IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| Cleanup of some editorial comments resolutions for LB201 |
| Date: 2014-08-26 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Ping FANG | Huawei Technologies | Vision Business Park, Nanshan, Shenzhen, China | 0086 755 36835832 | Ping.fang@huawei.com |

Abstract

As pointed out by Mark Rison, some editorial comment resolutions don’t provide enough details on what exactly change has been accepted and will be applied for the new version. This document provides cleanup to this kind of resolutions.

R1 addes CID 4634.

*Note:*

*Action line proposes the cleanup solution to the corresponding CID resolution.*

CID **4634**

CID comments is :

Comment is:

In Table 8-27, "Key Delivery" field is claimed to be present when dot11FILSActivated is true. This does not sound correct. Surely this field is not included if FILS was not used for this specific association. Should add "Present if FILS authentication is used and status code is 0." Similarly, some of the other fields in this table may need additional constraint to remove elements in cases they are not really used in the Association Response frame.

Issues: Resolution says “revised” but does not providing a revision

Discussion: The comment is similar to CID 5183. The ad-hoc notes indicate, that both CIDs (4634 and 5183) should be resolved by the same resolution. The resolution for CID 5183 (approved per Motion 105) is the same as for CID 4634 except that it indicates the comment as rejected. Note that Motion 105 explicitly stated to change the resolution status for CID 4634 to revised; but the motion left the existing resolution text as is.

Action: Change the resolution for CID 4634 to:

REJECT -- if dot11FILSActivated is true, the STA is doing FILS which implies that the field is present

CID **4696**

CID : "If dot11FILSActivated equal" be changes to "If dot11FILSActivated is equal" in 10.1.4.3.4.

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “Revised” but no details were provided.

Discussion: The subclause has been changed to 10.1.4.3.6 by Jarkko’s contribution on scanning. And in D2.1, it is not updated yet.

Action: Change the resolution from “Revised” to “Accepted” .

CID **4743**

CID : "What does "limited by the MLME-parameters" mean? What's an "MLME-parameter" anyway?"

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “Revised” but no details were provided.

Discussion:

CID 4904 also addresses the same issue here. The current change in D2.1 is from CID 4904. But this will result in “Upon receipt of the MLME-SCAN.request primitive, a STA shall perform scanning. A STA executes scanning procedures according to the parameters given in the MLME-SCAN.request primitive.” Which can be further improved as “Upon receipt of the MLME-SCAN.request primitive, a STA shall perform scanning according to the parameters given in the primitive.” So we suggest overwriting the resolution from CID4904, and applying the change as below.

Action: Change the resolution from “Revised” to “

Revised, change the sentence from “All ESSs are scanned unless the scanned ESSs are limited by the MLME-parameters” to “according to the parameters given in the primitive”.

CID **4770**

CID: "There is one exception to the rule. The STA" -- it's not a rule, since it's a "should"

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “Revised” but no details were provided.

Discussion:

Now the new parapgraph has been rewritten by 14/0765r7. The new text rephrased the conditions after “A STA that responds to a probe request according to 10.1.4.3.4 (Criteria for sending a probe response)shall transmit a Probe Response or a Beacon frame as follows”.

Action: Change the resolution from “Revised” to

Revised, change the sentence from “There is one exception to the rule. The STA shall respond to Probe Request frame which includes the Element ID of the RCPI element in the Requested Element Ids of the Request element.” to “If dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and if the Request element of the Probe Request includes the RCPI element ID, the STA shall include in the Probe Response an RCPI element containing the measured RCPI value of the received Probe Request frame. If no measurement result is available, the RCPI value shall be set to indicate that the value is unknown or is not used.”.

CID **4835**

CID: I just can't make any sense of "set the FILS Time and FUsed to explicitly request for an IP address FILSC Information fields to limit the number of STAs that are allowed to attempt link setup concurrently"

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “Revised” but no details were provided.

Action: Change the resolution from “Revised” to

Revised, change the sentence from “and set the FILS Time and FUsed to explicitly request for an IP address FILSC Information fields to limit the number of STAs that are allowed to attempt link setup concurrently” to “and set the FILS Time and FILSC Information fields to limit the number of STAs that are allowed to attempt link setup concurrently”.

CID **4772**

CID: "probe response or a beacon frame" be changed to "Probe Response or Beacon frame"

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “Revised” but no details were provided.

Action: Change the resolution from “Revised” to “Accepted”.

CID **4829**

CID: How can you set L and CRC-32 to lowercase?

