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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for CIDs 4222,4223, 4225, 4235, 4237, 4559, 4693, 4714

Green indicates material agreed to in the group,

yellow material to be discussed, red material rejected by the group and

cyan material not to be overlooked.

The “Final” view should be selected in Word.

Rev 1 – Comments from Mark Rison and subsequent changes.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4222 | 3524.00 | 25.5.7.1.3 |  |  | "106" should be "10<sup>6</sup>", and the size of "440x10<sup>6</sup>" on the previous line should be made consistent with surrounding text | As it says in the comment  L9  ACCEPTED |
| 4223 | 3544.00 | 25.6.9.2.3 |  |  | "1320" is off by 6 orders of magnitude | Add " <mult> 10<sup>6</sup>" after the cited text.  Also fix the size of "660x10<sup>6</sup>" on the same line to be consistent with surrounding text  L29  ACCEPTED |
| 4225 | 3566.00 | 25.15.3 |  |  | "540 " should be "540 MHz" | As it says in the comment  L29  ACCEPTED |
| 4235 | 3528.00 | 25.6.5.5 |  |  | "transmitted using duplication style" -- not defined | Change to "duplicated"  P3528L41  Proposal is to change phrase to  “the modulated S1G symbols are duplicated as described in 25.3.10.”  ACCEPTED  Note to editor:  Replace “transmitted using duplicated style” and replace with “duplicated”  REVISED: at P3528L41 delete “using duplication style” |
| 4237 | 3513.00 | 25.5.1 |  |  | " transmitted by CMMG SC MIMO" -- huh? | Change to " with MIMO"  L38, check CID 2375  Asked Sigurd. “This is about the Chinese mmWave apparently. The proposed change looks fine to me. I suppose the comment has to do with the fact that MIMO is a generic concept and shouldn’t be prefaced with “CMMG SC”. It’s more editorial than anything else.”  ACCEPTED |
| 4559 | 3545.00 | 25.7.2.3 |  |  | "A value of N in the Training Length field indicates that the AGC has 4N subfields and that the TRN- R/T field has 5N subfields." but 20.9.2.2.3 (referred to from Table 25-7--Fields in the CMMG SIG field) says "A value of N in the Training Length field indicates 4xN AGC subfields and that the TRN-R/T field has N TRN Units." so there is duplication and possibly also contradiction | Delete the xref to 20.9.2.2.3 in Table 25-7  *Mark R comment that my original did not address the duplication or the contradiction. He was right*.  20.9.2.2.3 P3132L34 says  “A value of *N* in the Training Length field indicates 4×*N* AGC subfields and that the TRN-R/T field has *N* TRN Units.”  25.7.2.3. P3545L44 says  “A value of *N* in the Training Length field indicates that the AGC has 4*N* subfields and that the TRN- R/Tfield has 5*N* subfields  So there is duplication and a problem in that one says N and the other says 5N.  Table 25-7 P3505L26 is the training Length field  “The use of this field is defined in 20.9.2.2.3 (BRP PPDU(#1379) header fields)”  I don’t see a problem with the cross reference as 20.9.2.2.3. does refer to the Training Field, but commenter wants to delete it and it is not strictly correct.  Is it N or 5N? 20.9.2.2.6 P3133 should tell us and Fig 2020 indicates 5, so I think that 5N is correct.  REVISED  At P3132L34 delete the “x” and add “5” before the “N TRN”  Sentence to read:  “A value of *N* in the Training Length field indicates 4*N* AGC subfields and that the TRN-R/T field has 5*N* TRN Units.”  Delete at P3545L44  “A value of *N* in the Training Length field indicates that the AGC has 4*N* subfields and that the TRN- R/Tfield has 5*N* subfields.”  Delete in Table 25-7 P3505L26  “The use of this field is defined in 20.9.2.2.3 (BRP PPDU(#1379) header fields)” |
| 4693 |  | 24 |  |  | CID 2036 follow-up, are the 128s in Figures 24-2/5 correct? | As it says in the comment  CID 2036, Draft 2  Figures 25-4, 25-5, and 25-6 show sequences of length 256 used in the preamble while the sequences are actually of length 32  I thought this was 3462 L47  Table 24 - 128 \* 1.14=146ns  Table says 14.6ns  Should be 146ns, next 2 lines show correct. So happens that needs correcting.  I look at Figures 25-4, 5 and 6 and I see no “128s”. It is all 256s in the equations above them in D2.0 and 3.0.  Resolution was in Doc 19/1034r01”  “Typos, the length of sequence in the STF should be 32 rather than 256. Therefore, the **Z256** in the STF in Figures 25-4 to 25-8 should be replaced with **Z32**as follows:”  **Not done**  REVISED  At P3462L47 replace 14.6 with 146.  Incorporate the changes for CID 2036 documented in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1034-01-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-11aj-related-comments-in-revmd-lb236.doc. |
| 4714 | 3504.00 | 25.3.9.1 |  |  | Table 25-7---Fields in the CMMG SIG field needs the same changes as made under CID 1351.  However Assaf reports that it "requires (a lot of) more work because the scrambling is not mentioned in the encoding process." | Ask Assaf to kindly to the more work  Assign to ASSAF |