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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs that are currently in quarantine:

* **11181,** **10157, 10158, 10479,** **11189, 11319, 11390, 11453,** **11508,** , 12322, 13162, 13241, **13346,** 13599, **13651,** 10063**10103,** **10155,** **10488,** **10628,** 10629, **10630,** 10703,10734, 10735, 10767**, 10848**, 10874, 10906, 10908,**10935, 11026,** **11027,** **11104, 11107,** 11151, 11160, **11170, 11177, 11243,** 11421, 11422, 11423, 11424, 11425, 11426, 11427, **11596,** 11706**11707,** 11741**,11759,** 11782, **11820, 11823**, 11960,**11962, 12035, 12056, 12131, 12174,** 12290, , **12318,** **12328,** 12334, 12359, 12409, 12414, 12426, **12442,** 12606, 12607, 12609, 12692,**12706,** **12717,** 12720, 12748, 12749, 12777, 12787, **12799,** **12826,** 12834, 12837,13013, 13086, 13109, 1322613245, 13246, 13249, 1330613348, **13349,** 13361, 13362, **13373,** 13395,13446,**13470, 13473,** 13490, **13648,** 13690, 13732, **13783,** 13840,13956, 13984, 13985, **14031,**

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document. Contains all CIDs that were discussed during the Joint or MAC ad-hoc conf calls, from July to September 17th, which have not reached consensus yet. This is going to be a work in progress document since there are some of these CIDs being requested for SP (those requests that are received by the Friday 14th deadline).
* Rev 1: Removed CIDs that are pending SPs., Updated on Sunday 16th (EOD).
* Rev 2: Added notes from discussions received from Stephen on 6 CIDs (tracking these CIDs with green font above). Fixed an error in the comment entries for 11453.
* Rev 3: Added all requests received until 10/19 and progress until 10/19. Using this font color to track CIDs that were discussed again and had majority support and classified them as done (pending motion of course). Green font is being used to track the CIDs that are pending for Motion on Wednesday 26th that have been straw polled with no majority support and for CIDs that the assignees have so far provided discussion notes. CIDs in red font are the ones that assignees have not provided discussion notes (unless I missed any e-mails so assignees please check).
* Rev 4: Added notes for CIDs 1473, 1470, and 14031 (changed to green font). CIDs 13055 and 13056 are postponed since there is a revised version in 1239.
* Rev 5-6: Removed 10906, 10908, 12290 as they are expected to be ran as separate motions (post-Quarantine). And some other updates on green/red classifications as per requests. There are 7 CIDs for which I have not received (or missed the e-mail) the technical notes. These are in red font.
* All CIDs that passed due to motion 452 are considered complete **(bold, underline font).** Updated CID status for those that had majority support during the MAC call of October 27, and those that were not run or had no majority support.

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** | **Pg/Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| **CIDs discussed in July 2022** | | | | | | |
| ~~10626~~ | ~~Abhishek Patil~~ | ~~35.3.5.1~~ | ~~421.03~~ | ~~Define a status code for rejection if an AP MLD receives an assoc request with either the MLD ID or the Link ID that doesn’t match its MLD ID or active Link IDs.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on July 28, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Po-Kai Huang 22/1054r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11181 | Joseph Levy | 35.3.5.1 | 422.37 | There is no need to state the state of affiliated non-AP STAs or affiliated APs as they do not have any state, for MLO only the MLDs have a state. There is only one MAC SAP in a non-AP MLD and it is paired with the MAC SAP of the AP MLD. Affiliated non-AP STAs can not exchange MPDUs with affiliated AP STAs. Group addressed frames do not require affiliation to be received, protected group addressed frame do require a GTK/IGTK to be receive and the GTKs/IGTKs are sent via the secure link established between the MLDs and not between the affiliated non-AP STAs or affiliated APs as these entities do not have an established secure link. Also, association requires the AP or AP MLD to report the location of a STA or non-AP MLD to the DS, that is the purpose of association to establish a network link (SAP to SAP). | Delete the paragraph: “For each setup link, the corresponding non-AP STA affiliated with the non-AP MLD is in the same associated state as the non-AP MLD and is associated with the corresponding AP affiliated with the AP MLD, without providing the corresponding non-AP STA to the corresponding AP mapping to the DS. For each setup link, the functionalities between a non-AP STA and its associated AP are enabled unless the functionalities have been extended to the MLD level and specified otherwise.” | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on July 28, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Po-Kai Huang 22/1054r3  Notes from Discussion:  < It was discussed during the meeting that the motivation for the sentence is to have each link reuses the baseline operation between an AP and an associated non-AP ST. By saying that each non-AP STA of an non-AP MLD keeps the same associated state as the non-AP MLD and is associated with the AP in the corresponding link, then baseline clause on per-link feature can then be reused. There were some differences in opinion on this aspect and a member insistss that the non-AP STA should not have any state.> |
| ~~13885~~ | ~~Ming Gan~~ | ~~35.2.2.1~~ | ~~403.55~~ | ~~Detecting whether the received user info field is HE variant or EHT variant should follow subclause 9.3.22, and then have unified description~~ | ~~please change it to have unified description~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on July 27, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yanjun Sun 22/1177r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| **CIDs discussed in August 2022** | | | | | | |
| ~~10014~~ | ~~Jay Yang~~ | ~~35.3.19.2~~ | ~~469.56~~ | ~~“The TBTT Information Field Type subfield shall set to 1” also can be used in AP MLD when at least one affiliciated AP is in unavailable state without causing compatible issue with legacy STA.~~ | ~~as the comments.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 29, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Kaiying Lu 22/1233r6~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10038~~ | ~~Morteza Mehrnoush~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~461.58~~ | ~~What is the EMLSR behavior if all EMLSR STAs of the non-AP MLD except one goes to power save (doze state)? As there is only one link remaining in EMLSR mode, it should follow the single-link single-radio procedure. Add explanation to cover this case.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1181~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1181r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10052~~ | ~~Morteza Mehrnoush~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~462.01~~ | ~~When the non-AP MLD is operating in EMLSR mode, the TID to link mapping should not disable a link (no TID mapped to EMLSR link) in which the the EMLSR STA is operating on.~~ | ~~Please add a text to clarify this.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1181~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1181r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10157 | Julien Sevin | 35.3.17 | 462.33 | An AP MLD has not the possibility to propose/initiate to a non-AP MLD to operate in EMLSR mode | Specify a procedure allowing an AP to transmit an EML Operating Mode Notification frame for proposing to a non-AP STA to initiate its EMLSR mode. | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Minyoung Park 22/1204r4  Notes from Discussion:  <The technical debate was on whether an AP MLD can indicate to a non-AP MLD to enable/disable EMLSR mode and the group couldn’t reach consensus.> |
| 10158 | Julien Sevin | 35.3.17 | 462.57 | An AP MLD has not the possibility to propose to a non-AP MLD to disabled the EMLSR mode | Specify a procedure allowing an AP to transmit an EML Operating Mode Notification frame for proposing to a non-AP STA to disable its EMLSR mode. | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Minyoung Park 22/1204r4  Notes from Discussion:  <The technical debate was on whether an AP MLD can indicate to a non-AP MLD to enable/disable EMLSR mode and the group couldn’t reach consensus.> |
