

Sony COMMENT SUBMISSION FORM

Date 2024-05-01	Document KDB 987594 D01 Draft
--------------------	----------------------------------

Page Number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/ Editorial)	Comment	Proposed change
19	Section 9. Overall Summary	Table 6	Technical	<p>The indication for CBP (Contention-based protocol) is not consistent across Table 6 and not consistent with Part 15.407(d)(6).</p> <p>In Table 6, the CBP column indicates NA for the lower row of Dual-Client, Standard Client, and Fixed-Client; and in the notes column, for these devices, the restriction “o” is indicated which is for CBP.</p> <p>According to Part 15.407(d)(6), All devices other than Standard AP must employ CBP. In Table 6, for the following devices, Dual-Client, Standard Client, and Fixed-Client, all indicate NA in the “Contention Based Protocol” column which is not consistent with Part 15.</p>	<p>Please correct the mismatch between the Contention Based Protocol column and the Restriction Notes Column.</p> <p>Please clarify what is meant in Part 15.407 (d)(6) by “all devices other than Standard AP must employ CBP”. For example, clarify that devices that are controlled by a Standard power AP are also exempt.</p>
28	Appendix A	Table 8	Technical	<p>In Table 8, there is no [X] in row [5] for Std-Client and Fixed-Client indicating that CBP is required. According to Part 15.407(d)(6), All devices other than Standard AP must employ CBP.</p>	<p>Please clarify what is meant in Part 15.407 (d)(6) by “all devices other than Standard AP must employ CBP”. For example, clarify that devices that are controlled by a Standard power AP are also exempt.</p>

Page Number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/ Editorial)	Comment	Proposed change
Throughout document	3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5. Table 8 [12]		Editorial	<p>User manual statements have been revised in this draft but are not consistent across several clauses and tables. Some examples of the various language used are shown below. These different statements for the same requirement may cause confusion.</p> <p><Example 1> <i>"This device is prohibited from being operated on..."</i> vs. <i>"The operation of this device is prohibited on..."</i> vs. <i>"It is prohibited to operate on..."</i></p> <p><Example 2> <i>"Transmitters in the 5.925-7.125 GHz band are prohibited from operating to control or communicate..."</i> vs. <i>"Operation of transmitters in the 5.925-7.125 GHz band is prohibited for control of or communications..."</i> vs. <i>"Prohibited for control of or communications..."</i></p>	Unify statements throughout the document.