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Abstract

This document proposes resolutions to 6 CIDs on TGaj D1.0: 8, 52, 149, 76, 146 and 148.

**Revision History**

R0: Initial version.

R1: Updated based on the discussions occurred in 11aj session.

**Technical Comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Type | Comment | Proposed Change | | Remark |
| 8 | 6.3.7.2.2 | 7 | 28 | T | The Associate request is providing information to an entity that already has that information. This seems redundant and should be removed. I.e. the CDMG capabilities included here says it is coming from a probe response or beacon, but this primitive is being used to generate an associate request which will be sent to the entity which sent the probe response or beacon. I.e. see the text "The values from the CDMG Capabilities element if such an element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null." | Not certain how to fix this because I am not certain what the intent was. I think that perhaps it is possible that the cited text was simply copied from the scan.confirm in the previous subclause, where this wording was appropriate. I believe that the wording here should probably be something more along the lines of "the CDMG capabilities that are supported by the MAC entity" - this error has been repeated in associate.confirm, associate.indication, associate.response, reassociate.request, reassociate.confirm, reassociate.indication, reassociate.response - the start.request has the same wording, but it might actually be accidentally appropriate here, although i would actually suggest it be changed even for this one, although not to the suggested change herein but something appropriate for this SAP. | |  |
| 52 | 6.3.7.2.2 | 7 | 28 | T | The info contained in the Associate request is already available in the same entity receiving this info. E.g. the CDMG capabilities included here says it comes from a probe response or beacon, but this primitive is being used to generate an associate request which will be sent to the entity which sent the probe response or beacon. I.e. see the text "The values from the CDMG Capabilities element if such an element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null." | | Needs to re-word to avoid such redundancy. |  |
| 149 | 6.3.7.4 | 8 | 44 - 46 | T | "The values from the CDMG Capabilities element if such an element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null."  Cl, 6.3.7.4.3 describes when an MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication is generated. It is generated when the STA receives an association request from the peer. There are no preconditions requiring receipt of a DMG Beacon or Probe Response. | |  |  |

Proposed resolution: **Revised.**

This is a copy and paste error. The description for CDMG Capabilities in the table at P7L18 is copied from the description in the previous subclause for SCAN.confirm primitive. But it is not applicable for the CDMG Capabilities in Associate.request primitive. The CDMG Capabilities in an Associate.request primitive is an association requesting STA’s own CDMG Capabilities, which is used to inform the peer AP or PCP the STA’s capabilities. Also we can see that the DMG Capabilites and VHT Capabilities exist in the following primitives in REVmc 4.2: associate.confirm, associate.indication, associate.response, reassociate.request, reassociate.confirm, reassociate.indication, reassociate.response, and start.request primitives. So the CDMG Capabilities is added in those primitives in 11aj accordingly.

Change the description for the CDMG Capabilities in the table at P7L18 with referring to the corresponding description for the DMG Capabilities in the same primitive as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Type | Valid range | Description |
| CDMG  Capabilities | … | As defined in 8.4.2.172 (CDMG Capabilities element) | ~~The values from the CDMG Capabilities element if such an element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null.~~ Specifies the parameters within the DMG Capabilities element that are supported by the MAC entity. The parameter is optionally present only if dot11CDMGOptionImplemented is true; otherwise not present. |
| QMG Capabilities | … | As defined in 8.4.2.182 (QMG Capabilities element). | Specifies the parameters within the QMG Capabilities element that are supported by the MAC entity. The parameter is present if dot11QMGOptionImplemented is true; otherwise not present. ~~and is absent otherwise.~~ |

