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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to editorial comments submitted in CC40. The text used as reference is D0.1.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 665 |  | 23.48 | What does "operational attributes" mean? Why don't use Sensing Measurement parameters which I believe is the intended meaning | As in comment |
| 852 | 11.21.18.1 | 65.02 | Use of different terms for the same thing - "operational parameters" vs "operational attributes". | Change text to: "The set of operational parameters used in a sensing measurement instance are also determined in the sensing measurement setup." |
| 853 | 11.21.18.1 | 65.21 | Use of different terms for the same thing - "operational parameters" vs "operational attributes". | Change text to: "A first sensing measurement setup procedure is then performed, which defines a set of operational parameters labeled with a Measurement Setup ID equal to 1. The concept of Measurement Setup ID is defined in 11.21.18.3 (Sensing session setup). After the sensing measurement setup, sensing measurement instances are performed based on the defined operational parameter set (Measurement Setup ID equal to 1)." |
| 854 | 11.21.18.1 | 65.27 | Use of different terms for the same thing - "operational parameters" vs "operational attributes". | Change text to: "After some time, a second sensing measurement setup procedure is performed between the AP and STA A that defines a second operational parameter set that is labeled with a Measurement Setup ID of 2. After the second sensing measurement setup, any subsequent sensing measurement instances may be performed based on either the first (Measurement Setup ID equal to 1) or second (Measurement Setup ID equal to 2) operational parameter sets. An operational parameter set may be terminated by performing a sensing measurement setup termination procedure; for example, ..."" |
| 856 | 11.21.18.1 | 66.19 | Use of different terms for the same thing - "operational parameters" vs "attribute set". | Also in both figures, while the AP and STA A still have the first sensing session active, a new sensing session setup procedure is performed between the AP and STA B that establishes a sensing session identified by the UID of STA B (UID 2). In Figure 11-41a (Example of a WLAN sensing procedure), a first sensing measurement setup procedure between the AP and STA B defines operational parameters that are identical to the operational parameters corresponding to Measurement Setup ID equal to 2 established between the AP and STA A and, therefore, shares the label of Measurement Setup ID equal to 2. Subsequent measurement instances associated with Measurement Setup ID equal to 2 may thus be associated with STA A, STA B, or both STA A and STA B. Each measurement instance may have one-to-many (including one-to-one) announcement and/or triggering, and may have either one-to-many or many-to-one (including one-to-one) sounding. As also illustrated in Figure 11-41a (Example of a WLAN sensing procedure), after a measurement setup is terminated, its label (specifically, the Measurement Setup ID) becomes available for re-use when a new measurement setup is performed, potentially with a different corresponding operational paramater set. |
| 859 | 11.21.18.5 | 68.03 | Use of different terms for the same thing - "operational parameters" vs "operational attributes". | Change text to: "The Measurement Instance ID may be used to identify the sensing measurement instance that utilizes operational parameters of the same tuple <Sensing Initiator's MAC address, Measurement Setup ID>." |
| 841 | 9.6.7.49 | 58.02 | Use of different terms for the same thing - "operational parameters" vs "assigned parameters" | Change text to: "The Measurement Setup ID field in the Sensing Measurement Setup Request frame indicates a Measurement Setup ID that identifies operational parameters in the Sensing Measurement Parameters Element ...." |

**Proposed resolution**:

**Discussion**:

**Modifications**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 851 | 11.21.18.1 | 65.25 | A measurement instance does not get "labelled with" a measurement instance ID, but rather a measurement instance ID is assigned. | Change text to: "Each measurement instance is assigned a Measurement Instance ID (see 11.21.18.4 (Sensing measurement setup))." |
| 229 | 11.21.18.1 | 66.30 | There isn't a defination for "label" on Line 30 so readers cannot know what a label represents exactly. | Add a sentence to explain what the label is, e.g., it contains measurement setup ID and/or instance ID?Or simply remove "label" and use "Measurement setup ID" instead." |

**Proposed resolution**:

**Discussion**: For comment 851, reference text is:



And for comment 229, reference text is:



