

**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	[13 February, 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  
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

## 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 (Huckabee, T): 1 second connect time, suggest accept in principle: “1 second connect time is a goal, not  
34 a requirement. Clause 5 is a qualitiative overview that does not place any requirments on devices. The  
35 authentication time required depends on the security suite that is selected. The security suite selection criteria  
36 indicates that a total connect time including authentication of less than one second is desired.”

37  
38 Accept.

39  
40 1663 (Shvodian, T): suggest accept, 0 length fields should be OK.

41  
42 Accept.

43  
44 1517 (Shvodian, TR): Add security parameters IE to association reponse. Suggest accept.

45  
46 Accept, OID goes into the association response rather than the beacon.

47  
48 1513 (Shvovdian, TR): Add error code for security required to association. Suggest accept.

49  
50 Accept.

51  
52 308 (Gilb, T), 964 (Roberts, TR): No separate security information in data frame anymore. Suggest accept  
53 308, accept in principle 964.  
54

Accept as indicated above.

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

894 - will accept if the following is appended to the response in 781

In clause 6.3.6.2.2, reference is made to the security subclauses that present the details on how the challenge commands are used.

904 - will accept if the following is appended to the response in 781

In clause 6.3.8.1.1, reference is made to the security subclauses that present the details on how the PNC does the security manager function.

1015 - will accept if the following is appended to the response in 781

In clause 7.5.3, reference is made to the security subclauses that present the details on how the PNC does the security manager function.

1233 - accept as per the response in 781

1293 - accept as per the response in 781

1725 - accept as per the response in 781

1097 - accept as per the response in part 1.c of doc 02/075r0

Accepted as indicated above.

**2.2 February 7, 2002**

547 (Gubbi, TR), 892, 895, 897, 1037, 1125, 1231, 1234, 1239, 1244, 1246, 1296 (Roberts, TR), 1247 (Roberts, T), 1682 (Shvodian, TR), 1689 (Shvodian, TR): Various security related items. Suggest accept in principle with the response for other security suite comments “The 802.15.3 committee is going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a mandatory cipher suite for DEVs that implement security.” For 1682, suggest adding “Since there are no shalls, shoulds or may, this section is informative and needs to be moved to the informative Annex. The commenter is invited and encouraged to provide additional text that describes other methods that provide the function of the certificate authority.”

Email from Rick Roberts:

LB12 Comment Resolutions from Rick Roberts. All acceptances are based upon text presented in doc 02/075r1.

1. On the comments that deal with security ... I accept the technical editors suggested resolution for the following items

892, 895, 897, 1037, 1231, 1239, 1246, 1296 and 1247

2. I reject the editors suggested resolution for the following items

1125, 1234, 1244

Both 1125 and 1234 are comments on security policy during a PNC handover. Basically the question is does the authentication list transfer during a PNC handover, or do all DEV's have to re-authenticate with the new PNC. In my mind, this is a security policy issue and not a security suite issue (unless someone can convince me that they are one in the same). I lack technical expertise in this area otherwise I would generate text. I prefer that the certificates transfer (old PNC vouches for all authenticated DEVs) but I understand that some of the security experts believe this is a bad idea. So I am confused and want to defer to the experts.

On item 1244, the question is where is the list of authenticated DEV's maintained. It seems it should be in the PSM which is co-located with the PNC. If this is true then a simple resolution would be to add the following text.

"In all scenarios, the security manager, which is co-located with the PNC, shall update the list of authenticated piconet DEVs to exclude the disassociating DEV."

3. For comment 1131 ... I accept the suggested resolution as proposed by the technical editor.

Committee

Accept, as above 547, 892, 895, 897, 1037, 1231, 1239, 1246, 1296, 1247, 1682, 1689 (and 1694)

Skip 1125, 1234, 1244

1299 (Shvodian, TR): Do we need de-authenticate? Why not just disassociate? Suggest accept, "Delete the deauthentication command, frame formats and MLME's."

Accept

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

Accept

1574 (Shvodian, TR): The PNC should wait until after the authentication if authentication is required for the piconet before broadcasting the Dev-Info (now PNC-Info) table. Suggest accept.

Accept

1131 (Roberts, TR): Authentication sub-clause in Clause 8 is considered silly, please delete. Suggest accept.

