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Abstract

This submission contains a liaison request from Neville Brownlee (IETF Individual Submission Editor) and the liaison response from the 802.11 WG.

# Liaison Request

Email received by Dorothy Stanley from Dan Romascanu and Nevil Brownlee Monday May 5, 2014, included the following concerns and requested review of the draft:

<snip>

IEEE 802.11 and draft-avula-shwmp-01:

 Several people from IESG and IAB have pointed out to me that it may

 conflict with work being done in IEEE 802.11, particularly in 802.11s.

<snip>

 Nevil Brownlee (ISE), rfc-ise@rfc-editor.org

# Liaison Response:

To: Neville Brownlee (ISE) mailto:rfc-ise@rfc-editor.org;

CC: ma0004@uah.edu; yoos@uah.edu; nok60@dongseo.ac.kr; dstanley@arubanetworks.com ; dromasca@avaya.com ; pthaler@broadcom.com;

Dear Neville,

Thank you for bringing draft-avula-shwmp-01.txt (Secure Hybrid Wireless Mesh Protocol) to our attention.

The IEEE 802.11 WG expresses no opinion on the utility of this draft, and has no general objection to the publication of such drafts. Such work is possible because the IEEE 802.11 standard was designed to enable the development of a variety of mesh path selection protocols to extend the range of conditions for which an IEEE 802.11 mesh is suitable. It was intended that path selection protocols could be developed independently of IEEE 802.11.

However, we do have a specific objection to the current draft because it fails to specify a unique code point to identify the mesh path selection protocol it specifies. All stations in a particular IEEE 802.11 wireless mesh must use the same path selection protocol to avoid interoperation failures. The protocol in use is identified in the 802.11 messages used to establish and maintain the mesh.

We request that appropriate allocation considerations be incorporated into the draft. For example, the draft could specify that the Active Path Selection Protocol Identifier be set to 255, the “Vendor Specific” value, and an appropriate Vendor Specific Information Element included. Alternatively, the allocation of a currently reserved IEEE 802.11 Active Path Selection Protocol Identifier value could be requested from the IEEE 802.11 WG. If this alternative is chosen, such a currently reserved code point must be allocated through the IEEE 802.11 ANA (Assigned Number Authority) mechanism to avoid conflict. The IEEE 802.11 WG will consider approval of such an allocation upon request.

Note that the IEEE 802.11 WNG (Wireless Next Generation) Standing Committee currently meets at every 802.11 WG meeting to provide an opportunity for new ideas for 802.11 to be presented, for example by the one or more authors of this draft or their representatives.

For your reference, IEEE Std 802.11™-2012 is the current version of the IEEE 802.11 Standard.

Please feel free to contact myself as chairman of the IEEE 802.11 Working Group and Dorothy Stanley as IEEE 802.11 to IETF Liaison Officer for further information.

Best Regards,

Adrian Stephens