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Abstract

This submission proposes comment resolutions of MAC Editorial comments from TGah Draft 1.0.

* CIDs: 2479, 2392, 2095, 1786, 2715, 2625, 2643, 2055, 2962, 2963, 2556, 2379, 2163 (13 CIDs)

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGah Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGah Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGah Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGah Editor” are instructions to the TGah editor to modify existing material in the TGah draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGah editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGah Draft.***

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2479 |  |  | I have a general concern that it is not always clear which features can only be used in the S1G band and which could be used in other bands | Somehow make it clearer | Revised-Agree in principle. Please see the proposed resolution of CID 2540 shown on the 11-14/0321r1.The general description of the S1G in the sub-clause 4 gives you which feature is supported in S1G band. Since 11-14/0321r1 was already approved in March meeting, no change is needed. |
| 2392 |  |  | There are dozens of non-ANA TBDs | Address them all | Revised- Agree in principle. Through the comment resolution of TGah Draft 1.0, we have fixed the TBD values in both editorial and technical sense. But, if you still find any TBD values from the next TGh Draft 2.0, please re-submit the comment with the specific page and line numbers. But, please don't blame our mistake.TGah Editor: No change is needed for this CID. But, please carefully review whether the missing reference number exists when generating Draft 2.0. |
| 2095 |  |  | From the 802.11 Operations Manual:3.9.2..."It is the responsibility of the TG to ensure that the draft is ready for balloting, i.e. that it is complete (e.g. no place holders or notes for future action, editing, or clarifications) and of sufficient quality. TGs are encouraged to perform an internal review / comment resolution cycle before bringing a draft to the working group for ballot. Failure to prepare adequately will result in a large number of comments, and will probably result in a failed ballot. It also antagonizes working group voters. The progress of a draft is accelerated by taking a more cautious route to initial ballot, resulting in a shorter overall period of comment resolution."The rush to ballot by asking a number of reviewers to withdraw their comments can be seen in the high number of TBDs. The Task Group should have taken another couple months to get the draft it presentable shape prior to starting the ballot. | Address the 42 TBDs in the draft before submitting to the WG for consideration. | Revised- Agree in principle. Through the comment resolution of TGah Draft 1.0, we have fixed the TBD values in both editorial and technical sense. But, if you still find any TBD values from the next TGh Draft 2.0, please re-submit the comment with the specific page and line numbers. But, please don't blame our mistake.TGah Editor: No change is needed for this CID. But, please carefully review whether the missing reference number exists when generating Draft 2.0. |
| 1786 |  |  | 11ah should consider including some type of low-power wake-up signal for getting low-power devices out of sleep mode. | Add a low-power wake-up waveform option | Rejected- NDP Paing frame can be used for the purpose of the low power wakeup signal. After reviewing the NDP Paging operation, if it is not still enough, please verify what is not sufficient. |
| 2715 |  |  | There are many "TBD" occurances in the draft | Need to find values for the many TBDs in the draft | Revised- Agree in principle. Through the comment resolution of TGah Draft 1.0, we have fixed the TBD values in both editorial and technical sense. But, if you still find any TBD values from the next TGh Draft 2.0, please re-submit the comment with the specific page and line numbers. But, please don't blame our mistake.TGah Editor: No change is needed for this CID. But, please carefully review whether the missing reference number exists when generating Draft 2.0. |
| 2625 |  |  | There are many "TBD" occurances in the draft | Need to find values for the many TBDs in the draft | Revised- Agree in principle. Through the comment resolution of TGah Draft 1.0, we have fixed the TBD values in both editorial and technical sense. But, if you still find any TBD values from the next TGh Draft 2.0, please re-submit the comment with the specific page and line numbers. But, please don't blame our mistake.TGah Editor: No change is needed for this CID. But, please carefully review whether the missing reference number exists when generating Draft 2.0. |
| 2643 | 63.62 | 8.4.2.7.1.2 | incomplete Figure 8-87o | put the two parts of Figure 8-87o into one page | Rejected-Figure 8-87o is not shown in TGah Draft 1.0. And, all sub-clause number, page number and line number were incorrect. We couldn’t figure out the comment. If the commenter has still same concern, please resubmit the comment with the correct figure number. |
| 2055 | 151.00 | 9 | This draft reflects a lot of good work but it is not very polished and contains several inconsistencies. It needs to be clarified editorially and technically before it is ready for Sponsor ballot. | I will provide specific suggestions in the comment resolution process. | Rejected- Through the comment resolution of TGah Draft 1.0, the next TGah Draft (probably D2.0) will be significantly improved in both editorial and technical sense.Please submit a valid comment in the next LB after reviewing the Draft 2.0. As you know, it is an invalid comment. |
| 2962 | 194.01 | 9.45 | it's' should be 'its' | change "it's" to "its" | Revised-Agree in principle. But, 11-14-0090/r3 already modified the proposed wording in more clearly. No change is needed. |
| 2963 | 194.05 | 9.45 | Redundant comma | remove the comma | Revised- Agree in principle. Also, it is necessary to specify the exact condition of supporting the Page Slicing.TGah editor to make changes shown in 11-14-0529r0 under the heading for CID 2963. |
| 2556 |  | 8.2.4.7.1 | A Table 8-13c (Maximum data unit sizes (in octets) and durations (in microseconds)) needs to be modified to support S1G STA. | Insert the subclause 8.2.4.7 (Frame Body field) and 8.2.4.7.1 (General), and modify the Table 8-13c by adding a new column corresponding to S1G STA.. | Revised-Agree in principle. But, please see the proposed resolution of CID 1426 from 11-14/0257r1. Since it was already approved in March meeting, no change is needed. |
| 2379 | 39 | 8.3.1.6 | The Duration field is unsigned, so saying it is set to a value greater than or equal to 0 is not very useful (and is also not true for all non-S1G STAs) | Change to say something like "The Duration field is set to 0 for a non-S1G STA (see 9.20.2.7 for an S1G STA)" (but note the baseline now includes DMG STAs | Revised- Agree in principle. Since the DMT STA is using the different rule, it should be updated based on the 802.11REVmc D2.0. TGah editor to make changes shown in 11-14-0529r0 under the heading for CID 2379. |
| 2163 | 117 | 8.4.2.170t | Table number 8-55 is not correct for Element IDs. | Change "8-55" to "8-61." | Revised- Agree in principle. But, please see the proposed resolution of CID 1132 from 11-14/0257r1. Since it was already approved in March meeting, no change is needed. |

