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| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause Number(C)** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 7850 | Yonggang Fang |   | 0.00 | The term of ML Probe Response is not consistent in the draft. Some uses "ML Probe Response", while other uses "ML probe response". | Please make the term of "ML Probe Response" consistent in the spec. |  Revised – currently, the right term that should be used in the spec is ML probe response and ML probe request. Instruct the editor to change all occurrences of ML Probe Response frame(s) in the spec to ML probe response(s) and all occurrences of ML Probe Request frame(s) in the spec to ML probe request(s). |
| 6757 | Romain GUIGNARD | 35.3.6.1.2 | 258.50 | In the default mapping mode paragraph, the text refers to multi-link setup. The default mapping mode is it also applicable for multi-link (re)setup or is there a particular case with (re)setup if a different mapping already occurred? | Please clarify for (re)setup |  Revised – rephrase by just talking about associated non-AP MLD. Apply the changes marked as #6757 in this document. |
| 4055 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.2 | 258.52 | All of the contents of this subclause is covered in the General clause (35.3.6.1.1). | Either delete this subclause and copy the 2nd sentence of the paragraph into the General clause (35.3.6.1.1) or move relevant sentences from the General clause into this subclause. |  Reject – the first sentence is not normative so there is no double statements. |
| 6578 | Payam Torab Jahromi | 35.3.6.1.2 | 258.54 | Extend "non-AP MLD and AP MLD" if TID-to-link mapinng can be used peer-to-peer. |   |  Reject – currently multi-link operation as P2P is not in the scope for more than one link. |
| 7816 | Yiqing Li | 35.3.6.1.2 | 258.54 | "performed" should be "perform". "was unsuccessful" should be "is unsuccessful" | As commented. |   Revised –Proposed resolution is to remove “performed” as part of the resolution of CID 6757. As for the remaining verbs the tense is correct since it points out to the activity if those actions did not happen. Hence past tense is correct.Apply the changes marked as #7816 in this document |
| 6283 | Ming Gan | 35.3.6.1.2 | 258.57 | Regarding "not occur or was unsuccessful or torn down", does that mean "not exist"? | Pleae change it to "not exist" |  Reject –Commenter is asking a question.. The current sentence is more precise since it calls out the states after which the STA operates under this mode. This is clearer than just saying does not exist. |
| 4056 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.2 | 259.22 | Clarify that the ML setup is not a failure if the AP rejects the proposed TID mapping and the TID mapping is default mode when the AP rejects a mapping proposed in the assoc req frame. | As in comment |  Revised – following the paragraph ending line 24 page 259 in draft 1.0, add the following note: “NOTE – Whether the multi-link (re)setup is successful or not is independent from whether the TID-to-link mapping negotiation that is done jointly with the multi-link setup is successful or not. A multi-link (re)setup can be successful even if the TID-to-link mapping negotiation is not successful.” |
| 4057 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.2 | 259.40 | The "otherwise" bullet is confusing to follow | Update the bullet as: "Otherwise, the responding MLD shall indicate rejection of the proposed TID-to-link mapping by setting the Status Code field in the TID-to-link Mapping Response frame to either <ANA> (DENIED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING) or <ANA> (PREFERRED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING\_SUGGESTED). When the Status Code in the TID-to-link Mapping Response frame is <ANA> (PREFERRED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING\_SUGGESTED), the responding MLD is suggesting a preferred mapping as indicated in the TID-to-link Mapping element included in the frame." |  Revised – agree with the commenter. Replace the last sentence of the bullet from: “The responding MLD may suggest a preferred TID-to-link mapping bysetting 134 (PREFERRED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING\_SUGGESTED) the Status Code in theTID-to-link Mapping Response frame and including the TID-to-link Mapping element in the TID-tolink Mapping Response frame. “ to: “When the Status Code in the TID-to-link Mapping Response frame is 134 (PREFERRED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING\_SUGGESTED), the responding MLD is suggesting a preferred mapping as indicated in the TID-to-link Mapping element included in the frame.” |
| 4058 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.2 | 259.54 | Is an MLD allowed to send an unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response frame with Status Code set to 'denied'? | Append "or <ANA> (DENIED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING)" at the end of the sentence |  Reject – it does not seem that useful to use the denied version. |
