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Abstract

This document proposes resolutions for the following 34 CIDs:

837,443, 444, 344, 425, 103, 104, 105, 208, 640, 983, 931, 933, 673, 107, 573, 381, 340, 155, 574, 674, 729, 730, 731, 341, 944, 342, 435, 382, 667, 668, 947, 948 and 575.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 837 | 22.12 | 6.3.99 | Clause 6 GDC Enablement 6.3.99 is unnecessary, as no unique normative requirements appear here. | Delete editing instruction and 6.3.99 text. | Reject-  The clause 6 is useful to show the relationship between the SME and the MLME. |

**Discussion:**

Even though the clause 6 does not include any unique normative text, it is useful to show the relationship between the SME and the MLME.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

The clause 6 is useful to show the relationship between the SME and the MLME.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 443 | 24.60 | 6.3.99.3.2 | MLME-GDCENABLEMENT.request does not include the Device's geo-location information that may be needed under UK regulations. | Under OFCOM Regulations a dependant STA may submit geo-location information to enabling STA. The request should allow the option to send geo-location information. | Rject-  Device Location Information is optional information. It is not needed to include in our draft.. |
| 444 | 24.60 | 6.3.99.3.2 | MLME-GDCENABLEMENT.indication does not include the device's geo-location information that may be needed under UK regulations. | Under OFCOM Regulations a dependant STA may submit geo-location information to enabling STA. The indication should allow the option for geo-location information. | Reject-  Device Location Information is optional information. It is not needed to include in our draft. |

**Discussion:**

OFCOM regulation has the following requirement for a slave WSD.

“The latitude and longitude coordinates of a slave WSD’s transmitting antennas may be communicated to a WSDB.”

It is an optional information.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 344 | 67.00 | 8.5.8.31 | can the dialog token have a value of 1 for every request sent by a STA? Can every STA send every GDC Enablement request with the value 1? If so, then there doesn't seem to be much point in having the dialog token. If not then there's some missing text to define the semantics of this request/response protocol. | get rid of the dialog token if it's not needed. If it is needed explain why and put some requirements around its use. | Reject-  Regarding the Dialog Token field, there is no missing text. Current IEEE 802.11 specification is also using the Dialog Token field without additional explanation. |

**Discussion:**

The Dialog Token field is used for matching action responses with action requests when there are multiple concurrent action requests (see 8.4.1.12).

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Regarding the Dialog Token field, there is no missing text. Current IEEE 802.11 specification is also using the Dialog Token field without additional explanation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 425 | 67.31 | 8.5.8.31, 8.5.8.32 | Remove GDC enablement request/response frame because after receiving the request, AP need to send the FCC ID of the slave device to database for verification. There will be not immediate response that can be sent to slave device. RLQP can handle this issue with delayed response. | per comment | Reject-  AP is not required to transmit GDC Enablement Response frame immediately after receiving GDC Enablement Request frame. |

**Discussion:**

STA transmits GDC Enablement Request frame to AP. If AP correctly receives GDC Enablement Request frame, it replies with ACK frame. Then, AP validates the Device Identification Information of the STA before transmitting GDC Enablement Response frame.

AP is not required to transmit GDC Enablement Response frame immediately after receiving GDC Enablement Request frame. So, there is no issue.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

AP is not required to transmit GDC Enablement Response frame immediately after receiving GDC Enablement Request frame.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 103 | 67.45 | 8.5.8.31 | Figure 8-460j claims that this is the frame body, but is it not. It is the action field of a public action frame. | At 67.33 change "The format of the ... frame body" to "The format of the ... action field".    At 67.45, change "body format" to "Action field format". | Revised-  Change “body” to “Action field” as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

Figure 8-460j is showing the action field of GDC Enablement Request frame. I agree with the proposed change.

**Proposed Resolution:** Revised.

Change “body” to “Action field”.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following sentence in 8.5.8.31 (Line 34, Page 67) as follows:***

“The format of the GDC Enablement Request frame ~~body~~ action field is shown in Table 8-460j (GDC Enablement Request frame ~~body~~ action field format).”

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following sentence in 8.5.8.31 (Line 45, Page 67) as follows:***

“Figure 8-460j—GDC Enablement Request frame ~~body~~ Action field format”

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following sentence in 8.5.8.32 (Line 5, Page 68) as follows:***

“The format of the GDC Enablement Response frame ~~body~~ action field is shown in Table 8-460k (GDC Enablement Response frame ~~body~~ action field format).”

