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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for multiple comments related to TGba D7.0 with the following CIDs:

8002, 8003, 8004

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 8002 |  |  |  | This is in response to the resolution to CID 7062. In SA ballot responses, it is inappropriate to refer to other "CIDs". 1) The Sponsor reviewers/commenters don't have access to the comment tracking systems that assign/use these "CIDs", so they have no way to understand that reference; 2) (mostly due to #1) responses to SA ballot comments should each be self-contained, without need to reference other materials (except full/explicit URLs, perhaps). |  | Rejected.The resolution was replaced with a full resolution by the 802.11 WG chair when submitted for the SA ballot. |
| 8003 | 29.9.3 | 125 | 3 | The WUR AP only interprets the success/failure of the WUR [Short] Wake-up frame, based on whether it gets a response from the non-AP WUR STA. But, nothing requires the non-AP WUR STA to send anything in response. The only requirement on the non-AP WUR STA appears to be in 29.8.4, that the non-AP WUR STA shall be in awake state in time. However, if the non-AP WUR STA can be awake and following the existing PS operation without sending any uplink frame, then the WUR AP will assume (per 29.9.3) that the Wake-up frame failed, and the AP won't be able to schedule the downlink transmission. Thus, the statements in 29.9.3, at P123.39 that the WUR AP can wait for (only) the transition delay before scheduling a transmission, and at P125.8 that says the Wake-up frame is assumed to have failed if no transmission from the non-AP STA is received, are in conflict. (Also, P124.7, similarly to P123.39.) | Add a requirement in 29.8.4 or 29.9.4, that the non-AP WUR STA shall ensure some transmission to the WUR AP occurs within the transition delay, after receiving a Wake-up frame. | Rejected.The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment. |
| 8004 | 29.9.3 | 124 | 20 | It is still very confusing to have these two paragraphs (the cited one and the following one). How is the behavior of WUR when TFS is established any different than the logical conclusion of following the existing (baseline) rules for TFS, and then the normal rules for WUR Wake-up that would apply any time a individually addressed frame is ready for transmission to a non-AP STA in WUR mode? The existence of these two paragraphs makes the reader think there is something new being described here, when I don't think any new behavior is actually described. Is the implication that other behavior that would normally happen (if these two paragraphs were not here) should not happen, because these two paragraphs apply \_instead\_? Or, is this just "helpful", and reminding that this is how the two facilities would interact? (Or, am I missing something, and there is something new here?) Whatever it is needs to be made clear, so the reader isn't left wondering what this is trying to say. | Delete the two paragrphs at P124 lines 20-30. | Rejected.The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment. |