

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16e/D8		Ballot Number: 0001037		Comment Date	
Comment # 4379	Comment submitted by: Brian		Kiernan	Member	2005/04/28
Comment	Type Technical, Binding	Starting Page # 573	Starting Line # 1	Fig/Table#	Section 12

I object to the resolution of comments #3520 and #3521, both of which dealt with system profiles.

Without adoption of definitive system profiles 802.16e cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients.

Definitive system profiles are absolutely required. Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution C80216e-05_60r2 or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Superceded
---------------------	--------------------------------------

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 4353.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions	l) none needed
----------------	------------------	----------------

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9		Ballot Number: 0001056		Comment Date	
Comment #	4379R	Comment submitted by: Brian Kiernan		2005-04-28	
Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	573	Starting Line #
				Fig/Table#	Section

I object to the resolution of comments #3520 and #3521, both of which dealt with system profiles. Without adoption of definitive system profiles 802.16e cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients. Definitive system profiles are absolutely required. Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution C80216e-05_60r2 or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
Reason for Recommendation		
Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Superceded	
See comment 4353		
Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution		
Group's Notes		
Group's Action Items		
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions l) none needed	
Editor's Questions and Concerns		
Editor's Action Items		

Document under Review: P802.16e/D8		Ballot Number: 0001037		Comment Date	
Comment # 4387	Comment submitted by: Remi		Chayer	Member	2005/04/28
Comment	Type Technical, Binding	Starting Page # 999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
I object to the resolution of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r3 (which was related to comments #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 80216-05_010). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution C80216e-05_60r2 was a start.					

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
Reason for Recommendation		
Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Rejected-Duplicate	
Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution		
See 4353		
Group's Notes		
Group's Action Items		
Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions l) none needed	
Editor's Questions and Concerns		
Editor's Action Items		

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9

Ballot Number: 0001056

Comment Date

Comment # 4387R

Comment submitted by: Remi Chayer

Comment

Type

Technical, Satisfied (was

Starting Page #

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

I object to the resolution of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r3 (which was related to comments #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 80216-05_010). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution C80216e-05_60r2 was a start.

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation:

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Rejected-Duplicate

See comment 4353

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16e/D8

Ballot Number: 0001045

Comment # 5700

Comment submitted by: Greg Phillips

Member

2005/06/08

Comment

Type Technical, Binding

Starting Page # Gen

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

In light of the report from the IETF on the security review of IEEE 802.16e D8. I cast a disapprove ballot.

If we knowingly allow the adoption of this standard after a report showing that the security of data transferred under the 802.16 standard can be compromised we can expect significant resistance from the market in adopting this technology.

One section of the specific text from the report that highlights these concerns is:

"Overall, significant issues were found in the usage of EAP by 802.16e. Issues were found with IEEE 802.16e compatibility with RFC 3748, the EAP Key Management Framework as well as AAA Key Management Requirements. Several of the issues discovered are considered "critical" in that if they are not repaired, IEEE 802.16e will provide little in the way of guaranteed security."

Their are many other items presented in addition to those relating to interoperability of AAA servers and failings of the current document.

I strongly make note that the work undertaken in this review process should not be ignored. These are very serious considerations that have been raised in the past and now we have highly qualified team describe them in sufficent detail for us not to ignore.

Suggested Remedy

Due to the late nature of this report sufficent time to draft a total remedy is not available. I suggest that the remedy process be undertaken as outlined in the report.

The review is available at <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>.

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: Superceded

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: Superceded

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions

l) none needed

No action required for this comment.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Document under Review: 802.16e/D9

Ballot Number: 0001056

Comment # 5700R

Comment submitted by: Greg Phillips

Comment Date

Comment	Type	Technical, Satisfied (was	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

In light of the report from the IETF on the security review of IEEE 802.16e D8. I cast a disapprove ballot.
If we knowingly allow the adoption of this standard after a report showing that the security of data transferred under the 802.16 standard can be compromised we can expect significant resistance from the market in adopting this technology.
One section of the specific text from the report that highlights these concerns is:
"Overall, significant issues were found in the usage of EAP by 802.16e. Issues were found with IEEE 802.16e compatibility with RFC 3748, the EAP Key Management Framework as well as AAA Key Management Requirements. Several of the issues discovered are considered "critical" in that if they are not repaired, IEEE 802.16e will provide little in the way of guaranteed security."
Their are many other items presented in addition to those relating to interoperability of AAA servers and failings of the current document.
I strongly make note that the work undertaken in this review process should not be ignored. These are very serious considerations that have been raised in the past and now we have highly qualified team describe them in sufficent detail for us not to ignore.

Suggested Remedy

Due to the late nature of this report sufficent time to draft a total remedy is not available. I suggest that the remedy process be undertaken as outlined in the report.
The review is available at <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Superceded
---------------------	-------------------------------

no text proposed, see comments No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions
	l) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: P802.16e/D8		Ballot Number: 0001045		Comment Date	
Comment # 5726	Comment submitted by: Dorothy Stanley		Member		2005/06/08
Comment	Type Technical, Binding	Starting Page # 999	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section 6.3
Errors in EAP usage identified in IETF review					

Suggested Remedy
Address the issues identified in <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Superceded Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation
No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Superceded

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution
No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items