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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for comments submitted on LB251 with comment type set to General except:

* CID 1782, 1346 and 1251 which are addressed as part of the comments on title in 11-21/0097
* CID 1184 which only says “No comments” and has been rejected.

It additionally proposes resolutions for 2 technical comments targeting Clause “General” and 2 technical comments with Clause blank.

The following 14 CIDs are addressed in this contribution:

* 1136, 1137, 1237, 1236, 1602, 1601, 1283, 1008, 1358, 1165, 1362, 1661, 1070, 1455

R1:

* Resolutions to CIDs 1165 and 1455 were edited during the call per the TG discussions.
* Resolution to CID 1070 was updated after the call to capture the TG discussions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page.line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1136 |  | General | PAR requires fairness with deployed OCM devices. The draft doesn't define how the fairness is ensured |  | Reject.  The draft does not need to define how the fairness is ensured, rather it must not introduce and access mechanism that impacts the fairness. TG has carefully examined NGV access mechanisms and via simulations, etc., was convinced NGV is fair to legacy OCB devices. |
| 1137 |  | General | Coex with regular 20MHz preamble is not supported. With the current spectrum allocation, this may be a requirement to take into account |  | Reject.  This is not part of the PAR and hence out of scope of TGbd. The spectrum still is available in geos other than the US. |
| 1237 |  |  | The 802.11 WG Editors have placed TGbd after TGbb in the amendment ordering. Please work with the Editors to adjust the amendment ordering, or include TGbb/TGbc in the dependancy list | The TGbd draft indicates Amendment 5: please check with the WG Editor and Editor adhoc to ensure the correct Amendment number and order. | Revised.  TG has discussed the issue and the editor has brought up the topic of TGbd draft order with the editors’ group.  Editor: Ensure that the correct amendment number and order is indicated in D2.0 before publication. |
| 1236 |  |  | Please update the draft to the latest/correct base documents prior to asking the WG to review. At the Nov plenary the reported versions were (md=d5.0; ax=d8.0; ay=d6.0; ba=d7.0; az=2.5;) | Need to update for Tgax and Tgaz.  In general, please update the referenced draft dependancys to the correct versions and ensure the changes to are relfected in the TGbd draft. | Accept.  Editor: Ensure that D2.0 is based on the latest revision of previous amendments before publication. |
| 1602 |  |  | Is DSRC reaching end of life and should it be deprecated? | Please clarify and if it is going to be deprecated, please indicate so in the draft | Reject.  The commentor is probabaly asking about the features introduced in 11p. They are not being deprecated. |
| 1601 |  |  | Per the R&O, FCC wants the technology to be converted from DSRC (.11p) to C.V2X. Is this the intention of the group? | Please clarify how .11bd would fit into C-V2X paradigm? If it does not remove all references to 5.9 GHz band. | Reject.  FCC ruling is specific to the US. 5.9 GHz band is available in EU and other geos where 11bd can be used. |
| 1283 |  |  | I still see several TBDs in the draft, which need to be fixed | All the TBDs need to be fixed. | Revised.  Editor: Ensure there is no TBD left in draft before publication of D2.0. |
| 1008 | 1.0 |  | Version of the amendment to which the draft is depending on is not up to date. | Please update | Accept.  Editor: Ensure that D2.0 is based on the latest revision of previous amendments before publication. |
| 1358 | 37 | 31 | "the" is missing when referring to the 5.9 GHz band | In other amendments, when referring to different bands, this is done using the 2.4 GHz band, the 5 GHz band etc. It seems the same approach should be taken also for this amendment. The comment applies to all places where 5.9 GHz band is mentioned and also where other bands, like the 60 GHz band, are mentioned. | Accept.  Editor: already addressed as resolution to CID 1379 |
| 1165 | 41.00 | 32.1.1 | While not required by the PAR, there is no preamble defined that is interoperable with any of the 802.11 PHY standards since 802.11a; there has been discussion in IEEE 802 and SAE about operating NGV in unlicensed bands on a shared basis with other 802.11 devices, but without a 20MHz 802.11n/ac/ax/be preamble to enable preamble detection, only Energy Detection is possible. This limits the ability of NGV to operate in unlicensed band with | Include PPDU modes that are compatible with other 20MHz 802.11 PHY layers operating in the 5GHz band. | Reject.  As the commenter pointed out, it is not required by the PAR. There is no actionable resolution provided. The group needs discuss further and the comment can be addressed when there is actionable proposal.  Discussions (not part of the resolution): the PAR does not disallow it.  What are the restrictions that do not allow it of happening now (OCB in UNII4)?  Probably possible… One other way would be using NGV enahncements/capabilities, like midamble.  Stephen bringing a contribution on the topic to WNG. |
| 1362 | 41.00 | 32.1.1 | Inconsistency in layout | Looking at different lists, like this one and the ones at page 17 and 20, is seems to be more space in between the lines on page 17? And less for the list on page 20. Makes the spec look funny. Is there a different setting or am I mistaken? | Reject  The difference is due to the fact that there are different types of list, aligned with the style guidelines |
| 1661 | 66.00 | 32.3.8 | In (32-11), (32-12), (32-13), term inside the large parenthesis does not fit on a single line. Hence it is stacked like in a matrix notation, which mathematically is incorrect. The term and the parantheses should be split over at least two lines. | Split the term inside the large parantheses over two lines and remove ".". Further in (32-12) remove"..." and in (32-13) remove "." between the two lines of the term inside the large parantheses. | Accept  Editor: implement as directed in the comment. Remove the dot between the two lines. 32-12 has 3 dots. Align to left in the big bracket. |
| 1455 |  |  | In some places C2 refers to a spectral mask (or sometimes a "transmit mask"), while in others it refers to a transmit power class. Per Table D-3 it seems it's the latter | Change references to C2 spectral/transmit masks to being to C2 transmit power class, throughout | Revised:  If corresponding text is “C2 spectral mask” should change to “spectrum mask for transmit power class C2” |
| 1070 |  |  | Nowhere in the draft it is mentioned that dot11OCBActivated should be set to True for NGV STAs. | Add text indicating that dot11OCBActivated shall be set to True for NGV STAs. | Revised  Editor: Modify the following sentence at the beginning of 31.2.1: as follows:  “In order to enable efficient coexistence (#1223)and interoperability(#1482), when dot11NGVActivated is true, the dot11OCBActivated shall be true. Moreover, the non-NGV PPDUs transmitted by NGV STAs carry …” |