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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution for comments related to the Unsolicited RSS Enabled field in the DMG Beacon frame.

- CID: 1949, 1645

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Proposed Resolution** |
| 1949 | 39 | 2 | In the draft text the Figure 9-61 does not cover A-BFT<>0 and the Figure 12 makes no sense to DMG devices due to "Unsolicited RSS Enabled field" that is not backward compatible | Keep the Figure 9-61 as is and provide additional figure that is EDMG specific that may define B14 and Next A-BFT only | RevisedKeep figures as-is.Add text to clarify that non-EDMG STA ignores the Unsolicited RSS Enabled subfield. Also that EDMG STA ignores this subfield when received from a non-EDMG STA.Additionally, add text to clarify that the IsResponderTXSS subfield is present only when Next A-BFT is zero. Note 1 - the unsolicited RSS as defined in 10.39.6.2 is only performed between two EDMG STAs. A non-EDMG STA does not use this subfield.Note 2 – a DMG STA needs to rely on the IsResponderTXSS subfield of the BI to determine the type of the A-BFT within that BI. Note 3 – a non-EMDG/EDMG STA can be determined by the EDMG Supported subfield in the DMG Parameters field. TGay editor to make the changes shown in 11-18/0636r3 under all headings that include CID 1949. |
| 1465 | 39 | 6 | It is confusing to have two different figures that are 99% identical except for the definition of one bit. Can we reduce these to one figure? | Consolidate the two pictures for Figure 9-61 and clarify the difference in the meaning of B14 when Next A-BFT is zero | RejectExisting text “The difference between the two formats is in the definition of the field occupying B14” makes the situation clear. See resolution of CID 1949 also for additional clarification texts.  |

**Proposed changes to D1.1:**

9.3.4.2 DMG Beacon

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Insert the below editor’s instruction and paragraphs before “Insert the following paragraph after the definition of the IsResponderTXSS subfield” (CID #1949)***

*Change the indicated paragraph and insert a new paragraph as follows*

The IsResponderTXSS subfield is present when the Next A-BFT subfield is zero, and is set to 1 to indicate the A-BFT following the BTI is used for responder transmit sector sweep (TXSS). This field is set to 0 to indicate responder receive sector sweep (RXSS). When this subfield is set to 0, the FSS subfield specifies the length of a complete receive sector sweep by the STA sending the DMG Beacon frame.

***Change the below paragraph as follows (CID #1949)***

The Unsolicited RSS Enabled subfield is present when the Next A-BFT subfield is nonzero and is set to 1 to indicate that the STA is capable of receiving an unsolicited RSS in response to its BTI. This subfield is set to 0 otherwise. This subfield is ignored when received by a non-EDMG STA and when received from a non-EDMG STA.

**SP**: Do you agree to accept the comment resolution as proposed in IEEE 802.11-18/0636r3?