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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 excluding clause 9.43.1 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 D 2.0, 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.

Since the 11ah D. 1.0 is based on different REVmc D1.1, it is preferred to have the editor to revise the element ID table when the 11ah specification also ramp up to REVmc latest version

**Proposed Response:**

CID 2474, CID 2953, 1382, 2788, and 2789, and 2161 are rejected

**Proposed Resolution Text:**

***N/A.***