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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for multiple comments related to TGax D1.0 with the following CIDs:

* 6537, 9282

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

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

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

# TXOP truncation

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6537 | 133 | 38 | What is meant by the phrase "otherwise it resets the NAV"? Is this descriptive or normative? | Change "it resets" to "it shall reset" (if this is what is intended). | Rejected-  NAV reset should not be mandatory because it’s internal process. And, similar descrptions related to ‘NAV reset’ already exist in legacy spec(10.22.2.9,10.3.2.4, etc.) . |
| 9282 | 133 | 37 | In clause 27.2.2, it is said that an HE AP doesn't need to maintain two NAVs. How the truncation rule described in clause 10.22.2.9 is applied to such AP is not clear. Even if the behavior described in clause 27.2.1 is also applied to such AP, such AP doesn't need to remember whether the most recent NAV update was due to an intra-BSS frame or an inter-BSS frame. | Clarify in clause 27.2.1 that an HE AP maintaining only one NAV doesn't need to hold the cause information of the most recent NAV update and that an HE STA maintaining two NAVs doesn't need to to hold the cause information of the most recent NAV updated of the basic NAV. Add a sentence in clause 10.22.2.9 to refer to clause 27.2.1. Or change the title of subclause 27.2.2 to "Operation of two NAVs" and describe the truncation rule which is specific to HE STAs maintaining two NAVs there. | Rejected-  The current text could also be adopted in AP with one NAVs as well as STA with two NAVs.  An additional description for two NAVs already exists in the subclause as follows:  *NOTE 1—For HE STAs with two NAVs, the TXOP truncation rule applies to each NAV separately* And, according the referece (27.2.1) in the subclause, an HE AP with one NAV is able to check if the NAV is Intra or Inter or the received frame is Intra or Inter. |