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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs that are currently in quarantine (A-C):

* **Abdel:**  (under discussion, 673)
* **Abhi:** (passed SP) (under discussion, doc?), (770), (withdrawn) (under discussion, doc?) (passed SP).
* **Arik:** 18249
* **Binita:** 15613 (32Y, 21N, 27A in 11-23/765r5), 15950, 15951, 15952, 15953, 15956
* **Frank:** 15475, 16049, 16444, 17870
* **Chunyu:** 15841, 15842, 15933, 15935, 16066, 16067, 16115, 16141, 16142, 16143, 16144, 16146, 16147, 16177, 16285, 16420, 16424, 16570, 16571, 16650, 16652, 16669, 16678, 16701, 17083, 17624, 18255

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 1: With updates from whatever has been received until AM1 of Wednesday. Pending the update of the resolution boxes with the document numbers. We will use the following format: REJECTED – “This CID is discussed on July 6, 2023, in 11-23/xxxx and the group could not reach consensus on a resolution. The SP result was: X, Y, Z (if an SP was run)”

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** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| **Abdel** | | | | | | |
| **Abhishek** | | | | | | |
| **Arik** | | | | | | |
| 18249 | Li-Hsiang Sun | 35.3.7.3.2 | 523.31 | Link removal Immiment has no meaning when BSS Termination Included =0 | remove "and Link Removal Imminent" | "REVISED  This CID is discussed on May 11, 2023 with 23/0593r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  This CID is discussed on April 20, 2023 with 23/0593r2, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore ""REVISED"" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution." |
| **Binita** | | | | | | |
| 15613 | Sanghyun Kim | 35.3.6 | 510.03 | Seamless link-set change procedures should be defined for the non-AP MLD. | The ML reconfiguration procedure should be extended for the non-AP MLD. | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0765r4, but no straw poll is conducted yet. This CID is discussed on May 12, 2023 with 23/0765r2, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15950 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.312.4 | 266.30 | The Link ID field identifies the AP/link for which information is being provided in the Per-STA Profile of the Reconfiguration ML element. The Link ID field description should be revised to reflect this. | Modify Link ID description to "The Link ID subfield is as defined in 9.4.1.75 (Link ID Info field) and specifies a value that uniquely identifies the link for which information is being provided in the Per-STA Profile subelement." | REVISED This CID is discussed on March 16, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15951 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.312.4 | 266.47 | The Reconfiguration ML element is used across different ML reconfiguration operations including AP Removal and to indicate updates to ML operation parameters. Other potential usage of this element were proposed in D2.0 round. The 'Operation Update Type' subfield should be defined such that it can be used to indicate these different ML reconfiguration use cases and new ones in future. Hence it is better to rename this field to a more generic name such as "Reconfiguration Operation Type" to be able to use and extend to various types of ML reconfiguration operations. | Rename the 'Operation Update Type' subfield to 'Reconfiguration Operation Type' as per reasons in the comment. | REVISED This CID is discussed on March 16, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15952 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.312.4 | 266.64 | The Operation Parameters Present subfield is not needed, since presence of the Operation Parameters subfield can be indicated based on the Operation Update Type value. If the value is set to 0, the Operation Parameters subfield is included. This saves reserved bits in the STA Control field for future extensibility. | Remove the Operation Parameters Present subfield and make the bit Reserved. Indicate when the Operation Update Type is set to 0 then the Operation Parameters subfield is present. | REVISED This CID is discussed on March 16, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15953 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.312.4 | 267.01 | The presence of fields in the STA Info field can also be indicated by the Operation Update Type field value. Capture this in the text. | Modify to "The STA Info field consists of fields whose presence is indicated by the subfields of the STA Control field or by the Operation Update Type field value. | REVISED This CID is discussed on March 16, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15956 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.312.4 | 268.21 | Subfield name A-MSUD Length does not match with the name of corresponding present subfield - 'Maximum A-MSDU Length Present' subfield. | Rename "A-MSUD Length" -> "Maximum A-MSDU Length" in Figure 9-1002ab | REVISED This CID is discussed on March 16, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| **Frank** | | | | | | |
