* Table 1 – Draft status – has not been updated.
* 2. Normative references
	+ Besides the first two insert/remove instructions, the rest of them do not belong to this section and need to be moved to their appropriate places in the document. **(Accept)**
	+ For improved understandability, many of these change instructions would need to be re-written to include the larger context of the change. (For instance, the instructions should not ask to replace a single word or a sentence in a table but should include a new version of the whole table.) **(include additional explanation in amendment test, replace tables or sections as appropriate)**
	+ Instructions [Replace “Bit 2: Reserved” with …] should include the data field name (the table is huge and what needs to be replace may not otherwise be obvious.) **(Same)**
	+ For the instruction [Replace “160/128” … in Table 7-5, 7-6, 7-10]
		- Should reference the actual parameter names, since:
			* Table 7-5 has multiple rows with “160/128”.
			* Only Table 7-5 has values “160/128”, the rest of them define it as “160 or 128”.
		- Do we not include the same change in Table 7-9, which seems to have the same parameters?
	+ Instruction to “replace “2-Truncate to 12 bytes”” does not reference any particular place in the document. **(Top of P45 – provide reference to base)**
	+ For the instruction [Replace “RSA-based” with “RSA-ECC-based” …]
		- Does this mean “RSA \_or\_ ECC” or RSA and ECC combined? Should be clarified and if the former should use slash instead of dash or spell it out.
		- The instruction says to apply this “throughout the first table” but would seem appropriate to apply this to the whole section. **(Technical question for author of contribution relating to ECC – other implications and rationale should be documented)**
	+ For the instruction [Replace the value of the Length field in the table in Clause 11.8.4.3 …]
		- The correct new length value is “2”, not “1/2” **(Clarify )**
	+ For the instruction [Insert “Bit 9: 224-bit HMAC …. ]
		- Is there a reason the existing already reserved bits 1, 6 and 7 are not used for the new values but the expansion uses bit 8 and above? **(Is this an error – will it affect previously reserved bytes? )**
	+ For the instruction [Replace the last row in Table 11-47 of clause 11.9.14 …]
		- Should 3-DES (value 1) continue to be supported? **(Clarify)**
	+ For the instructions [Insert before the third row in Table 11-48 …] and [Insert before the third to last row in Table 11-48 …]
		- These are confusing instructions. Would be better to ask to replace the whole table with a new version.
		- The value field values do not make sense (a mix of hex- and (low) decimal values)
		- Should DES continue to be supported?
		- (**Review and clarify)**
	+ For the instruction [Add the following text to the end of the text in the Length field of the last row of the table in Clause 11.9.19]
		- What does this instruction mean? Since it says to add text, does this mean that “Length = 4” remains as a valid option or not?
		- (**Review and clarify)**
	+ For the instruction [Add the following text to the end of the text in the Length field of the last row of the Table 6-220 …]
		- This instruction references a wrong table.
		- (**Review and correct)**
	+ For the instructions w/ re: Clause 11.9.22
		- This becomes very hard to understand with all the patch-up work. Should just write a complete new section/paragraph. **(re-write paragraph)**
	+ [Replace the text “PKMv2 RSA Request/Reply/Reject/Acknowledgement message” with the text “PKMv2 RSA-ECC Request/Reply/Reject/Acknowledgement message” in Clause X.Y.Z]
		- I’m counting many more references to “PKMv2 RSA” in the document than there are change instructions to make them “PKMv2 RSA-ECC”. Shouldn’t all these be changed? **(review and confirm)**
* 3 Definitions
	+ “Remote” should be added to the definitions or changed to Subscriber Station (SS) throughout the document. **(Be consistent - use Subscriber Station only)**
* 6.3.2.3.8 REG-RSP
	+ None of the instructions to the editor listed here belong to be under this section. Some of them belong to be under the next section (6.3.2.3.9 Privacy key management (PKM) messages).
	+ The instruction [Insert “PKMv2 ECC-Request” after “PKMv2 RSA-Request” in the 2nd paragraph after “PKM identifier” in Clause 6.3.2.3.8.] is out-of-sync with other instructions. Instead of introducing “ECC-Request” the other instructions ask to rename “RSA-Request” to be “RSA-ECC Request”.
