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Abstract

This submission contains the proposed CR for CID 2347 and 2699.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **P.L.** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolutions** |
| 2699 | Xiaofei Wang | 50.4 | 9.4.2.293 | I disagree with the resolution for CID 1105. A WUR Discovery frame offset compared to current TBTT of the transmitting AP may be beneficial and enable a discovering STA to quickly switching through different channels to scan for WUR discovery frames. | Add a field of "WUR Discovery frame offset" to indicate the offset of current TBTT of WUR discovery frames to enable a discovering STA to quickly switching through different channels to scan for WUR discovery frames. | Rejected:  TGba discussed the proposed changes and decides not to go in this direction. |
| 2347 | Marc Emmelmann | 31.43 | 9.4.2.273 | A non-AP STA should have the capability to indicate the preferred WUR channel to its AP since there may be quite a bit of frequency selectivity for a 4 MHz wide channel. Currently, a non-AP STA doesn't have any remedy if it is assigned a bad channel by its WUR AP. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.  The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Rejected:  TGba discussed the proposed changes and decides not to go in this direction. |