P802.3 PARs ad hoc
IEEE P802.3 ad hoc on pars from other WGs

Robert M. Grow, ad hoc chair

RMG Consulting

San Antonio, Texas, USA

9 November 2016

P802c (PAR modification)

Local Medium Access Control (MAC) Address Usage

- PAR — No comments.

P802.1AR (revision PAR)

Secure Device Identity

- PAR — No comments.

- CSD — No comments.

P802.1CS (new standard)

Link-local Registration Protocol

- PAR , 5.2 Scope — The scope appears in the standard and therefore should be written in present tense. While the first sentence does describe what is in the standard, the last sentence needs to be rewritten to describe what is in the standard, not what will be provided.

- CSD — The answers are very terse, causing some to infer that the CSD questions were not taken seriously.

P802.11 (amendment)

Low-power wake-up radio operation

- PAR, General — It would be helpful to reviewers if the PAR were output from the myProject system. Failure to use myProject also leads to errors, for example, the approval date is the approval by the SASB, which will not be November 2016; and the expiration date is based on the approval date. (Neither should be filled in at this point.)

- PAR, 5.2.b Project scope — As written the last sentence could be taken as requiring an implementation to be less than one milliwatt, or with an alternate parsing of words that the project is expected to allow WUR radios consuming less than one milliwatt. Rewrite to either clearly state as a requirement, or if not a requirement a possible implementation characteristic.

P802.11 (amendment) p.2

- CSD, 1.2.3 Distinct Identity — You may want to delete the second paragraph, because the title of a document does not create distinct identity of the specifications contained in the proposed amendment.

- 1.2.4,b) Technical Feasibility — The answer seems to contradict the response to Economic Feasibility, this response seems to say that technical feasibility is not known. Therefore, additional study time should be spent to determine with appropriate confidence WUR technical feasibility before a PAR is submitted. Based on the Economic Feasibility we assume enough is known about the technical feasibility that this question could be properly answered.

P802.19.2 (new standard)

Coexistence of Unlicensed Wireless Systems in an Automotive Environment

- PAR, General— We suggest the scope be broader and reflected in the title. The term vehicular environment would be better than automotive environment. Need and Stakeholders talk about vehicles. We believe the project should address motor coaches and other non-automobile highway vehicles? The Need (5.5 highlights traffic jams as a potential problem, and therefore, a motor coach could be a coexistence challenge. The Scope need an appropriate terminology change. Further the note in 8.1 to 5.2 belongs in the scope.

P802.19.2 (new standard) p.2

- PAR, 5.4 Purpose — Because Purpose is included in the standard, the statement should not include phrases like "typical scenarios the recommended practice will include:". Could probably be rewritten "typical scenarios include:"

- CSD — The CSD document uses both automotive environment and vehicle, and therefore causes the same concerns as expressed in the first general comment. Please use vehicular environment.