IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

WPAN 98/162r9 Debate

Date:	February 18, 1999
Author:	Peter Ecclesine Cisco Systems e-mail : petere@cisco.com

Greg Ennis is confused about doing this(voting to go forward with the (PAR) in context of leaving the 802.11 MAC and PHY. The modified PAR asks for a new working group. Also questions if vote is procedural or technical, because we don't believe the goals of the WPAN group can be meet in 802.11.

If the broad market appeal is splintered by the existence of Bluetooth and HomeRF, then WPAN would be better off trying to construct a new alignment is the reply.

Dean Kawaguchi – 802.11 lite may be possible but not make market sense; issues are
1) 802. Rules on Task Groups using the same MAC, or need to separate because of MAC changes. Worldwide use of the same band and interfering with others is also a consideration about being good neighbors is important. Issues will return at Sponsor Ballot. Symbol wants a WPAN device sooner, and I am not sure seperating off will reach market sooner.
2) Vic rules that the MAC defines the group, and an email from Jim Carlo says new 802.1 architecture document permits this. Vic says you have to use the MAC, but in a lite version.
Dean – is a strict interpretation of the wording of the PAR necessary? The one question of the same MAC drives the concerns.

Tom T – extension of .11 with incremental value. Believe everything can be done with extensions to .11, and am against leaving .11 Whoever standardizes Bluetooth will add a fourth group. This makes it worse.

Michael Fisher – What is the real purpose of this voting? Not clear that defeating this motion kills the PAR.
Some people seek keeping this activity in .11 Rev 9 says Task Group, but ExCom can choose how to proceed.
If the NO opinions are recorded and NO voters are present tomorrow

Bob O – belief of many that WPAN should remain in .11, and I agree. I fear that the PAR as a separate task group, maintaining compatibility with another Working Group is even harder. Little tweeks are not well understood. Hesitant because changes to Clauses have ramifications that don't have enough coordination.
The level of coordination will take place at Sponsor Ballot, not before. Argue against new Working Group

Naftali – The PAR can still go forward, but replicate work already done. Feel there is a creep in the PAN group from interoperability to exchanging data, and this requirement disappears from the PAR. Insist of exchanging data as requirement. Insist it stays in .11

Ivan – not a voter, but more than one MAC in .11 will not go forward was said on Monday. Own company is on other band and different MAC for RFID. Vote yes of Working Group instead of Study Group. Could be backdoor for Bluetooth to get IEEE standard. Within .11 or outside will be decided Thursday evening.

All the other groups also have their opinion about this.

Tom S – Opinion on Working Group is if .11 says no, this PAR will die, costing six months before Exec charters a WPAN to do the same thing.

Greg – wireless HomeRF can do data like Firefly for PAN applications. Bluetooth also has high-power version. Fear WPAN will have pressures to expand applications to expand to WLAN activities. History of the other groups suggest overlap into role of .11

Dean – Sponsor Ballot is a safeguard to the process. I will be on that group, and exercise my voice if I feel the need to. It would be faster if kept in .11, as there is overlap of interest.

Naftali – comment on .9 and .12: Shared media is different – we are talking about interference here. Is counterproductive to most people to have to cover separate Working Groups. Want it to draw on .11, and want to keep it within.

Bob O – move to amend PAR to replace Working Group to Task Group of 802.11, everywhere it appears.
Naftali seconds.

Greg asks Bob that the text might be wrong, so assume spirit is to change the PAR

Ivan – if this is a friendly amendment, can ExCom authorize not the same MAC to exist in WPAN. A slightly different MAC within .11 be authorized? The executive committee is being asked for this latitude to make small changes.

Johnny – vote on this amendment first. Speak in favor of amendment.

Steve Sh – WPAN intended a derivative MAC, but market votes anyway. Rules on MA without ambiguity. Vic personal opinion is related to .11 MAC with small extensions

Bob O – Whether 802.11 wants to participate in this PAN is the issue. The MAC can change as much as you convince .11 to change it. WPAN can be done successfully in .11 and keep work in .11

Dean – strongly in favor because we share the media. Call the Question.

Vote 33 – 8 – 5 motion to amend passes

==

Discussion to approve WPAN PAR as amended to be a Task Group of .11

No debate

Vote 31 – 9 – 4   motion passes but WPAN principals voted against it

Motion for question to exec

Tom S – guidance from others led this group to the slower and slower motion on WPAN.

John F – Wants his TgB as scheduled. Plenary adjourns at 5

Greg – against the motion because .11 MAC has termendous flexibility, can add elements, PICs can havve new types of devices. Need to investigate the flexibility. Don't think dramaticly different MACs should be considered until .11 MAC is investigated.

Bob O – exec will stay out of technical discussion. Doubt exec will question .11 or come back with how different it can be. This is a time water.

Harry – this would allow 5GHz to have a different MAC. This statement is too general.

Bob H - .11 MAC may be flexibe, but is it technically suitable? Want a motion with a recommendation to excom that has positive action from them.

Johnny – as .11 we are recommending what we want to happen. The jury is out on the .11 MAC used for WPAN. As that work progresses, a change of venue may be indicated.

Dean – agree .11 MAC could be made to work. How to get WPAN to buy back in to the group's view. Lots of people feel 5GHz is suitable to .11 MAC

Pat Ki – the fact that two MACs within one working group is allowable is fundamental. Quasi-identical was rrequired of .12

Steve S – there are big forces out there, and IEEE must allow multiple MACs within a working group because coexistance with these SIGs can only happen this way.

Tom T – multiple MACs or interoperability as the goal – that is the question

Tom S – support Bobs statement that we understand the rules of multiple MACs

Amend motion to ask a question

Bob H – must be done by 5pm as Study Group expires

Johnny – want to know

Greg – will just confuse the excom

Naftali – should work as a Task Group starting from .11 MAC. call the Q

Amended to ask excom for a ruling on multiple MACs in the same WG

Naftali – the Task Group should start working within .11, and call the Q

The motion fails 11 – 13 – 14

Motion 2 – send WPAN PAR 98/162r9amended to NesCOM for approval

This motion passes 36 – 0 – 7