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Rev 0: Initial version.

Rev 1: Editorial changes made during presentation: added “field” to Round-trip time and Reply Time.

***Comment Indices in 15-24-0010-00-04ab-consolidated-comments-draft-c:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Index#** | **Pg** | **Sub-Clause** | **Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Disposition** |
| Tero Kivinen | 502 | 24 | 9 |  | The security processing for compact frames is not properly defined, for example it does not include policy checking etc. | Remove compact frame format, and uses standard security processing. | Rejected |

**Disposition: Rejected**

**Disposition Detail:** Policy checking is not applicable for compact frames.

***Comment Indices in 15-24-0010-00-04ab-consolidated-comments-draft-c:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Index#** | **Pg** | **Sub-Clause** | **Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Disposition** |
| Benjamin Rolfe | 141 | 25 | 9.2.13 | 18 | "shall only" is poor specification language and unnecessary here. Don't need the "only". | Delete "only" | Accepted |
| Benjamin Rolfe | 140 | 25 | 9.2.12 |  | The value TurnAroundTime is not (as far as I can find) defined in this draft. Unfortunately, the term TurnAroundTime is defined and used in the base standard to mean the time it takes for a transceiver to switch from transmit to receive and receive to transmit operations, which is not I think the intended meaning of TurnAroundTime in this draft (I don thin this term means what you thin it means). I think what is meant in this draft is the time it takes to "turn around" e.g. loop back, a reply which is called reply time in the base standard. If in deed this is intended to be something other than what turn around time means in the base standard we need to use a different term. | Change TurnAroundTime to ReplyTime here and in 10.38.6.  | Revised |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 581 | 27 | 9.3.4.3 | 17 | """For Compact frames, the MHR is composed of the ID field, the RPA\_hash field, the RPA\_prand field if present and the Message Control field of the Compact frame.""The original ID field is now split into the Frame Type field and ID field, so Frame Type should also be included in the MHR." | "Change the cited sentence to:""For Compact frames, the MHR is composed of the Frame Type field, the Compact Frame ID field, the RPA\_hash field, the RPA\_prand field if present and the Message Control field of the Compact frame.""" | Accepted |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 582 | 27 | 9.3.5.3 | 23 | """For Compact frames, the MHR is composed of the ID field, the RPA\_hash field, the RPA\_prand field if present and the Message Control field of the Compact frame.""The original ID field is now split into the Frame Type field and ID field, so Frame Type should also be included in the MHR." | "Change the cited sentence to:""For Compact frames, the MHR is composed of the Frame Type field, the Compact Frame ID field, the RPA\_hash field, the RPA\_prand field if present and the Message Control field of the Compact frame.""" | Accepted |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 584 | 29 | 9.5.11 | 1 | It is not necessary to specify the Type as 16 octets. This is better to use a more general language similar to the baseline. | Change the Type column as:"Set of octets." | Accepted |

**Discussion**：

Comment# 140 is on this:





Field names used in Draft-C:





Comment# 584 is on this:



The length of the Key can vary depending on the security AEAD algorithm used. It is better not to specify the length and rather follow the baseline style:



**Disposition (#**140**): Revised**

**Disposition Detail:**

**Proposed text changes on P802.15.4ab™/D (pre-ballot) C:**

**9.2.12 Outgoing frame security procedure for Compact frames (#140)**

***Change the subfield as follows (Track changes ON)***

**Table 2—Compact frame exceptions to Private Payload field and Open Payload field definitions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Compact frame type**  | **Private Payload field**  | **Open Payload field**  |
| One-to-one Initiator Secure Report | Round-trip Time field | All other fields in the Message Content field |
| One-to-one Responder Secure Report | Reply Time field | All other fields in the Message Content field |
| One-to-many Initiator Secure Report | Round-trip Time field | All other fields in the Message Content field |
| One-to-many Responder Secure Report | Reply Time field | All other fields in the Message Content field |

**10.38.6 UWB MMS report phase (#140)**

***Change the subfield as follows (Track changes ON)***

…

A report primarily serves to provide ranging results obtained during the ranging phase. The values Reply Time field (as described in xxx 10.38.10.3 Common message fields (comment index#66, 67)) and Round-trip Time field (as described in xxx 10.38.10.3 Common message fields (comment index#66, 67))shall be reported as measured by its sender's local clock without CFO compensation to the receiver's side.