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Abstract:

This document contains comment resolution on the following CIDs for 28.3 and the proposed specification changes are in draft 2.3:

13017, 12104, 12105, 12014 and 12106.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 13017 | 28.3.14.3 | 482 | 19 | In Table 28-43, the minimum requirement for absolute transmit power accuracy of class B device being +/- 9dB is extremely loose. I could understand +/- 6 dB, but here we are talking about almost 10 dB of tolerance in both directions. What kind of device would pass any certification/regulation (coexistence) tests with such loose requirements? I think the purpose of the specifications is to give reasonable targets and not low-end values. | Modify the class B requirement for absolute transmit power accuracy as suggested in the comment. | Rejected.Defining Class B device is for low-cost devices which may not be a good choice to group Class B device with Class A device for MU transmissions. Thereofer +/-9dB is defined for such purpose.  |
| 12104 | 28.3.19 | 496 | 31 | "For tests in this subclause ...". This is mysterious. There are many \*normative statements\* in this subclause; are we supposed to understand that each of these \*normative statements\* is equivalent to a \*test\*? For example (in fact, in particular) are the CCA sensitivity requirements in 28.3.19.6 included in these "tests'? N.B. It would be entirely unsatisfactory to resolve this comment with a statement that this language is already present in the baseline. Yes, this language was included in 11ac. But prior to 11ac, it wasn't part of the baseline, and if it was in order then to alter the pre-existing baseline, then it's in order now to undo the mischief 11ac introduced. | Clarify. At minimum, add at the beginning of the clause "Except for the CCA sensitivity subclause (28.3.19.6) ...". | Rejected.There is no need to clarify. The description of the subclasue is similar to 11ac and the description does not cause problems in the tests. The inconsistence caused by only change in 11ax brings more confusion to the tests. If the commentor wants to change them systematically, he/she should provide detailed proposals to 11md.  |
| 12105 | 28.3.19 | 496 | 34 | "Each output port of the transmitting STA shall be connected through a cable to the Device Under Test". If this means that the CCA sensitivity requirements in 28.3.19.6 are only applicable in a cabled setup, then the statement is severely problematic. The whole point of a CCA requirement is that it places some restriction on the behavior of devices in their normal environment, i.e., wireless operation. How to test such behavior is a separate question. | Clarify. At minimum, add at the beginning of the clause or of the sentence "Except for the CCA sensitivity subclause (28.3.19.6) ...". | Rejected. There is no need to clarify. The exact description is in 11md for previous version 802.11 standards. Change causes inconsistence and more confusion.  |
| 12014 | 28.3.19.6.2 | 500 | 13 | "non-primary 20MHz channel" here is not clear. Does it mean each non-primary 20MHz channel as the counterpart in the HE TB PPDU transmission?  | Please clarify.  | Revised.11ax editor, please see the discussion for instructions of CID 12014 in doc IEEE xxxx. |
| 12106 | 28.3.19.6.3 | 500 | 26 |

|  |
| --- |
| "in an otherise idle": what does this mean? Does it mean that CCA has not already been declared? Or does it mean that there are no other transmissions? If the former, it may be impossible to meet, at least in some cirumstances, since in very dense environments the interference evel may be very high without any one individual transmission being strong enough to trigger CCA high. If the latter, it may be too weak as it excludes the important case ofdense environments. |

  | Clarify. | Rejected. The condition specified for setting behavior requirements is one condition of many that are possible. Clearly, the required behavior of a STA with respect to ED CCA already accounts for many of those other possible conditions, including the one that the commenter mentions. |

**Discussions for CID 12014:**

***TGax Editor: Please make the following text change (changed texts are in red) in the line 11-15, page 552 of D2.3***:

For a BQR transmission, CCA-ED shall detect a channel busy condition when the received signal strength exceeds the CCA-ED threshold as given by dot11OFDMEDThreshold for primary 20 MHz channel and dot11OFDMEDThreshold for the each non-primary 20 MHz channel (if present). The CCA-ED thresholds for the operating classes requiring CCA-ED are subject to the criteria in D.2.5 (CCA-ED threshold).