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##### This submission present proposed resolutions for the following 30 CIDs:

3195, 3196, 3335, 3391, 3416, 3550, 3692, 3703, 3721, 3729, 3363, 3412, 3251, 3426, 3464, 3260,

3360, 3413, 3484 (PHY), 3441, 3474, 3476, 3482, 3496, 3505, 3728, 3274, 3483, 3115

##### The proposed changes are based on REVme/D2.0.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – Initial version

##### R1 – Updated per the discussion on 2 December 2022

##### R2 – Updated per the discussion on 7 December 2022. Proposed resolution of CID 3726 is removed.

##### R3 –Proposed resolution of CID 3413 is updated.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3195 | 11.1.3.8.4 |  |  | "identified by an ElementID and Element ID Extension (if applicable)" -- missing "field" (also other locations) | 2x on referenced page change "an Element ID and Element ID Extension" to "Element ID and Element ID Extension fields" and 1x change "same Element ID and Element ID Extension" to "same Element ID and Element ID Extension fields" |
| 3196 | 11.1.3.8.4 |  |  | "identified by an ElementID and Element ID Extension (if applicable)" -- missing "field" (also other locations) | Identify locations where "field" is missing |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that the “field” is missing for both “Element ID” and “Element ID Extension”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3195:***

Accepted.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3196:***

Revised.

At 2348.24 and 2348.43, replace “an Element ID and Element ID Extension” with “Element ID and Element ID Extension fields”.

At 2348.45, replace “the same Element ID and Element ID Extension” with “the same Element ID and Element ID Extension fields”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3335 | 27.4.4 | 4198 | 50 | "See (#2369)10.12.2 (A-MPDU length limit rules) and 9.2.4.6.1 (General)" should be "and 9.2.4.8.1" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 4198.50 in D2.0 (a note in Table 27-54):**

NOTE—This is the maximum length in octets for an HE SU PPDU with a bandwidth of 160 MHz or 80+80 MHz using 2×996 RU, HE-MCS 11, 8 spatial streams, 0.8 μs GI duration, 1x HE-LTF, LDPC coding, 0 μs duration of the PE field, pre-FEC padding factor value of 4, and limited by 398 possible Data field OFDM symbols in aPPDUMaxTime. This is the maximum PSDU length an HE PHY could support assuming no restrictions in MAC. See (#2369)10.12.2 (A-MPDU length limit rules) ***and 9.2.4.6.1 (General)*** for additional restrictions on the maximum number of octets the MAC could support.

For 9.2.4.6.1, it is about HT Control field, which is not related to the discussion about the maximum number of octets the MAC could support. Agree with the commenter that 9.2.4.8.1 is an appropriate reference especially since it is about Frame Body field.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3335:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3391 | 11.21.15 | 2603 | 8 | "in the HE Capabilities element, that it transmits," spurious commas | Delete commas at 2603.8 |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2603.8 in D2.0:**

A non-AP STA that supports channel usage and has the TWT Requester Support subfield set to 1 in the HE Capabilities element, that it transmits, may negotiate an off-channel TWT schedule with its associated AP, for setting up a noninfrastructure network on an off-channel, by transmitting a Channel Usage Request frame that includes TWT Elements field if the AP has the off-channel TWT scheduling support bit set to 1 in the Extended Capabilities element.

Agree with the commenter that the two commas (one before and one after “that it transmits”) are redundant.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3391:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3416 | 12.7.2 | 2906 | 13 | "The following (#1836)EAPOL-Key PDUs are used to implement the" is missing a word | Append " handshakes" |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2906.13 in D2.0:**

The following EAPOL-Key PDUs are used to implement the:

— 4-way handshake message 1 is …

— 4-way handshake message 2 is …

— 4-way handshake message 3 is …

— 4-way handshake message 4 is …

— Group key handshake message 1 is …

— Group key handshake message 2 is …

Agree with the commenter that it is better to append “handshakes” so that the sentence is read as “The following EAPOL-Key PDUs are used to implement the handshakes”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3416:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3550 | 10 |  |  | Figure 10-21 gains nothing from the pseudo-3D | Make it 2D |

***Discussion:***

**Figure 10-21 in D2.0:**

****

While a pseudo-3D figure may gain nothing with respect to a conventional 2D one, the technical contents of the figure are clear. The commenter is welcome to prepare a submission that redraws the figure for the Task Group to consider.

