IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| Some LB 253 CRs |
| Date: June 24 2021 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Nehru Bhandaru | Broadcom | 250 Innovation Drive, San Jose CA | +1 408 391 2159 | nehru.bhandaru@broadcom.com |

Abstract

This document contains discussion and proposed resolutions for the following LB 253 comments on TGaz Draft 3.0:

5093, 5095, 5181, 5187, 5228, 5439

Changes specified in this submission are relative to 802.11me Draft 0.0 March 2021.

Revision Notes

R0 – initial version
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CIDClause/Page.Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 50934.5.4.223.21 | References should be given towards IEEE 802.11-2020, not IEEE 802.11 REVmd3.0 | Remove the "(802.11 REVmd 3.0)", in all instances. This is an amendment and there is no need to refer the main spec. | Resolution: RejectThe reference to (802.11 REVmd 3.0) in 11az draft are not changes proposed in the az draft but are in the base 802.11 draft being used and will automatically be removed… |
| 50956.3.56.5.236.9 | The unnumbered table in 6.3.56.5.2, must be numbered. In addition, it is very strange to have 5 rows that are all integers but the valid range is different among them. In addition, it looks like you are using 48 bits Integers which is a quite weird number of bits for an integer. I think this definition will pose implementation problems. | Make the table numbered. Use Integer lengths multiple of 8 (the normal ones, uint8, unit16, uint32..). | Resolution: RejectUnnumbered tables are used in this and related MLME sections; there is only one table in the section. It does not seem necessary to change.Also note that 48 is a multiple of 8; and 48 bits is sufficient resolution for the timestamps used for fine timing measurement; an implementation may choose to use a type like uint64 but that is not necessary to be specified in 802.11 standard. |
| 51819.4.2.29981.1 | "The Secure LTF Counter (#2289) field (#1129) is present in the ..." the verb present is usually used for optional elements, here it is a question of the value being meaningful or reserved | Change to "The Secure LTF Counter (#2289) field (#1129) is used in the initial protected Fine Timing Measurement frame and the R2I (#1664) protected Location Measurement Report frame; it is reserved otherwise." Change also two similar statements in the next two paragraphs | Resolution: AcceptAgree. The effect of this change is to change the word ‘present’ to ‘used’ in the identified paragraphs as the field is always present but may not be used.  |
| 518710.23.2.8106.24 | "- a Ranging NDP Announcement frame followed after SIFS by an HE NDP followed after SIFS by an HE NDP followed after SIFS by an LMR frame. (#1953, #4008)" - it should be HE Ranging NDP | Change to "- a Ranging NDP Announcement frame followed after SIFS by an HE Ranging NDP followed after SIFS by an HE Ranging NDP followed after SIFS by an LMR frame. (#1953, #4008)" | Resolution: AcceptAgree. The frame sequence refers to HE Ranging NDP and not HE NDP – HE Sounding NDP is defined in in 11ax (d8.0 27.3.17) |
| 52289.4.2.24168.22 | The FTM Ranging sessions should be protected equally in both Associated and Unassociated cases. As such, a STA should set the "Protection of Range Negotiation and Mgt frames required" bit to 1 whenever that STA sets MFPR =1. Also, define an abbreviation for this field name. | As in comment | Resolution: ReviseIt’s not clear protection should be same for associated and unassociated cases w/ MFPR=1. See discussion. However, we can abbreviate the long phrase ‘Protection of…Required’The abbreviation URNM-MFPR is already in TGaz draft 3.1TGaz Editor: No further action needed. |
| 54399.4.2.2659 | "Otherwise the STA sets the ISTA2RSTA LMR Feedback Policy field to 0. " An inconsistent name is used for this field of the Extended Capabilities element. | Modify the text to "Otherwise the STA sets the I2R LMR Feedback Policy field to 0. " | Resolution: Accept |

CID 5228 Discussion

It is not clear that unassociated ranging protection should be the same as associated protection when MFPR=1 – MFPR setting applies to associated case – for BSS members - and we might need the flexibility to allow some deployments/devices to not require ranging protection for BSS non-members.