**IEEE P802.15**

**Wireless Specialty Networks (WSN)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project | IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Specialty Networks (WSN) | |
| Title | **Suggested Resolution to PAR comments** | |
| Date Submitted | 9 November 2021 | |
| Source: | () | E-mail: ben.rolfe @ ieee.org |
| Optional Contact Information: |  |
| Re: | PAR Comments from PAR review | |
| Abstract | Addresses comments received from WG 802.11 | |
| Purpose | Support completion of the PAR process | |
| 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. | |

# 802.15ma PAR comments

## Comments from 802.11

802.15ma - Standard for High Data Rate Wireless Multi-Media Networks - Revision to IEEE Standard 802.15.3-2016, PAR and CSD

**Comment on Title of the Standard**

2.1 – NesCom Conventions states

“For PARs for new projects, standards developers who use general terms to represent ranges (e.g. high, medium, low) within the title, scope, or purpose, must numerically define such ranges where they first appear (title, scope, or purpose, as applicable). Any exception to this must be explained.”

So, the title should be considered to be updated to include the range that the revision will cover. As 802.15 is now not just Low data rate or personal area networks, the title should be updated to include a range per convention.

**Recommendation: Remove “High Data Rate” from the title.**

Reasoning:

1. “High Data Rate” is in fact meaningless.
2. Everything, including changing the title, is within scope of a revision.
3. There is absolutely no reason to include specific data rates in the title of the standard. Note that there is no data rate range given in the title (or scope) of 802.11 for example (a good example)
4. Reducing it to “Multi-media Networks” would be consistent with, for example, the title of 802.11.
5. The range of data rates for 15.3 is now vast and expected to expand
6. If we specify a specific range, to exceed the specified range would require a revision instead of an amendment (to change the title)
7. “Multi-Media Networks” differentiates 802.15.4 clearly from other 802.15 standards
8. The suggested remedy to add a range is impractical and based on what appears an incorrect assumption that 802.15.3 was previously a low data rate target

**5.5 Properly cite “802.15.3d, 802.15.3e and 80.15.3f” ..e.g. IEEE std 802.15.3d…”**

**Recommendation: Accept. The correct citations are:**

* **IEEE Std 802.15.4-2016**
* **IEEE Std 802.15.3d-2017**
* **etc…**

**8.1 Please list the full Standard name for those standards cited in the PAR:**

5.5 Standards cited in the PAR:

802.15.3d, 802.15.3e and 80.15.3f.

IEEE Std. 802.1D-2004,

IEEE Std. 802.1Q

**Recommendation: Regarding “full standard name” my first guess is this means use the title as published, e.g. “IEEE std 802.15.3f IEEE Standard for High Data Rate Wireless Multi-Media Networks Amendment 3: Extending thePhysical Layer (PHY) Specification for Millimeter Wave to Operate from 57.0 GHz to 71 GHz”**

**The group may invite Jon R. to clarify.**

**CSD: Not required for Revision Projects. – Thanks for the effort.**

Recommendation:

**Simply acknowledge the observation with the response: Thank you for the observation.**

Avoid the debate as to whether a CSD was required or any explanation as to why the group thought it was required. The group made the right decision but need not dwell on this reality. Note that Jon R, who chaired the 802.11 PAR SC, suggested no explanation nor justification is necessary. Follow his suggestion (via the EC reflector).