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Abstract

This document proposes a resolution for the following CIDs: 3032, 3178, 3179, 3180, 3181, and

3385. The proposed resolution is based on D3.0.

**REVISION NOTES:**

R0: initial

R1: Some CIDs were updated as a result of the group discussions

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 TGmc Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

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

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

**CID LIST:**

 CID Sec. Pg. Ln Comment Proposed Change Resolution

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3032 | 10.16.12 | 1682 | 34 | "A VHT STA is not required to perform any of the behavior described in this subclause associated withInformation Request and 20 MHz BSS Width Request" -- this statement either has no effect, or creates internal contradictions with "an HT STA shall" statements in this subclause. | Identify the exceptions in this subclause and replace "<a type of HT STA>..." with "<a type of HT STA> that is not a VHT STA..." where <a type of HT STA> might include things like "40MC HT AP 2G4" and similar abominations. | Rejected. Reason for rejection: There is not enough information from commenter.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3178 | 22.3.7.4 | 2470 | 38 | Clarify relationship between transmit chains and frequency segments | Change "the complex baseband signal of frequency segment i\_Seg in transmit chain i\_TX" with "the complex baseband signal on transmit chain i\_TX of frequency segment i\_Seg".The current wording suggests that both frequency segments appear on each transmit chain. | Revised. Editor, please change the text as follows: “represents the complex baseband signal of frequency segment *iSeg* ~~in~~and transmit chain *iTX*;” |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3179 | 22.3.7.4 | 2471 | 62 | Clarify starting point of time offset | Replace "starting time of the corresponding field" with "starting time of the corresponding field relative to the start of L-STF" | Revised. Editor please change the text to: "starting time of the corresponding field relative to the start of L-STF (*t*=0)." |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3180 | 22.3.8.2.2 | 2476 | 10 | Clarify interpretation of N\_TX for 80+80 | CSD values depend on N\_TX (which determines the row in Table 22-10). Which value should be used for 80+80?For example, in Figure 22-9, a total of four transmit chains is shown. Per formula(22-20), the four signals would be labelled as (0,1), (0,2), (1,1) and (1,2), with the first number being the segment number and the second the antenna number. Is N\_TX=4 or N\_TX=2 in this case? Which row of Table 22-10 should be used?We propose that the correct intepretation of N\_TX is the number of transmit chains per frequency segment and therefore N\_TX=2 in the example of Figure 22-9. Using N\_TX=4 in this case would result in 2x4 signals according to (22-20), with each of these signals requiring a transmit chain for its generation. | Revised. Editor please change the text in Table 22-10 to the following: **“Total****number of****transmit****chains (*NTX*) per frequency segment”** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3181 | 22.3.8.2.2 | 2476 | 31 | Use consistent naming for 80+80. Sometimes we use "noncontiguous transmission using two 80 MHz frequency segments". Other times, we use "noncontiguous 80+80 MHz VHT transmission" | Propose to use "noncontiguous 80+80 MHz VHT transmission" throughout | Accepted. Editor please make the proposed change throughout the draft. Based on D3.4: Page 2532, line 32: Change “For a noncontiguous transmission using two 80 MHz frequency segments” to “For a noncontiguous 80+80 MHz transmission”Page 2533, line 19: Change “For a noncontiguous transmission using two 80 MHz frequency segments” to “For a noncontiguous 80+80 MHz transmission”Page 2569, line 38: Change “For a noncontiguous transmission using two 80 MHz frequency segments” to “For a noncontiguous 80+80 MHz transmission”Page 2581, line 60: Change “In a noncontiguous transmission consisting of two 80 MHz frequency segments nonadjacent in frequency” to “In a noncontiguous 80+80 MHz transmission”  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3385 | 8.4.2.157.3 | 1032 | 7 | Not clear whether the Supported VHT-MCS and NSS Set field refers to per-user or total N\_SS, in the case of MU-MIMO | Suggest it be per-user | Revised. Editor please make the following change on pg 1032 ln 10: “The Supported VHT-MCS and NSS Set field is used to convey the combinations of VHT-MCSs and spatialstreams that a STA supports for reception and the combinations that it supports for transmission to a user. |