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Abstract

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

2433, 2483 – resolution approved

2414 and 2005, 2405, 2406, 2427, 2002, 2226, 2246, 2392– resolutions approved 2013-12-20

2199 – assigned to Carlos Cordiero

2410– assigned to Mark Hamilton

2065 – to be done

2407 – assigned to Brian Hart

2426 – Assign to Dan Harkins

**CID 2433**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2433 | 2720.57 | C |  |  | There appears to be a discrepancy for the AIFSN EDCA parameter specified in Table 8-118 (Page 731) and that specified in the MIB (dot11EDCATableAIFSN, Page 2720). | Add reference to the default values used when dot11OCBActivated is true. |  | GEN |

**Discussion:**

The comment is on a discrepancy between Table 8-118 AIFSN EDCA parameter and the dot11EDCATableAIFSN MIB variable when dot11OCBActivated (Outside the context of a BSS) is true.

The Table 8-118 definition is below:



And the MIB variable definition is below:



The dot11EDCATableIndex values are:



So, Table 8-118 says that when dot11OCBActivated (Outside the context of a BSS) is true, the default AIFSN values are 9/6/3/2 for BK/BE/VI/VO.

While the MIB variable says that the default AIFSN values are 7/3/2/2 for BK/BE/VI/VO.

**Proposed Resolution: Revised**

At 2720.57, change as indicated below:

dot11EDCATableAIFSN OBJECT-TYPE

SYNTAX Unsigned32 (2..15)

MAX-ACCESS read-write

STATUS current

DESCRIPTION

"This is a control variable.

It is written by the MAC upon receiving an EDCA Parameter Set ~~in a Beacon~~

~~frame~~.

Changes take effect as soon as practical in the implementation.

This attribute specifies the number of slots, after a SIFS, that the STA,

for a particular AC, senses the medium idle either before transmitting or

executing a backoff. See Tables 8-117 and 8-118. ~~The default value for this attribute is~~

~~7, if dot11EDCATableIndex is 1,~~

~~3, if dot11EDCATableIndex is 2~~

~~2, otherwise.~~"

::= { dot11EDCAEntry 4 }

Apply same changes to MIB variables at 2720.3 and 2720.24.

**CID 2199**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2199 | 1411.32 | 10.3.4.1 |  |  | Section 10.3.4.1 states that DMG STAs do not support authentication and deauthentication. This appears to be an optimisation that should only apply to cases where the Open Authentication algorithm is used, otherwise 11ad STAs cannot make use of other authentication algorithms such as SAE, Fast BSS Transition and those in 11ai. Even when Open Authentication is in use I'm not sure how multi-band operation is affected by this restriction. | Restrict this optimisation to cases where the Open Authentication algorithm is in use. This will require also changes in other parts of the draft, such as Figure 10-12 which shows authentication and association states. |  | MAC |

**Discussion:**

The cited text is below:



The commenter notes that because DMG STAs don’t support.11 authentication frames, they can’t use protocols that are carried in .11 authenticaiton frames. That’s true. If we changed to allow exchange of authentication frames, use would be optional so as to not make existing implementations non-compliant. Are there interoperability issues – if a DMG STA sends an authentication request frame to another DMG sta that doesn’t support authentication frames, won’t connect. Need advertisement mechanism?

Need discussion. What was the rationale for dropping use of authentication frames in 11ad?

Assigned to Carlos Cordiero

**Proposed resolution: TBD**

**Possible: Rejected**

“The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”

**CID 2410**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2410 | 2745.02 | C.3 |  |  | dot11HRCCAModeImplemented only appears in Annex C.3 I can find no reference to it outside of Annex C.3. Suggest it is deleted. | Delete dot11HRCCAModeImplemented at P2745L2, P2753L57, P2754L8-27, P2819L37 |  | GEN |

**Discussion:**

The cited MIB variable is below (at P2754L8-27):



Assigned to Mark Hamilton

**Proposed resolution: TBD**

**CID 2483**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2483 | 2401.00 | C.3 |  |  | dot11BeaconInterval' is referred In 10.2.3.3 (Initialization of power management within an IBSS), but it is not defined C.3. | Define the dot11BeaconInterval in MIB. |  | GEN |

 **Discussion:**

The cited MIB variable name is incorrect – change.

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Change from “dot11BeaconInterval” to “dot11BeaconPeriod”

**CID 2065**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2065 | 1200.14 | 9.22.7.2.2 |  |  | The insertion (9.22.7.2.2) is possibly in the wrong place. It is talking about Block Ack, not HT-Immediate block ack. Further, adding it necessitated turning the orginal contents of 9.22.7.2 into an introduction, when in fact it is the main meat of this subclause. | Find a better home for this subclause. Or if it in the right place, rename 9.22.7.2.1 to "General". |  | MAC |

**Discussion:**

Agree with the commenter that the 11ad insertion is in the wrong place.

Looking for a better place…….