SP on December 2, 2022: Do you agree to change Figure 10-21 from pseudo-3D to 2D?

Yes/No/Abstain: 1/4/3

***Proposed resolution for CID 3550:***

Rejected.

The commenter fails to identify an issue of the figure.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3692 |  |  |  | It is weird that the feature is "TIM broadcast" but the frames are just "TIM" frames | Rename TIM frames to TIM Broadcast frames (I can provide locations) |

***Discussion:***

While it may be weird that the feature is “TIM broadcast” but the corresponding frames are “TIM frames”, there is no concern to continue using “TIM frames”.

Note: Throughout D2.0, there are about 24 occurances of “TIM frames”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3692 (run as a separate motion):***

Rejected.

While it may be weird that the feature is “TIM broadcast” but the corresponding frames are “TIM frames”, there is no concern to continue using “TIM frames”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3703 | 1.4 |  |  | "The construction "between x and y", "x to y" or "x-y"" should have x and y in italics. Also the hyphen should be a minus or en dash (but in other places hyphens or em dashes are also sometimes used) | Change "The construction "between x and y", "x to y" or "x-y"" to have x and y in italics, and the hyphen as a minus (or en dash if that is within the available glyphs) |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 171.37 in D2.0:**



The alphabets “x” and “y” for “The construction "between x and y", "x to y" or "x-y"” are already in italics. There is no further change required.

Agree with the commenter that the hyphen of “x-y” should be an en dash.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3703:***

Revised.

At 171.37, replace the hyphen of “x-y” with an en dash.

At 171.38, replace the hyphen of “Bx-By” with an en dash.

At 171.39, italize “x”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3721 |  |  |  | "Tx" v "TX" inconsistency | Pick one and change the others to that. I can provide locations |

***Discussion:***

As per the acronyms and abbreviations in 3.4, “TX” is an abbreviation of transmit or transmitter. For the other abbrevations that involve “transmit” or “transmissions”, “TX” is used.



However, there are about 492 occurances of “Tx”. Does the Task Group want to replace all of these occurrances from “Tx” to “TX”?

NOTE – there are about 1594 occurances of “TX”.

Option 1:

Revised. Replace “Tx” with “TX” throughout the draft document.

Option 2:

Rejected. While there is inconsistency on the terms “TX” and “Tx”, such inconsistency does not result in any issue.

SP on December 2, 2022: Are you in favor of resolving CID 3721 with the reason along the lines of "Rejected. While there is inconsistency on the terms “TX” and “Tx”, such inconsistency does not result in any issue."

Yes/No/Abstain: 6/0/1

***Proposed resolution for CID 3721:***

Rejected. While there is inconsistency on the terms “TX” and “Tx”, such inconsistency does not result in any issue.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3729 |  |  |  | In 9.6.x, the first subsubsubclause is sometimes "General", sometimes "<blah> Action field" | Pick one and change the others to that. I can provide locations |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that an inconsistency exists. After reviewing all of the 33 subclauses under 9.6, <blah> Action field is preferred because the contents of the “General” subclause describe the Action field format.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3729:***

Revised.

