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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for multiple comments related to TGba D2.0 with the following CIDs (43 CIDs):

* 2270, 2271, 2272, 2279, 2280
* 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285
* 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2291
* 2292, 2293, 2295, 2296, 2297
* 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2307
* 2308, 2309, 2312, 2340
* 2343, 2345, 2346, 2353, 2355
* 2357, 2363, 2364, 2105, 2366
* 2368, 2369, 2395

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 2: Reviewed CIDs through 2283. Made minor changes to the resolutions during the call on 4/22.
* Rev 3: Reviewed CIDs through 2105. Made minor changes to the resolutions during the call on 4/29.

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2270 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.3.1 | 92 | 8 | add Nsym or N\_octet and PSDU\_LENGTH need to be added for FDMA transmission. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0. |
| 2271 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.3.1 | 91 | 48 | If N\_octet is required like N\_sym in other specs, define N\_octet in this subclause | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0. |
| 2272 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.12.4 | 87 | 8 | Receiver maximum input level for 4.9 GHz not defined. Add a value for 4.9 GHz. If it's the same as 5 GHz then state 4.9 GHz and 5 GHz. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the TGba functional requirement document (11-17/39r2), TGba R5 reads “TGba R5 The 802.11ba amendment shall define operations for 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz bands.”  Therefore, there is no need to define the receiver maximum input level for 4.9 GHz.  Moreover, It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  The comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0. |
| 2279 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 69 | 29 | "... non-punctured 20MHz sub-channel is shorter than L\_LENGTH described in 32.3.1 ....". The usage of "shorter than L\_LENGTH" is not accurate as L\_LENGTH is the the calculated length based on 6Mbps rate. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised.  Agree in principle that the L\_LENGTH should be replaced with “the length indicated by the L\_LENGTH field”.  TGba editor to make the changes shown in doc.: IEEE doc.: IEEE 802.11-19/0644r3 under all headings that include CID 2279. |
| 2280 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 69 | 23 | 20 MHz channel and 20 MHz sub-channel mixed in use through the spec. fix it. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The 20 MHz subchannel is used to indicate each 20 MHz channel within 40 or 80 MHz channel bandwidth when the WUR FDMA PPDU is used. The 20 MHz channel is used for the WUR PPDU defined in 31.2.2 WUR PPDU format. |
| 2281 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 69 | 22 | "20 MHz preamble", "40 MHz preamble" and "80 MHz preamble" are inaccurate terms. The sentence is also not correct grammatically. Because of the phase rotations, it is not exactly duplication. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined. The commenter doesn’t say why the terms are inaccurate.  The phase rotation is applied after the WUR FDMA PPDU formation. Therefore the duplication is still correct.  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0. |
| 2282 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 69 | 22 | "In each 20MHz sub-channel with duplicated 20MHz preample, one 4MHz WUR signal centered in the 20MHz sub-channel is transmitted is transmitted following the 20MHz preamble." the sentense contains redundant information and does not read very clear. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined. The commenter doesn’t specify which part of the sentence is redundant.  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0.  Moreover, the quoted sentence is not correct. In D2.1, it reads “In each 20 MHz subchannel with duplicated 20 MHz preamble, one WUR signal centered in the 20 MHz subchannel is transmitted following the 20 MHz preamble.” |
| 2283 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 69 |  | The last paragraph repeats the descriptions in 32.2.4.8 (Construction of the WUR-Sync and WUR-Data for the FDMA transmission), page 76, line 12-16. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0.  The comment is not correct.  The following paragraph in D1.0 P69:  “In FDMA transmission, the WUR transmission on each non-punctured 20MHz sub-channel has equal duration of transmission, and if the duration of WUR transmission on any of the non-punctured 20MHz subchannels is shorter than L\_LENGTH described in 32.3.1 (TXTIME and PSDU length calculation), the padding is used to ensure that WUR transmissions on each non-punctured 20MHz sub-channel always have the length indicated by the LENGTH field in the L-SIG.”  does not repeat the following paragraph in 32.2.4.8 P76 L12-16 in D1.0:  “e) Append the padding on non-punctured 20 MHz subchannel: If the duration of WUR transmission on any non-punctured 20 MHz subchannel is shorter than the indicated L\_LENGTH as described in 31.3.1 (TXTIME and PSDU length calculation), generate the padding according to 31.2.11 (WUR Padding field for a WUR FDMA PPDU) to align the length indicated by the LENGTH field in the L-SIG, and the padding is not applied to the punctured 20 MHz subchannel.”  In D2.0 the texts didn’t change and the two paragraphs do not repeat one against another. |