| 15475 | Xiandong Dong | 35.3.16.2.2 | 553.37 | When there are more than one link are requested to update the parameters, namely more than one Per-STA Profile subfield included of the Reconfiguration Multi-link element of a Multi-Link Operation Update Request frame, the associated AP MLD can only accept or reject all the requests indicated by the Per-STA Profile subfield at the same time, and cannot respond to the request corresponding to each link individualy. | The response process that can respond individually to the request of each link should be detailed. | REVISED This CID is discussed on April 26, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16049 | Binita Gupta | 35.3.16.2.2 | 552.53 | It is not clear how adding an affiliated AP to the AP MLD could result in operation parameters change of the non-AP MLD, since the non-AP MLD does not have any setup link with the new affiliated AP. The operation parameters may change if the non-AP MLD (Re)Associates and establishes new set of links including the newly added AP, but just adding an AP would not lead to operation parameter changes for a non-AP MLD. | Either move the condition in the last bullet or clarify how it results in changes to the operation parameters of the non-AP MLD. | REVISED This CID is discussed on April 26, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16444 | Laurent Cariou | 35.3.16.2.2 | 552.36 | This procedure only allows to update a very limited set of parameters, which makes it of very low usefulness. In order to increase the chances of this mode being actually used and deployed, there is a clear need to make it generic so that any element/field of a STA can be updated. A clear example where that would be helpful is after a Channel Switch from one band to another one. | Make this update procedure fully generic so that any element/fields can be updated. By reusing the Reconfiguration ML element, this would be very easy to do. | REVISED This CID is discussed on April 26, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 17870 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.16.2.2 | 552.45 | "Multi-Link Operation Update" does not intuitively suggest what this framework is trying to do. The Multi-Link Reconfiguration framework is ideal for this type of parameter update. | Update "Multi-Link Operation Update Request/Response" to "Multi-Link Reconfiguration Request/Response". Also move this subclause as a new subclause under 35.3.6. For example (35.3.6.x Configuration Update) | REVISED This CID is discussed on April 26, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| **Chunyu** | | | | | | |
| 15841 | Muhammad Kumail Haider | 35.8.4 | 619.24 | Subclause 11.1.3.8.4 doesn't fully cover the case for the transmitted BSSID as there is a new additional change as specified in the third bullet at L42. Fix the last setence to reflect so. | As in comment. | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15842 | Muhammad Kumail Haider | 35.8.4 | 619.44 | It's best to add an exemplary illustration/diagram of the announcement for the MBSS case to be clear. | As in comment. | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15933 | Zhou Lan | 35.8.4 | 619.49 | The following note is ont needed and does not add any new information "NOTE--The R-TWT scheduling AP that receives a request from a non-AP STA to establish membership in an R-TWT schedule advertised by the AP with Restricted TWT Schedule Info subfield set to 2 might reject the request." | Remove the note | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 15935 | Zhou Lan | 35.8.5.1 | 620.32 | "The second AP as a TXOP holder on the second link should ensure its TXOP ends no later than Tamount of time before the start time of the R-TWT SP on the first link," The seond AP in this case should not terminate its TXOP on the second link if the TXOP is for another STA other than the NSTR STA of concern. This should only happen if the seocndd AP is transmitting or receiving to that NSTR MLD STA in this TXOP | Add a condition that the second AP would terminate its TXOP only if it is transmitting to the second non-AP STA. " the terminated TXOP is communicating with the second non-AP STA". Rewrite this section to be easier to read. | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16066 | Binita Gupta | 35.8.4 | 619.17 | The first paragraph in 35.8.4 needs to be revised to account for different cases - 1) the EHT AP is not in a multiple BSSID set, or 2)the EHT AP is a transmitted BSSID of the multiple BSSID set or 3) the EHT AP is a Nontransmitted BSSID of the multiple BSSID set. 4) EHT AP is a co-hosted BSSID. Define how R-TWT schedules can be advertised for each of these cases. | Revise the paragraph as per the comment to capture requirements for R-TWT schedule announcement for the cases mentioned. | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16067 | Binita Gupta | 35.8.4 | 619.45 | Would be good to add a Figure to show for clarity how R-TWT schedules for transmitted and nontransmitted BSSID APs are carried in a Beacon or Probe Response frame, similar to Figure 35-12a. | As in comment. | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16115 | Insun Jang | 35.8.4 | 619.23 | When a STA is associated with a NonTxBSSID, how can it differentiate which rTWT schedules (carried in Beacon from