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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.

Rev 2 – Follow up comments from Mark Rison. Rechecked CIDs accordingly.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 commentL9ACCEPTED |
| 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 textL29ACCEPTED  |
| 4225 | 3566.00 | 25.15.3 |  |  | "540 " should be "540 MHz" | As it says in the commentL29ACCEPTED  |
| 4235 | 3528.00 | 25.6.5.5 |  |  | "transmitted using duplication style" -- not defined | Change to "duplicated"P3528L41Proposal is to change phrase to “the modulated S1G symbols are duplicated as described in 25.3.10.”ACCEPTEDNote to editor:Replace “transmitted using duplicated style” and replace with “duplicated” |
| 4237 | 3513.00 | 25.5.1 |  |  | " transmitted by CMMG SC MIMO" -- huh? | Change to " with MIMO"L38, check CID 2375Asked 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/Tfield 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 NTRN 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* subfieldsSo 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. ADVISE ASSIGNING TO ASSAD to check if really 5N, but in the meantime REVISEDAt 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 commentCID 2036, Draft 2Figures 25-4, 25-5, and 25-6 show sequences of length 256 used in the preamble while the sequences are actually of length 32I thought this was 3462 L47 Table 24 - 128 \* 1.14=146nsTable says 14.6nsShould 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 D2.0 and corrected in 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:”Now commenter refers to Figures 24-2, 24-5 and maybe 24-3These look OK to me (Fig 24-3 has Gu512 as sum of 4 Gb128). BUT I am no expert, needs to be assignedAssign to ASSAF?.In the meantime maybe correct the “128” problem I think I found. “At P3462L47 replace 14.6 with 146.” |
| ,which was not covered by 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 workAssign to ASSAF? |