

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

Project	IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)	
Title	<b>TG3 D10 running comment resolutions</b>	
Date Submitted	[8 July, 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 a record of comment resolutions for LB17.]	
Purpose	[To provide a record of the comment resolution for LB17.]	
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, Vancouver to Schaumburg

### 1.1 Tuesday, 30 July, 2002

#### 1.1.1 Tabled issues

135 (Heberling, TR) KO> Requests for asynchronous and isochronous channel time have two completely different sequences. Therefore the two can never be combined in the same request. Consequently, <add two sentences> The same channel time request frame cannot contain CTRB for both asynchronous and isochronous channel time. Incorrectly formatted requests shall be rejected by the PNC with the result code set to ILLEGAL\_REQUEST. **Suggest Accept**

Table until Tuesday, 30 July 2002. Homework to everyone to review 02/109r0 to see why it might be a problem to combine requests.

91 (Heberling, TR) - It should be possible for a PNC to deny creation of a child piconet. On line 41 add text: If the PNC rejects the creation of a child piconet, it shall set the ReasonCode of the channel time response command to CHILD\_UNSUPPORTED. **Suggest accept in principle** Since support of child piconets is an option, the comment is correct that a reasoncode of child\_unsupported is added. HOWEVER, it is dangerous precedent to allow PNCs that support pseudo-static GTS to not support child or neighbor piconets. Also, although for neighbors, this is a coexistence mechanism. We need a better answer.

Table until Tuesday, 30 July, 2002.

#### 1.1.2 CTM/Isoch

203 (Heberling, TR) The only parameters that are negotiable are the DesiredNumberOfTUs and the stream index. Consequently, please delete the sentences between lines 19 and 21 and replace with this sentence: "Only the DesiredNumberOfTUs in the CTRB of Figure 73 and the stream index shall be negotiable." **Suggest accept**

205 (Heberling, TR) After the last sentence in the list on line 48(The reason code field is set to "SUCCESS"), please add this next item to the list: Send a beacon with a stream announcement IE and the requested channel time if immediately available. This addition to the beacon is necessary to provide the requesting DEV with a more immediate response from the PNC particularly in the case where the DEV requested a sub rate CTA that could potentially result in the PNC not scheduling a beacon with the requested CTA IE until some considerable time in the future. This would cause the DEV to wait a long time to confirm the success of its request. **Withdraw per CID 74**

995 (Bain, TR) Figure 119 MSC for reserving asynchronous data channel time provides MAC-SAP primitives. The MSC figures for isochronous do not show this information. The MSCs of figure 113 through 118 should have this information added where appropriate. Consequently, add the MAC-ISOCH-DATA primitives as noted above **Suggest reject**

#### 1.1.3 CTM/MaxCTA

182 (Heberling, TR) KO> MaxCTA of any kind is a PNC decision which may change due to PNC capabilities and amount of associated DEVs. Since we're not specifying the algorithm we should leave this up to the PNC implementer. Consequently, delete the 2nd paragraph which starts: "The PNC shall not assign more than aMaxAssignedCTAs... **Suggest accept** pending acceptance of CID 71

### 1.1.4 CTM/Pseudostatic

451 (Gilb, TR) The probe command is now used to communicate the new CTAs to the DEVs using a pseudo-static GTS. However, that doesn't seem to be the best way to do it. Consequently, consider these options: - Keep probe - Add CTA to channel time status command - Bring back channel time grant command, possibly with a different name **Suggest accept** option 1: Keep the probe command pending acceptance of CID 180. **Accept in principle** option 2: It may be advisable to reuse the channel time status command name(given that the current channel time status command is being renamed to channel time response command) to convey CTAs, given the changes discussed while trying to come to consensus regarding CIDs 410, 155, 364, 907, 120, 366.

180 (Heberling, TR) KO> Informing the receiver when a pseudostatic CTA is moved will be so much overhead that it's unmanageable. Besides, the constructions in there to avoid transmitter contention. Receiver contention is ok! Let whoever missed the CTA in the beacon listen to the whole superframe. Besides, if the intended receiver misses the CTA in the beacon, how is it going to find out when the PNC wants to inform it about the change? 2nd problem: A PNC must have the authority to arrange CTA as it pleases. It cannot be stopped by a DEV not responding. Especially if it needs to rearrange CTA to fit in a request from a new DEV in a timely fashion. The PNC shall make an effort to inform the transmitter but it shall always proceed with the change. A third problem is that once the PNC has decided to change something, it must proceed. PNC may have a stronger signal than the DEV, hence the PNC doesn't hear the acknowledgements but the DEVs have heard the order to change. Consequently the PNC must finish what it has started. Therefore, see Resolution [08] in 02276r3P802-15\_TG3-commentsD10\_KO.doc, page 15. **Suggest accept**

186 (Heberling, TR) KO> The receiver cannot be involved during pseudostat move negotiation. Instead, the rules must be that a DEV that cannot interpret the CTA must stay awake for the whole superframe. That solves receiver problems with the move. The transmitter will still get the move probe handshake. Consequently, insert this text on line 17: "A DEV that did not correctly receive the CTAs of a beacon shall listen for the following superframes until the CTAs of a beacon are correctly received." **Suggest accept.**

### 1.1.5 Start issues

963 (Bain, TR) - MLME-START.request suggests the means to starts parents, children, and neighbors using the current PiconetType parameter. The MLME-START.request is not used for starting either child or neighbors. Both a neighbor and child would associate first (neighbor in associate) and then obtain channel time. Recommend that PiconetType parameter be removed from Table 6 (page 31, line 12). **Suggest accept in principle:** "1) Remove PiconetType parameter from Table 6 (page 31, line 12 and the MLME-START.request. 2) Also, since the MAC knows that the DME needs neighbor (not child) piconet established as part of the MLME-ASSOCIATE.request command (since the PNC must know in order to assign a reserved DEVID). Therefore: Add a new PiconetType parameter to MLME-ASSOCIATE.yyy commands, and add a row for PiconetType in Table 9 with the enumeration: 'Neighbor' and 'Member'. The 'Child' and 'PNC' enumerations are not needed. 3) In order to clear up when a member becomes a child to the parent PNC, add the following text to section 8.5.1 after line 25: 'A piconet member DEV or a member neighbor DEV shall allocate a private psuedo-static GTS for use with for its private piconet. When a member DEV that is not a neighbor is granted a private psuedo-static GTS, it shall be distinguished as a 'child PNC' by the parent PNC. The 802.15.3 child or neighbor network shall use the channel time allocated to the private GTS for its beacon, its CAP, and its CFP. The parent PNC shall manage the GTS that is allocated to the child or neighbor member, in the same manner as any other psuedostatic GTS.'


992 (Bain, T) - The description field for the PiconetDescriptionSet carries the incorrect direction of flow. For start operation, the direction is towards the MAC and not a return as defined in MLME-START.request. Also, for starting, it is but a single set and not multiples. New text for PiconetDescriptionSet in table 6 is recommended as "Characteristics of the superframe." **Suggest accept in principle,** 'Change the text in Table 6: Change "PiconetDescriptionSet" label to "PiconetDescription", and replace the text in the column Descrip-

tion of that same row with, ‘The characteristics of the new piconet to be started, except PiconetStatus, which is ignored.’”

**1.1.6 IE issues**

177 (Heberling, TR) - Figure 96 should be replaced with a proper MSC of the required protocol needed to establish a child piconet. Replace figure 96 with a proper MSC. **Suggest accept** ‘An MSC for child piconet initialization is included below. It needs twiddling to get the vertical lines to not show in the hex process blocks. Also, although consistent with other similar diagrams, this MSC seems to need the first beacon of the child PNC shown.

The MSC for creating a child piconet is illustrated in Figure 2.



**Figure 1—MSC for the creating a child piconet.**

987 (Bain, T) - It is suggested that the neighbor sub-clause be split. The breakout would be for neighbors intending to be for 15.3 piconets or for neighbors intending to be for non-15.3 piconets. Suggested text will be in document 02/289. **Suggest accept in principle**, should be editorial and be tech editor choice if non-15.3 and 15.3 type neighbors are split in 8.2.5.

200 (Heberling, TR) - If one allowed hierarchical piconets ad absurdum the integrity of the TDMA protocol could not be maintained. <add sentence> A neighbor PNC shall decline the start of a subordinate client or neighbor piconet within its private CTA. **Suggest accepting partial** - A neighbor (of the 15.3 type) should not be allowed to start a dependent neighbor piconet. However, suggest that a 15.3 neighbor (the only type we can control in the standard) be allowed to start a single child piconet.

356 (Heberling, TR) - We lack methods for parent PNC to gracefully shut down a neighbor piconet. The parent PNC cannot just remove the CTA since it would leave the neighbor piconet hanging. Change text <from> If the parent PNC wants to end either a child the parent PNC shall use either the stream termination process, 8.5.1.3, to remove the GTS from the beacon. If the parent PNC wants to end a neighbor piconet, it shall use the disassociation process, 8.3.4, to remove the neighbor PNC from the network. <to> If the parent PNC wants to stop a child piconet, the parent PNC shall use the Parent PNC termination of child piconet procedure, 8.2.4.1. If the parent PNC wants to stop a neighbor piconet, the parent PNC shall use the Parent PNC termination of neighbor piconet procedure, 8.2.5.1. **Suggest accept in principle** - use the techniques of contribution 02/316.


989 (Bain, TR) - To support the MLME-InitDependentPNC.request/confirm, text in this sub-clause should support the action of starting a dependent PNC. see the 6.3.x comment see 02/289. **Suggest accept** - use the text of 02/289. this is the same resolution as for child piconets of comments 986, 988.

962 (Bain, T) - The text is written in a way that implies that only a single neighbor piconet can exist within a parent piconet. adjust the sub-clause to reflect multiple neighbors. Then specify a process for the remaining neighbors and how they select one of their number to take over the role of parent. Interesting if they are all non-15.3 piconets. 8.2.5 should lead the change and this sub-clause follow obviously. **Suggest accept** - this makes clause 5 text match that there may be up to 6 neighbors for a single parent PNC.

588 (Gilb, TR) - If a parent piconet ends operation and a neighbor piconet continues to operate without disruption, does the neighbor piconet use all the airtime previously used by the parent piconet or does the neighbor piconet continue to operate in the space previously allotted by the parent? Is this specified anywhere? What if multiple neighbor piconets exist, or a child and a neighbor piconet both exist, when a parent piconet ends? Add text to clause 8 that describes what to do in this case. I suggest letting the neighbor piconet reclaim all of the unused time after the ATP expires if there are no other child or neighbor piconets in the parent piconet. If there is more than one child piconet in the parent piconet, the first one whose ATP expires becomes the first PNC. Others can join the new parent piconet and request time. Once that is done, add an informative summary of this to clause 5 once the decision has been made. Once that is done, add an informative summary of this to clause 5 once the decision has been made. **Suggest accept in principle** - see 02/316

179 (Heberling, TR) - Figure 98 should be replaced with a proper MSC of the required protocol needed to establish a neighbor piconet. Replace figure 98 with a proper MSC. **Suggest accept** - An MSC for neighbor piconet initialization is included below. It needs twiddling to get the vertical lines to not show in the hex process blocks. Also, although consistent with other similar diagrams, this MSC seems to need the first beacon of the neighbor PNC shown.

The MSC for the initiation of the neighbor piconet is illustrated in Figure 4.



**Figure 2—MSC for the initiating of a neighbor piconet.**

352, 354 - SUGGEST ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE - the text of 02/316r0 should be used for child and neighbor being made aware of shutdown.

181 (and an editorial) - SUGGEST ACCEPT - remove “either” in two places.

358 - SUGGEST ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE - use the text in 02/316r0

985 - SUGGEST REJECT - the solution of 02/316r0 should be used as it is a better solution than killing off everyone.

961 - SUGGEST ACCEPT - this brings clause 5 into alignment with suggested resolutions of clause 8

**1.1.7 IE/ASIE**

273 (Gilb, T) - withdrawn

76, 73 (Heberling, TR) - The sentence in line 50 opens the door for interoperability problems. Consequently, if the sentence: ..."Its use by the application capable DEV is outside of the scope of this standard." is not deleted and replaced with a specification for how this information element is to be used, I strongly recommend that this information element be removed from the specification. **Suggest accept in principle** but using an approach different than 02/176r1 resolution [16] text. It seems reasonable that piconets may have the possibility of multiple “vendor”s within a single piconet considering both ASIE and PNServices. If so, then the vendor ID as a single IE is not sufficient.

300 (Shvodian, TR) - The ASIE presents interoperability problem. What if two manufacturers choose the same IE value to convey different information. Anything application specific should be negotiated at the application layer, not in the MAC. Besides, that, the text in 7.4.11 says that the use of ASIEs are negotiated with command frames. What command frames? Proprietary ones? There are no command frames that negotiate the ASIE. **Suggest accept in principle** but using an approach different than 02/176r1 resolution [16] text.

The folloing is suggested to replace sub-clause 7.4.11

7.4.11 Application specific

{note: red text is add, green is delete}

The application specific information element (ASIE) shall be formatted as illustrated in Figure 3. The purpose of this IE is to allow custom information for enhanced operation that is outside of the scope of this standard.

octets: $L_n$	1	2	2	1	1
Application specific data	DEVID	Applica- tion data identifier	Vendor ID	Length ( $=5+L_n$ )	Element ID

The Vendor ID is a registered value. RAC is the registration authority. {xref to means to contact in the reference section of the standard}A value of Vendor ID not understood by a receiving DEV causes the remainder of this information element to be ignored

The application data identifier is developed by the PNC and provides information for a receiving DEV to identify new vs. repeating appliction specific data.

The DEVID identifies the DEV that will make use of this IE. 1

The application specific data is provided by the PNC. Its use by the application specific capable DEV, 2  
 understanding the Vendor ID, is outside of the scope of this standard. 3  
 4  
 5

More than one ASIE may be placed in any beacon. 6  
 7

The ASIE shall only be used by the PNC after negotiating the application specific capability with a DEV 8  
 using data and command frames. The negotiation of the application specific capability between the DEV and 9  
 the PNC is outside of the scope of this standard. 10  
 11

The following is suggested text for a new sub-clause 8.x.y 12  
 13

**8.x.y ASIE Operation** 14  
 15

The ASIE is used to implement beyond-the-scope features that require additional functionality by both the 16  
 PNC and one or more of its piconet member DEVs. The "additional functionality" is defined as an enhance- 17  
 ment that does not violate the standard and allows DEVs that do not have the functionality to operate nor- 18  
 mally. The IE data provides the messages that are only interpreted by the targeted DEV. 19  
 20

The ASIE communicates to potential DEVs that the PNC can provide its part of the additional functionality, 21  
 and it is also used to control that functionality. Multiple ASIEs may be added by the PNC unless limited by 22  
 standard services that are required by the PNC or by the size of the beacon. The designer should minimize 23  
 the size of each ASIE used to support the custom application. 24  
 25

{ note: some of the following text should be more properly as part of the MLME for ASIE } 26  
 27

The PNC DME uses MLME-PNC-CREATE-ASIE.request to tell the PNC MLME to place the specified 28  
 ASIE in one or more beacons. If the DME uses a "0" Application Data Identifier field, the PNC shall create 29  
 a new ASIE. A value other than zero shall cause the PNC MLME to modify the specified existing ASIE. 30  
 31

The MLME-PNC-CREATE-ASIE.indicate is used by the PNC MLME to tell the PNC DME whether or not 32  
 ASIE requested will be generated. If the Application Data Identifier field was set to "0" in the request, the 33  
 MAC shall assign a new Application Data Identifier that is different from that assigned to other current 34  
 ASIEs. The "0" value Application Data Identifier shall not be assigned to any ASIE. 35  
 36

If the requested Application Data Identifier belongs to an existing ASIE, the MAC shall modify the persis- 37  
 tence of that ASIE, and reply with the same Application Data Identifier in the indicate. If the Repeat field an 38  
 existing ASIE is set to "0", the PNC shall terminate the existing ASIE. 39  
 40

The application specific data of an existing ASIE cannot be modified. 41  
 42

The MLME-RECEIVE-ASIE.indicate is used by the MLME of the DEV addressed in the ASIE, to pass the 43  
 ASIE data up to the DME. The MLME must pass the data to the DME only once for each unique Applica- 44  
 tion Specific Identifier, ASIE. Since each ASIE may persist in multiple beacons, this persistence shown 45  
 shall be detected in the DEV MLME. 46  
 47

**1.1.8 IE/PNServices - 65, 395, 309, 308, 306, 88, 90, 107, 397, 170, 396, 802, 189** 48  
 49

306 (Shvodian, TR) This IE does not belong in the standard. This function belongs above the MAC. 50  
 Besides, this is never sent in the beacon. It is a field in the association request and response and should not 51  
 be an IE. Remove 7.4.23 **Suggest Agree in principle.** 52  
 53  
 54

Add a section to clause 8 (below). It will address the two IEs (ASIE and PNServices) in a single location regarding Vendor ID. The PNServices text (and clause 6 and 7) will address the vendor ID information that prevents an interoperability problem. For PNServices, The first two octets of the string (in each direction) would hold the vendor ID. It should be clear that this IE is not in the beacon but has the IE structure to allow graceful use in the association request/response. The naming of the MACPIB\_DEV PiconetServicesIE and MACPIB\_PNC PiconetServicesIE may imply a broadcast operation but it is within the confines of the association request/response. A change to include the 16 bit (registered) Vendor ID as the first two octets in the PNServices strings will be made.

### 8.x.x Vendor identification

One or more registered vendor identifications shall be part of all exchanges of Application Specific IE, {xref to 7 and the subclause in 8 (new)} and the Piconet Services IE {xref to 7.4.23 and 8.3.2}, within this standard. Those IEs provide applications above the DEV level with over-the-air messages in support of those applications but without interpretation by DEVs as defined in this standard.

Correct interpretation of application information is assured with the Vendor ID that is part of each use of either ASIE or Piconet Services IE. The registration authority assuring uniqueness for the vendor ID is RAR {xref to references clause}

{Note: prior to the ratification of this standard, the paperwork for registration must be set up}

63 (Heberling, TR) KO Services broadcast not standardized, thus not interoperable and must be removed from standard. Delete table 30. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

170 (Heberling, TR) The piconet services information element is a potentially powerful information element. Unfortunately, because its definition does not specify in any detail the contents of either the Piconet services field or the type field, this info element represents an interoperability liability. Consequently, this information element should be deleted from the specification until such time a complete definition is provided. Delete the piconet services information element or provide a detailed definition. **Suggest accept in principle**. The text to be supplied for CID 306 addresses the issues.

65 (Heberling, TR) KO Services broadcast not standardized, thus not interoperable and must be removed from standard. delete the clause 7.4.23 about piconet services. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

308 (Shvodian, TR) Piconet services IE should not be in the standard if the contents are not specified. Remove piconet services IE. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

90 (Heberling, TR) The piconet services IE is incompletely defined. Either add more detail as requested in Clause 7.4.23, P127, L28 or delete this IE from the command. Please perform either of the requested changes. **Suggest accept in principle**. The text to be supplied for CID 306 addresses the issues.

395 (Heberling, TR) Since the Piconet Services element is incompletely defined, please remove this IE from figure 48. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

397 (Heberling, TR) Remove the Piconet services IE from the Association response command since the comment in C7.4.23 P127, L27 recommends deleting this IE. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

88 (Heberling, TR) The piconet services IE is another one of those weasel information elements that attempts to add functionality to the 15.3 MAC without specifying the details of the functionality it attempts to add. Consequently, the piconet services IE needs to be either described in more detail so that the potential for interoperability issues is eliminated or it should be deleted. Please either provide more detail or delete



this information element from the 15.3 MAC specification. **Suggest accept in principle.** The text to be supplied for CID 306 addresses the issues.

