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Abstract

This submission proposes comment resolutions for the following comments:

8071, 8085, 8087, and 8133.

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** | **Clause Num** | **P** | **L** | **Comment** | **Propose Change** | **Resolution** |
| 8071 | 8.3.1.20 | 91.00 | 36 | "when used in S1G band". That's OK. But presumably there is a figure in the baseline that is unqualified. Also the "band" terminology is somewhat awkward. | Change cited text to "in an S1G STA". Show an edit to the existing figure "in a non-S1G STA". | Revised  Generally agree with the commenter.  TGah editor to change "when used in S1G band" to "in an S1G STA"  TGah editor to change the title of Figure 8-48 to “VHT NDP Announcement frame format in a non-S1G STA” |
| 8085 | 8.4.1.1 | 76.00 | 6 | The control frames are described as being in S1G PPDUs. It is not clear that the control frames do, or do not use PV1 in the Protocol Version field, though the appearance in clause 8.2 suggests that the value is PV0. It is not common practice to have the MAC protocol description be dependent on the type of PHY carrying the MPDU. It prevents forward compatibility with any future PHY that may choose to use these same control frames. | Change all occurrences where a frame described is dependent on being an S1G Control Frame to be indiependent of the PHY and to make use of a new PV value, such as PV1, as is done for the rest of the new frame formats proposed in this amendment. | Rejected  The control frames in S1G PPDUs can have PV1 and PV0 in the Protocol Version field. This is just like data frame can have PV1 and PV0 in the Protocol Version field. |
| 8087 | 8.3.1.1 | 89.00 | 34 | The control frames are described as being in S1G PPDUs. It is not clear that the control frames do, or do not use PV1 in the Protocol Version field, though the appearance in clause 8.2 suggests that the value is PV0. It is not common practice to have the MAC protocol description be dependent on the type of PHY carrying the MPDU. It prevents forward compatibility with any future PHY that may choose to use these same control frames. | Change all occurrences where a frame described is dependent on being an S1G Control Frame to be indiependent of the PHY and to make use of a new PV value, such as PV1, as is done for the rest of the new frame formats proposed in this amendment. | Rejected  The control frames in S1G PPDUs can have PV1 and PV0 in the Protocol Version field. This is just like data frame can have PV1 and PV0 in the Protocol Version field. |
| 8133 | 8.6.4 | 186.00 | 47 | DLS has not been successful in the market place. DLS between sensor class devices is unlikely to work. But if it did work, it wouldn't be used because of the difficulty of supporting power saving.  I suspect the protocol is incomplete regarding setting up DLS when the DLS devices are either on the same relay, or different relays.  I summarise: 1. What's here is incomplete 2. What's here addresses no market need 3. What's here adds unnecessary complexity. | Remove all changes to DLS. | ~~Revised~~  ~~Generally agree with the commenter.~~  ~~TGah Editor remove all DLS from the draft~~  Rejected  It is true that DLS is not widely supported and DLS is not good for power savinfng. However like 11ac, it is good to make DLS working in S1G band. |