Accept

1832 (Rasor, TR), 1803 (Rasor, 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."

Skip

1837 (Rasor, 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.""

Skip

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

1798 (Rasor, 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.

Accept

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

Accept

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

Accept

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

Accept

1810 (Rasor, TR), 1811 (Rasor, 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)."

Accept

1817 (Rasor, 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.'"

Skip

1819 (Rasor, 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.'"

Accept

1821 (Rasor, TR), 1829 (Rasor, 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."

Skip

1692 (Shvodian, 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 an annex."

Accept

291 (Gifford, T): Review the use of shall/should/may/can/will/must throughout the document to be sure they are used in accordance with IEEE's style. Suggest accept, reason "The editor (and others) have closely

reviewed the document for proper usage. The word must occurs only in the copyright information on the first page, the word can does not appear at all. The technical editor has been trully annoying in enforcing the no must or can rule.”

Accept

583, 588, 590 (Heberling, T): Reason code for disassociation is unnecessary: Suggest reject, reason “The committee reviewed the reason codes for the disassociate command in Dallas and felt that there was still useful information that could be passed using this reason code. Therefore, the reason code needs to stay in the MLME-DISASSOCIATE.xxx commands as well.”

Withdrawn

**2.3 Tuesday, 12 February, 2002**

Closed via email: 1669, 304, 306, 309, 322, 323, 357, 360, 363.

455 (Gilb, T): Should have been closed with 74, now closed with 74’s resolution.

Accept

123 (DuVal, T) - Why is the neighbor piconet needed? Suggest accept in principle, add text as described in documet 02/060r1 for clause 5.3.7, 5.3.8.

Accept

1664, 1665, 1667 (Shvodian, T): Allow 0 length fields in MLME. Same comment that we accepted for 1663 on 5 Feb, 2002, suggest accept.

Accept

458 (Gilb, T): Add reason code. Closed this issue with 907 (Roberts, TR) and 1419 (Shvodian, TR), but we have different reason codes and no description. Suggest close all with following:

**Table 1—MLME-REQUEST-KEY primitive parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
ReasonCode	Enumeration	SUCCESS, FAILURE, TIMEOUT	The result of the key request command.

Accept

460 (Gilb, T): No reason code for MLME-DISTRIBUTE-KEY. Closed with 913 (Roberts, TR) and 1421 (Shvodian, TR), suggest accept as in 1421, result is below:

**Table 2—MLME-DISTRIBUTE-KEY primitive parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
ReasonCode	Enumeration	SUCCESS, TIMEOUT	The result of the key distribution attempt.

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

Accept	1
	2
463, 464 (Gilb, T): Add reason code for deauthenticate: Suggest accept in principle, reason “De-authenticate command has been removed, so reason code is not needed.”	3
	4
	5
Accept	6
	7
902 (Roberts, TR): Add two acronyms: Suggest, add “DEK - data encryption key and DIK - data integrity key. SEED will be changed to lower case, ‘seed’ and a definition added ‘seed: initial small bit stream used as input by an algorithm to generate a (usually bigger) bit stream.”	8
	9
	10
Accept	11
	12
	13
900 (Roberts, TR): What are KEK, DEK, DIK and SEED? Suggest, accept in principle, “Add ‘KEK - key encryption key’ to the acronyms clause. The other acronyms will be defined as in the resolution for comment 902. The items will be defined with the proposals for the security suite. The 802.15.3 committee is going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a mandatory cipher suite for DEVs that implement security.”	14
	15
	16
	17
Accept	18
	19
	20
905, 906, 909 (Roberts, TR): Suggest accept in principle, “The 802.15.3 committee is going to issue a CFP, evaluate and choose a mandatory cipher suite for DEVs that implement security.”	21
	22
	23
Accept	24
	25
459 (Gilb, T): Device ID description is incorrect (cut ‘n paste error) in Table 16, page 42. Suggest accept.	26
	27
Accept	28
	29
461 (Gilb, T): Cut ‘n paste error, there is no MLME-DISTRIBUTE-KEY.response command. The response is the ACK, not a separate command. Suggest accept.	30
	31
	32
Accept	33
	34
462 (Gilb, T): Fix de-authenticate table. Suggest accept in principle: reason “De-authenticate command has been removed, so reason code is not needed.”	35
	36
	37
Accept	38
	39
465 (Gilb, T): Already accepted in 592, 593 (Heberling, T), suggest accept.	40
	41
Accept	42
	43
595 (Heberling, T): Add that the DEV sends a disassociation request to the PNC. Suggest accept in principle, “The DEV MLME, upon receiving this primitive, sends a disassociation request command frame to the PNC, if it is currently associated, sets the MAC to its initial conditions and clears all of its internal variables to their default values.”	44
	45
	46
	47
	48
Accept	49
	50
596 (Heberling, T): Suggest accept	51
	52
Accept	53
	54

