IEEE P802.15
Wireless Personal Area Networks

Project	IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)	
Title	**TG3 SB2 comment resolution**	
Date Submitted	[9 March, 2003]	
Source	[James P. K. Gilb] [Appairent Technologies] [15373 Innovation Drive, #210, San Diego, CA 92129]	Voice: [858-485-6401] Fax: [858-485-6406] E-mail: [gilb@ieee.org]
Re:	[]	
Abstract	[This document is a record of comment resolutions for SB2.]	
Purpose	[To provide a record of the comment resolution for SB2.]	
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 in Dallas

1.1 Monday, 10 March 2003

Ad-hoc meeting called to order at 4:25 pm CST.

CID 19 - ACCEPT.

CID 21 - ACCEPT.

CID 22 - ACCEPT.

CID 23 - ACCEPT.

CID 24 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. On page 232, line 8, change 'are discarded' to be 'is passed to the DME using the MLME-SECURITY-ERROR.indcate and no other action is taken on the frame by the MLME.' Also page 231 line 40 and all other occurances.

CID 27 - ACCEPT.

CID 28 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add sentence following "...not specified in this standard.", "The Security Message command has been included as a special command to assist in the implementation of vendor specific protocols for establishing security relationships and any related data.

CID 31 - ACCEPT.

CID 33 - ACCEPT.

CID 36 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change "authentication" to "secure membership" in two places.

CID 35 - ACCEPT.

CID 37 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change:Line 24: "such as a change in authentication state" to "such as a change in security relationship"Line 25: "transitions from being unauthenticated to authenticated or vice-versa" to "changes membership status in a security relationship"Line 27: "change in authentication status" to "change in secure membership status"

CID 38 - ACCEPT.

CID 39 - Write new text for the security membership row that replaces authentication and deauthenticaion rows, change the table title as well. - Bailey, due 11/3/03 am.

CID 41 - ACCEPT.

CID 42 - ACCEPT.

CID 44 - ACCEPT.

CID 45 - Replace authentication and deauthentication with MLME-MEMBERSHIP-UPDATE.request in the figures and in the text in 9.4.6.1. Lots of text, could be 12 March 2003.

CID 43 - Resolve with CID 45.

CID 46 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change two occurances of "authentication complete" to "security membership established". Also change de-authenticate to "secure membership rescinded"

CID 47 - Replace authentication and deauthentication with MLME-MEMBERSHIP-UPDATE.request in the figures and in the text in 9.4.6.3. Lots of text, could be 12 March 2003.

CID 48 - Replace authentication and deauthentication with MLME-MEMBERSHIP-UPDATE.request in the figures and in the text in 9.4.6.4. Lots of text, could be 12 March 2003.

CID 49 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change text on right side of figure to read' to be 'Disassociate command sent or received, membership status rescinded or PNC handover.' Add text to page 233, line 54. ', i.e. the DEVs secure membership has been rescinded.' Add text to page 234, line 3 change "If the MembershipStatus is set to NON-MEMBER, the MLME shall ...' to be 'If the MembershipStatus is set to NON-MEMBER, the DEV's secure membership is rescinded and the MLME shall ...'.

CID 50 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change text on right side of figure to read' to be 'Disassociate command sent or received, membership status rescinded or PNC handover.'

CID 51 - ACCEPT.

CID 151 - REJECT. The symmetric key operations happen at the MAC level and so the updating and exchanging of these keys is appropriate for the standard. The symmetric key operations are fully defined in this standard and they are an integral part of the frame formats. There needs to be a way for the MAC to change a key to maintain its freshness.

Meeting recessed at 5:33 pm CST.

Meeting called to order at 7:10 pm CST.

CID 76 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add a .indicate to be generated after the reciept of the second Assocation Request command with the Piconet Services Inquiry bit set. Change the existing .indicate primitive to be a .confirm that carries the information back to the DEV that requested it. Add the When generated and Effect of Reciept. Update the MSC in figure 103 to be PNC MLME -> .indicate -> PNC DME, PNC DME -> .response -> PNC MLME, and DEV MLME -> .confirm -> DEV DME.

CID 59 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change text to indicate that the Association IE only indicates that a DEV is associated. Add text to the PNC information command using the old text from the Association IE to indicate that this command is used to communicate changes in a DEV's membership.

CID 58 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add a timer to the MSC that starts after the MLME-ASSOCIATE.response primitve. Add text that says that the associating DEV has until the ATP timer expires to send the response frame. If the DEV sends the second response command after the timeout expires, the PNC sends the disassociate command as described in 8.3.4.

