IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| Resolution for miscellaneous comments in SB1 |
| Date: 2016-04-27 |
| Author: |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | Email |
| Edward Au | Huawei Technologies | 303 Terry Fox Drive, Suite 400, Ottawa, Ontario K2K 3J1 |  | edward.ks.au@huawei.com  |

##### This submission presents proposed resolution to CIDs 7633, 7134, and 7135. Changes indicated by instructions.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

R1 – updated as per the discussion in the April BRC meeting.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 7633 |  |  |  | There are half a dozen instances of "with a valid FCS". These should be removed, as it is implicit that if a frame has an invalid FCS you haven't received anything (otherwise you'd have to pepper every second line of the spec with "with a valid FCS"!) | Delete all 5 instances of "with a valid FCS" |

***Discussion:***

At line 824.51 in D5.3, there are two instances of “with a valid FCS”:



At line 3188.53 in D5.3, there are another two instances of “with a valid FCS” with the same contents:



******

At line 1593.38 in D5.3, there is another instance of “with a valid FCS”:

******

This instance of “with a valid FCS” is redundant. Proposed solution here is to replace “with a valid FCS and BSSID or SSID” with “with a valid BSSID or SSID” because it is mentioned in 11.1.3.7 that the STAs in an infrastructure network or PBSS shall use information that is not in the CF Parameter Set element in received Beacon frames, DMG Beacon frames, or Announce frames *only if the BSSID field is equal to the MAC address currently in use by the STA contained in the AP of the BSS* or to the MAC address currently in use by the PCP of the PBSS(11ad).

***Resolution:***

**Revised**

At lines 824.51 and 3188.53 in D5.3, delete “with a valid FCS” (total four instances).

At line 1593.38 in D5.3, replace “with a valid FCS and BSSID or SSID” with “with a valid BSSID or SSID”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 7134 | 21.2.5.2 | 2504 | 27 | The approved comment resolution that inserted the new first para in this subclause called for it to be inserted later in the subclause. | Determine if the new first para needs to be moved to a better location in this subclause. |

***Discussion:***

At line 2504.27 in D5.0:



It has been resolved by CID 7404.

***Resolution:***

Revised.

Incorporate the changes for CID 7404 in doc 11-16/291r1, changing "21-7" to "21-2". This makes the effective change, but by making changes in 19.2.5 and 21.2.5.2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 7135 | 21.2.5.2 | 2504 | 31 | I believe the inequality is the wrong way round. | change "less than" to "greater than" in the inequality on this line.Make matching change at 2506.13And change the text at 2330.43 to match. |

***Discussion:***

The comments at lines 2330.43 and 2504.31 has been resolved by CID 7404.

The comment at line 2506.13 has been resolved by CID 7405.

***Resolution:***

Revised.

For line 2506.13: change “less than” to “greater than” in the inequality on this line.

For lines 2330.43 and 2504.31: incorporate the changes for CID 7404 in doc 11-16/291r1, changing "21-7" to "21-2". This makes the effective change, but by making changes in 19.2.5 and 21.2.5.2.