598 (Heberling, T): We don't need MLME-RESET.confirm, and its description is incomplete. Suggest accept, "Delete sub-clause as specified in comment 598."

Accept

293 (Gilb, T): The capability information element does not need to be passed in the primitive, it is derived from the PIB. Suggest accept.

Accept

466 (Gilb, T) The primitive parameters for MLME-STREAM-CTA.indication are not defined, solution is to copy them from table 25 into table for this sub-clause. Suggest accept.

Accept

467 (Gilb, T): Missing reason code. Suggest accept, would look like below:

**Table 3—MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM primitive parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
ReasonCode	Enumeration	SUCCESS, TIMEOUT	Indicates the result of the stream termination command.

Table, pending changes to CTR, tag as CTR related.

468 (Gilb, T): The RequestorDEVAddress is missing a definition. Also add TIMEOUT to the valid range of the reason code. Suggest accept.

**Table 4—MLME-CHANNEL-STATUS primitive parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
RequestorDEVAddress	MAC address	Any valid MAC address	The MAC address of the DEV which is requesting the channel status.

Accept

607, 610 (Heberling, T), 470 (Gilb, T): Don't need ChannelIndex for this command, everyone is on the same channel. Suggest accept.

Accept

469 (Gilb, T): Change DestinationDEVAddress to RemoteDEVAddress to match the definition in table 28. Suggest accept.

Accept

616 (Heberling, T): Change from ACK\_TIMEOUT to RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT. Suggest accept in principle "Make change as indicated and add RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT to the valid range of the ReasonCode in Table 28."

Accept

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

617 (Heberling, T): Add a response timer to the MSC. Suggest accept, reason “Add response timers where appropriate in all MSCs in clause 6.”

Accept

619 (Heberling, T): Add MLME-CHANNEL-STATUS and MLME-CREATE-REPEATER message sequence chart clause and diagram just after the last clause of the MLME-CREATE-REPEATER.confirm primitive. Text and diagram are in clause 6.3.1.12 of doc 01/410r1. Suggest accept.

Withdrawn

621 (Heberling, T): Change NewChannelIndex data type from octet to integer on page 64. Suggest accept.

Accept

622 (Heberling, T): Change timeout type to duration on page 64. Suggest accept.

Accept

624 (Heberling, T): Add MLME-PNC-HANDOVER.request, indication, response and confirm clauses into the space just before current D09 clause 6.3.19. Based on doc 01/410r1? Suggest accept if 01/410r1 has been posted with the new MLME. Reason “Insert just before current D09 clause 6.3.19.”

Accept,

623 (Heberling, T): Add MLME-CHANNEL-STATUS, MLME-REMOTE-SCAN, and MLME-CHANGE-CHANNEL MSCs to the MLME-SAP interface clause from 01/410r0. Suggest accept if 01/410r1 has been posted with the MSCs and with caveat that the remote scan has been updated with the changes agreed to in Dallas (i.e. removing the channel change from the MSC). Reason “Accept MSCs, except that the remote scan MSC will have split into separate channel change and remote scan MSCs. Update should be put in 01/410r2.”

Accept

629, 635, 637 (Heberling, T): Change DevInfoSet to PNCInfoSet. Suggest accept in principle, “Change DevInfoSet to be DEVCTRSet.”

Accept

472 (Gilb, T), 1670 (Singer via Shvodian, T): DEV does not need to be authenticated to use probe command so delete the word “authenticated” from line 19, 20, 36 and 37 all on page 66 (i.e. every occurrence in 6.3.18.1). Suggest accept. For 1670, accept in principle, add “The command is used to request information about the current channel time requests from the PNC. However, authentication is not necessarily required, so the word “authenticated” has been deleted from this sub-clause.”

