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##### This submission present proposed resolution for the following CIDs: 319, 298, 330, 297, 336, 338, 347, 320, 388, 264, 306, 470, 300, 280, 477, 327, 476, 478, 254, 450. The proposed changes are based on REVme/D0.0.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 319 |  |  |  | " an SIFS" should be " a SIFS" (12x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

Agree with the proposed change but there are 14, rather than 12, locations in D0.0.

Please replace “an SIFS” with “a SIFS” at the following 14 locations in D0.0:

1920.15, 1920.23, 1921.23, 1921.26, 1922.8, 1922.10, 1922.11, 1922.15, 1922.21, 1922.23, 1922.27, 3464.16, 3464.26, 3479.47.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 298 |  |  |  | "NIST SP" should be "NIST Special Publication" (5x) and have a space afterwards (before the "800"; 1x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors at the following 5 locations in D0.0:

2580.5, 2677.54, 2679.40, 2681.2, 2682.5. At 2677.54, please also insert a space before 800.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 330 | 12 |  |  | "EAP-Finish/Reauth" should be "an EAP-Finish/Reauth packet" at 2605.16 and "EAP-Finish/Reauth Packet" should be "EAP-Finish/Reauth packet" at 2677.7 and "EAP-Finish/Reauth packet" should be "the EAP-Finish/Reauth packet" at 2678.47 | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

At 2605.15 in D0.0:



At 2677.7 in D0.0:



At 2678.47 in D0.0:



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 297 |  |  |  | "Measurement Pilot" is sometimes missing " frame" | Add " frame" after "the AP shall not generate the Measurement Pilot" at 2291.57, "Allowed Measurement Pilot" at 2292.10, "Measurement Pilot" in 11.10.15.3 (2x) and for dot11RMMeasurementPilotActivated in C.3 (2x) |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors at the following 6 locations in D0.0:

2291.57, 2292.10 (Figure 11-29), 2293.4, 2293.12, 3801.38, 3801.39,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 336 | C.3 |  |  | "Its value is determined by device capabilities." should be "Its value is determined by STA capabilities." | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

For your information. In Annex C.3, there are

* 293 instances of “Its value is determined by device capabilities”
* No instances of “Its value is determined by STA capabilities”.

***Seek TGme members’ direction to resolve this comment:***

Do you agree to replace “device capabilities” with “STA capabilities” or groundfather this term for the existing MIBs description?

***Proposed resolution:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 338 |  |  |  | "Advice of Charge plan" should be lowercase (2x) |  |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors at the following 2 locations in D0.0:

1477.1, 2399.55.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 347 |  |  |  | "vendor-specific element" (case-insensitively) should be "Vendor Specific element" and otherwise "vendor-specific" should be "vendor specific" (case-preservingly) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

“vendor-specific” is a grandfathered term, i.e., a hyphen is allowed, as per 802.11 Style Guide (09/1034r17), which is available at <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-1034-17-0000-802-11-editorial-style-guide.docx>.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

At 1095.33 (Figure 9-290) in D0.0, replace “Vendor-specific content” with “Vendor-Specific Content”.

At 1471.14 in D0.0, replace the title of Table 9-337 from “Vendor Specific Authentication Parameters” to “Vendor-specific Authentication Parameters”.

At 1489.3 (Figure 9-845) in D0.0, replace “Vendor-specific content” with “Vendor-Specific Content”.

At 1526.12 (Figure 9-876) in D0.0, replace “Vendor Specific Content” with “Vendor-specific Content”.

At 1526.31 in D0.0, replace “The Vendor Specific Content field contains vendor-specific field(s). The length of the vendor specific content in a Vendor Specific frame is limited by the maximum allowed MMPDU size” with “The Vendor-specific Content field contains vendor-specific field(s). The length of the vendor-specific content in a vendor-specific frame is limited by the maximum allowed MMPDU size”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 320 |  |  |  | "IFS" already stands for inter-frame space, so should not have "period" after it (8x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

An example at 792.20 in D0.0:



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors at the following 8 locations in D0.0:

792.20, 1680.16, 1715.25, 1716.47, 3445.22, 3464.16, 3464.27, 3479.47.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 388 | 11.2.7 |  |  | "or are QoS Null frame" should be "or are QoS Null frames" (2x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

At 2186.59 in D0.0:

At 2190.45 in D0.0:



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 264 |  |  |  | Figures should not have xrefs unless they will automatically be updated when the xref number changes, otherwise there will be spec rot | Either remove xrefs from figures and make the xref in the body text that refers to the figure, or find a way to include real xrefs in figures (maybe can overlay a text box with the xref?) |

***Discussion:***

***Seek TGme members’ direction to resolve this comment:***

It is challenging to include real cross references in the figures. If the task group would like to resolve, rather than reject, this comment, then we need a few volunteers to do the following:

* Identify a list of figures starting from clause 4 to annex Y with cross reference;
* Redraw the figures to remove/update the cross references, if needed;
* Update the corresponding description in the body text.