TxBSSID) corresponds to the NonTxBSSID to has a membership with that NonTxBSSID? Please clarify that issue | As in the comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16141 | SunHee Baek | 35.8.4 | 619.20 | The terms both "nontransmitting AP" and "transmitting AP" aren't official terms. "nontransmitting AP" is changed to "AP corresponding to the nontransmitted BSSID" and "transmitting AP" is changed to "AP corresponding to the transmitted BSSID". | As in the comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16142 | SunHee Baek | 35.8.4 | 619.22 | If an STA associate with an AP corresponding to the nontransmitted BSSID and receives a Beacon frame including all R-TWT schedules from an AP corresponding to the transmitted BSSID, then how does the STA distinguish the R-TWT schedules for the associated AP among the other R-TWT schedules with Restricted TWT Schedule Info subfield equal to 3? | Please clarify this case. | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16143 | SunHee Baek | 35.8.4 | 619.38 | The term "transmitting AP" isn't official terms. "transmitting AP" is replaced to "AP corresponding to the transmitted BSSID". | As in the comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16144 | SunHee Baek | 35.8.4 | 619.42 | The term "nontransmitting AP" isn't official term. "nontransmitting AP" is replaced to "AP corresponding to the nontransmitted BSSID". | As in the comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8, but no straw poll is conducted yet. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16146 | SunHee Baek | 35.8.5.2 | 621.10 | In R-TWT, overlapping quiet interval sets 1 TU to guarantee R-TWT SP, but the current spec doesn't support any method for non-AP EHT STAs that don't support R-TWT to ignore overlapping quiet interval. | Please specify how non-AP EHT STAs that don't support R-TWT may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exist. | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 21, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16147 | SunHee Baek | 35.8.5.2 | 621.12 | The NOTE doesn't specify why an R-TWT scheduling AP might transmit a CF-End frame during an overlapping quiet interval. | Please add the text shown the intention of the CF-End frame during overlapping quiet interval at the end of NOTE. For example, "to release TXOP set by the quiet interval if the AP and member STA don't have buffered frame." | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 21, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16177 | Rojan Chitrakar | 35.8.5.2 | 621.10 | "Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exist." why? Only EHT STAs that are members of the r-TWT SP should be exempted. | Modify as "Non-AP EHT STAs that are members of the corresponding r-TWT SP may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exist." | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 21, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16285 | Pascal VIGER | 35.8.5.2 | 620.56 | The Quiet element use is not appropriate to efficiently overlap an R-TWT SP : this is because r-TWT specifies a Target Wake Time corresponding to a TSF time (9.4.2.199), whereas the Quiet Element (9.4.2.22) uses an Offset from the n+1 TBTT. Thus, the Quiet element can not protect a TWT SP of current TBTT. This would require notification anticipation of any new/changing R-TWT SP timing, which seems not appropriate. | Either consider removing such protection, or indicate the limitation as in comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16420 | Jeongki Kim | 35.8.5.1 | 620.53 | In a r-TWT SP, non-member STA may transmit a frame using EDCA to AP although AP allocates a quiet interval overlapping with the r-TWT SP, especially when AP does not allocate the overlapped quiet interval at the start of the r-TWT SP. This may degrade the performance of the latency sensitive traffic. In a r-TWT SP, if the AP wants to further protect/support the latency sensitive traffic related to TIDs of the r-TWT SP, the AP can be able to control a transmission of non-member STA (legacy STA as well as EHT STA) with minimizing the impact of the non-member STA. The group need to discuss this issue and provide a good solution for supporting a latency sensitive traffic in a r-TWT SP. | Define a mechanism for AP to be able to control a transmission of a non-member STA in a r-TWT SP | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16424 | Jeongki Kim | 35.8.5.1 | 620.53 | In a trigger-enabled R-TWT SP, a non-member STA may transmit a RTS to AP and when an AP receives a RTS from the STA if the medium indicates idle, the AP sends CTS to the STA and the STA transmits data to AP. It may increase the delay of the latency senstive traffic of the member STA. Define the method of reducing the delay of the latency sensitive traffic of the member STA in R-TWT SP. | As in comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16570 | Arik Klein | 35.8.4 | 619.20 | Please replace the term "nontransmitting AP" with "AP corresponding to nontransmitted BSSID within a multiple BSSID set" | As in comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16571 | Arik Klein | 35.8.4 | 619.20 | An AP that is corresponding