

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review:	P802.16e/D8	Ballot Number:	0001037	Comment Date	
Comment #	4379	Comment submitted by:	Brian Kiernan	Member	2005/04/28
Comment	Type Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	573	Starting Line #	1
		Fig/Table#		Section	12

I object to the resolution of comments #3520 and #3521, both of which dealt with system profiles.

Without adoption of definitive system profiles 802.16e cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a standard. It can't even be called a "cookbook". In reality it is more like a shopping list from which anybody can pick any combination of non-interoperable ingredients.

Definitive system profiles are absolutely required. Despite the shortcomings identified as the reason for their rejection, the system profiles proposed during the last recirc were at least a starting point in defining an interoperable set of parameters.

Suggested Remedy

Adopt contribution C80216e-05_60r2 or any subsequent updates or revisions to it.

Proposed Resolution	Recommendation:	Recommendation by
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group	Decision of Group: Superseded
---------------------	--------------------------------------

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

See comment 4353.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes	Editor's Actions) none needed
----------------	------------------	---------------

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001037**

Comment Date

Comment # **4387**Comment submitted by: **Remi****Chayer**

Member

2005/04/28

Comment	Type	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	---------

I object to the resolution of Comment 3250 in 80216-05_12r3 (which was related to comments #1850, #1859, #1861 and #1864 in 80216-05_010). It is important to include complete profiles in the document. Contribution C80216e-05_60r2 was a start.

Suggested Remedy

The working group should start developing complete profiles based on the input from the participants.

Proposed Resolution**Recommendation:****Recommendation by****Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected-Duplicate****Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**[See 4353](#)**Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5700**

Comment submitted by: Greg

Phillips

Member

2005/06/08

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	Gen	Starting Line #	Fig/Table#	Section
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	------------	---------

In light of the report from the IETF on the security review of IEEE 802.16e D8. I cast a disapprove ballot.

If we knowingly allow the adoption of this standard after a report showing that the security of data transferred under the 802.16 standard can be compromised we can expect significant resistance from the market in adopting this technology.

One section of the specific text from the report that highlights these concerns is:

"Overall, significant issues were found in the usage of EAP by 802.16e. Issues were found with IEEE 802.16e compatibility with RFC 3748, the EAP Key Management Framework as well as AAA Key Management Requirements. Several of the issues discovered are considered "critical" in that if they are not repaired, IEEE 802.16e will provide little in the way of guaranteed security."

Their are many other items presented in addition to those relating to interoperability of AAA servers and failings of the current document.

I strongly make note that the work undertaken in this review process should not be ignored. These are very serious considerations that have been raised in the past and now we have highly qualified team describe them in sufficient detail for us not to ignore.

Suggested Remedy

Due to the late nature of this report sufficient time to draft a total remedy is not available. I suggest that the remedy process be undertaken as outlined in the report.

The review is available at <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>.

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: **Superceded** Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: **Superceded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions I) none needed

No action required for this comment.

Editor's Questions and Concerns

2005/08/05

IEEE 802.16-05/035r4

Document under Review: **P802.16e/D8**

Ballot Number: **0001045**

Comment Date

Comment # **5726**

Comment submitted by: Dorothy

Stanley

Member

2005/06/08

Comment Type **Technical, Binding**

Starting Page # **999**

Starting Line #

Fig/Table#

Section

6.3

Errors in EAP usage identified in IETF review

Suggested Remedy

Address the issues identified in <http://www.drizzle.com/~aboba/EAP/review.txt>

Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Superseded**

Recommendation by

Reason for Recommendation

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Superseded**

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

No text proposed. See comments 5129, 5135, 5320, 5321, 5329, 5341, 5614, 5669.

Group's Notes

Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes

Editor's Actions |) none needed

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items