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Abstract:

This document contains comment resolutions on the following CIDs for 27.3.10.7 and the proposed specification changes are in draft 5.1:

22384, 22385, 22409, 22410, 22411, and 22453

.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 22384 | 27.3.10.7.2 | 552 | 12 | CID 20728. But the quote from "page 411" indicates that the only exceptional case is an HE ER SU PPDU. Table 27-20 is about HE MU PPDUs, so the proposed change was correct | In Table 27-20 for UL/DL change "Set to the value indicated by the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG." to "Set to 1 if the HE PPDU is addressed to an AP. Set to 0 otherwise. See the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG." | Revised.  11ax editor, please see the discussion for instructions of CID 20738 in doc IEEE 802.11-19/1127r0. |

**Discussions for CID 386:**

***TGax Editor: Please make the following changes (changed texts are in red) in the line 12-14, page 552 of D5.1***:

Indicates whether the PPDU is sent UL or DL. ~~Set to the value indicated by the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG.~~ Set to 1 if the PPDU is addressed to an AP. Set to 0 otherwise. See the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG."

***TGax Editor: Please make the following changes (changed texts are in red) in the line 21-22, page 548 of D5.1***:

Indicates whether the PPDU is sent UL or DL. ~~Set to the value indicated by the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG.~~ Set to 1 if the PPDU is addressed to an AP. Set to 0 otherwise. See the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG."

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| **22385** | 27.3.10.7.2 |  |  | CID 20728/20729/20730. The HE-SIG field content tables should not be in terms of what the TXVECTOR was set to at the transmitter, since this is invisible and irrelevant to the receiver. What matters is that each possible field value means | Remove the references to TXVECTOR parameters from the HE-SIG field content tables (or only have them as a "see"). Instead describe what the meaning of each allowed field value is (e.g. UL/DL for MU PPDU is 1 if addressed to AP and 0 otherwise; "Set to 127 to indicate no duration information if TXVECTOR parameter TXOP\_DURATION is [set to] UNSPECIFIED." -> "Set to 127 to indicate no duration information." | Rejected:  CID20728 has been resolved in previous comment resolution.  CID20729 had been resolved in draft D4.2.  CID20730:  For UL/DL, Midamble, Periodicity, and TXOP, they are already fixed in resolutions for comments 20727, 20728 and 20729.  For BSS color, it is a very long description that described in details in Txvector. |
| **22411** | 27.3.10.7.2 |  |  | CID 20941. Well, if per the resolution "In some of the text, "PPDU with DCM" means the DCM applied to HE-SIGB." then it's even worse! | Change "HE PPDU with DCM" to "HE PPDU with DCM applied to the HE-SIG-B and/or Data field" throughout the spec. | Accepted |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 22409 | 27.3.10.7.2 |  |  | CID 20936. Resolution asserts that the proposed not is "not necessary. The note does not add further clarifications.", but the NOTE does clarify the ambiguity identified in the comment, an ambiguity which is both in the resolution to CID 16139 and in the referenced definitions from Clause 3 | Make the changes proposed for CID 20936 | Rejected.  This CID has been resolved in 1127/r4 |
| 22410 |  |  |  | CID 20936. The proposed change to Table 27-20--HE-SIG-A field of an HE MU PPDU has been ignored in the resolution | Make the changes proposed for CID 20936 | Rejected.  This CID has been resolved in 1127/r4 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| |  | | --- | | 22453 | | 27.3.10.7.2 | 553 | 32 | Need to address what to set if none of these (if) conditions is met, given the number of OFDM symbols in the HE\_SIG-B field >=16. (Follow up on the disposition of CID 21412)   |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | | Please clarify and update as needed. | | Rejected:  The text clearly say the conditions for B18-B21 set to 15.  It is impossible to set a number greater than 15 given 4 bits. |