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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs:

R0: initial the draft

R1: remove CID3024

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** |
| 3004 | Yang, Jay | 26/7 | IRM included in TA field of probe request, and thus "IRM in the Address 1" should be "IRM in the Address 2" | change "IRM in the Address 1" to "IRM in the Address 2" in L7P26 | Accepted-- |
| 3005 | Yang, Jay | 26/8 | the probe request should be sent to an unassociated AP, | change "it transmits" to "it transmits to an unassociated AP" in both L8P26 and L18P26. | Accepted-- |
| 3009 | Smith, Graham | 28/4 | "When the Device ID element is sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is reserved". What does reserved mean? All zeros or not present? In the IRM section we say "not present" . We should use the the same here. In addition, this needs to be moved ahead of "The Device ID field contains a device ID" as it comes before the device ID in the element. | Replace cited text with "When sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is not present ." and move to Page 27 ahead of line 63. | Revised--  Agree in principle.  TGbh Editor: Please remove the sentence “When the Device ID element is sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is reserved” from P28L4, and insert “When sent to an AP, the Device ID Status field is not present” into P27L42. Meanwhile, please change the octets of “Device ID Status” from “1” to “0 or 1” in Figure 9-1072a |
| 3016 | Smith, Graham | 27/32 | As the Device ID Status filed is omitted when sent from non-AP STA to AP, the Octets should be "0 or 1". | At 27.33 under "Device ID Status" change "1" to "0 or 1" | Revised--  The resolution is same to CID3009 |
| ~~3024~~ | ~~Stacey, Robert~~ | ~~27/40~~ | ~~The Device ID Length field is not a length; it's a field.~~ | ~~Change to "The Device ID Length field is set to the number of octets in the Device ID field." ("is set to" or "indicates"; I prefer "is set to" because indicates is not specific on the encoding)~~ | ~~Revised--~~  ~~Agree in principle.~~  ~~TGbh Editor: Please change “The Device ID Length field is the length of the Device ID field” to “The Device ID Length field is set to the number of octets in the Device ID field” in P27L40.~~ |
| 3025 | Stacey, Robert | 28/1 | The note, because it contains "optionally", is not purely informative. In this context "optionally" is equivalent to "might". | Change the note to read "NOTE--The device ID might be constructed as an opaque identifier as described in 12.2.12.1 (Device ID mechanism)". I would remove the additional reference to Annex AF; the first reference is all the reader needs. | Accepted-- |
| 3030 | Stacey, Robert | 27  /6 | The distinction between a feature being "active" vs "supported" is not clear, particularly in the context of on-air signaling (as opposed to the MIB). In this case we don't even have a capability indication for the feature and so "active" appears to be a poor substitute for "capability" (i.e., support). And this is doubly true since we are using it in a "Capability" element.  We might want "active" semantics in the MIB where an management entity can enable or disable a feature. But we don't need to reflect this in the OTA signaling; as for as the OTA protocol is concerned the feature is either supported or not supported. It a management entity has not activated it, then it is not supported. | Change "Device ID Active" to "Device ID Support". Change "IRM Active" to "IRM Support".  At 34.51 change "A non-AP STA that has dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true indicates the device ID mechanism is activated by setting the Device ID Active field to 1..." to "A non-AP STA that has dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true shall set the Device ID Support field to 1 to indicate that the device ID mechanism is supported..." (note the shall -- normative requirement to keep the MIB and OTA signaling aligned)  At 37.52 change "An AP that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true advertises activation of the IRM mechanism by setting the IRM Active field to 1..." to "An AP that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true shall set the IRM Support field to 1 to indicate that the IRM mechanism is supported..."  At 37.54 change "A non-AP STA that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true indicates the IRM mechanism is active by setting the IRM Active field to 1..." to "A non-AP STA that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true shall set the IRM Support field to 1 to indicate that the IRM mechanism is supported.." | Accepted-- |
