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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for comments:

13342, 13401, 11898, 13338, 13340, 13341, 13343, 13344

From the letter ballot of TGax D2.0.

Changes relative to D2.2

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **Page/Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 13342 | Ron Porat | 27.12 | 309.00 | The text is not explict which PPE threshold values to use for RU 106 + DCM. There are two interpretations: 1) 0, because RU106 falls outside the RU set that has PPE threshold values defined. 2) The PPE threshold values belonging to RU 242, due to the 'b+1' formula. The text needs to clarify this. | Make it more explicit and clear. | Revised  Editor: Please make the changes shown in document 11-18-0469r0 |
| 13401 | Ron Porat | 9.4.2.237.5 | 149.10 | Packet extension should be enabled for RU<242 in order to harmonize the design with RU>=242 and limit power consumption | change in the column 'RU allocation size' of table 9-262ad the number 242 to 'less than or equal to 242' | Revised.  Editor: Please make the changes shown in document 11-18-0469r0 |
| 11898 | Hongyuan Zhang | 9.4.2.237.5 | 147.65 | In Table 9-262ad (RU Allocation Index), RUs that are smaller than RU242 is not present, this means that PE shall always be 0 for these smaller RUs? | Add a note saying "No PE is required for RUs smaller than 242 subcarriers". | Revised.  Editor: Please make the changes shown in document 11-18-0469r0 |
| 13338 | Ron Porat | 9.4.2.237.5 | 148.64 | Previously, variable 'm' was used as max index of RU allocation index 'b' ; where b =[x, ..., m]. Variable 'b' is used to represent RU allocation index in general. | Change RUm to RUb | Accepted.  Editor: Please make the changes in D2.2 153.33 |
| 13340 | Ron Porat | 27.12 | 309.00 | Clarity of the text needs improvement. 'value' is present in middle column but missing in first and third columns. 'm' is introduced only as NSSnRUm subfield, but it is not explicit what m is. | change all columns as  .. RU Allocation index m = (b + DCM) to the ... | Revised.  Editor: Please make the changes shown in document 11-18-0469r0 |
| 13341 | Ron Porat | 27.12 | 309.00 | The text on RU allocation index selection when using DCM is unclear. Adding an example will prevent interpretation errors. | Add a note with an example for RU 242 + DCM, where the PPE threshold values for RU size 484 are to be used. | Revised.  Editor: Please make the changes shown in document 11-18-0469r0 |
| 13343 | Ron Porat | 27.12 | 309.00 | In case of RU 2x996 + DCM, b+1 refers to non-existing entry in the PPE threshold table. | Clarify that for RU 2x996 + DCM the PPE threshold values for RU 2x996 are used. | Revised.  Editor: Please make the changes shown in document 11-18-0469r0 |
| 13344 | Ron Porat | 27.12 | 309.00 | typo | Change"greater than equal" to "greater than or equal to" | Accepted.  Editor: Please make the changes in table 27-10 in D2.2 |

Discussion

The proposed changes in this document clarify the packet extension in relation to the DCM

Editor: Changes for all comments are as follows:

Please make the following changes in section 27.12:

In table 27-10 change RUm to RU(b+DCM)

Add above table 27-10 on page 328.04 the following paragraph:

The meaning in the table of “**RU Allocation index = (*b* + DCM)**” is as follows: with the exception of RU2x996, when DCM is applied in a given RU, the packet extension value is based on the next larger RU size (RU index +1) – e.g. when DCM is applied to RU242, packet extension value for RU484 is used. When DCM is applied to RU106, packet extension value for RU 242 is used. When DCM is applied to RU2x996, packet extension value for RU2x996 is used.

The nominal packet padding value shall be zero for all RU less than 242 unless the RU size is 106 and DCM is enabled.