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Abstract

This document proposes resolution to CIDs 3510, 3361

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3510 | References to "packet" should be to "PPDU" | Fix in 9.4.2.127.9 DMG Direction Measurement Capabilities field, 10.42.10.6 First Path Beamforming Training (2x) and in PACKET\_TYPE and EDMG\_PACKET\_TYPE throughout. Also change " PACKET-TYPE" to " PPDU\_TYPE" throughout and "EDMG-PACKET-TYPE" to "EDMG\_PPDU\_TYPE" throughout. Also change "the packet type" to "PPDU\_TYPE" in 11.22.6.4.2.1.4 PDMG LOS assessment for EDCA based ranging measurement exchange. Also change "Packet Type" to "PPDU Type" in Table 28-1000--EDMG-A Header fields setting for secure PDMG TRNs (#1173, #2383) |

Discussion: following the rules set in 11-20-0811-01-0ay-Resolution-to-some TGay SB000 Editorial CIDs we propose the following changes:

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “PACKET\_TYPE” with “PPDU\_TYPE”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “Packet Type” with “PPDU Type”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “EDMG\_PACKET\_TYPE” with “EDMG\_PPDU\_TYPE”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “EDMG-PACKET-TYPE” with “EDMG\_PPDU\_TYPE”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “PACKET\_TYPE” with “PPDU\_TYPE”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “PACKET-TYPE” with “PPDU\_TYPE”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “packet type” with “PPDU\_TYPE”***

***TGaz Editor: throughout the draft, replace “NDP packets” with “NDP PPDUs”***

***TGaz Editor: in P101L21 replace*** “BRP-RX packet” ***with*** “BRP-RX PPDU”

***TGaz Editor: in P101L28 replace*** “BRP-RX packets” ***with*** “BRP-RX PPDUs”

***TGaz Editor: in P60L20 replace “***packet***” with “***PPDU***”***

***TGaz Editor: in figure 11-36d TB Ranging availability window with two ISTAs replace “***MU packets”  ***with*** “MU PPDU” ***and “***SU packet” ***with*** “SU PPDU”

***TGaz Editor: in P163L14 replace “***packet***” with “***PPDU***”***

***TGaz Editor: in P164L14 replace “***packet***” with “***PPDU***”***

***TGaz Editor: in 12.13.4, replace “***packet” ***with*** “PPDU”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3361 | 82 | 27 | All the other fields in this section use 126 to mean 'accuracy larger than <add your scale here>", but here 125 means what is elsewhere 126, and 126 means 'no elevation measurement'. But if there is no elevation measurement, then there is no ability to estimate elevation accuracy, so why is the difference between 125 ands 127 even useful | Set accuracy larger than 125x360/2048 as 126, and set 127 as 'no ability to estimate elevation accuracy', as tis also includes the meaning of 125. | Reject: see discussion |

**Discussion:**

This is the offending text:

“The AOA Azimuth Accuracy subfield contains the AOA Azimuth result’s estimated accuracy in 360º/2048 resolution. Accuracy larger than 126×360º/2048 is represented by the value of 126. A value of 127 indicates no ability to estimate azimuth accuracy.

The AOA Elevation Accuracy subfield contains the AOA Elevation result’s estimated accuracy in 360º/2048 resolution. Accuracy larger than 125×360º/2048 is represented by the value 125. Value of 126 indicates no elevation measurement. Value of 127 indicates no ability to estimate elevation accuracy”

Why is there a difference between Azimuth accuracy and Elevation accuracy? The difference is that (there is an assumption) azimuth measurement is always performed while in some cases elevation is not measured (for example if the antenna array has only one line of elements). Therefore, elevation needs two special values, one indicating that no elevation measurement was performed, and one that indicates that there is no capability to estimate the accuracy. Hence the need for two special values vs one special value for azimuth.
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