| 4059 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.2 | 259.63 | An AP MLD has a complete view of the situation on all the links and is expected to take into account the BSS-wide conditions such as each non-AP MLD's constraints, traffic profiles for each non-AP MLD (e.g., latency sensitive flows) and load on each link when making mapping decisions for each non-AP MLD. Therefore, it would be in the beneficial for a non-AP MLD to follow the AP's proposed mapping. | The non-AP MLD must accept the mapping proposed by an AP MLD. |   |
| 4060 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.2 | 260.15 | The setting of field values must be described in clause 9 | The description in paragraphs starting line 15 and 19 must be covered in clause 9 along with description of other fields |   |
| 4742 | Chunyu Hu | 35.3.6.1.4 | 260.26 | The word "initial" in "the initial power" appearing at line 27 and 36, respectively, is redundant and also inaccurate since Reassociation could be one scenario resulting the power state. Remove them. | As commented |  Revised – agree with the commenter. Apply the changes marked as #4742 in this document. |
| 4743 | Chunyu Hu | 35.3.6.1.4 | 260.26 | The first and second pargraphs describe two different cases: the power state over the transmitting link vs other links, but the same subject. It's confusing two different phrases are used: "When a link becomes enabled ..." in the 1st pargraph, and "When a link transitions to being enabled" in the 2nd pargraph. Use the same phrase to avoid misleading readers to think they intend to describe two different conditions, e.g. "becomes enabled". | As commented |  Revised – agree with the comment. Use same wording in the 2 sentences. Apply the changes as marked as #4743 in this document. |
| 4744 | Chunyu Hu | 35.3.6.1.4 | 260.26 | According to the description in this subclause, when a MLD sets up multiple links through association handshake over one link, it has to explicitly signal AP over other links in order to "activiate" other links. This delays the delivery of downlink traffic. An explicit indication of the power management moode should be signaled to AP during the multi-link setup procedure. | As commented |  Reject – this proposal was already debated in the group and couldn’t reach sufficient support. |
| 5985 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.6.1.4 | 260.33 | The association may not include link transmition. It is missing from the paragraph. Please add this case. | As in comment |  Reject – the second paragraph covers the case where the association is done on another link. |
| 6287 | Ming Gan | 35.3.6.1.4 | 260.38 | since power save is STA's choice, should that be "may be power save mode, and its power state may be doze"? | as in the comment |  Reject – spec needs to determine, in the absence of explicit signaling in assoc exchange, what is the initial state. After that, it is entirely STA’s choice. Same as for baseline. |
| 5350 | Jarkko Kneckt | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.41 | The More Data field is used to early terminate TWT SP. If non-AP MLD operates a link in active mode in another link, the AP MLD should set the MD field to 0 , because no data frames are buffered in the AP MLD. This will early terminate TWT SP, if AP sends BA with MD signaling startus of buffered traffic or other frame that does not have EOSP. | Please clarify how More Data related TWT SP early termination is handled if non-AP MLD operates in multiple links. For instance, 802.11be should say that MD=0 is not early terminating TWT SPs for non-AP MLDs. |   |
| 6288 | Ming Gan | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.43 | Since TID-to-link mapping is optional, the description about more data for default mapping is imporatant. However, this part is not clear | please split this paragraph into two parts, one is for default mapping, the other is non-default mapping |  Revised – add a Note to clarify the meaning for default mapping. Apply the changes marked as #6288 |
| 6403 | Muhammad Kumail Haider | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.43 | Change "BU in one enabled link" to "BU on one enabled link" | as in comment |  Revised – modifications have already been made to that subclause in draft 1.31. |
