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Abstract

This submission proposes comment resolutions for the following comments:

8205, 8321, 8323, 8450.

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 TGah Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause Num** | **P** | **L** | **Comment** | **Propose Change** | **Resolution** |
| 8205 | 9.2.4.2 | 91.00 | 36 | Remove the word "or Sensor Traffic". Sensor Traffic is not defined anywhere else in the document. | Remove "or Sensor Traffic" from the table 9-1. A clause that explains the single AC nature of sensor STAs is already in 9.22.2.1. | Accepted |
| 8321 | 9.2.1 | 76.00 | 6 | It is unclear from the figure which part is "Used for beamforming with the AP/PCP" | add a line between the call out "Used for beamforming with the AP/PCP" and the box A-BFT Access | Acceptd |
| 8323 | 9.2.4.2 | 89.00 | 34 | There is no need to specify "Sensor Traffic" as a designation. As long as sensor traffic is mapped to AC\_BE, or UP 0, there is no need to specify this in this table | remove "or Sensor Traffic" from Designation for UP 0 | Accepted |
| 8450 | 9.31.1 | 186.00 | 47 | This paragraph seems to be out of the place in the general discussion section since no discussion in the original text in RevMC 4.0 was on any specific generations of STAs. It should be moved to 9.31.3. | Move this paragraph to 9.31.3 | Rejected  The changes in 9.31.1 were originally in 9.31.3. Based on comment, the changes were then moved to 9.31.1. The reason is that the changes applying to the whole subclause 9.31.3 can’t be in the same subclause. |