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Abstract

This submission proposes the resolutions for following 7 CIDs:

4569, 4667, 7198, 7399, 7996, 7997, and 8103

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 1: based on the offline discussion, modify the resolution for CID 4667

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 TGbe D1.0 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbe D1.0 Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

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

#### *CID 7996*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 7996 | 36.3.12.5 | 406.48 | 36.3.12.5 seems to cover the case of Non-HT duplicate PPDU as well (see P406L45). Then, we need to clarify that the mod 3 = 0 condition applies only to EHT PPDUs. | Change "The LENGTH field is set" to "the LENGTH field in an EHT PPDU is set" | Accepted. |

#### *CID 8103 and 7997*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 8103 | 36.3.12.5 | 406.50 | delete - from both EHT-PPDU and HE-PPDU. It should be EHT PPDU and HE PPDU. | as in comment | Accepted |
| 7997 | 36.3.12.5 | 406.50 | Spurious "dash" | Change "EHT-PPDU" to "EHT PPDU". Change "HE-PPDU" to "HE PPDU". | Accepted. |

#### *CID 4667*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 4667 | 36.3.12.5 | 406.53 | "L\_LENGTH + 2" makes good technical sense but nowhere in the draft is the motivation for this explained. This omission will lead to confusion since normally there is a 1:1 mapping between a TXVECTOR parameter and what is transmitted. | Add a NOTE explaining why the MAC does not itself populate the desired value for the L\_LENGTH field in its transmitted Trigger frame aka why it is that PHY (at the recipient of the trigger frame) that needs to apply the +2 | Revised.  The reason is already described in other clauses (ie., 35.4.2.2.1)  So, It is better to refer to the above clause (ie., 35.4.2.2.1) by using the NOTE rather than to express why need to apply the +2 for the L-LENGTH field in EHT TB PPDU in this clause.  TGbe Editor: incorporate the changes in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1100-01-00be-cc36-cr-for-36-3-5-L-SIG.docx |

***TGbe editor: please add the following Note at P428L54 of 11be D1.01***

NOTE- The TXVECTOR parameter L\_LENGTH field of an EHT TB PPDU has the same value as the UL Length subfield of a Trigger frame. The UL Length subfield of a Trigger frame that solicits either an HE TB PPDU or an EHT TB PPDU is set following (27-11) with m = 2 as defined in 35.4.2.2.1, then the non-zero m is reversed for EHT TB PPDUs by adding 2 as above. (#4667)

#### *CID 7399*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 7399 | 36.3.12.5 | 407.07 | The definition of the Parity(P) field is not clear. It is already defined in the baseline text (see IEEE 802.11-2020 clause 17.3.4.4), so it's possibly not even needed in this clause. | Either delete this sentence or replicate a similar line from the baseline text, changing the cited sentence to "Bit 17 shall be a positive parity (even parity) bit for bits 0-16" | Rejected.,  To indicate clearly that the parity bit is how to be used in the spec, it is good to use the current text. And 11n, 11ac, and 11ax also use the same wording. |

#### *CID 7198*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 7198 | 36.3.12.5 | 407.14 | "The stream of 48 complex numbers ..." . This is BPSK. Why are they complex? | Remove the word "complex" | Rejeted.  BPSK is a variant of PSK (i.e. Phase-shift Keying).  And, it use the two phases which are separated by 180, (i.e., 0 and 180).  So, it is better to keep the current word. |

#### *CID 4569*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 4569 | 36.3.12.5 | 407.16 | There exists a grammer mistake. 'The stream of ...' should not be used with 'are'. | The first 'are' should be revised as 'is' , e.g. the stream of 48 complex ...and is mapped to ... | Accepted. |