| 4061 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.44 | The sentence is too long and convoluted to read. Simplify the long sentence. | Replace the sentence as follows: "An AP MLD shall set the More Data bit in the Frame Control field to 1 if there exist, at the AP MLD, at least one additional BU belonging to a TID that is mapped to this link or a Management frame that is not carried in the PPDU and intended for the non-AP MLD. Otherwise, the AP sets the More Data subfield to 0." |  Revised – the whole paragraph has been rewritten in draft 1.4. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 5239 | Ilya Levitsky | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.44 | The rule needs to be clarified: When an AP MLD transmits a PPDU carrying a BU in one enabled link to a non-AP MLD, if there is, at the AP MLD, at least one additional buffered BU of any TID that is mapped to this link by the TID-to-link mapping function (including default mapping) or a Management frame for the same non-AP MLD that is not carried in the PPDU, the More Data subfield shall be set to 1, otherwise the More Data subfield shall be set to 0. It is unclear what to do if the remaining BU(s) were sent then through another link. | As in comment |  Revised – the paragraph has been modified since this comment was submitted and the next text clarifies the behavior on the non-AP MLD side, so answers the comment. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 8039 | Yuchen Guo | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.46 | The Management frame should not be measurement MMPDU | add "that is not a measurement MMPDU" after "Management frame" |  Revised - the paragraph has been modified since this comment was submitted and the proposed addition has been added already. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 6580 | Payam Torab Jahromi | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.47 | With the word PPDU, it is not clear in which MPDU(s) the "More Data" subfield need sot be set. | Specify which MPDU(s) needs ot have this bit set. |  Revised - the section has been modified since this comment was submitted and clarifications have been made on that topic. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 4745 | Chunyu Hu | 35.3.6.2 | 260.50 | This subclause describes on using power saving mode to manage the dynamic link transition, however, is missing a description of signaling. Furthermore, an efficient signaling to rerduce overhead and latency is lack per baseline in my view. Please address the problem. | As commented |  Rejected – using power state to use the link of its choice is the mechanism that is natively present and available to use. Signaling to change power state or power mode is already existing. |
| 7333 | stephane baron | 35.3.6.2 | 260.51 | Please clarify how this mode can inter operate with the EMLSR mode. An example of transition between those two modes will be usefull to understand how a single radio non-AP STA can be an EHT MLD. | As in comment. |  Rejected – the eMLSR mode can be enabled/disabled. Power state/mode changes can be done all the time whether using eMLSR or not. Doesn’t seem to be a need for clarifications. |
| 7852 | Yonggang Fang | 35.3.6.2 | 260.51 | This clause is for single radio, suggest to change the title of clause to "Dynamic link transitions for single radio". | See the comment. |  Reject – This is not only for single radio. The example indeed uses only one link at a time and is in the title for a single radio, but this can be applied to any device category and for multiple links. |
| 4110 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.5 | 260.54 | The caption for the figure is too long | How about: "Example of link transition operation by a single radio non-AP MLD using power-save states" |  Revised – agree with the commenter. Apply the changes marked as #4110 in this document |
| 6582 | Payam Torab Jahromi | 35.3.6.2 | 261.16 | Shorten Figure 35-6 caption to something like "Example of dynamic link transition" |   |  Revised – agree with the commenter. Apply the changes marked as #6582 in this document |
| 4382 | Arik Klein | 35.3.6.2 | 261.26 | The text relates the behavior of STA2 and STA3 in the example described in this section is not clear: "STA 2 and STA 3 \*stay\* in doze state"If being in doze state is mandatory - use "shall" atatementOtherwise - use "should" or "may" | If being in doze state is mandatory, revise the sentence to "STA 2 and STA 3 shall be in doze state"If being in Doze state is optional, revise the sentence to "STA 2 and STA 3 may/can/should be in doze state" |  Revised – clarify that it is the description of the example. The normative text allows the device to do as it wants or is capable of. Apply the changes marked as #4382 in this document. |
| 4383 | Arik Klein | 35.3.6.2 | 261.33 | The text relates the behavior of STA1 and STA3 in the example described in this section is not clear: "STA 1 and STA 3 \*stay\* in doze state"If being in doze state is mandatory - use "shall" atatementOtherwise - use "should" or "may" | If being in doze state is mandatory, revise the sentence to "STA 1 and STA 3 shall be in doze state"If being in Doze state is optional, revise the sentence to "STA 1 and STA 3 may/can/should be in doze state" |  Revised – clarify that it is the description of the example. The normative text allows the device to do as it wants or is capable of. Apply the changes marked as #4383 in this document. |
