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Abstract

This document contains proposed resolutions to SB0 comments assigned to the author.

R0: CIDs 5314, 5535, 5556, 5589 (MAC); 5971, 5973 (GEN); 6319 (EDITOR). The proposed resolution to CID 5971 is incomplete, and will be completed in a subsequent revision.

# Comments owned by MAC

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5314 | 740.51 | 8.4.2.20.7 |  | The sentence that begins "For operating classes that encompass a primary channel but do not identify the location of the primary channel," confuses operating classes with the field named "Operating Class". | Replace the full sentence that begins "For operating classes that encompass ..".  with:  "A request frame is a request to make iterative measurements for all primary channel positions in all channels listed in the frame's AP Channel Report subelement when all of the following pertain:  " -- The operating class indicated by the value of the Operating Class field in that frame encompasses a primary channel.  " -- The frame does not identify the location of that primary channel.  " -- The value of the frame's Channel Number field is 255.  " -- The channel is supported.  " -- The measurement is permitted on the channel.  " -- The channel is permitted in the current regulatory domain." |  | MAC |

**Discussion**

The proposed change text corrects the description of iterative measurements on all primary channel positions listed in the frame’s AP Channel Report subelement. The sentence being revised has 66 words and several qualifying phrases, and is much clearer when expressed as a dashed list.

**Proposed Resolution**

Accepted. Make changes proposed in CID 5314.

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5535 | 1637.19 | 10.8.3 |  | A comparison with the fourth paragraph of 10.8.2 leads to the question: why is there no specification of the use of Country, Power Constraint and VHT Transmit Power Envelope elements, as well as Maximum Transmit Power Level field, etc. with respect to mesh STAs? Are mesh STAs not subject to power contraint regulations? Or are mesh STAs not allowed to use 11ac facilities? | Insert a new paragraph specifying the use of power constraint facilities to accommodate regulations. |  | MAC |

**Discussion**

As 10.8.2 only discusses requirements for association, and 10.8.3 discusses requirements for peering, it is appropriate to add transmit power constraints to 10.8.3.

**Proposed Resolution**

Revised. Make changes under CID 5535 in <this-document>.

At 1637.19 (at the end of 10.8.3 after the para) add:

“If a STA sends a Country element, a Power Constraint element, and a Transmit Power Envelope element,

where the interpretation of the Maximum Transmit Power Level field in the Country element for a 20 MHz

or 40 MHz Subband Triplet field is the same as the Local Maximum Transmit Power Unit Interpretation

subfield, then at least one of local power constraints indicated by the Local Maximum Transmit Power For

20 MHz and Local Maximum Transmit Power For 40 MHz fields in the Transmit Power Envelope element

shall be the same as the indicated local power constraint expressed by the combination of Country element

and Power Constraint element.”

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5556 | 1640.04 | 10.9.1 |  | "Detecting radar in the current and other channels based on regulatory requirements": "based on" appears to modify "channels", when it actually modifies "detecting" | Replace "channels based" with "channels, based". |  | MAC |

**Discussion**

The comma insertion clarifies the phrase.

**Proposed Resolution**

Accepted. Make the change proposed in CID 5556.

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5589 | 1646.17 | 10.9.8.3 |  | "within a spectrum-managed IBSS": but there is no definition of "spectrum-managed" anythng in this standard. | Replace "within a spectrum-managed IBSS" with "in an IBSS". |  | MAC |

**Discussion**

Clause 10.9.8.3 **Selecting and advertising a new channel in an IBSS** describes one of the DFS procedures, which are defined for spectrum managed bands (PICS CF10). The proposed change removes a redundant qualification from the phrase.

**Proposed Resolution**

Accepted. Make the change proposed in CID 5589.

