802.3 ad hoc on PARs from other WGs

Dallas, Texas, USA

November 2015

Background

- The 802.3 WG chartered an ad hoc (open to any attendees) to submit comments on behalf of the 802.3 WG.
- Comments labeled “non-substantive”, do not require response from the WG, as they are largely editorial in nature. Nonetheless, the 802.3 WG will appreciate consideration of these comments.

P802d

URN Namespace

- PAR
  - 5.3: Change answer to no, remove explanation. If this is to be mirrored on OID, the IEEE-SA requested the assignment and will hold the root.
  - 6.1b: The RA doesn't develop tutorials but the RAC will work with WGs prior to posting a tutorial on the RA pages. IEEE 802.1 has the primary expertise in IEEE-SA for the development of a tutorial on this topic. Recommend: The Registration Authority Committee is requested to review and refine a tutorial for the generalized version of the IEEE 802 URN namespace definition.
- CSD
  - No comments.

802.1CQ
Multicast and Local Address Assignment

- PAR
  - General: This PAR ignores the problems of multicast in wireless networks. This is a major concern for IOT and should be addressed. (Everything on this PAR is true for wired, but not necessarily for wireless.)
- CSD
  - Coexistence – The stock answer used for a wired environment given is not really correct. The project does not specify a PHY, and a CA document would not address the problems with multicast in wireless environments.
  - Economic Feasibility — Expand CIDs. The RAC does not assign CIDs, the RA does. Context for CIDs also is not known for the project documents. Perhaps: A local address distribution protocol utilizing a Company ID (CID) is a possible capability, and CIDs are available from the IEEE Registration Authority for a known cost.

802.15.4t

Amendment for a High(er) Rate Physical (PHY) Layer

- PAR
  - The use of “High(er)” is problematic. We believe it will be unacceptable to NesCom and that publication editors will not accept that form for a standard title. Please pick one (High or Higher),
- CSD
  - Managed Objects — Is it really the case that 802.15.4 does not include any attribute that indicates to local STA what the capabilities of the wireless device are? If there is a capabilities attribute, then the new capability would have to be added. If there is no attribute the current answer is self contradictory, it say Yes but it has already been done by other projects.
  - Technical Feasibility — There is nothing in the answer to a) that answers the question of b). Therefore, the answer to b) is insufficient.
  - Economic Feasibility — There is nothing in the answer to a) that answers the question of d), but it is lightly addressed in Technical Feasibility a).

802.15.4u

Amendment for use of the Indian 865-867 MHz band.

- PAR
  - Full stop after title is not IEEE Style.
- CSD
  - Managed Objects — Is it really the case that 802.15.4 does not include any attribute that indicates to local STA what the capabilities of the wireless device are? If there is a capabilities attribute, then the new capability would have to be added. If there is no attribute the current answer is self contradictory, it say Yes but it has already been done by other projects.
  - Economic Feasibility — There is nothing in the answer to a) that answers the question of d). Perhaps 802.15.4 being low power consumption focused already leads the WG to intellectually ignore this question.

802.16s
Fixed and Mobile Wireless Access in Channel Sizes up to 1.25 MHz

- PAR
  - 4.2, 4.3 — These are very aggressive schedule dates, especially for a joint project. Please make sure they are realistic.
- CSD
  - No comment.