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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs:

R0: initial the draft

R1: remove CID3024

R2: remove CID3030, and update the resolution for some CIDs.

R3: update the text according to the feedback during the ad-hoc session in June.

R4: Update the resolution for CID3005 ,CID3153, CID3009 and CID3158

R5: update the resolution for CID3009, CID3158 during the ad-hos session

R6: update the resolution for CID3016,CID3122

r7: Removed the struck out text at the end of the editing instructions since it has nothing to do with the edits (an artifact of the text being removed with track changes on).

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** | **Name** | **P/L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3004 | Yang, Jay | 26/7 | IRM included in TA field of probe request, and thus "IRM in the Address 1" should be "IRM in the Address 2" | change "IRM in the Address 1" to "IRM in the Address 2" in L7P26 | Accepted-- |
| 3005 | Yang, Jay | 26/8 | the probe request should be sent to an unassociated AP, | change "it transmits" to "it transmits to an unassociated AP" in both L8P26 and L18P26. |  |
| 3009 | Smith, Graham | 28/4 | "When the Device ID element is sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is reserved". What does reserved mean? All zeros or not present? In the IRM section we say "not present" . We should use the the same here. In addition, this needs to be moved ahead of "The Device ID field contains a device ID" as it comes before the device ID in the element. | Replace cited text with "When sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is not present ." and move to Page 27 ahead of line 63. | Revised--  Remove the text “When the Device ID element is sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is reserved” from P28L4,  and Insert the following text “When the element is sent to an AP, the Device ID Status field is not present” into P27L42.  ~~Change the octets of “Device ID Status” from “1” to “0 or 1” in Figure 9-1072a~~ |
| 3016 | Smith, Graham | 27/32 | As the Device ID Status filed is omitted when sent from non-AP STA to AP, the Octets should be "0 or 1". | At 27.33 under "Device ID Status" change "1" to "0 or 1" | Revised--  At P27L33,P29L52 and P40L28, under “Device ID Status” change “1” to “0 or 1”  At P30L4, P40L46, under “IRM Status” change “1” to “0 or 1” |
| 3122 | DeLaOlivaDelgado, Antonio | 28  /16 | The IRM status length is 0 or 1, for coherence we should have the same as in the status of device ID, which is always present but reserved in one direction. | Either change device ID Status length to 0 or 1 (and say it is not present) or change IRM status to 1 and indicate it is reserved. | Revised--  At P27L33,P29L52 and P40L28, under “Device ID Status” change “1” to “0 or 1”  At P30L4, P40L46, under “IRM Status” change “1” to “0 or 1” |
| 3159 | RISON, Mark | 28  /4 | "from a non-AP STA to an AP" -- "from a non-AP STA" is unnecessary verbiage | Delete the latter cited text | Revised--  Remove the text “When the Device ID element is sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, the Device ID Status field is reserved” from P28L4,  and Insert the following text “When sent to an AP, the Device ID Status field is not present” into P27L42. |
| ~~3024~~ | ~~Stacey, Robert~~ | ~~27/40~~ | ~~The Device ID Length field is not a length; it's a field.~~ | ~~Change to "The Device ID Length field is set to the number of octets in the Device ID field." ("is set to" or "indicates"; I prefer "is set to" because indicates is not specific on the encoding)~~ | ~~Revised--~~  ~~Agree in principle.~~  ~~TGbh Editor: Please change “The Device ID Length field is the length of the Device ID field” to “The Device ID Length field is set to the number of octets in the Device ID field” in P27L40.~~ |
| ~~3025~~ | ~~Stacey, Robert~~ | ~~28/1~~ | ~~The note, because it contains "optionally", is not purely informative. In this context "optionally" is equivalent to "might".~~ | ~~Change the note to read "NOTE--The device ID might be constructed as an opaque identifier as described in 12.2.12.1 (Device ID mechanism)". I would remove the additional reference to Annex AF; the first reference is all the reader needs.~~ | ~~Yan?~~ |
| ~~3030~~ | ~~Stacey, Robert~~ | ~~27~~  ~~/6~~ | ~~The distinction between a feature being "active" vs "supported" is not clear, particularly in the context of on-air signaling (as opposed to the MIB). In this case we don't even have a capability indication for the feature and so "active" appears to be a poor substitute for "capability" (i.e., support). And this is doubly true since we are using it in a "Capability" element.  We might want "active" semantics in the MIB where an management entity can enable or disable a feature. But we don't need to reflect this in the OTA signaling; as for as the OTA protocol is concerned the feature is either supported or not supported. It a management entity has not activated it, then it is not supported.~~ | ~~Change "Device ID Active" to "Device ID Support". Change "IRM Active" to "IRM Support".  