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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs:

30, 48, 90, 120, 143, 159, 162, 163, 258, 276, 290, 291

R0: initial this draft.

R1: minor editorial change

R2: add proposed change on CID 290 and CID291, and other minor change according to the feedback during the call in 26th. Sep.

R3: update the resolution on two deferred CIDs: CID 159 and CID 276

R4: Remove the resolution of CID 276 and transfer it to Mark.

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGbh D1.0 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbh D1.0 Draft. (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGbh Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGbh Editor” are instructions to the TGbh editor to modify existing material in the TGbh draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGbh editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGbh Draft.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 30 | 28/4 | What is a "determined MAC address" as opposed to other types? Is this defined anywhere? | Please define what a "determined MAC address" is if it isn't defined elsewhere in the standard, | Revised--  Delete the word "determined".  TGbh editor: please make the proposed change label with CID30 in 1369r1 |
| 120 | 28/4 | The term "determined MAC address" is not defined anywhere and requires a definition. | Delete "determined MAC address". | Revised--  Delete the word "determined".  TGbh editor: please make the proposed change label with CID30 in 1369r1 |
| 163 | 28/3 | What is "a determined MAC address"? | Change to "an identifiable random MAC address (IRM)" | Revised--  Delete the word "determined".  TGbh editor: please make the proposed change label with CID30 in 1369r1 |
| 258 | 28/3 | The term "determined MAC address" is not defined or explained anywhere. Should this be "allocated MAC address"? | Delete ""determined" | Accepted-- |
| 48 | 27/52 | A field that is reserved is set to 0, which is the same value as "Recognized". This might limit future options for the field --- a non-AP STA when never be able to assign the meaning "recognized". | It might be preferable to define value 0 as reserved and bump the other values by one. | Rejected--  There is no strong reason to support that the value of 0 shall be a reserved value. In other instance in baseline, like Table 9-78 Status codes,the value of 0 means Successful, while other value ,like the value of 4, can be reserved. |
| 90 | 27/4 | An item in RSNXE should be an item of capability instead of an item indicating active/inactive | Change to an item of capability | Rejected--  Not all the flags indicate the capability in RSNE/RSNXE,e.g,in other instance in RSNE in baseline, PMFC indicates the capability of PMF, while PMFR indicates mandatory to enable it.  Active means such feature is enabled based on the precondition that the HW/SW is capable to support it. |
| 143 | 25/56 | According to clause 12 and 6, Device ID IE is included in Reassociation Request/Response, but it is omitted in Table 9-64 and Table 9-65. (e.g. P30L43: 2) When using FILS authentication in the Device ID element in the (Re)Association Request frame)  Please clarify and make consistent whether the Device ID element is included in Reassociation req/resp or not. | Propose to add row for Device ID to each of Table 9-64 and 9-65. | Revised--  Agree in principle.  TGbh editor: please make the proposed change label with CID143 in 1369r1 |
| 159 |  | Doesn't the presence of the Device ID element need to depend on dot11DeviceIDActivated and dot11FILSsomethingorother being true, and the presence of the IRM element need to depend on dot11IRMActivated and dot11FILSsomethingorother being true? | As it says in the comment | Revised--  Agree in principle.  TGbh editor: please make the proposed change label with CID159 in 1369r3 |
| 162 | 27/40 | What if sent by non-AP STA to non-AP STA? | Change to say "When sent by a non-AP STA, the Device ID Status field is reserved. When sent by an AP, the Device ID Status field contains one of the values shown in Table 9-322aq (Device ID Status field values)." Make similar changes in 9.4.2.307b (for both non-boilerplate fields) | Transfer to Okan. |
| ~~276~~ | ~~27/61~~ | ~~dot11DeviceID is not referenced in body text~~ | ~~Either add that the Device ID field contains the ID from dot11DeviceID here and add behavioral text (probably in clause 12) that sets the attribute when a Device ID is received at a non-AP STA, or remove the MIB attribute from Annex C.~~ |  |
| 290 | 27/27 | The design of the Device ID element format seems to be unreasonable. | Suggest to replace the "Device ID Status field" with a "Device ID Control field", and specified a "Device ID Status subfield" of the "Device ID Control field", the length of 3 bits is enough. | Rejected--  The is no gain to change the length of Device ID Status field from 8 bits to 3 bits. |
| 291 | 28/7 | The design of the IRM element format seems to be unreasonable. | Suggest to replace the "IRM Status field" with a "IRM Control field", and specified a "IRM Status subfield" of the "IRM Control field", the length of 3 bits is enough. | Rejected--  The is no gain to change the length of IRM Status field from 8 bits to 3 bits. |

**9.4.2.307b IRM element**

The IRM element contains a MAC address(CID30).The format of the IRM element is shown in Figure 9-788fn (IRM element format).

(CID143) TGbh editor: please insert the following Device ID item into Table 9-64 and Table 9-65 as bellows:

Table 9-64—Reassociation Request frame body

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Order** | **Information** | **Notes** |
| <ANA> | Device ID | The Device ID element is optionally present when using FILS authentication; otherwise, it is not present. |
| 63 | IRM | The IRM element is optionally present when using FILS authentication;  otherwise, it is not present. |

**Table 9-65—Reassociation Response frame body**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Order** | **Information** | **Notes** |
| <ANA> | Device ID | The Device ID element is optionally present when using FILS authentication; otherwise, it is not present. |
| 81 | IRM | The IRM element is optionally present when using FILS authentication;  otherwise, it is not present. |

**CID 159**

**TGbh editor: please make the following proposed change in the table of**

9.3.3.5 Association Request frame format, [9.3.3.6](http://9.3.3.6/) Association Response frame format, [9.3.3.7](http://9.3.3.7/) Reassociation Request frame format and [9.3.3.8](http://9.3.3.8/) Reassociation Response frame format.

Please replace

“The Device ID element is optionally present when using FILS authentication; otherwise, it is not present.”

With:

“If dot11DeviceIDctivated is true and dot11FILSActivated is true, The Device ID element is optionally present when using FILS authentication; otherwise, it is not present”

Please replace

“The IRM element is optionally present when using FILS authentication;otherwise, it is not present.”

With:

“If dot11IRMActivated is true and dot11FILSActivated is true,The IRM element is optionally present when using FILS authentication;otherwise, it is not present.”