Replace the title of 9.6.2 from “Spectrum Management Action frames” to “Spectrum Management Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.2.1 from “General” to “Spectrum Management Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.3.1 from “General” to “QoS Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.4.1 from “General” to “Block Ack Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.5 from “Vendor-specific action details” to “Vendor-specific Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.6 from “Radio Measurement action details” to “Radio Measurement Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.6.1 from “General” to “Radio Measurement Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.7 from “Public Action details” to “Public Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.7.1 from “Public Action frames” to “Public Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.8.1 from “General” to “FT Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.9.1 from “General” to “SA Query Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.10 from “Protected Dual of Public Action frames” to “Protected Dual of Public Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.12.1 from “General” to “TDLS Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.13 from “WNM Action details” to “WNM Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.13.1 from “WNM Action fields” to “WNM Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.14 from “Unprotected WNM Action details” to “Unprotected WNM Action frame details”.

Replace the title of 9.6.14.1 from “Unprotected WNM Action fields” to “Unprotected WNM Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.15.1 from “General” to “Self-protected Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.16.1 from “Mesh Action fields” to “Mesh Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.17.1 from “Multihop Action fields” to “Multihop Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.18.1 from “General” to “Robust AV Streaming Action field”.

Replace the title of 9.6.23.1 from “General” to “FILS Action field”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3363 | 12.7.2 | 2906 | 1 | "IPN corresponds to" should be "IPN field contains" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2906.1 in D2.0:**

The format of the IGTK KDE is shown in Figure 12-42 (IGTK KDE format). ***The IPN corresponds to*** the last packet number used by the broadcast/multicast transmitter, and it is used by the receiver as the initial value for the BIP replay counter.



Agree with the commenter that replace “IPN corresponds to” with “IPN field contains”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3363:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3412 | 15.2.3 | 3113 | 40 | "This RSSI parameter" -> "The RSSI parameter" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 3113.40 in D2.0:**



Agree with the commenter that “The” is better than “This”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3412:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3251 | 14.10.9.3 | 3068 | 28 | "For the per target fields (Per Target Flags, Target Address, Target HWMP Sequence Number) assume" -- font size changes. Also in "Where A-MPDU aggregation is employed, HT-immediate block ack is assumed". Also at 2753.55 | Use uniform font size at referenced location and also in "Where A-MPDU aggregation is employed, HT-immediate block ack is assumed." at 5679.55 and "nonzero" at 2753.55 and "is not SUCCESS(#1277) or SAE\_HASH\_TO\_ELEMENT" at 2831.43 |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2753.55 in D2.0:**



**Original text at 2831.43 in D2.0:**



**Original text at 3067.28 (not 3068.28 per the commenter’s input) in D2.0:**



**Original text at 5679.55 in D2.0:**



***Proposed resolution for CID 3251:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3426 | 12.7.10.3 | 2941 | 58 | "When (#1571)an EAPOL-Key request frame is received, then" -- spurious "then" | Delete the "then" |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2941.58 in D2.0:**

****

Agree with the commenter that “then” is not necessary.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3426:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3464 | 12.7.2 | 2904 | 56 | "the EAPOL protocol version field" should be "the Protocol Version field of the EAPOL PDU (see Figure 12-33 (EAPOL-Key frame format))" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2904.56 in D2.0:**

If the Key Data field uses an AEAD cipher, then the Key Data field shall not be padded and the AAD for the encipherment operation shall be the data of the EAPOL-Key PDU from ***the EAPOL protocol version field*** (inclusive) to the Key Data field (exclusive). Key Data fields that are encrypted, but do not contain the key material (e.g., the GTK), shall be accepted.

Agree with the commenter that it should be “the Protocol Version field of the EAPOL PDU (see Figure 12-33 (EAPOL-Key frame format))”.



