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*This document addresses the resolutions to the comments from the SA Ballot for IEEE 802.15.4z*

*CIDs: i-216, i-61, i-62, i-64, i-65, i-238, i-239, i-70, i-213.*

**CID i-216**

Resolution: Reject

Resolution Detail:

The CRG disagrees with the comment: This sub-clause provides a capability that enhances ranging techniques by providing a standardized information exchanged supporting a widely used ranging application. The contents of the IE are important for transactions and maintaining a standard way to communicating the contents enabled and specified through this scheme between ERDEVs. The contents of this IE are critically important as STS generation will be dependent on the contents specified in this IE based on the APDUs. So, this should be specified in 15.4z in this subclause. The feature is optional, but when used, the group believes defining how it is done enables doing so in an interoperable manner.

**CID i-62**

Resolution: Revise

*Change the sentence on Page 74, Line 17 as:*

The next higher layer may use the Ranging or Ancillary Message Number field of the RAICT IE to keep track of multiple messages during multiple message transfers.

*Change on Page 96, Figure 17 as:*

Change the name of the field “Ranging/Ancillary Message Sequence Number” to “Ranging or Ancillary Message Number”

*Change on Page 96 Line 15, Line 16, Line 18 as:*

Where “Ranging/Ancillary Message Sequence Number” occurs, change to “Ranging or Ancillary Message Number”

**CID i-61, i-64, i-65**

*Change the field in Figure 69 on Page 96*

“To Controller with RCR” to “Request”

*Change Lines 13-14 on Page 96 as follows:*

The Request field when one indicates that this RAICT IE is used to request the slots from the controller. Otherwise it is set to zero.

*Change on Page 74 Line 19 as:*

If the initiator is not the controller, the RAICT IE can be used to request to the controller, using the Request field, a number of slots as specified by Frames Remaining field to be scheduled for the next exchange.

*Change on Page 96 Lines 23-26*

To convey the sequence number of the current data frame, the number of ranging ancillary data frames remaining to complete this message and the message type to the responder when Request field is set to zero.

Request the controller to schedule the number of slots as specified in number of data frames (or ranging initiation messages) remaining when Request field is set to one.

*Change on Page 96 Line 20*

The Frames Remaining field conveys to the responder the number of frames remaining to complete the present ranging ancillary data message exchange, or, conveys a request for this number of slots for the next exchange when the Request field is 1.

**CID i-238**

*Change Figure 73 to the following*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bits: 1** | **15** | **Octets: 2/4** | **2/4** | **1** | **Variable** |
| Beacon Interval Length | RBS Duration | Beacon Interval | First RCM Slot | RM Table Length | RM Table |

**CID i-239**

*Change Page 98 Line 12 to the following:*

The Beacon Interval Length field when zero indicates that the Beacon Interval field length and the First RCM Slot field length is two octets, or when one that the Beacon Interval field length and the First RCM Slot field length is four octets.

**CID i-70**

*Add the following sentence on Page 14, Line 22 after the sentence “… ranging beacon.” :*

The ranging beacon occupies RBS number zero.

*Change Line 16 on Page 98 as:*

The First RCM Slot field conveys the ranging management period slot index where the first RCM is to be transmitted (i.e. effectively defining the end of the ranging management period).

**CID i-213**

*Add sentence on Page 104 Line 28 as follows:*

Typically, a new call of MLME-RX-ENABLE.request is not issued until the duration for the current list has elapsed, however, when a new call is issued, it overrides and cancels all the previous calls of MLME-RX-ENABLE.request and disables the receiver if enabled at the time the new call is issued.