Accept in principle, change “authenticated” to “associated (or associated and authenticated if authentication is required)”

1440 (Shvodian, T): Naming collision between probe and DEV-info commands. Suggest accept in principle, “The MLME-PROBE-PNC primitives (now renamed PNC Info primitives) are used to issue DEV Info commands (now renamed PNC Info commands.) The MLME-DEV-INFO primitives (now MLME-PROBE) are used to issue probe commands.”

Accept

## 2.4 Thursday, 14 February, 2002

456 (Gilb, T): Change "with which ... process" to "that is requesting the key"

653 (Heberling, T): Add MLME-NEW-PNC information from doc 01/410r1. Suggest accept in principle, "Add the text in 01/410r1 with the following corrections: change "with which it is associated and authenticated." in 6.3.1.31 to be "either as a result of the coordinator selection process, 8.2.3, or the PNC handover process, 8.2.4.", change "the non-initiating DEV or DEVs." in 6.3.1.32 to be "a non-initiating DEV.", delete "which it is associated and authenticated" from 6.3.1.33 and change enumeration item "(e) x number ... superframes)" to be "(b) The required number of new PNC announcement commands have been broadcast as indicated in 8.2.3 for PNC selection or in 8.2.4 for PNC handover.""

654 (Heberling, T): Add clause 6.3.1.34 MLME-DEV-INFO, MLME-PNC-HANDOVER, MLME-PROBE-PNC, and MLME-NEW-PNC message sequence chart from doc 01/410r1. Suggest accept in principle, "Add new MSC and text from 6.3.1.35 instead of 6.3.1.34. The DEV does not challenge the PNC to become PNC, rather the PNC evaluates the data in the association request to determine if PNC handover should happen. Also, change 'which is currently associated and authenticated.' to be 'which is currently associated, and if required, authenticated.'"

1438 (Shvodian, T): Should the requestor or responder choose the window size for channel status. Specifying a window size in the request will potentially force a delay of that amount of time while the responding DEV gathers the statistics. Suggest reject, "Having the requesting DEV specify a window size will either introduce delay in the response of the channel status request command or would require every DEV to keep a detailed history rather than simply a running count. While there are reasons why the requesting DEV might wish to specify the measurement window, the committee feels that the corresponding delay or added complexity to every DEV would be too much."

1817 (Razor, 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.'"

1125, 1234, 1244 (Roberts, TR), 1821, 1829 (Razor, TR): Should changing the PNC require re-authentication (note that this does change the PSM): Suggest ?

1425 (Shvodian, TR): Do we use DEV addresses or DEV IDs for the MLME primitives and why? What is our editorial policy? Suggest the following: "DEV IDs will be used for MLMEs except in those specific instances where the frame specifically requires a DEV Address (e.g. in the association request frame). This change will be applied to all MLMEs in clause 6 to provide a uniform interface."

1447 (Shvodian, T): Change max number of CTAs processed to be 8 bits (i.e. a maximum of 256 per device). Note that this implies a change in the frame format as well (which has a 2 byte number). Suggest reject. "While 65536 CTAs is likely way too many and 256 may be adequate, allowing the extra byte adds very little overhead."

1671 (Singer via Shvodian, T): Why does the device care about the last device to authenticate and deauthenticate? Where does it get this information? Remedy: Remove AuthenticateFailDevice (why is it called "Fail" anyway?) and DeauthenticateDevice. Suggest accept.

1731 (Karaoguz, T), 444 (Gilb, T): Remove reference to other PHY types (5 GHz and UWB) since they have not yet been approved (new PHY drafts will update this section as part of their draft). This comment was accepted for 550 (Gubbi, TR). Suggest accept.

1451 (Shvodian, TR): Current Power Level doesn't belong in the PIB. It is sent with each packet at the PHY SAP. Remove PHYPIB\_CurrentPowerLevel from the PIB. Suggest accept.