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following sentence in 8.5.8.32 (Line 16, Page 68) as follows:***

“Figure 8-460k—GDC Enablement Response frame ~~body~~ Action field format”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 104 | 67.45 | 8.5.8.31 | Given that figure 8-460j describes an action field format (see my related comment), it is followed by Vendor Specific elements and possible MIC element. It must be possible to parse this unambiguously, but it is not, because the variable length fields are structured as TLVs with types drawn from a different namespace.    The same problem exists for the GDC Enablement Response frame (68.16) | Add a Length field after Dialog Token with definition: "The Length field indicates the length of the remaining fields of the Action field in octets, and the value is variable."    Make matching changes near 68.16. | Reject-  In each regulatory domain, the size of Device Class and Device Indentification is not variable. So, the length field is not needed to indicate the length of the remaining fields. |

**Discussion:**

Device Class is 1 octet and Device Identification is 18 octets (FCC ID + Device Serial Number) and 11 octets (Industry Canada ID)

In each regulatory domain, the size of Device Class and Device Indentification is not variable. So, the length field is not needed to indicate the length of the remaining fields.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

In each regulatory domain, the size of Device Class and Device Indentification is not variable. So, the length field is not needed to indicate the length of the remaining fields.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 105 | 68.10 | 8.5.8.32 | The frame format of the GDC Enablement Response frame format contains "WSM Elements", but the primitive at 26.24 indicates a single WSM element. | Resolve the inconsistency. | Revised-  For the consistency of GDC Enablement procedure, modify Figure 8-460k as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

GDC Enablement Response frame provides single White Space Map IE to the STA.

**Proposed Resolution:** Revised.

For the consistency of GDC Enablement procedure, modify Figure 8-460k.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following in 8.5.8.32 (Line 10, Page 68) as follows:***

In Figure 8-460k, “~~WSM Elements~~ White Space Map IE”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 208 | 77.24 | 10.42 | What is the MAC state (e.g. associated/unassociated) when these operations take place? What permissible states could these frames be sent in? | Update this clause to describe what permissible MAC states are allowed for transmission of these frames. | Revise-  Indicate that GDC enablement procdure is occurred in MAC state 4 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |
| 640 | 77.30 | 10.42.1 | Please clarify when an enabling process occurs, e.g., whether the enabling frames are Class 1 or 2 or 3 frames. | As in comment. | Revise-  Indicate that GDC enablement procdure is occurred in MAC state 4 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |
| 983 | 77.30 | 10.42.1 | Please clarify when an enabling process occurs, e.g., whether the enabling frames are Class 1 or 2 or 3 frames. | As in comment. | Revise-  Indicate that GDC enablement procdure is occurred in MAC state 4 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

All frames for GDC enablement procedure (such as GDC Enablement Request frame, GDC Enablement Response frame, Contact Verfication Signal frame and White Space Map Announcement frame) are transmitted in State 4.

**Proposed Resolution:** Revised.

Indicate that GDC enablement procdure is occurred in MAC state 4.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the second paragraph in 10.42.1 as follows:***

This clause describes procedures for STAs when they are operating under the control of a GDB to satisfy regulatory requirements. For operation under such restrictions, GDC dependent STAs operate according to the control procedures of a GDC enabling STA that enables their operation.

The frame exchange sequence between GDC enabling STA and GDC dependent STAs for enabling their operation is occurred in State 4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 931 | 77.33 | 10.42.1 | "must" is deprecated in IEEE standards. | Replace "must" with "are required by regulation".  ("Required" also is not good, but specifying "by regulation" helps to indicate this is not a clandestine 802.11 requirement.) | Accept-  Our draft is for satisfying the the regulation requirement. Accpet the proposed change as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

Proposed change is okay to me beause I also want to say that our draft is for satisfying the the regulation requirement.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept.

Our draft is for satisfying the the regulation requirement. The proposed change is reasonable.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following sentence in first paragraph in 10.42.1 as follows:***

Such STAs may operate as geolocation database controlled (GDC) enabling stations, which ~~must~~ are required by the regulation to provide their identification, geolocation and other information to the GDB as specified by regulatory authorities.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 933 | 77.43 | 10.42.1 | Need to make it painfully clear that these rules apply to all STAs. | Replace "STAs shall" with "All STAs shall". | Revised-  Because this subclause is a normative behaviour of the GDC enablement procedure, remove the corresponding sentence as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

The following sentence is not needed. This subclause is a normative behaviour of the GDC enablement procedure.

