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Abstract
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# CID 697, 698, 705



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 697 | 52 | 21 | macMmsReportEnable is a really bad name for a siugnal that has 4 states. What does it mean by "If it is enabled…" | Change name | Revise. Change all occurences of macMmsReportEnable to macMmsReportSender. |
| Carl Murray | 698 | 52 | 21 | What happens if macMmsReportEnable is set to 0 but either macMms1stReportNSlots or macMms2ndtReportNSlots is non zero |   | Reject. (Answer: Then there are defined report slot lengths that no transmitter uses. Should not affect or disturb anything.) |
| Carl Murray | 705 | 57 | 17 | Why skip the block, why not just the round? |   | Reject. (Discussion: That would lead to non-uniform ranging sample intervals (time-jitter) and increases energy consumption especially on the responder side with lots of retries on successive fails. Skipping the entire block is the most simple solution.) |

# CID 209, 16, 58

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Billy Verso | 209 | 58 | 26 | The description here and Figure 43 seems to be duplicating what is in 10.38.10.3.7 The NB Channel Map field. Probably macMmsNbChannelMap is not needed; just macMmsNbChannelAllowList for each device, updated after over the air message exchange. | Delete paragraph and following paragraph, and the figure, and macMmsNbChannelMap attribute, over the air message can be used to update macMmsNbChannelAllowList configuration for each device. | Reject (resolved by #58) |
| Li-Hsiang Sun | 16 | 58 | 30 | " The macMmsNbChannelMap contains five parts: WLAN-non-occupied channels in the UNII-3 band, WLAN-occupied channels in the UNII-3 band, WLAN-non-occupied channels in the UNII-5 band, WLAN-occupied channels in the UNII-5 band, scaling factor. ThemacMmsNbChannelMap shall be formatted (for transmission) as shown in Figure 36." | the macMmsNbChannelMap should be updated to be the same as NB channel Map field used in messages and in Fig 43 | Reject (resolved by #58) |
| Alex Krebs | 58 | 58, 59 | 32ff | incorrect channel map | remove last sentence of p.58 and Figure 36. | Editorial. |

**Discussion:**

I think this whole part is a left over of incomplete editing of DraftB and the accepted "Revise NB channel map" CID resolutions from DCN 23-575r2. Therefore I had marked CID 58 as editorial and assume it's resolved already.

# CID 512

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Tero Kivinen | 512 | 64 | 21 | The output of the AES-128-ECB is not a integer number, thus you can't take module function out of it. The output of the encryption is the 128-bit bitstring. You most likely want to say something like that RPA\_hash will be rightmost 24 bits of the output of the encryption function. | Define calculations using bit strings. | Revise. Change lines 20-22:A 3-octed RPA\_hash is then computed using an IRK and initiator's RPA\_prand by constructing a 24-bit little-endian unsigned integer from bits 0 to 23 of h(key=IdentityResolvingKey, data=RPA\_prand) where h is the block cipher referred to by [B.3.2]. |

# CID 714

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 714 | 65 | 29 | This suggests that there are Compact frames without an FCS. Is this is not correct then it introduces unnecessary ambiguity? Pg64, line 5 states that each PSDU ends with a 2-octet FCS | Reconcile the 2 statements | Reject. (resolved through #627 by Rojan in DCN 23-20 in Panama F2F) |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 627 | 64 | 5 | "each PSDU ends with a 2-octet FCS, which …"Secure compact frames do not carry FCS, they carry MIC instead. | Change the sentence as:" each PSDU either ends with a 2-octet FCS, which shall be …., or ends with a MIC field as described in 10.38.10.3.16. | Revised. |

# CID 718

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 718 | 66 | 24 | "channels 1 to 93" doesn't appear to be right |   | Revise. Replace "channels 1 to 93" by "channels 1,5,9,...,93". |

