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Abstract

This document provides resolutions for CID 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 2793,1091, 1382, 2162, 2474, 2788, 2789, 2953

CIDs: 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 2793

The changes are in the following subclause: 8.4.1.47.1

CID: 1091

The changes are in the following subclause: 8.4.1.53

CIDs :1382, 2162, 2474, 2788, 2789, 2953

The changes are in the following subclause: 8.4.2.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Changes** |
| 1087 | 8.4.1.47.1 | 64.13 | 13 | This insertion creates a hanging subclause. Instead you need to add a .1 header to cover existing material, and then this becomes a .2 sibling to the existing material.  See also my general comment on this topic. | Insert 8.4.1.47.1 "General" to hold existing content of 8.4.1.47, then make this new subclause .2 |
| 1088 | 8.4.1.47.1 | 64.18 | 18 | "For S1G band," -- grammar | "For the S1G band," |
| 1089 | 8.4.1.47.1 | 64.18 | 18 | "the same VHT MIMO control field is applied in the sounding feedback frame, " -- this makes no sense to me. | Reword it so it makes sense. e.g. "the VHT MIMO control field is used in the sounding feedback frame, " |
| 1090 | 8.4.1.47.1 | 64.24 | 24 | "Channel Width field shall be reinterpreted as follows" -- normative statements are not allowed in Clause 8 | "The Channel Width field is defined as follows:"  Similar change at 64.31. |
| 2793 | 8.4.1.47.1 | 64.24 | 24 | Channel width field is represented for 2,4,8,16 MHz, but without indicating for 1 MHz. | 1MHz should be added. |

**Discussion:**

CID 1087:

Agree with the commenter. Will revise the text accordingly. Since both 802.11-2012 and 802.11REVmc\_D2.0 do not have clause 8.4.1.47. The new clause remains 8.4.1.47.1.

CID 1088:

Agree with the suggestion

CID 1089:

Agree with the suggestion

CID 1090:

Agree with the suggestion

CID 2793:

Channel width field in VHT MIMO control filed is carried in sounding feedback frame. Since the beamforming exchange is defined only for 2, 4, 8, 16 MHz (24.3.10.1, p 325 line 60). It does not need to add 1MHz indication.

**Proposed Response:**

CID 1087: Counter

CID 1088: Accept

CID 1089: Accept

CID 1090: Accept

CID 2793: Reject

**Proposed Resolution Text:**

***Instruct the editor to revise Clause 8.4.1.47.1 , “VHT MIMO Control Field used in S1G Band” as proposed below***

8.4.1.47 General

**8.4.1.47.1 VHT MIMO Control Field used in S1G Band**

For the S1G band, the VHT MIMO control field is used in the sounding feedback frame, with the

following exceptions.

— Nc index field shall not indicate a value that is more than 4

— Nr index field shall not indicate a value that is more than 4

— The channel Width field is defined as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Changes** |
| 1091 | 8.4.1.53 | 66.28 | 28 | Don't abbrev!  There are two different comment abbreviations of Synchronization. This will confuse folks who search for the wrong one. | Replace all "synch" with "synchronization". |

**Discussion:**

CID 1091: agree with the commenter.

In D 1.0 there are 4 instances of “sync” and 85 instances of “synch”.

**Proposed Response:**

CID 0191: Accept

**Proposed Resolution Text:**

***Instruct the editor to do a global search for “sync” and “synch” and replace it by “synchronization”.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Changes** |
| 1382 | 8.4.2.1 | 68.30 | 30 | TBD should be resolved in the table 8-55, for example the length of Relay Discovery, or S1G Operation | as in the comment |
| 2162 | 8.4.2.1 | 67.44 | 44 | Table number 8-55 is not correct for Element IDs. | Change "8-55" to "8-61." |
| 2474 | 8.4.2.1 | 68.00 |  | There are two Probe Response Options, and they have different sizes | Delete one of them (TGmc is deleting the lengths, fortunately) |
| 2788 | 8.4.2.1 | 68.30 | 30 | TBD in Table 8-55. | Fill in the number of octets in length. |
| 2789 | 8.4.2.1 | 68.46 | 46 | TBD in Table 8-55. | Fill in the number of octets in length. |
| 2953 | 8.4.2.1 | 67.58 | 58 | Length indication of RPS element should be in the range of 0 to 255 | Change the value of the colomn "Length of indicated element" corresponding to RPS element to '0 -255' |

**Discussion:**

CID 2474: agree with commenter.

In 11REVmc, the length field in Table 8-61 element ID is removed. CID 2953, 1382, 2788, and 2789 are no longer valid once the length field is removed.

CID 2162: agree with the commenter.

**Proposed Response:**

CID 2474: agree

CID 2953, 1382, 2788, and 2789: Counter.

CID 2162: agree

**Proposed Resolution Text:**

***Instruct the editor to change the table number from 8-55 to 8-61 and remove the length field according the 11REVmc table 8-55 format.***