“STAs shall use the procedures defined in this subclause if dot11GDCActivated is true.”

**Proposed Resolution:** Revised.

Because this subclause is a normative behaviour of the GDC enablement procedure, remove the following sentene.

“STAs shall use the procedures defined in this subclause if dot11GDCActivated is true.”

***TGaf Editor: Remove the following sentence in third paragraph in 10.42.1 as follows:***

~~STAs shall use the procedures defined in this subclause if dot11GDCActivated is true.~~

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 673 | 78.00 | 10.42.2 | No transmit power information is conveyed for a GDC dependent STA to use for starting enabling procedure | Add text clarifying how GDC dependent STA determines power levels to use for transmitting the enablement message | Reject-  Subclause 10.8.4 is already describing how a STA determines a regulatory maximum transmit power. |

**Discussion:**

In order to start the GDC enablement procedure, STA shall listen to GDC Enablng Signal.

Because GDC Enabling Signal is a Beacon frame, it may contain the power constrain information such as Channel Switch Wrapper element. And, such DFS operation rule is already described in 10.8.4.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Subclause 10.8.4 is already describing how a STA determines a regulatory maximum transmit power.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 107 | 78.05 | 10.42.2 | It is not clear to me how the "PeerSTAAddress" maps on to the either of the address fields in Figure 8-460I. Clause 10 does not describe this. | Add a description of how the Requester STA Address and Responder STA address fields are set, based on the GDCENABLEMENT request and response primitive parameters.  Add a description of how the GDCENABLEMENT indication & confirm primitive parameters are set based on Requester STA Address and Responder STA address fields.  Do this for both the request and response frames. | Reject-  Clause 10 is already describing how the Requester STA Address and Responder STA address fields are set. |

**Discussion:**

Clause 10 is already describing how the Requester STA Address and Responder STA address fields are set.

See Line 50 Page 79,

b)The GDC dependent STA sends a GDC Enablement Request frame to a GDC enabling STA from which it has received a GDC enabling signal.

See Line 23-24 Page 78,

Upon receipt of a GDC Enablement Request frame from a GDC dependent STA, the GDC enabling STA shall send a GDC Enablement Response frame with either of the following results:

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Clause 10 is already describing how the Requester STA Address and Responder STA address fields are set.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 573 | 78.10 | 10.42.2 | Should it be "Geodatabase" or "Geolocation database"? | Please clarify. This appears in few other places. | Reject-  “Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal” is a field name of the Extended Capabilities element. |

**Discussion:**

“Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal” is a field name of the Extended Capabilities element.

Throughout all draft, the geoatabase is not used for pointing the Geolocation database.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

“Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal” is a field name of the Extended Capabilities element.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 381 | 78.11 | 10.42.2 | Confusing. "The GDC enabling signal is a beacon frame containing a Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal field in the Extended Capabilities element set to 1". It is the geodatabase inband enabling signal field that is set to ?. Reword | "The GDC enabling signal is a beacon frame with an Extended Capabilities element that contains a Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal field set to 1. | Accept-  Change Line 11, Page 78 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

The proposed sentence looks good to me.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept.

***TGaf Editor: Repalce the the following sentence in second paragraph in 10.42.2 as follows:***

***From***

“The GDC enabling signal is a beacon frame containing a Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal field in the Extended Capabilities element set to 1.”

***To***

“The GDC enabling signal is a beacon frame with an Extended Capabilities element that contains a Geodatabase Inband Enabling Signal field set to 1.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 340 | 78.36 | 10.42.2 | Can an unsolicated GDC Enablement Response frame be broadcasted to all GDC dependent STAs? | Clarify | Revise-  GDC Enabling STA can transmit GDC Enablement Response frame with a broadcast address as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

If GDC Enabling STA wants to stop the service, it can transmit GDC Enablement Response frame with a broadcast address. But, in that case, the WSM IE shall not be included in unsolicited GDC Enablement Response frame.

