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Abstract

This document proposes resolution to the following SAB1 CIDs: 7097, 7099, 7101, 7102, 7107, 7108, 7109, 7112, 7119, 7120

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7097 | 232.00 |  | 27.2.2 | What happens if LTF\_REP is not present in the TXVECTOR? How many repetitions should be used? | Change "O" to "Y" in the TXVECTOR column in the LTF\_REP row. | Accept  Note to editor, changed already part of motion 202111-08 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7099 | 232.00 | 27.2.2 | 11ax has already been published and does not have/use the TX/RXVECTOR parameter RANGING\_FLAG. So, if 11az now mandates that the RANGING\_FLAG parameter is always present in all HE SU PPDUs, then there will be many places in the standard where we have to add "when TX/RXVECTOR parameter RANGING\_FLAG is 0" for the 'legacy' HE SU PPDU cases. Instead, the RANGING\_FLAG parameter should be made optional, and if the parameter is not present in TX/RXVECTOR, then it should be interpreted as a non-ranging PPDU. | At P232, row for RANGING\_FLAG + FORMAT is HE\_SU: Replace the Value column to "If present, indicates that the PPDU is an HE Ranging NDP. Not present otherwise." Change the TXVECTOR column from "MU" to "O". (Note - since it will need to be an "MU" when present, you might have to define a new type such as "O-MU" to indicate that.) At P232, row for RANGING\_FLAG + FORMAT is HE\_TB: Replace the Value column to "If present, indicates that the PPDU is an HE Ranging TB NDP. Not present otherwise." Change the TXVECTOR column from "MU" to "O". Change "The RANGING\_FLAG is set to 1" to "The RANGING\_FLAG is present" at P180L23, P182L30, P183L32. Change "RANGING\_FLAG is 1" to "RANGING\_FLAG is present" at P231(row for PSDU\_LENGTH), P232(row for LTF\_KEY), P232(row for LTF\_IV), P232(row for LTF\_REP), P233(row for NUM\_USERS), P233(row for SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG), P233(row for TX\_WINDOW\_FLAG). | ? |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7101 | 233.00 | 27.2.2 | What does "... LTF\_KEY will be MU" mean? | At P233, row for NUM\_USERS + ... SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG is 1, Value column, change "LTF\_KEY will be MU" to "LTF\_KEY are arrays with number of entries equal to NUM\_USERS." | Revise  TGaz editor,  make changes specified in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0259-00-00az-Some-SAB1-CR-v2.docx> |

***TGaz Editor: in P233, in the raw for NUM\_USERS+SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG is 1, in the Value column, change*** "LTF\_KEY will be MU" ***to*** *“*NUM\_STS, LTF\_REP and LTF\_KEY are arrays with number of entries equal to NUM\_USERS”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7102 | 233.00 | 27.2.2 | For the NUM\_USERS row, if FORMAT is HE\_SU, it is not clear which of the first two rows need to be used. Also, there is no FORMAT called "HE\_ER". | In the second row of NUM\_USERS, change "FORMAT is HE\_SU, HE\_MU, HE\_ER, HE\_ER\_SU or HE\_TB" to "RANGING\_FLAG is not present, and FORMAT is HE\_SU, HE\_MU, HE\_ER\_SU or HE\_TB" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7107 | 233.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Table 21-1 does not have a parameter named SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG | In the SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG row, change "See corresponding entry in Table 21-1" to "Not present" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7108 | 233.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Table 21-1 does not have a parameter named TX\_WINDOW\_FLAG. | In the TX\_WINDOW\_FLAG row, change "See corresponding entry in Table 21-1" to "Not present" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7109 | 234.00 | 27.2.3a | What is a "number of HE-LTF"? Number of HE-LTF symbols? spatial streams? something else? | In the row for LTF\_OFFSET, change "number of HE-LTF to skip to receive" to "number of HE-LTF symbols to skip before beginning to process the HE-LTF symbols" | Accept  (Note to editor, this is actually table 27.2.2a) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7112 | 235.31 | 31 | 27.3.11.1 | Incorrect reference. No subclause named 27.3.18b. Note that 27.3.18a now contains both HE Ranging NDP and HE TB Ranging NDP. | Delete "and 27.3.18b" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7119 | 238.08 | 8 | 27.3.18a.1 | Not clear what "different for HE-LTF repetitions" means. | Change "different for HE-LTF repetitions" to "different for each HE-LTF repetition" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7120 | 238.10 | 10 | 27.3.18a.1 | Repetitive NOTE. This is the same NOTE as the one at P237L36. | Delete the NOTE at P238L10-12 | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7121 | 238.13 | 13 | 27.3.18a.1 | "maximum of 64 Secure HE-LTF" Does this mean that the maximum number of repetition is 64? Or, does it mean that the total number of HE-LTF symbols is 64? (e.g. if N\_STS=4, then the maximum repetition is 16). | Clarify what "maximum 64 Secure HE-LTF" means. | **?** |
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