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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following LB271 comments on P802.11be D3.0: Comments in 36.3.12.7.2.

NOTE – Set the Track Changes Viewing Option in the MS Word to “All Markup” to clearly see the proposed text edits.

**Revision History:**

R0: Initial version. Resolve CID 16637, 16640.

.

# CID 16637

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16637 | 36.3.12.7.2 | 763.44 | There are some cases which are not specified as Validate nor Disregard. For example, EHT-SIG MCS = 3 and EHT-SIG Symbols < 3. In this kind of case, what is correct receiver behavior? | Please clarify. | Revised.The example in the comment (i.e., EHT-SIG MCS=3 and Number of EHT-SIG Symbols<3) is certainly an invalid combination. There could be other invalid combinations of the EHT-SIG MCS and Number of EHT-SIG Symbols, depending on the combination of UL/DL field and PPDU Type And Compression Mode field. There are many such cases of invalid combinations of U-SIG parameter values which are not classified as Disregard/Validate. Doing such a classification for every un-used combination while covering all the corner cases will be a very cumbersome exercise. The original design intent was that all such cases will lead to an error in EHT-SIG reception, i.e., an invalid CRC. The corresponding receiver behavior for an EHT-SIG CRC failure has been defined in 36.3.23 (EHT receive procedure). Added one sentence in 36.3.12.7.2 to point to 36.3.23.Instruction to editor: Add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph in P763L60: “It is possible that a certain combination of U-SIG field values in a U-SIG field that indicates a valid CRC, leads to an invalid EHT-SIG CRC. Further details on receive behavior for the aforementioned case, can be found in 36.3.23 (EHT receive procedure).” |

# CID 16640

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16640 | 36.3.12.7.2 | 775.01 | Shall an EHT STA be able to decode ER preamble format (four U-SIG)? | Make ER preamble reception as a mandatory requirement | Rejected.This is already captured in D3.0. An EHT STA shall be able to decode the version independent fields in U-SIG of an ER preamble. An EHT STA’s receiver behavior when an ER preamble is received is defined in the U-SIG subclause (P763L33-L41). No further change is needed. |