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##### This submission present proposed resolutions for the following 12 CIDs:

12079, 13749, 13750, 14002, 13746, 12366, 12367, 12152, 13123, 13188,

11985, 12982

##### The proposed changes are based on P802.11be D2.3.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – Initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 12079 | 9.4.2.78 | 199 | 33 | Correct the reference "(see 11.3 (STA authenticationAuthentication and association))," to "11.3 STA authentication and association" | as in comment |
| 13749 | 9.4.2.78 | 199 | 28 | typo on the subclause name of 11.3 | Remove "Authentication" |
| 13750 | 9.4.2.78 | 199 | 33 | typo on the subclause name of 11.3 | Remove "Authentication" |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 12079, 13749, 13750:***

Rejected.

It is not a typo. It is a limitation of Framemaker that the strikethrough cannot be displayed for any cross reference.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 14002 | 1 | 12 | 42 | Remove "(". | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 12.42 in D2.0:



Agree with the commenter that “(“ is redundant.

***Proposed resolution for CID 14002:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: This CID is implemented by CID 10142.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 13746 | 9.4.1.11 | 181 | 3 | news row should be new rows | Change "news row" to "new rows" |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 181.3 in D2.0:



Agree with the commenter that it is “new rows”, not “news row”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 13746:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: This CID is implemented by CID 12432.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 12366 | 9.4.1.199 | 207 | 55 | Meaning of the field when the DL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 1 should also be described. | Add the meaning of the field when the DL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 1. |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 207.55 in D2.0:



***Proposed resolution for CID 12366:***

Revised.

At 207.55,

replace

“The DL TID Bitmap Valid subfield indicates if the Restricted TWT DL TID Bitmap field has valid information. When the value is set to 0, it indicates that DL traffic of all TIDs is identified as latency sensitive traffic, and the Restricted TWT DL TID Bitmap field is reserved.”

with

“The DL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 1 to indicate that the Restricted TWT DL TID Bitmap field is valid. The DL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 0 to indicate that the DL traffic of all the TIDs mapped in DL to the link in which the R-TWT membership is being setup, is identified as latency sensitive traffic, and the Restricted TWT DL TID Bitmap field is reserved.”

Note to the Editor: This CID is implemented by CID 12054.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 12367 | 9.4.1.199 | 207 | 59 | Meaning of the field when the UL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 1 should also be described. | Add the meaning of the field when the UL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 1. |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 207.59 in D2.0:



***Proposed resolution for CID 12367:***

Revised.

At 207.59,

replace

“The UL TID Bitmap Valid subfield indicates if the Restricted TWT UL TID Bitmap field has valid information. When the value is set to 0, it indicates that UL traffic of all TIDs is identified as latency sensitive traffic, and the Restricted TWT UL TID Bitmap field is reserved.”

with

“The UL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 1 to indicate that the Restricted TWT UL TID Bitmap field is valid. The UL TID Bitmap Valid subfield is set to 0 to indicate that the UL traffic of all the TIDs mapped in UL to the link in which the R-TWT membership is being setup, is identified as latency sensitive traffic, and the Restricted TWT UL TID Bitmap field is reserved.”

Note to the Editor: This CID is implemented by CID 12054.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 12152 | 9.4.2.313.1 | 228 | 60 | In Figure 9-10002ae-EHT Capabilities element format, the first octet is "Element ID" not "Element". | As in comment. |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 228.60 in D2.0:



Agree with the commenter that the first octet is “Element ID”, not “Element”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 12152:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D2.3, the location is 250.6.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 13123 | 10.11 | 293 | 37 | "VHT PPDU or HE PPDU or EHT PPDU" awkward | Change to "VHT, HE or EHT PPDU" |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 293.37 in D2.0:



Agree with the commenter that the description can be simplified by chaning “VHT PPDU or HE PPDU or EHT PPDU” to “VHT, HE or EHT PPDU”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 13123:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D2.3, the location is 319.40.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 13188 | 12.6.21 | 349 | 47 | "AP authenticator" -- not clear what this is | Change to "AP's Authenticator". Ditto at line 46 change "AP MLD authenticator" to "AP MLD's Authenticator" |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 349.47 in D2.0:



Agree with the commenter on the proposed changes.

***Proposed resolution for CID 13188:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D2.3, the locations are 382.58 and 382.57, respectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 11985 |  | 1 | 4 | The naming convention is not correct for IEEE P802.11ax-2021, IEEEP802.11ay-2021 and IEEE P802.11ba-2021. Status lists them as projects "P". They should be listed as an approved standard "Std." | Change "IEEE P802.11ax -2021" to "IEEE Std. 802.11ax-2001" Change "IEEE P802.11ay -2021" to "IEEE Std. 802.11ay - 2021" Change "IEEE P802.11ba - 2021" to IEEE Std. 802.11ba - 2021" include trademark symbol. |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that the standards were approved and the proposed changes.

***Proposed resolution for CID 11985:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 12982 | 26.5.2.2.1a | 396 | 20 | Change "for" to "in" in "an RU for a 40 MHz HE TB PPDU", and similarly in other sentences in this subsection. | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

Original text at 396.20 in D2.0:



Agree with the commenter to replace “allocate an RU for” with “allocate an RU in”. The proposed resolution is “REVISED” rather than “ACCEPTED” to provide Editor the complete information for the change.

***Proposed resolution for CID 12982:***

Revised.

At 427.57 and 427.63 in D2.3, replace “allocate an RU for” with “allocate an RU in”.