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**Proposed Comment Resolutions to CID #’s**

**(623, 624, 625, 441, 440, 644)**

**CID 623**

Comment: "As specified in the sentence the separation between the Acknowledgment frame and the second transmission shall be at least the IFS period or aTurnaroundTime, whichever is greater; however the similar thing is not reflecting in the figure 15. Keep the separation in the figure as is per the approved amendment. Instead of LIFS, change it to max(LIFS,aTurnaroundTime) in Figure 15 and also change SIFS to max(SIFS,aTurnaroundTime) as per the approved amendment."

Proposed Change: Change as suggested.

**Proposed Resolution**: Accept in Principle

On page 34, line 36, include the following sentence,

“…the separation between the Acknowledgment frame and the second transmission shall be at least the IFS period or aTurnaroundTime, whichever is greater. aTurnaroundTime is defined in 10.2.“

Include max(LIFS,aTurnaroundTime) and max(SIFS, aTurnaroundTime) in Figure 15 instead of LIFS and SIFS to be consistent with the text.

Note to the editor: Include IFS instead of interframe spacing in section 5.2.6.5 and Table 85

**CID 624, 625**

Comment: It is unclear that what is expected time the device should wait to recevie an ack frame? Should it be >= AIFS?

Comment: What is the expected time the device should wait to claim if the transmission is a success or failed?

Proposed Change: Add what is expected time the device should wait for?

**Proposed Resolution**: Reject. Expected time can be sometimes way longer than AIFS, so no need to specify the minimum limit.

**CID 441**

Comment: "FSK zero crossing limit of +/-12.5% is unnecessarely tight, since it based on a peak measurement of a signal that is impacted by phase noise"

Proposed Change: change to 12.5% rms value

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept

**CID 440**

Comment: missing receiver interference rejection specification

Proposed Change: "add adjacent and alternate adjacent channel rejection spec.

(like sub-clause 22.3.5)"

**Proposed Resolution:** Accept in Principle

Include a new clause after clause 23.4.5 as follows,

23.4.6 Receiver interference rejection

The adjacent designated channels are those on either side of the desired designated channel that are closest in frequency to the desired designated channel. The alternate designated channel is more than one removed from the desired designated channel in the operational frequency band.

The adjacent channel rejection shall be measured as follows: the desired signal shall be a compliant LECIM FSK PHY signal, as defined in 23.2, of pseudo-random data at the center frequency of the desired channel.

In either the adjacent or the alternate channel, an unmodulated carrier in the center of that channel is input at the following level relative to the level of the desired signal:

— The adjacent channel rejection shall be greater than or equal to 10 dB.

— The alternate channel rejection shall be greater than or equal to 30 dB.

The test shall be performed for only one interfering signal at a time.

**CID 644**

Comment: Table 164 and 165 describes the frequency bands for LECIM; however the sentence says, "For devices other than LEICIM and TVWS PHYs, the frequency bands are listed in Table 163, Table 164, and Table 165." Remove Table 164 and 165 or LECIM PHY from the sentence.

Proposed Change: Change as suggested.

Proposed Resolution: Accept in Principle

Change the sentence as follows, “For devices other than LEICIM and TVWS PHYs, the frequency bands are listed in Table 163.~~, Table 164, and Table 165. , and~~”

**CID 86**

Comment: Maximum TX Power field: Is this field an unsigned integer, offset from -64 dBm, 2’s complement? How is the power measured, it is power delivered to the antenna or EIRP?

Proposed Change: Define it to be 2's complement EIRP in 0.5 dBm

**Proposed Resolution**: Accept in Principle

Include a sentence at the end of paragraph on page 185, line 15, “It is measured based on the regulatory requirements.”