

Cl 00 SC 2 P3 L0 MyBallot # 22

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Many of the RFCs cited here are in fact not IETF standards (nor are they even standards-track documents), but are informational documents, yet they are cited here as "normative" references.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the citation format from the RFC index, which has the standardization status as part of the citation.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 00 SC 2 P3 L0 MyBallot # 21

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Old citation for IEEE 802.1X dating from when it was a draft.

SuggestedRemedy

IEEE P802.1XÖ-2004 citation should remove the "P" and change the name to the official name (no draft!): "IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Port-Based Network Access Control".

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 00 SC 2 P3 L0 MyBallot # 23

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

RFC 4086 obsoleted RFC 1750 (it still has the same title).

SuggestedRemedy

Change RFC 1750 to RFC 4086.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 00 SC 2 P3 L0 MyBallot # 24

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Citation for RFC 4017 has inaccurate title.

SuggestedRemedy

Change title of RFC 4017 to "Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) Method Requirements for Wireless LANs".

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 00 SC 2 P3 L0 MyBallot # 20

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

IEEE Std 802«-1990 should be -2001.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to IEEE Std 802«-2001.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3..26 P6 L0 MyBallot # 14

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Missing punctuation.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a space after "disclosure" and add a period at end of sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised 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

9/22/2005 1:52:34 PM

Page 1 of 4

Cl 03 SC 3..26

Cl 03 SC 3.10 P5 L0 MyBallot # 27

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Incorrect citation of IEEE 802.1X.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "IEEE 802.1XÖ-2004."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.106 P11 L0 MyBallot # 17

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Incorrect citation of IEEE 802.1X.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "See IEEE 802.1XÖ-2004."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.107 P11 L0 MyBallot # 18

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Lack of parallel structure with 3.11.

SuggestedRemedy

Should have similar structure, such as: "The medium access control (MAC) address of the IEEE 802.1X Supplicant."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.11 P5 L0 MyBallot # 28

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Awkward sentence structure.

SuggestedRemedy

Would be clearer as: "The medium access control (MAC) address of the IEEE 802.1X Authenticator."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.116 P12 L0 MyBallot # 19

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Inconsistent definition. The synonym for "unicast frame" should be "directed frame" not "directed address".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "directed address" to "directed frame".

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.19 P6 L0 MyBallot # 29

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The name of the defined term is not in boldface.

SuggestedRemedy

Change formatting of "channel spacing" to boldface.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.24 P6 L0 MyBallot # 30

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Remove the second "with" from the name of the defined term.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances that spell out the definition of CCMP to remove the second "with".

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.69 P9 L0 MyBallot # 15

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Too much detail.

SuggestedRemedy

No need to mention frame types when defining multicast. Remove all text after the first sentence of the definition.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.72 P9 L0 MyBallot # 16

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Circular definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Don't use "pair" or "pairwise" when defining "pairwise". This definition avoids this issue: "Referring to, or an attribute of, two entities that are associated with each other, e.g., an access point (AP) and an associated station (STA), or two STAs in an independent basic service set (IBSS) network. This term is used to refer to a type of encryption key hierarchy pertaining to keys shared by only two entities."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.8 P5 L0 MyBallot # 25

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Circular definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the word "suite" from the definition, or define it.

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 03 SC 3.9 P5 L0 MyBallot # 26

Maufer, Thomas

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Incorrect citation of IEEE 802.1X.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "IEEE 802.1XÖ-2004."

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be forwarded to the Working Group Editor for action before publication of the revised standard.

Cl 10 SC 10.3.20.1.3 P289 L33? MyBallot # 31

Marshall, Bill

Comment Type T Comment Status R

This section is about sending EAPOL frames, not Michael MIC failures. This comment was first entered in LB75, but I goofed in the section number (entered it as 10.3.20.1.1 instead of 10.3.20.1.3) but had the line number on the page correct. There were two places on the page that needed correction; only the first was done in D3.0. In LB76 I voted yes, but submitted this comment again with the corrected section number. I don't find it in the resolution spreadsheet, and believe it never was registered as a comment in LB76.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to: This primitive is generated by the SME when the SME has an 802.1X EAPOL-Key frame to send

Proposed Response Response Status C

REJECT. The text referenced in the comment is not a proper subject of this recirculation ballot. This comment will be submitted by the task group chair during the initial sponsor ballot on the revision to 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 19 SC 19.1.1 P527 L 11 MyBallot # 12

Palm, Stephen

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

If an implementor wished to implement an 802.11g or 802.11a only product, this document provides no guidance as to which clauses and phrases are relevant. The PROPOSED RESOLUTION indicated "Upon approval of this revision, those designations cease to exist and are replaced by a new base standard." While that may be a nicety for IEEE procedures, it does a disservice to the industry (manufacturers, consumers, press) who actively use the designations.

The further "PROPOSED REJECT. This comment was dealt with in a previous ballot, where the reponse was provided. Even the informative section suggested "at the very least" would require nearly all the text of each of the separate amendments." makes no sense. The intent was to "REFERENCE" text, not copy it all verbatim.

For example, if we previously said/referenced "802.11g", what should we say now? "IEEE Stds.P802.11-REVma-1999 (Revision 2006)" does not really roll off the tongue and would be inaccurate since it contains many other things.

Should we we say something like "The clauses of IEEE Stds.P802.11-REVma-1999 (Revision 2006) formerly known as 802.11g"?

SuggestedRemedy

Clearly indicate which clauses and phrases are applicable to the individual amendments of 802.11a through 802.11j. This could be accomplished with abbreviations in the headers. At the very least, there should be an informative section to explain 802.11a through 802.11j which could be done by referenceing sections of the current text or reference the previous amendments.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT. This comment is a resubmission of a previous comment by this commenter, without modification. The previous resolution is unchanged, as the commenter has not provided any additional information to sway the decision of the resolution group.

Cl 19 SC 19.7.2.6 P553 L 224 MyBallot # 13

Palm, Stephen

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The term 802.11g was deleted, when it was my hope that the term be defined

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a definition for 802.11g and for all of the other 802.11a through 802.11j amendments.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT. This comment is a resubmission of a previous comment by this commenter, without modification. The previous resolution is unchanged, as the commenter has not provided any additional information to sway the decision of the resolution group.

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