CID 96 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The backoff counter is suspended and then re-starts with the next CAP. This is stated on page 181, lines 38-42. Delete the xref to 8.4.2 on line 39, the text is now in the same subclause.

CID 169 and CID 165 - Sounds interesting, check for outside opinion.

CID 149 and CID 150 - Probably a good idea, but we need to review the text to find all of the places where it will need to change, probably a few in clause 8 as well as the parameter names in clause 6. The beacon number will correspond to the superframe when the change takes effect. The beacon number - 1 superframe is the last superframe with the old status. ADH will review clause 8 text to find out where to change.

CID 93 - ACCEPT.

CID 120 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Asynchronous data can't use the Dly-ACK because there is no guarantee that the MSDU numbers will be sequential because asynchronous data frame all share the same MSDU counter, regardless of destination. If the DEV is sending asynchronous data to more than one destination, there will be gaps in the MSDU numbers.

The text in 8.8.3 is confusing, move the sentence on page 205, line 27 to 8.1 on line 27, page 159.

CID 125 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Use the yet unused bit combination in the ACK Policy subfield to indicate "Dly-ACK Policy with Dly-ACK Request", and merge reserved bits into a reserved subfield.

CID 129 - Will be reject, James to dig up the old reject text. Keep the same name.

CID 106 - Will be reject, WMS will dig up old email on why the retry bit is used. Also add an xref to 7.2.1.6 to the fragmentation and duplicate detection. 8.8.4 and 8.8.5.

CID 68 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The RIFS was intended as guidance of when the DEV could start the retransmission, however in the current draft it incorrectly mandates when the DEV will start transmitting. Change "limit has been met) at the end of RIFS as long" to be "limit has been met) after the end of RIFS as long"

CID 142, CID 152, CID 157, CID 101 - MIFS CTRq? WMS will check with KO to get better explanation of why it should be deleted.

CID 143 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the first sentence on line 20 to be "The Wake Beacon Interval field is defined in {xref 7.5.8.3}. This field is set to the system wake beacon interval for PS sets 0 and 1." Change the first sentence on line 24 to be "The Next Wake Beacon field is defined in {xref 7.5.8.4}. This field is set to the next system wake beacon for PS sets 0 and 1."

CID 98 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Add a new sentence to the end of line 26 on page 183: 'The source DEV may also send a frame to a destination DEV in any CTA assigned to that source even if the destination DEV is different that that indicated in the CTA block, provided the source DEV has determined that the destination DEV will be receiving in that CTA, {xref 7.4.11}.'

CID 148 - REJECT. Sending with the IE would save a total of 7 octets per DEV. However it would limit the total number of DEVs unless the Announce command could be fragmented. Alternatively, the number of DEVs in the piconet would have to be communicated if multiple Announce commands were used. The text on broadcasting the piconet information with the PNC Information command was unchanged between D15 and D16.

CID 156 - REJECT. Sending with the IE would save a total of 7 octets per DEV. However it would limit the total number of DEVs unless the Announce command could be fragmented. Alternatively, the number of DEVs in the piconet would have to be communicated if multiple Announce commands were used. The text on broadcasting the piconet information with the PNC Information command was unchanged between D15 and D16.

CID 158 - ACCEPT.

CID 155 - ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. In Figure 103, change 'in the first Association Request command.' to be 'in the Association Request command with the SrcId set to the newly assigned DEVID.' On page 177, line 1 change 'in the Association Request command' to be 'in the Association Request command with the SrcID set to the newly assigned DEVID' On page 177, line 3, change 'PNC has received the second Associ-

ation Request' to be 'PNC has received the second Association Request with the SrcID set to the newly assigned DEVID'

CID 53 - REJECT. The DEV will eventually timeout waiting for the IE if the DEV doesn't return it. This is sufficient for the state machines.

CID 54 - JPKG to ask JS how important this is. What if we put the received Overlapping PNID in the beacon. Can this be done by just sending it in piconet parameter change? How about letting it re-send it every 0x2A superframes. Also say that DEVs don't send it if the Piconet parameter change is in the beacon.

Meeting recessed at 10:22 pm CST.

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. Unsatisfied technical comments from SB1

3. Status summary

3.1 Status at Dallas

.

Table 1—Ballot resolution at opening of Dallas meeting

Type	SB1	SB2
T (technical)	447	67
E (editorial)	379	104
Total	826	171

.

Table 2—Comment resolution at opening of Dallas meeting

Type	3/10/03	3/11/03
Unresolved T	31	
Resolved T	36	
Unresolved E	72	
Resolved E	32	
Total coments	171	171

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