| 2284 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 68 | 59 | In Figure 32-2, the width (vertically) of the blocks for "Duplication of 20 MHz Preamble" indicates channel bandwidth, but the width of the blocks for "FDMA WUR Signal" indicates the signal bandwidth (4MHz). This representation of the PPDU format is confusing. The same comment for Figure 32-3. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The figure 32-2 and 32-3 in D1.0 are changed to have same widths in D2.1. The comment does not apply anymore. |
| 2285 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 68 | 49 | "WUR FDMA PPDU for 40MHz channel widths", and "WUR FDMA PPDU for 80MHz channel widths", the usage of "channel widths" is not consistent with later part of the draft | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0.  The comment does not explain where the inconsistency is regarding the usage of “channel widths” |
| 2286 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2.2 | 68 | 49 | "channel bandwidth" should be "channel bandwidths". | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised.  The “channel bandwidth” in the following sentence in P96L3 in D2.1 “The examples of WUR FDMA PPDUs with 40 MHz and 80 MHz channel bandwidth are illustrated in Figure 31-2 (An example of a WUR FDMA PPDU for 40 MHz channel widths(#2517)) and Figure 31-3 (An  example of a WUR FDMA PPDU for 80 MHz channel widths(#2517)), respectively” should be changed to “channel bandwidths”.  Instruction to TGba editor: replace “channel bandwidth” in P96L3 in D2.1 to “channel bandwidths”. |
| 2287 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 67 | 43 | Need to add an entry on WUR PSDU length for PHY to compute the L-Length | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The entry on PSDU\_LENGTH is added in D2.0 and this comment doesn’t apply anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2288 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 67 | 40 | Given two Format with WUR and WUR\_FDMA in FORMAT parameter in this table, Otherwise Condition means FORMAT is WUR\_FDMA which has nothing to do with Table 19-1. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the Otherwise condition doesn’t exist in D2.0 anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2289 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 67 | 25 | WUR\_DATARATE parameter in Table 32-1 is either undefined or not correctly defined for WUR\_FDMA format | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the WUR\_DATARATE parameter is defined for WUR\_FDMA in D2.0.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2291 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 67 | 22 | WUR FDMA PPDU may carry WUR frames using different data rates in different sub-channels. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0. |
| 2292 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 67 | 19 | Given two Format with WUR and WUR\_FDMA in FORMAT parameter in this table, Otherwise Condition means FORMAT is WUR\_FDMA which has nothing to do with Table 19-1. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the Otherwise condition doesn’t exist in D2.0 anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2293 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 67 | 12 | CHANNEL\_ BANDWIDTH parameter in Table 32-1 is confusing. In the condition, it is mentioned the FORMAT is WUR, but in value field the description is provided for both WUR and WUR\_FDMA | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the text “FORMAT is WUR” doesn’t exist in D2.0 anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2295 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 66 | 58 | Given two Format with WUR and WUR\_FDMA in FORMAT parameter in this table, Otherwise Condition means FORMAT is WUR\_FDMA which has nothing to do with Table 19-1. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the Otherwise condition doesn’t exist in D2.0 anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2296 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 66 | 54 | L\_DATARATE parameter in Table 32-1 is either undefined or not correctly defined for WUR\_FDMA format | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the L\_DATARATE is defined for WUR\_FDMA in D2.0.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2297 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 66 | 47 | Given two Format with WUR and WUR\_FDMA in FORMAT parameter in this table, Otherwise Condition means FORMAT is WUR\_FDMA which has nothing to do with Table 19-1 and Table 21-1. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the Otherwise condition doesn’t exist in D2.0 anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2298 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 66 | 43 | L\_LENGTH parameter in Table 32-1 is either undefined or not correctly defined for WUR\_FDMA format | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the L\_LENGTH is defined for WUR\_FDMA in D2.0.