**Proposed Resolution:** Revise.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the last paragraph in 10.42.2 as follows:***

A GDC enabling STA may issue an unsolicited GDC Enablement Response frame with a Status Code <ANA78> ("Authorization Deenabled") to notify a GDC dependent STA(s) to cease its transmissions and change its GDC enablement state to Unenabled. When an unsolicitied GDC Enablement Response frame with a Status Code <ANA78> ("Authorization Deenabled"), the WSM element shall not be included.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 155 | 78.42 | 10.42.3 | "A GDC dependent STA shall set dot11GDBAccessActivated to false."    Ho hum. There's a chicken an egg problem here. Table 10-21 states that the role is depdent on this MIB variable, not the other way around. | Replace with : "A GDC dependent STA is one in which dot11GDBAccessActivated is false" | Accept-  Change Line 42, Page 78 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

The proposed sentence looks good to me.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the first sentence in 10.42.3 as follows:***

A GDC dependent STA is one in which ~~shall set~~ dot11GDBAccessActivated ~~to~~ is false.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 574 | 78.48 | 10.42.3 | Change "receive-only mode in the band" to "receive-only mode within the band" | As in comment. | Accept-  Change Line 47, Page 78 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

The proposed sentence looks good to me.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the second paragraph in 10.42.3 as follows:***

A GDC dependent STA begins operation by setting its GDC enablement state variable to Unenabled, and operate in receive-only mode within the band, passively scanning channels for an enabling signal from a GDC enabling STA.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 674 | 79.00 | 10.42.3 | The requirement of security in enablement procedure and contact verification requires STAs to be securely associated with the enabling STA. Therefore in the current description, STA can be enabled only by APs. Therefore all APs will need to be GDC enabling capable and have location capabilities. This is a severe limitation | Need a method for APs to operate without the need for location information. | Reject-  Regulation requirement of GDC Enabling STA is that the GDC Enabling STA shall have the location information. |

**Discussion:**

I agree with the limition of current GDC Enablement procedure. But, there is no solution for AP to operate without the need for location information.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Regulation requirement of GDC Enabling STA is that the GDC Enabling STA shall have the location information.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 729 | 79.14 | 10.4.23 | Fix figure. | In figure, change "Enabling Signal" to "Enabling Signal and then transmit GDC Enablement Request". | Accept-  Modify Figure 10-39 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |
| 730 | 79.19 | 10.4.23 | Fix figure. | Status codes in figure don't agree with correct text at P78L30. Fix figure. | Accept-  Modify Figure 10-39 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |
| 731 | 79.26 | 10.4.23 | Fix figure. | Add state transition loop on left side of GDC Enabled block. Text for loop to read "Recieve CVS and reset dot11GDCEnablementValidityTimer". | Accept-  Modify Figure 10-39 as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

The proposed changes on GDC dependent STA state transition diagram looks good to me.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept

***TGaf Editor: Modify Figure 10-39 as follows:***
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 341 | 79.39 | 10.42.3 | "unless such action is mandated to be allowed in the regulatory domain (e.g., emergency services)." What are the specific signals that can tell GDC dependent STAs about these exceptions? | Clarify | Revise-  Delete an exception case of GDC Enablement procedure as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |
| 944 | 79.39 | 10.42.3 | This "unless such action" is attached to an exception sublcause, so it is unclear whether the "such action" applies to the exception or to the main body of the sentence. | Replace "such action" with a specific term that indicates which action. | Revise-  Delete an exception case of GDC Enablement procedure as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

Regulation is not specifying the exception case using TV White Space without receiving a permission from GDC Enabling STA. Delete an exception case of GDC Enablement procedure.

**Proposed Resolution:** Revise.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the following paragraph in subclause 10.42.3 as follows:***

Regulation requirement of GDC Enabling STA is that the GDC Enabling STA shall have the location information.

A GDC dependent STA that is able to receive a valid GDC enabling signal, but has not been enabled by a GDC enabling STA shall not transmit, except to perform GDC enablement with the GDC enabling STA transmitting the enabling signal~~, unless such action is mandated to be allowed in the regulatory domain (e.g., emergency services)~~.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 342 | 79.50 | 10.42.3 | Any requirement/restriction on transmitting the GDC Enablement Request frame? | Clarify | Reject-  Requirement on transmitting the GDC Enablement Request frame is already described in current draft. |
| 435 | 79.50 | 10.42.3 | No specific restriction being specified on transmitting the GDC Enablement Request frame. | Clarify | Reject-  Requirement on transmitting the GDC Enablement Request frame is already described in current draft. |

