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##### This submission present proposed resolutions for the following 22 ED2 CIDs:

Clause 26: 6595, 6596,

Annex L: 6042, 6043, 6044, 6045, 6046,

802.11az: 6152,

Clause 10: 6034, 6145, 6092, 6093, 6094, 6095, 6096, 6119, 6147, 6146, 6279, 6286, 6280

Clause 23: 6104

##### The proposed changes are based on REVme/D4.0.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – Initial version

R1 – Proposed resolutions for CIDs 6596, 6034, 6279 are updated

R2 – Proposed resolution for CIDs 6596 is updated

R3 – Proposed resolution for CIDs 6596 is further updated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6595 | 26.17.1 | 3984 | 23 | Bad xref: "see … and Table 10.23.2.5". Either this should be a table reference, or "Table" should be deleted. | Confirm the correct xref and fix. |

***Discussion:***

At 3984.23:



Agree with the commenter that it is a bad reference. It should be a subclause rather than a table. The reference is correct but the phrase “table” should be removed.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6595:***

Revised.

Remove “Table” at 3984.23.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6596 | 26.17.1 | 3984 | 12 | Table 9-190 xref is not a "hot link" | Fix it to be a hot link to the table. |

***Discussion:***

At 3984.12:



Agree with the commenter that the hot link needs to be fixed. In D4.0, Table 9-190 refers to Extended Capabilities field, which is not related to HT Operation Information field. The correct reference should be Table 9-228 (HT Operation element fields and subfields).



***Proposed resolution for CID 6596:***

Revised.

At 3984.12, replace “Table 9-190” with “Table 9-228” and make sure that the cross reference (i.e., the hot link) of Table 9-228 is added.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6042 | L.2 | 5716 | 34 | Annex L in 802.11 has examples of for encoding partial virtual bitmaps. Figure L-10 is for S1G STAs in OLB mode. The list of AIDs on page 5716 is not consistent with the bit settings in Figure L-10 after AID 31. | Change the list of AIDs to match the Figure. |

***Discussion:***

As referred to Figure L-10, the list of AIDs is AID 1, AID 6, AID 13, AID 15, AID 17, AID 22, AID 29, AID 31, AID 33, AID 38, AID 45, AID 47, AID 49, AID 54, AID 61, AID 63, AID 65, AID 70.



As per the description in 5716.34:



***Proposed resolution for CID 6042:***

Revised.

Replace “AID 38, AID 43, AID 50, AID 52, AID 59, AID 64, AID 71, AID 73, AID 80 and AID 85” with “AID 33, AID 38, AID 45, AID 47, AID 49, AID 54, AID 61, AID 63, AID 65, and AID 70” at 5716.34 in D4.0.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6043 | L.2 | 5717 | 49 | TIM PVB Figure L-11 is incorrect. Section 9.4.2.5.5 (ADE mode) states that the values of EWL subfield ranging from 0 to 7 represent WL being 1 to 8, respectively. The EWL field in Figure L-11 is set to the value 4 which maps to a WL value of 5, but Figure L-11 is using a WL of 4. | Modify the EWL field in Figure L-11 to have the value of 3 so that it maps to a WL value of 4. |

***Discussion:***

As referred to subclause 9.4.2.5.5:



As referred to Figure L-11, the length of each ΔAID subfields is 4. However, EWL is set to a value of 4, which means WL is of a value of 5.



***Proposed resolution for CID 6043:***

Revised.

Revise the encoding of EWL in Figure L-11 from “0 0 1” to “1 1 0”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6044 | L.2 | 5718 | 11 | For Figure L-12 on p5718 the Block Bitmap field has a value of 5 and not 3 as stated in the text. | Modify "The Encoded Information Block field in the Partial Virtual Bitmap field consists of Block Bitmap field with the value of 3 and two Subblock fields with the value of 66 and 160, respectively." to "The Encoded Information Block field in the Partial Virtual Bitmap field consists of Block Bitmap field with the value of 5 and two Subblock fields with the value of 66 and 160, respectively." |

***Discussion:***

As referred to Figure L-12, the commenter is correct that the Block Bitmap field has a value of 5, not 3, and therefore, the respective text should be updated accordingly from “the value of 3” to “the value of 5”.



***Proposed resolution for CID 6044:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6045 | L.2 | 5720 |  | In Figure L-14 the Inverse Bitmap bit in Block Control is not set and the bits set in the figure do not match the text after AID 33. | Modify the figure so that the Inverse Bitmap bit is set and make the text on p5719 consistent with the figure. |

***Discussion:***

As referred to Figure L-14, the commenter is correct that the Inverse Bitmap bit in the Block Control field is not set. It should be “1 0 1” rather than “0 1 0”. In addition, the list of AIDs as per the figure is AID 1, AID 6, AID 13, AID 15, AID 17, AID 22, AID 29, AID 31, AID 33, AID 38, AID 45, AID 47, AID 49, AID 54, AID 61, AID 63, AID 65, and AID 70, which are not the same as the list as descriped in the text.



