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***Proposed corrections to the IEEE Std 802.22TM- 2011***

Simplification of Table 20

In order to simplify Table 20, it is proposed to remove the two “Reserved” bits following the “Number of downstream burst profiles: n” and increase the number of bit for this variable from 6 bits to 8 bits to keep the DCD message format to the byte boundary.

Correction and simplification of Table 21

With respect to the first parameter of Table 21: “Downstream\_Burst\_Profile”, there seems to have been a copy-paste error. The profile in question is referred to at the end of Table 20 in an iteration calling Table 23 for each downstream profile to be used. Therefore, this entry in Table 21 should not appear and needs to be removed.

In Table 21, the last parameter is the “MAC version” which is redundant since this message is sent from the base station to which the CPE is associated and the SCH already includes this information as indicated in Table l. Its inclusion in Table 21 is therefore not necessary and could lead to some potential inconsistency. It is therefore proposed to remove this variable from Table 21.

Also, 4 “Reserved” bits have to be included in Table 21 after “Action Mode” to bring the DCD channel IEs to the byte boundary.

Simplification of Table 23 and elimination of Table 24

In Table 23, there is a parameter for “Length” that is unnecessary since its value will always be constant at 5 and could be received in error leading to undefined behavior at the receiver. Since it is a constant, there is no point of transmitting it. To resolve this issue, we propose to simply remove it.

Table 23 refers to Table 24 which has only one set of 2 values for a given DIUC, therefore the reference to a variable number of “Information elements (IEs)” in Table 23 is misleading. We propose that the two entries of Table 24 be inserted in Table 23 in lieu of the “Information elements (IEs)” entry and that Table 24 be deleted. As a result, the following Tables will need to be renumbered. This will make the Standard simpler, easier to read and less prone to interpretation error. It will also shorten the burst profile by one byte and the behavior in the case where a transmission error would have occurred on that byte will no longer be needed.