IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| 802.11[Resolutions to comment collection #28 CIDs(relative to IEEE 802.11 REVmd D1.0 and P802.11az D0.6) |
| Date: 2019-01-15 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Company | Address | Phone | Email |
| Ganesh Venkatesan | Intel Corporation | 2111 NE 25th Ave, Hillsboro, OR 97124 | 503 334 6720 | ganesh.venkatesan@intel.com |

**Abstract**

This submission proposes resolutions to MLME related CIDs from Comment Collection #28 (8, , 16, , 24).

History:

R0: Initial Version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.3.1.20 | 21 | Add "for non-Secure operation" at the end of sentence "The NSTS is determined by the ISTA and RSTA in the negotiation phase." AND add "The NSTS is determined by the ISTA and RSTA in the negotiation phase and LMR feedback for secure operation." | As per comment | REVISE: description of fields/subfields in Clause 9., should only include what the fields/subfields indicate. How these values corresponding to these fields/subfields are determined belong in Cl. 11. |
| 7 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.3.1.20 | 21 | Add "for non-Secure operation" at the end of sentence "The NSTS is determined by the ISTA and RSTA in the negotiation phase." AND add "The NSTS is determined by the ISTA and RSTA in the negotiation phase and LMR feedback for secure operation." | As per comment | REVISE: |
| 8 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.3.1.20 | 21 | Can we eliminate "Feedback Type" for NDPA? | As per comment | Accept |

**Discussion:**

Clause 9 describes what the fields/subfields indicate. How these fields/subfields are populated and what values they should be set to is described in Clause 11. Submission 18-1818r2 removed the Feedback Type subfield from the STA Info field. Apply changes described in submission 19-37r2 after changes described in 19-154 are applied.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.4.2.27 | 26 | As part of Extended Capability field, do we need to add bits to support HEz, VHTz, DMG, eDMG (see section 11.22.6.2). Also, do we need a bit to indicate "secure ranging is required' as announced by AP | As per comment | REVISE; incorporate editor instructions in submission 19-0005.  |

**Discussion**:

submission 19-005.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.4.2.246 | 33 | Not clear what the behavior is for the field 'Value"? | As per comment | REJECT. The value field is defined/described in Table-279 Status Indication field values in the baseline (REVmd D1.0) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.4.2.246 | 33 | Change 'Antenna" subfield with new agreed upon subfields, i.e., "# of Beamformee STS" and "Beamformer STS" | As per comment | Accept. Incorporate editor instructions in submission 19-0154. |
| 24 | Alireza Raissinia | 9.4.2.246 | 35 | Should we change "Ranging ID" to "RID/AID"? | As per comment | ACCEPT: Change Ranging ID in Figure 9-610d and the description of the Ranging ID field to RID/AID. |

***TGaz editor: Modify Figure 9-610d as shown below:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Subelement ID (1) | Length | Availability Window | RID/AID | Response | Trigger Frame MAC Padding Duration | Passive Location Ranging | Reserved | Max ToAAvailableExp | BSS Color |
| Bits | 8 | 8 | Tbd | 16 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 |

***TGaz Editor: Change the paragraph that describes the Ranging ID field in Cl. 9.4.2.246 as shown below:***

The Ranging ID is the same as the AID if the initiator is associated with the responder; and issimilar to AID and is assigned by the responder to identify the unassociated initiator. The Ranging ID and the AID are derived the same space and are non-conflicting. The RID/AID field is set to the value of the Ranging ID or the AID of the ISTA.