| 5271 | Insun Jang | 35.3.6.2 | 298.22 | How can an EHT AP know the low latency traffic information of EHT non-AP STA? Like BSR, if trigger-enalbed, need to such a mechanism | As in the comment, we need to design how to know the low latency traffic information of EHT non-AP STA |  Revised – SCS mechanisms have been defined since this comment has been submitted and D1.5 captures them already. No further action needed on this CID. |
| 5272 | Insun Jang | 35.3.6.2 | 298.22 | If the starting time of rTWT SP are affected by unexpected things (e.g., OBSS, transmission of leagcy STAs), low latency requirements may not be guaranteed. Therefore, for rTWT SP, its extension mechanism is needed | As in the comment |  Rejected – for such operation, the TWT SP duration would be over-dimensioned and can be terminated when the transmission is over. This was discussed in 11ax for regular TWT.  |
| 5273 | Insun Jang | 35.3.6.2 | 298.22 | What about missing case, i.e., EHT STAs that supports rTWT may miss the scheduled information of rTWT from Beacon which is very important one. Need to handle it. | As in the comment | Rejected – the r-TWT schedule information is provided in every beacon and updates related to it are part of existing critical update protocols. |
| 5274 | Insun Jang | 35.3.6.2 | 298.22 | Any EHT STAs schduled to a rTWT SP may be affected by OBSS, e.g., setting to OBSS NAV, which impacts on low latency requirements. In this case, we need to handle the case, e.g., OBSS NAV may be reset by monitoring OBSS STA's transmitted frames (e.g., More Data field = 1 and CF-end frames). | As in the comment | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 5029 | Evgeny Khorov | 35.3.6. | 261.17 | where the non-AP MLD transitions from ... It is not clear from Figure 35-6 why it is a non-AP MLD that decides to transit | Clarify the figure |  Rejected – there is no need to justify why the non-AP MLD would decide to do this, this is an example. |
| 7819 | Yiqing Li | 35.3.x | 246.15 | It is better to move 35.3.6.1.4 Power state after enablement to 35.3.10 Multi-link power management as a subclause. | As commented. |  Rejected – Slight preference for clarity to keep those rules in the link management section. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause Number(C)** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 5080 | Gaurav Patwardhan | 35.3.6 | 258.01 | There are use cases when an AP of an AP MLD needs to shutdown. While shutting down the AP, other APs/links affiliated with the same MLD should not be affected. | Add normative text for addressing the situation mentioned in the comment. |  Revised – Draft 1.5 already captures a mode for link removal. No further changes are needed. |
| 5081 | Gaurav Patwardhan | 35.3.6 | 258.01 | There are use cases when a link/channel becomes available for an AP MLD to use which was earlier unavailable. Eg: A 5GHz DFS channel became available which satisfies the channel separation requirements for another link to be operational. In such a case an AP which is now operational on that link should be added to an existing AP MLD. | Add normative text for addressing the situation mentioned in the comment. | Revised – Draft 1.5 already captures a mode for link addition. No further changes are needed. |
| 5282 | Insun Jang | 35.3.6 | 258.01 | A non-AP MLD or an AP MLD may want to change the opreating link as one of setup links, which requires Reassociation in current basline. That would be too burden. Therefore, we need to design mechanism(s) without Reassociation. | As in the comment | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 5283 | Insun Jang | 35.3.6 | 258.01 | For the case adding or removing affiliated AP(s), the Common Info may be also updated, e.g., MLD/EML capabilites. Therefore, during the proecedure, Common Info field should be also included | As in the comment | Revised – D1.5 already clarifies that point. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 6459 | namyeong kim | 35.3.6 | 258.01 | A non-AP STA of non-AP MLD can require to reconfigure own operating link to other link by some reasons (traffic congestion, link teardown, etc.). For this, the non-AP STA shall disassociate for all links as existing mechanism but it's too inefficient for non-AP MLD. | Please define a method to modify own operating link of non-AP STA to other link without (re)association or disassociation. | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 6460 | namyeong kim | 35.3.6 | 258.01 | MLD level info of MLD can be updated. If a STA affiliated with MLD reconfigure (Add /Delete Link) own link, the STA shall notify MLD level info (e.g. Maximum Number Of Simultaneous Links or EML Capabilities) of MLD which is affiliating with the STA to associated MLD which will be reconfigured the link. | Please define a method to notify MLD level info (e.g. Maximum Number Of Simultaneous Links or EML Capabilities) during frame exchange when a STA reconfigures link(s) of MLD which is affiliating with the STA. | Revised – D1.5 already captures the proposed change. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 5685 | kaiying Lu | 35.3.6.1.1 | 260.16 | Change "the Link Mapping Of TID field" to "Link Mapping Of TID n field" | As in comment | Accept |