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2299 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 66 | 41 | The L\_LENGTH parameter may be necessary. Because the PHY can calculate the TXTIME only after receiving the PSDU. But, the MAC can deliver the PSDU after the L-SIG transmission. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the text “Not present” doesn’t exist in D2.0 anymore.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2300 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 66 | 38 | The way to define "WUR PPDU format" using "WUR" may cause confusing since it may mean both single (or non-FDMA) WUR PPDU format and WUR FDMA PPDU. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised.  WUR PPDU is now changed to WUR Basic PPDU.  TGba editor to make the following change throughout draft 2.1: Change the WUR PPDU where it refers to the transmission over 20MHz single channel to WUR Basic PPDU. |
| 2301 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1.2 | 66 | 23 | In all the relevant entries in Tabl 32\_1, in the condition column, "Format is WUR" shoud also include the case of WUR\_FDMA. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 since the condition column already includes the case of WUR\_FDMA.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2307 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 65 | 44 | "The Wake-up radio PHY subcarriers are modulated using the Multicarrier On-Off Keying (MC-OOK) and the BPSK, QPSK, 16-QAM, 64-QAM, and 256-QAM are used for the coefficient of Wake-up radio PHY subcarriers."-- How to generate OOK waveform is up to implementation, multicarrier with BPSK, QPSK,... are just examples, as also stated in 32.2.3. Even if Tx use other modulation methods to generate the ON waveform, interop is still guranteed. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 anymore since the text in D1.0 in the comment is changed in D2.0 as follows: “The WUR PHY uses the Multicarrier On-Off Keying (MC-OOK) modulation, and the coefficients of WUR  PHY subcarriers may take values from the BPSK, QPSK, 16-QAM, 64-QAM, or 256-QAM constellation  Symbols”  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2308 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 65 | 26 | This paragraph is redundant to the last sentence in the first paragraph in subclause 32.1 And the statement in this paragraph is less accurate. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The same style is being used in other amendments. For example, in 802.11ax D4.1, P445L9-L43, the same style is being used. The first paragraph in P83L14 in 802.11ba D2.0 is to indicate that the WUR PHY is capable of transmitting and receiving PPDUs that are compliant with Clause 17 OFDM PHY and the sentence in P83L22 is to indicate the WUR PHY design is based on Clause 17 (e.g. reuse of L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG and so on). |
| 2309 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.1 | 65 | 10 | "a STA that supports WUR PHY specification shall be capable of transmitting and receiving PPDUs that are compliant with the mandatory requirements of ... Clause 17"? So, a WUR radio (PHY) has to be capable of 11a? That doesn't make sense. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    The comment is asking a question. It is not proposing a change that can in any sense be interpreted as “specific wording”  Moreover, the comment should be made on 802.11ba D2.0 for the current letter ballot, not on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2312 | MARC EMMELMANN | 32.2 | 65 | 1 | What is a mandatory requirement of the WUR PPDU transmission? The spec describes too many implementation dependent issues. Please clearly specify the requirement with "shall" sentence. And, remove other implementation dependent texts. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The WUR transmit specification is defined in subclause 31.2.12 in D2.1 WUR transmit specification with “shall” sentences. |
| 2340 | MARC EMMELMANN | 31.8 | 59 | 32 | There are some redundancies across this subclause in terms of normative behavior and descriptions. Please ensure that duplicates and redundant descriptions are removed. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined. The comment doesn’t specify which part is redundant descriptions. |
| 2343 | MARC EMMELMANN | 31.2 | 49 | 20 | Since an AP by definition is an entity that contains one STA and provides access to the DSS via the WM and a STA is defined as a logical entity that is a singly addressable instance of a MAC and PHY interface to the WM. Once an AP configures a BSS the frequency and bandwidth of the BSS are fixed, until the BSS is reconfigured. I don't believe that it is the intent of WUR to reconfigure the BSS of the AP that will be transmitting WUR PPDUs, hence the channel BW and frequency of the BSS (AP) will not change dynamically with WUR activity. Therefore the BW and channel configuration of the BSS (AP) are fixed by standard 802.11 configuration processes and the WUR capabilities simply overlay the standard 802.11 requirements. Therefore, there is no need to define a WUR primary channel, or the WUR secondary channel - these channels are simply