**Propose:**

Revised for CID 2963, 2379, per discussion and editing instructions in 11-14/0529r0.

***TGah editor: Modify the sub-clause*** ***9.45 as the following:***

9.45 Page Slicing

…

An S1G STA with dot11PageSlicingSupported set to true ~~supporting Page Slicing,~~ wakes up to receive DTIM beacon frame which contains the Page Slice element for its associated page slice (#927) from the AP. The STAs check the DTIM frame comprising of the Page Bitmap field and the Block Bitmap fields in Page Slice element and TIM, respectively. The Page Bitmap field in the Page Slice (#Ed: Removed redundant “Count”) element provides an early indication of buffered data for all blocks in the assigned page slices. If a bit in the Page Bitmap field of the Page Slice element is set to 0, it indicates that there is no buffered data for STAs with AIDs located in the block corresponding to that bit. These STAs may return to doze state immediately when there is no buffered group addressed data or after receiving buffered broadcast/multicast data as indicated in the DTIM. If the block bit in the Page Bitmap field is set to 1, then it indicates that there is buffered data at the AP for at least one of the STAs with AIDs in that block.

***TGah editor: Modify the sub-clause*** ***8.3.1.6 as the following:***

8.3.1.6 CF-End frame format

…

***~~Change the last sentence of the sub-clause 8.3.1.6 as the following:~~***

~~The Duration field is set to a value greater or equal to 0 as described in 9.20.2.7 (Truncation of TXOP).~~

When transmitted by a non-DMG and a non-S1G STA, the Duration field is set to 0. When transmitted by a DMG STA, the Duration field is set to the time required to complete the CF-End truncation sequence of which it is part (see 9.34.8 (Dynamic truncation of service period)): Duration = (*i* – 1) × (TXTIME(CF-End) + SIFS), where *i* is in the range [1,3] and indicates the order of the CF-End frame in the truncation sequence in the reverse direction (i.e., *i*=1 corresponds to the last CF-End frame in the sequence). When transmitted by an S1G STA, the Duration field is set to either 0 or a truncated time as described in 9.20.2.7 (Truncation of TXOP).