to nontransmitted BSSID is relevant only in multiple BSSID set only but not for co-hosted BSSID set, where each of the APs in this set transmits Beacon and Probe Response frames (as defined in 26.17.7) | Please remove the words "or co-hosted BSSID set" from the following sentence: "The membership is setup either with its associated EHT AP, or with any nontransmitting AP that belongs to the same multiple BSSID set or co-hosted BSSID set as the transmitting AP" | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16650 | Mohamed Abouelseoud | 35.8.4 | 619.49 | The following note is ont needed and does not add any new information "NOTE--The R-TWT scheduling AP that receives a request from a non-AP STA to establish membership in an R-TWT schedule advertised by the AP with Restricted TWT Schedule Info subfield set to 2 might reject the request." | Remove the note | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16652 | Mohamed Abouelseoud | 35.8.5.1 | 620.32 | "The second AP as a TXOP holder on the second link should ensure its TXOP ends no later than Tamount of time before the start time of the R-TWT SP on the first link," The seond AP in this case should not terminate its TXOP on the second link if the TXOP is for another STA other than the NSTR STA of concern. This should only happen if the seocndd AP is transmitting or receiving to that NSTR MLD STA in this TXOP | Add a condition that the second AP would terminate its TXOP only if it is transmitting to the second non-AP STA. " the terminated TXOP is communicating with the second non-AP STA". Rewrite this section to be easier to read. | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16669 | Liwen Chu | 35.8.4 | 0.00 | since a transmitted BSSID AP or co-hosted AP transmits the non-idle R-TWT schedules of the other APs in the same multiple BSSID set or co-hosted AP set. The critical update of AP MLD and the AP that transmitted Beacon etc. should be changed accordingly. | As in comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8, but no straw poll is conducted yet. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16678 | Qi Wang | 35.8.5.1 | 620.45 | "where T equals to one of the following values: -- 0 if the two non-AP STAs operate on a pair of NSTR links,...." "NSTR links" needs be replaced with "STR links" here. | As in comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 16701 | Yonggang Fang | 35.8.5.1 | 620.53 | In 26.8.3.3 of 802.11m, a rule of broadcast TWT which is applicable to RTWT: "A TWT scheduled STA should not transmit frames to the TWT scheduling AP outside of broadcast TWT SPs and should not transmit frames that are not contained within HE TB PPDUs to the TWT scheduling AP within trigger-enabled broadcast TWT SPs, except that the STA can transmit frames within negotiated individual TWT SPs as defined in 26.8.2 (Individual TWT agreements)." A STA affiliated with the EPCS non-AP MLD with R-TWT enabled should not have such restriction. | Please add a note "A STA affiliated with an EPCS non-AP MLD with dot11RestrictedTWTOptionImplemented set to true can perform priority channel access inside and outside of the SP of R-TWT using the values carried in the EDCA Parameter Set element in the Per-STA Profile corresponding to the AP to which the STA is associated in Priority Access Multi-Link element, if provided, or the default EDCA parameter values otherwise." | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 14, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 17083 | Mark RISON | 35.8.4 | 619.46 | "A non-AP STA should not request to establish membership in an R-TWT schedule advertised by the R-TWT scheduling AP with the Restricted TWT Schedule subfield set to 2. NOTE--The R-TWT scheduling AP that receives a request from a non-AP STA to establish membership in an R-TWT schedule advertised by the AP with Restricted TWT Schedule Info subfield set to 2 might reject the request." -- why allow this? | Change "should" to "shall" and delete the NOTE | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 17624 | Brian Hart | 35.8.5.2 | 621.11 | Current requrements for overlapping quiet intervals are weak and undermines the feature. | Option A:(Preferred) Improve the spec: "A non-AP STA that is a member of an R-TWT SP may behave as if the overlapping quiet interval of the R-TWT SP, if present, does not exist." Option B: Given the weakness of the requirements on overlapping quiet intervals, leave quiet intervals intact by deleting all reference to quiet intervals in relation to R-TWT SPs. | REVISED This CID is discussed on June 21, 2023, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
| 18255 | Li-Hsiang Sun | 35.8.4 | 619.42 | There should be a requirement that TWT element with rTWT Schedule Info set to 3 is not included in nonTXBSSID profile, and not subject to inheritance | as in comment | REVISED This CID is discussed on May 18, 2023 with 23/0458r8. The straw poll result is 45 Yes, 27 No, 30 Abstain. This CID is discussed on May 16, 2023 with 23/0458r5, but no straw poll is conducted yet. Please ignore "REVISED" - it is just for the sole purpose of showing that this CID has a pending resolution. |
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