# CID 721-725

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 721 | 68 | 23 | RcpPollSlots and macMmsRcpPollNSlots have incompatible ranges | resolve | Reject. (resolved by #61) |
| Carl Murray | 722 | 68 | 25 | RcpResponseSlots and macMmsRcpRespNSlots have incompatible ranges | resolve | Reject. (resolved by #61) |
| Carl Murray | 723 | 68 | 27 | Should RpDuration be linked to macMmsRpDuration (note they have incompatible ranges) | resolve | Reject. (resolved by #61) |
| Carl Murray | 724 | 69 | 1 | RcpResponseSlots and macMms1stReportNSlots have incompatible ranges | resolve | Reject. (resolved by #61) |
| Carl Murray | 725 | 69 | 4 | MrpSecondSlots and macMms2ndtReportNSlots have incompatible ranges | resolve | Reject. (resolved by #61) |
| Alex Krebs | 61 | 103 | 1 | The value ranges are incorrect for some fields. | Change Range values as specified in 10.38.10.3.10 | Editorial |

# CID 726, 727

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 726 | 69 | 23 | The range of 8.6 seconds for the time offset field seems excessive | Should discuss if we want the full range supported | Reject. |
| Carl Murray | 727 | 69 | 27 | The range of 8.6 seconds for the time offset field seems excessive | Should discuss if we want the full range supported | Reject. |

**Discussion:** 3 bytes seems too short (~34ms), especially for ADV\_CONF (#727), and there is not really any benefit in optimizing length here, since it 1-time use field in SOR/ADV-CONF prior to the ranging session.

# CID 728, 733



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 728 | 70 | 2 | This needs to be rewritten referencing 10.38.8.4.3 and macMmsPrngSeed |   | Revise. Change lines 2-3 to:This is a single octet field that carries the value macMmsPrngSeed used in the channel switching function as defined in 10.38.8.4.3. |
| Carl Murray | 733 | 71 | 10 | Is this correct? Can it not be changed in other compact frames, eg the SOR |   | Reject. (Yes. RPA prand is conveyed in ADV-POLL and POLL messages only. No need to send a new randomization every packet since all packets per discovery/round are sent in sequence on the same channel anyways, so easy to conjure for a tracker that they belong together even if addresses were rotated.) |

**Discussion:** None.

# CID 513, 346, 636



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Tero Kivinen | 513 | 71 | 14 | Line seems to be incomplete. | Complete it. | Reject. (resolved by #912) |
| Bin Qian | 346 | 71 | 14 | It seems the sentence is not complete  | As in the comment | Reject. (resolved by #912) |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 636 | 71 | 18 | "...selects MessageControl=0x00 for MsgIDs (0x02-0x07)." | Clarify what this means, else delete it. | Reject. (resolved by #912) |
| Alex Krebs | 912 | 71 | 13-14 | Improve language by replacing lines with: | A Message Control field value of 0x00 signals baseline support by the initiator for MMS messages. Baseline MMS messages are compact messages with Frame ID values 0x02 to 0x06 with Message Control 0x00 (Table 1). | Editorial. |

**Discussion:** None.

# CID 752

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 752 | 78 | 13 | It may be desirable to have a report compact frame without pass through data | Should consider adding | Revise. Change octets from "1" to "0/1" in Figure-69 and append after line 23: "The presence of this field is determined by Frame Length (13.1.3.2)". Reference is from 4me-D01. |

