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**IEEE 802.15 Plenary Meeting – Session #81**

**Grand Hyatt, San Antonio, Texas, USA**

**November 11-15, 2012**

**Tuesday 13 Nov 2012**

**6:30** SC Man called to order by Pat Kinney (Kinney Consulting)

* Submission review
	+ Cristina Seibert submitted the following:
		- 11012
			* Document's title (include revision/year): 802.15.4-2011
			* Clause number: 5.1.1.4
			* Page: 23
			* Issue, concern, or question: When BE is incremented following CCA, it should be set to the min of BE + 1 or macMaxBE (not macMinBE). This is what the current flow chart states: BE = min(BE+1, macMinBE). This is what is should state: BE = min(BE+1, macMaxBE). It is correct in the 2006 baseline.
			* Impact on existing equipment:  n/a
			* Discussion: condition was corrected by IEEE 802.15.4e-2012
		- 21012
			* Document's title (include revision/year): 802.15.4g-2012
			* Clause number: 18.1.2.1 and others
			* Page: 57 and others
			* Issue, concern, or question: The references in all blocks of various figures, including Figure 117 and Figure 132 are wrong, should be to Clause 18 not 16.
			* Proposed change: as suggested above.
			* Impact on existing equipment: n/a
		- 31012
			* Document's title (include revision/year): 802.15.4g-2012
			* Clause number: Annex D
			* Page: 126 and others
			* Issue, concern, or question: We define a SUN device as item FD8, but then later we reference it as FD6, for example in Tables D.2a and Table D.3 where we list mandatory items for this device, also in D.5 and D.6. Also, in Table D.3, we use RF10 in lots of places when we should have used RF12.
			* Proposed change: fix references in “Status” lines as suggested above.
			* Impact on existing equipment: n/a
	+ Noriyuki Sato submitted the following:
		- 131112
		- Document's title: IEEE 802.15.4-2011
		- Issue, concern, or question: Clause7.2.3
		- "Incoming frame security procedure". If we assume the procedure is done from the step a) to the step r) in order, unsecured frame cannot be accepted. The steps e), f) and g) are not for the unsecured frame but for the secured frame. The specification is described so that the step i) for the unsecure frame is done after these steps. Looking the specification 802.15.4-2006 the step correspond to the step i) was done before the steps correspond to steps e, f and g.

Attendees recommended that the 802.15 WG accept the submission as an appropriate change to IEEE Std. 802.15.4 and that it be considered during the next revision of 802.15.4.

* + Phil Beecher submitted the following:
		- 141112
		- Document's title: IEEE 802.15.4-2011
		- Request from ETSI TG28 to allow for payload information elements that are relevant to Europe
			* Consensus was to change unmanaged information element (IE) identification (ID) namespace to allow IEEE RAC assignment of Payload IE IDs for SDOs, et al
			* Consensus was to draft a Corrigendum PAR for approval at the 802.15 mid-week plenary for EC consideration on Friday

**7:15** SC Man adjourned

**Wednesday 14 Nov 2012**

No WNG meeting took place