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Abstract

This document provides LB279 comment resolutions to CIDs in section 9 based on **11bkD1.0, 11beD5.0, and REVmeD4.2 references**. The CIDs including 1136, 1010, 1045, 1046, 1165, 1229, 1231, 1243, 1244, 1246, 1247, 1249, and 1250 (13 total).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1136 | 11,21,6,4,6 | 64.12 | The statement "If the FORMAT parameter is set to" is not correct. If it is a test of the value of the FORMAT parameter then it should say "is" or "is equal to". But, I believe the intent is "When the FORMAT parameter is set to". Note: there are 18 instances of this phase, all should be corrected. | Replace "If the FORMAT parameter is set to ..." With "When the FORMAT parameter is set to ..." Also make this correction at: 65.21, 65.31, 65.33, 66.3, 66.7, 66.27, 67.8, 67.14, 67.16, 67.24, 67.27, 68.9, 68.17, 68.23, 68.25, 68.32, 68.33 | Revise  TGbk editor, change the text “If the FORMAT parameter is set to” to “If the FORMAT parameter is equal to” in all instances mentioned by the commenter. |
| 1010 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 26.13 | According to Table 9-322al - Format And Bandwidth subfield, a value of 5 or less will result in an HE format of bandwidth 160 MHz or less. As per table 9-322al, the Format and Bandwidth subfield should be set to 8 to indicate a 320 MHz FTM session. | Change "a value of 5 or less." to "a value of 8." | Reject  The ISTA can convey the support for 320MHz by including 320MHz Ranging subelement in the IFTMR frame. It was purposely chosen for ISTA not to transmit the Format And Bandwidth of value 8 since it is not aware of the RSTA’s capability. Not all RSTAs (previous 11az devices) understand the new field hence would impact backwards compatibility. |
| 1045 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 27.36 | Table 11-14aa - This table doesn't make much sense, two columns have redundant information (All entries are 320 MHz and 80 MHz puncturing) and the last columns is 8 bit (40 MHz incrementes), while it is compared in the text to the 16 bit version( 20 MHz increments). | Remove the first two columns and either change to or add 16 bit version of puncturing bit map. | Revise  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0215-02-00bk-lb279-comment-resolution-for-cids-in-section-11.docx> |
| 1046 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 28.10 | "Upon reception of an IFTMR frame with the Ranging Parameters ..." - this whole text seems redundant compared to what is stated on page 27. | Remove added text. | Revise  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0215-02-00bk-lb279-comment-resolution-for-cids-in-section-11.docx> |
| 1165 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 27.28 | I assume that it is ok to use 320MHz BW for range measurement when an AP pas 280MHz channel with either 40MHz in lowest 80MHz or 40MHz in highest 80MHz being punctured and the ISTA supports Puncturing 35 Pattern Support field set to 0. | Clarify it. | Reject  Spec is clear in indicating that when ISTA sets Punctruing Pattern Support field to 0, it only supports upper and lower 80MHz punctured BW (i.e. 240MHz continuous) and nothing else. But if the ISTA sets Punctruing Pattern Support field to 1, it indicates that it can support all puncturing patterns, so yes 11bk supports the case commenter states. |
| 1229 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 26.14 | "together with the Ranging Parameters element" is not clear | Change to "in the Ranging Parameters element" | Accept |
| 1231 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 26.15 | "In the subelement: 16 -- The Max R2I Nss = 320 MHz field is set to the maximum number of spatial streams the 17 ISTA is capable of receiving in the R2I NDP for 320 MHz bandwidth minus 1. 18 -- The Max I2R Nss = 320 MHz field is set to the maximum number of spatial streams the 19 ISTA is capable of transmitting in the I2R NDP for 320 MHz bandwidth minus 1. 20 -- The Puncturing Pattern Support field is set to 1 to indicate support of all puncturing 21 patterns, or it is set to 0 to indicate support of only the subset of puncturing patterns 22 defined in Table 11-14aa (Subset of puncturing patterns in 320 MHz Ranging when 23 Puncturing Pattern Support field set to 0). " is duplication of Clause 9 | Delete the cited text | Reject  The cited text adds normative behavior for ISTA to convey the capabilities that it requests for an specific FTM session. |
| 1243 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 27.10 | ", in the same IFTM frame" -- I don't understand what this means | Delete the cited text | Revise  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0215-02-00bk-lb279-comment-resolution-for-cids-in-section-11.docx> |
| 1244 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 0.00 | There is a lot of format stuff here that should be in Clause 9 only | As it says in the comment | Reject  Lack of clairy by the commenter for the cited text |
| 1246 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 27.30 | "shall not assign a 320 MHz 31 bandwidth option" -- it's not clear what assigning an option means | Clarify | Revise  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0215-02-00bk-lb279-comment-resolution-for-cids-in-section-11.docx> |
| 1247 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 28.11 | ", representing the ISTA's support for 320 MHz Ranging" is obvious and duplicative | Delete the cited text | Revise  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0215-02-00bk-lb279-comment-resolution-for-cids-in-section-11.docx> |
| 1249 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 28.17 | "If an RSTA is a standard power AP or an indoor standard power AP" -- Brian HART and Thomas DERHAM have recently done work in REVme in this area, which results in the zoo of AP types getting bigger | Cover the new types here too | Reject  The relavency for the cited text applies to Standard AP & Indoor Standard AP devices as the BSS operation can be controlled by an external system (i.e. AFC) so it is required. It is irrelevant for other APs. |
| 1250 | 11.21.6.3.3 | 28.19 | "should include Transmit Power 20 Envelope subelement(s)" is not clear, and not aligned with the previous sentence | Change to "should include at least one Transmit Power Envelope subelement" | Accept |

*Resolution for CID 1045*

*TGbk editor: Replace the table 11-14aa with the following table and keep the legend as is:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Disabled Subchannel Bitmap subfield value | Corresponding entry for the 320MHz bandwidth in Table 36-30  (Definition of the Punctured Channel Information field in the U-SIG for an EHT MU PPDU using non-OFDMA transmissions) (#1045) | |
| Field value | Puncturing pattern  (RU or MRU index) |
| [1111 0000 0000 0000] | 9 | [x x 1 1 1 1 1 1]  (3x996-tone MRU 1) |
| [0000 0000 0000 1111] | 12 | [1 1 1 1 1 1 x x]  (3x996-tone MRU 4) |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

*Resolution for CID 1046*

*TGbk editor: Change the text in P27L28-36 as follows:*

Upon reception of an IFTMR frame with the Ranging Parameters element including a 320 MHz Ranging subelement, ~~representing the ISTA’s support for 320 MHz Ranging~~,(#1247) the RSTA shall respond with the value of 8 in the Format and Bandwidth subfield in the Ranging Parameters element and include a 320 MHz Ranging subelement in the IFTM frame, if it supports the requested 320 MHz BW ~~option~~ with the coresponding punctured pattern included in the Disabled Subchannel Bitmap subfield in the EHT Operation element. (#1046, #1246)

*Resolution for CID 1243*

*TGbk editor: Change the text in P27L10-12 as follows:*

If the Format and Bandwidth subfield is set to a value of 8, ~~in the same IFTM frame,~~ the RSTA shall include a 320 MHz Ranging subelement together with the Ranging Parameters element in the IFTM frame. In the 320 MHz Ranging subelement: (#1243)

**References: P802.11bkD1.0, P802.11beD5.0 & P802.11REVmeD4.0**