**Proposed resolution: TBD**

**CID 2414, 2005**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2414 | 29.56 | 3.2 |  |  | CID 1674 from LB193 was marked as ACCEPTED but the change was not implemented in D2.0 | Delete the definiteion for EAPOL-Start frame or add an appropriate definition |  | GEN |
| 2005 | 29.44 | 3.2 |  |  | The "See EAPOL-Key frame" is bogus, because the two terms are no longer synonyms. | Add a definition, or delete cited entry |

**Discussion:**

CID 1674 is below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1674 | 27.55 | 3.2 |  | A | EAPOL-Key and EAPOL-Start are not the same. See 802.1X-2010 clause 11.3.2 | Delete Syn: EAPOL-Start frame. |

And its resolution is:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACCEPTED (GEN: 2013-06-26 17:25:33Z) | EDITOR | 201307 approved | Resolved |  | I | EDITOR: 2013-07-25 14:53:56Z |

The relevant text is below:



**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Change the definition to:

**EAPOL-Start frame:** A Data MPDU that carries an 802.1X EAPOL-Start PDU.

**CID 2405**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2405 | 1543.32 | 10.24.6 |  |  | The sentence "The STA does not support the fine timing measurement procedure." does not seem to have any meaning and can be removed. |  |  |

**Discussion:**

The cited text and context is below:



Similar text is



And:



And 1542, lines 1-7:



There are multiple wordings that describe the “is supported” case. Additionally in some cases the “does not support” case is described (Timing measurement and Fine timing measurement” and in some cases the “does not support case” is not described in the text.

Agree that the cited text is not required.

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Delete the text “"The STA does not support the [fine] timing measurement procedure." at 1542L1-2

and 1543 L30-32

**CID 2406**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2406 | 1543.22 | 10.24.6 |  |  | add explanatory text on what is the difference between timing measurement and the fine timing measurement. They both seem to provide the same thing, clock sync and flight time measurement. | as suggested |  |

Discussion:

There is discussion on the 2 capabilities in clause 4.



Is additional text needed?

**Proposed Resolution: Rejected**

There is already text in 4.3.14.18 and 4.3.14.19 that describes each feature.

**CID 2407**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2407 | 1544.04 | 10.24.6 |  |  | Text says: "A STA that supports the fine timing measurement procedure may transmit a Fine Timing MeasurementRequest frame to a peer STA". Yet, the figure 10-31 shows the request frame as being mandatory (not dotted line). | Align figures 10-30 and 10-31. In both figures the Request Frame is optional (right?), but in 10-30 it is dotted line, while in 10-31 is not.Also in figure 10-30 there is a star next to the Request, what does that mean?Make the Request Frame in both figures either dotted line or continuous line. The star should also be present in both figures or in neither. |

**Discussion:**

Assign to Brian Hart

**CID 2426**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2426 | 1879.14 | 13.5.7 |  |  | In the equation deriving MTK (1879.7), localLinkID and peerLinkID are used as well as nonces and MAC addresses. In the following paragraph starting from 1879.14, how "min" and "max" operations are treated and which octet is treated as MSB are described for nonces and MAC addresses. However, it is not clear how localLinkID and peerLinkID shall be treated in deriving MTK. | Please clarify how localLinkID and peerLinkID shall be treated (min, max operation and which bit is MSB). |

**Discussion:**

Assign to Dan Harkins

**CID 2427**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2427 | 1895.08 | 13.10.8.6 |  |  | Sentence in 1895.7 reads: "In order to improve path stability (and further reduce overhead), a mesh STA may use the same originator HWMP SN for a certain time interval. In this case, the originator HWMP SN shall be incremented only after at least dot11MeshHWMPnetDiameterTraversalTime has elapsed since the previous increment."The normative behavior "the originator HWMP SN shall be incremented only after..." is conditional where the condition is given as "a mesh STA may use the same...".It should be more reasonable to say "In this case, the originator WMP SN is incremented only after...". | Replace"In this case, the originator HWMP SN shall be incremented only after ..." with"In this case, the originator HWMP SN is incremented only after ...". |

**Discussion:**

The cited text is below:



**The commenter proposes to change from**

In order to improve path stability (and further reduce overhead), a mesh STA may use the same originator

HWMP SN for a certain time interval. In this case, the originator HWMP SN is incremented only after

at least dot11MeshHWMPnetDiameterTraversalTime has elapsed since the previous increment.

The preceeding “may” defines the requirement. Must the time interval be defined as in the current shall?

Propose to retain the current language. The “shall” defined the required elapsed time if the “may” condition is present.

**Proposed Resolution: Revised**

The “shall” defined the required elapsed time if the “may” condition is present.Reword to clarify the constraint on the time interval. Change the cited text as indicated below:

“ In this case, the originator HWMP SN shall not be incremented until

at least dot11MeshHWMPnetDiameterTraversalTime has elapsed since the previous increment. “

**CID 2002, 2226, 2246, 2392**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2002 | 28.18 | 3.2 |  |  | "The contiguous period of time" - do we need this qualification | Either remove "contiguous" here, or add it to all references to periods of time that are not otherwise qualified. |
| 2226 | 28.18 | 3.2 |  |  | "contiguous" means either "sharing a border" or "near another entity". What border is shared or other entity near a "contiguous interval"? | Replace "contiguous" with "continuous". |
| 2246 | 55.55 | 4.3.5.2 |  |  | "contiguous" means either "sharing a border" or "near another entity". What border is shared or other entity near overlapping BSSs? | Replace "contiguous" with "continuous". |
| 2392 | 1944.08 | 13.14.9.1 |  |  | "contiguous" means either "sharing a border" or "near another entity". But what is a single time period contiguous with? | Replace "contiguous" with "continuous". |

**Discussion:**

The comment is similar to that in CIDs 2338, 2339, 2359, 2336 which have already been resolved.

Cited text is below:

At 28.18

****

At 55.55

****

At 1944.08

****

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Delete “contiguous” at 28.18, and 1944.08.

At 55.55, change to “This is commonly used to provide complete coverage within a

physical volume.”

**References:**