

January 20, 2011

Doc.: IEEE 802.15-11-0053-02-004g

Project: IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)

Submission Title: [Comment resolutions for PICS]

Date Submitted: [January 20, 2011]

Source: [Kunal Shah]

Company [Silver Spring Networks]

Address []

Voice: [], FAX: [], E-Mail: [kshah@silverspringnet.com]

Re: []

Abstract: [This document provides resolutions to comments#108, 166, 379, 473, 556, 557, 558 and 740]

Purpose: [This document provides resolutions to comments of LB59]

Notice: This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE P802.15. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

Release: The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution becomes the property of IEEE and may be made publicly available by P802.15.

Summary

This document describes the proposed resolution on the comments related to the definition of frequency deviation.

The following comments are addressed: CID#108, 166, 379, 473, 556, 557, 558 and 740

Comments and proposed resolutions

CID #108: A PSDU size of 2047 should not be mandatory for SUN devices. While the protocol supports this value, there may be a variety of devices in the network and devices may choose to implement a smaller max packet size.

Proposed change: Remove the PSDU size requirement

Proposed Resolution: Reject. The PICS reflects what is in the draft and draft mentions the maximum PSDU size shall be 2047 for SUN PHYs.

CID #379: The SUN PHY has a variety of frequency options, but the PICS does not reflect that.

Proposed change: Add in entries for the supported frequencies for the SUN PHYs in the PICS.

Proposed Resolution: Accept in principle. Resolved as per CID#174

CID #473: RF7.1 enumerates the licensed bands and shows support for them as optional, but because the unlicensed bands are not listed, it implies that a single radio must support all of the others that are not listed - should those not be separately enumerated? For example, 2.4GHz should be its own line item, as one is not required to support it along with the sub-GHz bands, where I am assuming that to be compliant, one must only support one of those.

Proposed change: Enumerate the bands as their own line items

Proposed Resolution: AP. Remove RF7.1 from the table as these frequency bands are part of the table 75a and covered in RF 8.1

CID #556: Missing the 863-870 MHz band

Proposed change: Add 863-870 MHz band

Proposed Resolution: AP. RF7.1 is removed from the table. Resolved as per CID#473

CID #557 and 558: 470 MHz is not correct.

Proposed change: Change 470 MHz to 450 MHz

Proposed Resolution: AP. Resolved as per comment#545

CID #166: The PICS are confusing and not clear.

Proposed change: Please review and ensure they are correct.

Proposed Resolution: Accept in principle. PICS have been reviewed and it's been improved and more clear now.

CID #740: Entries of Table D.4 are incomplete with regard to the MR-O-QPSK PHY. RF16 is not correct, since pilot insertion is not optional.

Proposed change: Please, correct this.

Proposed Resolution: AP. Remove RF16 from the table.