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Abstract

The submission provides resolutions to comments related to PHY Introduction and 1 comment related to PHY capabilities.

In specific, the submission provides resolutions to 3 CIDs:
20769, 20774, and 21381

* Revisions:
* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 20769 |  | Re CID 16239: the stuff quoted in the resolution explains what an SU beamformer may do, but it does not justify the STA advertising that it is capable of doing these things. There needs to be something at the receiving STA that relies on the setting of this bit, otherwise it's useless | In Figure 9-772c change "SU Beamformer" to "Reserved". In Table 9-321b delete the "SU Beamformer" row; delete " if the SU Beamformerfield is 1 and", "If the SU Beamformer subfield is1:" (2x), ; change "Reserved if the SU Beamformer subfield is 0" to "Reserved if operation as an SU beamformer is not supported" (2x). In 27.6.2 delete the first para and delete " and shall set the SU Beamformer subfield to 1" in the third para | RejectedA precedent exists for defining Tx capability in previous amendments. |

***Discussion***

Such a field is still useful for telling the STA about the capabilities of the AP. It enables intelligent selection of an AP in cases when the STA can see multiple APs at association time. Moreover, a precendent exists for declaring transmit capabilities where the purpose is merely telling the receiving STA about the capabilities of the transmitter. One example of such a capability field is Tx-MCS Map.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 20774 |  | Re CID 16259: the amount of information in 27.1.1 dwarfs that in other PHYs. And the main point is that requirements not expressed anywhere else should not be hidden in an "Introduction" | Move the normative requirements into a new Subclause 27.1.1b, and keep only general introductory material in 27.1.1 | Rejected-Too much work is needed for satisfying what seems to be a subjective preference. |

***Discussion***

Thie proposed change is not technical in nature. It’s a matter of subjective opinion about the location of the text, and spec organization. Section 27.1.1 is an intricate section and breaking and re-organizing it is likely to introduce bugs in the spec and is a very time-consuming task at this late a stage of spec development. The commentor is encouraged to bring a more concrete proposal about achieving the objective of this comment.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 21381 | 446.64 | Reference to support of Clause 18, which is not mentioned in the introduction on page 441. In addition, Table 27-1 also mentions Clauses 15 and 16 for FORMAT = Non-HT. Those are missing in the text. | Should these clauses also be mentioned in the introduction? | RejectedSupport for clause 19 already ensures the support for clauses 18 and 16. |

***Discussion***

PHY introduction section mentions that HE device is required to support clause 19, while clause 19 further mentions that it needs to support clauses 18 and 16. So, the objective of the comment is already absorbed in the current dependencies of the existing spec.