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Abstract

This submission discusses resolutions to the following 9 CIDs from initial SA Ballot of TGbd D4.0.

The CID list is: 5001, 5004, 5006, 5008, 5019, 5046, 5047, 5080, 5081

Proposed changes in this document are with reference to TGbd D4.0.

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Intitial version of the document
* Rev 1: Updated typo in editorial instructions of CID 5019
* Rev 2: After discussion revised resolution of CID 5046

Proposed comment resolution

Presented and discussed, no open discussion points

Under discussion

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 5046 | 0.00 | The terms "higher layer" and "upper layer" appear 22 and 7 instances, respectively, in this amendment. It's not clear if this is intentional. They seem to convey the same point. | Please clarify the rationale of using these two terms in the context, and perhaps add a note to the first occurrence each. If there is nothing specific that supports using the different terms, suggest unifying them to one term throughout the amendment. | RevisedAgree with comment802.11-2020 base line uses 28 times upper layer(s) and 232 times higher layer(s)Term higher layer preferred over upper layer**TGbd editor:**Please replace all 7 occurences of “the upper layer” with “a higher layer” on P30L56, P64L38, P68L6, P68L15, P68L16, P68L21, and P68L23.Further please add “a” before “higher layer” on P49L8, replace “the” with “a” on P53L45, remove “the” in front of “higher layers” on P66L17, P67L16, and replace “the higher layer” with “higher layers” on P67L17. |
| 5001 | 38.14 | "An NGV STA may use the Ranging NDP Announcement frame format for non-TB ranging measurementexchange" it may be interpreted that the NDPA is a may for NTB while its mandatory part of the sequence. Furthermore clause 9 is about frame formats not normative behavior so a "May" statement here is not in accordance with the style guide. | Delete the sentence it does not provide additional information. | RevisedAgree with comment**TGbd editor:**Please delete sentence on P38L14-16, remove editing instructions and subclause headings 9.3.1 and 9.3.1.19 |
| 5019 | 51.58 | In 11az D4.1, "R2I N\_STS" is used, instead of "R2I NUM\_STS". | Change "R2I NUM\_STS" to "R2I N\_STS". The same change should be made in other parts of the spec related to his parameter. Similarly, Change "I2R NUM\_STS" to "I2R N\_STS". | RevisedAgree with comment, additionally found a wrong occurrence of NUM\_STS which should be NUM\_SS, an extra occurrence of FEC\_CODING, and N\_SS which should be NSS**TGbd editor:**Please replace NUM\_STS on P51L58 and P52L9 with N\_STS.Further replace NUM\_STS on P116L65 with NUM\_SS, remove FEC\_CODING on P116L64, and replace N\_SS on P123L28 with NSS. |
| 5008 | 51.62 | Remove sentence "The PSDU\_LENGTH parameter is set to 0." as PDSU\_LENGTH is not a TXVECTOR parameter. The same sentence on P52L14 can be removed for the above reason. | As in comment | AcceptedSee also CID 5080 |
| 5080 | 51.62 | The statement "The PSDU\_LENGTH parameter is set to 0." can be removed because PDSU\_LENGTH is not a TXVECTOR parameter. The same on P52L14 can be removed for the same reason. | As in comment | AcceptedSee also CID 5008 |
| 5081 | 51.65 | To be consistent with subclause 32.3.15 (NGV ranging NDP), suggest adding "NGV\_MCS is set to 0" in both paragraphs RSTA transmitting … to ISTA and ISTA transmitting … to RSTA. | As in comment | RejectAs P122L65 in 32.3.15 already defines “NGV\_MCS shall be set to 0” there is no need to repeat this in 11.21.6.4.6 |
| 5004 | 53.13 | unclear use of the word "by" in following sentence: "It may also be used by two STAs each co-located by an NGV STA (see 31.4 (NGV ranging))." | I guess following was meant: "It may also be used by two STAs each co-located with an NGV STA (see 31.4 (NGV ranging))." | Accepted |
| 5006 | 123.5 | "The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of the number of spatial streams the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and the number of LTF repetitions..." is incorrect because for zero LTF repetitions there would be zero NGV-LTF symbols. | Modify to "The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of thethe TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1), see Table 32-11(Number of NGV-LTFs required for different numbers of spatial streams)." | RevisedAgree with comment, resolution revised as proposed change contains typo. See also CID 5047**TGbd editor:**Please replace the sentence starting on P123L4 with“The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1), see Table 32-11 (Number of NGV-LTFs required for different numbers of spatial streams)." |
| 5047 | 123.05 | " … the product of the number of spatial streams the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and the number of LTF repetitions…" is incorrect because the number of LTF repetitions as indicated by LTF\_REP could be zero. | Modify to " ...the product of the number of spatial streams the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1). LTF\_REP indicates if LTF repetition is used or not. When LTF repetition is used, LTF\_REP=1. Otherwise, LTF\_REP is 0." | RevisedAgree with comment that LTF\_REP could be zero and thus number of NGV-LTFs could be zero. See also CID 5006.Second part of proposed change not improving current spec text and hence is not applied.**TGbd editor:**Please replace the sentence starting on P123L4 with“The number of NGV-LTF symbols in an NGV ranging NDP is the product of the TXVECTOR parameter NUM\_SS and (LTF\_REP+1), see Table 32-11 (Number of NGV-LTFs required for different numbers of spatial streams)."Further, please replace “denotes” with “indicates” on P122L63 |