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**Abstract**

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

* 10328,10329,11995,10800,10803,11492,10799,13455,13553

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

***TGbe editor: Please note Baseline is REVme\_D1.3 and 11be D2.1.1***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Commenter | Clause | Page | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 10328 | Mengshi Hu | 9.3.1.22.2 | 146.13 | It is confusing to mention "HE" in the HE/EHT-LTF Type/Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode subfield in the EHT variant common info field format. According to (Line 18, Page 145), it will be EHT variant common info field if B54 and B55 are equal to 1. In this case, why do we need HE here? Please add some clarifications. | As in the comment. | Rejected.After offline discussion, the commenter prefers to keep the current text as is for the stability of the spec. The subfield and related spec text are correct without any change. They were written in a way to serve as a stepping stone towards A-PPDU. Although A-PPDU will not be supported in 11be based on the group’s decision, similar to 16SS support, it’s better to avoid frame format changes at this stage for the stability of the spec. |
| 10329 | Mengshi Hu | 9.3.1.22.2 | 146.13 | It is confusing to mention "HE" in the Number Of HE/EHT-LTF Symbols subfield in the EHT variant common info field format. According to (Line 18, Page 145), it will be EHT variant common info field if B54 and B55 are equal to 1. In this case, why do we need HE here? Please add some clarifications. | As in the comment. | Rejected.After offline discussion, the commenter prefers to keep the current text as is for the stability of the spec. The subfield and related spec text are correct without any change and they were written in a way to serve as a stepping stone towards A-PPDU. Although A-PPDU will not be supported in 11be based on the group’s decision, similar to 16SS support, it’s better to avoid frame format changes at this stage for the stability of the spec |
| 11995 | Eunsung Park | 9.3.1.22.2 | 146.10 | Since A-PPDU is not currently supported, HE-LTF doesn't have to be considered in the EHT variant Common Info field. | Change "GI And HE/EHT-LTF Type" to "GI And EHT-LTF Type". Change "Number Of HE/EHT-LTF Symbols" to "Number of EHT-LTF Symbols". | Rejected.The subfield and related spec text are correct without any change and they were written in a way to serve as a stepping stone towards A-PPDU. Although A-PPDU will not be supported in 11be based on the group’s decision, similar to 16SS support, it’s better to avoid frame format changes at this stage for the stability of the spec |
| 10800 | Dong Guk Lim | 9.3.1.22.2 | 146.40 | EHT variant Common Info field is used for the EHT STA. So, it does not need to include the HE in each subfield in this field. | Modify all of "GI And HE/EHT-LTF Type/Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode " and "Number Of HE/EHT-LTF Symbols " to "GI And EHT-LTF Type/Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode "and "Number Of EHT-LTF Symbols ". | Rejected.The subfield and related spec text are correct without any change and written in a way to serve as a stepping stone towards A-PPDU. Although A-PPDU will not be supported in 11be based on the group’s decision, similar to 16SS support, it’s better to avoid frame format changes at this stage for the stability of the spec |
| 10803 | Dong Guk Lim | 9.3.1.22.5 | 165.60 | As described in table 9-45, the last row of this table allows that trigger frame contains both the HE variant user info field and the special user info field. So, in the above case, the special user info field can be included even though the EHT variant user field is not included. Clarify it. | As in the comment. | RevisedNOTE3 referred to by the commenter is correct, as the last row of table 9-45 cannot be used in 11be (the group has decided not support A-PPDU in 11be). As a reference, D2.1 has the following text to clarify that the last row of the table cannot be used “An EHT AP with dot11EHTBaseLineFeaturesImplementedOnly equal to true does not set [B54:B55] in the Common Info field to the value “10” in a Trigger frame. ”Tgbe editor, no further action is needed |
| 11492 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.3.1.22.1 | 144.43 | Is Note 1 meant to be normative? In that case, it should be stated as such. | as in comment | RevisedAgree with the commenter that normative text is needed. NOTE1 of Table 9-45a is redundant as there is corresponding normative text in D2.1. As reference, NOTE 1 in D2.0 cited by the commenter reads “NOTE 1—A non-AP EHT STA withdot11EHTBaseLineFeaturesImplementedOnly equal to true does not respond with a TB PPDU to a Trigger frame that does not follow the combinations listed in this table (see 35.5.2.3.4 (Conditions for not responding with a TB PPDU)).”There is corresponding normative text in D2.1 now in 35.5.2.3.4: “If a non-AP EHT STA is solicited to send a TB PPDU by a Trigger frame and the combination of the B54 and B55 in the Common Info field, the B39 in the User Info field addressed to it in the Trigger frame does not match any of the combinations of the values specified in the rows in Table 9-45a (Valid combinations of B54 and B55 in the Common Info field, B39 in the User Info field, and solicited TB PPDU format), then the STA shall not respond with a TB PPDU to the Trigger frame.”. Tgbe editor please delete NOTE1 of Table 9-45a in P146L47 in D2.1 |
| 10799 | Dong Guk Lim | 9.3.1.22.1 | 144.52 | In tale 9-45a, Note 2 notified that an EHT AP is possible to set [B54: B55] as 10 in a trigger frame. So, this sentence is able to make confusing. Delete it . | As in the comment. | RevisedAgree with the commenter in principle. NOTE2 was related to A-PPDU. As the group has decided not to support A-PPDU in 11be, NOTE 2 should be deleted to avoid confusion.Tgbe editor please delete NOTE2 of Table 9-45a in P146L51 in D2.1 |
| 13455 | Liwen Chu | 9.3.1.19 | 144.47 | I assume that Note 2 is also applied to HE STA. | As in comment | RejectedThis is a question instead of a technical issue. Answers below are provided here for clarification purpose only.NOTE2 was related to A-PPDU. As the group has decided not to support A-PPDU in 11be, NOTE 2 should be deleted to avoid confusion based on the resolution to CID 10799 |
| 13553 | Jian Yu | 9.3.1.22.13 | 172.57 | Define NFRP for EHT | As in comment | RejectedThere was discussion on NFRP expansion in 21/0884r1, but the group couldn’t reach consensus on a solution.  |

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.***