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This submission present proposed resolutions for CIDs 24212, 24210, 24539, 24536, 24534, 24532, 24533, 24359, 24333, 24531. The proposed changes are based on P802.11ax D6.0.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24212 | B.4.33.2 | 730 | 38 | Shouldn't HEP2.1, HEP2.2, HEP2.3 and HEP2.4 be mandatory? If not, why does the column "Support" offer the options Y, N, N/A? | Correct. Either Put "M" in column "Status" or leave column "Support" blank | RevisedAgree with the commenter in principle that these entries are mandatory but we cannot simply put “M” there without any reference object.**Instruction to TGax editor:**For each of the entries, HEP2.1, HEP2.2, HEP2.3 and HEP2.4, add “CFHE: M” into the status cell. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following entries in PICS:



Agree with the commenter in principle that these entries are mandatory but we cannot simply put “M” in the corresponding status cells without any reference object. Since these PPDU formats are applicable for all HE operations, the status is CFHE:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24210 | B.4.33.1 | 727 | 6 | Why is "Signaling of STA and BSS capabilities in Beacon, Probe Response, (Re)Association Response frames" not Mandatory for CFHE | Clarify or correct | Revised.Agree in principle with the commenter that the entries are related to HE.**Instruction to TGax editor:**Replace “(CFVHT ANDCFAP):M” with “(CFHE ANDCFAP):M”. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following entries in PICS:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24539 | C.3 | 764 | 15 | The current SMTbase is dot11SMTbase15, per REVmd. SMTbase14 was skipped (for accidental, historical reasons), so 802.11ax \_could\_ use it. But, that seems very counter-intuitive to have dot11SMTbase14 replace/update dot11SMTbase15. | Suggest changing dot11SMTbase14 to dot11SMTbase16. Also, instructions need to be given to mark dot11SMTbase15 deprecated, and replaced by this new dot11SMTbase (whatever it's called). | Revised.Agree in principle that the numbering of dot11SMTbase should be in ascending order.**Instruction to TGax editor:**At 764.14, 764.38, and 766.30, replace “dot11SMTbase14” with “dot11SMTbase16”.At 764.21, replace “SMTbase14” with “SMTbase16”.At 764.10, copy the dot11SMTbase15 OBJECT-GROUP from P802.11REV D3.2 and add the following at the beginning of the DESCRIPTION of this object-group: “Superseded by dot11SMTbase16”. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following MIB object-group:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24536 | C.3 | 747 | 38 | dot11MemberOfColocated6GHzESSOptionActivated appears to be a control variable (would need to be set ("controlled") by some external entity that make the determination about the ESS). It needs to be read-write. | Change the MAX-ACCESS to "read-write" . Add to the DESCRIPTION that it is written by an external management entity. | Revised.Agree in principle with the commenter on both comments (i.e., read-write, and written by external management entity). Revised instead of Accept because of editorial changes.**Instruction to TGax editor:**At 747.40, replace “read-only” with “read-write”.At 747.44, add the following new paragraph after the first paragraph in the DESCRIPTION: “It is written by an external management entity”. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following MIB object:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24534 | C.3 | 747 | 27 | dot11UnsolicitedProbeResponseOptionActivated appears to be a simple control variable over the AP's behavior. It needs to be read-write. | Change the MAX-ACCESS to "read-write" . Add to the DESCRIPTION that it is written by an external management entity. | Revised.Agree in principle with the commenter on both comments (i.e., read-write, and written by external management entity). Revised instead of Accept because of editorial changes.**Instruction to TGax editor:**At 747.27, replace “read-only” with “read-write”.At 747.31, add the following new paragraph after the first paragraph in the DESCRIPTION: “It is written by an external management entity”. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following MIB object:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24532 | C.3 | 742 | 62 | dot11AutonomousBSSColorCollisionReportingImplemented claims to be a capability (and looks like one, in the body text). It should be read-only. | Change the MAX-ACCESS to "read-only" | Accepted |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following MIB object:





|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24533 | C.3 | 745 | 35 | dot11SRGAPOBSSPDMinOffset says it is a control variable and writen by external management entity. Then it needs to be "read-write". | Change the MAX-ACCESS to "read-write". Same with the next 4 attributes (through dot11NonSRGAPOBSSPDMaxOffset). | Accepted.Note to the editors:The locations to replace “read-only” with “read-write” are 745.35, 745.49, 745.63, 746.12, and 746.27. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following 5 MIB objects:







|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24359 | C.3 | 754 | 39 | "SYNTAX OCTET STRING(SIZE(2))" does not match the DESCRIPTION | Change to "SYNTAX Unsigned32 (0..3)" | Accepted |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following MIB object:



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24333 | C.3 | 751 | 50 | dot11MUEDCATableAIFSN's description says "This attribute specifies the number of slots, after a SIFS, that the STA, for a particular AC, senses the medium idle either before transmitting or executing a backoff." but this is not true if the value is 0 | Add ", except that the value 0 indicates that EDCA is disabled for that AC" before the full stop | Accepted |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following MIB object:



The commenter is correct that the scenario when the AIFSC field is equal to 0 (c.f., see below) is not discussed in the DESCRIPTION of the MIB object.



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 24531 | C.3 | 742 | 44 | What is the purpose of a read-only attribute holding this duration? If it is a fixed value, just say so in the main text and remove this attribute. If it can be changed, it needs to be read-write and describe who writes it (an external management entity, for example?) and when changes take effect. | Delete dot11BSSColorCollisionAPPeriod and replace it with "50 seconds" in the body text. Similarly, for dot11BSSColorCollisionSTAPeriod, and "5 seconds", and "dot11ObssNbRuToleranceTime" and "1800 seconds". | RevisedThe MAX-ACCESS of these 3 MIB objects are “read-write” rather than “read-only”.**Instruction to TGax editor:**At 742.40, 742.52, and 744.15, replace “read-only” with “read-write”.At 740.43, 740.54, and 744.18, insert the following sentences at the beginning of the DESCRIPTION: “It is a status variable. It is written by an external management entity”. |

***Discussion:***

The commenter refers to the following 3 MIB objects:



