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**Abstract**

This document contains the report of the TGbb Mandatory Draft Review.

r0: initial findings

r1: reject one finding on should and make a few editorial fixes

# Introduction

## Purpose of this document

This document is the report from the group of volunteers that participated in the P802.11bb/D2.1 mandatory draft review.

This document contains recommendations for changes to the P802.11bb draft to bring it into improved compliance to IEEE-SA and WG11 style.

The recommended changes need to be reviewed by TGbb and approved, or ownership of the issues taken by TGbb.

## Process / references

The MDR process is described in:

* 11-11/615r6 – WG802.11 MEC Process

And references:

* 11-09/1034r20 – 802.11 Editorial Style Guide

This review was provided by Robert Stacey, the WG technical editor.

# Findings

## Style

### Style Gude 2.1.1 – Frame Format Figures

N/A – does not define any frames

### Style Guide 2.1.2 – Naming Frames

N/A – does not reference any frames

### Style Guide 2.2 – true/false

N/A – Neither true nor false appear in draft

### Style Guide 2.3 – “is set to”

N/A – draft does not contain text for the setting of fields

### Information Elements/Subelements

#### Style Guide 2.4.1 – Information Elements/subelements – Naming

N/A – draft does not reference any elements

#### Style Guide 2.4.2 – Definition Conventions

#### N/A – draft does not define new elements

#### Style Guide 2.4.3 – Element Inclusion Conventions

N/A – draft does not define new elements

### Style Guide 2.5 – Removal of functions and features

N/A – draft does not remove any features

### Style Guide 2.6 – Capitalization

12.16, 13.01: Subclause titles are not capitalized and neither are technical terms. “Light Communications (LC)” -> “Light communications (LC)”

13.11: “Light Communications” -> “light communications”

14.13, 14.18: “LC Light interface” – “light” here should not be capitalized, but it appears redundant anyway. Maybe “Light emitter/receiver interface”. Update Figure title to match.

14.23, 18.1, 18.4 (figures and elsewhere): “LC Optical {TX,RX} Antenna” is a technical term and should not be capitalized (change to “LC optical {TX,RX} antenna”)

14.23 (figure): “FEC Coder” -> “FEC encoding” or “FEC encoder” (and align terminology with other PHYs)

14.23 (figure): “GI Addition” -> “Insert GI” (and align terminology with other PHYs)

14.23 (figure): “Symbol Wave Shaping” -> “Window” or combine with “Insert GI” and change to “Insert GI and window” (align terminology)

14.23 (figure): “IFFT” -> “IDFT”, “FFT” -> “DFT” (align terminology)

15.14: The terms high throughput, very high throuput and high efficiency are not capitalized.

16.26, 27, 29: “LC IF Channel” -> “LC IF channel”

19.23: Subclause titles are not capitalized. In this case “CCA for LC” is sufficient since both acronyms are defined in Clause 3 and used frequently.

20.20: Subclause titles are not capitalized.

21.14: Subclause titles are not capitalized (should be “Light communications (LC) features”

21.11: “Light Communications” -> “Light communications”

### Style Guide 2.7 – Terminology: frame vs packet vs PPDU vs MPDU

No findings

### Style Guide 2.8 – Use of verbs & problematic words

No findings.

#### normative, non-normative, ensure

14.21: Inappropriate use of “may”. Change to “might”

19.03: Problematic use of “should” – criteria for “sufficient spatial separation” is not defined.

[Reject – criteria for spatial separation is understood by the implementor]

19.05: Inappropraite use of “may”: does not specify a requirement. Replace with “might” (2x).

#### which/that

No findings

#### articles

19.27 “for VHT PHY”: Missing article

19.29 “for HT PHY”: Missing article

#### missing nouns

No findings.

#### unnecessary nouns

No findings.

#### unicast and multicast

No findings.

### Style Guide 2.9 – Numbers

No findings.

### Style Guide 2.10 – Maths operators and relations

19.09, 13, 17: Use italics for variable N\_TX.

### Style Guide 2.11 – Hyphenation

14.22: “photo-diode” -> “photo diode” (two words)

14.23 (figure): “Up-conversion” -> “Upconversion” (base standard uses unhyphenated “upconvert”)

15.10: “up-converted” -> “upconverted”

### Style Guide 2.12 – References to SAP primitives

No findings.

### Style Guide 2.13 – References to the contents of a field/subfield

No findings.

### Style Guide 2.14 – References to MIB variables/attributes

No findings.

### Style Guide 2.15 – Hanging Paragraphs

13.11: Hanging paragraph – add subclause or uplevel 32.1.1 and 32.1.2

### Style Guide 2.16 – Abbreviations

No findings.

### Style Guide 2.17 – Format for code/pseudocode

N/A

### Style guide 3 – Style applicable to specific Clauses

#### Definitions (Clause 3)

12.06: HPA is already present in the baseline.

#### General Description (Clause 4)

No findings.

#### Frame formats (Clause 9) – shall or may?

N/A

#### SAP interfaces (Clause 6)

N/A

#### New top level clauses

No findings.

#### Annex A – Bibliography

N/A

#### Annex B – PICS

No findings.

#### Annex G – Frame exchange sequences

N/A

## ANA

Check for correct use of numbers against database.

Check names against database (update database if names have changed).

Robert Stacey

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resource** | **Value** | **Name** | **Status** |
| OperatingClassesGlobal | 150-154 | IR, 20 MHz spacing, etc. | Allocated but not present in draft: should be released. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Additional Actions:

## MIB

Conformance to 09/533r1 and 15/355r13

N/A

### Detailed proposed changes

* MIB Detail

# Collateral findings

15.19: “FEC ccoding (convolutional coding)”. Technical problem: FEC encoding is not equivalent to convolutional coding – CC is a specific type of FEC. Typo: “ccoding” -> “coding”

16.03, 16.15: “coding rates” -> “code rates”

19.21-22: Inconsistent terminology – “optical {TX,RX} antennas” vs “LC optical {TX, RX} antennas”

# IEEE-SA MEC

At the time of writing this report, the IEEE-SA mandatory editorial coordination (MEC) is ongoing. When complete, the findings will be added to this report.

|  |
| --- |
|  |