396 (Heberling, TR) Delete the sentences between lines 6 and 7 regarding the piconet services IE. The lack of specific details makes this IE a potential interoperability problem. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

309 (Shvodian, TR) Piconet services does not belong in the standard if its use is not standardized. **Suggest accept in principle.** The text to be supplied for CID 306 addresses the issues.

802 (Shvodian, TR) The piconet services IE does not belong in a standard since it is completely unspecified. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

107 (Heberling, TR) KO Services broadcast not standardized, thus not interoperable and must be removed from standard. Delete clause 8.3.2. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

189 (Heberling, TR) this clause describes a potentially worthwhile information exchange within the piconet. Unfortunately, the lack of detail regarding the services that a piconet or DEVs in the piconet provide opens the door for serious interoperability issues. Consequently, it is recommended that until the details of which services are provided and encoded, this clause should be deleted from the specification. **Suggest reject** as the solution for CID 306 addresses the issue.

### 1.1.9 PNCResponse

119 (PNC/Response - completed in Vancouver)

17, 94 - Two dependent comments that can't be retired totally as a result of this series of resolution.

Comment 188 - SUGGEST ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE - Comment 188 suggests that the text in clause 8.4.4.3 is not clear enough since the DEV (client) in fact only receives the information from the PNC. Thus, other than assuring that the text is clear on this, the comment should be satisfied. Suggested text is added in 8.4.4.3. In a new sentence that follows each of the 1st and 2nd paragraphs, add the following:

“This parameter is provided by the PNC as a read only indication of its ability to respond. The DEV may use the information to adjust its operating parameters.”

Comment 808, 94, 191,188, 17, 10, 92, 12, 86, 357 - SUGGEST ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE - The PNCResponse parameter is useless if the scheduler in the PNC for determining to which command frames the PNC must respond first is not specified. Comment 12 is a good observation in lack of specification. My d09 comment was addressing a broad issue of response but of most interest was the CTR and response to SPS info command. Perhaps the more general case of all commands is appropriate since they will include the CTR and SPS info commands. The text below remains limited to enhancing the current text. If so, then the text should indicate that all commands will be processed in order of receipt.

Add text after the last paragraph of 8.4.4.3 - “ The intent of the PNC responsiveness is for the PNC to indicate a characteristic of responsiveness based on the implementation of the PNC. From this, the associating DEV may derive sufficient information to adjust how it relates to the PNC and what the DEV expectations may be. It is up to the PNC to report this and it should be a useful parameter for the DEV to use, including finding a piconet with a PNC more suited to the DEV needs. PNC implementations may be responsive to within a single superframe of a successful command in the CAP or open MTS. Further, within the limitation of the CAP or open MTS capability, PNCs may be of such a design as to accommodate several command operations within a single superframe. Other PNCs may be of the other extreme and be implementations that presume a somewhat static application set. Again, the idea is for DEVs to be able to better understand the nature of the PNC of the network they are joining.

The distribution of association and open MTSs within superframes has a significant impact on PNC responsiveness {xref MTS in clause 8}.”

**1.2 Monday, 29 July, 2002**

Attendees: Jay Bain, John Barr, Bill Shvodian, Allen Heberling, Knut Odman, Rene Struik, Jeyhan Karaoguz, James Gilb

Meeting called to order, 9:06 am PDT.

**1.2.1 Email resolutions due 23 July 2002 and 29 July 2002**

July 23, 2002, from Ari Singer

783 - I agree in principle that an X should be included in the table for disassociate. However, if we accept the comment that devices may accept protected or unprotected frames in a secure piconet, we may want to change the text to say that the commands "should" be sent with the SEC bit turned on instead of "shall". We also need to make exceptions for commands that may be sent before the DEV is authenticated. For example, the probe command may be sent and received before authentication, but it is marked with an X in this table. The same applies to disassociate.

311 - I agree in principle. As mentioned above, if the DEV is not yet authenticated, it doesn't share a key with the PNC so the disassociate command must be sent unprotected. Perhaps it should say something like "The disassociation request command shall use the secure command format if the DEV is authenticated in the piconet."

From Allen Heberling

I accept these comments as written: ( 959, 312, 783, 311, 803, 804, 726, 814, 53, 958, 46, 609 )

However I suggest these editorial changes to 129 (<Change> "...is one less than the total amount of fragments..." <to> "...is one less than the total number of framgents..."

Cannot accept the indicated CIDs until clarification of these comments is received: ( Bain (977, 979, 949), Roberts: 1126 )

Further discussion is required on this comment: ( 485 )

From John Barr

1126 - How does a non-802.15.3 network which has just enough intelligence to associate as an 802.15.3 neighbor network synchronize with the PNC's clock? Also, on page 174, line 37 there is the following sentence: "All DEVs will resynchronize their clock based on the beacon arrival." The child PNC and the neighbor device controlling the allocation of the time slot for the neighbor network (we don't require that it be a piconet, just conform to the time allocation) are DEVs hearing the beacon. Also, a DEV in a child piconet will be required to synchronize with the beacon it hears from the child PNC. How can it also synchronize with he parent PNC? The child PNC uses the piconet timing of it's parent to determine when to send out its beacon and shall not allocate any more time than allocated by the parent PNC.

I think the resolution of this is more than just inserting the suggested sentence. Either change sentence to make it clear that the clock of the child and neighbor PNC are the only ones involved instead of all the DEVs in each subnetwork, or clean up the text in both sections to make sure that only one 'shall' statement is present

1126 (Roberts, T) - Suggest accept in principle, "Add a sentence after 'All DEVs within a single piconet shall be synchronized to the PNC 's clock.' that says 'In addition, child or neighbor PNCs shall synchronize their networks time usage to the parent PNC's beacon and their allocated GTS time.'"

Accept suggested resolution.

783 (Shvodian, TR) - The disassociation command requires authentication if authentication is required. Put and X in the Authenticated column of the Disassociation request command. Suggest accept.

Table until Thursday, 1 Aug, 2002. Re-categorize this one as security. Find the other security comment that discusses what to do when you receive insecure frames in a secure piconet.

311 (Shvodian, TR) - The disassociation request command should be integrity protected in a secure piconet. Add the following text: The disassociation request command shall use the secure command format in piconets using security mode 2 or 3. **Suggest accept.**

Accept in principle, "Add the sentence 'The disassociation request command shall use the secure command format if the DEV is authenticated in the piconet.'"

977 (Bain, T) - There is the omission of mention that a PNC that is either a child or neighbor may be found. They are valid as opposed to a PNC that is not of the child or neighbor type. (8.2.1, p 152, line 21) "same channel, that is not a valid child or neighbor PNC, it may ...." **Suggest accept.**

Accept in principle, "On 8.2.1, p 152, line 21, change 'same channel it may' to be 'same channel, that is not one of its own child or neighbor piconets, it may ...'"

979 (Bain, T) - It is not stated how the beacon number field is handled when the PNC is attempting a dynamic channel change. Does it continue to increment as if it was still sending beacons? This would be best for SPS DEVs. At end of 1st sentence, add a sentence as follows "The PNC shall continue to increment beacon count during the period when it is searching other channels." **Suggest accept.**

Accept in principle, "At end of 1st sentence, add a sentence as follows, 'The PNC shall increment the beacon number field by the number of beacons not sent while seaching the other channels when it resumes sending beacons.'"

949 (Bain, TR) - It would seem that all MTS should follow the same rule in using the maximum transmit power IE. The text calls for directed in both directions but not open or association. The text also does not note that the PNC shall use that setting for CAP and MTSs. See also comment in clause 5.3.11 page 20. "CAP, beacon and MTSs." on line 3. "in the CAP or MTSs to be ..." on line 7. " for the beacon, CAP, and MTSs to be ..." on line 8. **Suggest accept.**

Accept in principle, "The association MTS is exempt from the piconet maximum transmit power. Change 'for the CAP, beacon and directed MTSs.' to be 'for the CAP, beacon, and MTSs, excluding association MTSs.' on line 3, page 205. On line 7, page 205, from 'the CAP or directed MTSs' to be 'for the CAP or MTSs, excluding association MTSs.'"

485 (Gilb, T)

Tabled until text is available.

## 1.2.2 Tabled issues

202, 204, 402 (Heberling, TR) - Services broadcast not standardized, thus not interoperable and must be removed from standard. Remove MLME\_ASSOCIATE.request parameter DEVPiconetServicesIE. **Suggest**

**accept in principle**, “Adding the vendor IE to the associate request and response commands as outlined in 02/276r0 will take care of problems with standardization. Since this information is needed to provide a fast response time, the DEV PiconetServicesIE will remain in the associate request command.”

Possible proposal, vendor string + vendor specific IE but not DEV PiconetServicesIE.  
Table until Monday, 29 July 2002, Jay Bain will provide suggested text.

Table again until Wednesday, 31 July 2002, Jay Bain will provide suggested text by COB 29 July 2002.

920 (Bain, T) - It seems that information on what type of CAP/MTS used by piconet is not returned as part of a scan. Since MTS is optional in PICS a DEV may not support this and thus consider joining a different piconet. Add the CAP information from the channel timing IE to the MLME-SCAN.indicate primitive. Place as additional field in piconetdescriptionset in table 5. **Suggest accept**.

Need to add MAC parameter set to piconet description set and change the name of piconet description set for remote scan and add a new table. Also shows up in neighbor/child MLME set. ADH to work on it.  
Table until Monday, 29 July 2002.

Table again until Wednesday, 31 July 2002, ADH will provide suggested text by COB 29 July 2002.

#### **CTM/Isoch/Term\***

919 (Bain, T)) This relates to another comment directed to 8.5.1 on MSCs. The indication does not free the resources in PNC-DME that were allocated in other primitives for CTA. We have a MLME-TERMINATE-CTA.ind but it is not for the PNC DME. We need to define an additional primitive for this. **Suggest reject** since CID 155 redefines the MLME-TERMINATION-CTA.indication primitive.

Source terminating is informed by the ACK from the PNC.  
The target is informed of termination with the null-CTAs.

Target terminating is informed by the ACK from the PNC.  
Source is informed of termination with the channel time response command.

PNC terminating informs the target with the null-CTAs.  
PNC terminating informs source with channel time response command.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Accept in principle, “The procedure for termination has been modified so that the PNC DME is no longer informed of the stream termination as indicated in the resolution of comment 155. Thus the MLME is no longer needed.

ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

410 (Heberling, TR) Delete the MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication primitive since the PNC DME does not care about this piece of information only its MLME does. Consequently, the MLME can handle deallocating the ct allocated to the stream index specified when terminating this stream. Also, only isochronous data associated with a stream index requires a specific termination request. Asynchronous data follows a different set of rules. In the case where a target DEV is disassociating, the disassociation process spelled out in clause 6.3.6, clause 7.5.1.3, clause 8.3.4 and illustrated in Figure 102 will take care of notifying the PNC and the source DEV that the target DEV is no longer available to receive any data(asynch or isoch) **Suggest reject** deletion of MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication primitive per CID 155. .AND. **Sug-**

**gest accept** process describing disassociation and MSC as preferred method of terminating a stream when a DEV disassociates.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

155 (Heberling, TR) KO> MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication not used for target, only source. Consequently, for clause 6.3.14.10 MLME\_TERMINATION\_CTA.indication <change from> This primitive is used to inform the target DEV that channel time that was previously allocated is no longer present in the most recently received beacon. <to> This primitive is used to inform the source DEV that channel time that was previously allocated is no longer present in the most recently received beacon. **Suggest accept**

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

364 (Heberling, TR) Please change this sentence frag. from "...followed by a beacon in which the CTAs assigned to the indicated stream index are set to a null CTA..." to " followed by a beacon in which the CTAs assigned to the indicated stream index are removed." In the case where the SrcDEV is requesting the termination of the stream, the ACK to its request is sufficient. The receiving DEV will know that the stream has been deallocated by the absence of the CTAs associated with the stream index. This is a more concise means of terminating the stream CTA. In the case where the DestDEV is doing the termination the same rules apply. The SrcDEV will be notified via the absence of the CTA in the beacon. **Suggest accept**

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

907 (Bain,TR) Grammatical errors and reference to figure 118 is incorrect and does not pertain to text in this section. Consequently, change the paragraph to the following: "In the case where the PNC wishes to terminate the stream, it shall notify the originating DEV and the target DEV via the next periodic beacon that the CTAs assigned to the indicated stream index are set to a null CTA value for aMinBeaconInfoRepeat duration." **Suggest reject** pending acceptance of CID 364

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

120 (Heberling, TR) Change this sentence from "In the case where the originating DEV that wishes to terminate is the stream is the PNC,..." to " In the case where the originator of the stream termination request is the PNC, the PNC shall simply remove the CTAs associated with the terminated stream index from the next beacon." **Suggest accept** pending acceptance of CID 364

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

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

366 (Heberling, TR) The sentences between lines 44 and 46 are redundant. Therefore delete them. **Suggest accept** pending acceptance of CID 364.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

917 (Bain, TR) - The figures 117 and 118 should change to add the indication to PNC DME and to add the block noting the operation taking place in the PNC DME that allows the MAC and DME to be synched on resources. Other change needs to be in 6.3.14.10 and is a different comment. **Suggest reject** for these reasons: Fig. 118 is better represented by Fig. 102 which describes more precisely what happens when a DEV disassociates from the piconet and what the effect upon a stream would be. Fig. 117 do not require the required primitive since CIDs 155 and 364 describe a more efficient means of terminating a stream.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

Table again until Friday, 2 August, 2002. ADH will work on unified text for CTA termination, due by Friday 2 August, 2002.

**1.2.3 CTM/CTR**

45 (Heberling, TR) KO> Text makes no sense. The PNC allocates what it's asked for. The PNC will not go back and reallocate more time if its available later. The client is always responsible for requesting changes. Consequently, delete line 26-28. **Suggest accept**.

Table until Wednesday 31 July, 2002. Gilb will suggest new text, due by COB 30 July, 2002.

**1.2.4 CTM/CTRType**

161 (Heberling, TR) KO> Always use MACRO names for enumerated values so the reader can easily search the standard for occurrences and easily verify the implementation against the text. In this case it's worse because one type suggests that the DEV can change the MTS allocation. It can not! Consequently, reduce CTR type field to 1 bit. 0 -> ACTIVE\_GTS 1 -> SPS\_GTS. **Suggest accept**.

Withdrawn

Meeting adjourned 10:40 PDT, 29 July 2002.

**1.3 Friday, 19 July, 2002**

Attendees: Allen Heberling, Jay Bain, Jeyhan Karaoguz, Ari Singer, James Gilb, Bill Shvodian, Knut Odman, Mark Schrader.

Meeting called to order at 8:08 am PDT.

**1.3.1 Tabled issues**

3 (Heberling, TR) - A stream with del-ACK policy cannot be used with any other ACK-Request. Neither can the policy be changed, because enqueued frames with different ACK-Policy (del-ACK and other) will create unresolvable protocol conflicts. Consequently if del-ACK is declined by the destination, the stream must be terminated. 8.8.3, Insert line 9: Delayed Acknowledgement can only be used with isochronous data. Insert line 23, before "The destination DEV may change the max burst..." Upon reception of an imm-ACK frame

after sending a data frame with the ACK request field set to del-ACK, the source DEV MAC shall: -issue a MLME\_TERMINATE\_STREAM.indication to DME - send a Channel Time Request frame to PNC with the terminate bit set to 1 and the desired CT to 0.” **Suggest accept in principle**, “Change ‘shall be used only for directed stream data frames where’ to be ‘shall be used only for directed stream data frames, i.e. isochronous connections, where’ Add text to the section that says ‘The source DEV may change the ACK policy in a stream from Dly-ACK to Imm-ACK or no ACK by sending a frame with the ACK policy set to one of those values. This has the effect of canceling the Dly-ACK policy and the souce shall use the Dly-ACK negotiaion procedure before restarting the Dly-ACK mechanism. The receiver shall no longer maintain the ACK status of any previous frames sent with the Dly-ACK policy set.”

Accept proposed resolution with addition of a reason code for MLME-ISOCH-DATA.confirm that indicates when a delayed-ACK negotiation failed. See 02/276r3 for information on this addition.

202, 204, 402 (Heberling, TR) - Services broadcast not standardized, thus not interoperable and must be removed from standard. Remove MLME\_ASSOCIATE.request parameter DEVPiconetServicesIE. **Suggest accept in principle**, “Adding the vendor IE to the associate request and response commands as outlined in 02/276r0 will take care of problems with standardization. Since this information is needed to provide a fast response time, the DEVPiconetServicesIE will remain in the associate request command.”

Possible proposal,vendor string + vendor specific IE but not DEVPiconetServicesIE.  
Table until Monday, 29 July 2002, Jay Bain will provide suggested text.

920 (Bain, T) - It seems that information on what type of CAP/MTS used by piconet is not returned as part of a scan. Since MTS is optional in PICS a DEV may not support this and thus consider joining a different piconet. Add the CAP information from the channel timing IE to the MLME-SCAN.indicate primitive. Place as additional field in piconetdescriptionset in table 5. **Suggest accept**.

Need to add MAC parameter set to piconet description set and change the name of piconet description set for remote scan and add a new table. Also shows up in neighbor/child MLME set. ADH to work on it.  
Table until Monday, 29 July 2002.

Email comments due 19 July, 2002. No opposition, so resolutions will be applied as per 02/273r4.

### 1.3.2 CTM/Isoch/Mod

19 (Heberling, TR) KO> MLME\_MODIFY\_CTA.request can only modify the channel time and requested layout of the CTA, not destination and other parameters. Consequently, delete the following parameters from MLME\_MODIFY\_CTA.request and MLME\_MODIFY\_CTA.indication: NumTrgts, TrgtIdList, OrigID, SPSSetIndex, MinNumTUs (= what you already have!) NumAsyncTUs (see comment about asynch data) Replace CTR-Control with individual parameters CTR-Interval, GTS-Type and CTR-Interval-Type **Suggest Accept** the indicated parameters from the MLME\_MODIFY\_CTA.request. However, MLME-MODIFY-CTA.indication is a moot point due to acceptance of CID 33.

Pending confirmation that this matches changes already adopted for clause 8.  
Accept in principle, “Delete the following parameters from MLME\_MODIFY\_CTA.request and MLME\_MODIFY\_CTA.indication: NumTrgts, TrgtIdList, OrigID, SPSSetIndex, NumAsyncTUs. Replace CTR-Control with individual parameters CTR-Interval, GTS-Type and CTR-Interval-Type.

360 (Heberling, TR) Please delete this sentence: "Minimum number of TUs field is set to either the original value requested or anew value ..." The minimum value should be a fixed quantity. It is the DesiredNumber-OfTUs which is negotiable. **Suggest accept**.

Withdrawn

918 (Bain, TR) In the figure 115, it would seem the two .reqs on the right side should be .ind and .rsp. **Suggest reject** per acceptance of CID 33.

Accept in principle, "The .ind and .rsp MLMEs will be deleted per acceptance of CID 33."

**1.3.3 CTM/Isoch/Term\***

919 (Bain, T)) This relates to another comment directed to 8.5.1 on MSCs. The indication does not free the resources in PNC-DME that were allocated in other primitives for CTA. We have a MLME-TERMINATE-CTA.ind but it is not for the PNC DME. We need to define an additional primitive for this. **Suggest reject** since CID 155 redefines the MLME-TERMINATION-CTA.indication primitive.

Source terminating is informed by the ACK from the PNC.

The target is informed of termination with the null-CTAs.

Target terminating is informed by the ACK from the PNC.

Source is informed of termination with the channel time response command.

PNC terminating informs the target with the null-CTAs.

