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Abstract

Some issues that arose when the editor attempted to incorporate the 802.11ai D0.5 comment resolutions approved during the July 2013 meeting.

CIDs 1007, 1385, and 1397 all indicate that 13/478 provides resolution. However, the clause modified by this submission does not exist in the document and thus cannot simply be modified. There is no indication that a new clause is to be added, only that this non-existent clause should be modified.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clause Number(C)** | **Page(C)** | **Line(C)** |  |  |
| 8.4.2.183 | 36 | 52 |  |  |

From submission 13/0478r3:

***Instruct the editor to modify section 8.4.2.188.1 as indicated:***

**8.4.2.188.1 Fragmentation of Data**

Data that is too large for a single IE may be fragmented into........

After considerable time on this, the author was queried and provided the following explanation:

 11-13/0478r2 was voted in. That added 8.4.2.188 and its subsections.

Subsequently, 11-13/0478r3 was voted in. That further edited one of

the subsections that was added by 11-13/0478r2. If the documents are

addressed in the order in which they were motioned, I think the draft

will be in proper shape.

The latest revision to 0478 should have provided instructions to the editor for changeing the draft, not changes to itself.

CID 1003 modifies a sentence that is incomplete and yet does not satisfy this problem (incomplete sentence). Anyone have a better wording suggestion? For starters, the term "AP CCC" is not defined previously and this presents a problem. The ending phrase "...excluding the following dynamic information fields and elements." is subject to interpretation as to whether the exclusion refers to the AP CCC, an AP Configuration Information Set, the Probe Response frame, or both Beacon and Probe Response frames.

Original

A non-AP STA with dot11FILSActivated equals to true may retain one or multiple APConfiguration Information Sets, one for each preferred APs which the STA previously obtained. An APConfiguration Information Set is a set of information fields and information elements of the Beacon frame or the Probe Response frame, excluding the following dynamic information fields and elements.

- Time Stamp

- Time Advertisement

- BSS AC access Delay

- BSS Average Access Delay

- BSS Available Admission Capacity

- TPC Report

- Beacon Timing

- BSS Load

- Extended BSS Load

As revised:

**A non-AP STA with dot11FILSActivated equal to true may retain one or multiple AP Configuration Information Sets, one for each preferred AP which the STA previously obtained. An AP Configuration Information Set is a set of information fields and information elements of the Beacon frame or the Probe Response frame that include AP CCC element, excluding the following dynamic information fields and elements.**

- Time Stamp

- Time Advertisement

- BSS AC access Delay

- BSS Average Access Delay

- BSS Available Admission Capacity

- TPC Report

- Beacon Timing

- BSS Load

- Extended BSS Load

Example of why editor is going crazy:

The instruction is to replace, the deletion is shown but no new text to insert. Turns out it was delete.

*Instructions to Editor: In the clause of 10.1.4.3.8 , page 70, lines 28-35 replace the text as follows:*

The referenced clause does not match actual clause. Need to verify which is correct. (not hard to do, just takes time)

**10.24 WLAN interworking with external networks procedures**

**10.24.3 Interworking procedures: generic advertisement service (GAS)**

~~If a STA acquires a GAS Configuration Sequence Number from a current beacon or probe response, and if the STA retains GAS information previously acquired from a STA through a previous association attempt GAS message exchange including GAS configuration information and GAS Configuration Sequence Number, and if the GAS Configuration Sequence Number transmitted in the current beacon or probe response equals the value stored by the STA from the previous association attempt, then the STA attempting association shall not initiate a GAS query request to the discovered STA and instead shall use the previously acquired GAS information values as current values.~~

CID 1010 is resolved by 13/0742r3. Comparing this submission with Revmc and 11ad, finding some issues and differences:

The draft uses 11ad text as base, thus 11ad text should not be shown with underlines. Underlines apply to changes that we are making within 11ai, not other amendments.

* Frame filtering based on STA state

The current state existing between the transmitter and receiver STAs determines the IEEE Std(#130) 802.11 frame types that may be exchanged between that pair of STAs (see Clause 8 (Frame formats)). A unique state exists for each pair of transmitter and receiver STAs. The allowed frame types are grouped into classes and the classes correspond to the STA state. In State 1, only Class 1 frames are allowed. In State 2, either Class 1 or Class 2 frames are allowed. In State 3 and State 4, all frames are allowed (Classes 1, 2, and 3). In the definition of frame classes, the following terms are used:(11ad)

* *Within an infrastructure BSS:* both the transmitting STA and the recipient STA participate in the same infrastructure BSS
* *Within a PBSS:* both the transmitting STA and the recipient STA participate in the same PBSS

In clause 10.3.3, the paragraph starting with " The frame classes are defined as follows:" has changes that are questionable:

From submission: From 11ad (latest approved version of this):

a) Class 1 frames

1) Control frames

i) RTS

**ii) DMG Clear to send (DMG CTS)**

**iii) CTS**

iv)) ACK

v) Grant

vi) SSW

* Class 1 frames
* Control frames
* RTS
* **CTS**
* **DMG Clear to send (DMG CTS)(11ad)(Ed)**
* (#1198)Ack
* Grant(11ad)
* SSW(11ad)

(Red highlights are to focus on issue, not a part of any draft or proposed change)

Soooo, does the editor consider switching items "ii" and "iii" as in submission even when it is not specifically called out as a change?

References (#1198), and (ed) are not explained and don't know what should be done with them. The number 1198 assumed to refer to CID, but not identified as being a part of the submission. (11ad) is interpreted as identifying texted added by 802.11ad and the expression is removed from the draft (leaving text as published in 11ad)

From 13/0742r3: From 11ad:

2) Management frames

i) Probe Request/Response

ii) Beacon

**iii) Authentication**

**iv) Deauthentication**

v) ATIM

vi) Public Action

* Management frames
* Probe Request/Response
* Beacon
* FILS Discovery Frame
* **Authentication Deauthentication**
* ATIM

(Red highlights are to focus on issue, not a part of any draft or proposed change)

Is it intentional to merge two list items into one? Editor is making draft match 11mc/11ad instead of the submission.

Same/similar problem with b)Class 2 frames: used 11ad version instead of submission

From 11ad:

A multi-band capable device that uses OCT to move from State 2 to either State 3 or State 4 shall not transmit frames before the transmitting STA becomes on-the-air enabled (see 10.32.4).

From submission:

A multi-band capable device that uses OCT to move from State 2 to either State 3 or State 4 shall not transmit frames before the transmitting STA becomes on-the-air enabled (see 10.33.4 (On-channel Tunneling (OCT) operation.

Differing cross references (no change markings to show the change was intentional), assume 10.32.4 is correct.