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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions of comments received from TGah 1st Sponsor Recirculation Ballot (TGah Draft 6.0).

* CIDs: 9069, 9068 (2 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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9069 | 0.00 | 0 | The reason given to reject comments i-232 i-231 i-230 i-229 i-228 i-227 i-226 i-225 i-223 i-221 confirm that the definition violates the IEEE-SA requirement for what is part of a detinition of a term; "informative information" would in fact be explicitly prohibited from the definition.  "Each definition should be a brief, self-contained description of the term in question and shall  not contain any other information, such as requirements or elaborative text. The term should not be used in its own definition."  THus the BRC is confirming that the text identified as inappropriate is "elaborative text" and should be removed. | Remove all "elaborative text" that may, or may not, state a requirement. |  |

**Discussion:**

According to the IEEE-SA Standards Style Manual (see the below),

**10.6.3 Construction of the definitions clause**

A definitions clause is typically Clause 3 (unless the standard does not contain normative references, in which case the definitions clause would be Clause 2). Definitions should appear in alphabetical order, and the term defined should be written out completely and should not be inverted (e.g., “*drift rate*” rather than “*rate, drift*”). Each definition should be a brief, self-contained description of the term in question and **shall not contain any other information, such as requirements or elaborative text**. The term should not be used in its own definition.

In the initial Sponsor Ballot comments (i-232 i-231 i-230 i-229 i-228 i-227 i-226 i-225 i-223 i-221), the commenter asked to remove the “TXVECTOR parameter X equal to Y” phrase in a definion because it is an informative wording.

For example, a suggestion was to remove “(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1)” from the below definition.

**1 MHz mask physical layer protocol data unit (PPDU):** A PPDU that is transmitted using the 1 MHz transmit spectral mask defined in Clause 23 and that is a 1 MHz sub 1 GHz (S1G) PPDU ~~(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1)~~.

But, IEEE 802.11 baseline specification is also popularly using the same phrase as the following:

**40 MHz physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU):** A 40 MHz high throughput (HT) PPDU (TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to HT\_CBW40) or a 40 MHz non-HT duplicate PPDU (TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to NON\_HT\_CBW40 or TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW40), or a 40 MHz very high throughput (VHT) PPDU (TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW40).

The TGah BRC is asking a feedback from IEEE 802.11 EDITORs whether the comment should be accepted or not.

If IEEE 802.11 EDITORs agree on the comment, the TGah BRC proposes the resolution as the following:

**Resolution: Revised**

TGah Editor inserts the following editing instruction at the beginning of Clause 3.

“Remove the following TXVECTOR related phrases throughout the clause 3 of the baseline draft.

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to HT\_CBW40)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to NON\_HT\_CBW40)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW160)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW80+80)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW80)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW40)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW20)

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to NON\_HT\_CBW40 or TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW40)”

And TGah Editor removes the the following TXVECTOR related phrases throughout the clause 3 of the TGah Draft 6.0

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1).

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW2).

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW4).

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW8).

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW16).

Straw Poll: IEEE 802.11 EDITORs agree that the TXVECTOR related phrases in clause 3 are a violation of the requiremetns of IEEE-SA?

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9068 | 6.00 | 3.2 | The resolution to i-235 states that what the BRC "believes" but does not alter tha fact that the draft is in violation of the IEEE style manual as stated in the initial comment. The comment identifies extra information which may (or may not) be statement of requirements. It is cleary "extra information" and not part of the definition of the TERM, but charcteristics of the thing the to which the term refers. "because we didn't use shall" is not a valid response to the comment. The defintion vilolates the requiremetns of IEEE-SA. | Delete all text starting with "that consists of" through the end of the definition. |  |

**Discussion:**

In the initial Sponsor Ballot comments (i-235), the commenter asked to delete all text starting with "that consists of" through the end of the definition.

For example, see an example.

**sub 1 GHz modulation and coding scheme (S1G-MCS):** A specification of the S1G physical layer (PHY) parameters that consists of modulation order (e.g., BPSK, QPSK, 16-QAM, 64-QAM, 256-QAM) and forward error correction (FEC) coding rate (e.g., 1/2 rep2, 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 5/6) that is used in an S1G PHY protocol data unit (PPDU).

But, IEEE 802.11 baseline specification is also popularly using the same phrase as the following:

**high throughput (HT) modulation and coding scheme (HT-MCS):** A specification of the HT physical layer (PHY) parameters that consists of modulation order (e.g., BPSK, QPSK, 16-QAM, 64-QAM), forward error correction (FEC) coding rate (e.g., 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 5/6) and number of spatial streams (NSS) and that is used in an HT PHY protocol data unit (PPDU).

**very high throughput modulation and coding scheme (VHT-MCS):** A specification of the VHT physical layer (PHY) parameters that consists of modulation order (e.g., BPSK, QPSK, 16-QAM, 64-QAM, 256-QAM) and forward error correction (FEC) coding rate (e.g., 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 5/6) and that is used in a VHT PHY protocol data unit (PPDU).

**modulation and coding scheme (MCS):** A specification of the physical layer (PHY) parameters that consists of modulation order (e.g., BPSK, QPSK, 16-QAM, 64-QAM, and 256-QAM) and forward error correction (FEC) coding rate (e.g., 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 5/6) and, depending on the context, the number of spacetime streams.

The TGah BRC is asking a feedback from IEEE 802.11 EDITORs whether “…that consists of…” is a violation of the requiremetns of IEEE-SA or not.

If IEEE 802.11 EDITORs agree that it is a violation of the requiremetns of IEEE-SA, please suggest any proposed wording.

Straw Poll: IEEE 802.11 EDITORs agree that “…that consists of…” in clause 3 is a violation of the requiremetns of IEEE-SA?