| 10479 | Minyoung Park | 35.3.17 | 462.04 | It is not clear whether the EMLSR Link Bitmap subfield can be used to update the EMLSR links after the EMLSR mode is enabled. Allowing a non-AP MLD to update the EMLSR links would be useful for a non-AP MLD to change operation without disabling and enabling EMLSR mode again simply to update the EMLSR links. | Add a normative behavior that allows a non-AP MLD to update the EMLSR links by transmitting an EML Operating Mode Notification frame with a new bitmap value in the EMLSR Link Bitmap subfield after the EMLSR mode is enabled without disabling the EMLSR mode. | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Minyoung Park 22/1204r4  Notes from Discussion:  <The technical debate was on whether the EMLSR Link Bitmap update procedure need be defined explicitly in the subclause or can just simply reuse the existing EMLSR enablement procedure and the group couldn’t reach consensus.> |
| ~~10777~~ | ~~Chien-Fang Hsu~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~461.58~~ | ~~When there exists only one EMLSR link in awake state and others are on in doze state, the initial control frame to initialize DL traffic is redundant. To increase efficiency in this scenario, the specs should allow AP to omit initial control frame to intialize DL transmission.~~ | ~~Add rules allowing the AP to intialize DL transmission without initial control frame when only one EMLSR link is in awake state and others are in doze states.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1181~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1181r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10869~~ | ~~Yousi Lin~~ | ~~9.4.1.74~~ | ~~190.45~~ | ~~A non-AP MLD that is in EMLSR mode also has different per-link capabilities. And AP MLD needs to be informed about the capabilities. So EMLMR Supported MCS And NSS Set should be extended for both EMLMR and EMLSR.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022 with 22/1129r1, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022 with 22/1434r1, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11189 | Joseph Levy | 35.3.5.3 | 423.59 | After the completion of the disassociation procedure multi-link teardown has been accomplished and the state of the non-AP MLD is unassociated (State 2). A non-AP STA affiliated with the non-AP MLD does not have a state and never has a state, as it is not capable of having its own MAC SAP to MAC SAP association. | Replace: “After multi-link teardown, all the non-AP STAs affiliated with the non-AP MLD and the non-AP MLD are in the unassociated state (see 11.3.2 (State variables)).” With: “After the completion of the disassociation procedure, multi-link teardown has been accomplished and the state of the non-AP MLD is unassociated (State 2).” | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 3, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Po-Kai Huang 22/1174r0  Notes from Discussion:  < It was discussed during the meeting that the motivation for the sentence is to have each link reuses the baseline operation between an AP and an associated non-AP ST. By saying that each non-AP STA of an non-AP MLD keeps the same associated state as the non-AP MLD and is associated with the AP in the corresponding link, then baseline clause on per-link feature can then be reused. There were some differences in opinion on this aspect and a member insists that the non-AP STA should not have any state.> |
| 11319 | Robert Stacey | 35.3.4.2 | 416.37 | Does an AP have an SSID or is it the ESS that has the SSID? What is the difference between an “actual SSID” and an “SSID”? (Hint – the distintion might have to do with advertising an SSID vs not advertising an SSID). Using “may <do something> unless <condition applies>” does not make sense; “may <do something> if <condition is met>” makes more sense. | …may be se“ to the broadcast address if the Beacon frame last received from the AP included an SSID element. | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2  Notes from Discussion:  < Proposal discussed to have different requirements for addressing of Probe Response depending on the addressing of the Probe Request, but did not reach consensus.> |
| 11390 | Gaurang Naik | 9.4.2.312.2.2 | 217.19 | There needs to be normative text for this. Add the normative text in 35.3.17 and 35.3.18. | Add the following statement in 35.3.– – ‘A non-AP MLD with dot11EHTMLSROptionImplemented equal to true shall have dot11EHTEMLMROptionImplemented equal to false.’ And add the following statement in 35.3.– – ‘A non-AP MLD with dot11EHTEMLMROptionImplemented equal to true shall have dot11EHTEMLSROptionImplemented equal to false.’ | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 3, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Gaurang Naik 22/1159r1  Notes from Discussion:  < The proposed change was discussed in the TGbe MAC adhoc. There was discussion on whether a separate MIB variable is required considering Clause 9 already specifies the orthogonal setting of EMLSR Support and EMLMR Support subfields in the Basic Multi-Link element. No conclusion could be reached on the call by the members.> |
| 11453 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.17 | 462.18 | Support for EMLSR and EMLMR is mutually exclusive at the non-AP MLD. Add normative text to specify this. | Add the followi– – ‘A non-AP MLD with dot11EHTMLSROptionImplemented equal to true shall have dot11EHTEMLMROptionImplemented equal to false.’ | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Minyoung Park 22/1181r1  Notes from Discussion:  <The proposed change was discussed in the TGbe MAC adhoc. There was discussion on whether a separate MIB variable is required considering Clause 9 already specifies the orthogonal setting of EMLSR Support and EMLMR Support subfields in the Basic Multi-Link element. No conclusion could be reached on the call by the members.> |
| ~~11505~~ | ~~Xiaofei Wang~~ | ~~9.4.1.74~~ | ~~190.54~~ | ~~The sentence “An AP MLD with dot11EHTEMLSROptionImplemented equal to true that receives an EML Operating Mode Notification frame from a STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD sets the EMLSR Mode subfield of the EML Operating Mode Notification frame that is sent in response to the value obtained from the received EML Operating Mode Notification fra”e." is normative behaivor and does not belong in format section.~~ | ~~Move the cited sentence to clause 35~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1129~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1129r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11508 | Xiaofei Wang | 9.4.2.199 | 207.54 | The design of restricted TWT traffic info field doesn’t make sense; if there is no valid TID bitmap for DL or UL,those fields should be not included; it is just waste of bits. | As in comment | Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 25, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Muhammad Kumail Haider 22/1280r4  Notes from Discussion:  <After the resolution to CID was presented, the author had discussion with the commenter via email thread (all volunteers CC’d) and also in person. No consensus has been reached in terms of modifying the R-TWT setup signaling based on this CID, and there hasn’t been any follow up discussion or contributions from the group or the commenter for several weeks> |
| ~~11587~~ | ~~Vishnu Ratnam~~ | ~~35.3.7.1.6~~ | ~~430.61~~ | ~~When there are no ccurrenc BUs for a nonAP MLD that mapped to the current link, the AP MLD sets the “More Data” subfield to 0 in a downlink PPDU, or transmits a QoS null data frame in ccurren to a PS poll. The spec should provide a mechanism for the AP to also indicate, in the ccurren frame, presence of pending traffic for the nonAP MLD that is mapped to other links. The AP should also utilize such a mechanism to indicate a need to check the beacon for critical update.~~ | ~~Define a mechanism where using either a new element or subfield in the response frame, or by transmitting an individually addressed frame, an AP MLD can indicate to an STA of the nonAP MLD if there is buffered traffic for another STA of the nonAP MLD or if there is a need to check the beacon for a critical updates.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 29, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Vishnu Ratnam 22/1201r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11714~~ | ~~Gaurav Patwardhan~~ | ~~35.3.2.1~~ | ~~406.01~~ | ~~“A STA” and “A non-AP STA” is used interchangeably many times during Clause 35. Need to replace all the relevant ccurrences of “A STA” with “A non-AP STA”. Commenting on this particular line as a placeholder.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP 11-22-1779~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed with A’hi's CR document 22/1182r7 on August 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~The PoC is reassigned from Abhi to Po-Kai on August 30, 2022.~~  ~~Po-Kai Huang 22/1182r7~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12317~~ | ~~Guogang Huang~~ | ~~9.4.1.17~~ | ~~0.00~~ | ~~To reduce the delay, the More Data subfield in the Ack and Blockblock frames can be used to indicate whether there are pending traffic which need to be transmitted to the AP as soon as possible. Then the AP can do the RDG operation, TXOP sharing or trigger the ’TA's uplink transmission.~~ | ~~The commenter will provide contribution.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 15, 2022 and September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Guogang Huang 22/1043r4~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12322 | Guogang Huang | 12.5.3.3.1 | 339.53 | An unified framework should be defined for both individually addressed Data frame and Management frame. Please remove the wo“d "D”ta" | Please remove the wo“d "D”ta" | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, and then had another opportunity for SP on 10/28, 2022. Since there was no consensus there was no SP on this CID.  Michael Montemurro 22/1178r6 |