PNC terminating informs source with channel time response command.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

410 (Heberling, TR) Delete the MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication primitive since the PNC DME does not care about this piece of information only its MLME does. Consequently, the MLME can handle deallocating the ct allocated to the stream index specified when terminating this stream. Also, only isochronous data associated with a stream index requires a specific termination request. Asynchronous data follows a different set of rules. In the case where a target DEV is disassociating, the disassociation process spelled out in clause 6.3.6, clause 7.5.1.3, clause 8.3.4 and illustrated in Figure 102 will take care of notifying the PNC and the source DEV that the target DEV is no longer available to receive any data(asynch or isoch) **Suggest reject** deletion of MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication primitive per CID 155. **AND. Suggest accept** process describing disassociation and MSC as preferred method of terminating a stream when a DEV disassociates.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

155 (Heberling, TR) KO> MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication not used for target, only source. Consequently, for clause 6.3.14.10 MLME\_TERMINATION\_CTA.indication <change from> This primitive is used to inform the target DEV that channel time that was previously allocated is no longer present in the most recently received beacon. <to> This primitive is used to inform the source DEV that channel time that was previously allocated is no longer present in the most recently received beacon. **Suggest accept**

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

364 (Heberling, TR) Please change this sentence frag. from "...followed by a beacon in which the CTAs assigned to the indicated stream index are set to a null CTA..." to " followed by a beacon in which the CTAs assigned to the indicated stream index are removed." In the case where the SrcDEV is requesting the termination of the stream, the ACK to its request is sufficient. The receiving DEV will know that the stream has been deallocated by the absence of the CTAs associated with the stream index. This is a more concise means of terminating the stream CTA. In the case where the DestDEV is doing the termination the same rules apply. The SrcDEV will be notified via the absence of the CTA in the beacon. **Suggest accept**

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002



907 (Bain,TR) Grammatical errors and reference to figure 118 is incorrect and does not pertain to text in this section. Consequently, change the paragraph to the following: "In the case where the PNC wishes to terminate the stream, it shall notify the originating DEV and the target DEV via the next periodic beacon that the CTAs assigned to the indicated stream index are set to a null CTA value for aMinBeaconInfoRepeat duration." **Suggest reject** pending acceptance of CID 364

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

120 (Heberling, TR) Change this sentence from "In the case where the originating DEV that wishes to terminate is the stream is the PNC,..." to " In the case where the originator of the stream termination request is the PNC, the PNC shall simply remove the CTAs associated with the terminated stream index from the next beacon." **Suggest accept** pending acceptance of CID 364

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

366 (Heberling, TR) The sentences between lines 44 and 46 are redundant. Therefore delete them. **Suggest accept** pending acceptance of CID 364.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

917 (Bain, TR) - The figures 117 and 118 should change to add the indication to PNC DME and to add the block noting the operation taking place in the PNC DME that allows the MAC and DME to be synched on resources. Other change needs to be in 6.3.14.10 and is a different comment. **Suggest reject** for these reasons: Fig. 118 is better represented by Fig. 102 which describes more precisely what happens when a DEV disassociates from the piconet and what the effect upon a stream would be. Fig. 117 do not require the required primitive since CIDs 155 and 364 describe a more efficient means of terminating a stream.

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002

**1.3.4 Others**

445 (Gilb, TR) - Not all IEs should be able to be retrieved from all DEVs as a result of a probe command. Add a table of all of the IEs (possibly adding another 2 columns to table 46) that indicate if the element may be returned by the PNC or a DEV. For example, the piconet synchronization IE or piconet BSID would be returned by the PNC but not a DEV. Both the PNC and DEV would return the capabilities field. The CTA IEs or PCTM IE, on the other hand, would never be returned in response to a probe request since they only really belong in the beacon. **Suggest accept in principle:** Add the tables of valid IEs that may be sent or requested based on the tables in document 02/271r0.

Accept suggested resolution.

455 (Gilb, TR) - The probe MSC needs some work. The timeout closes when the .cfm is received. Also, we need to add and indication that the exchange of probe commands goes on until someone runs out of things to say. **Suggest accept.**

Accept.

655 (Gilb, TR) - If a MLME-PROBE.response can contain a request for IEs from the target dev for the response, then the dev generating the MLME-PROBE.response should set a "ProbeTimeout" timer before sending the probe command. This means that the MLME-PROBE.response primitive should contain a parameter named ProbeTimeout. Figure 127 should be modified to show this timer as well. The timer should be set each time a response includes an embedded request. This is the price to pay for overloading the primitives. Change as indicated. **Suggest accept.**

Accept

142 (Heberling, TR) - Timeouts only works in the client in the vertical direction. A client cannot set a timeout for its server, less the entire distributed state machine in the scheduler is completely specified (RTOS theory). Delete paragraph on line 9-16: "To accomodate peer discovery and peer-to-peer communication ... the required channel backoff time will be in addition to the delay described above". **Suggest accept in principle**, "The timeout applies only to a single DEV, i.e. a compliant DEV is required to create a response within a specified period of time after it receives the request. To clarify this, change 'A DEV that receives a probe command with any information request bit set shall respond with a probe command, 7.5.4.3, with its response within aProbeResponseDelay.' to 'A DEV that receives a probe command with any information request bit set shall respond with a probe command, 7.5.4.3, with its response within {xref aProbeResponseDelay} time of when it received the probe command.'"

Accept proposed resolution.

### 1.3.5 CTM/IsochMSC

135 (Heberling, TR) KO> Requests for asynchronous and isochronous channel time have two completely different sequences. Therefore the two can never be combined in the same request. Consequently, <add two sentences> The same channel time request frame cannot contain CTRB for both asynchronous and isochronous channel time. Incorrectly formatted requests shall be rejected by the PNC with the result code set to ILLEGAL\_REQUEST. **Suggest Accept**

Table until Tuesday, 30 July 2002. Homework to everyone to review 02/109r0 to see why it might be a problem to combine requests.

122 (Heberling, TR) 1) The channel time request command in the MSC has the wrong parameter indicated. Replace the "DCTR-TUs=0" with "Stream Termination bit=1" This change will make the MSC consistent with the text description in clause 8.5.1.3. 2) Move the MLME-TERMINATE-CTA(STREAM).confirm from its current position in the MSC to just below the ACK . This is a more appropriate location for the confirm, since the requesting DEV will have received confirmation via the ACK that the PNC received its request to terminate the CTAs associated with a specific stream index. Also remove the phrase w/(Null CTA, SI=x) from the beacon. There is no need for a null CTA. Finally, remove the MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM.indication from the MSC since the receiving DEV-3 DME doesn't need to know anything about the terminated stream. **Suggest Accept**

Accept in principle, "Replace the "DCTR-TUs=0" with "Stream Termination bit=1". 2) Move the MLME-TERMINATE-CTA(STREAM).confirm from its current position in the MSC to just below the ACK."

812 (Shvodian, TR) Termination Bit should be used to terminate the stream, not Des-TU set to 0 **Suggest Accept** or **withdraw** pending acceptance of CID 122.

Accept.

### 1.3.6 More comments

988 (Bain, TR) - To support the MLME-InitDependentPNC.request/confirm, text in this sub-clause should support the action of starting a dependent PNC. See previous 6.3.x comment. see 02/289. **Suggest accept** "Add the text in 02/289r0 for subclause 8.2.4, including the MSCs that describes the use of the MLME-INIT-DEPENDENTPNC.xxx primitives to start dependent piconets."

Table until Monday, 29 July, 2002. Do we need to send the PNID of the child up to the parent. JB, KO, ADH, JPKG, MS to review documents on email.

452 (Gilb, TR) - Shouldn't neighbor and child piconets request pseudo-static GTSs? In the case of a child piconet, if it doesn't, the beacon timing may move around, confusing members of the child piconet and making power saving difficult. Change "request a private GTS." to be "request a pseudo-static private GTS." here and change line 15, page 157 from "to obtain a private GTS for the neighbor piconet." to be "to obtain a pseudo-static private GTS for the neighbor piconet." **Suggest accept in principle** Delete the concept of a "private" GTS and use pseudo-static GTS wherever private is found. (check whole document).

Accept in principle, "Change 'request a private GTS.' to be 'request a pseudo-static private GTS.' here and change line 15, page 157 from 'to obtain a private GTS for the neighbor piconet.' to be 'to obtain a pseudo-static private GTS for the neighbor piconet.'"

198 (Heberling, TR) - If one allowed hierarchical piconets ad absurdum the integrity of the TDMA protocol could not be maintained. <add sentence> A child PNC shall decline the start of a subordinate client or neighbor piconet within its private CTA. **Suggest accept in principle** - The standard does not provide for child of child since the Parent Address (ethernet address) is included in the Child or Neighbor beacon. The text in 8.2.4 and 8.2.5 should indicate this to clarify. However, the start of a child in a neighbor piconet should not be precluded. This may be only if the neighbor is non-15.3 but should be for both neighbor cases if possible.

Withdrawn

960 (Bain, T) - It is not clear that only a single child piconet may exist in a single parent piconet. Clarify! It would seem that more than a single child could exist. If so, then the text in the draft should reflect that and also correct words for which child takes over the piconet and using what process. **Suggest accept in principle** "Add text in 5.3.2.1 and 8.2.4 to mention that more than a single child piconet is possible from a common parent piconet."

Accept in principle, "Add text in 5.3.2.1 and 8.2.4 to mention that more than a single child piconet is possible from a common parent piconet. Also add text that mentions that a child of a child or child of a neighbor is possible."

91 (Heberling, TR) - It should be possible for a PNC to deny creation of a child piconet. On line 41 add text: If the PNC rejects the creation of a child piconet, it shall set the ReasonCode of the channel time response command to CHILD\_UNSUPPORTED. **Suggest accept in principle** Since support of child piconets is an option, the comment is correct that a reasoncode of child\_unsupported is added. HOWEVER, it is dangerous precedent to allow PNCs that support pseudo-static GTS to not support child or neighbor piconets. Also, although for neighbors, this is a coexistence mechanism. We need a better answer.

Table until Tuesday, 30 July, 2002.

Meeting ended 10:01 PDT.

### 1.4 Email comments due Monday, 29 July, 2002

116 (Heberling, TR) Replace the channel time status command in the MSC with channel time response command. This requested change is consistent with the requested command name change in clause 7 ( CID 104: "Change the clause title from " Channel time status command" to Channel time response command". This name change is more concise and less likely to be confused with the channel status commands.). Move the Chk-Resources and Allocate Resources processes from the PNC DME to the PNC MLME in the MSC. Doc. 01/469r5 figure 3, page 13 had it right the first time. IN addition, the primitives currently passing from the PNC MLME to the PNC DME are incorrectly labeled. Finally, even though they are incorrectly labeled they are unneeded. So delete the primitives from figure 115. Also make sure to get rid of MLME-Modify-Stream.indication and .response from clause 6.3.14.6 and 6.3.14.7 since they are not needed. **Suggest**

**Accept** these items: 1) changing channel time status command to channel time response; 2) the others per acceptance of CIDs(413, 414, 33, 409)

118 (Heberling, TR) Replace the channel time status command in the MSC with channel time response command. This requested change is consistent with the requested command name change in clause 7. Move the Chk-Resources process from the PNC DME to the PNC MLME. And delete the MLME-Modify-Stream.ind/rsp from the MSC. Again doc: 01/469r5 had it right the first time. **Suggest Accept** per acceptance of CID 116 and per previous acceptance of CIDs (413, 414, 33, 409)

371 (Heberling, TR) - Figure 118 is an incorrect MSC of what happens when a Target DEV disassociates from a piconet. Figure 102 is the correct MSC. Consequently, either remove figure 118 or replace it with figure 102. **Suggest Accept** "Remove figure 118."

968 (Bain, T) - The ParentDEVAddress parameter description lacks text regarding a valid 15.3 neighbor found. "... is a child piconet or 15.3 neighbor piconet,..."**Suggest accept.**

986 (Bain, TR) - For a normal piconet start, the MLME-START.request contains MACParameterSet, PiconetMaxTXPower in addition to several other parameters. In that child and 15.3 neighbors "start" in different ways than MLME-START.request, a different mechanism should be defined. The MLME-START could be used (since the parameters of interest are present) but that is a very wierd overloading. MLME-Init-DependentPNC.request This primitive is used to begin the operation of the child or neighbor PNC. The semantics of the primitive need definition. MLME-InitDependentPNC.confirm This primitive is used to inform the DME that the dependent PNC was able to initiate operation with the parameters sent with the request primitive. In clause 8, in the appropriate child or neighbor sub-clause. An MLME-InitDependent-PNC.request shall be sent to the DEV after association and channel time allocation for a neighbor, or after channel time allocation for the child. The DEV would then apply the parameters of the MLME- before sending the first beacon it sends as a PNC. Note: The new MLME should come after the channel time is granted by the PNC. Because at least one PNC parameter is based on the resulting granted time, the DME should first inspect the granted time and then initiate piconet operation for the child or neighbor. The graphics need to be changed as well in 8.2.4 and 8.2.5 to include the step in the correct location. see 02/289. **Suggest accept** "Add the text in 02/289r0 for the MLME-INIT-DEPENDENTPNC.xxx with the correction that the parameter list of 6.3.x change to match planned reorganization of the piconet description set and MAC parameter set. Include text to be added to 8.2.4

587 (Gilb, TR) - If a parent piconet ends operation and a child piconet continues to operate without disruption, does the child piconet use all the airtime previously used by the parent piconet or does the child piconet continue to operate in the space previously allotted by the parent? Is this specified anywhere? What if multiple child piconets exist, or a child and a neighbor piconet both exist, when a parent piconet ends? **Suggest accept in principle** "The new handover procedures will let one of the child piconets take over the full channel if there are no other child or neighbor PNCs. see comment xx on what happens if multiples.

681 (Gilb, T) and several editorials - I don't understand this figure. Neither "unassigned GTS time" field fits exactly into the parent's CFP. Perhaps you meant the second one shown on the righthand side of the diagram. In that case the first one shown at the left should not be marked with an asterisk. **Suggest accept in principle** - There are several suggestions. Update the figure to use the form similar to that of figure 97. Suggest Mark S. does the update.

350 (Heberling, TR) <add text> Only the child PNC, which is a direct member of the parent PNC, can be allowed to exchange data with other members of the parant PNC. The reason is that the child piconet DEVs and the parant piconet DEVs may have the same DEVID but different PNID. Receivers must filter frames on both PNID and DestID to make sure they get only the frames addressed to them. Consequently two DEVs with the same DEVID in different piconets cannot exchange data. If this functionality is desired one would need a child PNC data forwarding capability which is currently not defined in the standard. The non-PNC members of the child piconet may not exchange data with any DEV in the parent piconet. **Suggest accept in**

**principle** - The text of 8.2.4 should have clarification that the standard does not provide for the direct transfer between a member of a child piconet and a member of a parent piconet. Furthermore, this includes any other child piconets that are dependents of the parent. The text of 02/316r0 plus a bit.

956 (Bain, T) - In this draft is a statement that a child piconet could form to enhance the range of a piconet. If the DEVs already part of the parent move to the child, what happens? Do they stay associated but release their channel time with the parent and reestablish channel time within the child piconet private GTS? Do child PNCs use the same address space as the parent? If so how does the child PNC obtain DEVID numbers from the parent when previously unassociated DEVs decide to join the child piconet (by whatever means they can distinguish the parent from the child)? If new address space for child piconet, it is assumed that all previously established DEVs with the parent will have to disassociate themselves from the parent and reassociate with the child. Add at end of paragraph "For child piconets established to extend the range of the parent piconet (xref) all DEVs moving from the parent would disassociate from the parent and reassociate with the child piconet." **Suggest accept in principle** "Add text to 8.2.4 that indicates that DEVs of a parent do not move to the child without going through disassociate/reassociate process."

582 (Gilb, TR) Need to specify what a parent or neighbor does if it misses 4 consecutive beacons. Should it be required to stop its beacon as well? Need to address the issue of what happens if lots of beacons are lost for child and neighbor piconets. Add text that describes the requirements to 8.2.4 and 8.2.5. **Suggest accept** There doesn't seem to be an alternative to not stopping operations of child or neighbor piconets after 4 consecutive parent PNC beacons are missed.

417 (Heberling, TR) - PiconetBSID as a parameter to establish the id of the piconet is not specified in the MLME-START.request parm list. Please add the PiconetBSID parm to the parm list before the PNID parm. Please make the requested change. **Suggest accept**.

894 (Bain, TR) MLME-START.confirm seems to be lacking parameters based on the text of sub-clause 8.2.1 (pg 151, ln 48) and 8.2.2 (pg 152, ln 35). The text indicates that the ChannelRatingList is in the MLME-START.confirm primitive and it is not present. recommended text will be in 02/289. **Suggest accept in principle**, "Add the ChannelRatingList and PiconetDescriptionSet to the parameters of MLME-START.confirm. See also CID 8."

8 (Heberling, TR) - MLME-START.confirm parameter list is not in agreement with the parameter list specified in clause 8.2.2. Please add the PiconetDescriptionSet, and ChannelRatingList parms to the MLME-START.confirm primitive. Please add the ChannelRatingList parameter to the MLME-START.confirm primitive and to Table 6. **Suggest accept in principle**, "Add the ChannelRatingList and PiconetDescriptionSet to the parameters of MLME-START.confirm. See also CID 894."

893 (Bain, T) - The MLME-START.confirm primitive and the text of this paragraph do not match. Also, it is a primitive and not a command. The text in this clause other than the editorial of command vs primitive, seems to match the intent so the change should be in clause 6 MLME-START.request/confirm more in 02/289. **Suggest accept in principle** 'The text in 8 is correct, so the parameters of the primitive in clause 6 will be changed as indicated in CIDs 894 and 8. In 8.2.2, change 'MLME-START.confirm command' to be 'MLME-START.confirm primitive'.'

908 (Bain, T) - CFPDuration parameter in the Elements of MACParameterSet table has a description that says "The duration in microseconds allocate to the CAP within the superframe" It would seem that some adjustment is necessary! Information in this table ties to Piconet synchronization parameters, 7.4.3. But, it is not clear what is intended in this case since the CAP value must be dynamic as the beacon duration changes. Is this a nominal split between CAP and CFP? **Suggest accept in principle**, "This parameter indicates the initial setting of the CAP duration. Therefore, change "CFPDuration" to be "CAPDuration" in table 7 and change the description to read 'The duration in microseconds initially allocated to the CAP within the superframe.'

110 (Heberling, T) - Move the paragraphs between lines 19 and 27 from their current location to line 44 in clause 8.2.2. The new location for this paragraph makes more sense given the content described in the moved paragraph. In addition to moving the indicated paragraph, modify the paragraph to this text: " Once a PNC has established a piconet, the PNC should periodically allocate channel time in the CFP such that there is quiet time for it to scan the channel for other piconets. If the PNC detects another piconet in the same channel it may take action to improve coexistence with the other piconet. Some of the actions the PNC may take include: - Changing to a different channel, 8.11 - Becoming a child or neighbor piconet of the other piconet, 8.2.4 and 8.2.5 - Reducing the piconet's transmit power, 8.x.1. **Suggest accept.**

912 (Bain, T) - The length field shows one less than the number of octets shown in the fields of this figure. Change length to be 3 in value instead of 2. **Suggest accept.**

951 (Bain, T) - Suggest adding clarification on interference to mean to others. Also, the extending battery life by reducing transmit power is not a characteristic of all possible alt-PHYs. "interference to other networks" on line 18 "in some PHY types to extend battery life" also line 10 should have the same change as above related to extending battery life. **Suggest accept.**

950 (Bain, T) - IF the comment on 8.13.1 is accepted, then the text in 5.3.11 should change to match. Remove "directed" from "directed MTSs" change "PNC reduce ..." to PNC and DEVS during these piconet control fields to reduce ...". Suggest accept in principle "Change the text in 5.3.11 to match the change adopted for the resolution of CID 949"

## 1.5 Thursday, 18 July, 2002

Attendees: James Gilb, Mark Schraeder, Jay Bain, Bill Shvodian, Ari Singer, Allen Heberling, Jeyhan Karaoguz, James Allen.