941 (Roberts, TR): PHY PIB values referenced, but not defined. Suggest accept in principle: “Move PHY PIB definition to clause 11.7, make it specific for the 2.4 GHz PHY. Additional PHYs will include an appropriate PHY PIB clause with any new draft. Add definitions for the three items, PHYPIB\_TxMaxPower and its 2’s complement encoding in dBm, as defined 7.4.8 and PHYPIB\_TxPowerStepSize is the step size in dB, also as defined in 7.4.8. The PHYPIB\_CurrentPowerLevel will be deleted as indicated in the resolution of comment 1451.”

1449 (Shvodian, TR): PHYPIB\_CurrentDataRate shouldn't be a PHY PIB. It is passed at the PHY SAP on a packet by packet basis. Remove PHYPIB\_CurrentDataRate from the PIB. Suggest accept.

940 (Roberts, TR): The text in line 4 claims there is a mapping between the data rate vector and the actual data rate that is PHY dependent. Where is this mapping in clause 11. How does this map to the PHYPIB\_DataRateVector and the PHYPIB\_CurrentDataRate? Suggest accept in principle: “The PIB references will be moved to clause 11.7. The PHYPIB\_DataRateVector encoding is defined in 11.7 as the mapping of supported data rates to a single octet, but the cross reference to this will be clarified when the PIB tables are moved. The PHYPIB\_CurrentDataRate, which is set through the PHY SAP on a packet by packet basis, will be removed, as indicated in the resolution of comment 1449.”

943 (Roberts, TR): Clause 11 does not list the managed object. Define PHYPIB\_MPDULengthMax in clause 11 ... refer to PHY subcommittee. Suggest accept in principle, “The PHYPIB\_MPDULengthMax is the same as the aMaxFrameSize and is fixed for compliant 2.4 GHz PHY DEVs. Thus the PIB entry is not needed and will be deleted.”

946 (Roberts, TR): Clause 11 does not address the managed objects of table 50. The PHY committee needs to add reference to the values used for PHYPIB\_NumPSLevels and PHYPIB\_PSLevelReturn. Suggest accept in principle, “The PHY PIB table will be moved to 11.7. Both values are implementation dependent. Will add the implementation dependent notation to the definition of PHYPIB\_NumPSLevels and add that PHYPIB\_PSLevelReturn is a time duration in microseconds.”

1696 (Siwiak, TR), 1733 (Karaoguz), 945 (Roberts, TR): Definition of the ranging item. Suggest accept in principle, “The PHY PIB tables will be moved to 11.7 and a note will be added that the ranging for the 2.4 GHz PHY is optional and that its method is implementation dependent and outside of the scope of the current standard. The encoding will be changed to be 2 bytes, with the distance indicated in cm (i.e. a range of 1 cm to 655.36 m with a resolution of 1 cm). New PHY projects will define a ranging parameter that is appropriate for that PHY.”

147 (DuVal, T): MAC CPS SAP is not shown in Figure 2. It is hard to understand how it fits in without seeing the relationships pictorially. Suggest accept, “The figure from annex A (figure A.1) will be copied to clause 6 as well as supporting text that describes the various layers of the model.”

1456 (Shvodian): Need a MAC\_DATA.confirm to indicate status in the event of a failure. Suggest accept, “WMS will submit text.”

476 (Gilb, T): There is only one type of primitive defined in the PHY service specification now. Delete “The primitives associated ... sub-layer to sub-layer interactions.” and connect the following paragraph to the previous one. Suggest accept.

477 (Gilb, T): This sub-clause is redundant and therefore really irritates the technical editor while simultaneously promoting bad habits. Delete sub-clause 6.9.3.1 in its entirety and wipe it from our minds. Suggest accept, reason “The committee would like to thank the technical editor for this enlightenment.”

952 (Roberts, T): Add figures to illustrate the vectors TXVECTOR and RXVECTOR. Suggest accept in principle “Tables 55 and 56 illustrate the components of the logical entities TXVECTOR and RXVECTOR. Add xref’s to these tables in the value column of table 54.”

551 (Gubbi, TR), 1732 (Karaoguz, T), 445 (Gilb, T): Set the CCA detection threshold to be dependent on the TX power in a manner similar to 802.11. Suggest reject, “802.11 has a much greater range of transmit powers (from 10s of mW up to 1 W) where 802.15.3 DEVs would typically use lower TX power, around 0 to 8 dBm.”