***Proposed resolution for CID 3464:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3260 | 12 |  |  | "TK bits" should be "TK\_bits" | Change at 2957.13 (3x), 2957.14, 2957.15 (2x), 2957.47 (3x) |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2957.12~2957.17 in D2.0:**

The total amount of bits extracted from the KDF shall therefore be 640+**TK bits**, 1124+**TK bits**, or 1408+**TK bits** depending on the negotiated AKM when WUR frame protection is negotiated, otherwise, shall be 512+**TK bits**, 896+**TK bits**, or 1280+**TK bits** depending on the negotiated AKM, where TK\_bits are determined from Table 12-8 (Cipher suite key lengths):

**Original text at 2957.47 in D2.0:**

X is 512+TK\_bits, 768+**TK bits**, 896+**TK bits**, or 1280+**TK bits** from Table 12-8 (Cipher suite key lengths)

Agree with the commenter that all appearances of “TK bits” at the identified locations should be replaced by “TK\_bits”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3260:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3360 | 1.5 |  |  | log\_10 should not be subscript 10; also in text below (CID 2379) | Desubscriptify log\_10 to log10 at 1455.6 (2x), 1455.29, 4315.48. Also add parens around N\_PSRT,nonpunc at 3939.10 |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 173.37 in subclause 1.5 of D2.0:**

****

**Original text at 1455.6 in D2.0:**

****

**Original text at 1455.29 in D2.0:**

****

**Original text at 3939.10 in D2.0:**



**Original text at 4315.48 in D2.0:**



***Proposed resolution for CID 3360:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3413 | 27.3.11.8.5 | 4095 | 31 | "NSD is 52 and 26 if the HE-SIG-B DCM field in the HE-SIG-A field is 0 and 1, respectively." should be or ... or | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 4095.31 in D2.0:**



As per the comments from IEEE SA Publication Editor (Michelle and Catherine):

“respectively is an adverb that means “for each separately and in turn, and in the order mentioned.” The correct use of respectively requires two parallel lists of corresponding items. For example, this sentence is correct: The values of x and y are 3.5 and 18.2, respectively.”

***Proposed resolution for CID 3413:***

Rejected

“and” is appropriate. “Respectively” is an adverb that means “for each separately and in turn, and in the order mentioned.” The correct use of respectively requires two parallel lists of corresponding items.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3484 | C.3 | 5349 | 36 | dot11HEChannelWidthOptionImplemented was added under CID 1072 but needs to be part of dot11PhyHEComplianceGroup | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 5343.19 in D2.0: dot11HEChannelWidthOptionImplemented was added as part of the Dot11PhyEntry:



As referred to original text at 5463.62 in D2.0, the commenter is correct that it is found that “dot11HEChannelWidthOptionImplemented” is missing in dot11PhyHEComplianceGroup. Actually, “dot11HEPuncturedSoundingOptionImplemented” is also missing.





***Proposed resolution for CID 3484:***

Revised.

At 5464.24, add the following two MIB attributes to the end of the dot11PhyHEComplianceGroup:

dot11HEPuncturedSoundingOptionImplemented,

dot11HEChannelWidthOptionImplemented.

Note to the Editors: Please check if a new dot11Groups is required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3441 | C.3 |  |  | "STATUS Deprecated" should be "STATUS deprecated" (16x) | Change throughout C.3 |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that it is “STATUS deprecated” not “STATUS Deprecated” following the editor’s style guideline on capitalization.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3441:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors: The 16 locations in D2.0 are listed as follows for your convenience, namely, 4902.13, 4918.63, 4976.64, 4979.39, 4984.53, 5086.47, 5091.37, 5193.35, 5220.64, 5221.28, 5221.41, 5221.54, 5450.39, 5452.21, 5460.48, and 5475.63.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3474 | 16.3.8.6 |  |  | "SYNC field of the received frame" in 16.3.8.6 (3163.51) should be "SYNC field of the received PPDU"; ditto "STF or the CEF field of the received frame" frame->PPDU in 25.3.13 (3762.56) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 3163.51 in D2.0:**



**Original text at 3762.56 in D2.0:**



Agree with the commenter that it is “PPDU” not “frame” following the editor’s style guideline on frame versus PPDU for PHY related subclauses.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3474:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3476 | 23.3.18.7 | 3682 | 38 | "within the specific dynamic range of the receiver" should be "within the specified dynamic range of the receiver" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 3682.38 in D2.0:**



***Proposed resolution for CID 3476:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3482 | 27.2.2 | 4006 | 35 | "the range of 0.5 to 2" should be "the range 0.5 to 2" | Change all the "the range of <n> to <m>" to "the range <n> to <m>" |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 4006.35 in D2.0:**



Agree with the commenter that “of” is not needed.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3482:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors, the locations in D2.0 are listed as follows for your convenience:

At 755.12, change “the range of 1 to 2007” to “the range 1 to 2007”.