| 3067 | McCann, Stephen | 25  /60 | Some of the "set to" statements are within conditionals and should be "equal to" | Change "set to" to "equal to", starting at the end of line 60. | Rejected--  The commenter made comment on baseline text rather than 11bh draft text. |
| 3068 | McCann, Stephen | 26  /1 | Some of the "set to" statements are within conditionals and should be "equal to" | Change "When included in a Beacon request with the Data field set to other than 1" to "When included in a Beacon request with the Data field not equal to 1". | Rejected--  The commenter made comment on baseline text rather than 11bh draft text. |
| 3112 | Hamilton, Mark | 25  /27 | Measurement ID element (which does go in Probe Request, for example) has no Element ID (and the other attributes) in 9.4.2.1. | Insert a row after the IRM row, with: Measurement ID (9.4.2.318), 255, 140, No, No. Change PASN Encrypted Data row to ID extension of 141. | Rejected--  The commenter fails to identify any technical issue.Measurement ID is already defined in subclause 9.4.2.318 |
| 3113 | Hamilton, Mark | 27  /63 | Neither "device ID" nor "measurement ID" are ever specified. | Add to the end of the sentence, "that is a sequence of up to xxx octets". (Need to choose what xxx is.) Same thing at 29.1. | Rejected--  The commenter fails to identify any technical issue. Device ID element contains Device ID, while Measurement ID element contains Measurement ID, it’s quite clear. |
| 3122 | DeLaOlivaDelgado, Antonio | 28  /16 | The IRM status length is 0 or 1, for coherence we should have the same as in the status of device ID, which is always present but reserved in one direction. | Either change device ID Status length to 0 or 1 (and say it is not present) or change IRM status to 1 and indicate it is reserved. | Revised--  The resolution is same to CID3009 |
| 3153 | RISON, Mark | 26  /10 | "The Measurement ID element has the format defined in 9.4.2.315 (Measurement ID element). The Measurement ID element is optionally included in a Beacon request to request that the responding STA include the provided Measurement ID element in the Probe Request frames it transmits." -- but this is about the subelements of the Beacon request, so s/element/subelement/g I presume. However, the payload of the subelement has to be incldued in the probe requests as the payload of the element | As it says in the comment | Revised--  TGbh Editor: Change the sentence “The Measurement ID element is optionally included in a Beacon request to request that the responding STA  include the provided Measurement ID element in the Probe Request frames it transmits. ”  To “The Measurement ID subelement is optionally included in a Beacon request to request that the responding STA  include the provided Measurement ID in its Measurement ID element in the Probe Request frames it transmits.  ” |
| 3156 | RISON, Mark | 27  /40 | "The Device ID Length field is the length of the Device ID field" missing units | Add "in octets" | Revised--  The resolution is same to CID3024 |
| 3158 | RISON, Mark | 27  /45 | "from an AP to a non-AP STA" -- "to a non-AP STA" is unnecessary verbiage | Delete the latter cited text | Revised--  In IRM, it says “When sent to an AP” in P28L24, and “When sent from an AP” in P28L26, the proposed change should align with IRM.  TGbh editor: change “When sent from an AP to a non-AP STA” to “When sent from an AP” |
| 3159 | RISON, Mark | 28  /4 | "from a non-AP STA to an AP" -- "from a non-AP STA" is unnecessary verbiage | Delete the latter cited text | Revised--  The resolution is same to CID3009 |
| 3191 | RISON, Mark | 25  /19 | Making the Device ID element non-extensible seems short-sighted to me. My understanding is that all elements defined after the extensibility column was added were expected to be extensible, for forward-compatibility | Change "No" in the penultimate column to "Yes" and add a Device ID Length field before the Device ID field in Figure 9-1072a--Device ID element format | Accepted-- |
| 3193 | RISON, Mark | 28 | There are two non-generic fields in this element. One is only used by APs, the other only by non-AP STAs. Wouldn't it be better two have two elements? | As it says in the comment | Rejected--  The commenter fails to identify any technical issue. |