953 (Roberts, TR): In table 55, in the value column for parameter Length, it is stated the max number of octets is determined by PHYPIB\_LengthMax. Should this be PHYPIB\_MPDU\_LengthMax. If not, then where is PHYPIB\_LengthMax defined? Suggest accept in principle, “Change ‘PHYPIB\_LengthMax’ to be ‘aMaxFrameSize’.”

1457 (Shvodian, TR): Data Rate and Power Level should not be PIB parameters. Rename the value. Suggest accept in principle, “Change the values to be, ‘The data rate for the packet, PHY dependent. For the 2.4 GHz PHY this is defined in 11.7.’ and ‘The TX power level for the packet, PHY dependent. For the 2.4 GHz PHY this is defined in 11.7.’”

## 2.5 Email resolution, responses requested by 19 Feb, 2002

471 (Gilb, T): Add TIMEOUT to ReasonCode valid range. Suggest accept in principle, “Add RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT to the valid range of the ReasonCode in Table 30 (see comment 639).”

639 (Heberling, T): Change from ACK\_TIMEOUT to RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT. Suggest accept in principle “Make change as indicated and add RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT to the valid range of the ReasonCode in Table 30.”

644 (Heberling, T), 473(Gilb, T): Type and valid range wrong for reason code. Suggests accept 644, accept in principle 473, “Change the valid range to be SUCCESS, RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT as indicated in comment 644.”

474 (Gilb, T): The sentence "The ReasonCode ... for failure." does not belong here since it has been put into the table, so delete it. Suggest accept.

652 (Heberling, T): Change from ACK\_TIMEOUT to RESPONSE\_TIMEOUT on page 70, line 37. Suggest accept.

929, 930, 932 (Roberts, T): Change “LME” to “PLME”, suggest accept in principle, for 929 “Change ‘shall be a request by the LME to reset’ to be ‘shall be a request by either the DME or MLME to reset’. The PLME-SAP is the same interface for both the MLME-PLME and the DME-PLME.” for 930 and 932 “Change ‘The LME is’ to be ‘The requesting management entity, either the DME or MLME, is’. The PLME-SAP is the same interface for both the MLME-PLME and the DME-PLME.”

934, 935, 936, 937 (Roberts, T): Add xref to appropriate MAC PIB tables, suggest accept.

1446 (Shvodian, T): No such thing as MACPIBCFPMMaxDuration anywhere else in the draft, so delete it from the PIB. Suggest accept.

939 (Roberts, T): Add the note that 11.1 is for the 2.4 GHz PHY, “... on the regulatory domains for the 2.4 GHz PHY is given in 11.1.” Suggest accept.

942 (Roberts, TR): Managed Object in Table 47 is misspelt. Correct spelling ... it should be PHYPIB\_MPDULengthMax. Suggest accept.

944 (Roberts, TR): Managed Object is misspelt. Spelling should be PHYPIB\_CCAThreshold. Suggest accept.

**2.6 Tuesday, 19 February, 2002**

1454 (Shvodian, TR): "All DEVs shall support the asynchronous data service." This is a LAN mentality, not WPAN. Devs can may be simplified by eliminating asynchronous data service. Make asynchronous data service optional. Suggest ?

**2.7 Later dates**

Power management (TBD date, tagged PM in database)

857, 859 (Roberts, T) - mode definitions.

Channel time request clean up (tagged as CTR in database)

1429, 1434 (Shvodian, TR): Clean up CTR, suggested remedy in 02/076r0?

467 (Gilb, T): Missing reason code. Suggest accept, would look like below:

**Table 5—MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM primitive parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
ReasonCode	Enumeration	SUCCESS, TIMEOUT	Indicates the result of the stream termination command.

Table, pending changes to CTR, tag as CTR related.

1425 (Shvodian, TR): 48 or 8 bit addresses in the MLMES? Did we already decide this one?

597 (Heberling, T): Piconet shutdown element. (tagged PiconetShutdown)

**3. Schuamburg ad-hoc, Feb. 25-27**

**3.1 New association response proposal**

(Tagged Association Info in the database)

576, 662 (Heberling, TR), 661 (Heberling, T)

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