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “ACCEPTED” but no specific change was proposed.

Action: Change the resolution from “ACCEPTED” to

Revised, move the parenthesis to the same line as definition of D, change the sentence from “D is the Domain Name,

(all set to lower case)” to “D is the domain name (all ASCII characters are set to lower case)”.

And make the following change to correct the capitalization of “domain name”

On page 47 line 64,

change “the hashed domain name of the Domain Information field is computed from the Domain Name that is compliant with the “Preferred Name Syntax” as defined in IETF RFC 1035 (same as the domain name used in 8.4.4.15 (Domain Name ANQP-element)).” to

 “The hashed domain name in the Hashed Domain Name subfield of the Domain Information field is computed from the domain name that is compliant with the “Preferred Name Syntax” as defined in IETF RFC 1035 (same as the domain name used in 8.4.4.15 (Domain Name ANQP-element)).”

On Page 96 line 62,

Change “When is used, an AP can indicate up to 7 domains that the AP is connected to using the hashed domain name field of the Domain Information field of the FILS Indication element. The domain name is set to the domain as defined in IETF RFC 6696. For each of the indicated domain names, the FILS element carries a 2 octet” to

“When is used, an AP can indicate up to 7 domains that the AP is connected to using the Hashed Domain Name subfield of the Domain Information field of the FILS Indication element. The domain name is the domain as defined in IETF RFC 6696. For each of the domain names, the FILS Indication element carries a 2 octet”

On page 97 line 7,

Change “H is the Hashed Domain Name,” to “ H is the hashed domain name”.

CID **4887**

CID: "The Category field indicates the public category, as specified in Table 8-43 (Category values) in 8.4.1.11 (Action field).set to the value for public action defined in Table 8-43 (Category values)." is completely garbled

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “ACCEPTED” but no specific change was proposed.

Action: Change the resolution from “ACCEPTED” to

Revised, change the sentence from “The Category field indicates the public category, as specified in Table 8-43 (Category values) in 8.4.1.11 (Action field).set to the value for public action defined in Table 8-43 (Category values).” to “The Category field is set to the value indicating the Public category, as specified in Table 8-54 (Category values).”.

CID **4719**

CID: "as shown in Figure 10-3d and Figure 10-3d" -- it's a great Figure but I still don't think it should be mentioned twice

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “ACCEPTED” but multiple proposed changes were proposed.

Action: Change the resolution from “ACCEPTED” to

Revised, change the sentence from “as shown in Figure 10-3d (Active scanning when a Probe Request frame is addressed to Broadcast address) and Figure 10-3d (Active scanning when a Probe Request frame is addressed to Broadcast address).” to “as shown in Figure 10-3d (Active scanning when a non-DMG STA transmits Probe Request to broadcast address).”.

CID **4734**

CID: It doesn't define them, it merely describes them.

Issues: The resolution to the CID is “ACCEPTED” but multiple proposed changes were proposed.

Action: Change the resolution from “ACCEPTED” to

Revised, change “defines” to “describes” in line 1 and line4.

CID **4710**

CID: Successful association enables a STA to exchange Class 3 frames in all cases (and what's an "association handshake" anyway?).

Issues: The resolution to the CID is REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-07-16 18:43:04Z)In D2.1. Merged the two paragraphs. But this is not clear enough for the detailed change.

Discussion: the change in D2.1 as indicated CID 4710 is “Successful association enables a STA to exchange Class 3 frames. Successful association sets the non-FILS STA's state to State 3 or State 4 and for FILS STAs to State 4 .”, the action below further improves this change.

Action: Change the resolution from “REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-07-16 18:43:04Z)In D2.1. Merged the two paragraphs.” to

Revised, change “Successful non-FILS association enables a STA to exchange Class 3 frames. Successful association sets the STA's state to State 3 or State 4.

Successful FILS association handshake enables a STA to exchange Class 3 frames. Successful association

sets the FILS STA's state to State 4.” to “Successful association enables a STA to exchange Class 3 frames. Successful association sets a non-FILS STA's state to State 3 or State 4 and sets a FILS STA’s state to State 4 .” and change the sentence on line 7 page 89 from “Successful reassociation sets a FILS STA's state to State 4 and enables it to exchange Class 3 frames” to “Successful reassociation enables a STA to exchange Class 3 frames. Successful reassociation sets a non-FILS STA's state to State 3 or State 4 and sets a FILS STA’s state to State 4.”

**References:**

14/0565r18 (D2.0 comments spreadsheet post-San Diego)