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Abstract

Editor instruction based on D3.1

CIDs resolved: 5138, 5093, 5356, 5095

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5138 | 138.00 | 16 | 11.21.6.4.2.1.2 | "The ISTA may use implementation dependent AWV (such as sectors) in the TRN field." - this is a bit confusing because for the purpose of the R2I AOD, the initiator is receiving | replace with "The ISTA may use implementation dependent AWV (such as sectors) in the reception of the TRN field." | **Revised**:Issue was fixed by changes proposed to resolve 5139 – no changes required |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5093 | 23.00 | 4.5.4.2 | 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. | **Accept** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5356 | 23.00 | 4.3.19.19 | Acronyms must be spelled out on first use (after clause 3). But, further, I don't think we really want to restrict the use of the concepts of initiating STA and responding STA to be just for enhanced positioning. Suggest we create general use terms/acronyms for these (not specific to this amendment). | Replace "RSTA" with "responding STA (RSTA)" and "ISTAs" with "initiating STAs (ISTAs)" at the cited location. In clause 3, add new definitions: "initiating station (STA): A STA that solicits an interaction with a peer STA" and "responding station (STA): a STA that responds in an interaction that is solicited by a peer STA". Check all uses of ISTA and RSTA to make sure they don't assume the context can only be timing/location/enhanced timing - that is, make sure the context is clear from the surrounding text - or add a phrase like "performing FTM" or "performing ranging" or similar, if needed. (I didn't find any that needed such fix, on a quick scan, though.) | **Revised** TGaz Editor: perform the instructions in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1038-01-00az-lb253-resolution-to-cid-set3.docx |

***TGaz Editor: Modify the text in P23L3 as follows:***

of the measurement exchange between a responding STA (RSTA) and multiple initiating STAs (ISTAs) at the same time.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~5101~~ | ~~40.00~~ | ~~8.3.5.20.1~~ | ~~"This primitive is a request by the MAC sublayer to the local PHY entity to provide the Secure TRN 17 bit sequences for the receipt of the EDMG secure ranging PPDU." - Language is opaque. To what entity does the PHY entity proivde the bit sequene?~~ | ~~replace offending text with "This primitve is a request by the MAC sublayer to the local PHY entity to generate the secure TRN bit seqeunces for the receipt of the EDMG secure ranging PPDU based on the information provided in the TRNVECTOR."~~ | **~~Accept~~** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5095 | 36.00 | 6.3.56.5.2 | 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..). | **Reject**in the baseline, tables following **Semantics of the service primitive”**are not numbered.The service primitives are not protocol definitions, so range of values is not relevant to implementation complexity and should represent the real range of values used |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~5376~~ | ~~44.00~~ | ~~9.3.1.19~~ | ~~Mention R2I/I2R Rep = 0 indicates no repetition~~ | ~~as in comment~~ | ~~Revise:~~~~The use of the value is clarified in 27.3.18a to which the text is pointing. However, this text, and other similar texts, use the name N\_REP while the name of the TXVECTOR field has been changed to LTF\_REP. This needs to be changed.~~~~TGaz Editor: perform the instructions in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1038-00-00az-lb253-resolution-to-cid-set3.docx~~ |

***~~TGaz Editor: in P44L4, P49L8, P49L19, P50L8 and P75L26, replace ”N\_REP” with “LTF\_REP”~~***
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