the channel(s) defined by the BSS. Further, I believe there is no intent to change the current 802.11 BSS channel access rules or behavior. Therefore, The Channel access rules should not be different for WUR PPDU transmission. Therefore the specification should simply say so. Since a WUR PPDU is not ACK in a standard manner and the ACK may have significant time delay the AP should behave as if an ACK was received for any WUR PPDU that has been transmitted. The management of retransmission should be left to whatever entity is requesting the WUR PPDU to be transmitted. Also this entity should provide the AC for sending each WUR PPDU as well as the content for the WUR PPDU. The process should not undermine the EDCAF by making a special case for WRU PPDUs, other than assuming that all transmitted WUR PPDUs where successfully ACKed. This will allow the entity the transmission of WUR PPDUs to be transmitted just like any other PPDU. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 anymore since the text in D1.0 no longer exist in D2.0.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot |
| 2345 | MARC EMMELMANN | 9.10.3.3 | 44 | 59 | Is it transmit ID or transmitter's ID | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 anymore since the text in D1.0 no longer exist in D2.0. The text in D2.0 reads “transmitter ID”.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2346 | MARC EMMELMANN | 9.10.3.2 | 44 | 7 | Evaluate if sending only 8 MSBs of the PPN is sufficient to protect broadcast WUR Wake Up frames. If it is possible then allow the TD Control to carry the 8 MSBs of the PPN when the frame is broadcast and protected. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined. |
| 2353 | MARC EMMELMANN | 9.4.2.273 | 31 | 31 | WUR AP shouldn't let the WUR STAs decide the On Duration and Duty Cycle Period values. Instead, a WUR STA should just indicate the preferred WUR duty-ratio in Table 9-318e, based on the power saving that it wishes. Then, the AP decides on the values of the On Duration, Duty Cycle Period, and Starting Time of the WUR Duty Cycle for this WUR STA, taking into the consideration of these parameters for other WUR STAs. Right now, the WUR AP can only decide on the value of the Starting Time of the WUR Duty Cycle. That is insufficient for the AP to optomize the WUR operations. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The definitions already clearly describe that the On Duration field indicates the “preferred On Duration” and the Duty Cycle Period field indicates the “preferred” elapsed time between the start times of two successive WUR duty cycle schedules. The final decision of the WUR mode setup is made by a WUR AP. The comment fails to identify the issue. |
| 2355 | MARC EMMELMANN |  | 30 | 16 | Sentence "Indicates the channel offset to be transmitted the WUR Wake-up frame relative to the WUR primary channel (see 31.9 (WUR FDMA operation))." in table 9-318c needs rewording | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 anymore since the text in D1.0 no longer exist in D2.0. The text in D2.0 reads “Indicates the offset of the WUR channel on which WUR Wakeup frames are transmitted relative to the WUR primary channel (see 30.10 (WUR FDMA operation)).”.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2357 | MARC EMMELMANN | 9.3.3.3 | 23 | 53 | Please avoid Beacon Bloat. The WUR Operation element may not be needed in all Beacon frames. Also if the element is present in the beacons the same parameter values are applied for all devices. This may not be desired; non-AP STAs hould br able to have unique, own WUR sleed and awake periods. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The WUR Operation element may be present in a Beacon frame when dot11WUROptionImplemented is true. Therefore the WUR Operation element is not always present in a Beacon frame. The information in the WUR Operation element applies to all associated WUR non-AP STAs. The WUR Mode element contains a WUR non-AP STA specific information. The preferred duty cycle is provided by a WUR non-AP STA. Therefore, same parameter values are not applied to all WUR non-AP STAs. |
| 2363 | MARC EMMELMANN | 3.4 | 19 | 62 | TWBTT is not used often in the draft and hence does not merit an acronym - please just spell it out where it is used. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  TWBTT is used 10 times in 802.11ba D2.0. Therefore it is reasonable to have TWBTT as an acronym. |
| 2364 | MARC EMMELMANN | 3.4 | 19 | 59 | The definition of PCR seems to be very vague. Isn't a PCR an 802.11 STA? Is the PCR a specific non-AP STA that has negotiated with an associated WUR AP to have a WUR configuration and hence a WUR ID associated with it? If so it should be defined as such. If not how is it different from a non-AP STA? I am unaware of any functionality of a PCR that is not currently in a non-AP STA, I don't think there shouldn't be two names for the same entity. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The comment doesn’t apply to D2.0 anymore since the text “PCR” in D1.0 no longer exist in D2.0.  This comment is invalid comment since the comment is on the previous failed letter ballot on 802.11ba D1.0 and the commenter didn’t read D2.0 and simply copy/pasted the previous comment from the previous failed letter ballot. |