| ~~12390~~ | ~~Rojan Chitrakar~~ | ~~35.3.19.1~~ | ~~469.12~~ | ~~W“y "peer dev”ce" is used here when the immediately preceding sentence and elsewhere use associated non-AP STA?~~ | ~~Repla“e "peer dev”ce" with associated non-AP STA.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1233r8~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 29, 2022 with 22/1233r6, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022 with 22/1233r8, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Kaiying Lu 22/1233r8~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12812~~ | ~~Laurent Cariou~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~463.60~~ | ~~When a non-AP MLD is in EMLSR mode and when only one STA that is operating on one of the EMLSR links is in awake state and the other STAs operating on the EMLSR links affiliated with the same non-AP MLD are in doze state, the non-AP MLD do’sn't need to wait for the EMLSR Transition Delay time to switch to the listening operation.~~ | ~~Please add an exception as follow“: "When there is only one STA in awake state operation on the EMLSR links, the non-AP MLD switches back to the listening operation after the end of the frame exchanges for both an AP initiated and a STA initiated cases without waiting for the EMLSR Transition Delay ti”e."~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1181~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1181r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12853~~ | ~~Mikael Lorgeoux~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~461.56~~ | ~~Lack of rules for an efficient operation of EMLSR mode regarding uplink TID-To-Link Mapping. Especially, in some situations, the transmitted BSRP TF (i.e. Initial Ctrl frame) may be not in line with the uplink TID-To-Link mapping in use.~~ | ~~Specify rules for transmission of BSRP TF regarding uplink TID-To-Link mapping.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1181~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 1, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1181r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13055~~ | ~~Chittabrata Ghosh~~ | ~~35.3.16.4~~ | ~~454.31~~ | ~~A similar rule as in the quoted tex“  "An AP MLD should not transmit a frame that solicits an immediate response to a STA that is affiliated with a non-AP MLD on a link that is a member of one or more NSTR link pairs for that non-AP MLD, if the immediate response is expected to overlap in time with group addressed MPDUs scheduled in another link of any of those NSTR link pairs and the non-AP MLD is expected to be receiving those group addressed MPD”s." is needed for an EHT STA that is participating in an r-TWT SP in one link, should not be scheduled an RU/M-RU in a TF by an EHT AP on another link that is a member of one or more NSTR link pairs.~~ | ~~Please add specific behavior to consider the scenario in this subclause~~ | ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 11, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yunbo Li 22/1239r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13056~~ | ~~Chittabrata Ghosh~~ | ~~35.3.16.4~~ | ~~454.31~~ | ~~A similar rule as in quoted tex“: "If a STA that is affiliated with a non-AP MLD successfully obtains a TXOP on one link of one of its NSTR link pairs before the TBTT of the other link of the NSTR link pair, then it should end its TXOP before the TBTT of the other link if it intends to receive Beacon frames on the other li”k." is needed if the obtained TXOP in one link overlaps with the start time of a restricted TWT SP scheduled on other link~~ | ~~Please add specific behavior roppedisy the issue pointed out in the comment~~ | ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 11, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yunbo Li 22/1239r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13162 | Mark RISON | 12.4.1 | 334.57 | This could be seen as a technical change to the baseline, as the definition “f "SAE ent”ty" does not refer to APs, while the original text makes it clear that two APs could use SAE between themselves (e.g. for AP PeerKey) | Change the definition at 53.63 “o "simultaneous authentication of equals (SAE) entity: an entity that is a station (STA), access point (AP) or a multi-link device (MLD) that participates in SAE authentication (see 12.4 (Authentication using a password”)." | Ready for Motion: Done  Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Michael Montemurro 22/1178r3  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13241 | Binita Gupta | 35.9.2.2 | 511.40 | As part of the rTWT setup procedures, should add requirements for the rTWT scheduling AP and rTWT scheduled STA to indicate LS traffic streams using rTWT TIDs. | Add following requirement“: "An rTWT scheduled STA should indicate specific TIDs for latency sensitive traffic streams in the Restricted TWT DL TID Bitmap and Restricted TWT UL TID Bitmap subfields of the Restricted TWT Parameter Set field in the TWT request sent to the rTWT scheduling AP for an rTWT se”up“  "An rTWT scheduling AP should indicate specific TIDs for latency sensitive traffic streams in the Restricted TWT DL TID Bitmap and Restricted TWT UL TID Bitmap subfields of the Restricted TWT Parameter Set field in the TWT response sent to the rTWT scheduled STA for an rTWT se”up" | Ready for Motion: Done  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 25, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Muhammad Kumail Haider 22/1280r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13346 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.2.4.1 | 410.04 | another exception should be added, i.e. the element identified by the element ID is not applicable in reported link (6GHz related Capabilities element in 6GHz reporting link, or VHT, HT Capabilities element in 5GHz reporting link). | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Abhishek Patil 22/1182r7  Notes from Discussion:  <Clause 35.3.3.3 states that conditions in tables specified in 9.3.3 need to be satisfied for an element to be included in the per\_STA profile subelement (i.e., applicable to the reported STA and hence (non)inheritance does not apply). Therefore, we don't need to explicitly state that certain elements are not carried in the profile.> |
| 13599 | Yongho Seok | 12.5.3.4.4 | 342.“6 | "The receiver shall discard any Data frame that is received with its PN less than or equal to the value of the replay counter that is associated with the TA and priority value of the received MP”U." In the MLO, the replay counter is not associated with the TA. Please update this baseline rule. And, in Figure 12-23, the MLD MAC Address value should be provided into the Replay check box. | As in the comment. | Ready for Motion: Done  Rejecteds -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Michael Montemurro 22/1178r3  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13651 | Rubayet Shafin | 35.3.19 | 468.25 | Simultaneous Transmission and Reception would be a key feature for Mobile AP MLD in 11be. However, currently the mechanisms and operational procedures for STR Mobile AP MLD is missing in the spec. | Please provide description of framework and operation of STR Mobile AP MLD. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on August 29, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Kaiying Lu 22/1233r6  Notes from Discussion:  < When it was presented, it was requested to defer by the commenter. However, the commenter did not provide any reason or discussion> |
