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Following CIDs are covered in this document (total 12):

PHY: 6178, 6335, 6319, 6603, 6604, 6605, 6606, 6607, 6608, 6609, 6180, 6181

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6178 | 192.31 | 22.2.4.1 | Section reference is incorrect. TX center frequency leakage is 22.3.18.4.2. | Change '22.3.18.5.2' to '22.3.18.4.2' twice on P192L31 (once in the box for Clause 20, and another in the the box for Clause 18). |

**Discussion:**

Context (P192)



As the commenter has noted, sections 20.3.20.7.2 and 18.3.9.7.2 are the transmit center frequency leakage sections. The corresponding section in clause 22 is 22.3.18.4.2.





**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6178:

ACCEPT.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6335 | 192.61 | 22.2.4.2 | "detected as a NON\_HT OFDM PPDU" is not exact. "detected as a non-HT PPDU and the RXVECTOR parameter NON\_HT\_MODULATION is OFDM" is better. | As in comment. |

**Discussion:**

Context (D3.0 P192):





Note further that for a non-HT PPDU not using the bandwidth signaling TA, the detection/distinction between OFDM vs. NON\_HT\_DUP\_OFDM modulation type is not mandatory, and the detection scheme is implementation specific. Even for non\_HT PPDUs using the bandwidth signaling TA, the ultimate distinction between OFDM vs. NON\_HT\_DUP\_OFDM is performed by the MAC. Hence, the PHY at this point only has an estimate of the NON\_HT\_MODULATION.

**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6335:

REVISE.

On P192L61, change “detected as a NON\_HT OFDM PPDU” to “detected as a NON\_HT PPDU and the NON\_HT\_MODULATION is estimated to be OFDM”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6319 | 194.08 | 22.2.4.2 | The usage of "5.0 GHz" may lead to a misunderstanding that the applicable spectrum is limited to 5.0X GHz (i.e., between 5.00 GHz and 5.10 GHz). | Change "5.0 GHz" to "5 GHz" |

**Discussion:**

Context (D3.0 P192):



‘5 GHz’ would be appropriate as the commenter has stated.

**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6319:

ACCEPT.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6603 | 241.21 | 22.3.10.5.2 | Parsing operation includes tail bits | Change "the scrambled SERVICE, PSDU and PHY pad bits" with "the scrambled SERVICE, PSDU and PHY pad bits and the unscrambled tail bits" |

**Discussion:**

Context (D3.0 P241):



…



Note that the scrambler output contains the SERVICE, PSDU and PHY pad bits, but does not contain the tail bits. Only the SERVICE, PSDU and PHY pad bits are ‘divided’ between encoders. The tail bit is subsequently ‘appended’ to each FEC input sequence.

**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6603:

REJECT.

Note that the scrambler output contains the SERVICE, PSDU and PHY pad bits, but does not contain the tail bits. Only the SERVICE, PSDU and PHY pad bits are ‘divided’ between encoders. The tail bit is subsequently ‘appended’ to each FEC input sequence.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6604 | 242.48 | 22.3.10.5.5 | Change "OFDM symbols" to "OFDM symbols for each user" | See Comment |

**Discussion:**

Context (D3.0 P242):



The commenter is correct that Equation (22-60) computes the initial number of OFDM symbols for each user.

**Proposed Resolution:**

CID: 6604

ACCEPT.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6605 | 243.06 | 22.3.10.5.5 | Clarify description of N\_SYM\_max\_init | Change "The initial estimate of the largest number of symbols" to "The largest initial number of symbols over all users" |

**Discussion:**

Context (D3.0 P241-242):



…



N\_sym\_init,u is the initial number of symbols for user u. Thus, the proposed resolution is appropriate.

**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6605:

ACCEPT.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6606 | 243.13 | 22.3.10.5.5 | The algorithm for calculating N\_SYM,u is somewhat confusing. | Change description as follows:"Then, for each user u that uses LDPC coding in the MU PPDU, the final number of symbols in the Data field (N\_SYM,u) shall be calculated as follows:Execute steps a) to d) in 20.3.11.7.5 with N\_pld (Equation (20-35)) replaced with N\_pld,u (Equation (22-62)) and N\_avbits (Equation (20-36)) replaced with N\_avbits,u (Equation (22-63)).N\_SYM,u for that user shall then be equal to the value of N\_SYM obtained at the end of step d) (Equation (20-41)), using these values. |
| 6607 | 243.24 | 22.3.10.5.5 | Value of N\_avbits,u can be simplified | Replace with:"N\_avbits,u = N\_SYM\_max\_init N\_CBPS,u" |
| 6608 | 243.36 | 22.3.10.5.5 | Replace "PPDU length" with "The number of symbols in the Data field" | See comment |
| 6180 | 243.51 | 22.3.10.5.5 | Computation of Npld for user u is already defined in Equation (22-62). Also, this section is for MU PPDU, hence there is no need for the phrase "for MU PPDU". | Change "First, N\_pld shall be computed using Equation (22-57) instead of Equation (20-35). Next, for an MU PPDU, step (d) in 20.3.11.7.5 ..." to "First, replace Equation (20-35) for computing N\_pld,u with Equation (22-62), and Equation (20-36) for computing N\_avbits,u with Equation (22-63). Next, step (d) in 20.3.11.7.5 ..." |
| 6609 | 243.51 | 22.3.10.5.5 | Correctly specify N\_pld for MU as well | Replace "Npld shall be computed using Equation (22-57)" with "Npld shall be computed using Equation (22-57) for SU or Equation (22-62) for MU" |

