

## Summary: La Jolla MAC Layer Discussions

## La Jolla Questions about WPAN

- Can a proper subset of 802.11 MAC be used for PAN?
- Can a subset of the 802.11 MAC lead to a significant implementation simplification and power consumption reduction?
- By what means and by how much can the MAC be simplified? What ratio of cost reduction might be expected?
- What incremental benefit can be derived from simplifying the RF (PHY) relative to the MAC?

## Commentary on MAC

- Best way to coexist with 802.11 is to reuse 802.11.
- Power savings “could” be accomplished by selecting a subset of options from those available in 802.11 and then hard wiring those options.
- Ad hoc and AP complexity are comparable.
- Ad hoc still requires ATIM
- Authentication and WEP are significant contributors to MAC complexity.
- Chris Zegelin foresees single RF and single MAC devices.
- Master slave - is the lowest power arrangement

## MAC Commentary (Cont.)

- Removing AP function would greatly simplify MAC - but adds complexity every where else.
- Device MAC could be simplified to talk to ad hoc only
- How does association work in ad hoc network.
- Temporary access point assignment to reduce power consumption.
- Current MAC is not optimized for low power - there are better ones.
- Network coalescing adds great complexity which should be concentrated in AP.

## Review of the 802.11 MAC

### **What option set of the 802.11 MAC would be appropriate for WPAN?**

## Options to KEEP

- Single BSS
- Peer to peer data frame type
- IBSS Beacon/join

## Options to EXTEND

- Add a new power management protocol

## Options to REMOVE or make OPTIONAL

- Reduces real time computational load
- MIB
- PCF
- RTS/CTS
- Fragmentation
- NAV
- WEP
- Association/authentication
- TIM/DTIM
- Multiple rates
- ESSID
- to DS / from DS
- Wireless DS