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# Easy Ones

## Propose ACCEPT

Notes:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 220 | 213 | 16.1 | | | 21 | the right section is 16.8.1 | change to 16.8.1 |
| 646 | 213 | 16.1 | | | 21 | The reference to 16.8 on this line should be 16.8.1, While editorial in nature, this is a technical change to the meaning of the specification. | change "16.8" to "16.8.1" |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |
| 285 | 46 | 10.32.2 | | | 15 | " it may be advantageous" is an informative statement, not an optional requirement. This is stating a possiblity, not quite a recommendation. The correct word is "can". | Chante "may" to "can" |
| 286 | 46 | 10.32.2 | | | 18 | " it may be advantageous" is an informative statement, not an optional requirement. This is stating a possiblity, not quite a recommendation. The correct word is "can". | Chante "may" to "can" |
| 125 | 49 | 10.32.3.5 | | | 2 | Figure 6' is not cited in the text. | Citation of Figure 6 can be added at the end of Line 28 of Page 48 like 'as shown in Figure 6'. |
| 158 | 52 | 10.32.8.2 | | | 5 | MLME-SET.request instead of MLME-STS.request | change to MLME-SET.request |
| 305 | 64 | 10.39.1 | | | 1 | clause 0 should be clause 16 | as in the comment |
| 383 | 64 | 10.39.1 | | | 3 | This says "… and, where O-QPSK PHY shares a common clock source with the UWB PHY, …" however elsewhere the standard says that the O-QPSK PHY for NBA "shall be derived from the same clock reference as the UWB PHY", so there is no need to say have this "where phase since it has to have a common clock source" | Delete: ", where O-QPSK PHY shares a common clock source with the UWB PHY". |
| 494 | 95 | 10.39.11.1.2.1 | | | 29 | Especially as line 39 says the generartion of RPA prand is out of scope of this standard, to avoid the distinction of NHL or MAC and whether "shall" is approptiate we should change the language used here. | Change "shall use" to "uses", and on next line "shall communicate" to "communicates" |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |
| 496 | 96 | 10.39.11.1.2.2 | | | 16 | This sub-clause contains 5 shall statements, which would be bettter changed avoid the distinction of NHL or MAC. Especially I don't think we want to specify MAC mechanisms to generate random numbers, or keep track of what the NHL is doing in the protocol potentially over multiple sessions in parallel. | change "shall use" to "uses", and "shall be" to "is", and delete the sentence on line 27. |
| 498 | 96 | 10.39.11.1.2.2 | | | 27 | This "shall be able" seems a little strange. It is the NHL that uses MCPS-DATA.request to send the Acquisition Compact frame and provide this address, so it is in control of this. This sentence is not needed. | Delete the sentence on line 27. |
| 187 | 108 | 10.39.11.1.3.14 | | | 4 | The Management PHY configuration field can also be included in the message content field of the compact frame | add "or in the message content field of the compact frame" |
| 188 | 108 | 10.39.11.1.3.14 | | | 7 | The Management MAC configuration field can also be included in the message content field of the compact frame | add "or in the message content field of the compact frame" |
| 189 | 108 | 10.39.11.1.3.14 | | | 10 | The Ranging PHY configuration field can also be included in the message content field of the compact frame | add "or in the message content field of the compact frame" |
| 190 | 108 | 10.39.11.1.3.14 | | | 13 | The MMS Number of Fragments field can also be included in the message content field of the compact frame | add "or in the message content field of the compact frame" |
| 183 | 99 | 10.39.11.1.3.4 | | | 3 | add "bits: in Figure 60 | add "Bits:" in the upper left corner |
| 184 | 99 | 10.39.11.1.3.4 | | | 11 | add "bits: in Figure 61 | add "Bits:" in the upper left corner |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |
| 517 | 105 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | | | 11 | encodes the duration of macMmsRpDuration | change to "encodes the ranging phase duration" |
| 518 | 105 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | | | 11 | encodes the duration of macMms1stReportNSlots | change to "encodes the duration of the first reporting period of the reporting phase" |
| 303 | 105 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | | | 22 | MrpThirdSlots is not used by "either the initiator or the responder" for transmission based on Figure 50 | change to initiator |
| 521 | 105 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | | | 22 | encodes the duration of macMms3rdReportNSlots | change to "encodes the duration of the third reporting period of the reporting phase" |
| 522 | 105 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | | | 22 | encodes the value of macMmsNonInterleavedMode | change to "encodes the interleaving mode to be used " |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |

Proposed resolution: Accept

## Propose Revised

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 342 | 37 | 10.21.6.1.2 | 29 | For the controlee/controller association, the MLME-ASSOCIATE.request needs to provide the address of the controller device. The CoordAddrMode, CoordPanId, and CoordAddress can be reused for this. But this reuse should be indicated in the text. | Add Table 10-104 rows from base standard to show the necessary edits, i.e., to change "coordinator" to "coordinator/controller" in the descriptions of CoordAddrMode and CoordAddress parameters. |
| 346 | 39 | 10.21.6.1.3 | 1 | ControllerCapabilityInformation for MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication (in Table 10-105) says it is a bitmap as defined in 10.41.4.1, which I think would be clearer if it was actually referring to the bitmap format figure it was meaning. I think it should be a bitmap containing the field in Figure 187. The clause reference on its own does not suffice. | Refer to Figure 187 directly, and add to its description that as well as being a field in the over the air message that is it also the format of the capability information bitmap parameter of the MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication |
| 182 | 95 | 10.39.11.1.2.1 | 37 | Higher layer methods may be used to synchronize generation and application of RPA prand values between the initiator and the responder. The method to set or update the RPA PRand is missing. The Higher layer can set or update the RPA Prand PIB with MLME-SET.request primitive in the macIrkDescriptorElement for the associated macIrkEntry IRK stored. | add at the end of the paragraph the following text "The Higher layer can set or update the RPA Prand PIB with MLME-SET.request primitive in the macIrkDescriptorElement for the associated macIrkEntry IRK stored." |

Proposed resolution: Revised

Disposition detail: May need some text cleanup by the editor. Propose to give the editor license to clean up the proposed text and provide the resolution detail.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 230 | 42 | 10.29.6.6 | 12 | It seems that this chart only applies to non-iterleaved mode. | Change line 12 to: "The non-interleaved MMS UWB ranging packets specified for the HRP-ARDEV in 16.2.11, can be used for DS-TWR with message sequence as per Figure 3." |

Proposed resolution: Revised

Disposition detail: change to “The MMS UWB ranging packets specified for the HRP-ARDEV in 16.2.11, can be used non-interleaved for DS-TWR with message sequence as per Figure 3”

## Proposed Rejected

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | | **Sub-clause** | | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 46 | | 13 | 2 | 14 | | I do not think we need IETF RFC 1951 DEFLATE as normative reference. | Move this to bibliography. |

Proposed resolution: Rejected

Disposition Detail: In 10.40.4.5.2 Sensing report compression, RFC 1951 is properly cited in normative text: When compression is used it shall be applied using the DEFLATE compressed data format described in IETF RFC 1951.

# Proposed to discuss or reassign

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Page** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 352 | 45 | 10.32.1 | 15 | Use of "IEs such as" in the definition of the RCM makes it a vague definition open to misinterpretation. RCM previously had a very specific meaning. We should delete the 3 words to leave a clear specification of which IEs have to be present in order for the frame to be considered an RCM. | Delete: "IEs such as ". |

Explanation: The “IEs such as” was added for Draft 02. Need to confirm what was intended by this text.

Candidate: Youngwon (Hyperblock shepherd).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 377 | 61 | 10.32.9.12 | 1.1 | Table 9 row 1 is incorrectly talking about the "Ranging Block Description List Length field" when I believe it should be talking about the Ranging Block Duration field | In first row of Table 9 (below headings) description of Ranging Block Duration Units field value zero, change "Size of Ranging Block Description List Length field is one octet, and the Ranging Block Description List field units are in numbers of ranging rounds" to "The size of the Ranging Block Duration field is one octet and its units are ranging rounds" |
| 378 | 61 | 10.32.9.12 | 1.2 | Table 9 row 2 is incorrectly talking about the "Ranging Block Description List Length field" when I believe it should be talking about the Ranging Block Duration field | Change description of Ranging Block Duration Units field value of one to: "The size of the Ranging Block Duration field is two octets and its units are ranging slots" |
| 379 | 61 | 10.32.9.12 | 1.2 | Table 9 row 3 is incorrectly talking about the "Ranging Block Description List Length field" when I believe it should be talking about the Ranging Block Duration field | Change description of Ranging Block Duration Units field value of two to: "The size of the Ranging Block Duration field is three octets and its units are RSTU" |

Explanation: Need confirmation that the text is correct.

Candidate: Youngwon (Hyperblock shepherd).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 372 | 53 | 10.32.9.3 | 17 | The statement "In the case of hyper block mode, only the least significant 8 bits are used to specify the block index." Could be a little more clear, if it instead quotes the allowed value range as per the proposed change. | Change the sentence to say, "In hyper block mode, the Round Index field is used to specify the block index, and this shall be limited to the range 0 to 255. When not in hyper block mode the full 16-bit field allows for a round index range of 0 to 65535." |

Explanation: Need confirmation that the text is correct.

Candidate: Youngwon (Hyperblock shepherd).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 267 | Technical | 105 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | change the range from 1 - 15 to 0 - 15 | The minimum value for macMmsRcpPollNSlots can be 0 |
| 268 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 | 10 | The minimum value for macMmsRcpRespNSlots can be 0 | change the range from 1 - 15 to 0 - 15 | 10.39.11.1.3.9 |

Explanation: Require further discussion; This issue was withdrawn by commenter on initial ballot. One reason was the need for additional