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Abstract

This document addresses the following CIDs: 1688 1689 1718 2406 1719 1857 2034 2038 2077 2078 2079 2081 2088 2441 2409 2442 2489 2019 2490 2492 2493 2497 2498 1398

2325 2412 2427.

R0: initial version.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1688 | 69.36 | 9.6.7.48 | "The Location Measurement Report frame is an Action No Ack frame of category Ranging. "if a new category "ranging" is defined, it should be added to Table 9-53 Category Values in Cl. 9.4.1.11. | Update Table 9-53 Category Values with the new category "ranging" | **Revised.** We clarify that it is a Public Action No Ack frame as per document: 11-19-1880 |

***TGaz Editor: Modify text starting at P91L29 as:***

**9.6.7.48 Location Measurement Report frame format**

The Location Measurement Report frame is an Action No Ack frame of category Public (#1688).

***TGaz Editor: Modify text starting at P94L12 as:***

**9.6.7.49 ISTA Passive Location Measurement Report frame format**

The ISTA Passive Location Measurement Report frame is an Action No Ack frame of category
Public(#1688).

***TGaz Editor: Modify text starting at P94L27 as:***

**9.6.7.50 Primus RSTA Broadcast Passive Location Measurement Report frame format**

The Primus RSTA Broadcast Passive Location Measurement Report frame is an Action No Ack
frame of category Public(#1688).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1689 | 70.03 | 9.6.7.48 | A new action value has to be defined for "Location Measurement Report" and Table 9-362 Public Action field values in Cl. 9.6.7.1. | Update Table 9-362 Public Action field values with the new public action corresponding to "Location Measurement Report". | **Revised.** Agree in principle with the commenter. This problem has already been resolved in draft 1.5 P87L22.  |
| 1718 | 16.01 | 6.3.56.2.2 | There is no corresponding section for NGP Parameters | Add the subclause and the fix the subclause number | **Revised.** In draft 1.5 the term “NGP Parameters” in this table has been replaced with “Ranging Parameters”. We fixed the reference as per document 11-18-1880.  |
| 2406 | 14.27 | 6.3.56.2.2 | Should "Randing Parameters" be "NGP Parameters" instead? Table after that says "NGP Parameters" is added. | Correct the term to have consistency. | **Revised.** In draft 1.5 the term “NGP Parameters” in this table has been replaced with “Ranging Parameters”. We fixed the reference as per document 11-18-1880.  |

***TGaz Editor: Modify Table entry starting at P32L1 as:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ranging Parameters | As defined in9.4.2.279(RangingParameters) (#1718) | As defined in9.4.2.279(RangingParameters) (#1718) | Optional element containing theconfiguration for the proposedNGP session | Yes |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1719 | 13.01 | 6.3.56.1 | The Ranging NDPA which is the response of the Trigger frame should be added in the Figure 16-7c. | As in the comment | **Reject.** Section 6.3 describes the MAC SAP interface between the MAC layer Management Entity and the Station management Entity (SME) and the resulting flow to the peer STAs at MLME and SME. As a result, PHY entity is not described. The NDP is a PPDU (Phy PDU) that is not visible at the MAC level and as such is not described in this figure. Refer to 11.22.6.4 Measurement exchange section for complete flow. |
| 1857 | 20.23 | 9.3.1.20 | Why are there two different ToD Error fields? Shouldn't there be only one? Figure 9-981b and Figure 9-981c | Correct the field titles or delete one of the two figures | **Reject.** Figure 9-981b refers to ToD Error field while Figure 9-981c refers to ToA Error field which are distinct fields.  |
| 2034 | 20.23 | 9.3.1.20 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]"The RID11/AID11 subfield contains the 11 least significant bits of the RID or AID of a STA " -- well, which is it? It can't contain both | Clarify | **Revised.**In draft 1.5 P41L12 this sentence has been revised to clarify that the AID value is used for associated STA and the RSID value is used for unassociated STA.  |
| 2038 | 20.06 | 9.3.1.20 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]It is not clear how a VHTz Ranging NDPA is distinguished from an HEz Ranging NDPA | Add a bit to the RNDPA format to distinguish these | **Reject.**For TB Ranging the first STA Info field in the Ranging NDP-A frame contains AID11/RSID11 field value equal to 2044. This can be used to distinguish between TB and NTB Ranging.  |
| 2077 | 35.08 | 9.4.2.246 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]" and is similar to AID " -- how similar? What does this mean? | Just delete | **Rejected.** This sentence is already deleted in draft 1.5.  |
| 2078 | 35.09 | 9.4.2.246 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]"The Ranging ID and the AID are derived the same space and are non-conflicting. " is behaviour and needs to be in Clause 10 | As it says in the comment | **Revised.** We prefer to keep this text in the current location as this sentence conveys information about the value of that particular field and clarifies when this value corresponds to an AID and when to an RSID. We further clarify this by revising the text as per document 11-19-1880.  |

***TGaz Editor: Modify text starting at P75L25 as:***

The AID/RSID field contains an identifier for the ISTA for the duration of the FTM session. If the
ISTA is associated with the RSTA the value is set to the ISTA’s AID. If the ISTA is not
associated with the RSTA, the AID/RSID field is set to the RSID which has the same length
as the AID and is assigned by the responder to identify the unassociated ISTA. The RSID and the AID are derived the same ID number space and are non-conflicting (#1709, 2437, 2078).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2079 | 35.21 | 9.4.2.246 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]"that an RSTA transmit. " -- which RSTA? | Change to "transmitted by the RSTA." | **Revised.**We revised the text as per document 11-19-1880.  |