Called to order at 8:10 am, PDT, 18 July, 2002.

398 (Heberling, TR) - Delete the BSID field from the piconet parm change info element. Replace the change time out field with a NbrOfChangeBeacons field. Also delete the text definition of the BSID field located at P120, L4-5. Since based on the analysis of C8.2.1 and C8.2.7 it makes no sense to change the BSID on the fly. The new format of the Piconet parm change IE shall be as illustrated here: |ElementID|Length= 4|ChangeBcnCntDown(1)|NewChannelIndex(1)|PNID(2)| See doc: 02/276r0 Page 22 for new text descriptions and recommended text changes. **Suggest accept in principle**, "The change time out field will be changed to NbrOfChangeBeacons (or similar name). However, the setting of the BSID is under user control and provides a human friendly manner to identify the piconet (i.e. a text string instead of list of hex numbers). Because of this, the user will want to be able to set this value from time to time without re-starting the entire piconet and re-program every DEV in thier net. However, since it is intended for use control, it is unlikely that it will change very often."

Accept suggested resolution.

194 (Heberling, TR) - When PNC switches channels, the DEVS cannot be free to change at any time within a timeout. If they switch early (or late) they will not hear a beacon and eventually issue a MLME\_SYNCH\_LOST.indication to their DME. The switch must be synchronized. A similar manner as the new handover proposal is used with a count down to switch. All DEVS must stay awake to receive the beacons and they must switch at the same time. No DEV shall be allowed to transmit until they have correctly received a CTA from their PNC on the new channel. See doc: 02276r0, page 21, resolution [10] Changing Channels. **Suggest accept in principle** "DEVS will be allowed to stay in PS mode during a channel change. However, the channel change will become a countdown of beacons as indicated in the resolution of other comments. Additional text will be added to the channel change sub-clause that indicates that a DEV

that is the source of a pseudo-static slot shall not be allowed to transmit until it has heard the first beacon after the channel was scheduled to change.”

Accept suggested resolution.

501 (Gilb, TR) - We have not described what action to take when a command frame is received by a DEV. Add a table that lists the commands and the actions to take (accept, may accept or shall ignore) that lists if the frame is received from a DEV or PNC and if it is received secure or insecure. **Suggest accept.**

Accept suggested resolution.

437 (Gilb, TR) - We are using different methods to communicate lists of DEVIDs, we really should use only one. Change all lists of DEVIDs (except in the CTR) to match the format used for the PCTM IE, 7.4.15, e.g. the SPS status IE. **Suggest accept.**

Accept suggested resolution.

old comment, 495 in 02/055r15 (Gubbi, TR) - Reserve 0xF0 to 0xF9 for future use: We never know what else we'll need special addresses for. Reserve 0xF0 to 0xF9 for future use. **Suggest accept in principle** (previously accepted), “Reserve 0xF0 to 0xF6 for future use, 0xF7 through 0xF9 were reserved for additional neighbor piconets.”

Accept suggested resolution.

708 (Gilb, TR) - I think this subclause needs some work. For example, what happens when retransmitting a fragment? Presumably the fragment number is not increased in that case and the standard should say so. If the first fragment of an MSDU cannot be transmitted, shouldn't the remaining fragments be discarded? How many MSDUs must potentially be reassembled at one time? Since the standard says that "multiple" SDUs may be retransmitted in a fragment burst, it should provide a value for this maximum number. On line 20, this subclause talks about delivery to the FCSL. On line 38, it talks about delivery to the SSCS. One term should be used consistently, in addition to the provision of answers for the issues I raised in the comment section. **Suggest accept in principle:** “Change all references to SSCS to be FCSL, as well as the spelled out versions. In subclause 8.7 change ‘Each subsequent fragment is sent with the fragment number incremented by one.’ to say ‘Each subsequent fragment shall be sent with the fragment number incremented by one. However, the fragment number shall not be increased when a fragment is retransmitted.’ However, the maximum number of MSDUs that may potentially be reassembled at any give time depends on the specific implementation as well as the number of other connections that the DEV is currently supporting. If a DEV runs out of room to store the fragments, it drops the MSDU, as indicated in the draft.”

Accept suggested resolution.

448 (Gilb, TR) - The SPS information response command could be quite long. There needs to add a way to fragment the command. Either change the command to allow fragmentation as in the PNC handover information command or allow this command to be fragmented. **Suggest accept** “Change the text in clause 7 and 8 to reflect the fact that certain commands may be fragmented. Add the SPS information response command to this list. Add a table or list in 7.5 with the commands that may be fragmented and a cross-reference in subclause 8.7 that says “The commands that are allowed be fragmented are listed in {xref 7.5}. Also, delete the fragmentation field entry from Tables 44 and 45 and add text to the 7.3.3 ‘Only certain commands are allowed to be fragmented as indicated in {xref 7.5}. For commands that are not allowed to be fragmented, the fragment number and the max fragment number field shall be set to 0””

Accept suggested resolution.

449 (Gilb, TR) - There are now three commands that may need fragmentation and we have adopted a command level fragmentation rather than using the existing process. Change the rules to allow fragmentation for only the following commands: PNC handover information command (remove last fields and text) PNC information command (remove last fields and text) SPS inquiry response command. The first two changes require updating the text and MSCs in clause 8 as well. **Suggest accept in principle**, "Add the PNC handover information command and PNC information command to the list of commands in 7.5 that may be fragmented (see resolution of 448). Delete the last fields from these commands and the associated text. Update the MSCs in clause 8 to reflect the deletion of the last field and add text to the sentence that references the figure that states that while the command may be fragmented, only one command is shown in the MSC. In 8.2.3 change "The PNC shall first send the PNC information commands ... with the last field set appropriately, 7.5.3.3." to read "The PNC shall first send the PNC information command, {xref 7.5.4.2}, to the chosen AC. Note that the PNC may fragment the PNC information and PNC handover information commands using the process described in {xref 8.7}. When the PNC has received an ACK for the last fragment of the PNC information command it shall then begin sending all of the current channel time requests to the chosen AC using the PNC handover information command, {xref 7.5.3.3}."

Accept suggested resolution.

490 (Gilb, TR) - PNC information command has been modified to include a "last" field similar to what was done in the PNC handover information command. However, the text in 8.9.1 has not been updated. Use sub-clause 8.2.3, page 153, lines 32-39, as a template for inserting appropriate text into sub-clause 8.9.1. Check the MSC to reflect the new behaviour of the signal exchange between the two entities. However, if we adopt standard fragmentation for this command, then the update is somewhat different, we just need to note that the command may be fragmented. **Suggest accept in principle**, "The PNC information command is now allowed to be fragmented using the normal fragmentation process, see the resolution of comments 448 and 449. Therefore, the text in 8.9.1 is now correct."

Accept suggested resolution.

176 (Heberling, TR) - There is no application for having several CTAs of the same stream in the same super-frame. Besides there is no definition how the PNC should handle a request where enough avail-TU exists but not enough CTR-interval. As an addition, it would be practically impossible to use with pseudo static streams. Only the CTR-interval-type 1 (subrate) has a useful implementation and hence the frame format of CTR-Control can be simplified. The interval 0 has no use after ATS is incorporated. Delete sentence on line 21-22 "If multiple slots per superframe are requested,..." **Suggest reject**: "As in all cases, if the PNC is unable to satisfy the request for the CTR interval, it simply rejects the channel time request. However, if the PNC is able to satisfy it, it may allocate it. Similarly, the PNC is able to move pseudo-static slots, if necessary, to satisfy requests for multiple slots per superframe. Since the PNC controls the superframe duration, DEVs with specific latency requirements need to be able to control this by asking for more than one slot per superframe. This is the application for having several CTAs of the same stream in a superframe. If the PNC is unable to do this, it simply rejects the request."

This resolves with CIDs 378, 788, 379, 39, discussed later.

658 (Gilb, TR) - Clause 8.9.3 says: "The channel status request command may be used by any DEV in the piconet to get information from a target DEV about the link quality between the two DEVs." Clause 8.11 says: "To do this, the PNC sends the channel status request command, defined in 7.5.6.1, to request that the DEVs provide their channel status via the channel status response command, 7.5.6.2." Is the PNC allowed to send a channel status request command to a DEV if the PNC is currently not transferring data to the DEV? Add text that indicates that the channel status request command shall only be sent to DEVs with which the originating DEV is currently transferring data. **Suggest accept in principle**, "Allow the PNC to request the channel status from DEVs in the piconet. They report the aggregate statistics for all of their connections."

Table until July 29.



### 1.5.1 CTM/Asynch\*

15 (Heberling, TR) KO> The CTA request for asynchronous data can only be initialized by the MAC after having reviewed the current needs of its asynchronous data queue. It can be issued at certain time intervals, as new MAC\_ASYNC\_DATA primitives are entered or as transmissions fails and needs to be repeated. It can not be initialized by the DME since the DME has no knowledge of the current queue status or how much of the requested time has already been allocated in CTAs. This is a MAC internal functionality and it just so happens that it reuses the same CTR command as is used by the isochronous stream request. It is also wrong to use destination lists with isochronous MLME\_STREAM\_CREATE requests. Consequently, in the MLME\_CREATE\_CTA.request primitive and in table 18 - Delete the parameters NumTrgts and NumAsynchTUs, and replace the parameter TrgtId list with TrgtID. **Suggest accept**

Accept suggested resolution.

34 (Heberling, TR) NumAsynchTUs is an unnecessary parameter for the primitives MLME-CREATE-STREAM, MODIFY-STREAM, TERMINATE-STREAM. Consequently, Delete NumAsynchTUs from Table 18. **Suggest accept**

Accept suggested resolution.

16 Heberling, TR) KO> Same comment as 15 above However, consequence is to <Change text in 6.3.14.1.1> <from> This primitive is generated by an originating DME to initiate a bi-partite channel time negotiation between a DEV and its PNC. The purpose is to establish a channel time for the originating DEV to communicate with one or more DEVs in the piconet. <to> This primitive is generated by an originating DME to initiate a bi-partite channel time negotiation between a DEV and its PNC. The purpose is to establish an isochronous data stream for the originating DEV to communicate with one DEV, a multicast group or all DEVs (broadcast) in the piconet. **Suggest accept**

Accept suggested resolution.

906 (Bain, T) The text seems to be incorrect. Consequently, change the phrase to the following: "Each CTA shall have the same asynchronous stream index, source, start time and duration"; **or** per 197 (Heberling, E) Please change this sentence frag.: from "...and the same destination, start time and duration." to "... , different destination DEVID, and the same start time and duration." **Suggest accept** Bain's proposed change.

Accept in principle "Change 'Each CTA shall have the asynchronous stream index and the same destination, start time and duration.' to read 'Each CTA shall have the asynchronous stream index and the same SrcID, start time and duration but different DestIDs.'"

614, 652 (Gilb, T) The MLME-CREATE-CTA.req should be shown coming from the DEV-2 DME. What is "MAC-Q"? Also, the CL is no longer the packet CL but the FCSL (i.e. frame convergence sublayer). Consequently, change MAC-Q to be simply MAC. Change Packet CL to be FCSL in figure 4. **Accept in Principle** 1) replace MAC-Q and MLME with simply DEV-2 MAC. 2) Rename Packet CL to FCSL 3) Delete Figure 4 since it is duplicated in Figure 119. 4) Incorporate suggested changes identified in CID 327

Accept suggested resolution.

914 (Bain, T) In figure 119, The PNC DME has the task of building the beacon. However, in the isochronous operation figures, the PNC MLME is shown to be building the beacon. Consequently, change the location of the build beacon element to the PNC MLME. **Suggest accept in principle** per CID 327

Accept suggested resolution.

327 (Heberling, TR) Figure 119 is a flawed MSC of the Asynchronous channel time reservation process and data frame exchange. Consequently, delete the current MSC from this section of clause 8.5.2.1 and replace it with 02r0P802-15\_TG3-Asynch-channel-time-allocation.eps. **Suggest accept.**

Accept in principle, "Update the MSC to be similar to the ones in section 2.2 of document 02/273r3."

195 (Heberling, T) KO> Asynchronous channel time is not modifiable or terminated due to the fact that asynchronous data is non deterministic in when it will arrive and when it will expire. Consequently, please change this sentence frag. from "The creation, modification, and termination of asynchronous channel..." to "The reservation of asynchronous channel..." **Suggest accept** for the reason given.

Accept in principle, "The sentence will be changed to say "reservation and termination" Add text to the asynchronous creation (now reservation section) that says that the source may request zero desired number of TUs and zero minimum number of TUs, which has the effect of terminating the request. For PNC termination of an asynchronous request, adopt the same process as isochronous termination.

813 (Shvodian, TR) There is no reason in the world to terminate an asynchronous GTS. The slots are allocated then they go away. Consequently, delete this sub clause since it is unnecessary. **and** 370 (Heberling, TR) Please delete the Asynchronous GTS termination clause. Asynchronous data does not play by the same rules as isochronous data. Consequently, it is incorrect to assume that the isochronous stream termination rules apply to an asynchronous channel time allocation. **Suggest accept.**

Accept in principle, as in the resolution of 195. The termination subclause will be heavily modified, no more destination termination, source termination use reservation procedure and PNC uses isochronous termination procedure.

### 1.5.2 CTM/CTRinterval

378,788,379,39

378 (Heberling, TR) The CTR interval type field was found to cause inconsistent interpretations of the CTR Interval and the CTR TU. Consequently, delete the CTR interval type field from figure 74. **and** 788 (Shvodian, TR) Remove CTR interval type.**and** 379 (Heberling, TR) Due to a previous comment regarding Figure 74, the definition of CTR Interval type is no longer needed. Consequently, delete the sentence from between lines 37 & 38 inclusive. Also remove the sentence between lines 44 & 45 for the same reason. **and** 39 (Heberling, TR) KO> There is no application for having several CTAs of the same stream in the same superframe. Besides there is no definition how the PNC should handle a request where enough avail-TU exists but not enough CTR-interval. In addition, it would be practically impossible to use with pseudo static streams. Only the CTR-interval-type 1 (subrate) has a useful implementation and hence the frame format of CTR-Control can be simplified. The interval 0 has no use after asynchronous GTS is incorporated **Suggest accept** for the reasons given.

Suggestion of limiting CTR interval to be no more than 8 when the type indicates slots per superframe. Suggestion of also limiting to only pseudo static?

Table until July 29, 2002 conference call, carry discussion to email. We are looking for suggestions, includes 176, 378, 788, 379, 39.

789 (Shvodian, TR) Since there is no guarantee how much the PNC will spread out multiple GTS slots in a superframe, DEVs must be prepared to accept the worst case assignment. Consequently, Delete reference to CTR interval type, Remove line 36 to 45 and replace with: The CTR interval field indicates the number of superframes from one slot to the next. The value contained in the CTR interval field shall be a power of two

Tabled, as above

368 (Heberling, TR) Please change this sentence frag. from " ... GTS Type and CTR interval type shall be set to 0..." to " and GTS Type shall be set to 0..."

Tabled, as above

**1.5.3 CTM/Isoch**

401 (Heberling, TR) MLME-CREATE-CTA, MLME-MODIFY-CTA, AND MLME-TERMINATE-CTA are incorrectly named. The correct primitive names for these entries are: MLME-CREATE-STREAM, MLME-MODIFY-STREAM, AND MLME-TERMINATE-STREAM. Comments in clauses 6.3.14.1-11 give the technical reasons for why the original names are correct and need to be reinstated. **Suggest Accept**

Accept.

404 (Heberling, TR) Insert the parm (ACK Policy) between stream Index and CTR-Control.

Table

405 (Heberling, TR) Insert the parm ACK Policy into the parm table between parms StreamIndex and CTR-Control. Type: Enumeration; Range: no-ACK, imm-ACK, dly-ACK; Defn:Default ACK request type for stream

Table

406 (Heberling, TR) Add this enumerated result code to the ResultCode range: ILLEGAL\_ACK\_POLICY

Table

80 (Heberling, TR) An isochronous data stream is negotiated before hand and afterwards has a stream index assigned to it as a result of the negotiation. Consequently, there is no need for the parameters TrgtID, OrigID, or Priority to be part of the MAC-ISOCH-DATA.request parameter list. However, there is a need for an ACK policy parameter field to be part of the parm list. Consequently, remove the parameters(TrgtID, OrigID, and Priority) from the MLME-ISOCH-DATA.request parm list, and add the ACKpolicy parm. **Withdrawn** per acceptance of CID 23

Withdrawn.

78 (Heberling,TR) The data frame format and MAC header do not support the passage of the priority field from one MAC to the other. Consequently, the primitive MAC-ISOCH-DATA.indication should not contain the priority field. Therefore please remove the priority parameter from the MAC-ISOCH-DATA.indication parameter list. **Suggest Accept** per acceptance of CID 23

Accept suggested resolution.

Call ended, 9:40 am, PDT, 18 July, 2002.

**1.6 Email resolutions due Tuesday, 23 July, 2002**

977 (Bain, T) - There is the omission of mention that a PNC that is either a child or neighbor may be found. They are valid as opposed to a PNC that is not of the child or neighbor type. (8.2.1, p 152, line 21) "same channel, that is not a valid child or neighbor PNC, it may ...." **Suggest accept.**

959 (Bain, T) - The ReasonCode valid range points to the wrong section of clause 7. Change "As defined in 7.5.1.2" to "As defined in 7.5.1.3". **Suggest accept.**

312 (Shvodian, T) - What reason code does a DEV use when disassociating from the PNC? Add reason code: 4 -> DEV leaving the piconet. **Suggest accept** (Note: this was in D09, but was taken out. However, a DEV disassociating has no valid code it can send now. The other 4 codes only apply to the PNC sending the disassociate command.)

783 (Shvodian, TR) - The disassociation command requires authentication if authentication is required. Put and X in the Authenticated column of the Disassociation request command. **Suggest accept.**

311 (Shvodian, TR) - The disassociation request command should be integrity protected in a secure piconet. Add the following text: The disassociation request command shall use the secure command format in piconets using security mode 2 or 3. **Suggest accept.**

485 (Gilb, T) - The use, in this standard of the DME/MLME boundary can be confused with architectural decisions rather than simply a split that was created to facilitate describing the standard. Add a paragraph that describes that the DME contains the functionality that is outside of the scope of the standard and other management functions while the MLME and MAC contain the functionality specified in the standard. Also add that the split is arbitrary and is not intended to be an architectural split for an implementation. **Suggest accept.**

129 (Heberling, TR) - Max fragment number field used wrong. Change 'Each fragment shall be sent with the max fragment number field set to the total amount of fragments of the current MSDU.' to 'Each fragment shall be sent with the max fragment number field set to the highest fragment number of the current MSDU, which is the same as the total amount of fragments of the MSDU - 1.' **Suggest accept in principle**, "Change the sentence to read 'Each fragment shall be sent with the max fragment number field set to the highest fragment number of the current MSDU, which is one less than the total amount of fragments of the MSDU.'"

803 (Shvodian, TR) - RIFS needs to allow time for an ACK transmission, not just CCA or aBackoffSlot. 802.11 allows for the full transmission of an ACK. Otherwise, if the ACK is not heard, the retransmission may well collide with the ACK and that frame will not get through either. Change the equation for RIFS to:  $RIFS=2*SIFS+ACKTime$ . **Suggest accept** (implied by resolution of 819).

804 (Shvodian, TR): - The following is misleading: The beacon frame, which is neither in the CAP nor the CFP, does not use inter-frame spacing. Interframe spacings still apply to the beacon, but they are ensured by the location of the GTS slots. Delete the sentence. **Suggest accept in principle**, "Replace the sentence with 'The interframe spacing requirement for the beacon is ensured by the location of the GTS slots which is determined by the PNC, {xref 8.4.4.7}.'"

