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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for comments of TGba D3.0 with the following 10 CIDs:

* 3023, 3129, 3133, 3178, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3199, 3329, 3330

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGba D3.0 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGba D3.0 Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGba Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGba Editor” are instructions to the TGba editor to modify existing material in the TGba draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGba editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGba Draft.***

#### *CIDs 3023, 3129, 3133, 3178, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3199, 3329, 3330*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3023 | 30.3.11 | 156.59 | Table 30-3 does not actually define T\_(WUR-Sync,i\_BW) but T\_WUR-Sync. Perhaps from context it's anyway clear that they are only being indexed per subchannel in this case, though. | Add more definitions in Table 30-3? Use existing definitions but make clear that TXTIME is computed as in Eq 31-12 from the main channel rather than from a subchannel? Do nothing at all and rely on the i\_BW context? | Revisied-Agree in principle with the commenter. Clarify T\_(WUR-Sync,i\_BW) and T\_(Sym,i\_BW).Alos, at the beginning of 30.4.1, add the text “For WUR Basic PPDU” for clarification.TGba editor to make the changes shown in 11-19/1194r1. |
| 3129 | 30.3.11 | 156.59 | T\_WUR-Sync should be TWUR-sync, iBW, same for Tsym | Correct it. | Revisied-Agree in principle with the commenter. Clarify T\_(WUR-Sync,i\_BW) and T\_(Sym,i\_BW).TGba editor to make the changes shown in 11-19/1194r1. |
| 3133 | 30.4.1 | 166.7 | At the beginning of 30.4.1, add that the below calculation is for WUR basic PPDU. For example, (31-14) only applies for WUR basic PPDU. For FDMA case, PSDU length should include padding | As in comment | Revisied-Agree in principle with the commenter. At the beginning of 30.4.1, add the text “For WUR Basic PPDU” for clarification.TGba editor to make the changes shown in 11-19/1194r1. |
| 3178 |  |  | add Nsym or N\_octet and PSDU\_LENGTH need to be added for FDMA transmission. | Picking up on comment 2270. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected-*Nsym,iBW* for the FDMA transmission is defined in section 30.3.11 (WUR Padding field for a WUR FDMA PPDU). *Nmax\_octet* for the FDMA transmission is defined in section 30.3.14 (WUR transmit procedure). We don’t have to define PSDU\_LENGTH for the FDMA transmission because it is not referred to in the FDMA transmission. |
| 3183 |  |  | The last paragraph repeats the descriptions in 32.2.4.8 (Construction of the WUR-Sync and WUR-Data for the FDMA transmission), page 76, line 12-16. | Picking up on comment 2283. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected-The cited paragraph no longer exists in D3.0. |
| 3184 |  |  | "WUR FDMA PPDU for 40MHz channel widths", and "WUR FDMA PPDU for 80MHz channel widths", the usage of "channel widths" is not consistent with later part of the draft | Picking up on comment 2285. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected-TGba doesn’t see what commenter suggests. Detailed suggestion is needed. Also, channel width is normally used in the baseline spec. |
| 3185 |  |  | WUR FDMA PPDU may carry WUR frames using different data rates in different sub-channels. | Picking up on comment 2291. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected-TGba doesn’t see what commenter suggests. Detailed suggestion is needed. |
| 3199 | 30.3.3 | 137.7 | There needs to be a definition of the WUR FDMA PPDU format, somehow/somewhere. If these are only examples, what is the actual definition of requirements? | Per CID 2373 on the previous letter ballot, these look like the definition of this PPDU format, or could with sufficient flexibility added where needed to account for varying data rates or number of information bits. Such a clear and strict definition of what must be in a PPDU is necessary. | Rejected-It is already defined in the section 3 (Definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations) and well described in section 30.3.3 WUR FDMA PPDU format. Also, there are many descriptions regarding the FDMA transmission in the spec. We don’t have to include those descriptions in the definition. |
| 3329 | 30.3.11 | 156.43 | Add reference for 'HDR information bit 1' | Replace the term "HDR information bit 1" with "HDR information bit 1, as described in Table 30-14 (WUR PPDU Data Rates)." | Accepted- |
| 3330 | 30.3.11 | 156.45 | It should be clarified that the LFSR, used for symbol randomization, is updated every T\_{Sym-HDR} for the padding field. | Add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph in 30.3.11: "The state of the LSFR is updated every T\_{Sym-HDR} during the padding field." | Accepted- |

*TGba Editor: Please make the following changes in 156.59 of D3.0:*

*TWUR-Sync,iBW* and *TSym,iBW* denote *TWUR-Sync* and *TSym* for 20 MHz subchannel *iBW*, respectively. *TWUR-Sync* and *TSym* are defined in Table 30-3 (Timing-related constants). (#3023)(#3129)

*TGba Editor: Please make the following changes in 166.07 of D3.0:*

For WUR Basic PPDU, the value of the TXTIME parameter shall be calculated as follows: (#3023)( #3133)

*TGba Editor: Please make the following changes in 156.43 of D3.0:*

For a WUR FDMA PPDU, if padding is needed on any 20 MHz subchannels, the padding waveform shall be generated by repeating the MC-OOK waveform of HDR information bit 1 as described in Table 30-14 (WUR PPDU Data Rates). The symbol randomizer as described in 30.3.4.4 (Symbol Randomizer and Per-transmit chain Cyclic Shift) should be used in the padding field continued from the WUR-Data field. The state of the LSFR is updated every *TSym-HDR* during the padding field. (#3329)(#3330)