At 755.15, change “the range of 1 to 8191” to “the range 1 to 8191”.

At 858.49, change “the range of 0 to 30” to “the range 0 to 30”.

At 2283.40, change “the range of 0 to 30” to “the range 0 to 30”.

At 2283.42, change “the range of 0 to 30” to “the range 0 to 30”.

At 2298.52, change “the range of 1 to 15” to “the range 1 to 15”.

At 2368.35, change “the range of 0 to 255” to “the range 0 to 255”.

At 2917.15, change “the range of 0 to 1” to “the range 0 to 1”.

At 3875.64, change “the range of 0 and OCW” to “the range 0 to OCW”.

At 3991.19, change “the range of 1 to 4095” with “the range 1 to 4095”.

At 3997.35, change “the range of 0 to aPSDUMaxLength octets” to “the range 0 to aPSDUMaxLength octets”.

At 4006.35, change “the range of 0.5 to 2” to “the range 0.5 to 2”.

At 4073.55, change “the range of 4 to 7” to “the range 4 to 7”.

At 4073.56, change “the range of 4 to 7” to “the range 4 to 7”.

At 4133.22, change “the range of 0 ≤ *k* ≤ *NSD* – 1” with “the range 0 ≤ k ≤ *NSD* – 1”.

At 4133.22, change “the range of *NSD* ≤ *q*(*k*) ≤ 2*NSD* – 1” to “the range *NSD* ≤ *q*(*k*) ≤ 2*NSD* – 1”.

At 4133.24, change “the range of 0 ≤ *k* ≤ *NSD*/2 – 1” with “the range 0 ≤ *k* ≤ *NSD*/2 – 1”.

At 4133.24, change “the range of *NSD*/2 ≤ *k* ≤ *NSD* – 1” with “the range *NSD*/2 ≤ *k* ≤ *NSD* – 1”.

At 4241.26, change “the range of 14 to 1023” to “the range 14 to 1023”.

At 4243.17, change “the range of 1 to 8” to “the range 1 to 8”.

At 4243.28, change “the range of 1 to 8” to “the range 1 to 8”.

At 4440.42, change “the range of 0 to 255” to “the range 0 to 255”.

At 4440.56, change “the range of 0 to 255” to “the range 0 to 255”.

At 4582.48, change “the range of 0 to aMPDUMaxLength octets” to “the range 0 to aMPDUMaxLength octets”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3496 | 12.7.2 | 2901 | 14 | "in which case the Request (bit 11) is also set to 1" should not have "the" (my mistake in reviewing) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2901.14 in D2.0:**

Error (bit 10) is set to 1 by a Supplicant to report that a MIC failure occurred in a TKIP MSDU (in which case ***the Request (bit 11) is also set to 1***); it is set to 0 otherwise.

Agree with the commenter that “the” is not needed.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3496:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3505 | 11 |  |  | OCVC stands for "operating channel validation capable" so "OCVC capable" doesn't make sense | Change "OCVC capability" to "OCVC" throughout (I can provide locations); see CID 1459 |

***Discussion:***

**As per the resolution of CID 1459:**

REJECTED; after review of the CID, the group determined that a change was not wanted. See Straw Poll Results from Aug 25,

Straw Poll Do you prefer?

