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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following 6 comments received for TGbe LB266:

* 6 CIDs: 11111, 11112, 11116, 11117, 12286, 12461.

SP: Do you agree to the resolutions provided in doc 11-22/1051r1 for the following CIDs for inclusion in the latest 11be draft?

11111, 11112, 11116, 11117, 12286, 12461.

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

***TGbe editor: Please note Baseline is 11be D2.2***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Pg/Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 11111 | Brian Hart | 512.03 | "otherwise, it is available for new membership" may be too optimistic since 100 STAs could request membership at the same time | Soften this. And probably invert the sentence for simplicity, so try "If the Restricted TWT Schedule Full subfield in the Broadcast TWT Info subfield in a Restricted TWT Parameter Set field is set to 0, it indicates that, at the transmission time, the corresponding r-TWT schedule is available for accommodating new membership ; otherwise, it is not available for new membership." | **Rejected.**  Based on the context from the previous sentences, the indicated sentence clearly articulates the intention. The suggested text would unnecessarily complicate the statement. |
| 11112 | Brian Hart | 512.14 | Since the PHY really doesn't support stopping partway through an AMPDU, "MPDU" is probably wrong in "Before starting transmission of any MPDU, " | Try "Before starting transmission of any PPDU or determining the Duration field in any MDPU therein," | **Accepted** |
| 11116 | Brian Hart | 512.42 | "Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exist." is too loose, since Quiet elements also have a DFS purpose. Also "may" is wrong for clients that are expected to use that r-TWT SP. | Try "Non-AP EHT STAs that are members of an upcoming restricted TWT service period shall behave as if the quiet interval that overlaps the restricted TWT service period does not exist." | **Accepted** |
| 11117 | Brian Hart | 512.48 | Odd English "shall ensure QoS Data frames of r-TWT TID(s) to be first delivered during the r-TWT SPs". | Try "shall ensure that QoS Data frames of the r-TWT TID(s) are delivered first during each r-TWT SP" | **Accepted** |
| 12286 | KENGO NAGATA | 511.56 | As described in this clause, a r-TWT scheduling AP can indicate whether or not the schedule is available for accommodating any new membership and can notify other STAs. However, in the case of multiple r-TWT scheduling APs schedule r-TWT SP respectively, multiple r-TWT SP might be overlapped and should be avoided. TGbe should define mechanisms to prevent this issue. | As in the comment. | **Rejected.**  Although agree with the commenter about the raised issue, this change would be more appropriate for multiple AP coordination topic, and we can revisit this in the next generation standards development phase. |
| 12461 | Daniel Verenzuela | 512.04 | All EHT STAs that support r-TWT should be allowed to use this feature with some level of fairness. The current recommendation "A STA should not request to establish membership in an r-TWT schedule advertised by the r-TWT scheduling AP with Restricted TWT Schedule Full subfield set to 1." can lead to EHT STAs not being able to participate in r-TWT SPs for long periods of time leading to unfairness in the use of this feature. | Define mechanism for EHT STAs that support r-TWT to be able to obtain membership of an r-TWT in a fairly even when r-TWT SPs are full. | **Rejected**  If the AP cannot accommodate any new membership in the schedule, it needs to declare upfront that the schedule is currently unavailable. The “Full Schedule” signaling is serving that purpose. It is not related to fairness. In fact, with this signaling, the AP is suggesting the STA to not waste effort in seeking membership in such schedule and rather try a different schedule that may satisfy the STA’s traffic requirements. This, in essence, is saving TWT negotiation time for the STA, which would be quite important if the STA has latency-sensitive traffic. |