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 Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs submitted during CC31 for 11bc D0.1 (25 CIDs):

315, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 142, 144, 145, 146, ~~147~~, 148, 311, 35, 149, 154, 2, 181, ~~318~~, 180, ~~243~~, 249, 245, 328

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Type** | **Pg/Ln** | **Section** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 315 | Stephen McCann | T | 20.02 | 9.3.3.2 | Although the term UL is defined in IEEE 802.11-2016, the first use should be expanded, as it could be easily confused with Upper Layer. | Change "eBCS UL" to "eBCS Uplink (UL)" | **Accept** |
| 134 | Mark RISON | T | 20.03 | 9.3.3.2 | Is the element really optional if BCS is implemented? | Delete "optionally" at the referenced location | **Accept** |
| 135 | Mark RISON | T | 20.03 | 9.3.3.2 | Is this really about whether the feature is implemented, or about whether it's activated? | Change Implemented to Activated at the referenced location | **Accept** |
| 136 | Mark RISON | T | 20.05 | 9.3.3.10 | Is the element really optional if BCS is implemented? | Delete "optionally" at the referenced location | **Accept** |
| 137 | Mark RISON | T | 20.05 | 9.3.3.10 | Is this really about whether the feature is implemented, or about whether it's activated? | Change Implemented to Activated at the referenced location. Ditto in other places | **Accept**TGbc editor: Please update all instances of dot11eBCSSupportImplemented to dot11eBCSSupportActivated throughout the 11bc draft |
| 138 | Mark RISON | E | 20.05 | 9.3.3.10 | "within a broadcast ProbeResponse frame" -- the whole table is about probe rsps already | Delete the cited text | **Accept** |
| 139 | Mark RISON | T | 20.11 | 9.2.4.1 | Should explicitly specify whether elements are fragmentable or not | Put No in blank cells | **Accept** |
| 142 | Mark RISON | E | 22.04 | 9.4.2.bc.1 | "related to forwarding service to a remote destination." is missing something | "related to support for forwarding data to a remote destination." maybe? | **Accept**TGbc editor – please make changes as proposed by the commenter |
| 144 | Mark RISON | E | 22.07 | 9.4.2.bc.1 | " in a Beacon and broadcast Probe Response frame" -- which one? | Change to " in Beacon and broadcast Probe Response frames it transmits" | **Accept** |
| 145 | Mark RISON | E | 22.07 | 9.4.2.bc.1 | " in a Beacon and broadcast Probe Response frame" -- why not in unicast probe responses? 9.3.3.10 has no such restriction anyway | Delete "broadcast" | **Accept** |
| 146 | Mark RISON | E | 22.09 | 9.4.2.bc.1 | "can include" -- it can and does | Change to "includes" | **Accept** |
| ~~147~~ | ~~Mark RISON~~ | ~~E~~ | ~~22.09~~ | ~~9.4.2.bc.1~~ | ~~"if it intends to provide" -- it does intend to do so, if it includes it~~ | ~~Delete "if it intends"~~ | **~~Accept~~** |
| 148 | Mark RISON | E | 22.23 | 9.4.2.bc.2 | Caption is misleading as there is no such field | Delete the subclause header, so the body is just part of 9.4.2.bc.1 | **Reject**The element can be transmitted by an eBCS AP or an eBCS non-AP STA. The contents of the element are different based on the transmitter. Therefore, we need to have separate subclause describing each case. |
| 311 | Stephan Sand | E | 23.00 | 9.4.2.bc.2 | duplicate "able to" in Table 9-bc4, row 2, column 3, line 2 | remove "able to" after successfully | **Accept** |
| 35 | Bahareh Sadeghi | E | 23.01 |  | "able to" is repeated twice in the sentence | change to " frame only if it issuccessfully able to" | **Revised**The text was revised based on resolution to CID 311. **TGbc editor: No further changes are needed.** |
| 149 | Mark RISON | E | 23.19 | 9.4.2.bc.3 | Caption is misleading as there is no such field | Delete the subclause header, so the body is just part of 9.4.2.bc.1 | **Reject**The element can be transmitted by an eBCS AP or an eBCS non-AP STA. The contents of the element are different based on the transmitter. Therefore, we need to have separate subclause describing each case. |
| 154 | Mark RISON | E | 23.28 | 9.4.2.bc.3 | "The format of UL Non-AP STA Control " missing "field" | As it says in the comment | **Accept** |
| 2 | Abhishek Patil | T | 24.12 | 9.4.2.bc | Do we need this IE? The eBCS UL frame already provides a container (field) for carrying higher layer data. | Delete this subclause | **Accept** |
| 181 | Mark RISON | E | 29.03 | 9.6.7.bc | I think 9.6.7.bc should be under 9.6.7.1, no? | As it says in the comment | **Accept**TGbc editor: please update the reference for eBCS UL frame to clause 9.6.7.1: i.e.,9.6.7.1.bc eBCS UL frame format  |
| ~~318~~ | ~~Stephen McCann~~ | ~~T~~ | ~~29.11~~ | ~~9.6.7.bc~~ | ~~Within Figure 9-bc15, a Destination URI Length sub-field is required to parse the frame.~~ | ~~Add a Destination URI Length sub-field to Figure 9-bc15~~ | **~~Reject~~**~~Destination URI is an element which carries its own Length field and is always carried in the eBCS UL frame.~~ |
| 180 | Mark RISON | T | 29.21 | 9.6.7.bc | Bit positions in wrong cell | Shift all right by one cell | **Accept** |
| ~~243~~ | ~~Mark RISON~~ | ~~T~~ | ~~46.06~~ | ~~11.bc.3.1~~ | ~~"may not" is ambiguous~~ | ~~Change to "might not"~~ | **~~Revised~~** |
| 249 | Mark RISON | E | 46.06 | 11.bc.3.2 | "a STAs request" should be "a STA's request" | As it says in the comment | **Accept** |
| 245 | Mark RISON | E | 46.13 | 11.bc.3.2 | " by include" should be " by including" | As it says in the comment | **Accept** |
| 328 | Xiaofei Wang | E | 23.02 | 9.4.5.bc.2 | error in reference to Figure 9-bc13. please correct | as in comment | **Accept** |