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**Abstract**

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs for TGbe LB266:

* 12493,10982,13865,12757,12758,11500,11502,11501,11503,11999,11499

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

***TGbe editor: Please note Baseline is IEEE 802.11-2020, 11ax D8.0, and 11be D2.0***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Commenter | Clause | Page | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 12493 | Jeongki Kim | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.13 | In Tgbe D2.0, the "TXOP Sharing Mode subfield" is changed to "Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode subfield". Change "TXOP Sharing Mode subfield" to " Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode subfield" in the following parts.- line 26, 29 on page 31- line 49 on page 35- line 43 on page 148- line 13, 17, 18, 22, 24, 40, on page 169- line 34, 39, 45, 56 on page 400- line 18, 20, 28, 45 on page 401- line 1, 2, 9, 25, 41, 49 on page 402- line 17 on page 403 | As in comment | Accepted |
| 10982 | Yanjun Sun | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.21 | The title of Table-953e needs to be revised by replacing "Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode subfield" with "TXOP Sharing Mode subfield". Please propagate the changes to the related text as well. | As in comment | RevisedAgree with the commenter in principleNOTE for Tgbe editor: please implement the same changes as those for CID 12493 |
| 13865 | yujin noh | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.13 | There is no MU-RTS Trigger frame format including TXOP Sharing Mode subfield in Common Info field. | Need to define how TXOP Sharing Mode subfield is configured in MU-RTS Trigger frame. | RevisedAgree with the commenter that there is a typo in the name for the ‘TXOP Sharing Mode’ subfield in the sentence and the name for the subfield needs to be updated to the latest ‘Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode’.NOTE for Tgbe editor: please implement the same changes as those for CID 12493 |
| 12757 | Patrice Nezou | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.13 | The TXOP sharing Mode subfield is located in the Common Info field. The Duration of the transmission was moved to the User Info field. Why not for the TXOP sharing mode field ? Moreover, in case of multiple RUs, it reduces the possible configuration and the possible allocation. | Move the definition of the TXOP sharing mode to the User Info field | RejectedThis is a good thought, but there is no compelling reason to move the TXOP sharing mode from Common Info field to User Info field due to the following reasons.First, the commenter referrer to the case of multiple RUs, which is not applicable to 11be STAs which can only send non-TB PPDUs after being solicitated by a MU-RTS TXS Trigger frame.Second, if the intention of the commenter is to be better prepared for future expansion, Common Info field still looks like a better place, as there are more reserved bits in the Common Info field than those in the User Info field. |
| 12758 | Patrice Nezou | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.13 | The MU RTS TXS trigger frame is an extension of the MU RTS. It creates many inconsistencies with the classical MU RTS. Many fields of the MU RTS frames are not used by the MU RTS TXS frame. It would be better to create a dedicated Trigger frame for the MU RTS TXS frame. | Create a dedicated Trigger for the MU RTS TXS frame. | RejectedThere are more benefits to expand MU- RTS frame for TXOP sharing. E.g, it is a control frame understood by legacy HE STAs and it also avoids consuming another precious subtype value from the very limited reserved values for control frames if the current design also works. Lastly, the key difference between the formats of an MU-RTS TXS Trigger and an MU-RTS frame is the Allocation Duration subfield, so there is no inconsistency between them. |
| 11500 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.40 | why is the name MU-RTS TXS trigger frame only limited in this subclause and 35.2.1.2? | remove "for the remainder of this subclause and throughout35.2.1.2 (Triggered TXOPsharing procedure)" | Accepted |
| 11502 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.3.1.22.9 | 170.36 | The CTS frame cannot be transmitted at the same time on primary 20, primary 40 and primary 80 MHz channels. | change to "on one of the following channels: the primary 20 Mhz channel, primary 40 Mhz channel, ..." | RejectedThe list of channels are connected by “or”, so it’s clear that the CTS can only be transmitted on one of the channels. |
| 11501 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.3.1.22.9 | 170.49 | Is it to "indicate" or "include" primary 20 MHz channel? | change "include " to "indicate" | Accepted |
| 11503 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.3.1.22.9 | 171.08 | In the figure 9-96, if 69 indicates the entire 320 MHz channel, the channel should also include the channel indicated by the value 68 | correct the figure | RevisedAgree with the commenter in principle. The figure has been revised by expanding the left edge of the box indicated by 69 (320 MHz) to the left a little more, in order to clearly show that it includes the primary 160 MHz indicated by 68.Tgbe editor please implement changes as shown in doc 11-22/1002r1 tagged as #11503 |
| 11999 | Eunsung Park | 9.3.1.22.9 | 171.08 | B7-B1 of RU Allocation subfield in MU-RTS Trigger frame seem sufficient to indicate specific channels. Is there any reason to use B0 of RU Allocation subfield and PS160 subfield? | Make B0 of RU allocation subfield and PS160 subfield reserved in MU-RTS Trigger frame. | RejectedIt is true that B7-B1 will be sufficient to indicate the channels for CTS response. However, B0 cannot be changed to a reserved bit mainly due to the need to maintain backward compatibility and to simplify receiver design. In 802.11ax, B0 is set to 0 or 1 depending on whether the bandwidth is greater than 80 MHz on the transmitter side. The key reason behind that choice was simplicity in decoding logic, as it allows a transmitter to use the same RU look-up table for both the Basic Trigger frame and the MU-RTS Trigger frame.802.11be inherited the similar approach to simplify receiver design, by allowing a receiver to use the same RU look-up table for both the Basic Trigger frame and the MU-RTS Trigger frame for 320 MHz. As the PS160 bit is set to 1 for 320 MHz for the Basic Trigger frame, MU-RTS Trigger frame has inherited the same value. From simplicity perspective, it is beneficial not to make the PS160 bit a reserved field. |
| 11499 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.3.1.22.9 | 168.57 | Isn't it always the AP that decides the User Info field in an HE/EHT variant? Does it imply that in the previous paragraph, the AP doesn't decide it is sending the EHT variant, such as sending a 320 MHz MU-RTS? Please clarify | as in comment | RevisedAgree with the commenter in principleTgbe editor please implement changes as shown in doc 11-22/1002r1 tagged as #11499 |

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

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

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

**9.3.1.22.9 MU-RTS Trigger frame format**

… …

***TGbe editor: Please update Figure 9-96 as follows (i.e., expand the left edge of the box indicated by 69 (320 MHz) to the left a little more, in order to clearly show that it includes the primary 160 MHz indicated by 68):***

(#11503)

***Figure 9-96— B7–B1 of RU Allocation subfield in MU-RTS Trigger frame for various bandwidths***

***…***

***TGbe editor: Please update the paragraph at P168L57 in D2.0 as follows:***

If any non-AP EHT STA is addressed in an MU-RTS Trigger frame from an EHT AP and any of the following conditions is met, the User Info field addressed to an EHT STA in the MU-RTS Trigger frame is an EHT variant User Info field:

— The bandwidth of the PPDU carrying the MU-RTS Trigger frame is 320 MHz.

— The PPDU carrying the MU-RTS Trigger frame is punctured.

Otherwise, (#11499)the User Info field might be an HE variant User Info field or an EHT variant User Info field.