726 (Gilb, TR) - Withdrawn

1126 (Roberts, T) - Insert a sentence in line 3. Between the first and second sentence insert the following: In addition, child and neighbor PNC DEVs shall be synchronized to the parent PNCs clock. **Suggest accept in principle**, "Change 'All DEVs within a single piconet shall be synchronized to the PNC 's clock.' to be 'All DEVs within a single piconet shall be synchronized to the PNC 's clock, including and child or neighbor piconets.'"

814 (Shvodian, TR) - It should be clarified that it is the superframe clock that is being reset. change "clock" to "superframe clock" in lines 7 and 9. **Suggest accept.**

53 (Heberling, TR) - Must scan for both BSID and PNID. Change text to read: "..., the MLME scans the specified channel until either a beacon with the specified PNID and BSID is detected or..." **Suggest accept.**

958 (Bain, T) - Use of "initiate" instead of "indicate" "This primitive is used to indicate that the ...." **Suggest accept.**

979 (Bain, T) - It is not stated how the beacon number field is handled when the PNC is attempting a dynamic channel change. Does it continue to increment as if it was still sending beacons? This would be best for SPS DEVS. At end of 1st sentence, add a sentence as follows "The PNC shall continue to increment beacon count during the period when it is searching other channels." **Suggest accept.**

46 (Heberling, TR) - The parameters "NmbrChannels" and NmbrPiconets" described in clause 7.5.6.4 are missing from MLME-REMOTE-SCAN.confirm primitive's parameter list. Please add the missing parameters to MLME-REMOTE-SCAN.confirm's primitive list. **Suggest accept in principle.** "Add the missing parameters 'NmbrChannels' and 'NmbrPiconets' to the primitive list and Table 20."

609 (Gilb, TR) - The parameters "ReasonCode" and "ResultCode" have been confused in this section. The MLME-REMOTE-SCAN.response should contain a "ReasonCode" instead of a "ResultCode". Page 69 Line 39: Add "REQUEST\_DENIED" to valid range for "ResultCode". Page 70 Line 30-32: Change to "The DME upon receiving this primitive may send either an MLME-SCAN.request to its MLME to initiate the requested channel scan or an MLME-REMOTE-SCAN.response with the ReasonCode indicating that the request for a remote scan was denied, 7.5.6.4" Page 70 Line 42: Replace "ResultCode" with "ReasonCode". **Suggest accept.**

949 (Bain, TR) - It would seem that all MTS should follow the same rule in using the maximum transmit power IE. The text calls for directed in both directions but not open or association. The text also does not note that the PNC shall use that setting for CAP and MTSs. See also comment in clause 5.3.11 page 20. "CAP, beacon and MTSs." on line 3. "in the CAP or MTSs to be ..." on line 7. " for the beacon, CAP, and MTSs to be ..." on line 8. **Suggest accept.**

**1.7 Tuesday, 16 July, 2002**

Attendees: Dan Bailey, Ari Singer, Jay Bain, Rene Struik, Bill Shvodian, Allen Heberling, Knut Odman, James Gilb, Jim Allen, Mark Schraeder, Bob Huang.

909 (Bain, T) - Piconet Maximum transmit power is a beacon parameter that as suggested in the text (as a means of working with interference), may change during the duration of a piconet. It is not clear, how this parameter is adjusted after the initial configuration with MLME-START.request. Many of the operations regarding channels involve the DME so there should be a means to reflect a DME choice into the IE of 7.4.7. I recommend that we overload the existing MLME-PICONET-PARM-CHANGE.request and create a duplicate of the parameter PiconetMaxTxPower. Suggest accept in principle, "Add a new MAC PIB element to 6.5.1 as follows:"

Managed Object	Octets	Definition	Type
MACPIB_MaxTXPower	1	The maximum TX power allowed in certain times of the superframe as defined in 8.13.1.	Dynamic

Accept original, add to MLME-PARM-CHANGE.request and create a duplicate of the parameter PiconetMaxTxPower. Note, we will be changing the MaxTXPower to be a field in the synchronization fields. Related to comments 292 and 824.

926 (Bain, TR) - The text of 8.5.2.1 pg 181 line 40-43 on no guarantee of what delay will be between the time of request and a beacon indicating the time should also be placed in 8.5.1. Place the text mentioned above into 8.5.1 with a change that noting the change from async to isosync. Suggest accept.

Accept.

3 (Heberling, TR) - A stream with del-ACK policy cannot be used with any other ACK-Request. Neither can the policy be changed, because enqueued frames with different ACK-Policy (del-ACK and other) will create unresolvable protocol conflicts. Consequently if del-ACK is declined by the destination, the stream must be terminated. 8.8.3, Insert line 9: Delayed Acknowledgement can only be used with isochronous data. Insert line 23, before "The destination DEV may change the max burst..." Upon reception of an imm-ACK frame after sending a data frame with the ACK request field set to del-ACK, the source DEV MAC shall: -issue a MLME\_TERMINATE\_STREAM.indication to DME - send a Channel Time Request frame to PNC with the terminate bit set to 1 and the desired CT to 0." Suggest accept in principle, "Change 'shall be used only for directed stream data frames where' to be 'shall be used only for directed stream data frames, i.e. isochronous connections, where' Add text to the section that says 'The source DEV may change the ACK policy in a stream from Dly-ACK to Imm-ACK or no ACK by sending a frame with the ACK policy set to one of those values. This has the effect of canceling the Dly-ACK policy and the souce shall use the Dly-ACK negotiaion procedure before restarting the Dly-ACK mechanism. The receiver shall no longer maintain the ACK status of any previous frames sent with the Dly-ACK policy set.'"

Table until Thursday.

819 (Shvodian, TR) - CCA should not be used for retransmission. In a poor channel the sending DEV may not hear the other DEV. It needs to wait for an ACK time. 802.11 does not use CCA. It uses an ACK timeout. (p84 of 802.11 1999). Replace CCA with ACK time. Suggest accept, "Fix the text to indicate that the DEV waits for the length of time required for the appropriate ACK, either Dly-ACK or Imm-ACK."

Accept, WMS to provide text.

340 (Heberling, TR) - The rules for association and authentication with PNC are inconsistent. < add text> In a piconet operating in security mode 0 or 1, an association shall also imply authentication. No authentication frame exchange shall be done with PNC in these modes. Suggest accept in principle, "A DEV will become a 'member of the piconet' or have 'membership in the piconet' when it is associated for mode 0 or completes authentication for mode 1, 2 or 3. Text will be added to specify this and the draft modified to use 'membership' instead of 'associated, and if required authenticated'. Note that the authentication process for mode 1 will be resolved as a part of another comment. If a null security suite is used, then the authentication process will be required. Otherwise, it will have the status of mode 0, i.e. that association is equivalent to authentication."

Accept above resolution.

342, 348 (Heberling, TR) -

Withdrawn

202, 204, 402 (Heberling, TR) - Services broadcast not standardized, thus not interoperable and must be removed from standard. Remove MLME\_ASSOCIATE.request parameter DEVPiconetServicesIE. Suggest accept in principle, "Adding the vendor IE to the associate request and response commands as outlined in 02/276r0 will take care of problems with standardization. Since this information is needed to provide a fast response time, the DEVPiconetServicesIE will remain in the associate request command."

Table until Thursday, text due from Allen.

109 (Heberling, TR) - No need to broadcast piconet information after association. Instead the newly associated DEV should ask for the information it desires. The PNC may still broadcast information at intervals of its own choice. If nothing has changed in the piconet, no broadcast is necessary. Delete first sentence "The PNC shall broadcast ... after a DEV associates" Delete "In addition" <Change from> The PNC shall send the piconet information for each of the associated DEVs at least once every aBroadcastDEVInfoDuration via a PNC information command. <to> The PNC may broadcast the piconet information for each of the associated DEVs when any change of association status has occurred or at intervals of the PNCs own choice via a PNC information command. Suggest reject "A new DEV joining the piconet is unable to do anything until it finds out information about the other DEVs in the piconet. The information about the DEVs in the piconet is the first thing that the new DEV will likely require. It also allows other DEVs to update their own information in case they have missed the indication of a previous DEV joining or leaving the piconet. The broadcast of the DEV information table after association is unchanged since D09."

Accept in principle, "Change the text in the broadcasting the piconet information subclause to say that it is done after the DEV becomes a member of the piconet, not after association only."

372 (Heberling, TR) - This whole clause raises the question of why does the PNC info command get broadcast unsolicited? When a DEV associates, its Association IE info is broadcast via the beacon. If the Associating DEV needs the DEV association list from the PNC it can request directed frames from the PNC. There is no need to clog the medium with an unsolicited broadcast. Consequently, remove this clause. Please make the requested deletion. Suggest reject "A new DEV joining the piconet is unable to do anything until it finds out information about the other DEVs in the piconet. The information about the DEVs in the piconet is the first thing that the new DEV will likely require. It also allows other DEVs to update their own information in case they have missed the indication of a previous DEV joining or leaving the piconet. The broadcast of the DEV information table after association is unchanged since D09."

Accept in principle, "Change the text in the broadcasting the DEV info table to say that it is done after the DEV becomes a member of the piconet, not after association only."

105 (Heberling, TR) - Timeouts only works in the client in the vertical direction. A client cannot set a timeout for its server, less the entire distributed state machine in the scheduler is completely specified (RTOS theory). Delete the sentence: "The time difference between sending an ACK..." Suggest accept in principle, "The timeout is a requirement only for the PNC to enable fast join times for the network. However, the current sentence does not state that clearly. Change 'The time difference between sending an ACK to an association request and sending an association response command meant for the same DEV shall not exceed aAssocRespConfirmTime.' to be 'The time difference between when the PNC sends an ACK to the association request command from a DEV and when it sends an association response command meant for the same DEV shall not exceed aAssocRespConfirmTime.'"

Accept suggested resolution.

625 (Gilb, TR) - It is not likely but it is possible that this information element could be longer than 256 bytes long if enough devices associate/disassociate at the same time. Indicate that the PNC may use multiple DEV association IEs in the beacon too many DEVs are associating than will fit in the beacon. Suggest accept.

Accept.

777 (Shvodian, TR) - DEV association IE does not belong in the beacon. There is no guarantee that the associating DEV will get the beacon anyway. The beacon is big enough as is. Other DEVs cannot talk to that DEV until it authenticates if it is a secure piconet anyway. The PNC info table is broadcast when the DEV associates (or authenticates in a secure piconet). If the DEV does not receive the PNC info table and has not MTS assigned to it, it will shall to associate again. Suggest accept.

Withdrawn.

920 (Bain, T) - It seems that information on what type of CAP/MTS used by piconet is not returned as part of a scan. Since MTS is optional in PICS a DEV may not support this and thus consider joining a different piconet. Add the CAP information from the channel timing IE to the MLME-SCAN.indicate primitive. Place as additional field in piconetdescriptionset in table 5. Suggest accept.

Table until Thursday. Need to add MAC parameter set to piconet description set and change the name of piconet description set for remote scan and add a new table. Also shows up in neighbor/child MLME set. ADH to work on it.

361 (Heberling, TR) - The current wakeup mechanisms are not sufficient to wake up a DEV when a major system change occurs. Examples are channel change, PNC handover, beacon duration or location change and PNID change. A method is needed to allow all APS and SPS devices to easily check if a system change is in progress. The intervals for such checks must be decided by PNC. See resolution [13] in 02276r0P802-15\_TG3-commentsD10\_KO.doc A system change bit is added to the mode field of the PNC synchronization IE. All DEVs are required to check this bit at minimum intervals. The bit is unrelated to any APS and SPS wakeup method. Suggest reject "There is no way to both guarantee that sleeping DEVs will see system change and make changes quickly. In fact it is not possible to to guarantee that DEVs that are ACTIVE will see the system change. The only way to guarantee that DEVs are aware of the change before it happens is to send directed frames to each DEV with Imm-ACK policy. When a system change happens and a DEV, for whatever reason, misses it, the DEV will begin to scan for its piconet. If it finds it before the ATP expires, it will re-join the piconet. If not, it will re-associate with the piconet when it finds it."

Table until PM resolved.

418 (Heberling, TR) - Doc: 02/276r0 provides an argument for the persistence of the PiconetBSID. Consequently, change this sentence frag. from: "...PNID, BSID, and ChannelChangeTimeout parameters." to "...PNID, and NmbrOfChangeBeacons parameters." Please make the indicated change. Suggest reject "The setting of the BSID is under user control and provides a human friendly manner to identify the piconet (i.e. a text string instead of list of hex numbers). Because of this, the user will want to be able to set this value from time to time without re-starting the entire piconet and re-program every DEV in thier net. However, since it is intended for use control, it is unlikely that it will change very often."

Comment is rejected as noted above.

210 (Gilb, TR) - The LQI gives better information if it is for the entire frame rather than for just the last CAZAC. In fact, the results for the CAZAC are not that good relative to checking the results of the TCM demodulator. Change "The LQI SNR shall be measured in the last CAZAC sequence of the PHY preamble, 11.4.2." to be "The LQI SNR shall be reported as the value for the received frame after the FCS for frames that have a frame length longer than 100 octets." Suggest accept in principle, "Change the the last two sentences in 11.6.7 from 'The LQI SNR shall be measured ... via the PHY-RX-START.indication, 6.7.4.3.' to read 'The LQI SNR shall be measured during the TCM frame body and shall be reported after the last FCS symbol. This number shall be reported via the PHY-RX-END.indication, {xref 6.7.4.6}.' Change subclause 6.7.4.3 to remove LQI from the parameter list. Change subclause 6.7.4.6 to add LQI before the RXERROR parameter. Modify subclause 6.7.4.6.1 to include LQI in the list of parameters that are described, with the description 'LQI is a 5 bit field that represents an SNR estimate from the receiver, {xref 11.6.7}.'"

Accept.

508 (Gilb, TR) - The CCA only detects the CAZAC, but doesn't tell you to keep signalling busy until the end of the frame, up to the max frame length. Add text that says the CCA shall be maintained as busy until the end of the frame for which the inverted CAZAC was detected. Suggest accept.

Accept



512 (Gilb, T) - Incorrect sentence: "At the end of SLEEP state in APS mode, the DEV shall wakeup sufficient time before the expiration of the maximum sleep time in order to inform the PNC that it is in the ACTIVE mode." Change to "When transitioning from APS mode to ACTIVE mode, the DEV shall enter the AWAKE state sufficient time before the expiration of the maximum APS time in order to inform the PNC that it is in the ACTIVE mode." Suggest accept.

Accept

510 (Gilb, T) - When a dev is in APS mode, it can be in either the AWAKE or SLEEP state. Therefore, the following sentence is not correct: "The DEV shall be allowed to enter SLEEP state for a maximum sleep time duration indicated by the PNC in the APS sleep response command,..." Change to Replace with: "The DEV shall be allowed to enter APS mode for a maximum APS time duration indicated by the PNC in the APS response command,..." Suggest accept.

Accept.

729 (Gilb, T) - Related to switching to ACTIVE mode, can't the DEV send ANY PDU to the PNC that requires an Imm-ACK, not just a command? Change to ..."the DEV shall send any directed frame, which may be an MSDU or MPDU with no payload, that requires"... Also change "wakeup" to "wake up" in this paragraph. Suggest accept.

Suggest accept in principle, "Only the probe command will be used to register that the DEV is entering ACTIVE mode. See also comment 363."

313 (Heberling, T), 353 (Heberling, TR) - SPS set is not defined. Please define. Also, the structure of the DEVID list is not defined either. Please define. Please provide the requested definitions. Suggest accept "Add text that says 'The SPS set field is defined in {xref 7.5.7.4}.' Also, change the DEVID list to be formatted in the same way as the PCTM field, i.e. a starting DEVID and a bitmap that is as long as is required. Copy over the text, figure and description. This gives us a uniform method of listing DEVIDs in the standard."

Accept suggested resolution.

347 (Heberling, TR) - What is the difference between ACTIVE PS mode and the Awake state? Please clarify. Please provide the requested clarification. Suggest accept, "Resolve as in comment 456, Add text that says something similar to 'There are three modes and 2 states in each mode. The modes are ACTIVE, APS and SPS. Within each mode, a DEV is either awake or sleeping.' Gather up all of the modes and state references and put them in the beginning of 8.12 rather than spread out throughout the subclause."

Accept suggested resolution.

335 (Heberling, TR) - The first sentence of this paragraph is and incomplete sentence. Please rewrite the sentence so that it expresses a complete thought. Please provide the requested rewrite of the indicated sentence. Suggest accept, "Change the first sentence to read 'SPS mode allows a DEV that is sensitive to power utilization to reduce its power usage while remaining synchronized with the SLEEP states of other selected DEVs.'"

Accept.

## 1.8 Email, due Friday, 19 July, 2002

464 (Gilb, T) - We should have an informative annex with sample calculations and examples of frame headers, commands, IEs, beacons, etc. Assign each person one item to create and assign 2 people to review their

work. Suggest accept in principle “If there is time left when all other tasks are completed, we will try to put together some examples.”

632 (Gilb, T) - Delete the word "can". Suggest accept in principle, “Change ‘The CCM ideas can easily be extended to other block sizes, but this will require further definitions.’ to ‘The CCM ideas are easily extended to other block sizes, but this would require further definitions.’”

502 (Gilb, TR) - Cross reference to parameter missing. Add: "The parameter used in this primitive is defined in {xref Table 35}."(in 6.7.3.5) Suggest accept.

5, 131 (Heberling, TR), 786, 818 (Shvodian, TR) - Implied ACK policy is no longer needed since we have support for asynchronous time slots. Remove this sub clause and any reference to implied ACK. Suggest accept. For 5 and 131, suggest accept in principle. “Implied ACK and all references to it will be removed from the draft.”

424 (Heberling, TR) - A 20 day Letter Ballot is much too short an interval to adequately review the volume of new text that was incorporated into D10. Particularly, all the material associated with security. There are major integration issues that need to be addressed that I did not have time to consider. Also given the PICs is now included in this document, there was no time to properly review the decisions made by the various editors to determine if they were in agreement as to what should be mandatory or optional. Recommend that the next LB for 802.15.3 be extended to 30 days minimum. Suggest reject “While we all appreciate the hard work that goes into reviewing a document for letter ballot, neither the ballot resolution committee nor the task group has the power to set the length of the letter ballot. The working group voted to set that duration.”

688 (Gilb, TR) - Withdraw

279 (Gilb, TR) - Meaning? I think you want to set the SrcID to the PNCID. Change to "The SrcID shall be set to the PNCID." Suggest accept.

48 (Heberling, TR) - The clause title: "Changing channels" is too restrictive given the change in primitive name. Rename clause 6.3.17 Changing Channels to "Changing Piconet parameters. Suggest accept.

209 (Gilb, TR) - PHYPIB\_CCAThreshold is an 802.11 holdover and is not used in this standard. Delete this PIB entry. If it stays, however, it should be -55 dBm, but better still, just xref where it is defined. Suggest accept in principle, “Change the value of the PIB entry to indicate that it is implementation dependent but no more than the value listed in {xref 11.6.5}. Also remove ‘For the 2.4 GHz PHY’ text where found in the PIB tables in this subclause.”

1169 (Shellhammer, T) It is quite common for an 802.11b network to utilize all three channels. In addition to the adjacent and alternate channels plot the co-channel FER in figure D.2. Also, add a figure on 802.11b co-channel operation (like figures D.3 and D.4). Accept in principle, “While 802.11b networks will use all three channels in an infrastructure environment, it is not likely in the home environment targeted by 802.15.3. In addition, the APs for these channels will be widely spread (> 50 m distance) so that they do not interfere with each other. However, we will add additional results for co-channel interference with the note that this case is unlikely due to the ability of the 802.15.3 network to find the ‘quietest’ channel.”