	+ The instructions like [Replace “128” with “256” in Table 7-5] are not clear since there are many “128” values in the table. There were also earlier other instructions about these same tables (Table 7-5 etc.), which are now not grouped together.
	+ **(These don’t belong in this section – move into Key Management)**
* 6.3.37.1.1 Minimizing MAC and PHY layer overhead
	+ “The bandwidth allocation messages do not have to be transmitted every frame, but may be transmitted every frame.” Consider revising to “The bandwidth allocation messages do not have to be transmitted every frame to save bandwidth but may be transmitted every frame if needs arise.”
	+ **(Clarify wording)**
* 6.3.37.1.4 Support of AIRM by the BS MAC sub-layer
	+ There was a previous accepted review comment to change “self-interference” to “intrasystem interference”.
	+ (**Be consistent with use of “intrasystem interference)**
* 6.3.37.3.3 Frame duration and Super-frame duration
	+ “self-interference” is here also. **(Fix)**
* 6.3.37.3.4.2 Between AIRM and BSs in the control area
	+ “All BSs are synchronized using GNSS.” Should be more specific and explain what this means. Does this mean that start of frame should be aligned with GNSS 1PPS signal for every base? Does this set a limitation that there needs to be an even number of frames in each 1PPS period?
	+ Figure 6-220 – This figure would serve as a better example if there would not be an even number of superframes in the presented 1PPS period.
	+ I assume AIRM does not have to be GNSS synchronized and does not have to be fully aware of the frame timing. This assumption would be good to be explained. **(explain further)**
	+ **(Clarify the relationship between framing and GNSS 1 pps sync. Frames per second has to be integer because superframe is 1 s)**
* 6.3.37.4.3 Allocation control message (ALLOC-CTRL-MSG) format
	+ This section is now empty. It should explain ALLOC-CTRL-MSG control code usage (Cancel, Activate, Terminate have not been explained) and the message structure.
	+ Table 6-330 should be under this section. **(editorial)**
* 6.3.37.5.2 Network Attach Request Message format
	+ Add reference to Table 6-331. **(add)**
* 6.3.37.5.3 Network Attach Response Message format
	+ Add reference to Table 6-332. . **(add)**
* 6.3.37.7.1.1 Allocation\_IE for Subchannel group Relocation
	+ Empty section. At minimum Table 6-334 should be moved to be under this section. **(editorial)**
* 8.6.3.1 Base station self sufficiency operation
	+ “The sector base station transmits all downlink traffic received by the to the subscriber stations within the sector.” There is some word (sector?) missing here. **(editorial)**
* 8.6.4.2.1 SC FDMA baseband signal generation, Subchannel grouping
	+ Symbols/variables in the equation not explained. Could refer to Section 8.6.4.2.2 . **(add explanation)**
* 8.6.4.2.2 SC-FDMA Baseband Signal Generation (Single subchannel)
	+ Symbols/variables tau\_s, T\_s, N\_slot, N\_bin, N\_sym not explained. **(add explanation)**
* 8.6.5.2 Frame Duration
	+ Table 8-378 minimum frame duration values are not in line with Table 6-325 values in the MAC section. The discrepancy needs to be resolved. **(make consistent)**
* 8.6.6.1 Bins and slots
	+ Consider adding the highlighted text: “It is constructed using configurable number of bins such that one slot always contains 48 data symbols.”
	+ “A bin spans over one subcarrier/tone across multiple symbols in time and consists of one pilot symbol and configurable number of data symbols, e.g. total of 9 symbols.
	+ “The default structure of a bin containing 9 symbols is shown in Figure 8-154. This can be modified to improve the spectral efficiency by increasing the data symbols to pilot ratio. Alternatively, decreasing the data to pilot symbol ratio will increase tolerance for multipath fading.”
	+ **(Accepted)**
* 8.6.6.3 Mapping of bins into slots & bytes vs MCS
	+ Add the missing reference (Table 8-380?)
