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Abstract

This document proposes resolution to the following SAB1 CIDs: 7367, 7368, 7369, 7370, 7371, 7372, 7373, 7251, 7301, 7070, 7150, 7078, 7080, 7094, 7095, 7096, 7097, 7099, 7101, 7102, 7107, 7108, 7109,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7367 | 173.16 | 16 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |
| 7368 | 174.04 | 4 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |
| 7369 | 174.17 | 17 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |
| 7370 | 174.28 | 28 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |
| 7371 | 174.34 | 34 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |
| 7372 | 175.03 | 3 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |
| 7373 | 175.27 | 27 | 11.21.6.4.5.3 | "AID equal to 2043" should be "the AID11 subfield equal to 2043". | Replace "AID" by "the AID11 subfield" | **accept** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7251 | 199.22 | 22 |  | Pesky "only". As written, the only thing the STA can do is association. | Change to "an RSNA STA shall allow association only if..." | **Accept** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7301 | 209.08 | 8 | 12.7.1.3 | IEEE 802.11ba/D7.0 is claimed to be used as a baseline, but that draft was not made available in myProject for this ballot (Supporting Document(s) ZIP file should have included it to allow the changes to be fully reviewed). | Make all the baseline material available to the people in the ballot pool. | Revise:TGaz editor, in P209L7-8 repalce thext “***Change “12.7.1.3 Pairwise key hierarchy as follows” merging with the baseline changes in***  ***802.11ba D7.0.”*** with “***Change “12.7.1.3 Pairwise key hierarchy” as follows.*** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7077 | 229.12 | 12 | 26.16 | 11az D4.0 P236L28-31 states that the NSTS And Mid-amble Periodicity field of the HE-SIG-A1 is encoded based on either the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_STS[1] or NUM\_STS. However, the NSTS And Mid-amble Periodicity field of the HE-SIG-A1 has two way of encoding, one when Doppler=0 and another when Doppler=1. It needs to be clarified which mode the encoding should use for Ranging NDP. | Add subclause 26.16 (Midamble parameter setting rules) to the 11az draft, and add language effectively stating that the TXVECTOR parameter DOPPLER shall be set to 0 when transmitting a Ranging NDP. | **Revise:**TGaz editor,make changes specified in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0156-00-00az-Some-SAB1-CR.docx> |

***TGaz Editor: Insert the following text before 26.17 (P229L12):***

**26.16 Midamble parameter setting rules**

***Editor: Insert the following at the end of 26.16***

A STA shall set the TXVECTOR parameter DOPPLER to 0 when transmitting an HE Ranging NDP or an HE TB Ranging NDP.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7105 | 231.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Is TIME\_OF\_DEPARTURE\_REQUESTED parameter not needed when transmitting an HE TB Ranging PPDU? | If TIME\_OF\_DEPARTURE\_REQUESTED is needed when transmitting an HE TB Ranging PPDU, then make the TXVECTOR "O" for HE\_TB. | **Revise:**TGaz editor,make changes specified in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0156-00-00az-Some-SAB1-CR.docx> |

