802 Architecture Group Report

IEEE 802.16 Presentation Submission

Document Number:
> IEEE 802.16-04/72

Date Submitted:
> November 15th

Source:

David Johnston		Voice:	503 264 3855
Intel		Fax:	503 264 3483
2111 NE 25th		E-mail:	dj.johnston@intel.com, david.johnston@ieee.org
Hillsboro, OR 97124			

Venue:
> November 2004, 802 Plenary, San Antonio, TX

Base Document:

Purpose:

> Report on proceeding of the 802 Architecture Group.

802 Architecture Group Report

David Johnston, Intel

Phil Barber, BMT

General Items

- Due Dilligence around PARs is weak (criticism)
  - Broad discussion about the extent to which groups adhere to their PAR and 5 criteria
  - Criticism of treating a PAR as a license for a group to do whatever it pleases
  - Lack of compliance test to 5 criteria at time of SEC approval to pass to RevCom
  - Compatibility with .1D is required. Two groups (including 802.16) have not written the required bridging section in 802.1D
    - This would require 802.16 to raise a PAR to amend 802.1D
  - Many observations that review and oversight mechanisms fail to address PAR & 5C violations

General Items

– **Security was a concern**

- .1X/ae/af does not meet link security needs for all MACs (Including 802.16, MAC & MBS keying)

- Observations that individual MACs need to address security for their own headers and protocols

– **DFS & TPC (Power control & Channel Selection)**

- Lack of any pan-802 coordination of this

- Probably can apply to other network interface items as well

General Items

– MTU

- 802.3 modifying its frame size
- Affects others who assume 1500 as a minimum (due to bridging with other LAN segments)
  – 802.1D bridging specifies dropping bridged frames that are too large for the target media
- Especially .16, that has an undefined MTU
- General observation that an MTU discovery should developed in 802.1. Proposals to 802.1 welcomed

Proposal for Resolution
(Final slide developed in meeting)

- Due diligence issues
  - Tony Jeffries to propose to SEC that the rules for forwarding to SB & RevCom be strengthened
  - WGs should review projects against PAR/5C requirements during the development cycle
- Each WG
  - Prioritize issues
  - Characterize problem
  - Propose approach to resolve, or identify as intractable
  - Identify other groups (802 or external) that may be affected