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# CID #5 (Rejected)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx #** | **Cat.** | **Pg.** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| Aldana, Carlos | 5 | Technical | 208 | 13.2.2 | 22 | Make 500 kb/s support mandatory to reduce airtime | As in comment |

**Resolution: Reject**

The group has reached consensus regarding that we only mandate the 250 kb/s data rate to allow the maximum interoperability. When both sides support higher data rate, it is always possible for the two sides to employ the higher data rates.

# CID #6 (Rejected)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx #** | **Cat.** | **Pg.** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| Aldana, Carlos | 6 | Technical | 208 | 13.2.2 | 22 | Make 1000 kb/s support mandatory to reduce airtime | As in comment |

**Resolution: Reject**

The group has reached consensus regarding that we only mandate the 250 kb/s data rate to allow the maximum interoperability. When both sides support higher data rate, it is always possible for the two sides to employ the higher data rates.

# CID #141 (Rejected, more discussions)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx #** | **Cat.** | **Pg.** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| LI, HuanBang | 141 | General | 212 | 13.3.2 | 8 | Since this subclause specifies the transmit power spectral density (PSD) mask, it'd be better to replace 'the transmitted spectral product' to 'the transmitted power spectral density' . | make change. |

**Resolution: Rejected**

This wording has been used in 15.4 spec. If the usage is correct, we better reuse it here.

# CID #647, 649, 650, 654, 221, 222, 143 (Accepted)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx #** | **Cat.** | **Pg.** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| VERSO, BILLY | 647 | Technical | 214 | 16.2.1 | 14 | For STS packets, the RMARKER position in the figure was indicated as "informative", because it is precisely specified in 6.9.1, we should do the same for SENS packets. | Add word "informatively" after "shown" |
| VERSO, BILLY | 649 | Technical | 214 | 16.2.1 | 19 | "ranging sequence sent as short fragments", could be improved as a description since "short" is arguably dependant on the programming, also I think we should be careful with the term "ranging sequence" | Change "ranging sequence sent as short fragments" to "sequence of fragments" |
| VERSO, BILLY | 650 | Technical | 214 | 16.2.1 | 20 | Since "span" it a measurement (of distance or time) "fragments" shouild be "miliseconds" | Change "fragments" to "miliseconds" |
| VERSO, BILLY | 654 | Technical | 221 | 16.2.11.1 | 20 | The reference to 16.8 on this line should be 16.8.1, While editorial in nature, this is a technical change to the meaning of the specification. | change "16.8" to "16.8.1" |
| MAMAN, MICKAEL | 221 | Technical | 221 | 16.2.11.1 | 4 | the right section is 16.8.1 | change to 16.8.1 |
| MAMAN, MICKAEL | 222 | Technical | 221 | 16.2.11.1 | 20 | the right section is 16.8.1 | change to 16.8.1 |
| LI, HuanBang | 143 | General | 237 | 16.4.1.1 | 18 | Wrong subclause number. | replace '16.3.4.2' by '16.4.1.2'. |

**Resolution: Accepted**

# CID #224 (Revised)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx #** | **Cat.** | **Pg.** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| MAMAN, MICKAEL | 224 | Technical | 222 | 16.2.11.1 | 15 | MMS UWB packet can be RIF only | remove "additional" |

**Resolution: Revised**

In page 222, line 15, revise the sentence as follows:

From:

“Where the MMS packet includes RIF fragments, additional RIF RMARKERs are defined for each RIF fragment, as the peak of the first pulse in the RIF and the peak of the last pulse in the RIF.”

To:

“Where the MMS packet includes RIF fragments, RIF RMARKERs are also defined for each RIF fragment, as the peak of the first pulse in the RIF and the peak of the last pulse in the RIF.”

# CID #223, 655 (Revised)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Idx #** | **Cat.** | **Pg.** | **Sub-clause** | **Line #** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| MAMAN, MICKAEL | 223 | Technical | 222 | 16.2.11.1 | 12 | the right section is 16.8.1 | change to 16.8.1 |
| VERSO, BILLY | 655 | Technical | 222 | 16.2.11.1 | 12 | The reference to 16.8 on this line should be 16.8.1, although it could alos be 16.8 on its own without the 16.8.2, however since it is really repeating what was on line 20 of the previous page, I think we should delete this line. | Delete this line |

**Resolution: Revised**

Deleted line 12 in page 222.