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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs:

R0: initial the draft

R1: Update the CID number.

R2: Update the resolution for CID3039

R3: Update the resolutions based on the feedback during F2F meeting in May.

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGbh D1.0 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbh D1.0 Draft. (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGbh Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGbh Editor” are instructions to the TGbh editor to modify existing material in the TGbh draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGbh editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGbh Draft.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Name** | **P/L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3012 | Smith, Graham | 35/28 | "When using PASN authentication, in the Device ID element in the first PASN frame". I think that it should be "a Device ID element". Similar for the other 5 bullets. | At Page 35 lines 28,29,30, 35, 36, 37, replace "the Device ID" with "a Device ID", | Accepted-- |
| 3013 | Smith, Graham | 35/41 | "A STA may delete a stored device ID at any point in time for implementation specific reasons (for example, configuration changes have lost the device ID, or sufficient time has passed since the last association to the ESS)." Do we really need to say this? We don't want this to happen. At least relegate this to a note. | Make cited sentence a NOTE. Replace "may" with "might". NOTE: A STA may might delete a stored device ID at any point in time for implementation specific reasons (for example, configuration changes have lost the device ID, or sufficient time has passed since the last association to the ESS)." | Revised--  TGbh editor: re move the text in the parenthesis(in P35/41) |
| 3020 | Smith, Graham | 35/42 | A STA may delete a stored device ID at any point in time for implementation specific reasons (for example, configuration changes have lost the device ID," Hmm…if the STA has lost the device ID, then surely it has been effectively deleted. So we are saying that a STA may lose a device ID, and that is OK? Not sure this is a good example. I would delete it and just keep the "long time" example. | At 35.42 delete "configuration changes have lost the device ID, or" | Revised--  TGbh editor: remove the text in the parenthesis(in P35/41) |
| 3038 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 35/22 | Change “...unless the receiving STA...” to “...unless the intended receiver STA…” to make it clear | as in comment | Rejected--  “the receiving STA” means it’s a determined STA.  While “intended receiver STA” means it’s a potential receiver STA. The transmitter may broadcast the Device ID element if we walk on this direction. It does not align with current feature design. |
| 3039 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 35/29 | Change to “(Re)Association Request” frame. | as in comment | Rejected--  According the to rule defined in 4.5.3.4 Reassociation.”The reassociation service is invoked to “move” a current association of a non-AP STA from one AP to another “ And “Reassociation also enables changing association attributes of an established  association while the non-AP STA remains associated with the same AP.  ”  The above two cases are based on not losing connection with the ESS. While 11bh group intends to address the identification with RCM before association, and thus Reassocation is out of 11bh scope. |
| 3040 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 35/36 | Change to “(Re)Association Request” frame. | as in comment | Rejected--  According the to rule defined in 4.5.3.4 Reassociation.”The reassociation service is invoked to “move” a current association of a non-AP STA from one AP to another “ And “Reassociation also enables changing association attributes of an established  association while the non-AP STA remains associated with the same AP.  ”  The above two cases are based on not losing connection with the ESS. While 11bh group intends to address the identification with RCM before association, and thus Reassocation is out of 11bh scope. |
| 3041 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 35/41 | Move the example to a note as it does not add anything of value to the normative language | as in comment | Revised--  TGbh editor: remove the text in the parenthesis(in P35/41) |
| 3042 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 35/50 | Swap the order of paragraphs at L61 and L50 because the one at L61 is more specific and should come first and then L50 is a catchall for all other situations. Otherwise there is ambiguity in reading the text. | as in comment | Revised--  TGbh editor: change “When an AP with dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true receives a frame containing a device ID from a non-AP STA and the AP recognizes the received device ID, the AP shall perform one of the following Actions...”  To “When an AP with dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true receives a frame that is not a PASN frame, containing a device ID from a non-AP STA and the AP recognizes the received device ID, the AP shall perform one of the following actions..  ” at L50P35 |
| 3043 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 36/11 | Should be a stronger condition, i.e. a “shall” instead of a “may” considering the AP was not able to determine the non-AP STA’s identity | as in comment | Revised--  change “may” to” shall” in P36L11 |
| 3055 | McCann, Stephen | 35/42 | The text "since the last association to the ESS", is incorrect as associations are between peer STAs. | Change the cited text to "since the last association to an AP in the ESS" | Revised--  TGbh editor: remove the text in the parenthesis(in P35/41) |
| 3074 | Montemurro, Michael | 35/1 | "intends to use" should just be "uses" | At cited location, change "intends to use" to uses | Accepted-- |
| 3075 | Montemurro, Michael | 36/5 | The MAC address is bound to the device ID, not the Address 2 field. | Change "the shared identity state with the AP or ESS (as per the concepts of 12.2.12) is now bound to the Address 2 field in the Association Request frame" to "the shared identity state with the AP or ESS (as per the concepts of 12.2.12) is now bound to the MAC Address in the Address 2 field in the Association Request frame" | Revised--  Change the cited text to “the shared identity state with the AP or ESS (as per the concepts of 12.2.12) is now bound to the MAC address in the Address 2 field in the Association Request frame” |
