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

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

##### R1 – removed CID 336 (as per the discussion on April 26, it is transferred to GEN ad-hoc)

##### R2 – removed CID 347 for further work; added the missing resolution for CID 450.

##### R3 – changes made during the June 7th teleconference call

##### R4 – removed CID 280 (as per the discussion on June 7, it is transferred to MAC ad-hoc)

R5 – removed CID 477 (as per the discussion on July 13, it is assigned to Mark Rison)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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.

As of June 7, 2021:

* Robert Stacey volunteer for a few figures related to PHY-CONFIG and CCA interaction in Clauses 21 and 27, e.g., replace these figures with tables and update the text if appropriate.
* Mike recommends Emily and Edward to bring this issue to the Editors’ meeting and see whether an update to Editor’s Style Guide is needed.
* Mike asks Emily and Edward to send an email to REVme reflector and identify a few volunteers to lead this effort.

***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 |
| 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:***

Accepted.