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Abstract

This submission proposes comments resolution of the following 6 CIDs received for TGbe Draft 6.0:

CIDs:

23021, 23022, 23032, 23118, 23124, 23125

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

***TGbe editor: The baseline for this document is IEEE 802.11be D6.0***

1. **Introduction**

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. The introduction and the explanation of the proposed changes are not part of the adopted material.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 23021 | Srinivas Kandala | 17.3.5.5 | 500.53 | "VHT STA, HE STA, or EHT STA" should be "VHT STA or HE STA" | as in comment. | Rejected  The commenting paragraph covers the VHT STA, HE STA, or \*EHT STA that is not a STA 6G\*, while the following paragraph covers the EHT STA that is a STA 6G. After the EHT STA removed, \*EHT STA that is not a STA 6G\* will not be covered. |
| 23022 | Srinivas Kandala | 10.12.3 | 363.58 | "HE or EHT STA" should be just "HE STA", since an EHT STA is an HE STA. | as in comment. | Rejected  The current sentences are technically correct.  Both “HE TB PPDU” and “EHT TB PPDU” are mentioned in the following part of the commenting sentence. If “EHT STA” is removed, then a HE STA will response with EHT TB PPDU based on the updated sentence which is not correct. Hence, no changes are needed. |
| 23032 | Joseph Levy | 35.2.1.2.3 | 514.37 | The phrase "shall start from" is not used in the base line or else where in the draft. There for the meaning of the term is not clear. Typically the statement is "shall start at", which is used in the draft in three locations, and in the baseline in three location. | Change: "shall start from"  To: "shall start at" | Accepted |
| 23118 | Benjamin Rolfe | 10.3.2.7 | 338.54 | "An HE STA 2G4 that initiates a TXOP by transmitting an RTS frame with the TA field set to a bandwidth signaling TA shall not send an RTS frame to a non-HE STA for the duration of the TXOP" is poor (and incomplete) specification. "shall not" usually signals an incomplete specification. In this case we have specified when the RTS is not sent but not when it is sent nor what to do if it is received by the non-HE STA at the wrong time. Making a \*guess\* as to what was really meant by this "shall not" (and if I guessed wrong, that proves my point ;-). | Replace with: An HE STA 2G4 that initiates a TXOP by transmitting an RTS frame with the TA field set to a bandwidth signaling TA to a non-HE STA shall wait the duration of the TXOP before sending an RTS to the non-HE STA. | Rejected  The term “shall not” is used to indicate a requirement. Please note that these terms are commonly use in IEEE802.11 standards. For example, there are 23 occurrences in IEEE802.11be D6.0 and over 80 occurrences of “shall not send” in IEEE 802.11 be D6.0 and REVme D5.0 respectively.  Similar expression is used in REVme D5.0. *“ A VHT STA that initiates a TXOP by transmitting an RTS frame with the TA field set to a bandwidth*  *signaling TA shall not send an RTS frame to a non-VHT STA for the duration of the TXOP.”* |
| 23124 | Benjamin Rolfe | 3.2 | 63.28 | The note includes technical details of the thing to which the term refers and does not belong in clause 3. | Delete NOTE | Rejected  The note is intended to aid the reader to understand this specific case is an NSTR link pair.  Originally, the note is in clause 35, it is moved to clause 3 based on the previous comment. Please find more information for CID 1482 in doc 11-21-0530r5 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0530-05-00be-cr-nstr-link-pair-definition.docx). |
| 23125 | Benjamin Rolfe | 3.2 | 63.22 | More technical detail that does not belong in clause 3 - everything about what non-simultaneous transmit and receive (NSTR) link pair is and does are technical details (requirements) on the thing to which the term refers. | Replace with "A pair of links corresponding to stations (STAs) affiliated with a multi-link device (MLD) " or delete al of it from clause 3. | Rejected  The comment fails to identify a technical issue. The definition explicitly calls out what an NSTR link pair is and uses wording that is commonly used in clause 3.    There were a lot of discussion about the definition of NSTR. Finally, the task group agreed on current version. Please find more information in doc 11-21-0530r5 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0530-05-00be-cr-nstr-link-pair-definition.docx). |