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Abstract

This document provides CR for CIDs: 24149 24150 24430 24535 24056 24258

1. **Introduction**

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. The introduction and the explanation of the proposed changes are 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 o***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24114 | Patil, Abhishek | 307.25 | 11.5 | 11ax expanded the format of RNR and extended its functionality to 6 GHz discovery and advertisement of nonTxBSSID profiles. Therefore, it is likely that an AP is unable to fit all the information in a single RNR IE. | Update the spec (11.50 and frame formats) to allow more than one RNR IE in relevant mgmt. frames. Provide clear rules to prevent abuse (e.g., an AP shall include more than one RNR only if it is unable to carry information of its co-located 6 GHz AP(s), nonTxBSSIDs, and/or neighboring AP(s) in a single RNR element). |  |
| 24149 | McCann, Stephen | 462.28 | 26.17.2.4 | The cited sentence in summary states "An AP that .... is in the same co-located AP set as one or more6 GHz APs shall .... support responding with a Neighbor Report ANQP element",but then the note below states"NOTE 1--The Neighbor Report ANQP-element can also carry Neighbor Report elements .... that are not in the same co-located AP set."which contradicts the first sentence. | Change the cited sentence to read "An AP that operates in the 2.4 GHz or 5 GHz band and has neighbor information about one or more6 GHz APs shall include the Advertisement Protocol element in Beacon and Probe Response frames that ittransmits and shall support responding with a Neighbor Report ANQP element". | Reject – the shall requirement in the normative text applies only to the APs in the same co-located AP set. The note simply recalls that it is possible to also provide information for other APs, but there is no shall statements there. |
| 24150 | McCann, Stephen | 462.06 | 26.17.2.4 | Does the cited sentence "If an AP operating in the 2.4 GHz or 5 GHz band is in the same co-located AP set as a 6 GHz AP andhas a different SSID....", assume that the different SSIDs are within the same ESS? | Add the following note at P462L15 "Note - It is recommended that the different SSIDs belong to the same ESS". | Reject – there is no mention of an ESS in this paragraph. APs with different SSIDs can be part of the same co-located AP set, which is the scenario we are in in this paragraph. |
| 24430 | RISON, Mark |  | 26.17.2.4 | [Resubmission of comment withdrawn on D5.0] CID 20804. The resolution seems to be trying to make a distinction between a "recommendation to the internal implementation" and "a normative ["should"] behavior from the standard's perspective". I don't think there is any such distinction. If there is a distinction between "NOTE it is recommended" and "should", please point me at the IEEE style guide or similar document that describes the distinction | Change "NOTE 2--It is recommended that the AP responds with a GAS comeback delay of zero." to "The AP should respond with a GAS comeback delay of zero." in the referenced subclause | Accept |
| 24535 | Hamilton, Mark | 165.18 | 9.4.2.36 | How does a reporting STA know whether "the reported AP is part of an ESS where all the APs that operate in the same channel as the reported AP and that might be detected by a STA receiving this frame have dot11UnsolicitedProbeResponseOptionActivated equal to true"? Same problem in the RNR. Same thing for "Member Of ESS With 2.4/5 GHz Co-Located AP subfield" in the NR and RNR. | Either need to remove these subfields from the respective NR and RNR frames, or add a MIB attribute that can be set by an external entity to tell an AP that it is part of such an ESS, and use the new MIB attribute to set these subfields. | Reject – we have defined a MIB variable for that prupose: dot11MemberOfColocated6GHzESSOptionActivated. |
| 24056 | Inoue, Yasuhiko | 43.45 | 3.2 | "detected access point (AP): An AP might be detected by a station (STA) if the STA and the AP are on the same channel and in range."I do not think we need a definition for such a general term. | Remove the definition of detected access point. | Reject – this definition was added based on a CID in a previous LB as it is useful in the definition of Member Of ESS With 2.4/5 GHz Co-Located AP.  |
| 24258 | Seok, Yongho | 43.45 | 3.2 | The terminology of the detected AP is not referred in current draft.There is no reason to have it in the definition. | Remove the definition of the detected AP. | Reject – this definition was added based on a CID in a previous LB as it is useful in the definition of Member Of ESS With 2.4/5 GHz Co-Located AP. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Proposed changes**

**9.4.2.36 Neighbor Report element**

**TGax editor: modify the following sentence**

The Co-Located With 6 GHz AP subfield is set to 1 to indicate that the AP reported by the Neighbor Report element is in the same co-located AP set as a 6 GHz AP and that the 6 GHz AP can be discovered by receiving relevant Management frames (beacon frame, probe response frame, …) sent by the reported AP. It is set to 0 otherwise.