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Abstract

This submission contains proposed comment resolutions to the following CID based on P802.11be D6.0.

CID 23098, 23100

Revisions:

- Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

-

# CID 23098

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page.**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 23098 | 935.48 | 36.4.1 | Higher level LMEs are out of scope of this standard ("may be accessed…" states an optional requirement). The clue that this isn't correct use of "may". It's just the natural word for what we probably mean but note in "word usage" that "may" defines an optional requirement within scope of this standard. Sigh... | change "may be accessed" to "accessible" | Revised  Agree with commenter in principle.  **Instructions to the editor:**  **Please make the changes to the spec as shown in 11-24/1039r0** |

***TGbe editor:***

***Please make the following changes in Page 935 Line 48 in D6.0:***

Table 36-69 (EHT PHY MIB attributes) lists the MIB attributes that are accessible by the PHY entities and the intralayer of higher level LMEs. These attributes are accessed via the PLME-GET, PLME-SET, PLME-RESET, and PLME-CHARACTERISTICS primitives defined in 6.7 (PLME SAP interface).

# CID 23100

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page.**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 23100 | 936.04 | 36.4.2 | Are management entities within scope of this standard? Or assumed to be above the MAC sublayer? If so is this really optional? This says that if MAX-ACCESS is read-write, the MIB attribute may not be readable or writable (may == may or may not). Probably not what is intended. My guess is that the effect of MAX-ACCESS is described elsewhere (in the base standard?) and this is redundant. But if not this is a technical problem (an implementation that does not allow dynamic MIBs to be written or read is compliant). | Not sure what is intended. Could delete everything after the first sentence | Rejected  The word “may” is used to indicate a permissible action, not to indicate a possibilities (see REVme 1.4 Word usage).  In addition, HT, VHT, and HE all further describe dynamic MIB attributes. Modification should be start with REVme if needed. |

**Discussion**



