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Abstract

This document proposes comment resolutions for MAC CIDs:

1612, 1621, 1631, 1651, 1865, 1896, 2067 and 2183 (REVme D1.3).
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| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2183 | 4254.25 | 26.14.1 | "The PPDU is a PPDU with-- An A-MPDU including TA or RA equal to either the BSSID of the BSS in which the STA isassociated or any of the other BSSs in the same multiple BSSID set or co-hosted BSSID setto which its BSS belongs and-- The RA is not the individual MAC address of the STA or the group address(es) of the STA.-- The PPDU is either an HE MU PPDU with the RXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG set to 0 ora VHT MU PPDU containing an A-MPDU with-- The RA(s) in the A-MPDU are equal to the STA's individual address and-- The STA has received in the A-MPDU at least one MPDU delimiter with EOF equal to 1 andwith MPDU length field equal to 0." -- grammar all over the place, making this incomprehensible | Delete the cited text | Revised:Incorporate the changes indicated in 11-22/1269r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1269-03-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-MAC-CIDs> ), for CID 2183. | MAC |

**2183 Discussion**Agree in principle. The text is not clear and can be modified as follows:**Revised:**Change the cited text as follows:— The PPDU contains:— An A-MPDU including a TA or an RA equal to either the BSSID of the BSS to which the STA is associated, or any of the other BSSs in the same multiple BSSID set, or co-hosted BSSID set, to which its BSS belongs, and (#2183)— The RA is not the individual MAC address of the STA or the group address(es) of the STA.— The PPDU is either an HE MU PPDU, with the RXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG set to 0, ora VHT MU PPDU containing an A-MPDU and— The RA(s) in the A-MPDU is equal to the STA’s individual address and— The STA has received in the A-MPDU at least one MPDU delimiter with the value of EOF equal to 1 and with an MPDU length field equal to 0. (#2183)Note to editor. This is at P4260L29 in D1.3

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1865 | 4140.13 | 26.3.3.1 | It should be made clear that the A-MSDU Present bit must not change for a set of QoS Data frames with the same SN | At 4140.13 add "--- The A-MSDU Present subfield of all QoS Data frames containing fragments with the same sequence number and TID shall be the same." | Revised:Agree in principle. Incorporate the changes indicated in 11-21-1128r6.(<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1128-06-000m-on-frattacks-and-related-matters.docx>), for CID 2128.Note to editor: See the text change to “Change 26.3.3.1 General” at the top of page 3 of 11-21-1128r6, as a resolution to this CID. | MAC |
| 1631 | 1923.1 | 9.6.10 | "The Protected Dual of Public Action frames have the same format as the corresponding nonprotected PublicAction frame." -- this is presumably referring to the Action field of such frames, since the Action frame must have a MIC element at the end to protect it. Or maybe not? In any case, there must be something to protect it; maybe it's a CCMP/GCMP encapsulation? This is all very unclear | Change to "The Action fields of Protected Dual of Public Action frames have the same format as those of the corresponding nonprotected PublicAction frame.". At the end of 12.6.20's first para add "A individually addressed Protected Dual of Public Action frame shall be protected using the pairwise cipher suite. A group addressed Protected Dual of Public Action frame shall be protected using BIP." | RevisedAgree in Principle Change the cited text at P1924L38 (D1.3) to “The Action fields of Protected Dual of Public Action frames have the same format as those of the corresponding nonprotected PublicAction frames.”At P3195L4 (D1.3), add at the end of 12.6.20’s first paragraph:“An individually addressed Protected Dual of Public Action frame shall be protected using the pairwise cipher suite. A group addressed Protected Dual of Public Action frame shall be protected using BIP." | MAC |
| 1612 | 1812.21 | 9.4.5.10 | "The NAI Realm Count field specifies the number of NAI realms included in the NAI Realm ANQP-element." -- this is a rather awkward way of implementing things | Change to "The NAI Realm Count field specifies the number of NAI Realm Tuple subfields included in the NAI Realm ANQP-element." | AcceptedNote to editor. This is at P1814L21 in D1.3 | MAC |
| 1621 | 1968.23 | 9.6.15.3.2 | "The RSNE is present only when dot11MeshSecurityActivated," -- none of the other Action fields say "present only when", only "present when" | Delete "only" in the cited text | RejectedThe suggested changed phrase “present when” does not exclude it being present when the condition is false. Therefore, the proposed change alters the behaviour of this action field which is not required. | MAC |
| 1651 | 3321.33 | 14.2.7 | It is not specified that two STAs shall not establish a mesh peering if they use adifferent AKM suite or cipher suite | At the end of 14.2.7 add "h) Both mesh STAs do not advertise an RSNE, or both mesh STAs advertise the same RSNE." | RevisedA non-mesh STA can associate with an AP that has a different RSNE, the requirement is that there is a non-null intersection of ciphers and AKM.Change the cited text to:“h) Both mesh STAs have dot11MeshSecurityActivated equal to false or both mesh STAs have dot11MeshSecurityActivated equal to true and the neighbor mesh STA advertises an RSNE that is compatible with that of the scanning mesh STA”Note to editor. This is at P3330L34 in D1.3 | MAC |
| 2067 |  | 11.1.3.1 | Beacons have been Balkanised, with DMG Beacons and S1G Beacons going their own way. However, a lot of the rules for Beacons have not been fully extended to the separatists, e.g. "If the multiple BSSID capability is supported, Beacon frames shall be transmitted using any basic rate valid for all of the BSSs supported.", "An IBSS STA that sent a Beacon or DMG Beacon frame shall remain in the awake state", "All Beacon frames shall be submitted to this service for protection processing." | At the end of 11.1.3.1 add a para "Unless otherwise specified, the rules that apply to Beacon frames apply equivalently to DMG Beacon and S1G Beacon frames." | RejectedThere is no reason to include text about S1G Beacon frames in locations where S1G is not supported. It is more appropriate to address specific locations where different rules apply to Beacon and S1G Beacon frames. | MAC |
| 1896 | 2362.48 | 10.37.1 | "A CTS frame cannot be used for CMMG NDP announcement"" -- this seems obvious to me, since a CTS frame cannot have an HT Control field. Unless this is thinking of the case where the CTS frame is ina Control Wrapper frame? If so, that should be spelt out | Change to "A CTS frame cannot be used for CMMG NDP announcement even if it is in a Control Wrapper frame" | Accepted.Note to editor. This is at P2368L1 in D1.3 | MAC |
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