**Modifications**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 104 | 11.21.18.1 | 65.07 | The 2 examples given in 11.21.20.1 (Figures 11-41a and Figure 11-41b) are very valuable but argualbly out-of-place in this normative section. Suggest moving these examples (figures and text) to a new Annex. | Move Figures 11-41g through 11-41n and corresponding text to a new Annex. |
| 103 | 11.21.20.1 | 75.6 | The 7 examples given in 11.21.20.1 (Figure 11-41g - Figure 11-41n) are very valuable but argualbly out-of-place in this normative section. Suggest moving these examples (figures and text) to a new Annex. | Move Figures 11-41g through 11-41n and corresponding text to a new Annex. |

**Proposed resolution**:

**Discussion**:

**Modifications**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 644 | 9.4.2.322 | 39.26 | TRN-M, TRN-P, TRN-N are adopted. But in 11ay, these fields are named as EDMG TRN-Unit M, EDMG TRN-Unit P, and EDMG TRN-Unit N. | Change TRN-M, TRN-P, TRN-N and EDMG-TRN-N to EDMG TRN-Unit M, EDMG TRN-Unit P, and EDMG TRN-Unit N. |
| 645 | 9.4.2.322 | 40.45 | EDMG-TRN-M, EDMG-TRN-P and EDMG-TRN-N are used. But in 11ay, these fields are named as EDMG TRN-Unit M, EDMG TRN-Unit P, and EDMG TRN-Unit N. | Change EDMG-TRN-M, EDMG-TRN-P and EDMG-TRN-N to EDMG TRN-Unit M, EDMG TRN-Unit P, and EDMG TRN-Unit N. |

**Proposed resolution**: Reject (644) and accept (645)

**Discussion**: For reference,

It is acceptable, but arguably not recommended, to use new/different field names (to those used in the 11ay amendment) when defining a new element. However, the definition of such fields must make reference to the correct terms used in Clause 28 (EDMG PHY).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 894 | 9.4.1.9 | 31.12 | It is a Status Code field. Table 9-78 shows the title of "Status Codes", which is contradictory to Status Code field | change the title of Table 9-78 to "Values of Status Code" |

**Proposed resolution**: Reject

**Discussion**: The baseline text refers to codes carried within the Status Code field, which are defined in Table 9-78, as "status codes" (and not "value(s) of Status Code"). For example, the following two sentences can be found in 9.4.1.9:

- "If an operation is successful, then the status code is set to SUCCESS (0)"

- "A status code of SUCCESS\_POWER\_SAVE\_MODE also indicates a successful operation"

In these two examples, SUCCESS and SUCCESS\_POWER\_SAVE\_MODE are referred to as "status codes" (and not "values of status code"). Therefore, the title of Table 9-78 is consistent with notation defined in 9.4.1.9.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 23 | 11.21.18.1 | 66.22 | title of the figure put in parenthesis when referring to the figure. | no need to put the caption of a figure in parenthesis when referring to the figure. This is a global problem in the document. |

**Proposed resolution**: Reject

**Discussion**: The draft follows the format used in the baseline document (IEEE P802.11REVme™/D1.1) and in the 802.11 Style Guide ([https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-1034-20-0000-802-11-editorial-style-guide.docx](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https%3A/gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https*3A*2F*2Fmentor.ieee.org*2F802.11*2Fdcn*2F09*2F11-09-1034-20-0000-802-11-editorial-style-guide.docx&data=05*7C01*7Canirudha.sahoo*40nist.gov*7C98d25f8ea917459f5b4408da4a63db28*7C2ab5d82fd8fa4797a93e054655c61dec*7C1*7C0*7C637904089998133987*7CUnknown*7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0*3D*7C0*7C*7C*7C&sdata=Tl*2F*2F3LkajOuMxjGJwyxpk1hmp2dtE5Luy8Homg0drRM*3D&reserved=0__;JSUlJSUlJSUlJSUlJSUlJSUlJSUlJSUlJQ!!Bt8RZUm9aw!7hKpJN7kS27YbdM6abWIOZtw9Gy6W7s8DfvqH5_44K1hFGjrEMV_4q3J_Ty0EFFnfleu54ydVFuOi5hvqP2cue3LCwsb$)), which shows the caption of figures and tables when reference is made.