1168 (Shellhammer, T) - The theoretical BER curves from 802.15.2 need some work. Modify to new formula once new 802.15.2 draft becomes available. Also, replot figure D.1 so that it is possible to determine which curve is for which system. Accept in principle “If the new formulas are available in time, the coexistence curves will be re-calculated. If not, it will be considered for revision at a future time.”

1170 (Shellhammer, T) - In clause D.3.3 it is not clear the separation between the two nodes in the system under evaluation. For example, the separation between the two 802.15.3 nodes is not specified in clause D.3.3.1 as far as I could tell. Please add text to state the separation between node of the system under evalu-

ation. Do similar for the other systems under evaluation (i.e. 802.11b and 802.15.1). Suggest accept in principle, "Add text to D.3 that states that the separation of the members of the desired system is implied by the receive signal power, which is 10 dB above sensitivity. Add to the assumptions section that the received power is 10 dB above sensitivity since at sensitivity the channel fading cause  $\gg$  10% FER."

1167 (Shellhammer, T) Receiver sensitivity does not effect coexistence performance. What does effect it is the signal-to-interference ratio (SIR) of the various standards. Remove clause D.3.2. section "a" and replace it with a section on SIR. Suggest accept in principle "None of the standards discussed have a SIR performance specified for other systems. SIR performance depends on the modem design and so would vary among implementations. However, the SNR performance is a reasonable approximation of the SIR performance of the system since the SIR is not known. Add text to D.3.2 that discusses why SNR was used instead of SIR for the analysis."

1164 (Shellhammer, T) - Since CSMA/CA is often based on frame detection it is not clear why this is the "best method" of coexistence. State that a method of detecting frames from the other standard would be required to use this method for coexistence. Suggest accept in principle "Some CCA detection is done purely on an energy detection basis (this optional for 802.11 and required for 802.15.3). In addition, the timing parameters used in the CSMA/CA affects the performance of the systems. Add text that better describes the situations under which CSMA/CA would be an appropriate coexistence method, mentioning timing and the requirement for either energy detection or frame detection."

1165 (Shellhammer, T) - It is not clear what happens if one Piconet chooses the four-channel plan and another Piconet selects the three-channel plan, since the first Piconet was already established. It looks like you could never effectively use the four-channel plan. Explain. Suggest accept in principle "Add text to clause D that explains what happens in this situation."

1166 (Shellhammer, T) - References to collaborative coexistence mechanism states that "no on-air signaling is required." This is true of PTA, however, AWMA uses signaling over 802.11 to manage the coexistence mechanism. Please remove the phrase "no on-air signaling is required." Suggest accept.

1163 (Shellhammer, T) - IEEE 802.11 not only uses CDMA/CA but is also uses a poling mechanism in Point Coordination Function. Mention PCF to prevent comments in sponsor ballot. Suggest accept.

1139 (Roberts, TR) - I missed this on the first letter ballot but specification of the EVM test seems to be incomplete. Below is suggested text to complete the specification. 11.5.2 EVM Calculated Values A compliant transmitter shall have EVM values of less than those given in Table 104 for all of the modulation levels supported by the PHY when measured for 1000 symbols. The error vector measurement shall be made on baseband I and Q data after recovery through an ideal reference receiver system. The ideal reference receiver shall perform carrier lock, symbol timing recovery and amplitude adjustment while making the measurements. The ideal reference receiver shall have a data filter impulse response whose cross-correlation is within 0.5 dB referenced to the impulse response of an ideal root raised cosine, 35% excess bandwidth,  $F_c=5.5$  MHz (3 dB point) filter. Suggest accept in principle, "Add text to the end of 11.5.2 that says 'The ideal reference receiver shall have a data filter impulse response that approximates that of an ideal root raised cosine filter with 30% excess bandwidth.'"

507 (Gilb, TR) - Need to add HCS to list of things in the frame. Change "... PHY preamble, PHY header, MAC header and the FCS." to be "... PHY preamble, PHY header, MAC header, HCS and FCS." Suggest accept.

506 (Gilb, TR) - HCS needs to be scrambled as well. Change "... MAC header and frame body." to be "... MAC header, HCS and frame body." Suggest accept.

504 (Gilb, TR) - CCIT CRC-16 implementation, the description doesn't say that it needs to be set to all 1s when initialized and the figure doesn't really show how to get the data out. Add text that says that the register

shall be set to all 1s before beginning the process and show how the data is xor'ed and shifted out of the registers when it is done. Suggest accept.

580 (Gilb, TR) Errors in 802.11's description of the CRC calculation. 1. The text states "consider the following 48-bit length sequence" but in fact the sequence is only 32-bits. 2. The text identifies bits as follows "b0.....b48", but it seems that "b0.....b31" would be correct. Again, it is only a 32-bit stream. 3. The text identifies the HCS output sequence as follows "b0..... b16" but in fact, since it is only 16-bits, it should be "b0..... b15". Suggest accept.

943 (Bain, TR) - The text solution does not match the comment on LB12. The first value is to be the means to return the PHY to a operational state (not in a power save state). "Vector number 0 is the entry used by the MAC to instruct the PHY to return from a reduced power state, or off state, to a state where it is ready to receive command. Other values are implementation dependent." Suggest accept in principle, "The table is only times, not the instruction. PSLevel in 6.7 and 6.7.5 controls the PHY's on/off state. Add text to the description of PSLevel in Table 35 that says 'PSLevel value 0 is used by the MAC to instruct the PHY to return from a reduced power state, or off state, to a state where it is ready to receive command. Other values are implementation dependent.'"

505 (Gilb, TR) - The status of the scrambler with respect to the second PHY header is ambiguous. In order to ensure that the FER of the 11 Mb/s mode remains low, the scrambler will need to be reset so that losing one of the first two bits does not cause an FER failure. Add text that states that the PHY header of the second repetition of the PHY + MAC header + HCS is unscrambled and that the scrambler is re-initialized with the same seed used for the first header when it begins scrambling the second header. The scrambler continues for the frame body following the second header structure as normal. Suggest accept.

456 (Gilb, TR) - Need to add a better explanation of the power save modes here. Add text that says something similar to "There are three modes and 2 states in each mode. The modes are ACTIVE, APS and SPS. Within each mode, a DEV is either awake or sleeping." Gather up all of the modes and state references and put them in the beginning of 8.12 rather than spread out throughout the subclause. Suggest accept.

947 (Bain, T) - "enable DEVS to completely ...." may be how many implementations will operate but this is implementation specific as to how deep the DEV will "turn off". Change to 'to turn off completely or reduce power...'. Suggest accept.

**1.9 Pending resolution (aka hard ones)**

361 (Heberling, TR) - The current wakeup mechanisms are not sufficient to wake up a DEV when a major system change occurs. Examples are channel change, PNC handover, beacon duration or location change and PNID change. A method is needed to allow all APS and SPS devices to easily check if a system change is in progress. The intervals for such checks must be decided by PNC. See resolution [13] in 02276r0P802-15\_TG3-commentsD10\_KO.doc A system change bit is added to the mode field of the PNC synchronization IE. All DEVs are required to check this bit at minimum intervals. The bit is unrelated to any APS and SPS wakeup method.

Pending resolution of power save modes.

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

## 2. Comment resolution in Vancouver

### 2.1 MLME policy

- Change MLME-CREATE-CTA parameters to pass only those things needed to verify the functioning of the standard. Since the channel time parts are not going to be verified, only that a CTA.

### 2.2 Channel time management (CTM/Async\*, CTM/Isoch\*)

IDs: 15, 16, 34, 368, 813, 370, 614, 195, 906, 652, 914, 907, 917, 155, 411, 364, 366, 120, 410.

For asynchronous data, initial command comes from FCSL via MAC SAP with the MAC-ASYNC-DATA.request. Then the DEV MLME decides if it needs more time (hexagon decision). If so, it sends the frame over the air. The PNC MLME decides what to do and in the case of rejection responds with channel time status command, otherwise it is a beacon. Neither the PNC DME nor the DEV-2 DME are involved.

Asynchronous termination: Do we allow the destination to terminate. PNC is allowed to terminate and the source is allowed to terminate (this simply means that it sets the request to zero).

Now we don't need MLME-CREATE-CTA.indication or MLME-CREATE-CTA.response, just let the PNC MLME do the response over the air. Also we don't need MLME-MODIFY-CTA.indication or MLME-MODIFY-CTA.response

Note: Perhaps we want to rename MLME-xxx-CTA to be MLME-xxx-STREAM?

20, 21 , 411 (Heberling, TR) Terminations can never be unsuccessful. The command can only originate from the client and the PNC cannot refuse termination. If the PNC wishes to initialize a termination it will just remove the CTA.

For the ResultCodes on negative actions, allow timeout but do not refer to it as unsuccessful, instead refer to it in the text as indicating that the ACK was not received.

20 - Reject: The ResultCode indicates if the ACK was received for the command. The DEV may consider this to be success or it may take other action depending on the implementation. However the text associated with this is incorrect since it refers to the lost ACK as "unsuccessful" rather than that the ACK was not received.

21 - Accept in principle. Change "The originating DME, when it receives this primitive, is notified whether its CTA termination request was successful or unsuccessful." to be "The originating DME, when it receives this primitive, is notified of the result of its CTA termination request."

411 - Accept in principle. The ResultCode indicates if the ACK was received for the command. The DEV may consider this to be success or it may take other action depending on the implementation. Retain the result code, change the text in clause 6.3.14.11.1 to say: "The originating DEV MLME sends this primitive to its DME after the DEV MLME either has received an ACK to its CTA request command or the RequestTimeout has expired." and change the text in clause 6.3.14.11.2 as indicated in the resolution of comment number 21.

Ed note: This probably applies to other comments, particularly disassociation and deauthentication.

## 123 (Heberling, TR) - Many issues

Beacon confirmation of synchronous request. Suggest stream creation information element. IDs 123, which really is a reference to [06] in 02/276r0. Asked for straw poll, do we require ACK before building the beacon, result was 4/1/5 (y/n/a). So action is for WMS to create new text in 8.5.1.1, page 175, line 50 that indicates this and send it to the reflector by COB 10 July 2002.

Resolution for 123: Accept in principle: Detailed resolution is in document 02/273r2.

(Beginning of resolution for comment #123)

Don't use new IE, other edits that will be made are (based on 02/276r0 notation):

8.5 Channel Time management, <Page 175, line 3, TR> Accept as written

8.5.1 Isochronous Stream management, <Page 175, line 13-15, Editorial> Accept as written.

<Page 175, line 19-20, TR> (needs work, but seems like the right direction)

<Page 175, line 24, Ed> Accept as written.

8.5.1.2 Isochronous stream modification, <change two last bullets , TR>

Change to implement:

The CTR type field shall be set to the same value as in the original request for that stream index.

All the other channel time request command parameters are set to appropriate values as defined in 7.5.5.1.

Minimum number of TUs field is set to either the original value requested or a new value if the DEVs requirements have changed.

Desired number of TUs field is set to a value that is greater than or equal to the minimum number of TUs.

Note: This allows a DEV to change from every beacon to subrate and vice-versa. Does this cause enough problems that we should require a tear-down and re-establishment?

<page 177, line 46, TR> Accept as written.

Figure 115 – MSC for modifying a stream <revert to old, TR> Accept as written

8.5.1.3 Isochronous stream termination, <Page 179, line 40-42, TR > Withdraw this issue.

Figure 117 – MSC of source DEV-2 requesting termination of its stream <TR>: Withdraw this issue.

New issue: Make sure that we mention somewhere that only the source or the PNC of a broadcast or multicast stream shall be able to terminate the stream. Page 179, line 30, Add text “In the case of multicast or broadcast streams, only the source DEV or the PNC may terminate the stream.”

Figure 118 – MSC for a target DEV-2 disassociating causing a source DEV-3 stream termination <delete whole MSC, TR>. Accept as written, also delete lines 23-24 on page 180. Add text that says “When either the source or destination of a stream is disassociated from the network the streams are terminated as indicated in {xref disassociation}.

8.5.2.1 Asynchronous channel time creation and modification reservation <Page 181, line 26, TR> Accept as written.

<Page 181, line 37, TR> Change “and the same destination” to be “and the same source”

<Page 181, line 40, E> JPKG to check grammar, otherwise it is probably OK.

<Page 181, line 49, E> Accept as written.

Figure 119 – MSC for reserving asynchronous data channel time. Discussed earlier, new MSC is below:




Figure 4—MSC for a approved asynchronous channel time request




Figure 5—MSC for a denied asynchronous channel time request

8.5.2.1 Asynchronous GTS termination: Change it to only allow the source and PNC to terminate.

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

Change “Only the PNC, the originating DEV, or the target DEV shall be able to” to be “Only the PNC or the originating DEV shall be able to”  
 (end of resolution of comment #123)

**2.3 Child/neighbor handover ()**

**2.4 Handover**

779, 785 (Shvodian, TR) - Add a new handover handover IE to be used to announce the beacon number where handover will take place.

785 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The new IE will be added as indicated in the resolution of comment #779.

779 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add an PNC Handover information element. It only needs to be 4 octets total (IE number, Length=2, handover countdown, PNC response) . The last beacon sent by that PNC shall have counter number 0.

Note: the PNC response field depends on the resolution of the comments relative to this field.

24 (Heberling, TR) - Withdrawn

154 - Withdrawn

797 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add a beacon countdown in the new PNC handover IE.

22 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add new subclause as follows:

6.3.11.5 MLME-PNC-HANDOVER-INFO.indication This primitive indicates the reception by the DEV of an unsolicited DEVInfo list sent by the PNC as part of the PNC handover procedure, 8.2.3. The semantics of this primitive are: MLME-PNC-HANDOVER-INFO.indication(DEVInfoSet) 6.3.11.5.1 When generated The MLME sends this primitive to its DME upon receiving a complete DEVInfo list via the PNC info command. 6.3.11.5.2 Effect of receipt The new PNC's DME is provided with a copy of the complete DEVInfoSet.

160 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the indication to be initiated by the PNC handover information element in the beacon as opposed to the broadcast PNC handover command. This now passes one element, the PNC response value.

98 - ACCEPT. Delete all other references to it in the draft, replacing it, where appropriate with the PNC handover IE.

154 - Withdrawn

14 (Heberling, TR) - Add these parameters to the MLME-PNC-HANDOVER.request parameter list: NmbrHndOvrBcns, DEVInfoList. Delete NmbrOfDEVs from the parm list since it can be determined from the DEVInfoList. Also add these new parameters to Table 15 with these type/range and defs. NnumberHndOvrBcns: Type:Integer; Range: 4-255; Def: The number of beacons, containing the PNC handover IE, the old PNC will transmit before control of the piconet by the old PNC is turned over to the new PNC.

606 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The new PNC timeout has been replaced by the number of beacons.

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



162 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add new clause 6.3.11.3 which describes the MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.response primitive. The text of which is included here. 6.3.11.3 MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.response This primitive is used to initiate a response to an MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.indication. The semantics of this primitive are: MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.response()

6.3.11.3.1 When generated This primitive is sent by the new PNC's DME to its MLME after receiving these two primitives in succession, MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.indication, MLME-PNC-INFO.indication and the DME is ready to take over as the new PNC of the piconet.

6.3.11.3.2 Effect of receipt When the new PNC's MLME receives this primitive from its DME it is informed that its DME is ready to become the new PNC of the piconet.

399 - Withdrawn.

381 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Delete the HandoverTimeout from the MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.indication parameter list

100 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the PNC handover information command to PNC handover CTRB command. Also change the title of figure 64 as well. Delete the "Last" field from the command body and its descriptive text.

43 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The new handover will use the number of beacons to avoid this problem.

323 - Accept.

319 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change this sentence fragment from "... and obtain the DEV information from the current PNC within ..." to "... and be prepared to receive the list of DEV information list, {xref 7.5.4.2}, and CTRB records from the current PNC."

317 - ACCEPT. Change this sentence fragment from "...with an indication of the hand-over time out." to "... with the parameters specified in the PNC handover request command, 7.5.3.2."

325 - Please delete the sentence starting with these words: " The PNC shall indicate that the transfer is complete..." Also delete the first two sentences of the last paragraph and insert these sentences: " The chosen AC after receiving the PNC handover request command, the list of DEV information, and the CTRB records shall respond to the PNC with a PNC handover response command. This will signal to the PNC that the chosen AC is ready to commence the handover beacon sequence. The PNC upon receiving the PNC handover response shall ACK the received command and then put the PNC handover IE, {xref 7.4.x}, in the beacon. (additional text is provided in 02/276r0 Page8, Clause 8.2.3 paragraph 3 and page 9 paragraph 1.) Meanwhile the chosen AC after receiving an ACK to its PNC handover response command will prepare to broadcast its first beacon as the new PNC after the last beacon received from the current PNC. The current PNC shall decrement the beacon countdown field in the PNC handover IE with each beacon broadcast until the field is zero. After sending the last handover beacon, the old PNC relinquishes control of the piconet, generates an MLME-PNC-HAN-DOVER.confirm to its DME, and stops generating beacons. The new PNC shall broadcast its first beacon as close to the start time of what would have been the old PNC's next beacon."

382 - The PNC MLME sends this primitive to its DME The PNC MLME sends this primitive to its DME after it has sent its last beacon as PNC or if it fails to receive the PNC handover response command within the HandoverTimeout interval.

For effect of receipt, The ResultCode is set to SUCCESS when the PNC sends its last beacon as PNC before the HandoverTimeout interval expires. The ResultCode is set to HAN-DOVER\_FAILED if the PNC fails to

receive the PNC handover response command before the HandoverTimeout interval expires, then the Result-Code is set to TIMEOUT.

677 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The old sentence was deleted.

172 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The proposed text for these changes are below: 7.5.3.1 PNC handover request command keep the first two sentences intact. Make these changes to figure 63: |Cmd-Type|Length=2|NmbrDevs(1)|NmbrCTRBs(1)|. NmbrDevs is the same definition as is currently defined in this clause. NmbrCTRBs is the number of CTRBs, excluding requests for asynchronous channel time, currently being served by the PNC that will be transferred from the current PNC to the new PNC using the PNC handover CTRB command. 7.5.3.2 PNC handover response command This command is used to inform the current PNC that the DEV selected to become the new PNC is ready to assume PNC responsibilities. The structure of this command shall be as illustrated in figure xxx |Command type|Length=0|(PNC response, if it survives, xref to where it is defined).|

400 - Accept.

192 - Withdrawn

## 2.5 ACK (ACK\*)

1024 (Rasor, TR) - Figure 11: the non-secure Immediate ACK Frame Format does not contain a FCS, which is incompatible with practice with all other frame formats.

Reject, There is no need for an FCS if there is no payload. The Imm-ACK has an HCS on the header, so all of the information in the packet is protected by a CRC. Depending on the what is done with an FEC in a future PHY, there may be a minimum packet size for interleaving and additional latency. Furthermore, this is an item that has been unchanged since before D09. (accepted by Rasor).

421 (Heberling, TR) - <change from> If an Imm-ACK is expected for that frame, the remaining time in the time slot needs to be large enough to accomodate the current frame, 2 SIFS periods and the Imm-ACK frame at the same PHY rate as the transmitted frame. <to> If an Imm-ACK or del-ACK is expected for that frame, the remaining time in the time slot needs to be large enough to accomodate the current frame, 2 SIFS periods and the Imm-ACK or del-ACK frame at the same PHY rate as the transmitted frame.

Accept

3 (Heberling, TR) - Del-ACK policy: 1) Once you request Dly-ACK policy on a stream, can you change it? If so, is it required to do a Dly-ACK request? If Dly-ACK is declined, you should be able to keep sending Dly-ACK policy, change to Imm-ACK policy or No-ACK, but you cannot mix them up. Can we pass up the decline to the higher layers? If so, it can re-negotiate the time.

