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Abstract

Proposed resolutions to the following CIDs are included in this document:

1005, 1043, 1059, 1061, 1063,

1064, 1069, 1070, 1080, 1104

**CID 1005**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1005 | 812.61 | 8.5.3.2 |  |  | Table 8-193--ADDTS Request frame Action field formatIn the order column of the table, what is "n" and how is it supposed to work? A similar use of "n" appears in a few other tables for Action frames in other subclauses and is equally puzzling. | Clarify the order field value for those rows of the table which contain "n" - clarify other action frame format tables that have similar designations. |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the occurrence of “n” in the order field of three action field formats, for example:



 “n” is used in the order field in the following tables:

Table 8-201—ADDTS Request frame Action field format

Table 8-202—ADDTS Response frame Action field format

Table 8-205—QoS Map configure frame body

The “Order” field indicates the order in which the listed fields appear in the frame. In Table 8-201 for example, the TCLAS element is optional; there may be say 2 of these fields. Then “n” would be 6, with fields 5 and 6 containing TCLAS fields, 7th field containing the TCLAS processing field, etc.

Does the order indicate simple order, allowing for multiple of a single field type, or does it indicate the field position in the frame?

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Either:

For Table 8-201—ADDTS Request frame Action field format,

either

Insert an explanation at 812.46 as shown below:

“The Action field of the ADDTS Request frame contains the information shown in Table 8-201 (ADDTS

Request frame Action field format); in the “order” column, “n” is equal to 5+(the number of TCLAS elements-1).”

Or

Change from

“5-n” to “5”

“n+1” to “6”

“n+2” to “7”

“n+3” to “8”

“n+4” to “9”

“n+5” to “10”

For Table 8-202—ADDTS Response frame Action field format,

At 813.51

either

The Action field of the ADDTS Response frame contains the information shown in Table 8-202 (ADDTS Response frame Action field format);in the “order” column, “n” is equal to 7+(the number of TCLAS elements-1).”

Or

Change from

“7-n” to “7”

“n+1” to “8”

“n+2” to “9”

“n+3” to “10”

“n+4” to “11”

And for Table 8-205—QoS Map configure frame body

815.17, either

The frame body of the QoS Map Configure frame contains the information shown in Table 8-205 (QoS Map

configure frame body); in the “order” column, “n” is equal to 3+(the number of Intra-Access Category Priority elements – 1).

Or

Change from “3-n” to “3”

**CID 1043**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1043 | 845.03 | 8.5.8.18 |  |  | Figure 8-475 QMF Policy element length should include 0 as a valid length in the case when it is absent. | replace "3-257" with "0 or 3-257" |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the length value shown for the QMF Policy element, currently 3-257. The commenter proposes to change from “3-257” to “0 or 3-257” as the field is optional. Agree with the commenter.



**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**CID 1059**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1059 | 1022.45 | 9.21.10.3 |  |  | References to 9.13 and 9.3.2.5 at the cited location are probably wrong. | Correct them |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the following text, the references to 9.13 and 9.3.2.5:



**Proposed resolution: Revised**

At 1022.48, change

from “9.13 (PPDU duration constraint)” to “9.23 (Protection Mechanisms)

And

From”9.3.2.5 (RTS/CTS with fragmentation” to “9.3.2.7 Dual CTS protection)

**CID 1061**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1061 | 1024.26 | 9.21.10.3 |  |  | The reference to 9.3.2.2 should be 9.3.2.1 | Change it to 9.3.2.1 |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the reference to 9.3.2.2 shown below. “9.3.2.1 CS mechanism” is indeed the better reference



**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**CID 1063**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1063 | 1098.25 | 10.2.2.5 |  |  | "frames individually addressed" is a curious construction. | change to "individually addressed frames" |  |

**Discussion:**

The comment is to change from “frames individually addressed” to “individually addressed frames”. Agree.



**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**CID 1064**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1064 | 1098.40 | 10.2.2.5 |  |  | There is no antecedent for "the non-GCR ... flows" below. | change "the" to "any" |

**Discussion:**

The text cited is below.



**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**CID 1069**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1069 | 1263.04 | 10.24.16.3.1 |  |  | Should reference to 13.13 be 13.14 | As in comment. |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the following text in the GCR procedures section:





The commenter suggests that the reference should be to 13.14 Power save in a mesh BSS.

Agree with the commenter that 13.14 is the better reference, used for example at 69.32

****

**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**CID 1070**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1070 | 1306.36 | 10.28.3 |  |  | Need to add a reference to how comparison of these 6-octet-string quantities is performed, or define it here. | Define how comparison is performed with these 6-octet strings. |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the MIX comparison of MAC addresses at line 36:



****

The definition of the MIX function is at line 57. The comparison (less than/greater than) at lines 36 and 41 is clear. Propose to make an addition, analagous to that made for CID 1552 (text in 11-13-0432-00): The Max and Min operations for IEEE 802 addresses are with the address converted to a positive integer treating the first octet as the most significant octet of the integer.

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Insert the following sentence at 1306.59:

“The resulting 6 octet value is converted to a positive integer treating the first octet as the most significant octet of the integer.”

**CID 1080**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1080 | 1159.60 | 10.8.4 |  |  | "Where TPC is being used for radio measurement without spectrum management, the inclusion of a PowerConstraint element in Beacon and Probe Response frames shall be optional." - since (pre-11ac), the means by which TPC is invoked is the Power Constraint element, then what does this mean? | Replace "when TPC is being used for RM without SM" by text relating directly to the underlying MIB variables: i.e. dot11SpectrumManagementRequired is false and dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true |

**Discussion:**

The cited text is:

“Where TPC is being used for radio measurement without spectrum management, the inclusion of a Power

Constraint element in Beacon and Probe Response frames shall be optional.”

It seems reasonable to make the text more specific.

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Change the text as shown below:

**“**When dot11SpectrumManagementRequired is false and dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true, the inclusion of a Power

Constraint element in Beacon and Probe Response frames shall be optional. **“**

**CID 1104**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1104 | 1149.08 | 10.5.2.4 |  |  | I can't find any "ADDBA GCR Group Address Present subfield" defined in the spec. I think this is a throw-back to an early draft of 11aa when we were adding fields to the Block Ack Parameter Set, before deciding that it was easier to just add a new IE to the Request / Response frames. | Delete the text "ADDBA GCR Group Address Present subfield equal to 1" |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on the following text:



Agree with the commenter.

**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**References:**