At 34.51 change "A non-AP STA that has dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true indicates the device ID mechanism is activated by setting the Device ID Active field to 1..." to "A non-AP STA that has dot11DeviceIDActivated equal to true shall set the Device ID Support field to 1 to indicate that the device ID mechanism is supported..." (note the shall -- normative requirement to keep the MIB and OTA signaling aligned)  At 37.52 change "An AP that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true advertises activation of the IRM mechanism by setting the IRM Active field to 1..." to "An AP that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true shall set the IRM Support field to 1 to indicate that the IRM mechanism is supported..."  At 37.54 change "A non-AP STA that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true indicates the IRM mechanism is active by setting the IRM Active field to 1..." to "A non-AP STA that has dot11IRMActivated equal to true shall set the IRM Support field to 1 to indicate that the IRM mechanism is supported.."~~ | ~~Accepted--~~ |
| 3067 | McCann, Stephen | 25  /60 | Some of the "set to" statements are within conditionals and should be "equal to" | Change "set to" to "equal to", starting at the end of line 60. | Rejected--  The commenter made comment on baseline text rather than 11bh draft text. |
| 3068 | McCann, Stephen | 26  /1 | Some of the "set to" statements are within conditionals and should be "equal to" | Change "When included in a Beacon request with the Data field set to other than 1" to "When included in a Beacon request with the Data field not equal to 1". | Rejected--  The commenter made comment on baseline text rather than 11bh draft text. |
| 3112 | Hamilton, Mark | 25  /27 | Measurement ID element (which does go in Probe Request, for example) has no Element ID (and the other attributes) in 9.4.2.1. | Insert a row after the IRM row, with: Measurement ID (9.4.2.318), 255, 140, No, No. Change PASN Encrypted Data row to ID extension of 141. | Accepted-- |
| 3113 | Hamilton, Mark | 27  /63 | Neither "device ID" nor "measurement ID" are ever specified. | Add to the end of the sentence, "that is a sequence of up to xxx octets". (Need to choose what xxx is.) Same thing at 29.1. | Rejected--  The comment fails to specify a specific change that will satisfy the commenter.  . |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3153 | RISON, Mark | 26  /10 | "The Measurement ID element has the format defined in 9.4.2.315 (Measurement ID element). The Measurement ID element is optionally included in a Beacon request to request that the responding STA include the provided Measurement ID element in the Probe Request frames it transmits." -- but this is about the subelements of the Beacon request, so s/element/subelement/g I presume. However, the payload of the subelement has to be incldued in the probe requests as the payload of the element | As it says in the comment |  |
| 3156 | RISON, Mark | 27  /40 | "The Device ID Length field is the length of the Device ID field" missing units | Add "in octets" | Revised--  Revise Change cited text to “The Device ID Length field is set to the number of octets in the Device ID field. |
| 3158 | RISON, Mark | 27  /45 | "from an AP to a non-AP STA" -- "to a non-AP STA" is unnecessary verbiage | Delete the latter cited text | Revised--  Discusstion:  In IRM, it says “When sent to an AP” in P28L24, and “When sent from an AP” in P28L26, the proposed change should align with IRM.  Change “When sent from an AP to a non-AP STA” to “When the element is sent from an AP” |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3191 | RISON, Mark | 25  /19 | Making the Device ID element non-extensible seems short-sighted to me. My understanding is that all elements defined after the extensibility column was added were expected to be extensible, for forward-compatibility | Change "No" in the penultimate column to "Yes" and add a Device ID Length field before the Device ID field in Figure 9-1072a--Device ID element format | Revised--  Change "No" in the penultimate column to "Yes". |
| 3193 | RISON, Mark | 28 | There are two non-generic fields in this element. One is only used by APs, the other only by non-AP STAs. Wouldn't it be better two have two elements? | As it says in the comment | Rejected--  The commenter fails to identify any technical issue. |

***CID3005, CID3153***

***Revised----***

***Change “***

The IRM Recommendation subelement is optionally included in a Beacon

request to request that the responding STA use an IRM in the Address 1 field in the Probe Request frames it

transmits. “

To

“

When the IRM Recommendation subelement is included in a Beacon request, it requests the responding STA to use an IRM in the Address 2 field in the Probe Request frames the STA transmits.

”

1. In P26L12, change the text “The Measurement ID element is optionally included in a Beacon request to request that the responding STA include the provided Measurement ID element in the Probe Request frames it transmits.

to

“When the Measurement ID subelement is included in a Beacon request, it requests the responding STA

to include the provided Measurement ID element in the Probe Request frames the STA transmits.

”