

**IEEE P802.15**  
**Wireless Personal Area Networks**

Project	IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)	
Title	<b>TG3 LB12 Comment resolution working document</b>	
Date Submitted	[20 January, 2002]	
Source	[James P. K. Gilb] [Apparent Technologies] [9921 Carmel Mountain Rd. #247, San Diego, CA 92129]	Voice: [858-538-3903] Fax: [858-538-3903] E-mail: [gilb@ieee.org]
Re:	[]	
Abstract	[This document is an additional record of comment resolution of LB12.]	
Purpose	[To provide a record of comment resolution, particularly for comments that are resolved based on the resolution of prior comments.]	
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.	

## 1. Comment resolution

- 1  
2  
3 a) Coexistence - Response in 1728, “The proposed informative Annex (00000r0P802-15-3-  
4 Annex\_Coexistence.pdf) has a description of the coexistence methods that are available in the draft.  
5 Also see 02/041r2 for a presentation and additional text on this issue. For 802.15.4 compatibility see  
6 subclause 6.9 in 00000D13P802-15-4\_\_Draft\_Standard.pdf. TG2 has been consulted and they will  
7 help with analysis.”  
8 Also resolved: 1850 (Dydyk, T), 1765 (Callaway, E)
- 9 b) Security - Response in 781, “The 802.15.3 committee is going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a  
10 mandatory cipher suite for DEVs that implement security.”  
11 Also resolved: 1845 (Dydyk, T), 894 (Roberts, TR), 904 (Roberts, TR), 1015 (Roberts, TR), 1233  
12 (Roberts, T), 1293 (Roberts, TR), 1725 (Rofheart, TR), 1682 (Shvodian, TR, Add response: “Since  
13 there are no shalls, shoulds or may, this section is informative and needs to be moved to the infor-  
14 mative Annex. The commenter is invited and encouraged to provide additional text that describes  
15 other methods that provide the function of the certificate authority.”), 1689 (Shvodian, TR), 1767  
16 (Y-C Chen, TR), 1741 (Maa, TR), 1785 (Liu, TR), 802 (Kinney, T), 1750, (H-K Chen, TR), 727  
17 (Herold, T)
- 18 c) TBD’s - For page 107, response in 296 “Bit has been removed.”, for page 133, response in 294  
19 “Security is applicable on a piconet basis, not a stream-by-stream basis. Delete the sentence and the  
20 associated bits in figure 76 (b4-b6). Reassign the bits as reserved and move the other bits foward so  
21 that the reserved bits are contiguous.”, for page 175, response in 1744 “Clause 9 has been deleted.  
22 TBD has been removed.”  
23 Also resolved: 1674 (Shvodian, T), 1097 (Roberts, TR), 1119 (Schrader, T), 52 (Bain, T), 1846  
24 (Dydyk, T)
- 25 d) Power managment -  
26  
27

## 2. Comment resolution order

### 2.1 February 5, 2002

32  
33 768: 1 second connect time, suggest “1 second connect time is a goal, not a requirement. Clause 5 is a quali-  
34 tative overview that does not place any requirments on devices. The authentication time required depends  
35 on the security suite that is selected.”

36  
37 1663: suggest accept, 0 length fields should be OK.

38  
39 1517: Add security parameters IE to association repsonse. Suggest accept.

40  
41 1513: Add error code for security required to association. Suggest accept.

42  
43 308 (T), 964 (TR): No separate security information in data frame anymore. Suggest accept 308, accept in  
44 principle 964.

45  
46 1127 (TR): When is PNC handover required? Suggest accept in principle. The intention, lost in the words, is  
47 that handover always occurs if the Des-Mode bit is set and may occur otherwise. Either change last sentence  
48 to read: “Therefore, if re-authentication is not desirable and the PNC Des-Mode bit is not set in the new  
49 DEV is not set, a PNC running security in the piconet should not perform PNC handover unless it is leaving  
50 the piconet.” or simply delete the last sentence.

51  
52 894 (TR), 904 (TR), 1015 (TR), 1233 (T), 1725 (TR), 1682 (TR), 1689 (TR): Various security related items.  
53 Suggest accept in principle with the response for other security suite comments “The 802.15.3 committee is  
54 going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a mandatory cipher suite for DEVs that implement security.”

1832 (TR), 1803 (TR): PSM and PNC as separate entities: Suggest reject, reason as follows: “The task group previously considered this option and instead chose to co-locate the PSM and PNC. The main reason for requiring the PNC to also be the PSM is to prevent having two points of failure in the piconet. If the PSM and PNC reside in separate DEVs, then all of the DEVs in the piconet need to be able to hear both DEVs rather than just the PNC. With the current architecture, the piconet is defined as all devices that are able to hear the PNC. Another reason for co-locating the two functions is that it reduces the communications overhead and complexity of the security suite.”

1837 (TR): Security and communication with child and neighbor piconets. Suggest accept in principle. “The draft already states (see 8.2.5 and 8.2.6) that the child and neighbor piconets are autonomous and do not share authentication or security. Add a note to the end of the first paragraph in 10.2 that says ‘These requirements apply only to the piconet and are not transferred to child or neighbor piconets, which have distinct security requirements.’”

1798 (TR): Delete reference to IEEE MAC address. This is a re-definition of the Device ID (now Device Address), so deleting the reference to the IEEE MAC address is actually a good thing, suggest accept.

1679 (T): Clean up text in security requirements to reflect choices: Suggest accept.

1805 (TR): Editorial change to the introduction text to include the mention of roles of the DEVs. Recommend accept (doesn’t change implementation anyway).

1681 (TR): Allow for keys to be entered by the user. Suggest accept deletion of sentence and parenthetical comment.

1810 (TR), 1811 (TR): The PNC is PSM connection is listed twice, it can be removed from the first reference. Suggest accept in principle, “Delete the sentence in 10.3.2.1, line 25, and change “assumes” to be “shall assume” in 10.3.2.2, lines 15 and 16 (two places total).”

1817 (TR): Specify what happens when group structure and role change simultaneously. Suggest accept in principle. “Add the following sentence after the enumerated points in 10.3.3.1 ‘Simultaneous changes of the group structure and of the role are conceptually thought of as taking place sequentially.’”

1819 (TR): Add new security event for handover. Suggest accept in principle. “Add an enumeration item as “2) PNC promotion. This refers to a PNC-capable DEV assuming the role of PNC.””

1821 (TR), 1829 (TR): Should changing the PNC require re-authentication (note that this does change the PSM): Suggest accept in principle, reason “The requirement for re-authentication when the PNC handover occurs will be specified by the security suite implementation. The 802.15.3 committee is going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a mandatory security suite for DEVs that implement security. Changes to the current description will be made when the security suite is selected.”

1692 (TR): Make the cipher suite (now security suite) requirements normative. Suggest accept in principle with “The 802.15.3 committee is going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a mandatory security suite for DEVs that implement security. The description of the requirements for the security suite would be listed in the informative annex.”

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54