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**IEEE 802.15 Plenary Meeting – Session #78**

**Hyatt Regency, Atlanta, Georgia, USA**

**May 13-17, 2012**

**Wednesday 14 May 2012**

**10:52** 802.15 WNG SC chaired by P Kinney (Kinney Consulting) brought to order noting that today’s meeting included two presentations:

* Letter Ballot 81 MAC Features
* L2 Routing Demands for FAN

**10:54** Letter Ballot 81 MAC Features (15-12-0261-01) by R Krasinski (Philips)

* J Gilb explained the process and rationale for recirculating a draft standard noting that a critical aspect is a review of the resolutions of comments.
* Coordinator Switching
	+ Comment: coordinator doesn’t know what coordinator to switch devices
	+ Comment: devices don’t know they are moving
	+ Comment: orphaning already addresses this use case
	+ Comment: coordinator switching implicitly assumes coordinators are communicating
	+ Comment: out of scope since use case doesn’t agree with scope
* Channel Switching
	+ Comment: since current timeframe is in minutes, current 802.15.4 mechanisms (e.g. orphan) are sufficient
		- Response: this is not a range issue, rather it is a regulatory demand to vacate the channel(s)
	+ Comment: merit in the need for channel switching but should consider mechanism that would work for other applications
	+ Comment: coordinator alignment is broadcast and not directed to a specific device with a time initiation requirement
	+ Comment: investigate modifying coordinator alignment to address the needs of this application in addition to TG4k and TG4m; e.g. Coordinator Alignment with option of Broadcast frame or Unicast frame with ACK, etc.
* Association Proxy
	+ Comment: justification for this change is incorrect, the decision as to what coordinator to associate with is above the MAC
	+ Comment: 15.4 process culture is that this is done by a higher layer via the read/write PIB attributes
* Multi-Periodic GTS
	+ Comment: need for this function is questioned
	+ Comment: scheduled mechanisms in a low duty cycle system have been done in 15.4, for example please review DSME
	+ Comment: this breaks the standard due to beacon timing
* Wrap up
	+ TG4j meetings follow this one
	+ Important that TG4j understand that 15.4 experience and knowledge abounds at these meetings
	+ Only MAC changes necessary for PHY are within scope

**11:55** L2 Routing Demands for FAN (15-12-0268-01) by Noriyuki Sato and Kiyoshi Fukui (OKI), Thomas Herbst (Silver Springs Networks)

* Comment: please review the document 11-12-0589-01 (Trill) with respect to routing
	+ Response: Have looked at this effort, but process could be an issue
* Comment: slide 6 – 15.5 is misunderstood, i.e. no address shortage, various energy options do exist
* Straw Poll: How many companies have an interest on this activity?
	+ 14
* Do we establish an interest group or a study group within 802.15 to discuss it?
	+ IG: 18
* Given the interest and the expected participation an interest group will be formed at the closing plenary.

**12:16** Meeting adjourned