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Abstract

This document provides resolutions for CIDs: 3703, 2613, 3556, 3555

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resn Status** | **Resolution** |
| 3703 |  |  | In general, there are no documents in mentor for simulation results to show that that 802.11ac meets the functional requirements that the task group has set. | Please, provide simulation results that that 802.11ac meets the functional requirements that the task group has set in 11-09-0451-16-00ac-tgac-functional-requirements-and-evaluation-methodology.doc | D | Disagree. There is no formal requirement in 802 or 802.11 policies, procedures, or operations manual for a task group to develop a functional requirements document and provide simulation results demonstrating compliance. While the task group did develop a functional requirements and evaluation methodology document, its main purpose is to compare multiple competing proposals. However, the task group did not have competing proposals. |
| 2613 |  |  | In general, there are no documents in mentor for simulation results to show that that 802.11ac meets the functional requirements that the task group has set. | Please, provide simulation results that that 802.11ac meets the functional requirements that the task group has set in 11-09-0451-16-00ac-tgac-functional-requirements-and-evaluation-methodology.doc | D | Disagree. There is no formal requirement in 802 or 802.11 policies, procedures, or operations manual for a task group to develop a functional requirements document and provide simulation results demonstrating compliance. While the task group did develop a functional requirements and evaluation methodology document, its main purpose is to compare multiple competing proposals. However, the task group did not have competing proposals. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resn Status** | **Resolution** |
| 3556 |  |  | The .11ac draft is too boring. It needs some jokes. The .11n editor managed to slip at least one joke in that was only discovered by the IEEE-SA publications editor and removed. | Identify an arty type and get him/her to form a humo(u)r ad-hoc. | P | Agree in principle. While the task group agrees that life should be more humorous, we are all boring engineers and too burnt out by 11n, so we won’t be forming a humor ad-hoc. However, perhaps the commenter will appreciate the following editor instruction, which adds a reference to <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc1149>. Also refer to implementation of said protocol, <http://www.blug.linux.no/rfc1149/>**TGac editor:** add the following reference to Annex A:IETF RFC 1149, A Standard for the Transmission of IP Datagrams on Avian Carriers, D. Waitzman, April 1990. |
| 3555 |  |  | The .11ac draft is too small. .11n was 500+ pages and .11ac is a measly 263 pages. You need to understand that your editor is paid by the word and act accordingly. | Follow the lead of .11n and add gratuitous features that nobody will ever implement. Explain these at great length.I have a proposal for a different type of A-MPDU subframe CRC calculation based on three of the middle bits of the TA address field. That should be good for 5 pages. | D | Disagree. The task group believes that everything that can be invented has been invented. There is nothing left to add to the draft. |