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**Abstract**

This submission contains resolutions for CIDs 7047, 7056, 7065, 7072, 7076 (total of 5).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Resolution** |
| 7047 | 77.30 | 9.4.2.298 | "Table 9-322h23fb—Format And Bandwidth subfield" - the entries in the table impliy sort of a backward compatibility, as in a larger value signalled indicates support of all smaller values, is that accurate? | Clarify if a value signals only support of that specific value or all smaller values | **Revise.**  Submission 11-21-1944r2 addresses the same issue brought up by different CID and adopted by the group. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1944-02-00az-sa1-comment-resolution-for-seven-cids.docx>   TGaz editor, no further action needed beyond incorporation of 11-21-1944r2. |
| 7056 | 84.03 | 9.4.2.299 | Is the Secure LTF Parameters element included in the I2R LMR? If yes, why? Either way this should be carified. | Add a statement clarifying if the Secure LTF Parameters element is included in the I2R LMR. | **Revised.**  Agree with commenter, submission 11-21-1944r2 adopted changes to the text to clarify that the I2R LMR shall be included in the case of secure LTF measurement in the I2R LMR frame.   Refer to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1944-02-00az-sa1-comment-resolution-for-seven-cids.docx>   TGaz editor, no further action needed. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Resolution** |
| 7065 | 87.20 | 9.4.2.302 | Figure 9-788edt—AOD Feedback field format : Consider splitting the reserved field to align to the 32 bit boundary; I know there is also an interest to group reserved bits, but most CPUs work on byte and 32 bit boundaries | Suggested to split the reserved bits into two subfields of 4 bit (before AOD Elevation Accuracy) and 1 bit at the current location; or alternatively move all reserved bits before AOD Elevation Accuracy subfield | **Revise.**  TGaz editor make the following change to figure 9-788edt: switch between the AOD Elevation Accuracy field and the Reserved field such that the Reserved field shows at bit numbers B28 to B32 and the AOD Elevation Accuracy field shows between B33 and B39. |
| 7072 | 89.11 | 9.4.2.303 | Figure 9-788edw—PASN Parameters element Comeback field format : The size of the Comeback After subfield shows "0 or 2" - when is the size '0' ?? | Change size to '2' or add a statement explaining when the size is '0' | **Revise.**  TGaz editor make changes as shown below in  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0168-00-00az-TGaz-SAB1-Group-CR-part2.docx> |

**CID 7072 Resolution:**

**TGaz editor make changes to P802.11az D4.0 P.89 L.11 as follows:**where the Comeback After subfield is time in TUs after which the non-AP STA is requested to retry the PASN authentication. The Comeback After subfield is set to 0 indicates that the operation can be retried with the Cookie of nonzero length in the Cookie subfield. The Comeback After subfield is Reserved in a PASN authentication frames from a non-AP STA.. (#1460, 16 #5019)

**TGaz editor change figure 9-788edw in P802.11az D4.0 P.89 L.10 as follows: Change Comeback After field size in Figure 9-788edw to 2 (i.e. delete 0 or) in the Comeback After field size.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Resolution** |
| 7076 | 152.15 | 11.21.6.4.3.2 | The text in Figure 11-37d states "two HE MU PPDUs in spatial domain (I2R NDP)". But I am not aware of any Ranging NDP using HE MU PPDU. | Clarify what an I2R NDP using HE MU PPDU is. | Revise. Agree with the commenter.  TGaz editor in the legend note change "Figure shows two HE MU PPDUs in spatial domain (I2R NDP) and one HE SU PPDU with NSSS=4 (R2I NDP) using stacked images." to "Figure shows two HE TB Ranging NDP in spatial domain (I2R NDP) and one HE Ranging NDP with NSS=4 (R2I NDP) using stacked images." |