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Abstract

This document proposes resolutions for the following 6 CIDs:

95, 420, 440, 441, 442 and 896

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 95 | 20.59 | 6.3.98.2.2 | the MLME-CVS.confirm is a "confirm without a response" and fails to meet WG11 design patterns for the MLME interface.Also the ResultCode is a parameter whose values are purely locally determined without any normative specification of how they are determined. | Delete the CVS confirm primitive. | Accept- Because MLME does not receive any response frame as the result of CVS frame transmission, CVS frame is not needed. So, remove MLME-CVS.confirm primitive as the proposed change from comment. |

**Discussion:**

MLME-CVS.confirm primitive is not needed for CVS procedure because CVS procedure uses a uni-direction frame exchange sequence.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept

Because MLME does not receive any response frame as the result of CVS frame transmission, CVS frame is not needed. So, remove MLME-CVS.confirm primitive as the proposed change from comment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 441 | 20.60 | 6.3.98.2.2 | May want to include a protected field to the MLME-CSV.confirm as done in other primatives | Protected field be added to the MLME-CSV.confirm primative | Revised-MLME-CVS.confirm primitive is not need. (see CID 95)So, remove MLME-CVS.confirm primitive. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 420 | 52.34 | 8.4.2.171 | No need to have MAP ID in the CVS, one bit in the CVS is enough to tell master device that the channel condition has been changed. Remove CVS TLV | per comment | Reject-If CVS frame provides MAP ID of the white space map, it can enhance the validating its white space map.  |

**Discussion:**

The definition of CVS is for for purposes of validating the list of available channels used by the Mode I device.

If CVS frame provides MAP ID of the white space map, it can enhance the validating its white space map.

For example, when the list of available channels is changed, AP transmits CVS frame with one bit indicating a change of the list of available channels.

The target STA does not successfully receives CVS frame because of several reasons (e.g, simple transmission failure or sleep mode).

However, if a malicious user may transmit ACK frame of CVS frame for the target STA, AP will not inform the change of the list of available channels any more.

But, if we includes MAP ID in CVS frame, the target STA can always checks whether the list of available channels is changed or not.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject

If CVS frame provides MAP ID of the white space map, it can enhance the validating its white space map.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 440 | 20.09 | 6.3.98.1.2 | May want to include a protected field to the MLME-CSV.request as done in other primatives | Protected field be added to the MLME-CSV.request primative | Accept-Add protected fields in 6.3.98.1.2 as editing instructions in 11-12/1340r0. |
| 442 | 21.40 | 6.3.98.3.2 | May want to include a protected field to the MLME-CSV.indication as done in other primatives | Protected field be added to the MLME-CSV.indication primative | Accept-Add protected fields in 6.3.98.3.2 as editing instructions in 11-12/1340r0. |

**Discussion:**

Because CVS frame should be transmitted in a protected management frame, a protected field should be added in MLME-CVS.request and MLME-CVS.indication primitives.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept

Add protected fields in 6.3.98.1.2 and 6.3.98.3.2 as editing instructions in 11-12/1340r0.

***TGaf Editor: add the following row in 6.3.98.1.2 as as follows:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Protected | Boolean | true, false | Specifies whether the request is sent using a Robust Management frame.If true, the request is sent using the Pro­tected Contact Verification Signal frame.If false, the request is sent using the Contact Verification Signal frame. |

***TGaf Editor: add the following row in 6.3.98.3.2 as as follows:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Protected | Boolean | true, false | Specifies whether the request is sent using a Robust Management frame.If true, the request is sent using the Pro­tected Contact Verification Signal frame.If false, the request is sent using the Contact Verification Signal frame. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 896 | 22.11 | 6.3.98 | Per the IEEE 802.11 Style Guide, there is no such set of primitives as request/confirm/indication. | Add in a MLME-CVS.response primitive. | Reject-CVS procedure does not have any response frame from the peer STA. MLME-CVS.response primitive is not needed |

**Discussion:**

MLME-CVS.response primitive is not needed for CVS procedure because CVS procedure uses a uni-direction frame exchange sequence.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject

CVS procedure does not have any response frame from the peer STA. MLME-CVS.response primitive is not needed