13 (Heberling, TR) - Dly-ACK negotiation, do we need to add more values? ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The name of the field may need to change. Also need to delete aMaxDlyACKBurstSize from the end of clause 8 and change the reference to it to indicate that it is a value passed in the Dly-ACK frame.

768, 816, 817 (Shvodian, TR) - Dly-ACK policy/No-ACK explained: ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The ACK stream policy is set with the stream, individual data packets set an ACK policy, the two bits in the frame field are back to ACK-policy and the one bit Dly-ACK is Dly-ACK request. (Note: we still need someone to write precise text).

819 - (Shvodian, TR) - Accept if Implied ACK goes away, probably accept anyway. The text needs some work and we need to say that you have to leave time for a Dly-ACK request as well. WMS to provide some text.

1 (Heberling, TR) - Does MAC or CL decide ACK policy for each packet? This depends in part on the resolution of 3. WITHDRAWN by Heberling.

806 (Shvodian, TR), 184 (Heberling, TR) - The recipient of Delayed ACK traffic is no longer responsible for obtaining channel time for sending the Dly-ACK frames

Accept 184, Accept 806 in principle, "Resolve as indicated in 184."

820 (Shvodian, TR) - The retry bit is also used to detect duplicate frames.

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change to "The source ID, stream index, fragmentation field and retry bit are used to detect multiple receptions of the same frame."

## 2.6 IEs (IE\*)

73, 76 (Heberling, TR), 300 (Shvodian, TR) - Does this create interoperability problems?

Suggest accept in principle, use the suggestion in 02/276r1 (resolution [16] in the document), but we need to find a way to get unique manufacturer identifiers. Suggestions are:

- Use MAC address first 2 (or is it 3) octets
- String that is the trademarked manufacturer name.
- Have the RAC assign number
- Have 802.15 assign OIDs
- Have 802.15 assign number.

74 (Heberling, TR) - Remove DEV GTS status information element. The supposed benefits provided by this information element do not warrant chewing up 34 octets of beacon time. In its place introduce this new information element: StreamAnnouncement IE 7.4.10 Stream announcement The stream announcement information element shall only be sent by the PNC in the beacon. The stream announcement IE shall be formatted as illustrated in Figure 33. This IE is used to indicate in the beacon to a DEV that its requested CTA |Element ID|Length|= 2|SrcDEVID|StreamIndex| SrcDEVID is defined in 7.x.x Stream Index is defined in 7.x.x.

Accept in principle: Delete the DEV GTS Status IE. However, the stream announcement information element is not needed.

## 2.7 Implied ACK (ACK/Implied)

WMS will post to the list to see if someone still needs it. Comments 786, 131, 5 (withdraw if implied ACK is deleted), 818.

## 2.8 Starting child or neighbor piconets (DepPN)

968 -

## 2.9 Frame issues

255 (Heberling, TR)

Withdrawn

770 - accept.

444 - Rejected.

778 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Delete the maximum transmit power IE, take the Max TX power level field and put it with the new piconet syncrhonization field in the beacon. Add text that says that if the PNC does not want to limit the TX power it shall set the field to 0x7F.

432 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The beacon ordering was resolved with comment #937 and 386.

937 - ACCEPT. Change the piconet synchronization IE into a field.

436 - Parent BSID?

500 - Withdrawn

70 - Accept: The pad bit has been removed, make the indicated change.

166 - Accept: The pad bit has been removed, make the indicated change.

1018 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the text to "At the receiver, the initial remainder shall be preset to all ones. The serial incoming bits of the calculation fields and FCS, when divided by  $G(x)$ , in the absence of transmission errors, results in a unique non-zero remainder value. The unique remainder value is the polynomial."

64 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The FCS field shall be transmitted in the order specified in {xref 7.1}. Change the text on page 101, line 47, from "Any field containing a CRC is an exception to this convention and is transmitted with the coefficient of the highest-order term first." to read "Any field containing a CRC is an exception to this convention and is transmitted msb first."

774 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Modified as follows: "The frame body is a variable length field and contains information specific to individual frame types. The minimum frame body is zero octets. The maximum length frame body is  $aMaxFrameSize-4$  octets. This maximum length includes the security fields, if present."

1020 - REJECT. The non-secure frames do not need a sequence counter. The secure frames probably don't need a sequence counter either, that will be resolved by another comment.

## 2.10 Security/authentication (SEC/Auth)

57 (Heberling, TR) The MAC address isn't needed as parameter in the Authentication exchange. The header carries the DevID of source and destination, and if either side is unknown to the other, they are not likely to accept authentication anyway.

Withdrawn

941 (Shvodian, T)

Dan is to figure this one out.	1
	2
769, 890 (Shvodian, TR) Do we need a SEC pad - Yes, add an octet to secure frame formats. It is set to the number of octets that the encryption algorithm added. If the frame is unencrypted, the is field shall be set to 0. (unless the encryption already deals with this.)	3
	4
	5
	6
48 (Gilb, TR) Withdrawn	7
	8
834 (Shvodian, T) - Do we need to protect ACKs	9
	10
Accept (deletes protected ACKs)	11
	12
835 (Shvodian, T)	13
	14
Accept in principle. PNC handover does not require ACL handover. (See clause 9.3.2).	15
	16
831 (Shvodian, T)	17
	18
Accept.	19
	20
832 (Shvodian, T)	21
	22
Accept in principle. PNC handover does not require ACL handover. (See clause 9.3.2).	23
	24
836 (Shvodian, T)	25
	26
Accept in principle. ACLs are needed, text needs to be added to mode 3 to clarify this requirement.	27
	28
837 (Shvodian, T)	29
	30
Accept.	31
	32
836 (Shvodian, T)	33
	34
Accept in principle. ACLs are needed, text needs to be added to mode 3 to clarify this requirement.	35
	36
836 (Shvodian, T)	37
	38
Accept in principle. ACLs are needed, text needs to be added to mode 3 to clarify this requirement.	39
	40
872 (Shvodian, T)Withdrawn	41
875 (Shvodian, T)Reject	42
854 (Shvodian, T)ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The security manager maintains a separate association/ authentication state for each of the DEVs with which it is willing to authenticate.	43
	44
863 (Shvodian, T)ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Text will be added (based on another comment) that describes what happens in this case.	45
	46
853 (Shvodian, T)Accept.	47
866ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. None of the commands use the secure command format. Clause 7.5.2.x specifies that these commands are always sent in the non-secure format.	48
	49
	50
<b>2.11 PNC Responsiveness</b>	51
	52
10, 12, 17, 86, 92, 94, 188, 191, 357 (Heberling, TR), 808 (Shvodian, TR)	53
	54

17 and 94 have more than just PNC Responsiveness.

808 - Suggested remedy is to have JB add text that clarifies the usage of the PNC responsiveness, text is due by the morning of 11 July, 2002.

For the rest, ADH will review a prior document to see if there is a compromise available. 02/109, review will be later today.

## 2.12 Transmission sequence resync

41 (Heberling, TR), 478 (Gilb, TR), 787 (Shvodian, T) - Transmission sequence resync command is not needed.

Accept: The transmission sequence resync command and all references to it will be removed from the draft.

## 2.13 Misc

56 (Heberling, TR) Inconsistent DEVID naming conventions between clause 6 and clause 7. Which is it going to be: SrcID instead of OrigID, DestID instead of TrgtID? Lets be consistent.

Accept in principle. The BRC will closely review the use of OrigID, TargetID, SrcID and DestID to reduce the number of uses of OrigID and TargetID to the absolute minimum necessary.

423 (Heberling, TR) - Missing an MSC illustrating the primitives and signals needed during a de-authentication initiated by a DEV to the PNC.

Withdrawn

96 (Heberling, T) Missing a reason code for when the DEV disassociates from the piconet. Add this reason code 4-> DEV\_LEAVING\_PICONET.

Accept.

55 (Heberling, T) Disassociation cannot "fail". Both PNC and client shall regard a disassociate request as being completed when requested and proceed with the disassociation procedure. The PNC needs to get back the DevID from the confirm in case it has disassociated several DEVs. The reasonCode is not needed since the request cannot fail, and even if it did there is no recovery.

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The command is issued when it gets an ACK or the time out has occurred. The ResultCode is used to inform the DME of the result of the process. Change text in 6.3.6.3.1 to "This primitive is sent by the originating MLME to its DME after sending a disassociation request command, {xref 7.5.1.3}, and receiving either an ACK or an ACK\_TIMEOUT." Change the text in 6.3.6.3.2 to "The originating DME, when it receives the MLME-DISASSOCIATE.confirm primitive, is notified of the result of the disassociation procedure."

158 (Heberling, TR) The MLME-DISASSOCIATION.confirm primitive has value only to the PNC. A DEV that requests to be disassociated from the piconet doesn't really care if it receives an ACK, since by the time it does receive an ACK it would most likely be shutdown. Consequently, the only entity that is interested in receiving a confirmation is the PNC, since it will still be in operation and therefore interested in knowing which DEV, it(PNC) had previously requested disassociate, responded with an ACK. Given this perspective please make these changes: Change this sentence from: "This primitive reports the results of a disassociation request." to "This primitive reports to the PNC the results of a PNC initiated disassociation request

directed to a DEV. The semantics of the primitive are: MLME-DISASSOCIATE.confirm(DEVID) 6.3.6.1  
 When generated This primitive is sent by the PNC MLME to its DME after receiving an ACK from the  
 DEV to which the PNC had sent a disassociation request command 7.5.1.3. (Delete lines 35-37) 6.3.6.2  
 Effect of receipt The PNC DME, when it receives the MLME-DISASSOCIATE.confirm primitive, is noti-  
 fied as to which DEV has been disassociated.

Accept in principle, Add to then end of 6.3.6.2 “The PNC DME, when it receives the MLME-DIS-  
 ASSOCIATE.confirm primitive, is notified as to which DEV has been disassociated.

1) IEs PNsServices CID-63: This one will be handled with the vendor identification that will be used for the  
 ASIE.

2) MTS CIDs 58 Trying to compromise, up to ‘Change this sentence fragment from"... 0x00 reserved for  
 asynchronous data and 0xFE reserved for unassigned streams." to "...0x00 for asynchronous GTSs and  
 asynchronous data, 0xFD reserved for MTSs, and 0xFE reserved for unassigned streams.”“

119, ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the sentence to read "If commands are not allowed in the CAP, the  
 PNC should assign an MTS with the new DEVs DEVID as the SrcID as soon as possible after a successful  
 association, {xref 8.3.1}, preferably in the next superframe, in order to support fast connections."

190 Withdrawn.

3)PICs CID 1171 Although I did not have a personal comment regarding the PIC, I feel very strongly that  
 this is an area of the Specification that I will definitely clobber during the next recirc. if we do not discuss in  
 detail what functionality shall be mandatory and what should be optional.

1171 (Cypher, TR)

ACCEPT. The BRC will closely review the PICS to ensure that it is correct before the next letter bal-  
 lot.

4)PNCInfo CIDs 377 & 140

377 - This will be true when we fix the fragmentation of the commands for handover.

140 - This will be true when we fix the fragmentation of the commands for handover.

5) Scan(BSID) CIDs 83, 795, 416; BSID CIDs420,51,419,50,52

83 - Withdrawn, except that need to make sure another comment addresses adding the BSID to the scan pro-  
 cedure.

795 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need to specify that we scan for both or one, the other or any. (need better  
 text).

416 - Accept

420 - Withdrawn

51 - Withdrawn

419 - Withdrawn

50 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Delete the ChannelChangeTimeout parameter. Replace the deleted parm with NmbrOfChangeBeacons. see doc: 02/276r0 Page 21 for further description.	1
	2
	3
52 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace ChannelChangeTimeOut parameter with the NmbrOfChangeBeacons parm. Also make sure the definition of this parameter goes in the appropriate table, as indicated in 02/276r0, p21.	4
	5
	6
	7
6) CTM CIDs 32,30,23,28,80,33,408,407,409,413,414,401	8
	9
32 - Accept.	10
	11
30 - Accept	12
	13
23 - Accept	14
	15
28 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Remove NumTrgts and NumAsyncTUs from the all instances of MLME-CREATE-CTA, MLME-MODIFY-CTA, and MLME-TERMINATE-CTA. Rename the TrgtIDlist to Trgt-DEVID in all the indicated primitives.	16
	17
	18
	19
80 - Withdrawn	20
	21
33 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. MLME-yyy-CTA.indicate and MLME-yyy-CTA.response do not go up or come down from to the PNC DME. Delete these MLMEs and fix the MSCs to reflect this change.	22
	23
	24
408 - Withdrawn, Resolution of 33 makes this unnecessary.	25
	26
407 - Withdrawn, Resolution of 33 makes this unnecessary.	27
	28
409 - Withdrawn, Resolution of 33 makes this unnecessary.	29
	30
413 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Move the Chk Resources and Evaluate request to the PNC MLME. Delete the MLME-CREATE-CTA.{ind,rsp} from the MSC. Delete the PNC DME from the MSC. Delete the Allocate Resource hexagon.	31
	32
	33
	34
414 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Move the Chk-Resources processes from the DME to the MLME. Delete the and Allocate Resources hexagon.	35
	36
	37
401 - Withdrawn	38
	39
7) DEVID CID 56 - Resolution in process, agreement in principle.	40
	41
8) DisAssoc/DeAuth CIDs	42
	43
344 (Heberling, TR) - Withdrawn	44
	45
348 (Heberling, TR) - Withdrawn	46
	47
346 (Heberling, TR) - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add text "The PNC does not use the de-authenticate command to remove a DEV from the piconet."	48
	49
	50
9) bit/byte ordering CID 150	51
	52
150 (Heberling, TR) - Ask the reflector, BRC will vote, outcome either way is OK.	53
	54



10) FrmFrmt/... CIDs 386, 385,66,68 1

386 (Heberling, TR) - Accept 2

385 (Heberling, TR) - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Move the table to 7.3.1 so that it is clear that it applies to both secure and non-secure beacon formats. Delete the SECID, integrity code and time token IEs since they are already in the frame format for the secure beacon. 3

425 (Gilb, TR) - Accept. 4

66 (Heberling, TR) - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the text to "At the receiver, the initial remainder shall be preset to all ones. The serial incoming bits of the calculation fields and FCS, when divided by G(x), in the absence of transmission errors, results in a unique non-zero remainder value. The unique remainder value is the polynomial:" 5

68 (Heberling, TR) - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. "The FCS is the one's complement of the sum of the remainders in "a" and "b" below: a) The remainder resulting from ((xk\*(x31+x30+...)) divided(modulo 2) by G(x)). The value k is the number of bits in the calculation field. b) The remainder resulting from the calculation field contents, treated as a polynomial, multiplied by X32 and then divided by G(x)." Note: add reference to ANSI X3.66 CRC-32 when we get a copy to review to get the correct reference. 6

11) ChnlTime change CID 194 7

194 - Accept in principle, DEVs may sleep and BSID stays. 8

12) System Change Bit CID 361 Possible withdrawn. 9

10 10

11 11

12 12

13 13

14 14

15 15

16 16

17 17

18 18

19 19

20 20

21 21

22 22

23 23

24 24

25 25

26 26

27 27

28 28

29 29

30 30

31 31

32 32

33 33

34 34

35 35

36 36

37 37

38 38

39 39

40 40

41 41

42 42

43 43

44 44

45 45

46 46

47 47

48 48

49 49

50 50

51 51

52 52

53 53

54 54

### 3. Status at closing in Vancouver

- a) Ballot resolution committee formed, members are:
- b)

**Table 1—Ballot resolution as of close of St. Louis meeting**

Type	LB17	Unresolved as of 12 July, 2002
T (technical)	131	?
TR (Technical required)	444	?
T and TR	575	?
E (editorial)	622	?
Total	1197	?

### 4. Suggested resolutions from JPKG

#### 4.1 Clause 6 comments.

Comment (TR): (Clause 6, multiple locations) When the device is operating in security modes 1, 2 or 3, the MLME needs to be able to indicate to the DME what type of protection is used on a given received frame so that the DME can decide whether or not to accept the frame. This is important because some devices may want to choose to send unprotected frames to certain other devices and the DME needs to be able to determine whether its policy allows it to accept those frames. An indication needs to be added to each MLME.indication and each MLME.confirm in Clause 6, which indicates that a frame is received from another DEV, specifying whether the frame had security turned on and whether the frame came from a device in the ACL.

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

Author’s note: The interfaces for the above described MLME messages should add the following entries to the semantics tables:

```
MLME-XXX.indication (or .confirm) (
    SecurityUse,
    ACLEntry
)
```

Author’s note: The following table entries should be added to the above described MLME messages.

**Table 2—MLME-XXX.indication (or MLME-XXX.confirm) parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
SecurityUse	Boolean	TRUE or FALSE	This indicates to the DME if the received data frame had the security suite applied to it.
ACLEntry	Boolean	TRUE or FALSE	This indicates to the DME if the sender was found in the ACL.

Comment (TR): (Clause 6, multiple locations) Devices need to have the capability of choosing when to send frames with security and when not to. The decision for when to send a frame with security and what key to use should be determined by the DME. An indication needs to be added to each MLME.request and MLME.response in Clause 6, which cause the DEV to send a frame to another DEV, specifying whether that frame should be protected by security.

Author’s note: The interfaces for the above described MLME messages should add the following entry to the semantics tables:

```
MLME-XXX.request (or .response) (
    KeySelection
)
```

Author’s note: Insert the following entry into Table 61 on page 86:

**Table 3—MLME-GTS.request parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
KeySelection	Enumeration	PICONET-MGMT, PICONET-DATA, PEER-MGMT, PEER-DATA, NONE	Specifies the key that shall be used to protect the outgoing frame or that security shall not be used on the frame.

Comment (TR): (Clause 6) When devices are running in a secure mode, they need to be able to indicate to the DME when frames received or frames being sent cause security operation failures. These security operation failures could be caused by not having the specified key or by a failed integrity check or some other cryptographic failure.

Author’s note: The following sub-clause should be added to Clause 6 to support the above comment.

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

**4.1.1 Security management primitives**

These primitives define how the MLME communicates security related events to the DME.

**4.1.1.1 MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication**

This primitive allows the MLME of any DEV to indicate a failed security processing operation to the DME.

**4.1.1.1.1 Semantics of the service primitive**

This primitive shall provide the following interface:

```
MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication (
    SrcID,
    DestID,
    SECID,
    ReasonCode
)
```

Table 4 specified the parameters for the MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication primitive.

**Table 4—MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication parameters**

Name	Type	Valid Range	Description
SrcID	Integer	Any valid DEVID as defined in 7.2.3{xref}	The DEVID of the entity from which the frame causing the error originated.
DestID	Integer	Any valid DEVID as defined in 7.2.3{xref}	The DEVID of the device that the frame was intended for.
SECID	Octet string	Any valid security session identifier.	Specifies the unique security session identifier for the key that was used on the incoming frame or that was requested to be used on the outgoing frame.
ReasonCode	Enumeration	UNAVAILABLE-KEY, FAILED-SECURITY-CHECK, BAD-TIME-TOKEN	The reason for the security error.

**4.1.1.1.2 When generated**

This primitive is issued by the MLME when it receives an MLME.request message from a higher layer that requires security to be applied to a frame, but it is unable to find an appropriate key in the ACL or fails to be able to apply security to the frame. This primitive is also issued by the MLME when it receives a validly formatted frame from another device that induces a failed security check according to the security suite or for which the device is unable to find the designated key in the ACL. This primitive is also issued by the MLME when the time token received in a frame does not correspond to the current time token known by the DEV or if the last beacon was not valid.

**4.1.1.1.3 Effect on receipt**

On receipt of this primitive, the DME is notified of a security error and the reason for the security error.

Author’s note: End of added text for that comment.

Comment (E): (Table 11, pg. 41) The entries for ChallengeType and ChallengeLength should be removed as they are not used any longer.