# Comments owned by GEN

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5971 | 3337.63 | E.1 |  | It is hard to manage a mixed BSS where some STAs only understand a regional Operating Class table, and others understand the Global Operating Class Table. It is difficult to signal measurement requests and responses for operating classes in more than one table. Add an explicit requirement that multi-domain capable STAs support Table E-4 Global Operating Classes going forward, and that use of non-Global Operating Classes may be deprecated in future revisions of the standard. | Add an explicit requirement that multi-domain capable STAs support Table E-4 Global Operating Classes going forward, and that use of non-Global Operating Classes may be deprecated in future revisions of the standard. |  | GEN |

**Discussion**

As the comment indicates, in countries that have non-global operating classes, management information has to be sent with one country element to STAs that do not support the Global operating classes, and with another country element to STAs that do not support the relevant non-global operating classes. 9.21 “Operation across regulatory domains” specifies multi-domain operation, and is the place to encourage support for the Global operating classes. We propose to insert 9.21.3a Operation with multiple country elements before 9.21.4 Operation with coverage classes.

**Proposed Resolution**

Revised. Make changes under CID 5971 in <this-document>.

At 1320.50 insert: 9.21.3a Operation with multiple country elements

At 2720.44, add: “MD16 Operation with multiple country elements

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5973 | 3343.01 | E.1 |  | Close to half of the Japan table entries duplicate other entries as a legacy from 802.11j. We should indicate they are deprecated and may be reserved in a future version of the standard. | Add a note saying we are deprecating use of classes 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 38, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55 and they may be reserved in a future version of the standard. |  | GEN |

**Discussion**

As the comment indicates, the removal of class distinctions based on transmit mask and interference class, introduced by 802.11-2012, resulted in many Japanese operating classes that have not been implemented in a real-world product. I do not know of any products for Behavior Limits set “licensed base STA” or Emissions Limit set “other interference areas.” I do know of “mobile STAs” and “nomadic use” in “interference limited areas.” We adopt the same convention as the PICS and use an asterisk after each obsolete class and precede Table E-2 with explanatory text

**Proposed Resolution**

Revised. Make changes under CID 5973 in <this-document>.

At 3343.01 (after sentence) add: “Note that some of the operating classes in this table were never used and are obsolete. The obsolete operating classes indicated by an asterisk (\*) might be removed in a future revision of the standard.”

At 3343.21 in the “Operating class” column an asterisk after classes as shown: 2\*, 4\*, 5\*, 7\*, 9\*, 10\*, 12\*, 14\*, 15\*, 16\*, 18\*, 19\*, 21\*, 23\*, 24\*, 27\*, 28\*, 35\*, 38\*, 40\*, 43\*, 45\*,

47\*, 48\*, 49\*, 50\*, 52\*, 53\*, 54\* and 55\*.

# Comments owned by EDITOR

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Resn Status** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6319 |  |  |  | The behavior limits sets identified in Annex E are no longer so identified by number, just by name, so using the numbers elsewhere is just needlessly confusing | Change from numbers to words on p. 666 (4x), 890 (2x), 891 (4x), 1649 (2x), 1694 (4x), 3352. Delete the Encoding column in Table D-2 |  | EDITOR |

**Discussion**

As the comment indicates, the standard uses names for behaviour limits in Annex E.

**Proposed Resolution**

Accepted. Make changes under CID 6319 in <this-document>.

At 666.37, replace “class that includes a value of 13 or 14 in the behavior limits as specified in Annex E,” with “class that includes a value of PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior or PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior in the behavior limits as specified in Annex E,”.

At 666.40, replace “does not include a value of 13 or 14” with “does not include a value of PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior or PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 890.13, replace “a value of 13 or 14” with “a value of PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior or PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 891.09, 891.15, 891.19 and replace “value 16:” with “value DFS\_50\_100\_Behavior:”.

At 1649.17, replace “**behavior limits set of 16**” with “**behavior limits set of DFS\_50\_100\_Behavior**”.

At 1649.21, replace “includes the value 16;” with “includes the value DFS\_50\_100\_Behavior;”.

At 1694.18, replace “if the Behavior Limit parameter of the selected row contains the value 13” with “if the Behavior Limit parameter of the selected row contains the value PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior”

At 1694.21, replace “selected row contains the value 14” with “selected row contains the value PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 1694.24, replace “selected row contains neither the value 13 nor the value 14” with “selected row contains neither the value PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior nor the value PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 3331.07, delete the “Encoding” column from Table D-2.

At 3352.43 , replace “STAs operating under the behavior limits set 17” with “STAs operating with a behavior limits set value of ITS\_nonmobile\_operations”.