

# 802.3 – Comments on other WG PARs

3 November 2014

San Antonio, TX, USA

# P802c

- Mention in PAR the amendment will primarily be making recommendations (e.g., informative annex)
- We see value in allowing multiple local address administrators in a local domain (which does require something like a CID as the basis)

# P802.1AS

- PAR, 5.6 – Stakeholder list is incomplete. List does not include any hardware vendors, only application providers. As is clear from other project information, bridge vendors, providers and users are also stakeholders. Bridge silicon vendors may also be stakeholders.

# 802.1Qch

- PAR, 5.6 (non-substantive) – Stakeholders response begins with an incomplete sentence. Delete “such as”?

# 802.15.7a (p.1)

1. PAR, 2.1 (non-substantive) – This has been changed from the IEEE format. Publication uses a line break before amendment, not an emdash. Publication will also number the amendment. It is acceptable to not specify an amendment number, but it will be “Amendment \_\_\_: <Standard Name>”. Consequently, “for a” should be deleted from the title.
2. PAR, 2.1 – “Optical Camera Communications” is poorly phrased. Aren’t most cameras optical devices? Is the amendment only for optical cameras, or is it optical communications for cameras (if so the optical does not need to be repeated in the Amendment title). The amendment repeating parts of the base standard title creates confusion. Based on other information, work will use other non-camera components (e.g., flashlights), making “camera” in the title misleading to potential interested parties. Please rethink the title, and replace with a properly descriptive title.
3. PAR, 5.1 - With 10 active 802.15 projects it is doubtful that 100 individuals will be actively involved in development of the project. The answer to this question should be the number of people attending TG meetings, not WG members (as the question used to ask).

## 802.15.7a (p.2)

4. PAR, 5.4b - The scope of the project is outside the scope of the standard, and contrary to the title of the standard (range of wavelengths). This is absolutely not acceptable and should prevent approval by the 802 EC unless changed. (E.g., this could be done as a revision project, or a separate standard.)
5. PAR, 5.4b - The amendment scope also contradicts the title of the base standard. Ultra-violet and Infra-red are not visible.
6. PAR, 5.4b - The first sentence of scope confuses wavelength and frequency and needs to be edited (e.g., delete “frequencies”).

## 802.15.7a (p.3)

7. PAR, 5.5 - Second paragraph, unexpanded acronyms are not allowed, please expand OCC, (hopefully also changing the term per comments 2 and 8).
8. PAR, 5.6 - The amendment title contradicts the stakeholders list as the possible applications are considered broader than cameras (e.g., lighting). This can be misleading to interested parties excluded by “camera”. A properly descriptive title will fix this.
9. CSD, Broad Market - Expand OCC (hopefully also changing the term- (comments 2, 8).