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**IEEE 802.15 Plenary Meeting – Session #82**

**Hyatt Regency, Vancouver, Canada**

**January 13-17, 2013**

**Tuesday 22 Jan 2013**

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

* Agenda
  + Review subject matter for upcoming Corrigenda (P802.15.4r)
  + Review submission by Billy Verso
* Corrigenda matter, two requests were discussed

1. Document's title: 802.15.4-2011
   * + Issue, concern, or question: 131112

* "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. 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.

1. Document's title: 802.15.4e-2012

* Issue, concern, or question: 141112
* Request from ETSI TG28 to allow for payload information elements that are relevant to Europe
* SCmain consensus was to change unmanaged information element (IE) identification (ID ) namespace to allow IEEE RAC assignment of Payload IDs for SDOs, etc.
  + There was no opposition to limiting the Corrigenda to the above two corrections. It was agreed that James Gilb would be responsible for the text for correction 1 (security) and Ben Rolfe would be responsible for correction 2 (payload information elements).
* Submission review
  + - Attendees recommend the following submission to accepted and be considered during the next revision of 802.15.4.
      * Document's title: IEEE 802.15.4-2011
      * Issue, concern, or question: 150113
      * The IEEE-802.15.4a(2007) clause 3 definition of ranging marker (as "The first ultra-wide band (UWB) pulse of the first bit of the physical layer (PHY) header (PHR) of a ranging frame (RFRAME). does not appear in the normative text of IEEE 802.15.4-2011. It was not put into clause 3 of IEEE 802.15.4-2011 because it was a UWB PHY specific item, and the intention was to include it in the UWB PHY clause 14, but, this was not done. It is identified in the informative Annex E clause E.1.1 in the 3rd last sentences of the 1st paragraph, it says "The first pulse of the PHR is the ranging marker (RMARKER)
      * Since it was defined in the normative text of IEEE-802.15.4a(2007) it should be defined in the normative text of IEEE 802.15.4-2011.

**19:30** meeting adjourned

**Wednesday 16 Jan 2013**

No WNG meeting took place