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Abstract

Proposed resolutions to the following CIDs (assigned in Orlando) are included in this document:

1263, 1269, 1392, 1480, 1694,

1703, 1704, 1705, 1706

**CID 1263**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1263 | 510.06 | 6 | 8.4.1.9 |  |  | "suggests the STA transitions to other BSSs": thie languag is too broken here. | Should be "suggests that the STA transition". Should be "to a different BSS", since the STA can't transition to multiple BSSs. |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the text that defined the meaning of status code value 58, in Table 8-38.

The current text is:

“The TS has not been created because the request cannot be honored; however, the HC suggests the STA transitions to other BSSs to setup the TS.”

The commenter observes that a STA cannot transition to multiple BSSs. Agree.

**Proposed resolution: Accept.**

Applying the commenter’s propose change results in the following text:

“The TS has not been created because the request cannot be honored; however, the HC suggests that the STA transition~~s~~ to a different~~other~~ BSS~~s~~ to setup the TS.”

**CID 1269**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1269 | 629.63 | 63 | 8.4.2.26 |  |  | "that augment the Capability Information field". The capabilities do not augment a field. | Replace "augment" with "augment those specified in the". |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the introductory descriptive text for the Extended Capabilities element.

The current text is:

“The Extended Capabilities element carries information about the capabilities of an IEEE Std 802.11 STA

that augment the Capability Information field. The format of this element is shown in Figure 8-191

(Extended Capabilities element format).”

The commenter observes that capabilities do not augment a field; they augment other capabilities. Agree.

**Proposed resolution: Revised.**

Applying the commenter’s propose change results in the following text:

“The Extended Capabilities element carries information about the capabilities of an IEEE Std 802.11 STA

that augment those specified in the the Capability Information field. The format of this element is shown in Figure 8-191 (Extended Capabilities element format).”

Minor edits to the commenter’s proposed resolution:

**Proposed change:**

“The Extended Capabilities element carries information about the capabilities of an IEEE Std 802.11 STA

that augment the capabilities specified in the Capability Information field. The format of this element is shown in Figure 8-191 (Extended Capabilities element format).”

**CID 1392**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1392 | 575.34 | 34 | 8.4.10.20.10 |  |  | figure 8-128 is for target MAC address but figure shows originator MAC address in the field which then would be the same as figure 8-127. I wonder if this is a copy paste error? | change field to reflect that the MAC address is of the STA that is having its location info requested. |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the field name of an entry in Figure 8-128. The field name does not match the figure name, but rather matches that in the propr table. The current text is shown below:



 Agree that there is an error here.

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

**Proposed Change:**

In Figure 8-128, change the name of the last field in the subelement from “Originator Requesting STA MAC Address” to “Target MAC Address”.

**CID 1480**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1480 | 438.50 | 8.4.2.9 |  |  | Rules on overlap of subband triplets v. requirements to support wacky regulatory domains | Allow overlap; the requirement should just be that there's no overlap in channel numbers for a given operating width (see 11ac/D5.0 wording for inspiration, if not salvation) |  |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the Country element variable length description (Page 548):

“The Element ID and Length fields are defined in 8.4.2.1 (General). The length of the element is variable, as

the element may contain more than one triplet comprising the First Channel Number, Number of Channels,

and Maximum Transmit Power Level fields and referred to as subband triplets. Alternatively, where

dot11OperatingClassesRequired is true and the First Channel Number/Operating Extension Identifier octet

has a positive integer value of 201 or greater, then that triplet comprises the Operating Extension Identifier,

Operating Class, and Coverage Class fields. Together they are referred to as an operating triplet. The

minimum length of the element is 8 octets.”

11ac is indeed editing the Country element length description, adding a definition of the Subband triplet field and Operating Classes related text (See 11ac D5.0 P75). Those changes will roll-in with the approved 11ac amendment. Additionally, the commenter does not indicate the specific changes needed to address the comment.

**Proposed resolution: Rejected**

The commenter does not indicate specific changes that would satisfy the comment.

**CID 1694**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1694 | 587.14 | 8.4.2.21.2 |  |  | Three bits in the 11k Basic Report are today useless, and have no text in clause 10 supporting their use. The OFDM Preamble bit, the Unidentified Signal bit and the Radar bit should be marked as obsolete and subject to removal in a subsequent version of the standard. | Mark the three bits with text like "The mechanisms described in these three fields are obsolete. Consequently, these three fields may be reserved in a later revision of the standard." |  |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the text currently included in the Measurement Report Type: Basic Report, Map Field:





The commenter observes that no text exists in Clause 10 regarding use of 3 of the bits in the Map field: OFDM Preamble, Unidentified Signal, and Radar.

See however 10.9.8.1, P 1165L39:



**Proposed resolution: Rejected**

Definition of the bits is clear in clause 8, and there is text in 10.9.8.1 P1165L39 referring to use of the measurement report to indicate that radar was detected.

**CID 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1703 | 705.47 | 8.4.2.67.43 |  |  | Clause 8.4.2.63 normative language "the RSNE shall be truncated to the maximum length allowed" should be changed. | "the RSNE is truncated to the maximum length allowed" |
| 1704 | 688.26 | 8.4.2.57 |  |  | Clause 8.4.2.57 normative language "Channel numbering shall be dependent on" should be changed. | "Channel numbering is dependent on" |
| 1705 | 593.46 | 8.4.2.21.7 |  |  | Clause 8.4.2.21.7 normative language "Reported IBSS dynamic frequency selection (DFS)elements shall be truncated so that"; "Reported RSNEs shall be truncated so that only" should be changed. | "Reported IBSS dynamic frequency selection (DFS) elements are truncated so that"; "Reported RSNEs are truncated so that only" |
| 1706 | 530.11 | 8.4.1.31 |  |  | Clause 8.4.1.21 normative language "Identifier field shall contain a public organizationally unique"; "Organization Identifier field (j) shall be the minimum number"; "the first 3 octets shall contain the OUI portion" should be changed. | "Identifier field contains a public organizationally unique"; "Organization Identifier field (j) is the minimum number"; "the first 3 octets contain the OUI portion" |

**Discussion:**

All 4 of these comments relate to the use of normative text in Clause 8.

**Proposed resolution for CIDs 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706: Accept.**

**References:**