**Discussion:**

After receiving GDC Enabling Signal, GDC dependent STA can transmit GDC Enablement Request frame to GDC enabling STA. This is a requirement on transmitting the GDC Enablement Request frame.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Requirement on transmitting the GDC Enablement Request frame is already described in current draft.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 382 | 79.64 | 10.42.3 | Not sure the paragraph is stating the conditions correctly. It currently reads:    "A GDC dependent STA that has not attained GDC enablement from a GDC enabling STA shall not transmit beyond dot11GDCEnablementTimeLimit (in seconds), measured from the time of the first PHY-TXSTART.request primitive, while attempting to attain GDC enablement. Then, when the GDC enablement attempt fails within the allowed maximum time, it shall not transmit for dot11GDCEnablementFailHoldTime (in seconds), before it can again attempt to attain GDC enablement" | Please clarify. If it has not attained GDC enablement, then if it is going to transmit up to dot11GDCEnablementTime Limit, is this only if the STA is attempting to attain enablement with a different enabling STA? Otherwise should it not transmit since it is not enabled? Also the phrase says "when the attempt fails". Should that read "if the attempt fails"? I find this section a little confusing. Please clarify. | Rejct-  The paragraph is stating the conditions correctly. |

**Discussion:**

The paragraph is stating the conditions correctly. I couldn’t find any misleading sentence.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

The paragraph is stating the conditions correctly.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 947 | 80.03 | 10.42.3 | This "can" clearly is a hidden "may". | Replace "can" with "may". | Reject-  There is no reason for changing from “can” to “may”. |

**Discussion:**

“Then, when the GDC enablement attempt fails within the allowed maximum time, it shall not transmit for dot11GDCEnablementFailHoldTime (in seconds), before it can again attempt to attain GDC enablement.”

There is no reason to replace “can” with “may”.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

The paragraph has no tehncial issue for changing from “can” to “may”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 948 | 80.05 | 10.42.3 | Per the IEEE Style Manual NOTEs are required to be informative. | Replace each "may" in this paragraph with "might"; if the normative language is intended, then delete the "NOTE--", but still repalce the first "may" with "might". | Accept-  Modify NOTE as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |
| 575 | 80.06 | 10.42.3 | Sentence in this NOTE is too long. Please simplify it. | A suggestion --- "A GDC dependent STA may detect several GDC enabling STAs. If the GDC dependent STA fails to attain GDC attainment with one GDC enabling STA, it may reattempt with another GDC enabling STA within the maxium time limit of dot11DDCEnablementTimeLimit (in seconds). | Accept-  Modify NOTE as editing instructions in 11-12/1342r0. |

**Discussion:**

NOTE is an informative text. Replace "may" with "might”. And, simplify the NOTE as proposed by the commenter.

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept.

***TGaf Editor: Modify the Note in subclause 10.42.3 as follows:***

~~NOTE—Before attempting GDC enablement with any one GDC enabling STA, a GDC dependent STA may have detected several GDC enabling STAs, may attempt GDC enablement with one and fail, and then attempt GDC enablement with another within the allowed maximum time limit of dot11GDCEnablementTimeLimit (in seconds).~~

NOTE—A GDC dependent STA might detect several GDC enabling STAs. If the GDC dependent STA fails to attain GDC attainment with one GDC enabling STA, it might reattempt with another GDC enabling STA within the maxium time limit of dot11DDCEnablementTimeLimit (in seconds).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 67 | 80.00 | 10.42.4 | When a CAQ is sent by a GDC enabling STA (S1) to another GDC enabling STA S2 that has direct access to a GDB, how is the dot11GDBAccessActivated attribute of S1 set | Add text clarifying how the dot11GDBAccessActivated attribute is set | Reject-  Table 10-21 is already specifying how the dot11GDBAccessActivated attribute is set. |

**Discussion:**

I don’t understand what the comenter is saying. But, regarding the proposed change, Table 10-21 is specifying how the dot11GDBAccessActivated attribute is set.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Table 10-21 is already specifying how the dot11GDBAccessActivated attribute is set.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 668 | 80.00 | 10.42.4 | Text does not specify how two GDC enabling STAs can securely communicate for CAQ messaging | Add references to secure communication between the GDC enabling STA | Reject-  Subclause 10.42.4 is saying that a protected dual management frame provides a secure communication for CAQ messaging. |

**Discussion:**

See the following paragraph in subclause 10.42.4.

“STAs may transmit a channel availability query request in a CAQ public action frame (see 8.5.8.27 (Channel Availability Query frame format), or its protected dual (see 8.5.11 (Protected Dual of Public Action frames) or in a GAS Initial Request frame containing RLQP CAQ element (see 8.4.5.2 (RLQP Channel Availability Query element)).”

Two GDC enabling STAs also securely communicate for CAQ message with a protected dual management frame.

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject.

Subclause 10.42.4 is saying that a protected dual management frame provides a secure communication for CAQ messaging.