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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution for CID 11700 received in LB266 (11be D2.0).

***TGbe editor: The baseline for this document is 11be D2.0***

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 1: updated based on offline feedback
* Rev 2: provide two potential solutions based on offline discussions with members
* Rev 3,4, 5, 6: based on offline feedback from members

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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Pg/Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 11700 | 9.4.2.316 | 525.12 | The current Target Wake Time field is 2 octets in the TWT element for R-TWT with a granularity of one TU. This may not allow to specify start times that have less than one TU resolution | Please clarify | **Revised**  Agree with the comment. A mechanism is provided to allow a STA to align the R-TWT SP start time with the latency sensitive traffic arrival defined in frames per second.  TGbe editor, please implement changes shown under option 2 as shown in 11-22/1373r8 tagged as 11700 |

### Discussion:

Per 11be D2.0 P208L6, in subclause 9.4.2.199 (TWT element), we have the following Broadcast TWT Parameter Set field format:
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Description automatically generated

**Figure 9-766-Broadcast TWT Parameter Set field format**

The Broadcast TWT Parameter Set field includes a Target Wake Time field that is 2 octets.

Also, per baseline REVme D1.3, in subclause 9.4.2.199 (TWT element), the Target Wake Time field is 8 octets in case of Individual TWT whereas in case of Broadcast TWT, the Target Wake Time field is 2 octets with the lowest bit of the 2 octets corresponding to bit 10 of the relevant TSF value.

In addition, per baseline REVme D1.3 P4218L41, we have: The TWT scheduling AP shall set the Target Wake Time field to TSF [10:25], where TSF corresponds to the next TWT that is scheduled for this TWT parameter set when it queues for transmission the frame that contains the TWT element. The TSF timer at which the next TWT is scheduled has bits 0 to 9 equal to 0 and bits 26 to 63 equal to the same value as the respective bits in the current TSF timer.

Thus, the current rules allow to negotiate a Target Wake Time that has 1 TU resolution (>= 1024 µsec). However, latency sensitive traffic such as XR and cloud gaming traffic arrival is defined it terms of frames per second (fps), e.g., 60 fps (1 frame every 16.667 ms), and hence requires a finer time resolution. Although, the TWT Wake Interval allows a lower resolution, the upcoming TWT beacon announcements will carry only 1 TU resolution. Thus, the difference between the start time of the R-TWT SP and the latency sensitive traffic arrival will get accumulated. As a result, the current Target Wake Time field does not allow to align the latency sensitive traffic arrival time with the R-TWT SP start time and the latency sensitive traffic may not be able to benefit from the R-TWT SP. In this proposal, we address this issue.

**Target Wake Time field mismatch issue:**



We add a NOTE as good practice for implementation to avoid decoding errors that can happen at the receiving STA where the receiving STA use different B63-B26 than those intended by the transmitting STA for determining the SP start time during the lifetime of an R-TWT schedule.

### Proposed Text:



































**Option 2 (Keep the TWT in TU resolution):**

***TGbe editor: Please add this paragraph at the end of subclause 35.9.3 (r-TWT service periods announcement) (CID 11700)***

**35.9.3 R-TWT service periods announcement**

An R-TWT scheduling AP when announcing an R-TWT schedule, shall set the Target Wake Time field in the TWT element in transmitted Management frames to TSF [10:25], where TSF corresponds to the first R-TWT SP start time of the corresponding R-TWT agreement.

The R-TWT scheduling AP shall determine the start time of R-TWT SPs that happen after the first R-TWT SP (Next R-TWT SP start time) in a periodic R-TWT schedule based on the start time of the first R-TWT SP and the TWT Wake Interval of the corresponding R-TWT schedule.

***TGbe editor: Please add this NOTE after the following paragraph “If transmitted by a TWT requesting STA or a TWT scheduled STA and the TWT Setup Command subfield contains a value corresponding …” in subclause 9.4.2.199 (TWT element) (CID 11700)***

NOTE – If the Broadcast field is set to 1, the Target Wake Time field carries only B10:B25 of the relevant TSF timer, and changes in the B26:B63 of the corresponding TSF Timer are not communicated to the receiving STA. Hence, an EHT STA must consider when setting up a Broadcast TWT schedule the rollover of B26:B63 of the TSF Timer that may happen at the receiving STA during the lifetime of the Broadcast TWT schedule (i.e., resulting from the Target Wake Time field and Broadcast TWT Persistence field).

~~SP1: Which option as described above (11-22/1373r1) do you support to move forward with the resolution for CID 11700?~~

* ~~Option 1 (proposed resolution related to adding Extended TWT element)~~
* ~~Option 2 (proposed resolution related to keeping TWT field in TU resolution)~~
* ~~Abstain~~

SP: Do you agree to the resolution in Option (2) for CID 11700 provided in doc 11-21/1373r8 to be included in the latest 11be draft?