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# #276

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Index #** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| Li-Hsiang Sun | 276 | 33 | 10 | 1 | For applications using NB transmissions (e.g. data offload) with on-off cycles and if not performing LBT or power control, the duration of the off state should either be large enough to allow other technologies’ nominal channel occupancy time, or small enough to prevent other technology following LBT procedure from acquiring the channel and later being interfered | as in comment |

Discussion: We have agreed to add a mandatory 300 RSTU gap at the end of POLL/RESP transmissions in

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/24/15-24-0648-01-04ab-lb207-d01-comment-resolution-vancouver-cids-188-236-404-659-987-993-1167-1168-1169-1335-1348-1357-1403.docx. We had some discussion in the Kobe F2F that the commenter may want to suggest to further changes in the next revision if the group cannot find consensus on forcing devices to use LBT before every transmission.

Proposed resolution: Rejected.

Disposition detail: Withdrawn by commenter.

# #405

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Index #** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| Tero Kivinen | 405 | 58 | 10.38.3.2 | 10 | The initialization process figure is nice, but the message sequence chart would also be needed, i.e., the figure that shows what higher layers and MLMEs do to initiate sending those messages.  | Add message sequence chart for initialization showing which MLME calls are needed to initialize things in initiator and responder, and what MLME calls are used to transmit and receive those frames. My understanding is that at least some of the MLME calls are not defined yet, so making this chart would find out the gaps in the specification. Also as there are tight timing requirements between SOR and POLL frames that means all this should be done in the MAC, thus MLME call is needed to do the whole transaction. |

Discussion: The sequence chart has been provided and accepted in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/25/15-25-0008-02-04ab-proposed-resolution-for-comment-id-417-420-421-424-444-on-message-sequence-charts.docx

Proposed resolution: Revised.

Disposition detail: As proposed in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.15/dcn/25/15-25-0008-02-04ab-proposed-resolution-for-comment-id-417-420-421-424-444-on-message-sequence-charts.docx.

# #998

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Index #** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| Carlos Aldana | 998 | 81 | 10.38.9.3.7 | 18 | To simplify design, there should be a way to signal the end of the NB channel map. Please add a field to Figure 49 to signal NB channel end. | As in comment |

Discussion: There are insufficient bits left to add this feature and adding more octets is not justified for adding this feature due to lack of desirability.

Proposed resolution: Rejected.

Disposition detail: Feature addon undesirable.