***TGaz Editor: Modify text starting at P76L10 as:***

The BSS Color field field has the same format as in the BSS Color Information field . Each subfield of the BSS Color Information field is set to the same value in the HE Operation element transmitted by the RSTA. The BSS Color Information field is reserved in the IFTMR (#1710, #2079).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2081 | 35.04 | 9.4.2.246 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]"The Element ID and Length fields are defined in 9.4.3 (Subelements). " -- there's no Element ID field in a subelement | Use the wording from the baseline for subelements | **Revised.**We revised the text as per document 11-19-1880.  |

***TGaz Editor: Modify text starting at P74L5 as:***

The Subelement ID and Length fields are defined in 9.4.3 (Subelements) (#2081).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2088 | 36.26 | 9.4.2.251 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]"Number of SecureLTF Sequence " -- bad grammar | Change to "... Sequences" | **Reject.**There is no such field in draft 1.5.  |
| 2441 | 15.00 | 6.3.56.2.2 | LCI Report is not mentioned at all in 9.6.7.33. Correct the reference. | As in comment. | **Revised.** The reference is correct. We revised the text as per 11-19-1880 to add LCI Report in the Table.  |
| 2409 | 16.01 | 6.3.56.2.2 | The Description column for Fine Timing Measurement Parameters is not properly copied from the baseline. It appears to be the same with that of Location Civic Report. Correct it. | As in comment. | **Revised.** We revised the entry in that table as per 11-19-1880 |

***TGaz Editor: Add an entry for the LCI Report in the Table starting at P31L1 as below:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Max t4 ErrorExponent | Integer | 0-31 | The maximum error in the t4value. This is represented using afunction of the Max t4 ErrorExponent parameter as defined inEquation (9-4), or is null if theFollow Up Dialog Token is 0 | No |
| (#1565)LCI Report  | As defined in9.6.7.33 (FineTimingMeasurementframe format) | As defined in9.6.7.33 (FineTimingMeasurementframe format) | Optional element to report LCI information ofsender | No (#2441) |
| Location CivicReport | As defined in9.6.7.33(FineTimingMeasurementframeformat) | As defined in9.6.7.33(FineTimingMeasurementframeformat) | Optional element to reportlocation civicinformation of sender | No |
| Fine TimingMeasurementParameters | As defined in9.4.2.167(FineTimingMeasurementParameterselement) | As defined in9.4.2.167(FineTimingMeasurementParameterselement) | Optional element containing the proposed FTM configuration (#2409) | No |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2442 | 15.00 | 6.3.56.2.2 | Location Civic Report is not mentioned at all in 9.6.7.33. Correct the reference. | As in comment | **Reject.**The reference is correct. Please refer to P1549L17 in REVmd Draft 2.4.  |
| 2489 | 19.08 | 6.3.5.5.5 | The addition is not clearly marked. | please mark the addition clearly | **Rejected.**The addition of the Ranging Parameters element is clearly marked in draft 1.0.  |
| 2019 | 8.14 | 6.3.58.2.2 | [Re-raising this comment from the comment collection, as it is not possible to determine from 18/1544r8 whether/how it was addressed. References are to the CC draft and hence may be wrong against D1.0.]No new parameter is apparent | Use standard 802.11 change-tracking | **Rejected.**The addition of the Ranging Parameters element is clearly marked in draft 1.0. |
| 2490 | 22.14 | 6.3.56.2.1 | What is a "RSTA"? There doesn't seem to have a definition for it. | please define what a "RSTA" is | **Revised.**The meaning of the term “RSTA” has already been clarified in Draft 1.5 P21L18.  |
| 2492 | 22.14 | 6.3.56.2.2 | unclear what the change is. Please clearly indicate the change in parameters | please clearly mark the new changes | **Revised.** Agree in principle. However, the changes have already been clearly marked in Draft 1.5 P30L30.  |
| 2493 | 23.01 | 6.3.56.2.2 | Ranging parameters" is not included in the table | add "ranging parameter" | **Revised.** Agree in principle. However, the term Ranging Parameters is present in the Table in draft 1.5. Please refer to P32L1.  |
| 2497 | 12.03 | 6.3.56.1 | It could be a scenario that a STA needs to send the Ranging NDPA to multiple responding STAs so as to perform timing measurement with them and get its geo location. It should consider this case in the spec and describe it with a figure. | as in the comment | **Rejected.** The benefit of the proposed behaviour is unclear because of the additional overhead of receiving NDP and LMR from multiple non-collocated RSTAs.  |
| 2498 | 16.10 | 6.3.56.2.3 | It needs to add a case for ISTA centric timing measurement exchange with multiple RTSA. | As in the comment | **Rejected.** The commenter fails to provide enough rationale or details for this proposed behaviour.  |
| 1398 | 33.04 | 9.4.2.1 | Table 9-87 - refers to a "Ranging CSI Information" - is that intended to be Ranging Parameters Element? | Change to Ranging parameters element or clarify otherwise. | **Revised.**Agree in principle with the commenter. However, this term has been changed to “Ranging Parameters” in draft 1.5.  |
| 2325 | 146.00 | 21.2 | Section 21 is missing in the text body but the TOC has it. | Please correct. | **Rejected.** The 11az specification document only covers changes relative to the 11ax specification draft. Since 11az frames made no change to Clause 21, the description of that section is missing.  |
| 2412 | 17.20 | 6.3.56.3.1 | "Imminently" Should this be "immediately"? | As in comment. | **Revised.**Agree in principle with the commenter. However, the sentence containing this word has been removed in draft 1.5.  |
| 2427 | 37.09 | 9.4.2.127.1 | Clarify where to add DMG Direction Measurement Capabilities subfield. Is it at the end? | As in comment. | **Rejected.**Unless otherwise said the instruction to add a new column automatically implies it to be added at the end.  |