| ~~14001~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~462.48~~ | ~~The STAs on other EMLSR links transition to active mode after transition delay, but transition delay may be long. Therefore, the AP MLD should not transmit the initial Control frame to those STAs during transition delay.~~ | ~~The AP MLD needs a restriction on its transmission during transition delay for STAs not in active mode.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1204~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1204r4~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~14077~~ | ~~Ming Gan~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~462.34~~ | ~~It is straight forward to allow AP to initiate and send an EML Operating Mode Notification frame~~ | ~~add the case that AP initiates and sends an EML Operating Mode Notification frame~~ | ~~Pending SP doc number??~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on August 17, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1204r4~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| **CIDs discussed up to September 16th 2022** | | | | | | |
| ~~10013~~ | ~~Jay Yang~~ | ~~35.3.7~~ | ~~427.05~~ | ~~if one of the affilicated AP operating on CAC state, the link should be disable and enabled again once’it's out of CAC mode.~~ | ~~11be SPEC should have a solution to indicate the CAC mode and the remaing time, so that the non-AP MLD can decide whether to associated with such AP MLD.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1782~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Laurent Cariou 22/1429r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10031~~ | ~~Morteza Mehrnoush~~ | ~~35.3.19.1~~ | ~~468.30~~ | ~~The power saving mechanism of the non-AP MLDs associated with the NSTR mobile AP MLD is not defined. If the STA on the primary link goes the power save (and doze state), then the STA on the non-primary link also should go the power save (and doze state) but not the other way around, because STA affiliated with non-AP MLD can only initiate PPDU transmission over th~~~~e~~ ~~2nd link if STA of the same non-AP MLD initiate the start time sync PProppedtonion over primary link. Also during the PS mode, if the STA affiliated with non-AP MLD wants to poll DL buffer, send in UL, or NSTR mobile AP sending the DL buffer, it should follow the same mechanism for start time sync and end tiroppedtent of the primary/non-primary links.~~ | ~~Please add text to explain these behaviors in spec.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1537~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Morteza Mehrnoush 22/1357r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10050~~ | ~~Morteza Mehrnoush~~ | ~~35.8.2~~ | ~~509.59~~ | ~~A“d”"s" to STA “n "... behalf of the STAs affiliated with the same MLD ”.."~~ | ~~as in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1526~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1526r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10063 | Morteza Mehrnoush | 35.9 | 510.51 | The current TDLS setup do’sn't accommodate the r-TWT schedule among the peer STAs so that the rTWT SP can be scheduled and announced directly between the TDLS peer STAs. This is specially helpful when two TDLS peer STAs switching to off-channel and AP do’sn't have knowledge of the traffic between TDLS peer STAs. Please define such a procedure in the spec. | as in comment | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| ~~10071~~ | ~~Thomas Derham~~ | ~~9.4.2.316~~ | ~~252.64~~ | ~~The User Priority field in a TCLAS is used as an input classifier filter, i.e. use cases where an MSDU/MPDU is classified in the MAC after its UP has already been assigned. In SCS use cases, packet classification is generally based on the classifier types (e.g. IP tuple, MAC addresses, etc) in the TCLAS, and the User Priority field is set to 255 (not used for comparison). Where SCS is used to assign a UP to downlink MSDUs, the UP to be assigned is specified in the Intra-Access Category Priority element (see 11 25.2 of baseline). Therefore, the sentence saying the User Priority subfield should be set to the same as the value in TCLAS seems incorrect, since this would not equal the UP that the data frames will be assigned.~~ | ~~Remove the sentence from this subclause (clause 9 should just define the field). Potentially move to clause 11 SCS, and modify so it refers to the Intra-Access Category Priority element instead of TCLAS.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1436~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Duncan Ho 22/1436r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10078~~ | ~~Pei Zhou~~ | ~~35.2.1.2~~ | ~~400.60~~ | ~~For the TXOP Sharing mode=1, the method of returning TXOP to AP is that, AP could transmit wh“n "the medium is idle at the TxPIFS slot boundary after the end of either the transmission of an immediate response frame sent to that STA or the reception of a frame from that STA that did not require an immediate respo”se". For the TXOP Sharing mode=2, we can restrict the STA from P2P transmission first, and then followed by uplink transmission. In this way, we can use the same rule to return back the remaining TXOP as TXOP Sharing mode=1. The benefit is that a frame with RDG/More PPDU subfield = 0 is avoided. Only a simple rule is needed. In case there is only P2P transmission for a STA when TXOP Sharing mode=2, we can then use the current solution: STA transmits a frame with RDG/More PPDU subfield = 0.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10079~~ | ~~Pei Zhou~~ | ~~35.2.1.2~~ | ~~399.57~~ | ~~Can Triggered TXOP sharing procedure apply to MLD level/device? If a NSTR non-AP MLD roppedting on link 1 with its peer-non-AP MLD under TXOP Sharing mode(=2), AP STA/MLD or other non-AP STAs/MLDs should not transmit to the NSTR non-AP MLD on other links due to NSTR limit.~~ | ~~As in comment. Please provide rules for NSTR device operates in Triggered TXOP procedure.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1189~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10103 | Xiangxin Gu | 35.3.4.2 | 415.26 | MLD ID subfield can be omitted for the case that the targeted MLD is the MLD with which the responding AP affiliated. | Change to: 1) MLD ID subfield is not present if the targeted MLD is the MLD with which the responding AP (addressed by Address 1 or 3 of the Probe Request framroppedtted 2) MLD ID subfield is present otherwise. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2  Notes from Discussion:  <Discussion to clarify the meaning of the 2 sentences, but there was so far objection to the clarification.> |
| ~~10125~~ | ~~Xiangxin Gu~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ |  | ~~462.56’It's useful to have a mechanism for an EMLSR/EMLMR supporting non-AP MLD to enable EMLSR/EMLMR mode by PS-Poll or QoS Null frame after awaking from doze.~~ | ~~Define the mechanism to enable EMLSR/EMLMR mode by PS-Poll or QoS Null frame~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Xiangxin Gu 22/1205r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10155 | Julien Sevin | 35.3.17 | 462.33 | An AP MLD has not the possibility to refuse an EML Operating Mode Notification frame and shall accept that the non-AP MLD operates in EMLSR Mode which is not necessarly possible if the the AP MLD is a NSTR mobile AP MLD. | Specify a procedure allowing an AP to refuse an EML Operating Mode Notification frame transmitted by the non-AP MLD initiating an EMLSR mode | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 8 and September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Minyoung Park 22/1434r2  Notes from Discussion:  <The technical debate was on whether an NSTR mobile AP MLD can support EMLSR mode for a non-AP MLDs and the group couldn’t reach consensus.> |