| 2105 | Eduard Garcia Villegas |  |  |  | In document 17/0029r10, the TG approves the list of usage models that the new amendment resulting from P802.11ba should enable. D1.0 does not yet define the whole set of mechanisms/functionalities needed to satisfy those usage models, and the same comment applies to D2.0. Initial comment was rejected due to lack of consensus, but the issue was not really discussed within the TG. |  | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  Response to the commenter: the usage model document (11-17/29r10) defines nine usage models as follows and the defined usage models are supported by 802.11ba D2.0 as follows:  1. smart home – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  2. warehouse – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  3. outdoor cattle farms – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  4. sensor network synchronized wake up – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx, duty-cycle wake-up operation, group ID, group addressed wake-up frame  5. wearable devices unsynchronized wake up – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  6. wearable devices reconnection – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  7. moving goods tracking wake up – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx, group ID, group addressed wake-up frame  8. wake up vehicle-to-pedestrian radio – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  9. smart scanning – supported by WUR Discovery operation |
| 2366 | MARC EMMELMANN | 4.3.15a |  |  | In document 17/0029r10, the TG approves the list of usage models that the new amendment resulting from P802.11ba should enable. D1.0 does not yet define the whole set of mechanisms/functionalities needed to satisfy those usage models. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined.  Response to the commenter: the usage model document (11-17/29r10) defines nine usage models as follows and the defined usage models are supported by 802.11ba D2.0 as follows:  1. smart home – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  2. warehouse – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  3. outdoor cattle farms – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  4. sensor network synchronized wake up – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx, duty-cycle wake-up operation, group ID, group addressed wake-up frame  5. wearable devices unsynchronized wake up – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  6. wearable devices reconnection – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  7. moving goods tracking wake up – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx, group ID, group addressed wake-up frame  8. wake up vehicle-to-pedestrian radio – supported by WUR PPDU Tx/Rx  9. smart scanning – supported by WUR Discovery operation |
| 2368 | MARC EMMELMANN | General |  |  | Relevant to the security and privacy, implications include wake up procedures. Hostile wake ups can have serious concerns over battery drainage and false functioning of systems in case of association with the attacker. Intruder can eavesdrop privacy information in WUR packets. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  The security and privacy are addressed by the protected WUR frame defind in Clause 30.9 Protected WUR frames in 802.11ba D2.1. |
| 2369 | MARC EMMELMANN | 9.4.2.5 |  |  | Although a WURx doesn't operate using TIM element, it is worth to indicate whether there is buffered traffic to a non-AP STA having WURx. If such STA is operating in PCR and sees that there is indication, then the STA can tell the AP that it is currently operating in PCR. The mismatch of state recognition can be fixed. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  A WUR AP indicates whether there is buffered traffic to a WUR non-AP STA in a TIM element in a Beacon frame. A WUR non-AP STA utilizes a TIM element in a Beacon frame when it is in the awake state. |
| 2395 | Mark RISON |  |  |  | Running the 11ba/D2.0 ballot with significant overlap with 11ax and 11ay ballots does not allow for proper review and hence is not conducive to what should be the desired outcome of a technically and editorially sound amendment | Do not run a ballot on what is an amendment in the early stages of its process (non-recirculation letter ballot) with significant overlap with any other ballot | Rejected.  Based on the comment resolution guide document 11-11/1625r2, this is an invalid comment.    It fails to locate and identify the issue in 802.11ba D2.0.It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes can be determined. |

**31.2.3 WUR FDMA PPDU format**

**TGba Editor: *Change the sentence below in TGba Draft 2.1 as follows: (#2279)***

In FDMA transmission, the WUR transmission on each non-punctured 20 MHz subchannel has equal duration of transmission, and if the duration of WUR transmission on any of the non-punctured 20 MHz subchannels is shorter than the length indicated by the L\_LENGTH field described in 31.3.1 (TXTIME and PSDU length calculation), then padding is used to ensure that WUR transmissions on each non-punctured 20 MHz subchannel always have the length indicated by the LENGTH field in the L-SIG.