IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Misc unassigned comments part 2  (relative to IEEE 802.11 REVmd D2.4 and 802.11az D1.5) | | | | |
| Date: 2019-11-10 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Dibakar Das | Intel |  |  | dibakar.das@intel.com |
| Ganesh Venkatesan | Intel | 2111 NE 25th Ave, Hillsboro, OR 97124 | 503 334 6720 | Ganesh.venkatesan@intel.com |
| Jonathan Segev | Intel |  |  | [jonathan.segev@intel.com](mailto:jonathan.segev@intel.com) |
| Feng Jiang | Intel |  |  | Feng1.jiang@intel.com |

Abstract

This submission resolves the following CIDs: 1109 2429 2397 2399 2408 1466 1651

History:

R0: Initial Version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1109 | 154.06 | 27.5.3.5 | Keep 11az spec text separate from 11ax, 11ay as much as possible. This approach will easily create backward compatibility and maintenance issues. | As in comment. Applicable to clauses 28 and 29 as well. | **Reject.**  The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined. If needed this issue can be fixed as part of the MDR process. |
| 2429 | 37 | 9.4.2.127.1 | Should all the DMG STAs be able to decode or parse DMG Direction Measurement Capabilities subfield? I don't think so. Only those capable of 11ay extension. Then, some kind of rule, say checking the peer STA if it has the capability, should be added. | As in comment. | **Reject.**  The element DMG Capabilities that contain this field is an Extensible element. As such, it is expected that legacy STAs can parse only the relevant fields. |
| 1651 | 49 | 9.4.2.279 | With non-TB Ranging, if the ISTA sends a request for Ranging Priority in IFTMR and the corresponfing IFTM has nothing in response, what does it mean? Is the RSTA required to use the proposed Ranging Priority, do anything or ignore it? | If there is no response from the RSTA corresponding to the proposed Ranging Priority in the IFTMR, there is no point in sending the Ranging Priority in IFTMR in the first place. Either render the Ranging Priority as exclusive to TB Ranging; or add Ranging Priority response to IFTM (instead of it being reserved) for non-TB ranging. | **Reject:** commenter withdrew the comment. |
| 1466 | 56.04 | 9.4.2.279 | The fields "Full Bandwidth  UL MU-MIMO", "Device Class" are not used for NTB Ranging | Move them to TB Ranging | **Reject:** commenter withdraw the comment. |
| 2397 | 13.01 | 6.3.56.1 | Figure 16-7c looks odd by the sense that there is no primitive at STA B side to start the exchange. Add a primitive to STA B or add a mechanism for STA A to request STA B sending Location Poll Trigger. (Should Location Poll be Ranging?) | As in comment. | **Revised.**  The purpose of the MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT.request for TB Ranging is for the SME to inform the MLME at the ISTA that it should be ready to receive a TF Ranging Poll from the RSTA (see P33L7 in draft 1.5). As such no primitive is shown at the RSTA side. Agreed on principle that “Location Poll” should be renamed as “Ranging Poll”. However, this has already been fixed in draft 1.5. TGaz editor: no further revision needed. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2399 | 13.01 | 6.3.56.1 | APs can only transmit Trigger frames in 11ax. Therefore, STA B (RSTA) in Figure 16-7c should be an HE AP. It should be clarified somewhere. | As in comment. | **Reject.**  The 11az spec inherits Trigger frame transmission capabilities from 11ax. As such there should be no ambiguity that for TB Ranging, RSTAs can only be those HE STAs that are allowed to transmit TF. |
| 2408 | 16.01 | 6.3.56.2.2 | "Applies to nTB or TB Ranging?" column is left blank for VendorSpecific but it needs to be filled out somehow. Add something like depending on intended use. | As in comment. | **Revised.**  We add text for the corresponding entry to clarify that this entry can also be used for TB or NTB Ranging. TGaz editor: please revise the spec text as per 11-19-1991r0. |

***TGaz Editor: Modify the last entry in the table in P32 starting at P32L1 as:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (#1565)LCI Report | As defined in 9.6.7.33 (Fine Timing Measurement frame format) | As defined in 9.6.7.33 (Fine Timing Measurement frame format) | Optional element to report LCI information of sender | Yes (#2408, 2441) |
| Location Civic Report | As defined in 9.6.7.33 (Fine Timing Measurement frame format) | As defined in 9.6.7.33 (Fine Timing Measurement frame format) | Optional element to report location civic information of sender | Yes (#2408) |
| Fine Timing Measurement Parameters | As defined in 9.4.2.167 (Fine  Timing Measurement Parameters element) | As defined in 9.4.2.167 (Fine  Timing Measurement Parameters element) | Optional element containing the proposed FTM configuration (#2409) | No |
| Ranging Parameters | As defined in 9.4.2.246 (Ranging Parameters) | As defined in 9.4.2.246 (Ranging Parameters) | Optional element containing the configuration for the proposed NGP session | Yes |
| Vendor Specific info | A set of elements | As defined by 9.4.2.26 (Vendor Specific element) | Zero or more elements | Yes (#2408). |