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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for comment CID 1 for clause 9.34a.1 of TGaj Draft 0.5.

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1 | 38.1 | 9.34a.1 | It's not proper to define a PCP/AP NOT to do something, because in most cases it's hard to verify. | Modify the paragraph with proper words to clarify a verifiable behavior of PCP/AP under mentioned scenario. | Revised.  Please TGaj editor to modify the 11aj spec D0.5 as proposed in 11-15/0424r0. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Discussion**

The original text in 11aj D0.5 state “The member PCP or AP of a cluster starting on a 1.08 GHz channel shall not allocate QP on 2.16 GHz com­mon channel to transmit its DMG Beacon frame if there is no legacy DMG non-AP or non-PCP STA within its BSS or it does not involve in a synchronization pair with another PCP or AP operating in the adjacent 1.08 GHz channel. Otherwise, the member PCP or AP shall transmit its DMG Beacon frame during its NP of the allocated QP on 2.16 GHz common channel, similar to the S-PCP or S-AP.”

Actually there’s no way to verify whether the member PCP or AP be aware or there’s legacy DMG STA within its BSS. And there’s no way to verify whether the member PCP or AP be aware if there’s a BSS working on adjacent 1.08GHz channel. So there’s no way to verify whether a PCP or AP will follow the statement here.

The intention here is when a cluster decides to start on a 1.08GHz channel, it seams making a parallel decision to be uncompliant with DMG. This might be an implementation choice. But it’s not proper to madate this operation in spec to eliminate the possibility for DMG-compliant deployment.

So the proposed resolution is “Revised” and the proposed modification is as follows.

**Instruction to TGaj Editor: *Modify the first paragraph in page 38 in 11aj spec draft D0.5 as below:***

**9.34a CDMG PCP or AP clustering**

**9.34a.1**

…….

~~The member PCP or AP of a cluster starting on a 1.08 GHz channel shall not allocate QP on 2.16 GHz com­mon channel to transmit its DMG Beacon frame if there is no legacy DMG non-AP or non-PCP STA within its BSS or it does not involve in a synchronization pair with another PCP or AP operating in the adjacent 1.08 GHz channel. Otherwise, t~~The member PCP or AP ~~shall~~may transmit its DMG Beacon frame during its NP of the allocated QP on 2.16 GHz common channel, similar to the S-PCP or S-AP.