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Abstract

This submission proposes to address the following CIDs 2071, 2075, 2076, 2078, 2112, 2115, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2121, 2127, 2132 (12 CIDs total) based on P802.11bk D2.0 and P802.11REVme\_D5.0.

Revisions:

1. .

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2071 | 20.5 | 9.3.1.22.10 | "contains a value in the range of 0 to 63 which" -- 9.2.2 already defines that all fields are unsigned integers unless stated otherwise, and it's a 6-bit field as shown in the figure, which is normative, so this is repetition | Delete the cited text | **Reject.**  The text clarifies the allowed values rather then the format. Same field size could have been used with a different arbitrary range e.g. modulo 56, but its not. Furthermore definition 9.2.2 Conventions is for unsigned integer, whereas this is a modulo operation i.e. different. |
| 2075 | 25.11 | 9.4.2.301 | EHT does not allow more than one LO, so the parenthetical is confusing | "Delete ""(single RF LO)"" after ""EHT"" in the table. At 25.17 change ""The field value of 8 specifies the STA support for 320 MHz operation as 320 MHz single RF LO using EHT format in addition to supporting 160 single RF LO, 80, 40 and 20 MHz bandwidths in HE format."" to ""The field value of 8 specifies the STA support for 320 MHz operation as 320 MHz using EHT format in addition to supporting 160 single RF LO, 80, 40 and 20 MHz bandwidths in HE format. | **Accept.** |
| 2076 | 28.02 | 9.4.2.301 | "The Max R2I NSS field indicates the maximum number of spatial streams to be used in an R2I 3 NDP for 320MHz PPDU bandwidth transmissions in the session. (#1226)" -- not clear what 0 means then | Add "The value 0 is reserved."; ditto next para | **Reject.**  Value of 0 is used when there is a single spatial stream in use refer to: D2.0 P.31L.21-22 and on describing the setting of the MAX R2I NSS and MAX I2R NSS: “the Max R2I NSS field is set to the maximum number of spatial streams the ISTA is capable of receiving in the R2I NDP for a 320 MHz bandwidth minus 1” |
| 2078 | 28.02 | 9.4.2.301 | "The Max R2I NSS field indicates the maximum number of spatial streams to be used in an R2I 3 NDP for 320MHz PPDU bandwidth transmissions in the session" -- has a "minus 1" been lost? | Add "minus 1"; ditto next para | **Revise.**  The allowed range is greater than 0, this is a repetition of 2076 on the same exact topic.  TGbk editor in end of P.28L.3 and P.28:.5 insert the following sentence “The value 0 is reserved” |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2112 | 89.02 | 36.2.3a | "configures for the PHY 3 of a STA to demodulate an EHT Ranging NDP or an EHT TB Ranging NDP" -- not any STA, this STA. And "for the PHY" is weird | Change to "configures the PHY to be able to demodulate an EHT Ranging NDP or an EHT TB Ranging NDP" | **Accept.** |
| 2115 | 90.? | 36.3.19a | N\_TX is used 4 times, but never defined | Define N\_TX | **Reject.**  Several searches were performed with various variants of the term and was not able to identify the location of N\_TX in the draft spec. However N\_TX is a parameter in the TX and RX vector and as such defined in the baseline e.g. 11be.  NTX (where TX is subscript) is used in 36.3.19a, however this parameter is defined in the baseline. and well defined in 802.11be-D5.0.  Should the commenter like to make changes to baseline 11be, suggest to do that directly with the relevant project. |
| 2117 | 92.20 | 36.3.19a.1 | "If the TXVECTOR parameter SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG is equal to 0, the TXVECTOR 21 parameter NUM\_USERS is equal to 1, and all the EHT-LTF symbols belong to a single EHT-LTF 22 User Block. " -- the bit between the commas duplicates the table in 36.2.2 | Delete the bit between the commas, and the commas, and the following "and" | **Reject.**  P.87 in Table 36-1 TXVECTOR and RXVECTOR parameter NUM\_USERS, does not specify all EHT-LTF symbols as belonging to single EHT-LTF User Block hence this is not repetition and 92.20 cannot be simply deleted. |
| 2118 | 92.25 | 36.3.19a.1 | Per CID 1331 "will" was supposed to be expunged but there's still one | As it says in the comment | **Revise.**  TGbk editor in P802.11bk D2.0 P.92L25 replace “will be” with “is”. |
| 2119 | 93.17 | 36.3.19a.1 | "(#1337) In each EHT-LTF User Block within the EHT-LTF field, the number of transmit antennas 18 shall be" -- I still don't understand how a number of antennas applies to a User Block (which is some field) | Is this about the number of antennas used to transmit that particular field? Or about the number of antennas signalled in a field of that field? Or something else? | **Reject.**  The commenter did not identify an deficiency or issue with the spec. and seems to be just seeking information.  The sentence specifies that there should be a correlation between the number of Tx antennas used and in the field NUM\_STS. And that this number or rank can change from one user block to another when secured LTF is used. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2121 | 102.6 | B.4 | "(CFHE OR CFEHT):O" -- you can't be an EHT STA without also being an HE STA, can you? | Revert the addition of "OR CFEHT" (and the parens) here and elsewehere in B.4 | **Reject.**  Agree that support for EHT operation also derives support of HE operation, however this is to specify component of the operation executed under EHT operation and not as part of the HE operation. |
| 2127 | 19.02 | 9.3.1.22.1 | "the assigned STA's transmit power is HE-MCS 0 for an HE TB PPDU or EHT-MCS 0 for an EHT TB PPDU. " -- makes no sense: an HE-MCS is not a transmit power. Similarly in next para | As it says in the comment | **Revise.**  TGbk editor change:  “If the Secured Sounding Ranging Trigger frame does not assign an MCS, then the assigned STA’s transmit power is HE-MCS 6 for an HE TB PPDU or EHT-MCS 6 for an EHT TB PPDU.”  To:  “If the Secured Sounding Ranging Trigger frame does not assign an MCS, then the assigned STA’s transmit power is the maximum transmit power of HE-MCS 6 for an HE TB PPDU or EHT-MCS 6 for an EHT TB PPDU.” |
| 2132 | 23.34 | 9.3.1.23.4 | "soliciting 35 an HE TB PPDU or an EHT TB PPDU" -- it can't solicit anything else, but in the future it might be able to solicit another kind of TB PPDU. This insertion does no good, only potential harm | Delete the cited text | **Reject.**  The intent of the requirement is to limit the formats the Poll Ranging Trigger frame may solicit. |