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Abstract

This submission proposes comment resolutions of MAC frame format style comments from TGah Draft 4.0.

* CIDs: 6026, 6027, 6028, 6029, 6030, 6031, 6032, 6033, 6034, 6035, 6036, 6037, 6038, 6039, 6115, 6102, 6103, 6104, 6105, 6106, 6107, 6108, 6109, 6110, 6114 (25 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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6026 | 95.07 | 6.3.3.5 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Revised-  Specifying [; otherwise not present] is not a mandatory from 802.11 Style Guide.  But, specifying the false condition of MIB variable is no harmful.  So, agree in principle.  But, because the clause number does not match with a comment and it is good to change all cases throughout Draft 4.0, please follow the editing instruction in this document.  TGah editor to make the changes shown in 11-15/0265r3 under all headings that include CID 6026. |
| 6027 | 95.11 | 6.3.3.5 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Revised-  Specifying [; otherwise not present] is not a mandatory from 802.11 Style Guide.  But, specifying the false condition of MIB variable is no harmful.  So, agree in principle.  But, because the clause number does not match with a comment and it is good to change all cases throughout Draft 4.0, please follow the editing instruction in this document.  TGah editor to make the changes shown in 11-15/0265r3 under all headings that include CID 6027. |
| 6028 | 95.14 | 6.3.3.5 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6029 | 96.26 | 8.3.3.6 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6030 | 96.29 | 8.3.3.6 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6031 | 97.08 | 8.3.3.7 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6032 | 97.11 | 8.3.3.7 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6033 | 97.14 | 8.3.3.7 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6034 | 97.26 | 8.3.3.7 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Revised-  Specifying [; otherwise not present] is not a mandatory from 802.11 Style Guide.  But, specifying the false condition of MIB variable is no harmful.  So, agree in principle.  But, because the page and line numbers do not match with a comment and it is good to change all cases throughout Draft 4.0, please follow the editing instruction in this document.  TGah editor to make the changes shown in 11-15/0265r3 under all headings that include CID 6034. |
| 6035 | 97.29 | 8.3.3.7 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Revised-  Specifying [; otherwise not present] is not a mandatory from 802.11 Style Guide.  But, specifying the false condition of MIB variable is no harmful.  So, agree in principle.  But, because the page and line numbers do not match with a comment and it is good to change all cases throughout Draft 4.0, please follow the editing instruction in this document.  TGah editor to make the changes shown in 11-15/0265r3 under all headings that include CID 6035. |
| 6036 | 98.26 | 8.3.3.8 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6037 | 98.30 | 8.3.3.8 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6038 | 100.21 | 8.3.4 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6039 | 100.25 | 8.3.4 | The presence of fields is not specified if the MIB variable in the Notes is equal to false | Add "ohterwise it is not present" at the en | Accepted |
| 6115 | 96.20 | 8.3.3.6 | dot11ShortMACHeaderOptionImplemented or dot11PV1MACHeaderOptionImplemented. It should be dot11PV1MACHeaderOptionImplemented. See clause 9.55 | Replace "dot11ShortMACHeaderOptionImplemented" with "dot11PV1MACHeaderOptionImplemented" throughout the draft. | Accepted |
| 6102 | 15.28 | 6.3.3.2.3 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6103 | 22.37 | 6.3.7.2.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6104 | 24.24 | 6.3.7.3.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6105 | 26.36 | 6.3.7.4.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6106 | 29.32 | 6.3.7.5.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6107 | 31.35 | 6.3.8.2.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6108 | 33.50 | 6.3.8.3.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6109 | 35.42 | 6.3.8.4.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6110 | 38.32 | 6.3.8.5.2 | "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" misspelled in Description of new table entry for RelayActivation | Replace with "dot11RelaySTAcCapable" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Replace “dot11RelaySTAcCapable” with “dot11RelaySTACapable”.  (There is 9 occurances in clause 6) |
| 6114 | 57.31 | 6.3.111 | The Header compression procedure is negotiated between two STAs (does not matter whether AP or STA, see 9.51). Hence the classifications here are inconsistent. | In P57L31: Replace "AP with which it is associated" with " peer MAC entity".  In P58L26: Replace "AP" with "peer MAC entity".  In P58L40, P59L6, P60L6: Remove "non-AP".  In P60L30: Replace "non-AP STA" with "peer MAC entity". | Accepted |

**Propose:**

Revised for CID 6026, 6027, 6034, 6035, per discussion and editing instructions in 11-15/0265r3.

***TGah editor: add “ohterwise it is not present." at the end of the following sentences.***

* *Page 94, Line 46*
* *Page 94, Line 49*
* *Page 94, Line 56*
* *Page 94, Line 61*
* *Page 95, Line 7*
* *Page 95, Line 11*
* *Page 95, Line 14*
* *Page 95, Line 56*
* *Page 95, Line 63*
* *Page 96, Line 14*
* *Page 96, Line 17*
* *Page 96, Line 26*
* *Page 96, Line 29*
* *Page 96, Line 45*
* *Page 96, Line 58*
* *Page 96, Line 61*
* *Page 97, Line 8*
* *Page 97, Line 11*
* *Page 97, Line 14*
* *Page 97, Line 56*
* *Page 97, Line 64*
* *Page 98, Line 14*
* *Page 98, Line 17*
* *Page 98, Line 26*
* *Page 98, Line 30*
* *Page 98, Line 45*
* *Page 98, Line 48*
* *Page 98, Line 51*
* *Page 99, Line 4*
* *Page 99, Line 7*
* *Page 99, Line 11*
* *Page 99, Line 56*
* *Page 99, Line 59*
* *Page 99, Line 62*
* *Page 100, Line 4*
* *Page 100, Line 7*
* *Page 100, Line 11*
* *Page 100, Line 21*
* *Page 100, Line 25*