terry	10	Negative	17	7.3.2.13	42	Technical	In 7.3.2.13: what about BARKER bit for IBSS cases?	Determine what to do for the IBSS case in setting the Barker_Preamble_Mode bit. One possibility: Add the following text to paragraph four of the clause: If a member of an IBSS detects one or more NonERP STAs which are members of the same IBSS, then the Barker_Preamble_Mode bit shall be set in the ERP Information Element of transmitted Beacon and Probe Response frames. Another: disallow use in IBSS.	counter - add the sentence as follows: "If a member of an IBSS detects one or more non-shortpreamble capable STAs which are members of the same IBSS, then the Barker_Preamble_Mode bit should be set to one in the ERP Information Element of transmitted Beacon and Probe Response frames which contain that element." - this allows the IBSS maximum flexibility in determining whether barker preamble should be used based on a number of inputs from many member STA of the IBSS	Counter
Monteban, Leo	6	Neg	17	7.3.2.13	27..29	Technical	The text refers to table 7.3.2.13 for guidance how to set the bits in the ERP Information element by a Beacon sender. Table 7.3.2.13 however only defines expected behavior of client stations (Beacon receivers) for the two bits that are most interesting (Use_Protection and Barker_Preamble_Mode).	Include the guidance for setting the two referenced bits in the table.	counter - delete the table, also, the sentence in the first paragraph of 7.3.2.13 containing the phrase "according to Table 7.3.2.13." must be deleted.	Counter
Cole, Terry	15	Negative	19	9.2.11	17	Technical	In 9.2.11, there is no rate specified at which the CTS should be sent.	A respective statement should be added just for clarification.	reject - clause 9.6 already provides the complete description of what rate the cts to self frame should be transmitted	Reject

Moreton, Mike	18	Negative	19	9.6	42	Technical	Strongly object to the removal of the requirement that all control frames be sent at a basic rate.	Reinstate it.	counter - the adoption of a change to the rules in 9.10 (which are referenced within 9.6) and a change to make protection mandatory in the case of associated legacy STA, solves the one interesting case that existed with the rules with the specific case of protection frame transmissions - with the rules thus amended, the intent of the basic rate requirement is met with the existing rules because it relies on mandatory rates first, with a fallback to basic rates -- in the event that a mandatory rate is selected which does not cover associated legacy STA, the protection mechanism will resolve that case, because protection mechanism frames are required to be sent a clause 15 or 18 rate which is also a basic rate and protection is now required in this case	Counter
---------------	----	----------	----	-----	----	-----------	--	---------------	---	---------

Monteban, Leo	8	Neg	19	9.2	7..10	Technical	The text refers to a parameter aBasicRateSet of the MLME_Join.request primitive. This does not exist in the 1999 standard nor in any later supplement.	It is not clear why this clause is included. Apparently the intention is to take out the statement that all RTS and CTS shall be sent at a basic rate, to be aligned with 9.10. See my other comments on 9.10. Suggest to take the clause out (I.e. not change 9.2) unless we want to include corrections to the base standard (like the MLME-Join.request error).	reject - the error cited was introduced by the changes to the 802.11-1999 standard by the 802.11b amendment, and not by proposed changes made as part of the 802.11g draft -- 802.11g is not permitted by our PAR to change the base any more than is what is necessary to effect changes pertinent to the new phy - changes such as those to deal with the join request parameter problem cited are properly addressed by a maintenance group, such as 802.11m - 802.11g does need to make the change highlighted in the draft to 9.2, because the new rules are written to allow control frame transmission at mandatory rates which may not be included in the basic rate set, and therefore, the new rules would contradict those of 9.2, if 9.2 were left unchanged - note that the new rules revert to the existing 9.2 rules in the case of existing 802.11b and 802.11-1999 devices, therefore avoiding any possible backwards non-conformance issue.	Reject
Moreton, Mike	19	Negative	22	19.1.2	44	Technical	This sentence used to make some sense, but now that the "ERP-" prefixes have been added it appears to exclude non-ERP devices from an ERP BSS.	Change "BSS" to "PHY".	Counter. Agree that some clarification is needed. Editor should change paragraph to: "An ERP BSS is capable of operating in any combination of available ERP modes (Clause 19 PHYs) and NonERP modes (Clause 15 or Clause 18 PHYs). For example, a BSS could operate in an ERP-OFDM only mode, a mixed mode of ERP-OFDM and ERP-DSSS/CCK, or a mixed mode of ERP-DSSS/CCK and NonERP. When options are enabled, combinations are also allowed."	Counter
Sanderson, Doug	7	No	60	19.9.5.16	42	Technical	PMD_CS.indicate is generated to indicate receive activity	Change "transmission" to "reception"	Counter. The sentence in question does not add any information to the standard. Editor should delete sentence.	Counter

Moreton, Mike	22	Negative	65	C	11	Technical	<p>The proposed changes to the SDL cover only a small proportion of the changes described in the main body of the text. This leaves the SDL seriously incomplete, and more importantly contradicting the text in important areas of change. Given the SDL takes precedence, the group will be throwing away much of their work if they leave the SDL changes as they are.</p>	<p>Add use of the extended supported rates element. Add handling of the Use_Protection and NonERP_Present bits. Model setting of flags such as "Use CTS to Self". Add short slot time handling. Make corrections required by the changes in 9.6 (especially the change in duration values due to the changed rules about control frame rates). Check all existing SDL for further required changes.</p>	<p>Reject. The SDL does not conflict with the text since items pointed out by the commenter are fully described by the text but are not covered by the current SDL. For instance, the extended rates elements are fully described in subclause 7.3.2 of text. The Use_Protection and Non_ERP_Present bits are described sufficiently in subclauses 9.10 and 7.3.2 of the draft. CTS_to_self is described in subclause 9.2.11 and the handling of short slot time is described in subclauses 19.8.4 and 7.3.1.4. Also, previous amendments to the standard have not been illustrated in the SDL all the functionality described in the text.</p>	Reject
---------------	----	----------	----	---	----	-----------	---	---	---	--------