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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for multiple comments related to TGba D3.0 with the following CIDs (7 CIDs):

3180, 3181, 3182, 3186, 3189, 3192, 3193

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGba Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGba Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGba Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGba Editor” are instructions to the TGba editor to modify existing material in the TGba draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGba editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGba Draft.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3180 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | If N\_octet is required like N\_sym in other specs, define N\_octet in this subclause | Picking up on comment 2271. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.  It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)  It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.  Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Response: The N\_octet in the comment cannot be found in 802.11REVmd D2.1 nor in 802.11ax D4.1. |
| 3181 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | "20 MHz preamble", "40 MHz preamble" and "80 MHz preamble" are inaccurate terms. The sentence is also not correct grammatically. Because of the phase rotations, it is not exactly duplication. | Picking up on comment 2281. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.  It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)  It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.  Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Response: The phase rotation is applied after the WUR FDMA PPDU formation. Therefore the duplication is still correct. |
| 3182 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | "In each 20MHz sub-channel with duplicated 20MHz preample, one 4MHz WUR signal centered in the 20MHz sub-channel is transmitted is transmitted following the 20MHz preamble." the sentense contains redundant information and does not read very clear. | Picking up on comment 2282. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.  It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)  It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.  Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Response: The cited sentence no longer exist in 802.11ba D3.0. |
| 3186 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | "a STA that supports WUR PHY specification shall be capable of transmitting and receiving PPDUs that are compliant with the mandatory requirements of ... Clause 17"? So, a WUR radio (PHY) has to be capable of 11a? That doesn't make sense. | Picking up on comment 2309. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.  It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)  It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.  Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Response: the cited sentence does not exist in 802.11ba D3.0. The paragraph is changed as follows, therefore it doesn’t mean WUR has to be capable of 11a.  “In addition to the requirements in Clause 30 (Wake-Up Radio (WUR) PHY specification), a WUR STA that supports WUR PHY specification shall be capable of transmitting and receiving PPDUs that are compliant with the mandatory requirements of the following PHY specifications: — Clause 17 (Orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) PHY specification) if a WUR STA is a non-HT STA — Clause 19 (High-throughput (HT) PHY specification) if a WUR STA is an HT STA — Clause 21 (Very high throughput (VHT) PHY specification) if a WUR STA is a VHT STA — Clause 27 (High Efficiency (HE) PHY specification) if a WUR STA is an HE STA” |
| 3189 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | There are some redundancies across this subclause in terms of normative behavior and descriptions. Please ensure that duplicates and redundant descriptions are removed. | Picking up on comment 2340. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.  It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)  It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.  Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Response: the redundancies no longer exist in 802.11ba D3.0 in the subclause “protected frame”. |
| 3192 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | A group delay indicated by an AP to a group STAs assigned to the same Group ID may greatly benefit the power saving for the group of STAs since the STAs may not need to wake up prematurely to wait for a delayed packets that are expected to arrive later. | Picking up on comment 2354. The comment was invalidly rejected. The comment identified a specific technical issues that was not considered nor resolved in a previous letter ballot. The comment identifies a technical document (comment reslution spreadsheet of privious letter ballots) which included in depth instructions that can be immediately adopted to satisfy the comment.  It should also be noted, that during the process of comment resolution of the privious ballot, the TG choose again to discard comments without due discussion / consideration for the reason of going to recirculation (see minutes, stating: In order to address all comments, Po-Kai has collected the 16 CIDs that have not been addressed elsewhere. All are rejected, and large majority of the comments are rejected based on being invalid comments.)  It should also be noted that the TG choose for some comments which picked up on previous -- falsely rejcted comments -- to have a proper discussion and address the issues. So the reason for rejection does not hold.  Specifically, the rejectedc comment stated: Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected.  Response: The comment in the proposed change is not correct. The comment was discussed in the task group. Please see the minutes (11-19/956r2) below: “11-19/0820r0, “Spec Text for CR for CID 2354, 2698 and 2753”, Xiaofei Wang (Interdigital)  This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs: 2354, 2698 and 2753. The baseline for this comment resolution document is 802.11ba Draft 2.0.  The presentation is made to get some feedback from the group.  Q: The membership of a group is dynamic, so this means that if a device is leaving things need to be updated?  Q: I also have this concern, I believe it comes with a lot of overhead?  Q: I wonder what kind of gain you expect from this? I guess it also depends on how different delays the different STAs have.  A: I can try to generate some numbers with respect to this.  Straw Poll: Do you support the solutions to the comments?  Y/N/A: 4/4/11” |
| 3193 | MARC EMMELMANN |  |  |  | The comment resolution committe did not properbly address several comments in the comment resolution proces. Document 19/932r1 rejects several comments with the reason "insufficient detail to immediate adopt a resolution / invalid comment". The TG cannot prove that it made a sufficient effort to contact the commenter to provide changes. In fact, the minutes state that the comment was not in depth discused but were reject "in the last minute" in favor of going into recirculation. (see 19/956r1) | Fully address all comments from the previous round and document in the comment resolution (in case of rejection) that the TG has contacted the commenters to clarify any open issues regarding the comment or to have intensively discussed the issue in question | Rejected.  Response: all the comments were discussed in the task group properly following the 802.11 WG operation manual. The comment is incorrect. |