***Proposed resolution:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 306 |  |  |  | Is it "non-AP S1G STA" or "S1G non-AP STA"? (Note: it's "non-AP QoS STA") | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

It is “non-AP S1G STA”.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

Replace “S1G non-AP STA” with “non-AP S1G STA” at the following 19 locations in D0.0:

189.26, 1732.29, 1732.35, 1850.54, 2069.45, 2070.9, 2105.29, 2152.32, 2152.36, 2152.40, 2152.43, 2152.47, 2152.51, 2152.56, 2152.59, 2240.2, 2362.36, 3291.41, 3423.9.

Replace “non-S1G non-AP STA” with “non-AP non-S1G STA” at the following location in D0.0:

2362.45.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 470 |  |  |  | "any of capabilities" needs a " the" after the "of" (2x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

At 1102.22:



At 1449.21:



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 300 |  |  |  | "Transmitter Address" should be lowercase if not followed by "field"; ditto "Receiver Address" | Fix in 4.3.11.4 Frame (2x), 14.10.5 Collocated STAs (2x), C.3, 11.10.6 Requesting and reporting of measurements |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

Replace “Transmitter Address” with “transmitter address” at the following locations in D0.0:

229.62, 229.63, 2776.46, 3907.18.

Replace “Receiver Address” with “receiver address” at the following locations in D0.0:

2267.56, 2776.47.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 280 |  |  |  | "A VHT beamformer may use the worst case for various parameters to estimate the duration of theexpected frame(s) that contain(s) the feedback response(s), such as the lowest rate in basic rate, HT-MCS orVHT-MCS set, no grouping and the highest precision codebook." cf. "An HT beamformer may use the following worst-case parameters to estimate the duration of the expectedframe that contains the feedback response: lowest rate in basic HT-MCS set, HT-mixed format, no grouping." is inconsistent (hyphen in worst case, references to rate as well as MCS, etc.) and should be consitentificated | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

At 1931.1 in D0.0:



At 1919.21 in D0.0:



***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

At 1919.21 in D0.0, replace

“An HT beamformer may use the following worst-case parameters to estimate the duration of the expected frame that contains the feedback response: lowest rate in basic HT-MCS set, HT-mixed format, no grouping.”

with

“An HT beamformer may use the following worst case parameters to estimate the duration of the expected frame(s) that contain(s) the feedback response(s), such as the lowest rate in basic HT-MCS set, HT-mixed format, and no grouping.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 477 |  |  |  | It is not clear what an "entity" is | Change "peer entity" to "peer STA" (x86) |

***Discussion:***

There are 85 “peer entity” in total: one instance in clause 3 and the remaining 84 ones are in clause 6.

For the one in clause 3, it is located at 199.54 in D0.0:



For the others in clause 6, one example at is shown as follows:



***Seek TGme members’ direction to resolve this comment:***

Do you agree to do a global replacement from “peer entity” in “peer STA” in clause 6?

***Proposed resolution:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 327 |  |  |  | "EDCA parameter set element " should be "EDCA Parameter Set element " | Fix on pp. 1103, 2082 |

***Discussion:***

At 1103.32 in D0.0:



At 2082 in D0.0:



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 476 |  |  |  | "alternate transmit queue" should be "alternate EDCA transmit queue" (3x) and "the Alternate EDCA transmit queues" should be "the alternate EDCA transmit queues" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors at the following locations in D0.0 in replacing “alternate transmit queue” with “alternate EDCA transmit queue”:

250.25, 1696.16, 1696.22.

Note to the Editors at the following location in D0.0 in replacing “the Alternate EDCA transmit queues” with “the altnerate EDCA transmit queues”:

4072.57.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 478 |  |  |  | "KDF-Hash-Length" should have Hash and Length in italics | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

In D0.0, there are 19 instances of “KDF-Hash-Length”. Some of them have “Length” only in italics, and the remaining ones have none in italics.

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editors at the following locations in D0.0:

2535.3, 2535.33, 2535.35, 2540.2, 2540.18, 2540.20, 2543.36, 2543.44, 2623.31, 2625.3, 2625.12, 2625.48, 2625.52, 2626.22, 2626.26, 2654.19, 2654.26, 2765.18, 2765.23.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 254 |  |  |  | "NA" should be "N/A" | Make the change indicated throughout Table 10-31--Beam tracking time limit determination and Table 11-21--Setting of Single AID field |

***Discussion:***

At 2035.1 in D0.0:



At 2460.28 in D0.0:



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 450 | 11 |  |  | What's all the wibbling about sending frames to the "broadcast destination address" in aid of? | Delete the " destination", and in the last hit also delete the " (DA)" |

***Discussion:***

There are 8 instances of “broadcast destination address” in D0.0 at the following locations:

2132.21, 2132.28, 2134.23, 2134.36, 2134.43, 2134.50, 2144.63, 2272.28.

All instances are related to sending probe request frame to the “broadcast destination address”. For example:



***Proposed resolution:***