a) Make no change

b) Change “OCVC Capability’ to “OCVC”

c) Abstain

Results: 5a 1b 2c

**Original text at 2400.53 in D2.0:**

On receiving a WNM Sleep Mode Response frame with Action Type field in the WNM Sleep Mode element set to “Exit WNM sleep mode”, if dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the AP’s RSNE indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2401.20 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the AP’s RSNE indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2401.35 in D2.0:**

if dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the non-AP STA’s RSNE indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2402.9 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the non-AP STA’s RSNE indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2488.4 and 2488.5 in D2.0:**

***An AP that has indicated OCVC capability*** shall deauthenticate ***non-AP STAs that have indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2496.46 in D2.0:**

If the STA chooses to perform the specified switch and dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the AP has indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2536.44 in D2.0:**

dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the sending STA had indicated OCVC capability*** in its association

**Original text at 2536.51 in D2.0:**

A STA that responds with an SA Query Response frame to ***a STA that indicated OCVC capability*** shall include an OCI element in the response frame if dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true.

**Original text at 2536.55 in D2.0:**

When a non-AP or non-PCP STA receives the SA Query Response frame from ***a STA that indicated OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2537.3 in D2.0:**

If a non-AP or non-PCP STA initiated an SA Query procedure following a channel switch and does not receive the SA Query Response frame from ***a STA that indicated OCVC capability*** within dot11AssociationSAQueryMaximumTimeout TUs from the beginning of the SA Query procedure, it shall deauthenticate from the BSS.

**Original text at 2773.50 in D2.0:**

If ***OCVC capability*** is not present in a non-AP STA or if the current AP does not advertise ***OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2785.43 and 2785.44 in D2.0:**

***When OCVC capability is present***, a STA shall advertise this capability in RSNE and shall include operating channel information and validate the Operating Channel Information (OCI) received from an ***OCVC capable peer*** in certain protected messages used for key establishment and confirmation.

**Original text at 2785.47 in D2.0:**

***A STA with OCVC capability*** validates that the channel information in received OCI matches its current operating channel parameters by

**Original text at 2786.1 in D2.0:**

If the NT-MLME of ***a STA with OCVC capability*** processes an MMPDU containing OCI received in an

MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive (see 11.31.5 (On-channel Tunneling (OCT) operation)):

**Original text at 2786.16 in D2.0:**

If ***a STA with OCVC capability*** receives a frame from a peer STA that is not on the same primary channel (or frequency segment 1 channel number) used by the STA to receive PPDUs from the peer STA,

**Original text at 2915.7 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the Supplicant RSNE indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2917.32 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***Authenticator RSNE indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2924.16 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***Authenticator RSNE indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2925.16 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***Supplicant RSNE indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2958.37 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***AP indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2959.43 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the STA indicates OCVC capability*** in the RSNE in the request,

**Original text at 2960.56 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***STA indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2961.59 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the AP indicates OCVC capability*** in its

RSNE,

**Original text at 2986.9 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the FTO indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2986.57 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the target AP indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2991.44 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***Authenticator indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 2992.37 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***Supplicant indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 3035.44 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the received RSNE indicates OCVC capability***,

**Original text at 3036.49 in D2.0:**

If dot11RSNAOperatingChannelValidationActivated is true and ***the received RSNE indicates OCVC capability***,

***Proposed resolution for CID 3505:***

Revised.

At 249.23 (subclause 3.4):

Change

“OCVC operating channel validation capable”

to

“OCVC operating channel validation capable or operating channel validation capability”

At 2785.44, delete “capable”.