| ~~10168~~ | ~~Julien Sevin~~ | ~~35.3.19.1~~ | ~~468.44~~ | ~~In the scope of an NSTR mobile AP MLD operation, an NSTR mobile AP MLD shall designate one link of an NSTR link pair as the primary link. No procedure has been specified to designate the primary link~~ | ~~Specify a procedure for designating a primary link~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1233r8~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Kaiying Lu 22/1233r8~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10345~~ | ~~Tomoko Adachi~~ | ~~35.3.8~~ | ~~0.00~~ | ~~When a link do’sn't receive MPDUs at all for some period and the recorded SNs become older than 2^11 while the other links receive MPDUs, the link will respond with an outdated BlockAck frame in the next turn. The window at the scoreboard context control at that link needs to be updated at an appropriate time to catch up with those in other links.~~ | ~~When and how to update the scoreboard context control on the outdated link can be implementation dependent but at least the outdated link should be able to transmit a BlockAck frame to acknowledge the SN of a successfully received MPDU and to transmit a BlockAck frame in response to a BlockAckReq frame. For instance, when partial state operation is applied at the outdated link, it can be the same with when there is no temporary record (REVme D1.3 10.25.6.4 b) and d)). The outdated link can be defined as a link having recorded SNs older than 2^11 compared with the most advancing WinStartR in any of the other enabled links.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10357~~ | ~~Tomoko Adachi~~ | ~~35.3.8~~ | ~~0.00~~ | ~~The baseline spec (10.25.6.5) allows to set any value for the status between the SSN of the BlockAck frame and adjusted WinStart\_R, if the adjusted WinStart\_R is greater than the SSN of the BlockAck frame. How this rule is applied at an MLD should be described. At an MLD, WinStart\_R or the scoreboard context control used to generate the BlockAck frame may be in link level or in the MLD level. In any case, the above rule in 10.25.6.5 should apply. The fact that WinStart\_R can be the same or later than WinStart\_O and will never be earlier applies also to MLO case, so there is no problem.~~ | ~~Add a description that the rule in 10.25.6.5 that allows to set any value for the status between the SSN of the BlockAck frame and adjusted WinStart\_R, if the adjusted WinStart\_R is greater than the SSN of the BlockAck frame applies depending on which scoreboard context control is used to generate the BlockAck frame.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10387~~ | ~~GEORGE CHERIAN~~ | ~~35.3.9~~ | ~~0.00~~ | ~~Allow dynamic fragmentation when the MLD is operating with only one link is enabled~~ | ~~As in the comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10488 | Eldad Perahia | 35.3.7.1 | 427.07 | TID-to-link mapping as defined is useless for Enterprise. For 802.11be to support Enterprise use cases, it is required to have the following enhancements: - Introduce a priority level in TID-to-link mapping negotiations - Defi“e "enhanced TID to link sub”et" mapping capability - Introduce a method for both non-AP STAs and APs to identify reasons for TID mapping changes - Add scalable TID-to-link mapping mechanisms (broadcast advertisement and group-negotiation) | as in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022 with 22/1429r2, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  This CID is discussed on October 12, 2022 with 22/1509r4. The straw poll result is 52Y, 34N, 28A.  Laurent Cariou 22/1509r4  Notes from Discussion:  < Multiple proposals have been discussed. Some aspects of this CID have been accepted based on the resolution of other CIDs, but not all.> |
| ~~10597~~ | ~~Abhishek Patil~~ | ~~35.3.2.1~~ | ~~406.11~~ | ~~Clarify that an AP MLD assigns a unique link ID to each link on which its affiliated APs operate on and that the link ID is continuous. There can be a gap in the link ID space if the AP MLD performs ML reconfiguration procedure which results in removal of an affiliated AP. However, if the same AP (BSSID) is added back to the same channel, then the AP MLD assigns the same link ID as before.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1422r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10625~~ | ~~Abhishek Patil~~ | ~~35.3.4.4~~ | ~~417.55~~ | ~~Description in clause 9.4.2.312.2 explains which subfields are present in the Common Info field and includes the conditions or references to normative text in clause 35.3.x. Duplicating information runs the risk of making different part of the spec out of sync. This paragraph do’sn't need to duplicate clause 9~~ | ~~Delete the cited paragraph~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1462~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1462r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10628 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.5.4 | 424.15 | Clarify the case when a non-AP MLD may not include Link Info field. Perhaps a NOTE that provides an example such as a non-AP MLD that is capable of operating on 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz is associating with an AP MLD that is operating on 5 GHz and 6 GHz. In such case, there is only one overlapping link between the two MLDs and that the (Re)Association Request frame is sent on 5 GHz link containing Basic Multi-Link element without the Link Info field. Same comment for paragraph on line 50 of this (424) page. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <Even though adding an example of a single-link setup between MLDs is a good approach as informative, some members do not prefer to add only multi-link setup case except legacy association as example(s) in case of the setup of a single-link.> |
| 10629 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.5.4 | 424.20 | Description in clause 9.4.2.312.2 explains which subfields are present in the Common Info field and includes the conditions or references to normative text in clause 35.3.x. This paragraph do’sn't need to duplicate Description in clause 9.4.2.312.2 explains which subfields are present in the Common Info field and includes the conditions or references to normative text in clause 35.3.x. Duplicating information runs the risk of making different part of the spec out of sync. This paragraph do’sn't need to duplicate clause 9. Same comment applies to paragraph starting line 56 on this (424) page. | Delete the cited paragraphs from the two locations | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 10630 | Abhishek Patil | 35.3.5.4 | 425.16 | What do“s "if the Status Code is not set to REFUSED\_REASON\_UNSPECIFI“D " mean? | Delet“: "if the Status Code is not set to REFUSED\_REASON\_UNSPECIF”ED" | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <The commented sentence was already agreed in the last round (CC36) while the CID is commenting to remove it.  However, some members still want to keep the text based on previous discussions> |
| ~~10640~~ | ~~Abhishek Patil~~ | ~~35.3.9~~ | ~~433.35~~ | ~~The details of dynamic fragmentation for a TID is mapped to a single link (or when both MLDs are operating on a single link for all TIDs) are missing.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10678~~ | ~~Duncan Ho~~ | ~~12.7.6.3~~ | ~~358.46~~ | ~~For MLO, OCI verification should occur on all the links. Will need to make sure OCI works correctly for MLo. e.g., we should include the OCI KDE for each requested link in msg 2 for the AP MLD to verify the operating channels of the STAs corresponding to the requested links~~ | ~~As in the comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10679~~ | ~~Duncan Ho~~ | ~~12.7.6.4~~ | ~~361.11~~ | ~~For MLO, OCI verification should occur on all the links. Will need to make sure OCI works correctly for MLo. e.g., we should include the OCI KDE for each requested link in msg 3 for the non-AP MLD to verify the operating channels of the APs corresponding to the requested links~~ | ~~As in the comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10703 | Liangxiao Xin | 9.4.2.316 | 254.15 | No peak data rate is defined in the element. The mean data rate, the peak data rate, and the burst size are the parameters of the token bucket model, which provides standard terminology for describing the behavior of a traffic source. | Please add the definition of peak data rate and add the peak data rate field in the element | Pending SP: Majority Support: Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Duncan Ho 22/1436r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~10721~~ | ~~Xiandong Dong~~ | ~~35.3.19.1~~ | ~~468.45~~ | ~~is it needed roppeineroppedtism wrt how does the NSTR mobile AP designate a link as primary link, if not, how does the non-AP MLD know it will not send probe request on nonprimary link, please clarify~~ | ~~as in the comment~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1233r8~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Kaiying Lu 22/1233r8~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10732~~ | ~~Insun Jang~~ | ~~35.9.4.2~~ | ~~512.41~~ | ~~How can non-AP EHT STAs, which does not support rTWT, differentiate any existing quite interval roppedtoing or not? If they ’on't understand rTWT parameters, we need to handle how it can work~~ | ~~As in the comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Chunyu Hu 22/1471r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10734 | Insun Jang | 35.3.5.4 | 424.20 | Requirements for several fields in the Common info field of the Basic ML IE carried in the (Re)Association Request frame are missing | As in the commenroppedtonons for missing parts needs to be added | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 10735 | Insun Jang | 35.3.5.4 | 424.20 | Requirements for several fields in the Common info field of the Basic ML IE carried in the (Re)Association Response frame are missing | As in the commenroppedtonons for missing parts needs to be added | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 10679 | Chien-Fang Hsu | 35.3.22 | 476.54 | When an EHT STA establishes an SCS stream, an SCSID is also generated. The stream may share a TID with other streams or other traffic from the EHT AP. On the EHT STA side, there is no way to differentiate multiple traffic streams (SCS or non-SCS) because they are sharing the TID. This may cause the head-of-line blocking problem delaying the SCS stream requiring higher QoS. | Adding signaling of the SCSID to the MSDU (A-MSDU) carrying the SCS stream while some other streams are sharing the same TID so that the receiver can do traffic prioritation accordingly. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dibakar Das 22/1187r1  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 10848 | Jinsoo Choi | 35.3.7.1.1 | 427.25 | Regarding the te“t "At any point in time, a TID shall always be mapped to at least one setup link both in DL and UL, which means that a TID-to-link mapping change is only valid and successful if it will not result in having a single TID for which the link set is made of zero setup lin”s.", what if the AP removal (by MLD reconfiguration) happens and some TIDs miss the mapping of links, i.e., should we clarify if this wou’dn't happen at all (e.g. AP removal is only allowed without this kind of issues) or add some text for such exception? | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1429r2  Notes from Discussion:  < Proposal to add a note to clarify the language of the specification has not reached consensus.> |
| ~~10859~~ | ~~Jinsoo Choi~~ | ~~35.9.4.2~~ | ~~512.42~~ | ~~The senten“e "Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exi”t." is not enough delivering the meaning of what this intends for. Need to add more text to clarify the purpose and required protocol/signaling.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Chunyu Hu 22/1471r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10861~~ | ~~Yousi Lin~~ | ~~x.y~~ | ~~0.00~~ | ~~When an AP MLD transmits to a non-AP MLD on one NSTR link pair that belongs to the NSTR link pairs for that non-AP MLD, the AP MLD needs to do PPDU end time alignment. But on the non-AP ’LD's side, when it receives a PPDU from its associated AP MLD on a link that is a member of one or more NSTR link pairs, it may need to be awake on all links that construct NSTR link pairs with the link where the PPDU is transmitted until the reception of the PPDU is finished, in case that the AP MLD sends other PPDUs on those links. This may result in a waste of power for non-AP MLD. Also, the implementation of end time alignment is complex. May need a simplified operation mode for NSTR operations that can save more power for non-AP MLD and also reduce the implementation complexity for AP MLd.~~ | ~~the commenter will bring a contribution to resolve it.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yousi Lin 22/1292r0~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10874 | Yousi Lin | 35.9.1 | 510.51 | Currently rules are only designed trigger enabled r-TWT. May need to define rules for EDCA based r-TWt. | as in comment | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, and then had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022, but no SP was ran as there was no consensus.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r8 |
| 10906 | Akira Kishida | 9.4.2.316 | 251.40 | The QoS Characteristics element contains requirements of QoS expectations of a traffic flow as defined; however, there is no mechanism to notify measurement results of the set of parameters corresponding to the contents of the QoS Characteristics element. Therefore, some mechanisms should be determined to know whether the traffic flow fulfills the requirements of the QoS Characteristic element or not. | A new element such as t“e "QoS Characteristic report elem”nt" should be created to notify the results of measurements of each component in the QoS Characteristic element. | Rejected– A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022 and in October 19 with SP result 21Y, 14N, 26A. Then had two motions on October 26, 2022:  Motion 453: 30Y, 21N, 37A (failed)  Motion 455: 24Y, 26N, 34A (failed)  Guogang Huang 22/1213r4 and r6 |
| 10908 | Akira Kishida | 35.9 | 510.51 | A mechanism for how an AP confirms whether the requirements described in the QoS Characteristics element are fulfilled or not should be defined in 35.9 and 35.3.22. | As in the comment. | Rejected-- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022 and in October 19 with SP result 21Y, 14N, 26A. Then had two motions on October 26, 2022:  Motion 453: 30Y, 21N, 37A (failed)  Motion 455: 24Y, 26N, 34A (failed)  Guogang Huang 22/1213r4 and r6 |
| ~~10914~~ | ~~Kiseon Ryu~~ | ~~35.9.4.2~~ | ~~512.42~~ | ~~An r-TWT STA that is not a member of the r-TWT SP should consider overlapping quiet intervals.~~ | ~~Repla“e "Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exi”t." wi“h "Non-AP EHT STAs with dot11RestrictedTWTOptionImplemented set to false may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exi”t."~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/????~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Jeongki Kim 22/1471r2~~  ~~New Doc:??~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~10934~~ | ~~Thomas Handte~~ | ~~35.9.4.2~~ | ~~512.“2~~ | ~~"Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exi”t." How can a non-AP EHT STA with dot11RestrictedTWTOptionImplemented set to falroppedtoish if a signaled quiet interval can be ignored, because it is a overlapping quiet interval or cannot be ignored because it is not an overlapping quiet interval? Since the Non-AP EHT STA do’sn't support r-TWT, it may not parse the TWT element to figure out the status of a quiet interval~~ | ~~Please clarify or delete the sentence. A solution would b“: "Non-AP EHT STAs with dot11RestrictedTWTOptionImplemented set to true may behave as”.."~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Chunyu Hu 22/1471r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 10935 | Thomas Handte | 3.2 | 54.15 | EMLMR has in contrast to EMLSR no definition | Please add: Baseline could be a generalized EMLSR definition | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Stephen McCann 22/1196r5  Notes from Discussion:  <A new definition for EMLMR was presented at the September interim TGbe session, but no conclusion of how the definition should be updated, could be reached by the members. The discussion continues by email> |
| 11026 | Hanqing Lou | 9.4.2.311 | 209.“3 | "The EHT Operation Information Present subfield is set to 1 if the channel width indicated in an HT Operation, VHT Operation, or HE Operation element that is present in the same Manage ment frame is different from the Channel Width field indicated in the EHT Operation Information fi”ld". The Disabled Subchannel Bitmap subfield is in the EHT Operation Information field. If the channel width is the same as VHT Operation Element, but Disabled subchannel Bitmap is updated, will the EHT Operation Information Present subfield be set to 1? | When Disabled Subchannel Bitmap Present subfield is 1, the EHT Operation Information Present subfield shall be 1. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Guogang Huang 22/1267r5  Notes from Discussion:  < There is no controversial technical issue for this CID. But the commenter want to add some text for clarification. But I think we should find another related CID to address the commenter’s concern, rather than use this CID> |
| 11027 | Hanqing Lou | 35.3.1 | 405.34 | Base on this paragraph, a non-AP STA may change its MAC address when its dot11MultiLinkActivated is set from true to false. Detailed explanation may be needed here since MAC address changing may require some frame exchanges between AP and STA. | Please clarify | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Po-Kai Huang 22/1316r1  Notes from Discussion:  < The commenter is asking a question. It was explained in details during the meeting that that changing MAC address in this context does not need further frame exchange. When non-AP STA is not affiliated with a non-AP MLD anymore, the non-AP STA basically disconnected from the associated AP MLD already and set the MAC address to the desired value internally without frame exchange. We also explain that this is need for the legacy AP to identify the same address for the DS to complete reassociation. A member still asks for deferral after the explanation.> |