# CID 66, 67 and duplicates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Alex Krebs | 66 | 78 | 22 | Rounttriptime description missing | Change line to "The Round-trip Time field is the the time difference between the RMARKERs of the POLL and the RESP MMS fragments measured at the initiator side in 1/499.2MHz resolution." | Accept. |
| Alex Krebs | 67 | 79 | 16 | Reply-time description missing | Change the line to "The Round-trip Time field is the the time difference between the RMARKERs of the POLL and the RESP MMS fragments measured at the responder side in 1/499.2MHz resolution." | Revise. Change the line to "The Reply Time" field is the the time difference between the RMARKERs of the POLL and the RESP MMS fragments measured at the responder side in 1/499.2MHz resolution." |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 646 | 78 | 22 | Contents are missing. | Add the contents | dup 66 |
| Carl Murray | 753 | 78 | 22 | Field description missing | Add field description | dup 66 |
| Carl Murray | 754 | 79 | 16 | Field description missing | Add field description | dup 67 |
| Carl Murray | 833 | ## | 17 | Field description missing | Add field description | dup 66/67 |
| Carl Murray | 835 | ## | 13 | Field description missing | Add field description | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 917 | 89 | 13 | Reply-time description missing | see #67 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 922 | 90 | 10 | Rounttriptime description missing | see #66 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 923 | 98 | 21 | Rounttriptime description missing | see #66 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 918 | 99 | 13 | Reply-time description missing | see #67 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 919 | 100 | 5 | Reply-time description missing | see #67 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 924 | 100 | 24 | Rounttriptime description missing | see #66 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 920 | 101 | 17 | Reply-time description missing | see #67 | dup 66/67 |
| Alex Krebs | 921 | 102 | 13 | Reply-time description missing | see #67 | dup 66/67 |
| Carl Murray | 799 | 89 | 13 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #67 |
| Carl Murray | 800 | 90 | 10 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #66 |
| Carl Murray | 825 | 98 | 21 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #66 |
| Carl Murray | 827 | 99 | 13 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #67 |
| Carl Murray | 829 | 100 | 5 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #67 |
| Carl Murray | 831 | 100 | 24 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #66 |

# CID 30 and duplicates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Li-Hsiang Sun | 30 | 102 | 18 | There should be a default value of ranging slot (called slots) in Table 9 because it is configurable via management MAC config.  | as in comment | tbd. |
| Carl Murray | 836 | 102 | 18 | Is this table complete - for example where is the ranging slot duration defined |   | dup 30 |

**Discussion:**  TE: Was this lost from DraftB (see Table-9 below)? If yes, then just reinsert and add names: macMmsRangingSlotDuration, macMmsRangingRoundDuration, macMmsRangingBlockDuration.



# CID 237

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Billy Verso | 237 | ## | 6 | The channel assignment clause for the HRP UWB PHY, was not updated however we have an new definition in 16.4.1.2 covering an (optional) extended set of channels. Being able to select these individually is needed for instance to do frequency stitched sensing with individual frame TX on the different frequencies, (as an alternative to the automatic stepped case). Would also allow for future regulatory changes without further UWB text update. | Add in coverage for extended range. And, revisit all places UWB channel number is signaled, especially in new 4ab messages. To ensure the UWB channel number field size is sufficient to signal the extern range. | tbd.  |

**Discussion:** Not clear what the benefit would be to send longer NB message fields covering overlapping channels 0-97? What is the general idea here regarding the channel number conflict between the legacy 15.4a channels 0-15 (Table-16-27 [4me-D01]?

# CID 34, 63 and duplicates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Alex Krebs | 63 | 71,72,74 | 19,5,5,12 | SMC\_TLVs description missing | see external document DCN ??? | See below. |
| Li-Hsiang Sun | 34 | 71 | 15 | It is not clear whether SMC TLV are related to: 1) the receiving capability to understand msg ID and ctrl from the peer, or 2) in additionally to receving capability it also indicates that the sender of this field requires the peer to understand msg id and ctrl indicated in SMC TLV from the sender | when SMC TLV in ADV\_POLL, it is case 2), when SMC TLV in ADV\_RESP, it is case 1) | See below. |
| Benjamin Rolfe | 164 | 71 | 19 | Incomplete specification (TBD): Multiple fields lack definitions (SMC TLVs, CAP duration field, Initialization Slot Duration field). Note that I can not find this field used in any part of this draft other than frame definitions. Maybe we don't need it? | Complete definition or delete the fields that are not needed  | partially solved as per below, other issues --> reassign please |
| Tero Kivinen | 515 | 71 | 19 | Line seems to be incomplete. | Complete it. | see #63 |
| Carl Murray | 737 | 71 | 19 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #63 |
| Mickael Maman | 903 | 71 | 19 | The SMC TLVs field is ….??? | "The SMC TLVs field is a sequence of structure which shall have Type, Length and Value (TLV). | see #63 |
| Tero Kivinen | 517 | 72 | 5 | Line seems to be incomplete. | Complete it. | see #63 |
| Carl Murray | 740 | 72 | 5 | Field description missing | Add field description | see #63 |
| Mickael Maman | 904 | 72 | 5 | The SMC TLVs field is the list of supported message control commands. This is … | complete the sentence as previously #13 | see #63 |
| Bin Qian | 348 | 72 | 5-7 | The descriptions of the SMC TLVs field, CAP Duration field, Initialization Slot Duration field are missing | As in the comment | partially solved as per below, other issues --> reassign please  |
| Bin Qian | 350 | 74 | 5 | The number of occupied octets of SMC TLVs is missing | As in the comment | see #63 |
| Benjamin Rolfe | 165 | 74 | 7 | Incomplete specification (TBD): SMC TLVs.  | Complete definition or delete the fields that are not needed  | see #63 |
| Carl Murray | 746 | 74 | 12 | Incomplete description | Complete description | see #63 |