At 2400.53, 2401.20, 2401.35, 2488.4, 2488.5, 2496.46, 2536.44, 2536.51, 2536.55, 2537.3, 2773.50 (x2), 2785.43, 2785.47, 2786.1, 2786.16, 2915.7, 2917.32, 2924.16, 2925.16, 2958.37, 2959.43, 2960.56, 2961.59, 2986.9, 2968.57, 2991.44, 2992.37, 3035.44, and 3036.49, delete “capability”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3728 |  |  |  | "-- The "Channel starting frequency" column in Table E-4 (Global operating classes) is greater than orequal to 5.925 and less than or equal to 7.125" -- columns don't have values, cells do. And it would be better to give units (though it's true the cell itself doesn't) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 868.16 in D2.0:**



***Proposed resolution for CID 3728:***

Revised. Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-22/2063r1 at <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2063-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments-part-2.docx>

At 868.16, updated the text (highlighted in red, bold, and underline for convenience) as follows:

The **value in the** “Channel starting frequency **(GHz)**” column in Table E-4 (Global operating classes) is greater than or equal to 5.925 and less than or equal to 7.125 for the operating class indicated in the Operating Class field.

At 868.20, updated the text as follows:

The **value in the** “Channel spacing **(MHz)**” column in Table E-4 (Global operating classes) is greater than or equal to 40 MHz for the operating class indicated in the Operating Class field.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3274 | 10 |  |  | "receives a valid frame" and "received any valid frame" -- frames are either received or not received | Delete "valid" in "An S1G STA that receives a valid frame " at 1775.44, "receives a valid frame" at 2059.58, 2060.6, 2254.4, "receive a valid frame" at 2252.50, 2253.62 |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 1775.44 in D2.0:**

NOTE 1—An S1G STA that ***receives a valid frame*** that does not include a valid Duration field does not update its NAV. However, it updates its RID as described in 10.3.2.5 (Setting and resetting the RID).

**Original text at 2059.58 in D2.0:**

The AP or PCP shall use the DMG Control modulation class for all subsequent transmissions to the non-AP and non-PCP STA until it ***receives a valid frame*** from the non-AP and non-PCP STA.

**Original text at 2060.6 in D2.0:**

The AP or PCP shall use the CMMG Control modulation class for all subsequent transmissions to the non-AP and non-PCP STA until it ***receives a valid frame*** from the non-AP and non-PCP STA.

**Original text at 2252.50 in D2.0:**

In the Normal mode, if the destination REDS does not ***receive a valid frame*** from the source REDS within data sensing time after the start of a link change interval, the destination REDS shall immediately change the link to attempt to receive frames from the source REDS through the RDS.

**Original text at 2253.62 in D2.0:**

If the current link is the direct link and the destination REDS does not ***receive a valid frame*** from the source REDS within data sensing time after the start of each link change interval, the destination REDS shall change the link and consider the first period to begin at the start of the link change interval.

**Original text at 2254.4 in D2.0:**

If the destination REDS ***receives a valid frame*** from the source REDS, the destination REDS shall remain on the direct link and consider the link change interval to begin at the start of the first period.

Agree with the commenter that “valid” is not necessary.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3274:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3483 | 26.11.10 | 3949 | 8 | "the power boost factor POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR" should be "the POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR parameter"; at line 18 "the POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR" -> "the POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR parameter" (3x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 3949.8 to 3949.18 in D2.0:**



Agree with the commenter on the proposed resolution but the line numbers may not be correct.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3483:***

Revised.

At 3949.8, replace “the power boost factor POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR” with “the POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR parameter”.

At 3949.12, 3949.14, and 3914.18, replace “the POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR” with “the POWER\_BOOST\_FACTOR parameter”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 3115 | 11.2.3.14.3 | 2395 | 33 | There are locations where the counters are referred to using the field name capitalization. This is not in line with the style of the 802.11 specification. Counters should use lower case names, Fields and elements using the term "Counter' in their name should be capitalized. | Replace "...the FMS Counter ID assigned ..." with "...the FMS counter ID assigned ..." |

***Discussion:***

**Original text at 2395.33 in D2.0:**

If the FMS stream identified in the FMS subelement matches a delivery interval already in use at the AP, the AP shall assign the FMS stream to use ***the FMS Counter ID assigned***for that delivery interval.

***Proposed resolution for CID 3115:***

Revised.

At 1105.64 and 2395.33, replace “Counter” with “counter”.