| 3076 | Montemurro, Michael | 36/20 | I know that this example shows an ESS, but with PASN AP1 and AP2, do not have to be infrastructure APs in an ESS. | Change "The example illustrates a non-AP STA performing PASN to establish FTM session(s) in an ESS containing AP1 and AP2." to "The example illustrates a non-AP STA performing PASN to establish FTM session(s) with AP1 and AP2. It is assumed that AP1 and AP2 have the capability to synchronize updates to the device ID for the non-AP STA." | Rejected--  First, this is explicitly an example, so it doesn't need to cover all cases. Second, the TG has not discussed the sharing of an identity beyond the ESS, and that potentially raises privacy concerns. |
| 3082 | Montemurro, Michael | 35/35 | There is no reason why a non-AP STA could not use Device ID as part of FT initial Association | Insert the following paragraph at 35.14. "A non-AP STA and AP with dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true may use the device ID mechanism as part of an initial mobility domain association." | Rejected--  The current text says “When not using PASN or FILS authentication, in the Device ID KDE in message 3 of the 4-way  handshake  ” already cover the case the commenter mentioned. No need further change. |
| 3114 | Hamilton, Mark | 35/22 | If this is an element (or subelement) name, then it is capitalized | Change "device ID" to "Device ID" | Accepted-- |
| 3127 | Lalam, Massinissa | 35/25 | "If a non-AP STA has a device ID configured, then it shall provide a device ID using the procedures described below" seems to indicated the non-AP STA must transmit its device ID. Also I don't know what is "a device ID configured". Maybe rephrase such as: "If a non-AP STA that has dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true wants to provide a stored device ID, then it shall provide the devide ID using the procedures described below" | As in comment | Revised--  Change to cited text to “If a non-AP STA has been provided a device ID, then it may provide that device ID. When it provides the device ID, then it shall use the procedures described below” |
| 3128 | Lalam, Massinissa | 35/34 | Replace "An AP shall provide a device ID using the procedures described below" with "An AP that has dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true shall provide a device ID using the procedures described below" | As in comment | Rejected--  The current draft already has text “A STA should not send a frame containing a device ID (sub)element to any STA unless the receiving STA sets  the Device ID Active field to 1 in the Extended RSN Capabilities field  ”. No need to duplicate the condition in every sentence. |
| ~~3131~~ | ~~Mutgan, Okan~~ | ~~37/42~~ | ~~Draw example figures of the signaling for IRM and device ID, preferably each mechanism with identifier recognized or not recognized. (Previous letter ballot consists of several comments that are not completely clear about the signaling procedures)~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ |  |
| 3133 | Harkins, Daniel | 35/30 | Passing the Device ID in message 3 of the 4-way handshake is too late. The device has already authenticated and to properly authenticate a device its identiy must be determined already. | add the Device ID to associate requests and responses even when you're not doing FILS. When this is done it will also be necessary to make Annex AF normative and move it into section 12. | Rejected--  This topic already discuss many times, and The group have run a motion “  **Motion #29: CIDs 239, 243, 242**  Approve resolution of CID 239, 243, 242 with Revised: Incorporate the changes in 11-24/0068r1.  Moved: Dan Harkins  Second: Stuart Kerry  Result: Yes: 8, No: 19, Abstain: 12 (Motion fails)  ”  The group don’t reach consensus on this direction. |
| ~~3134~~ | ~~Harkins, Daniel~~ | ~~36/2~~ | ~~what does the non-AP STA do with this binding?It assumes there's a binding…but what does it do with that knowledge? How does it use this binding?~~ | ~~define what the binding implies and how knowledge of the binding is used or get rid of the paragraph~~ | ~~Assign to Mark?~~ |
| 3145 | RISON, Mark | 35/27 | Why is a Device ID element included in the first PASN frame but a Device ID subelement included in the second one? | Make it a subelement in both cases | Revised--  Device ID is a standalone element in the first PASN frame, while Device ID is a subelment in the PASN Encrypted Data element(for encryption reason). However, we found other place that is not consistent in P35L63.  TGbh editor: change “Device ID element” to “Device ID subelement” in P35L63, |
| 3147 | RISON, Mark | 35/42 | " some time has passed" -- not clear how much time some time is | Change to " an implementation defined amount of time has passed" | Revised--  TGbh editor: remove the text in the parenthesis(in P35/41) |
| 3194 | RISON, Mark | 37/44 | "(including nothing if the device ID is encrypted)" is confusing because in the example at least DIDs are always encrypted in Figure 12-0a when sent from the AP | As it says in the comment | Rejected--  The sentence say if the Device ID is encrypted by implementation, the Draft doesn’t include any new procedure. |
| 3200 | RISON, Mark | 46 | "may proceed with the assumption that the shared identity state with the AP or ESS (as per the concepts of 12.2.10) is now bound to the TA field in the Association Request frame" -- it is not clear what the implications/consequences of this assumption are | MarkH clarified that the intent was "It’s not that “something bad will happen”, but that something good (optimization) was hoped for, will not happen. The non-AP STA will not be recognized, and any state that had previously been established will need to be re-established. Or, in the case of this phrase, when things do work correctly, the AP and non-AP STA may proceed with the assumption that this state is still established, and they don’t need to take effort to re-establish it." so express that somehow | Assign to Mark? |