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Abstract

This submission discusses resolutions to the following 9 CIDs from initial SA Ballot of TGbd D4.0.

The CID list is: 5001, 5004, 5006, 5008, 5019, 5046, 5047, 5080, 5081

Proposed changes in this document are with reference to TGbd D4.0.

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Intitial version of the document
* Rev 1: Updated typo in editorial instructions of CID 5019

Proposed comment resolution

Presented and discussed, no open discussion points

Under discussion

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 5046 | 0.00 | The terms "higher layer" and "upper layer" appear 22 and 7 instances, respectively, in this amendment. It's not clear if this is intentional. They seem to convey the same point. | Please clarify the rationale of using these two terms in the context, and perhaps add a note to the first occurrence each. If there is nothing specific that supports using the different terms, suggest unifying them to one term throughout the amendment. | Revised  Agree with comment  802.11-2020 base line uses 28 times upper layer(s) and 232 times higher layer(s)  Term higher layer preferred over upper layer  **TGbd editor:**  Please replace all 7 occurences of upper layer with higher layer on P30L56, P64L38, P68L6, P68L15, P68L16, P68L21, and P68L23. |
| 5001 | 38.14 | "An NGV STA may use the Ranging NDP Announcement frame format for non-TB ranging measurement exchange" it may be interpreted that the NDPA is a may for NTB while its mandatory part of the sequence. Furthermore clause 9 is about frame formats not normative behavior so a "May" statement here is not in accordance with the style guide. | Delete the sentence it does not provide additional information. | Revised  Agree with comment  **TGbd editor:**  Please delete sentence on P38L14-16, remove editing instructions and subclause headings 9.3.1 and 9.3.1.19 |
| 5019 | 51.58 | In 11az D4.1, "R2I N\_STS" is used, instead of "R2I NUM\_STS". | Change "R2I NUM\_STS" to "R2I N\_STS". The same change should be made in other parts of the spec related to his parameter. Similarly, Change "I2R NUM\_STS" to "I2R N\_STS". | Revised  Agree with comment, additionally found a wrong occurrence of NUM\_STS which should be NUM\_SS, an extra occurrence of FEC\_CODING, and N\_SS which should be NSS  **TGbd editor:**  Please replace NUM\_STS on P51L58 and P52L9 with N\_STS.  Further replace NUM\_STS on P116L65 with NUM\_SS, remove FEC\_CODING on P116L64, and replace N\_SS on P123L28 with NSS. |
| 5008 | 51.62 | Remove sentence "The PSDU\_LENGTH parameter is set to 0." as PDSU\_LENGTH is not a TXVECTOR parameter. The same sentence on P52L14 can be removed for the above reason. | As in comment | Accepted  See also CID 5080 |
| 5080 | 51.62 | The statement "The PSDU\_LENGTH parameter is set to 0." can be removed because PDSU\_LENGTH is not a TXVECTOR parameter. The same on P52L14 can be removed for the same reason. | As in comment | Accepted  See also CID 5008 |
| 5081 | 51.65 | To be consistent with subclause 32.3.15 (NGV ranging NDP), suggest adding "NGV\_MCS is set to 0" in both paragraphs RSTA transmitting … to ISTA and ISTA transmitting … to RSTA. | As in comment | Reject  As P122L65 in 32.3.15 already defines “NGV\_MCS shall be set to 0” there is no need to repeat this in 11.21.6.4.6 |
| 5004 | 53.13 | unclear use of the word "by" in following sentence: "It may also be used by two STAs each co-located by an NGV STA (see 31.4 (NGV ranging))." | I guess following was meant: "It may also be used by two STAs each co-located with an NGV STA (see 31.4 (NGV ranging))." | Accepted |
| 5006 | 123.5 | "The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of the number of spatial streams the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and the number of LTF repetitions..." is incorrect because for zero LTF repetitions there would be zero NGV-LTF symbols. | Modify to "The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of thethe TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1), see Table 32-11 (Number of NGV-LTFs required for different numbers of spatial streams)." | Revised  Agree with comment, resolution revised as proposed change contains typo. See also CID 5047  **TGbd editor:**  Please replace the sentence starting on P123L4 with  “The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1), see Table 32-11 (Number of NGV-LTFs required for different numbers of spatial streams)." |
| 5047 | 123.05 | " … the product of the number of spatial streams the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and the number of LTF repetitions…" is incorrect because the number of LTF repetitions as indicated by LTF\_REP could be zero. | Modify to " ...the product of the number of spatial streams the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1). LTF\_REP indicates if LTF repetition is used or not. When LTF repetition is used, LTF\_REP=1. Otherwise, LTF\_REP is 0." | Revised  Agree with comment that LTF\_REP could be zero and thus number of NGV-LTFs could be zero. See also CID 5006.  Second part of proposed change not improving current spec text and hence is not applied.  **TGbd editor:**  Please replace the sentence starting on P123L4 with  “The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1), see Table 32-11 (Number of NGV-LTFs required for different numbers of spatial streams)."  Further, please replace “denotes” with “indicates” on P122L63 |