**Discussion:**

(D3.0, P243):



Note that when looking at Equations (22-63) and (22-64), reader may think that the Navbits,u in (22-64) is the one computed in (22-63). However, the Navbits,u is the one which may have been updated in step d) of 20.3.11.7.5. Hence, the commenter of CID 6606 is correct that the current draft is somewhat confusing. Note that Equations (22-62) and (22-63) is completely replacing step a) in 20.3.11.7.5 (802.11-2012, P1713):





Hence, we should write a new step a) in 22.3.10.5, and refer to steps b) through d) in 20.3.11.7.5.

Regarding CID 6607, the commenter is correct that substituting Equations (22-60) and (22-62) into (22-63) leads to the simpler equation proposed by the commenter:

N\_avbits,u = N\_SYM\_max\_init N\_CBPS,u.

Regarding CID 6608, the commenter is correct that Nsym is the number of symbols in the data field.

As for CIDs 6180 and 6609, commenters are correct that Equation (22-57) is for SU PPDU and thus is the incorrect reference.

(D3.0, 242)



Correct reference should be Equation (22-62).

 (D3.0, P243)



**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6606:

REVISE. See proposed text changes for CIDs 6606/6607/6608/6180/6609 in 11-12/0810r0 which clarifies the confusing description.

CID 6607, 6608:

ACCEPT. See proposed text changes for CIDs 6606/6607/6608/6180/6609 in 11-12/0810r0 for the comprehensive text change merged with changes from other CIDs.

CID 6180, 6609:

REVISE. See proposed text changes for CIDs 6606/6607/6608/6180/6609 in 11-12/0810r0 which clarifies the N\_pld definition.

**Proposed Text Change for CIDs 6606/6607/6608/6180/6609:**

Change D3.0 P243 (22.3.10.5) as follows:

Based on the above equation, compute the initial estimate of the largest number of symbols using Equation (22-61).

 (22-61)

1. Then, for each user *u* that uses LDPC coding in the MU PPDU, the final number of symbols in the Data field () shall be calculated as follows. Compute the number of uncoded bits, , and the number of available coded bits, , for user *u* fitting in  OFDM symbols.(#6606)

 (22-62)

(#6607) (22-63)

Then, perform steps b) through d) in 20.3.11.7.5 with  and replaced with  and , respectively.  for user *u* shall then be equal to the value of  obtained at the end of step d) (Equation (20-41)).(#6606)

NOTE—The purpose of going through the above steps is to compute . Thus, it is not necessary to actually encode the data using LDPC at this stage.

For BCC users, .

Then, compute the number of symbols in the Data field (#6608) using Equation (22-65).

 (22-65)

When constructing the Data field for user *u* encoded using LDPC code, the MAC follows the padding procedure described in 9.12.6 (A-MPDU padding for VHT PPDU) and delivers a PSDU that contains PSDU\_LENGTH*u* octets (see 22.4.3 (TXTIME and PSDU\_LENGTH calculation)). The PHY follows the padding procedure described in 22.3.10.1 (General) to fill  symbols, where  is defined in Equation (22-61). Then, for each user, all bits in the Data field including the scrambled SERVICE, PSDU and pad bits shall be encoded using the following procedure.

1. Compute  and  using Equation (22-62) and (22-63), respectively.

Perform steps b) and c) in 20.3.11.7.5 with  and replaced with  and , respectively.





Perform steps e) through g) in 20.3.11.7.5 with  replaced with  and  replaced with .(#6180)

When constructing the Data field for users encoded using BCC, …

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 6181 | 246.37 | 22.3.10.7 | "R" is undefined. | Change "Repeat R times" to "Repeat N\_res times". |

**Discussion:**

Context (D3.0, P246):



Note that “R” has been changed to “N\_res” in other places (P246L33).

**Proposed Resolution:**

CID 6181:

ACCEPT.

[EOF]