	+ Remove the highlighted part: “64QAM 5/6: Minimum byte allocation is 30. 6 bytes”
	+ **(Fix)**
* 8.6.7 Downlink transmitter
	+ In Figure 8-156 title, does CC denote Channel Coding (as marked in the figure) instead of Convolution Coding? **(Clarify)**
* 8.6.7.1.5 Repetition
	+ “This repetition scheme is applied only to the use of QPSK modulation with all coding schemes.” The current MCS table only includes repetition to QPSK ½. The conflict needs to be resolved. **(Clarify – repetition may be used with higher MCS than QPSK. Add a separate table of MCS and repetition factors)**
* 8.6.7.5 TX signal filtering
	+ Does this section require changes or clarification since the latest simulated results did not show adequate performance with 256QAM?
	+ (**Rewording needed – provide an example of filtering for all MCS for informative annex)**
	+ **The following text is accepted for content in this section:**
	+ When channels or subchannel groups are non-contiguous, the resulting transmitted waveform needs to meet regulatory standards for not exceeding certain emission levels in the unoccupied parts of the channel. The use of specific filtering is required for the transmitted waveform in this scenario.
	+ The required filter specifications are different based on various factors such as
		- The frequency band and its regulatory environment and constraints
		- Subchannel spacing and how it meets the regulatory channel bandwidth
		- The amount of signal quality degradation caused by the filter that can be tolerated for the resulting transmit waveform.
		- The amount of spectral regrowth and other non-linear/non-ideal effects in the transmit signal chain that also need to be combated.
		- Radio interoperability
	+ Due to the filtering requirements being very situation specific, the filter design is not specified and left to the system designer.
	+ The required filtering can limit the highest available MCS.
* 18.1 General
	+ “Each service flow has an associated traffic priority within a range of 0 to 7 (the lower the number, the higher the priority).” Should change to: the higher the number, the higher the priority (to match 11.13.5).
	+ **(Correct to make draft consistent with DPP**
* 18.2 DPP Air Interface Protocol (AIP)
	+ “The DPP SS shall transmit the Gain Adjustment and Synchronization fields in the lowest subchannel of the subchannel group if more than one subchannel is used” This will make the communication work sub-optimally in the presence of very narrow-band interference.
	+ **(Fixed location of the Gain/Sync information would make system vulnerable to NB interference on that subcarrier. Could it be movable or adaptable? Further analysis need to determine potential resolution)**
* 18.2.1 Burst structure
	+ “non-intended DPP SS receiver shall use the ACK indication for ACK-based deferral as defined in XXX.” Fix the undefined reference (18.3.5.2 and 18.3.5.3).
	+ “The DPP SS shall transmit DPP PDUs in accordance with XXX” Undefined reference.
	+ **(Editorial)**
* 18.2.2 DPP PDU structure
	+ Table 9-1 “CRC for the above 5 bytes (as in Table XXX)” Undefined reference (should be: 6.3.3.5.3) **(Editorial)**
	+ Table 9-2. Why did FSN size go back to being 2 bits? Previously it was agreed this would be 8 bits long. **(Editorial - corrected)**
* 8.3.1 General
	+ “The DPP SS shall indicate to its peer the need to acknowledge error-free receipt of one or more DPP PDUs in the burst by using the ACK indication bit in the DPP PDU header shown in Table XXX.” Undefined reference (should be: Table 9-1). **(Editorial)**
* 18.3.3 Intended Receiver behavior
	+ “The DPP SS receiver shall transmit ACK messages using Robust MCS. d” The sentence has garbage characters in the end.
	+ “Refer Figure 6 for the DPP SS RX flowchart” The figure reference is wrong and ending period is missing. **(Editorial)**
* 18.3.4 Non-Intended Receiver Behavior
	+ Need to add a clarifying sentence whether a non-intended receiver shall perform ACK deferral or not. (**already corrected )**
* 18.3.5 CSMA/CA with RTS, CTS
	+ The table and figure references are wrong in this section.
* 18.3.5.2 Non-Intentional Receiver Behavior
	+ Missing table reference.