| 4054 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.6.1.1 | 258.50 | Do we need to modify any rules for Multi-TID AMPDU when TID mapping is negotiated? | As in comment | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6258 | Ming Gan | 35.5.9 | 264.43 | The title of subclause of 35.5.9 is vague, please change it to a title with meaning, for example, Crosslink Info Process Procedures | as in the comment |  Revised – D1.5 already captures that change. No further actions needed. |
| 6526 | Pascal VIGER | 36.3.6.1 | 258.09 | The concept of TID-to-Link mapping applies to route (or duplicate) traffic onto opened Links between a STA and an AP MLD, but is relatively static.As transmit buffer can be served over several links, the current BSR reporting mechanism is not adapted to transmitter requirement. Even if "the non-AP MLD can use any link within this set of enabled links to transmit frames", there is no way to inform the AP of a preferred link usage among the enabled link set and at a given time. | An updated BSR shall inform the AP scheduler of an amount of data with regards to a given link.This Temporary information is useful for subsequent UL scheduling. | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 5214 | Huizhao Wang | 36.3.6.1.1 | 258.24 | A link is "enabled" or "disabled" is only significant to 11be context. A "disabled" link may not participate any MLD frame exchange, but it surely can be used for frame exchange with none 11be STAs. So, management, broadcast/mcast data and control frames will likely be sent on "disabled" links. | Change the text to indicate the "disabled" link won't be used for unicast frame exchange. | Revised – changes have been made to clarify that the TID-mapping applies to the non-AP MLD. No further actions are needed for this CID. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause Number(C)** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 5922 | 35.3.6.1.1 | 258.25 | "Only MSDUs or A-MSDUs with TIDs mapped to an enabled link may be transmittedon that link." The requirement does not seem to apply to group addressed frames or TDLS frames | add exception for group addressed frames and TDLS frames | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 6579 | 35.3.6.1.1 | 258.25 | Define what happens if/when all links that a TID is ampped to are gone as a result of AP removal. |  | Revised – TID-to-link mapping rules require that a TID is always mapped to a setup link. No further actions are needed for this CID. |
| 6731 | 35.3.6.1.1 | 258.28 | "If a link is disabled, it shall not be used for frame exchange, including Management frames for both DL and UL."I guess this statement is more for non-APs, I assume APs will continue to transmit beacon frames on a disabled link if the link is enabled for at least one non-AP STA.This is excessively restrictive; there may be cases where for any reasons the sole enabled link may be down; at least class 1, 2 frames should be allowed to be transmitted on disabled links (for example to transmit keepalive frames within Max Idle Period). | Clarify that this sentence applies only to non-AP STAs. Allow at least class 1, 2 frames and may be certain class 3 frames (e.g. TID-to-link mapping request/response) to be transmitted on disabled links by non-AP STAs. | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 6504 | 35.3.6.1 | 258.06 | According to Table 9-13--Ack policy, No Ack row "is not used for QoS Data frames with a TID forwhich a block ack agreement exists".Therefore all traffic of a TID shall follow same ACK policy, which is a pity when only subset of traffic is latency sensitive.There shall be a means to avoid ACK for latency sensitive data. | Provide a no-ack delivery for latency sensitive data only, as example by a no-ack link reserved for Low latency traffic. | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |
| 6524 | 35.3.6.1 | 258.06 | A single STA can support more than one traffic (local applications) for a given traffic type (filling a AC queue or TID).Especially, the low latency traffic is a specific traffic that shall be considered independently of a traffic class (TID) that it could belong to. | According to SCS mechanism, a TSPEC could provide parameters that describe the LL traffic characteristics. The SCSID is to be used to discriminate LL data in order to be handled by LL medium access mechanisms: e.g. MU triggering, rTWT use.There is a need to identify which link(s) the SCS can use. | Rejected – the group didn’t reach consensus on a set of changes that would satisfy the commenter. |