***Proposed resolution for CID 6045:***

Revised.

Modify Inverse Bitmap bit in the Block Control field in Figure L-14 from “1 0 1” to “0 1 0”.

At 5719.28 in D4.0, replace “AID 1, AID 6, AID 13, AID 15, AID 17, and AID 22, AID 29, AID 31, AID 38, AID 43, AID 50, AID 52, AID 59, AID 64, AID 71, AID 73, AID 80 and AID 85 “ with “AID 1, AID 6, AID 13, AID 15, AID 17, AID 22, AID 29, AID 31, AID 33, AID 38, AID 45, AID 47, AID 49, AID 54, AID 61, AID 63, AID 65, and AID 70”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6046 | L.2 |  |  | TIM PVB Figure L-15 is incorrect. Section 9.4.2.5.5 (ADE mode) states that the values of EWL subfield ranging from 0 to 7 represent WL being 1 to 8, respectively. The EWL field in Figure L-15 is set to the value 4 which maps to a WL value of 5, but Figure L-15 is using a WL of 4. | Modify the EWL field in Figure L-15 to have the value of 3 so that it maps to a WL value of 4. |

***Discussion:***

As referred to Figure L-15, the length of each ΔAID subfields is 4. However, EWL is set to a value of 4, which means WL is of a value of 5.



***Proposed resolution for CID 6046:***

Revised.

Revise the encoding of EWL in Figure L-15 from “0 0 1” to “1 1 0”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6152 |  |  |  | The 11az amendment uses the term "if and only if". This was sadly retired a few generations ago in favour of an explicit blah; otherwise blah | This comment should be rejected as 11az has not been incorporated yet |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6152:***

Rejected.

For Draft 4.0, the 802.11az amendment has not been incorporated yet.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6034 | 10.5 | 2291 | 63 | "Page Length" should be "Page Slice Length" | Replace "Page Length" with "Page Slice Length" at 2291.63 and 2292.8 |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 9.4.2.191, the commenter is correct that it is “Page Slice Length”, rather than “Page Length”, when one wants to indicate the number of blocks included in each TIM for the associated page

except for the last TIM:



Having said that, both the Page Slice Length and Page Slice Count fields are actually in the Page Slice Control field of the Page Slice element, rather than directly in the Page Slice element per the text as shown below:

At 2291.63:



At 2292.8:



***Proposed resolution for CID 6034:***

Revised.

At 2291.63 in D4.0, replace “has indicated a Page Slice Count equal to 0 and a Page Length greater than 1 in the Page Slice element” with “has indicated a Page Slice Count field equal to 0 and a Page Slice Length field greater than 1 in the Page Slice Control field of the Page Slice element”.

At 2292.8 in D4.0, replace “has indicated a Page Slice Count equal to 0 and a Page Length equal to 1 in the Page Slice element” with “has indicated a Page Slice Count field equal to 0 and a Page Slice Length field equal to 1 in the Page Slice Control field of the Page Slice element”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6145 | 10.9 | 1874 | 5 | The following fragment of a sentence is duplicated: "the subtype of the wrapped frame." Please remove the duplicate fragment. | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

At 1874.5, the words “the subtype of the wrapped frame.” are duplicate.



***Proposed resolution for CID 6145:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6119 | 10.23.2.10 | 1919 | 52 | The phrase "in the range of" should not be used when proving a range of values, "in the range" is the preferred phrase. | Replace "in the range of" With "in the range" Also at the following locations: 1919.56, 4458.42, 4625.36. Note this does not apply to 1024.37, as no numeric range is given. |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6119:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6147 | 10.25.6.8 | 1979 | 30 | In a report or document "doesn't" should be spelled out to "does not". | Please replace "doesn't" with "does not". Further please replace "doesn't" with "does not" on P3972L34, P4580L33, and P4581L1 |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6147:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6146 | 10.37.8 | 2061 | 35 | After Page 2061 there are 3 empty pages. | Please remove the empty space and the empty pages and continue with 10.38 on the same page |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6146:***

Rejected.

The empty pages were generated by FrameMarker based on the contents of the source files. Even Editors may manually remove these empty pages, additional empty pages may be generated whenever the source files are complied.

