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Abstract

This submission contains proposed comment resolutions to comments on P802.11bn D0.1. The changes are based on P802.11bn D0.2.

The submission provides resolutions to the following 7 CIDs in NDP Annoucement frame format subclause 38.3.1.19

122, 916, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1667, 3630

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause Number(C)** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution**  |
| 122 | JUNG HOON SUH | 9.3.1.19 | 38.55 | We have passed several motions regarding the UHR variant NDPA, but the place holder for this NDPA is empty. Need to fill this sub-clause. | First of all, we need to elect a PoC for this UHR NDPA topic and prepare the proposed draft for the sub-clause, based on the passed motions. | RevisedEditor has added this subclause in D0.2 following the passed PDT <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0414-00-00bn-pdt-joint-ndp-announcement-frame-format.docx>.Note to editor:No change is needed  |
| 916 | Wookbong Lee | 9.3.1.19 | 38.57 | Specify NDP-A for UHR sounding (Co-BF) based on EHT NDP Announcement frame. | As in comment | RevisedDuplicate of CID 122Note to editor:No change is needed  |
| 1667 | Jian Yu | 9.3.1.19 | 38.55 | Define 9.3.1.19 NDPA frame format | as in comment | RevisedDuplicate of CID 122Note to editor:No change is needed |
| 3630 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 9.3.1.19 | 38.55 | NDP Announcement might need update to account for CBF functionalities is my take. | As in comment. | RevisedDuplicate of CID 122Note to editor:No change is needed |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1945 | Insik Jung | 9.3.1.22.3 | 45.07 | As Motion 262 is passed, 1st user field and 2nd user field regarding CoBF sounding NDPA need to be described in the spec text. | Describe the 1st user field and 2nd user field in the spec. | RevisedEditor has added this in D0.2 following the passed PDT <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0414-00-00bn-pdt-joint-ndp-announcement-frame-format.docx>.Note to editor:No change is needed  |
| 1946 | Insik Jung | 9.3.1.22.3 | 45.07 | In 2nd special STA Info field, in addition to the "Recommended MCS" discussed in Motion 250, recommendation of the number of spatial stream might be needed. If not, BFRP would always trigger single-stream transmission from its target STAs, which would not be a good direction. | Define "Recommended Nss" field in the 2nd special STA Info field. | RejectedMCS is mainly determined by the pathloss while the number of spatial streams will be affected by the capability at both the AP and STA side. On the other hand, single stream is recommended for simplicity and robostness as proposed in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0734-00-00bn-misc-cbf-topics-part-ii.pptx |
| 1947 | Insik Jung | 9.3.1.22.3 | 45.07 | When describing the "Recommended MCS" field, the role of the field need to be clarified. That is an indication to recommend robust MCS level for the other participating AP to trigger it's STAs' CSI feedback. (It's triggered STAs' MCS) | Describe text to clarify the role of the "Recommended MCS" field | RevisedEditor has added this in D0.2 following the passed PDT <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0414-00-00bn-pdt-joint-ndp-announcement-frame-format.docx>.Note to editor:No change is needed  |