| ~~11071~~ | ~~Po-Kai Huang~~ | ~~12.7.6.1~~ | ~~355.45~~ | ~~The description implies that OCI KDE can be used for MLO. However, OCI KDE needs to be redesigned to include link ID and information for 320 MHz verification because 320 MHz may have 320 MHz-1 or 320 MHz-2.~~ | ~~Define MLO OCI KDE. Ideally, follow the format of OCI KDE to include link ID and chan“e "Frequency Segment 1 Channel Num”er" to simp“y "Channel center frequeny of 320 ”Hz", which is set to channel center frequency of 320 MHz when 320 MHz is used and 0 otherwise.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11074~~ | ~~Po-Kai Huang~~ | ~~35.3.8~~ | ~~432.05~~ | ~~There has been confusion on the partial state and full state operation for MLO. You may have partial state in each link independently or partial state but record maintained globablly. You may also have full state and record maintained globally. Suggest to add these 3 combintations and clarify the allowed combinations.~~ | ~~Add the following to clarify the combinatio“. "A recipient MLD may do one of the following: - Have a separate scoreboard context control with partial state operation in each link - Have one scoreboard context control with partial state operation for all links - Have one scoreboard context control with full state operation for all li”ks"~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11075~~ | ~~Po-Kai Huang~~ | ~~35.3.8~~ | ~~432.05~~ | ~~It has been discovered that full state in each link independently will have issues to respond BA when the data progress in another link say link 1 for a long time and switch to link 2, which still has old record. Similar problem exists for partial state in each link independently if the record is not constantly discarded.~~ | ~~Add the following to resolve the issu“. "If the recipient MLD has a separate scoreboard context control in each link, the STA affiliated with the MLD in each link shall implement the partial-state operation and should discard the temporary record in the following defined time periods: \* After sending a BA where the BA and the acknowledged A-MPDU(s) are in one TXOP and before processing the scoreboard context of the next received the QoS Data frame of the TID from the initiator MLD in the link \* After the end of the current TXOP and right before processing the scoreboard context of the next received the QoS Data frame of the TID from the initiator MLD in the link in a new TXOP if BA is not transmitted at the end of the current TXOP NOTE----a STA affiliated with a recipient MLD that discards the temporary record later than the time periods mentioned in the previous paragraph could fail to update the scoreboard context per the received frame within the transmit buffer control of the initiator MLD and ’an't acknowledge the received fra”e."~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1336~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11079~~ | ~~Po-Kai Huang~~ | ~~35.3.9~~ | ~~433.36~~ | ~~Suggest to disallow dynamic fragmentation when dot11EHTBaseLineFeaturesImplementedOnly equal to true because dynamic fragmentation shall not be classified as baseline features for MLd.~~ | ~~add the followi“g "STA affiliated with an MLD with dot11EHTBaseLineFeaturesImplementedOnly equal to true shall set the Dynamic Fragmentation Support field of the HE MAC Capabilities Information field to”0."~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11089~~ | ~~Robert Stacey~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.1~~ | ~~399.“7~~ | ~~"an obtained T”O– -- obtained by who“? "portion of time with”n– -- a TXOP is an amount of time so this is equivalent to the simp“e "part of the T”OP“. "to only an associated non-AP ”T– -- what does only add her“? "to ... for ”.." can be simplified.~~ | ~~Chan“e "a portion of the time within an obtained TXOP to only an associated non-AP EHT STA for transmitting one or more non-TB PP”Us" “o "a part of its TXOP for the transmission of one or more non-TB PPDUs by an associated non-AP EHT ”TA"~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11092~~ | ~~Robert Stacey~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.2~~ | ~~400.22~~ | ~~The bracketed (i.e....) is not equivalent “o "shall be addressed”to". A number between 1 and 2006 does not necessarily represent an associated STA. Also, if it did represent an associated then it would have to be between 1 and 2006.~~ | ~~Removed the bracketed statement.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11104 | Brian Hart | 35.3.7.1.1 | 427.33 | Various simulations (e.g., 11-20/1841r2) show that MLO in congested scenarios on all links just increases collisions and degrades performance. Changing EDCA parameters has limited value due to implementations in the field. Therefore a known-good, field-proven technique is to spread clients across all links via BTM, selected assoc rej etc. However, with MLO, the client can perform MLD setup with all links then go into PS mode on all but one link. In order to achieve Wi-Fi6 levels of performance in a congested environment, the AP must disassoc clients and only let them back in with a single link. Ditto, when hte congestion eases and MLO is possible again, the AP has to disassoc such clients again. | Provide the AP with an enforceable (i.e., mandatory) way to load balance clients: to signal to individual STAs or a group of STAs to limit what links their traffic are sent on, for both UL and DL. Since clients have constraints that are hard to express and time varying , provide both a way for the AP to express a requested preferred link (e.g., Link Recommendation) or a request a new agreed T2LM agreement before the AP needs to use the mandatory mechanism. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1429r2  Notes from Discussion:  < Multiple proposals have been presented to ask for a mandatory TID-to-link mapping and didn’t reach consensus > |
| 11107 | Brian Hart | 9.4.2.312.2.2 | 220.12 | Capability 2 is onerous for implementations, and capability 1 is a very limited form of T2LM. | Introduce a capability 1.5 whereby the MLD supports at least one link (e.g. N-1 links) with all TIDs mapped, and supports another link that has some TIDs mapped. Then renumber the capabilities: 0->0, 1->1, 1.5->2, 2->3. | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022 with 22/1510r2, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  This CID is discussed on September 28, 2022 with 22/1510r4, and the straw poll result is 29 Yes, 34 No, 23 Abstain..  Gaurang Naik 22/1510r4  Notes from Discussion:  <Members could not conclude on the details of the MU-EDCA rules to be used for the TID(s) that are not mapped to a link.> |
| 11151 | Youhan Kim | 35.15.2 | 526.“1 | "EHT duplicate m”de" is not used else where. | Chan“e "EHT PPDU in EHT duplicate m”de" “o "EHT PPDU using EHT-MCS”14" | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Liwen Chu 22/1502r0  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11160 | Boon Loong Ng | 35.9 | 510.51 | In an MLD, if a link becomes unavailable (for example, through link muting for power saving) and if that link had r-TWT schedule established, another link should be used for the latency-sensitive traffic delivery. There needs to a procedure roppedtsly retrieve the corresponding latency-sensitive traffic from the other link. | As in comment. | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, and then had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022, but no SP was ran as there was no consensus.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r8 |
| ~~11162~~ | ~~Boon Loong Ng~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~461.55~~ | ~~The EMLSR operation procedure for P2P/TDLS communication is currently missing and needs to be described in the spec.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1434~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11170 | Joseph Levy | 3.2 | 51.06 | The changes to the definition of SP do not clarify anything and are not correct. An SP is a period of time established by the TXOP holder to transmit frames to a QoS STA and/or allow the QoS STA to transmit frames to the TXOP holder by granting the QoS STA a TXOP during the TXOP hol’er's TXOP. Which is what the original definition said. Adding the wor“s "(portions ”f)" a“d "or alloca”ed" do not provide clarity, just confusion. | Delete the addition to the definition of service period. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Stephen McCann 22/1196r5  Notes from Discussion:  < Following the presentation of this CID during the September interim, new wording has been provisionally agreed by email. The CID needs to be re-presented to seek further approval.> |