Note to the commenter: The IEEE SA Publication Team may handle these empty pages prior to the publication of the standards.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6279 | 10.25.9.2 |  |  | " the Starting Sequence Number field value (SSN)" -- spurious parenthetical | Delete "(SSN)". In 10.25.9.4.1 move "Both WinTailB and WinHeadB are initialized to the preceding Starting Sequence Number field value (SSN - 1), to indicate no MPDU was received, within the current reception window." up one para and delete "(SSN)" and "(SSN - 1)" from the combined para |

***Discussion:***

At 1988.2 (subclause 10.25.9.2):



Agree with the commenter that the abbreviation “(SSN)” is not needed.

At 1988.35 (subclause 10.25.9.4):



Agree with the commenter that the abbreviation “(SSN)” at 1988.35 and “(SSN – 1)” at 1988.44 can be deleted. As per the offline discussion with the commenter, the main reason the commenter proposed to move the paragraph at 1988.42 up to combine with the paragraph at 1988.38 to form a single paragraph is to make it clear that the words “preceding Starting Sequence Number field value” refers to the vaue as described at 1988.35.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6279:***

Revised.

Delete the abbreviation “(SSN)” at 1988.2 and 1988.35.

Delete the abbreviation “(SSN – 1)” at 1988.44.

Move the paragraph at 1988.42 up to combine with the paragraph at 1988.38 to form a single paragraph.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6286 | 10.25 |  |  | 10.25 and 11.5 sometimes use "set up" and sometimes use "establish". It would be better to use a single term | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

For the sake of consistency, propose to use the “establish” rather than “set up”. It is because the phrase “establish” is used for block ack agreement and TWT in not only subclause 11.5 but also other subclauses.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6286:***

Revised.

* At 1956.43, replace “To set up a block ack agreement” with “To establish a block ack agreement”.
* At 1956.44, replace “the block ack agreement is being set” with “the block ack agreement is being established”.
* At 1956.55, replace “A block ack agreement shall not be set up” with “A block ack agreement shall not be established”.
* At 1956.54, replace “a TWT has been set up” with “a TWT has been established”.
* At 1957.28, replace “no TWT has already been set up” with “no TWT has already been established”.
* At 1957.36, replace “if a TWT has already been set up” with “if a TWT has already been established”.
* At 1958.33, replace “A GLK-GCR block ack is set up” with “A GLK-GCR block ack is established”.
* At 1958.47, replace “If the block ack mechanism is being set up for a TS” with “If the block ack mechanism is being established for a TS”.
* At 1958.48, replace “should precede the setup of the block ack mechanism” with “should precede the establishment of the block ack mechanism”.
* At 1958.49, replace “If the block ack mechanism is being set up for the GCR service” with “If the block ack mechanism is being established for the GCR service”.
* At 1958.51, replace “precede the setup of the block ack mechanism” with “precede the establishment of the block ack mechanism”.
* At 1958.54, replace “to set up the block ack” with “to establish the block ack agreement”.
* At 1958.58, replace “Once the block ack exchange has been setup” with “Once the block ack exchange has been established”.
* At 1961.19, replace “The unsolicited block ack extension agreement is considered set up” with “The unsolicited block ack extension agreement is established”.
* At 1961.50, replace “After setting up an immediate block ack agreement” with “After establishing an immediate block ack agreement”.
* At 1962.1, replace “during block ack setup” with “during block ack establishment”.
* At 1962.3, replace “during block ack setup” with “during block ack establishment”.
* At 1962.13, replace “The DELBA frame transmitted to release the block ack setup of a GCR service” with “The DELBA frame transmitted to release the block ack establishment of a GCR service”.
* At 1964.20, replace “After setting up an immediate block ack agreement” with “After establishing an immediate block ack agreement”.
* At 1982.49, replace “A GLK AP may set up a GLK-GCR block ack agreement” with “A GLK AP may establish a GLK-GCR block ack agreement”.
* At 1986.47, replace “by setting the BA” with “by establishing the block ack”.
* At 1990.57, replace “to setup the agreement” with “to establish the agreement.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6280 | 10.41.2.1 |  |  | There are two "An example of SLS" figures | Differentiate the figures in some way in their captions |

***Discussion:***

Figure 10-80 considers a scenario that receive sector sweep is used at the responder sector sweep. Figure 10-81 considers a scenario that transmit sector sweep is used at the responder sector sweep.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6280:***

Revised.

Replace the caption of Figure 10-80 from “An example of SLS” with “An example of SLS where receive sector sweep is used in the responder sector sweep”.

Replace the caption of Figure 10-81 from “An example of SLS” with “An example of SLS where transmit sector sweep is used in the responder sector sweep”.

At 2140.49, replace “at the responder sector sweep” with “in the responder sector sweep”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 6104 | 23.2.2 | 3588 | 20 | [HP] Missing newline | Insert newline before the second sentence (If greater ...) |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 6104:***

Accepted