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Recommended Resolutions

# Proposed resolution Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 147 | 21 | 8.3.2.3 | 9 | simplify the table of RangingReportDescriptor with 4 tables of size 8 | merge RxRif1-8MarkerStart into RxRifMarkerStart[8], RxRif1-8MarkerEnd into RxRifMarkerEnd[8], TxRif1-8MarkerStart into TxRifMarkerStart[8], TxRif1-8MarkerEnd into TxRifMarkerEnd[8] |

Discussion: This can be considered an editorial change as the proposed change does not change technical content of the conceptual SAP and will simplify and clarify the draft standard.

# Proposed resolution Revised

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 15 | 84 | 10.39.8.4.2 | 22 | if all NB channels are occupied, we should migrates towards UWB driven MMS | Change the "may" to a "shall" |
| 65 | 28 | 8.3.4 | 1 | The KeySource seems to be described incorrectly. KeySource is normally not the originator of the received frame or to be used transmitting the frame. It is used to find the associated key from the security tables, and it is included in the auxiliary security header, but does not necessarely match the originator of the frame.  | If this is trying to be the originator of the frame then use some different name than KeySource. Remove the whole table 2, and CompactSecurityParams, and use standard SecurityParams, which already have SecurityLevel, KeyIndex, and KeySource fields. |
| 150 | 28 | 8.3.4 | 1 | SecurityLevel 0x00 with no security is missing | change valid range of SecurityLevel to 0x00-0x07 |
| 329 | 28 | 8.3.4 | 1 | Given that SecurityLevel, KeyIndex, KeySource are already present in SecurityParams structure in base standard. It would be more unified approach to reused these for compact frame security. | Integrate the descriptions for compact frame security into the base standard SecurityParams and delete the separate CompactSecurityParams parameter. |

## CI: 15

Propose REVISED

Resolution Detail: change the sentence to ""When all 250 O-QPSK channels are marked as blocked, devices cannot engage in an NBA MMS UWB session, but use of UWB driven MMS UWB" is still possible."

Discussion: "shall", "may" and "should" are all incorrect in this sentence. This is not a valid (complete) statement of a requirement. It is a statement of fact or possibility (the "for example” is the clue). Elsewhere in the draft it is specified how *macMmsNbChannelAllowList* is used to constrain the narrow band channel usage, both when channel switching is enabled and when channel switching is disabled. If no NB channels are given it is still possible to use UWB only MMS UWB, but it is not mandatory (e.g. MMS is not mandatory to use).

## CI: 150, 329, 66

Propose REVISED

Resolution detail: proposed change given for CI 329.

Discussion: Propose we accept the proposed change in CI# 329 with the editor's concurrence the detail is sufficient for him to complete the change. This resolves CI #150 in the process as the range for SecurityLevel in the base standard is from 0 to 7.

Comparing D02 to the base standard, there are two differences in the description of the security parameters:

1. In D02 SecurityLevel, as noted in CI#150 value 0 is excluded, and also value 4 is explicitly excluded. Since in the base standard the SecurityLevel value 4 is Reserved this last exclusion is unnecessary. Excluding level 0 is also unnecessary. I see no valid technical reason not to use the existing definition for SecurityLevel. In reading the functional text, security level 0 (not secured) is allowed for compact frames. In the base standard text for MCPS-DATA we state that when security level is 0 the other parameters are ignored.

2. In the base standard the KeySource parameter may be an extended address, or a shorter address comprised of a Pan ID and Short Address (as defined in 9.4.4.2 Key Source field). We state in D02 that this is an extended address and refer to 10.39.11.1.2.3 which only addresses using extended addresses.

As a side note not in the comments but which is resolved by this proposed resolution: "IEEE address" and "An extended IEEE address" are incorrect (neither are actual defined things). The correct term is "extended address" which is defined in clause 7.1 to be an EUI-64.