1. **Introduction**
2. **Proposed spec text**

***TGbe editor: Modify subclause 35.3.6.1.2 Default mapping mode as shown below:***

###  Default mapping mode

(#1790)(#2427)(#2907)(#3377)(#3027)(#2908)Under this mode, all TIDs are mapped to all setup links for DL and UL, and all setup links are enabled. A non-AP MLD associated with an AP MLD shall operate under this mode if a TID-to-link mapping negotiation for a different mapping did not occur, was unsuccessful or was torn down. (#6757, #7816)

***TGbe editor: Modify subclause 35.3.6.1.2 Default mapping mode as shown below:***

### Power state after enablement

(#1791)When a link becomes enabled for a STA that is affiliated with a non-AP MLD after successful multi- link setup with (Re)Association Request/Response frames transmitted on that link, the (#4742)power management mode of the STA, immediately after the acknowledgement of the (Re)Association Response frame, is active mode.

(#2340)(#1062)(#3028)(#2851)When a link becomes (#4743) enabled for a STA that is affiliated with a non-AP MLD after successful multi-link setup with (Re)Association Request/Response frames transmitted on another link or after successful TID-to-link mapping negotiation with TID-To-Link Mapping Request/ Response frames transmitted on another link, the (#4742) power management mode of the STA, immediately after the acknowledgement of the (Re)Association Response frame or of the TID-To-Link Mapping Response frame, is power save mode, and its power state is doze.

### Use of More Data subfield by an MLD

(#1195)(#1444)(#1882)An AP affiliated with an AP MLD uses the More Data subfield as defined in 9.2.4.1.8 (More Data subfield) to indicate to a non-AP STA in PS mode affiliated with the non-AP MLD that more individually addressed BUs are buffered for that non-AP MLD. The indicated buffered BUs (not including the BU currently being transmitted) are buffered at the AP MLD for the non-AP MLD and correspond to Data frames with TIDs that are mapped to this link by the most recent DL TID-to-link mapping (negotiated TID-to-link mapping or default mode mapping, see [35.3.6.1 (TID-to-link mapping)](#bookmark23)) or Management frames that are not measurement MMPDUs (see [35.3.11.4 (Traffic indication)](#bookmark37)).

NOTE – In the case of default mapping, all TIDs are mapped to all links, so that individually addressed buffered BUs refer to all individually addressed Data frames and individually addressed bufferable Management frames that are not measurement MMPDUs. (#6288)

An AP affiliated with an AP MLD shall follow the procedure defined in 11.2.3.6 (AP operation) for setting the More Data subfield and the EOSP subfield, except that in individually addressed frames the More Data subfield is used to indicate the presence of more BUs at the AP MLD for a non-AP MLD, as defined above.

When a STA is affiliated with a non-AP MLD operating with default mapping (see [35.3.6.1.2 (Default](#bookmark25) [mapping mode)](#bookmark25)) receives an individually addressed MPDU from its associated AP affiliated with the associated AP MLD with the More Data subfield set to 1, then at least one of any non-AP STA affiliated with the non-AP MLD shall follow the procedure defined in 11.2.3.7 (Receive operation for STAs in PS mode) and 11.2.3.8 (Receive operation using APSD) and may send PS-Poll frames or UAPSD trigger frames to retrieve buffered BUs buffered at the AP MLD.

When a STA that is affiliated with a non-AP MLD operating with a negotiated non-default TID-to-link mapping (see [35.3.6.1.3 (Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping)](#bookmark26)) receives an individually addressed MPDU from its associated AP with the More Data subfield set to 1, then at least one of any STA affiliated with the non-AP MLD that is operating on a link that is mapped to any of the TIDs that is also mapped to the link on which the individually addressed MPDU with the more data bit set to 1 is sent (as specified by the most recent DL TID-to-link mapping) shall follow the procedures defined in 11.2.3.7 (Receive operation for STAs in PS mode) and 11.2.3.8 (Receive operation using APSD) and may send PS-Poll frames or UAPSD trigger

frames with any TID that is mapped to this operating link to retrieve the buffered BUs buffered at the AP MLD.

***TGbe editor: Modify subclause 35.3.6.2 Dynamic link transitions as shown below:***

### Dynamic link transitions

A non-AP MLD may use the power states of its non-AP STAs to dynamically change the link(s) on which it operates. [Figure 35-7 (Example of operation of a single radio non-AP MLD with default mapping (all TIDs](#bookmark27) [mapped to all setup links), where the non-AP MLD transitions from operating on link 1 with STA 1 to](#bookmark27) [operating on link 2 with STA 2)](#bookmark27) provides an illustration of operation of a single radio non-AP MLD with default mapping (all TIDs mapped to all setup links), where the non-AP MLD transitions from operating on link 1 with STA 1 to operating on link 2 with STA 2.
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### Figure 35-7— Example of link transition operation by a single radio non-AP MLD using power states (#4110, #6582)

In this example, while operating on link 1: (#4382)

* STA 1 of the non-AP MLD may use active mode or power save mode with the awake state to retrieve BUs from the AP MLD and may use power save mode with doze state to save power.
* STA 2 and STA 3 stay in doze state.

In this example, while operating on link 2: (#4382)

* STA 2 of the non-AP MLD may use active mode or power save mode with the awake state to retrieve BUs from the AP MLD and may use power save mode with doze state to save power.
* STA 1 and STA 3 stay in doze state.