***TGaz Editor: in “*Table 27-1—TXVECTOR and RXVECTOR parameters: in the lines associated with** TIME\_OF\_DEPARTURE\_REQUESTED ***replace*** “Format is HE\_SU” ***with*** “Format is HE\_SU or HE\_TB and RANGING\_FLAG is 1”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7078 | 231.02 | 2 | 27.2.2 | Condition for the PSDU\_LENGTH is not fully shown. | State the full "Condition" for the PSDU\_LENGTH parameter. | Reject: the condition shown on PSDU\_LENGTH line is complete, the artiact at the bottom is not a missing line. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7080 | 232.00 |  | 27.2.2 | TX/RXVECTOR parameter "RANGING\_F" is not used anywhere in 11az D4.0. | Fix the name "RANGING\_F". | Revise: TGaz Editor, make sure that “RANGING\_FLAG” appears fully in the PDF version (this a word to PDF conversion issue) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7094 | 232.00 |  | 27.2.2 | RX\_START\_OF\_FRAME\_OFFSET is already present in the baseline document (REVme D0.4 P4295L11). | Delete the row for "RX\_START\_OF\_FRAME\_OFFSET" | Accept(P4304L39 in RevME D1.0) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7095 | 232.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Why is LTF\_KEY optional in TXVECTOR? Does this mean that one can transmit a secure LTF ranging NDP without using LTF\_KEY? | Change "O" to "Y" in the TXVECTOR column in the LTF\_KEY row. | AcceptNote to editor, changed already part of motion 202111-08 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7096 | 232.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Why is LTF\_IV optional in TXVECTOR? Does this mean that one can transmit a secure ranging NDP without using LTF\_IV? | Change "O" to "Y" in the TXVECTOR column in the LTF\_IV row. | Accept,Note to editor, changed already part of motion 202111-08 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7097 | 232.00 |  | 27.2.2 | What happens if LTF\_REP is not present in the TXVECTOR? How many repetitions should be used? | Change "O" to "Y" in the TXVECTOR column in the LTF\_REP row. | AcceptNote to editor, changed already part of motion 202111-08 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7099 | 232.00 | 27.2.2 | 11ax has already been published and does not have/use the TX/RXVECTOR parameter RANGING\_FLAG. So, if 11az now mandates that the RANGING\_FLAG parameter is always present in all HE SU PPDUs, then there will be many places in the standard where we have to add "when TX/RXVECTOR parameter RANGING\_FLAG is 0" for the 'legacy' HE SU PPDU cases. Instead, the RANGING\_FLAG parameter should be made optional, and if the parameter is not present in TX/RXVECTOR, then it should be interpreted as a non-ranging PPDU. | At P232, row for RANGING\_FLAG + FORMAT is HE\_SU: Replace the Value column to "If present, indicates that the PPDU is an HE Ranging NDP. Not present otherwise." Change the TXVECTOR column from "MU" to "O". (Note - since it will need to be an "MU" when present, you might have to define a new type such as "O-MU" to indicate that.) At P232, row for RANGING\_FLAG + FORMAT is HE\_TB: Replace the Value column to "If present, indicates that the PPDU is an HE Ranging TB NDP. Not present otherwise." Change the TXVECTOR column from "MU" to "O". Change "The RANGING\_FLAG is set to 1" to "The RANGING\_FLAG is present" at P180L23, P182L30, P183L32. Change "RANGING\_FLAG is 1" to "RANGING\_FLAG is present" at P231(row for PSDU\_LENGTH), P232(row for LTF\_KEY), P232(row for LTF\_IV), P232(row for LTF\_REP), P233(row for NUM\_USERS), P233(row for SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG), P233(row for TX\_WINDOW\_FLAG). | ? |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7101 | 233.00 | 27.2.2 | What does "... LTF\_KEY will be MU" mean? | At P233, row for NUM\_USERS + ... SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG is 1, Value column, change "LTF\_KEY will be MU" to "LTF\_KEY are arrays with number of entries equal to NUM\_USERS." | ReviseTGaz editor,make changes specified in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0156-00-00az-Some-SAB1-CR.docx>  |

***TGaz Editor: in P233, in the raw for NUM\_USERS+SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG is 1, in the Value column, change*** "LTF\_KEY will be MU" ***to*** *“*NUM\_STS, LTF\_REP and LTF\_KEY are arrays with number of entries equal to NUM\_USERS”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7102 | 233.00 | 27.2.2 | For the NUM\_USERS row, if FORMAT is HE\_SU, it is not clear which of the first two rows need to be used. Also, there is no FORMAT called "HE\_ER". | In the second row of NUM\_USERS, change "FORMAT is HE\_SU, HE\_MU, HE\_ER, HE\_ER\_SU or HE\_TB" to "RANGING\_FLAG is not present, and FORMAT is HE\_SU, HE\_MU, HE\_ER\_SU or HE\_TB" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7107 | 233.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Table 21-1 does not have a parameter named SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG | In the SECURE\_LTF\_FLAG row, change "See corresponding entry in Table 21-1" to "Not present" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7108 | 233.00 |  | 27.2.2 | Table 21-1 does not have a parameter named TX\_WINDOW\_FLAG. | In the TX\_WINDOW\_FLAG row, change "See corresponding entry in Table 21-1" to "Not present" | Accept |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7109 | 234.00 | 27.2.3a | What is a "number of HE-LTF"? Number of HE-LTF symbols? spatial streams? something else? | In the row for LTF\_OFFSET, change "number of HE-LTF to skip to receive" to "number of HE-LTF symbols to skip before beginning to process the HE-LTF symbols" | Accept(Note to editor, this is actually able 27.2.2a) |
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