* 18.3.5.3 Deferrals
	+ “When the non-intended DPP SS receiver detects a CTRL-MSG with RTS in the Control Message Type field, it shall compute its deferral time by adding a 1.5 \* (configurable maximal round-trip duration for the transmission of the RTS and CTS messages) plus the burst duration.” This does not match what’s in the latest DPP contribution. What’s the logic behind “1.5x”? And why include RTS length?
	+ For CTS Deferral, the current text only defines the behavior for non-intended receiver.
* 18.4.1 Offline state
	+ “When configured to use two distinct bands in ‘Automatic’ pairing mode…” “When configured to use two distinct frequencies in ‘List Selection’ pairing mode…” Should use the same language here, band vs. frequency.
* 18.4.2 Online state
	+ “When configured for Automatic Pairing mode, the ASSOCIATE Request message transmitted by a DPP SS shall indicate the transmitting DPP SS MAC address and an empty Name field” Add: “and an empty Certificate Authority Name field”
* 18.4.3 Association state
	+ Undefined references.
	+ “but does not transmit any user data until it reaches the Operational state.” The terminals are not in operational state before being authenticated. How would the TLS authentication data exchanges then happen? There are currently no control messages defined for the TLS exchange.
* 18.4.4 Operation state
	+ “The DPP SS shall leave the Operational state and return to Association state if its peer DPP SS does not respond/transmit any burst for a configurable Operational State Time Limit in units of seconds.” The inclusion of this brings up the question whether there would be a need to include periodical keep-alives in the communication.
	+ The figure references are wrong.
* 18.5.1 Identity filtering
	+ The figure references are wrong.
* 18.5.2.1 Authentication and Key management
	+ The sixth paragraph includes a time value that is currently TBD. **(Need to find answer- take offline)**
	+ “Upon receiving a certificate from another DPP SS, if configured to ‘Automatic’ pairing, the receiving SS shall authenticate the sending SS identity using its configured public key.” Would there be a way to avoid exchanging the public certificate with TLS since it will not be used for authentication in this case? **(can this wasted BW be avoided? Take offline)**
	+ It would need to be defined how the TLS communication is distinguished from the other communication. **(Yael: Need a header bit or selection number to identify)**
	+ I assume only the handshake part will be used from TLS and TLS is not used for encrypting or authenticating any of the follow-up user data communication. There needs to be a clarification of this here in this section or elsewhere. **(Clarify in document – Yael)**
	+ If TLS is only used for authenticating the communicating radios during the handshake and the rest of the communication is not authenticated/encrypted, there is questionable value for performing the authentication during the handshake. **(was clarified** – **need to be sure the state transition from TLS to data is specified. Need to specify that data is not sent outside of encrypted time**)
* 18.5.4 Link Adaptation (LA)
	+ Wrong references**. (editorial)**
* 18.5.5 Power Control
	+ Undefined reference. **. (editorial)**
* 18.5.6.1 General
	+ Undefined reference. **. (editorial)**
	+ “The Relay station shall not use the RTS CTS protection mechanism.” Should be more clear and state that relay stations cannot be used if the DPP operation is configured with CSMA/CA with RTS/CTS. **(Clarify -**
* 18.5.7.1 Control Message (CTRL-MSG)
	+ Table 18-4 - Why are “Sender Name” and “Receiver Name” included as part of CTRL message? And only with 48 bits size? **(Withdraw) (Maybe consider a more specific term for “Name” in this context - keep Sender and Receiver in for context. Whenever name is used for comparison, in include sender and receiver)**
	+ Table 18-4 – Re: CMAC/HMAC Digest, what keys will be used to generate and verify this CMAC/HMAC? This needs to be explained in the document and so far there does not seem to be any discussion about that. **(Discussed – clarify that the TLS handshake delivers these keys)**
* 18.5.7.2 Association Message
	+ Table 18-5 – Should mark “CA name” size to be variable. **(set to** variable**)**
* 18.5.7.3 Measurement *Report* Message
	+ Table 18-7 – Undefined reference for “MCS”. (**Fixed)**