Do the same in the tables at P8L1~15, P8L41~57, P9L15~31, P10L1~15, P10L32~47, P11L7~22, P11L50~65 and P12L32~52.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Type | Comment | Suggested Remedy | Remark |
| 148 | 6.3.3.3 | 6 | 37 - 40 | T | "The parameter is optionally present only if dot11CDMGOptionImplemented is true." What does this mean?  This parameter is optional to include in the Confirm only when dot11CDMGOptionImplemented is true? In this case "only" is not needed  Or this parameter is included in the Confirm when dot11CDMGOptionImplemented is true? In this case both "only" and "optionally" are not needed  Also where is the referred MIB variable set to true -- at the device sending the DMG Beacon/Probe Response or at the device receiving the DMG Beacon/Probe Response. | Remove "only" and "optionally" as appropriate. Note that this issue applies to all insertions to Clause 6. Better yet, delete this statement. If the received DMG Beacon or Probe Response included the CDMG Capabilities element, this information is included in the Confirm. The setting of the MIB variable at the sender/receiver has nothing to do with the inclusion/exclusion of this parameter in the Confirm. |  |

Proposed resolution: **Revised.**

Remove “only” from this sentence to avoid confusion. Here the sentence may not intend to set an MIB value, just is a general description when this element presents. It exists in the description for many elements such as DMG/VHT/HT Capabilities in the corresponding table in REVmc4.2. So here suggest not to remove the whole sentence.

Change the table at P6L37-40 as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Type** | **Valid range** | **Description** | **IBSS adoption** |
| CDMG  Capabilities | As defined in frame format | As defined in 8.4.2.172 (CDMG Capabilities element) | The values from the CDMG Capabilities element if such an element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null.  The parameter is optionally present ~~only~~ if dot11CDMGOptionImplemented is true; otherwise not present. | Do not adopt |
| QMG Capabilities | As defined in frame format | As defined in 8.4.2.182 (QMG Capabilities element). | The values from the QMG Capabilities element if such an  element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null.  The parameter is optionally present ~~only~~ if dot11QMGOptionImplemented is true; otherwise not present.. | Do not adopt |
| QMG Operation | As defined in frame format | As defined in 8.4.2.183 (QMG Operation element). | The values from the QMG Operation element if such an element was present in the Probe Response or DMG Beacon frame, else null.  The parameter is optionally present ~~only~~ if dot11QMGOptionImplemented is true; otherwise not present.. | Do not adopt |

Do the similar changes in clause 6 in 11aj draft.

**General Comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Type | Comment | Proposed Change | Remark |
| 76 |  | 56 | 5 | G | "E-BT-R OK" this is a poor name. "OK" is colloquial English, and its meaning is unclear. | Rename this to "E-BT-R Enabled" throughout the draft.  Make similar renaming of all "\* OK" field names. |  |

Proposed resolution: **Accept.**

Do as proposed change in table 8-581p and make similar changes throughout the draft.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | B0 | B1 | B2 | B3 | B4 | B5 | B6 | B7 |
|  | Backup  AWV Setting | | Peer E-BT-R  Request | E-BT-R  Enabled~~OK~~ | Peer E-BT-T  Request | E-BT-T  Enabled~~OK~~ | Switching to  Backup  AWV Request | Switching to  Backup  AWV Enabled~~OK~~ |
| Bits: | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| * E-BT Control field format | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Type | Comment | Suggested Remedy | Remark |
| 146 | 4.3.24 | 5 | 4 through 6 | T | "The basic channel access of a QMG STA (see 9.36 (DMG and QMG channel access)) allows it to operate in an Infrastructure BSS, in an IBSS, and in a PBSS. ". A STA can only operate in one of BSS, IBSS or PBSS at any time. | Replace with "The basic channel access of a QMG STA (see 9.36 (DMG and QMG channel access)) allows it to operate in an Infrastructure BSS, in an IBSS, or in a PBSS. " |  |

Proposed resolution: **Accept**

Change the sentence at P5L4-6 as follows:

“…The basic channel access of a QMG STA (see 9.36 (DMG and QMG channel access)) allows it to operate in an Infrastructure BSS or in an IBSS or ~~and~~ in a PBSS.”