Comment (T): (6.3.8.1, pg. 46) The use of the SECID in the MLME-REQUEST-KEY.request and MLME-REQUEST-KEY.indication implies that the requesting device knows the SECID of the key it is requesting. This will be true for piconet-wide keys because the SECID will be included in the beacon, but for peer-to-peer keys, the DEV may not know the SECID of the current key, in which case it perhaps should be allowed to request the key without knowing its SECID.

Comment (E): (Table 31, pg. 84) The SECID, sequence numbers and time token should have lengths 2, 4 and 6 respectively.

Comment (T): (Table 31, pg. 84) There should be two SECIDs, one for the management key and one for the data key. Recommend inserting an additional entry for MACPIB\_PNCManagementSECID that indicates the SECID of the management key. The MACPIB\_PNCSECID should be called the MACPIB\_PNCDataSECID and correspond to the data key only.

Comment (T): (Table 32, pg. 85) Each entry in the access control should be able to support keys shared with that particular device. For each access control list table, there should be ManagementKeyInfo, ManagementSECID, DataSECID, DataKeyInfo, SMSeqNum and DEVSeqNum entries. Recommend adding these field to the table.

**4.2 Clause 7 comments**

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.3) A 2-byte secure frame counter needs to be added to the secure frame formats in Figure 10, Figure 12, Figure 17 and Figure 19. The entry should be called “Secure frame counter” and should be added directly after the Time token in each figure. Similarly, the following entry should be added to Table 38:

**Table 5—Beacon frame body**

Information element	Sub clause	Note	Present in beacon
Secure frame counter	{xref}	The secure frame counter used by the PNC in this superframe, which is used to ensure uniqueness of the nonce.	As needed

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.3.2) A secure delayed ACK frame should be specified. The same conventions used with the other frames should be implemented.

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.4) The 2-byte secure frame counter needs to be added as an information element. Insert the following text for the secure frame counter:

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

**4.2.1 Secure frame counter**

The secure frame counter is used to guarantee that the nonce used for CCM security in a given frame is unique. The secure frame counter information element shall be formatted as illustrated in Figure 6.

**Figure 6—Secure frame counter information element format**

octets: 2	1	1
Secure frame counter	Length (=2)	Element ID

The secure frame counter represents the number of times the selected key has been used during that super-frame. This counter shall be included in the CCM nonce.

Author’s note: End of added text for this comment

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.5) In each of the commands, the DME should control whether the SEC field is set to 1 or 0. In each case in which the SEC field is mentioned, the word “shall” should be changed to should or the sentence should be removed. For example, in 7.5.1.1, remove the second sentence or change it to “The SEC field in the frame control field should be set to 0.”

Comment (T): (Clause 7.5.1.2) It appears that if the length of the OID is variable, it may not be possible to unambiguously parse the association response command. Recommend adding the length of the OID before the OID to make this unambiguous.

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.5.2.1) The RSA security suite should be added to the document and the following entries should be added to the list of public-key object types:

- 5 -> RSA 1024-1 key
- 6 -> RSA X.509 certificate

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.5.2.5-7.5.2.9) The sequence number in the request key, request key response, distribute key, distribute key response, and de-authenticate commands are not necessary, as the general format for commands specified in 7.3.3.2 includes the sequence number in the command already. The sequence number should be removed from all of these commands.

Comment (TR): (Clause 7.5.2.6-7.5.2.8) The security session ID (SECID) should be included before the Encrypted Seed (where the sequence number currently resides) in the request key response, distribute key request and distribute key response commands. This value is needed to uniquely identify the key that is being transmitted in the protocol. Note that the SECID should not be included in the request key command since the requesting party may not know the SECID of the key being requested. Recommend adding the following text to each of the three commands:

The SECID is the unique identifier for the seed (and corresponding key) that is being transported in this protocol.

**4.3 Clause 8 comments**

Comment (T): Many of the operational requirements used in clause 8 describe what the DME has to do in order to perform certain operations. The responsiveness of a DEV to operations performed by other devices tends to be based on what the DME does, but the standard doesn’t really have any control over the DME.

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

Should the “shall” statements in clause 8 be made into “should” statements since they aren’t actually requirements on the MAC layer itself? If so, clause 8 should be changed accordingly to indicate that the requirements in this clause are only optional.

#### 4.4 Clause 9 comments

Comment (T): (Clause 9.3) The security policies described in clause 9.3 are policies that must be implemented by the DME in order to provide the security intended by the security architecture. As such, they cannot be requirements that are placed on the DME. Recommend changing the text in clause 9.3 to:

Security policies determine the actions taken to preserve the security of the piconet. In general, these security policies are implemented by the DME and are thus outside the scope of this standard. However, proper implementation of the security policies is imperative to providing the security services and operational functionality claimed in this standard. It is therefore strongly recommended that implementers ensure that the DME implements the following security policies accurately.

Comment (T): (Clause 9.3) In order to help implementers clearly understand the security processes defined in this document, a description of the processes for implementing security should be included in the standard.

Author’s note: The following text should be added to clause 9 in the security policies sub-clause.

##### 4.4.1 Secure frame generation

When a DEV wishes to send a secure frame, it shall obtain the appropriate keying material from the MAC PIB depending on the key indicated by the DME. If the DME indicates that the PICONET-MGMT key shall be used, the DEV shall use the key from the MACPIB\_ManagementKeyInfo entry from the MAC PIB piconet security group parameters. If the DME indicates that the PICONET-DATA key shall be used, the DEV shall use the key from the MACPIB\_DataKeyInfo entry from the MAC PIB piconet security group parameters. If the DME indicates that the PEER-MGMT key shall be used, the DEV shall use the key from the MACPIB\_ManagementKeyInfo entry from the corresponding MAC PIB access control list group parameters table. If the DME indicates that the PEER-DATA key shall be used, the DEV shall use the key from the MACPIB\_DataKeyInfo entry from the corresponding MAC PIB access control list group parameters table. If the DEV is unable to find the corresponding key that is to be used, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to UNAVAILABLE-KEY and shall not transmit the requested frame.

If the DEV is able to obtain the appropriate security suite and key from the MAC PIB, the DEV shall check to see if the last beacon was valid by obtaining the MACPIB\_ValidBeacon value. If the last beacon was not valid, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to BAD-TIME-TOKEN and shall not transmit the requested frame. If the beacon was valid, the DEV shall apply the operations defined by the security suite using the key(s) to the frame. The time token included in the frame shall be the value found in the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken and the SECID included in the frame shall be the value corresponding to the key being used.

The integrity code shall be computed on the entire frame up to the integrity code itself including the MAC header. The result of the integrity code computation shall be encrypted and placed in the integrity code field in the secure frame. The encryption operation shall be applied only to the integrity code, seeds that are being transmitted in a distribute key command or request key response command and the payload of data frames. The result of the encryption operation shall be inserted into the frame in the place of the data that was encrypted.

If any of the security operations fail, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to FAILED-SECURITY-CHECK and shall not transmit the requested frame.

If the security operations have been successfully performed and the payload field has been modified appropriately, the device shall then compute the FCS over the modified frame.

Comment (T): (Clause 9) The following table should be added at the end of the clause describing secure frame generation along with this text:

The key used to protect a particular frame depends on the purpose of the frame. In general, all secure commands between the PNC and other devices should be protected with the PNC management key. All secure data frames to or from the PNC, all secure broadcast frames and all secure beacons should be protected with the piconet group data key. For two DEVs that share a peer-to-peer security relationship, peer-to-peer management keys should be used for all secure commands and peer-to-peer data keys should be used for all secure data frames. If two DEVs in a secure piconet do not have a peer-to-peer security relationship, they may use the piconet group data key for secure commands and secure data frames transmitted between them. The following table summarizes which keys should be used for each type of frame.

**Table 6—Key selection for secure frames**

Frame type or command	None	PNC-DEV mgmt. key	Piconet group data key	Peer-to-peer mgmt. key	Peer-to-peer data key	Comment
Beacon frame			X			All secure beacon frames shall be protected by the group data key.
Immediate acknowledgement frame		X	X	X	X	Secure immediate acknowledgement frames should use the key used in the frame that is being acknowledged.
Delayed acknowledgement frame		X	X	X	X	Secure delayed acknowledgement frames should use the key used in the frame that is being acknowledged.
Data frame			X		X	Secure data frames between devices that share a peer-to-peer key shall use the peer-to-peer data key, otherwise they shall use the piconet group data key.
Association request	X					Association request commands shall not be secured with any key.
Association response	X					Association response commands shall not be secured with any key.
Disassociation request		X				
Disassociation response		X				

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



**Table 6—Key selection for secure frames**

Frame type or command	None	PNC-DEV mgmt. key	Piconet group data key	Peer-to-peer mgmt. key	Peer-to-peer data key	Comment
Authentication request	X					Authentication request commands shall not be secured with any key.
Authentication response	X					Authentication response commands shall not be secured with any key.
Challenge request	X					Challenge request commands shall not be secured with any key.
Challenge response	X					Challenge response commands shall not be secured with any key.
Request key		X		X		The management key for the relationship (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) shall be used for this command.
Request key response		X		X		The management key for the relationship (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) shall be used for this command.
Distribute key request		X		X		The management key for the relationship (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) shall be used for this command.
Distribute key response		X		X		The management key for the relationship (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) shall be used for this command.
De-authenticate				X		
New PNC announcement			X			
PNC handover		X				
PNC handover information		X				
PNC information request		X				
PNC information		X				
Probe		X	X	X		If the devices do not share an individual relationship, the piconet group data key shall be used. Otherwise, the management key (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) for the relationship shall be used.
Transmission sequence sync		X				

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

**Table 6—Key selection for secure frames**

Frame type or command	None	PNC-DEV mgmt. key	Piconet group data key	Peer-to-peer mgmt. key	Peer-to-peer data key	Comment
Channel time request		X				
Channel time status		X				
Channel status request		X	X	X		If the devices do not share an individual relationship, the piconet group data key shall be used. Otherwise, the management key for the relationship (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) shall be used.
Channel status response		X	X	X		If the devices do not share an individual relationship, the piconet group data key shall be used. Otherwise, the management key for the relationship (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) shall be used.
Remote scan request		X				
Remote scan response		X				
Transmit power change		X	X	X		If the devices do not share an individual relationship, the piconet group data key shall be used. Otherwise, the management key (peer-to-peer or PNC-DEV) for the relationship shall be used.
APS sleep request		X				
APS sleep response		X				
SPS change		X				
SPS configuration request		X				
SPS configuration response		X				
SPS inquiry		X				
SPS inquiry response		X				

**4.4.2 Removing security from frames**

When a DEV receives a secure frame, it shall obtain the appropriate keying material from the MAC PIB depending on the SECID and source address found in the frame. To find the correct key, the DEV shall first check the MAC PIB for an ACL entry that corresponds to a peer-to-peer relationship with the sending DEV

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

and that has a MACPIB\_DataSECID or MACPIB\_ManagementSECID that matches the received SECID. If no peer-to-peer ACL entry matches the received frame, the DEV shall check the MACPIB\_PNCDataSECID and MACPIB\_ManagementSECID to determine if it matches the received SECID. If either of these entries gives a match, the DEV shall use the security suite in the corresponding MACPIB\_SecuritySuite and the key corresponding to the SECID. If an appropriate entry in the ACL cannot be found, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to UNAVAILABLE-KEY and shall not perform any additional operations on the received frame.

If the DEV is able to obtain the appropriate security suite and key from the ACL, the DEV shall compare the received time token to the value in the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken. If the frame is a beacon frame, the DEV shall determine if the received time token is greater than the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken. If the frame is not a beacon frame, the DEV shall determine if the received time token is equal to the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken. If either of these checks fail, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to BAD-TIME-TOKEN and shall not perform any additional operations on the received frame. If the time token matches, the DEV shall apply the operations defined by the security suite to the frame.

Before the security operations have been performed and the payload field has been modified, the DEV shall check the FCS. The DEV shall also check that the time token in the frame corresponds to the value in the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken. If the time token does not match, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to UNAVAILABLE-KEY and shall not perform any additional operations on the received frame

The decryption operation shall be applied only to the integrity code, seeds that are being transmitted in a distribute key command or request key response command and the payload of data frames. The result of the decryption operation shall be replaced into the received frame in the place of the encrypted data. The integrity code shall be computed on the entire frame with the decrypted data replacing the encrypted data up to the integrity code itself including the MAC header.

If any of the security operations fail, the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the DME with the ReasonCode set to FAILED-SECURITY-CHECK and shall not perform any additional operations on the received frame.

If the security operations have been successfully performed and the frame has been modified appropriately, the device may then continue to process the frame.

#### 4.4.3 Joining a secure piconet

If a DEV wishes to join a secure piconet, it should associate with the PNC in order to be assigned a local DEVID and time slots to perform the authentication process. Since the device must be associated before the authentication process has taken place, the association command and response should have the SEC field in the frame control field set to 0.

Once the DEV is associated, the PNC should allocate an MTS to allow the DEV to proceed with the authentication protocol as described in 9.9.1{xref}. Before the authentication process is initiated, the DEV and PNC should ensure that they will be able to successfully implement the authentication protocol. Once the DEV is associated, the DEV or PNC may choose to send probe commands to each other to request or transmit public key objects or to request or transmit preferred OIDs. When a public key object is received in a probe command before authentication, the DEV may choose to determine whether that public key would be accepted in an authentication protocol and update its ACL if desired. The DEV and PNC may also exchange additional information before authentication if desired.

After the DEV has associated and exchanged the desired information with the PNC, the DEV should initiate the authentication protocol. The authentication and challenge commands are designed to be used with secu-

rity turned off. In the authentication request command, the DEV should select either the security suite OID received in the association response or an OID received in a probe command after associating. Once the authentication protocol has been initiated, the DEV should follow the states and state transitions specified in 9.9.1.1 and 9.9.1.2 {xref}. While in the authentication process, the authentication commands should have the SEC field in the frame control field set to 0. If during the authentication process there is a security check failure of any kind, the DEV or PNC should return the appropriate error in the challenge response command or authentication response command respectively and exit from the authentication protocol.

#### 4.4.4 Secure beacon processing

##### 4.4.4.1 Generating secure beacons

A PNC in a piconet using security should send secure beacons protected with the piconet protection key stored in the MACPIB\_DataKeyInfo field in the MAC PIB. For each superframe, the PNC should increment the time token stored in the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken in the MAC PIB and transmit a secure beacon with the SEC field in the frame control field set to 1.

##### 4.4.4.2 Receiving secure beacons

In order to maintain secure and reliable operations in the piconet, a DEV shall use the beacon to help maintain the current time token and the current key. When the DEV receives a secure beacon (a beacon with the SEC field in the frame control field set to 1), it shall verify that the time token is greater than the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken, that the SECID matches the MACPIB\_PNCSECID stored in the MAC PIB and that the integrity code passes. If all of these checks succeed, the DEV shall set the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken to the received time token value and set the MACPIB\_ValidBeacon to valid. If the time token is greater than the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken, but the SECID does not match the MACPIB\_PNCSECID, the device may set the MACPIB\_CurrentTimeToken to the value in the beacon and send a key request command to the PNC to obtain the new key.

Comment (T): (Clause 9.4) The following descriptive text should be added to clause 9.4.

The security mode indicates in what manner a DEV shall utilize the entries in the MAC PIB piconet security group parameter and MAC PIB access control list group parameters. The security mode in use is determined by the MACPIB\_SecurityOptionImplemented entry in the MAC PIB.

Comment (T): (Clause 9.4.1) The description of security mode 0 is not descriptive enough and should refer to a DEV operating in the mode, not a piconet operating in the mode. Recommend replacing the text in 9.4.1 with the following text:

A device operating in security mode 0 shall not utilize the ACL entries and shall not perform any security related operations on MAC frames. While in this mode, if the MAC receives a frame with the SEC field set to 1, the MAC shall discard the frame and the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the higher layer with the ReasonCode set to UNAVAILABLE-KEY. If the MAC receives a frame with the SEC field set to 0, the MLME shall set the SecurityUse and ACLEntry fields to FALSE in the indication to the DME.

Comment (T): (Clause 9.4.2) The description of security mode 1 is not descriptive enough and should refer to a DEV operating in the mode, not a piconet operating in the mode. Recommend replacing the text in clause 9.4.2 with the following text:

Security mode 1 provides a mechanism for the MLME of a PNC to indicate to the DME if a received frame purportedly originated from a device in the ACL. The PNC may use this information as a criterion for allowing a device into the piconet. A device operating in security mode 1 shall not perform any security related operations on MAC frames. While in this mode, if the MAC receives a frame with the SEC field set to 1, the

MAC shall discard the frame and the MLME shall return an MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indication to the higher layer with the ReasonCode set to UNAVAILABLE-KEY. If the MAC receives a frame with the SEC field set to 0, the MLME shall set the SecurityUse field to FALSE and the ACLEntry field to TRUE or FALSE depending on if the sender is in the ACL in the indication to the higher layer.

Comment (T): (Clause 9.4.3) The description of security mode 2 is not descriptive enough and should refer to a DEV operating in the mode, not a piconet operating in the mode. Recommend replacing the text in clause 9.4.3 with the following text:

Security mode 2 provides a mechanism for a device to perform cryptographic security on frames transmitted in the piconet. DEVs operating in security mode 2 use public-key cryptography to verify the authenticity of other DEVs in the piconet and symmetric-key cryptography to protect frames using encryption and integrity. The cryptographic operations used for secure frames exchanged with the PNC and with other members of the piconet security group shall be performed as specified by the security suite indicated in the MACPIB\_SecuritySuite in the MAC PIB piconet security group parameters. The cryptographic operations performed for secure frames exchanged with a peer DEV shall be performed as specified by the security suite indicated in the MACPIB\_SecuritySuite entry associated with that peer security relationship in a MAC PIB access control list group parameters table. While in this mode, the MAC may accept frames with the SEC field in the frame control field set to 1 or 0 and shall set the SecurityUse in the MLME message to the DME to TRUE or FALSE respectively.

Comment (T): (Clause 9.4.4) The description of security mode 3 is not descriptive enough and should refer to a DEV operating in the mode, not a piconet operating in the mode. Recommend replacing the text in clause 9.4.4 with the following text:

Security mode 3 provides a mechanism for a device to perform cryptographic security on frames transmitted in the piconet. DEVs operating in security mode 3 use public-key cryptography and public-key certificates to verify the authenticity of other DEVs in the piconet and symmetric-key cryptography to protect frames using encryption and integrity. The cryptographic operations used for secure frames exchanged with the PNC and with other members of the piconet security group shall be performed as specified by the security suite indicated in the MACPIB\_SecuritySuite in the MAC PIB piconet security group parameters. The cryptographic operations performed for secure frames exchanged with a peer DEV shall be performed as specified by the security suite indicated in the MACPIB\_SecuritySuite entry associated with that peer security relationship in a MAC PIB access control list group parameters table. While in this mode, the MAC may accept frames with the SEC field in the frame control field set to 1 or 0 and shall set the SecurityUse in the MLME message to the DME to TRUE or FALSE respectively.

#### 4.5 Clause 10 comments

Comment (TR): (Clause 10.2.2) The mandatory to implement sub-suite should be less expensive and easier to implement than the current mandatory to implement sub-suite (ECIES-prime-256 raw 1). A security suite based on the RSA algorithm should be made mandatory.

Comment (TR): (Clause 10) The RSA-OAEP based security suite proposed in document {xref} should be inserted into the draft and made the mandatory to implement algorithm.

Comment (TR): (Table 82, pg. 259) The challenge response generation entry and the authentication response generation entry should add the following sentence at the end:

The secure frame counter used in the CCM nonce shall be the 2-byte string 0x0000.

## 5. Notes

Are sub-rate slots allowed to be pseudo-static?

Clarify 3 modes, 2 state (should already be comment).

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