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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following CIDs received for TGbe D6.0 (SA ballot recirc):

23007 23034 23086 23101 23127 23128

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

***TGbe editor: Baseline for this document is 11be D6.0***

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.

***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** | **Category** | **Clause** | **Page.line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 23007 | Binita Gupta | T | 9.4.2.321.2.3 | 256.34 | The rules for when the Extended ﻿MLD Capabilities And Operations subfield is included in the Common Info field in a Basic ML element is missing in this clause. NOTE 4 on P539L47 indicates that the rule is covered in ﻿9.4.2.321.2.3, however this clause does not define the rule. | Add rule for when the Extended ﻿MLD Capabilities And Operations subfield is included in the Common Info field in a Basic ML element. This should be the same rule as for including the MLD Capabilities And Operations subfield in the Basic ML element. | *Work-in-progress* |
| 23034 | Joseph Levy | E | 9.4.2.321.2.4 | 292.37 | It is preferred to state what the condition of a requirement is, prior to stating the requirement. | Replace: "The subfields are as defined in 9.4.2.5 (TIM element) if the reported AP does not correspond to a nontransmitted BSSID or as defined in 9.4.2.72 (Multiple BSSIDIndex element) if the reported AP corresponds to a nontransmitted BSSID." With: "If the reported AP does not correspond to a nontransmitted BSS the subfields are as defined in 9.4.2.5 (TIM element). IF the reported AP corresponds to a nontransmited BSSID the subfields are as defined in 9.4.2.72 (Multiple BSSIDIndex element)." | **Revised**  Agree with the comment and accept the proposed resolution with the following changes: replace ‘IF’ with ‘If’ and replace ‘Multiple BSSIDIndex element’ with ‘Multiple BSSID-Index element’.  **TGbe Editor: Please apply the changes proposed by the comment with fixes as shown above.** |
| 23086 | Abhishek Patil | T | 35.3.20 | 607.15 | The note 3 and note 4 on pg 607 describe the behavior at an AP and need to be expressed as normative text. | Delete 'NOTE 3 -', adjust the font size to normative text, replace 'carries' in the first (line 19) and third (line 28) bullet as 'shall carry', and replace 'can' in the second bullet (line 24) to 'may'. Delete 'NOTE 4 -', adjust the font size to normative text, and replace 'selects' to 'shall select' (line 35). | **Accepted** |
| 23101 | Benjamin Rolfe | T | AA.3 | 1034.24 | Another pesky "may" in an informative clause. In this case I think the sentence isn't adding much. | Delete sentence. | **Revised**  The cited sentence is required as it clarifies that APs affiliated with an AP MLD can be a mix of TxBSSID or a nonTxBSSID. To address the comment, the proposed resolution is to replace the ‘may’ with a ‘can’. Also, fixes ‘within the same AP MLD’ with ‘affiliated with the same AP MLD’.  **TGbe Editor: Please replace ‘may’ with ‘can’ and ‘Further, APs within’ with ‘Furthermore, APs affiliated with’ in the cited sentence.** |
| 23127 | Benjamin Rolfe | T | 3.2 | 63.05 | "as defined in" is (clearly) introducing a normative requirement. Which does not belong in clause 3. | Delete definition from clause 3. | **Revised**  Agree in principle. The ‘as defined’ doesn’t feel appropriate an the definition of the term in clause 3.2.  **TGbe Editor: Please replace ‘as defined in 35.3.4.2 (Use of multi-link probe request and response).’ with ‘. Also see 35.3.4.2 (Use of multi-link probe request and response).’** |
| 23128 | Benjamin Rolfe | T | 3.2 | 62.64 | "as defined in" is (clearly) introducing a normative requirement. Which does not belong in clause 3. | Delete definition from clause 3. | **Revised**  Agree in principle. The ‘as defined’ doesn’t feel appropriate an the definition of the term in clause 3.2.  **TGbe Editor: Please replace ‘as defined in 35.3.4.2 (Use of multi-link probe request and response).’ with ‘. Also see 35.3.4.2 (Use of multi-link probe request and response).’** |