***Instructions to the editor: add a subsection "Supported Message Control Tag Length Values field" to 10.38.10.3 as shown below:***

**10.38.10.3.x Supported Message Control Tag Length Values field**

This is a variable length field that contains zero or more Supported Message Control Tag Length Value (SMC\_TLV) structures. The SMC\_TLV structure is formated as shown in Figure XXX.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Octets: 1 | 1 | variable |
| SMC\_Tag | SMC\_Length | SMC\_Values |

Figure XXX -- The Supported Message Control Tag Length Value structure

The value of SMC\_Tag refers to a Compact Frame ID value as shown in Table-1.

The value of SMC\_Length is the number of octets of the SMC\_Values field.

The value of SMC\_Values is an array of SMC\_Length octets, where the value of each contained octet signals support of a Message Control field (10.38.10.3.2) value of the Compact frame with ID SMC\_Tag.

***Instructions to the editor: continue the sentence p.71 l.19 and p.72 l.5 as shown below:***

The SMC TLVs field is the list of supported message control commands as defined in 10.38.10.3.x. This is used by the iniator to signal to responders which compact frames and which message control values it supports.

***Instructions to the editor: continue the sentence p.74 l.12 as shown below:***

The SMC TLVs field is the list of supported message control commands as defined in 10.38.10.3.x. This is used by the responder to signal to the initiator which compact frames and which message control values it supports.

# CID 639, 743, 79

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx** | **Pg** | **L.** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| Carl Murray | 743 | 72 | 15 | Would it be better to get rid of message control 0x00 as 0x01 provides the same functionality but is more flexible at the cost of 1 octet | Should discuss | tbd. |
| Rojan Chitrakar | 639 | 72 | 15 | The 3 message control version are almost the same and can be easily unified by adopting the presence bitmap in all versions. | Unify the 3 message control versions by adopting the presence bitmap field in all versions. | tbd. |
| Pooria Pakrooh | 79 | 66 | 9 | For airtime efficiency, it is good to have the option for signaling the UNII-3 and UNII-5 bitmaps, separately. | Add two tables, under Figure 43, with the following contents: "Figure 44: The NB Channel Map field for UNII-3--> Contents: NB Channels 0-3 (bits 0-3) / WLAN channel bitmask (UNII-3) (bits 4-9) /NB Channel start (bits 10-12) /NB Channel step (bits 13-14)/ Reserved (bit 15)"AND "Figure 45: The NB Channel Map field for UNII-5--> Contents: NB Channels 50-57 (bits 0-7) / WLAN channel bitmask (UNII-5) (bits 8-31) /NB Channel start (bits 32-34) /NB Channel step (bits 35-36)/ reserved (bits (37-39)" | tbd, |

**Discussion:**  Merging 0x10 to 0x30 with assigning SMC\_TLVs one of the remaining PresenceBitmap bits sounds like a good idea. However, we should keep this aligned with #79, which will need an additional bit for UNII-3/UNII-5 separation, and it won't be a simple bitmap then anymore. However I would like to keep 0x00 clean without any variable frame part processing as it is not a question of one less/more byte (#743), but more of implementation complexity (e.g. what happens if there is disjoint field presence in ADV-RESP/SOR?). Can we defer and do a joint document to solve these CIDs together (Pooria, Bin, Alex, ?).