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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs:

R0: initial the draft

R1: update the resolution.

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** |
| 3006 | Yang, Jay | 31/60 | IRM should be in TA field in probe request, and thus "the Address 1 field" should be "the Address 2 field" | change "the Address 1 field" to "the Address 2 field" in L60P26. | Revised--  change "the Address 1 field" to "the Address 2 field" in P31L62 |
| 3101 | Hamilton, Mark | 31/62 | [XG] Why RA (Address 1) in the Probe Request can be an IRM? It should be TA. | Change to "the Address 2" | Accepted--  Note to the Editor,the resolution is same to CID3006 |
| ~~3139~~ | ~~RISON, Mark~~ | ~~31/50~~ | ~~" measurement request is Active" should be " Measurement request is Active"~~ | ~~As it says in the comment. Ditto at 32.25~~ | ~~Accepted--~~ |
| ~~3140~~ | ~~RISON, Mark~~ | ~~31/62~~ | ~~"measurement request" should be "Measurement request"~~ | ~~As it says in the comment~~ | ~~Revised--~~  ~~Duplicated CIDs.Note to the Editor, the resolution is same to CID 3139~~ |
| ~~3141~~ | ~~RISON, Mark~~ | ~~32/17~~ | ~~"measurement request" should be "Measurement request"~~ | ~~As it says in the comment~~ | ~~Revised--~~  ~~Duplicated CIDs, Note to the Editor,the resolution is same to CID 3139~~ |
| 3167 | RISON, Mark | 32/29 | "To enhance the privacy, the AP shall assign a new measurement ID for each measurement exchange." is ambiguous -- does it mean "if the AP wants to enhance the privacy, it shall" or does it mean "The AP shall (because doing so enhances privacy)" | Change "To enhance the privacy, the" to "The" | Accepted-- |
| 3037 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | 29/1 | Althougth there is a definition of 'measurement ID' in Clause 3, it by itself is not enough for the element description in Subclause 9.4.2.x . Here in 9.4.2.318 there has to be more detailed description of the same. Atleast mentioning what form it contains, eg: A string with alphanumeric characters, etc. If not specific text, then a note would also suffice. Implementers need to know what to broadly expect in such fields. | as in comment | Rejected--  In the definition text at clause 3.2 measurement ID is a transient device ID provided by the network. we don’t need to further explain what’s the content in the measurement ID |