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Abstract

This document proposes resolutions to CIDs 4214 and 5393 of WG Letter Ballot 187.

The comments are copied from IEEE 12/0223r2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 4214 | 274.22 | 22 | 22.5 | The selection of N\_ES in the tables of Section 22.5 is not always intuitive and deserves some explanation (see, e.g., the confusion of Mark Rison in his email to the 11ac reflector on Dec. 1, 2012) | Please clarify. If I'm not mistaken the rule is something like add an extra BCC encoder every 600 Mbps, but if this results in a non-integer number of punctured blocks per encoder per OFDM symbol, pick the next best option provided the complexity increase is limited (cf. 11/0577r1). | REVISED, a clarification on how the N\_ES values were selected is included – see 12/0301r0 |
| 5393 | 274.22 | 22 | 22.5 | Lack of explanation on how N\_ES values were selected in 22.5 is soliciting comments for clarification. | Provide a brief explanation on how N\_ES values were chosen. | REVISED a clarification on how the N\_ES values were selected is included – see 12/0301r0 |

**Discussion**

The selection of N\_ES in the MCS tables of Section 22.5 seems to follow some logic, but some entries seem a bit arbitrarily, for instance N\_ES = 3 for MCS 2 in Table 22-51. This may result in some confusion, for instance in an email sent to the TGac email reflector on Dec 1, 2012:

“By the way, MCS 2 in Table 22-51 of D1.4 has got to be wrong for

N\_ES (should be 2, surely).”

The proposal is to add a clarifying statement, knowing that an exact formulation is hard to capture (see e.g. 11/0577r1).

**Resolution**

*Editor, please add the following line just before the tables in Clause 22.5:*

*NES* values were chosen to yield an integer number of punctured blocks per OFDM symbol.