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Abstract
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Discussion:

The comment is rather about my sentence than about any specific text in the draft.

There are few places in the draft that can be seeing as relevant to the proposed change:

1. **10.24 Block acknowledgment (block ack).** The sub clause contains all definition related to behaviour of the block acknowledgement feature. Definitions across the entire sub clause is devoted to QoS data frames, QoS data MPDU’s and MSDU’s. An Action no Ack frame is of different frame type than QoS data frame so there is nothing that needs clarification that Action No Ack frames are not realted to the block acknowledgement feature.
2. **9.2.4.5.4 Ack Policy subfield.** As clearly stated in the Table 9-9—Ack Policy subfield in QoS Control field of QoS Data frames in relation to No Ack policy: “This value of the Ack Policy subfield is not used for QoS Data frames with a TID for which a block ack agreement exists.”

Summary: In both cases mentioned in the Proposed Change column existent text is completely clear and no additional clarifications are needed

Recommendation:

Reject the comment
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