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Abstract

This submission addresses a subset of the editorial comments on 802.11bd D0.3.

There were 92 comments submitted marked “Editorial”

Except the comments discussed in this document, the rest of the comments are either Accepted and implemented in D0.4 or are duplicate of non-Editorial comments and as such identified in the database.

The following comments are discussed in this document:

-23, 65, 73, 74, 162

Revisions:

R1 – CID 65 assigned to Joe Levy; CID 74 discussion text added.

R2 – resolution for CID 74 updated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page.line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| **23** | **36.47** | **32.3.4** | I assume DCM is identical to DCM in 11ax. If this is the case please add a reference when DCM is introduced. | Introduce a reference to the baseline definition of DCM. | RevisedThe reference should be to clause 32.3.8.6Editor: replace”<TBD>” with “Clause 32.3.8.6”(D0.4) |
| **65** | **19.06** | **6.6.1** | Why is this in clause 6.6.1? Doesn't it belong in the 6.3 with all the other MLME primitives. | Place these MLME primitives in the proper clause. | Reassigned to Joe Levy to be handled w/ other Clause 6 comments |
| **73** | **22.10** | **31.1** | Calling TGbd STA a NGV STA is not a great idea, as once this STA and its capabilities are in the specification, what would we call a the next NGV STA? Therefore, I think we should come up with at better and more specific name for the TGbd STA. I suggest we use High Throughput Vehicular - HTV. Or some other more specific name. | Replace NGV with HTV | Reject.While undersand the motivation, the name NGV is well used and known outside the IEEE as well, at this stage it might be best to keep it and allow next generations to come up with other names. |
| **74** | **22.5** | **31** | Given that the NGV MAC section is only ~2 pages - does it make more sense to just add the features in to the main MAC section (Clause 10). | Remove Clause 31 and add the NGV functionality to Clause 10, an appropriate location. | RejectI verified that it is an editorial change and can be done anytime by the editor.Suggest to rejct now and revisit it after D1.0 after we have a better feel of the whole draft and address it as a comment on D1.0. |
| **162** | **35.00** | **32.3.1** | It seems max N\_TX is 2 in NGV. | Fix the number of TX chains to 2 in Figures 32-5 and 32-6 as shown in Figure 32-7. | Reassigned to QinghuaDiscussion: N\_TX is the number of antennas. If the figure shows the number of streams then it makes sense to update the figure, otherwise number of antenna is an implementation choice and not limited. |