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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution to 303r0: point 2

And submission 302r0 point 8

1. Page 38, line 28 ("The TBTT Information Length subfield.."): In P802.11af, " A value of 0 indicates one TBTT Information field is present.", but in P802.11ai, " The TBTT Information Count subfield value is nonzero." Is the difference intentional? Neither seems to be right (a value of 0 would seem to indicate would there are none of these fields rather than one, but the 11ai version indicates that such fields would never exist).

**A proposed resolution is required.**

**Proposed resolution:**

From Page 38, line 28, replace

“The TBTT Information Count subfield contains the number of TBTT Information fields that are included in the Neighbor AP Information field. The TBTT Information Count subfield value is nonzero.”

by the exisiting baseline 11af text with the following changes

“The TBTT Information Count subfield ~~is 4 bits in length and~~ contains the number of TBTT Information fields that are included in the Neighbor AP Information field, minus one. A value of 0 indicates one TBTT Information field is present.”

Also the following comment resolution needs to be modified – following is the accepted resolution

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012 | Adrian Stephens | 39.52 | " is 4 bits in length and contains". Figures are normative, so is this text. It is bad to repeat the same normative specification in two places, because Le Chatallier's theory of natural cussedness indicates that eventually they will say different things. | Review the descriptions of all fields and remove any redundant definitions of field size. | Revised. In draft 1.2, carry the following changes: - 40.48: Change "...subfield is 2 bits in length and defines.." to " … subfield defines .." - 40.55: Change "...subfield is 4 bits in length and contains..." to "...subfield contains .." - 40.60: Change "...subfield is 1 octet in length and contains .." to " ... subfield contains .. " - 41.1: Change "...Class is 1 octet in length and indicates.." to "...Class indicates ... " - 41.5: Change "...Number is 1 octet in length and indicates ..." to " Number indicates ..." |

**Proposed resolution:**

Revised. In draft 1.3, carry the following changes:  
- 38.19: Change "...subfield is 2 bits in length and defines.." to " … subfield ~~is 2 bits in length and~~ defines.."  
- 38.26: Change "...subfield is 4 bits in length and contains..." to "...subfield ~~is 4 bits in length and~~ contains .."  
- 38.30: Change "...subfield is 1 octet in length and contains .." to " ... subfield ~~is 1 octet in length and~~ contains .. "  
- 38.37: Change "...Class is 1 octet in length and indicates.." to "...Class ~~is 1 octet in length and~~ indicates ... "  
- 38.40: Change "...Number is 1 octet in length and indicates ..." to " Number ~~is 1 octet in length and~~ indicates ..."

- 38.58: Chagne “The TBTT Offset in TUs subfield is 1-octet in length and TBTT Offset subfield is one octet in length ~~and.~~When included in a Probe Response frame or FILS Discovery frame, it indicates the offset in TUs, …” to “~~The TBTT Offset in TUs subfield is 1-octet in length and~~ When the TBTT Offset in TUs subfield is included in a Probe Response frame or FILS Discovery frame, it indicates the offset in TUs,…”

302r0

1. Clause 8.4.2.171: In P802.11af, Figure 8-401cl—Neighbor AP Information field format, the right-most column octet sizes are "0 or n" but we have "variable". In Figure 8-401cm—TBTT Information Header subfield the columns in our table do not match those in P802.11af. In Figure 8-401cn—TBTT Information field the first column is missing "in TUs" that appears in 11af. Were these intentional changes? If so they need to be underlined. Also, the umarked (which should indicate unchanged) text in this clause does not match that of P802.11af. There is also a whole paragraph in P802.11af that is missing in our draft. It is assumed that none of these diferences from 11af were intentional.

**Propose to modify the figures and text in clause 8.4.2.171 to match 11af execpt where already explicitly identified as a change.**

**Proposed resolution:**

Clause 8.4.2.171: In P802.11af, Figure 8-401cl—Neighbor AP Information field format, the right-most column octet sizes are "0 or n" but we have "variable". – change the figure to be same as 11af, including the figure number

In Figure 8-401cm—TBTT Information Header subfield the columns in our table do not match those in P802.11af. – change the figure to be same as 11af, including the figure number. Also include the whole paragraph refereed in the comment (starting as “The Filtered Neighbor AP subfield … ” ) in the 11ai text

In Figure 8-401cn—TBTT Information field the first column is missing "in TUs" that appears in 11af. – Add the “in TUs” as in comment and also change the figure number to be the same as in 11af draft