| 11177 | Joseph Levy | 3.2 | 0.00 | There is no definition of an NSTR mobile AP, though the term is used in many location in the draft. Please define. | Add a definition for NSTR mobile AP. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Stephen McCann 22/1196r5  Notes from Discussion:  <A new definition for NSTR mobile AP was presented at the September interim TGbe session, but no conclusion of how the definition should be updated, could be reached by the members. The discussion continues by email> |
| 11243 | Peshal Nayak | 9.4.2.316 | 252.01 | Information in the QoS characteristic element can be useful for the STA for in a number of scenarios (e.g., to help a non-AP STA or non-AP MLD to specify a suggested/demanded set of TWT parameters). How can the STA obtain such information for downlink traffic? | Define a mechanism by which the STA can request the information in the QoS characteristic element from the AP for downlink traffic. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Duncan Ho 22/1436r2  Notes from Discussion:  <Usually the APs do not have such DL QoS info of a flow. That’s the reason for the design of the QoS characteristics element and MSCS, where both rely on the QoS info available at the STA. Besides, since most DL traffic went through the Internet, their arrivals to the AP may not be as deterministic as the UL traffic, which is generated very closely to the STA. But at the end there was no consensus by the members.> |
| ~~11252~~ | ~~Sigurd Schelstraete~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.1~~ | ~~399.“8~~ | ~~"allows an AP to allocate a portion of the time within an obtained TXOP to only an associated non-AP EHT ”TA". If the intention is that this mechanism can only be used by associated STAs, it would be clearer to add that as a separate sentence, rather than in passin“ ("to only an associated ”TA")~~ | ~~chan“e "to only an associa”ed" “o”"a". Add sentence at end of paragra“h "The Triggered TXOP sharing procedure can only be used with associated S”As"~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11421 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.21 | Typ‘: 'Common info fi’ld' -‘> 'Common Info fi’ld'. Same change on P424L56. | As in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11422 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.22 | There is no need to specify the presence of mandatory fields (such as MLD MAC address). Same comment for P424L56. | Either remo‘e 'MLD MAC addr’ss' from the list or a‘d 'Common Info le’th' subfield to the list. Als‘,’'A' should be capitalized ‘n 'MLD MAC addr’ss'. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11423 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.24 | A non-AP MLD also does not include the MLD ID subfield in the Basic ML element it transmits. | A‘d 'MLD’ID' in the list of subfields not carried in the Common Info field in the Basic ML element carried in (Re)Assoc Request frames. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11424 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.56 | (Re)Assoc Response frames carry Medium Synchronization Delay Information subfield in the Basic ML element. | a‘d 'and may include the Medium Synchronization Delay Information subfi’ld' at the end of the paragraph. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11425 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.24 | EML Capabilities subfield is not always present. Per 35.3.17, if dpt11EHTEMLSROptionImplemented is false and dot11EHTEMLMROptionImplemented is false, then EML Capabilities is absent. Same comment for (Re)Assoc Response frame, P424L58 | Change the condition for EML Capabilities from shall to may and refer to 35.3.17. Do the same on P424 L58 for (Re)Association Response frame. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11426 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.58 | An AP MLD does not include MLD ID subfield in the Common Info field of (Re)Assoc Response frames it transmits. | A‘d 'MLD’ID' in the list of subfields not carried in the Common Info field in the Basic ML element carried in (Re)Assoc Response frames. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11427 | Gaurang Naik | 35.3.5.4 | 424.61 | NOTE 3 is a duplicate of NOTE2. | Delete Note 3. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~11433~~ | ~~Gaurang Naik~~ | ~~35.3.10~~ | ~~434.22~~ | ~~Removal of an AP must be a critical update, i.e., addition of the Reconfig ML element in the Beacon must be listed in 11.2.3.15 as a critical update. Directly setting the CUF to 1 can create problems if the non-AP MLD misses the Beacon frame(s) that had the CUF set to 1. Same comment for addition of the AP. Also, the same comment for nontransmitted BSSID case (P435L13).~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1539r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11459~~ | ~~Gaurang Naik~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~463.54~~ | ~~subject to its spatial stream capabilities, operating mode, ... shall be capable of receiving a PPDU that is sent using more than one spatial str’am' The operating mode could be with just one spatial stream, in which case, the statement would not be true.~~ | ~~Cha‘e 'more than one spatial str’am' ‘o 'one or more spatial str’am'.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11537~~ | ~~Xiaofei Wang~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.09~~ | ~~NAV does not necessarily associate with a particular STA or AP, does this paragraph mean NAV set by the MU-RTS frame? Otherwise, the NAV needs to specified to from a particular STA~~ | ~~as in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11539~~ | ~~Xiaofei Wang~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.13~~ | ~~This sentence is unclear and has technical inaccuracies and should be rewritten.~~ | ~~as in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11542~~ | ~~Xiaofei Wang~~ | ~~35.3.1~~ | ~~405.15~~ | ~~How does AP MLD support MLO with just one affiliated AP? Particularly since It is stated that "EHT AP supports MLO". And when there is just one AP, why go through the overhead instead of conducting a regular association?~~ | ~~as in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Po-Kai Huang 22/1316r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11544~~ | ~~Xiaofei Wang~~ | ~~35.3.1~~ | ~~405.34~~ | ~~If a non-AP EHT STA with dot11MultiLinkActivated once set to true, but is no longer affiliated with the MLD, it does not seem to make sense to keep using the old MLD MAC address.~~ | ~~as in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Po-Kai Huang 22/1316r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11596 | Vishnu Ratnam | 35.3.7.1 | 427.07 | A mechanism is required for an AP MLD to temporarily disable a link for some or all associated nonAP MLDs for power save or other reasons. | Define a mechanism where an AP MLD can indicate via a broadcast signaling the temporary termination of the BSS operations for an indicated time duration. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no consensus (Straw poll results: 17 Yes, 15 No, 20 Abstain).  Vishnu Ratnam 22/1355r2  Notes from Discussion:  < A mechanism for temporarily disabling an AP has already been accepted in MAC motion 405 (doc 11.22/1023r5). However, the group did not reach consensus to solve this comment by pointing to 11-22/1023r5> |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~~11704~~ | ~~Abdel Karim Ajami~~ | ~~35.10~~ | ~~512.57~~ | ~~An AP that supports Triggered TXOP sharing should also support disablement requests (UL MU Data disable functionality) from the STA. Specify that OM Control UL MU Data Disable RX Support shall be set to 1 if Triggered TXOP sharing is supported.~~ | ~~As in the comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11706 | Abdel Karim Ajami | 9.4.2.199 | 206.24 | To assist latency sensitive traffic of p2p link, it may be useful to allow a STA to negotiate R-TWT schedule for p2p | As in the comment | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 11707 | Gaurav Patwardhan | 4.3.16a | 56.32 | Missing optional support for cross-link Management frame signaling. | Add a bulle“: "In an MLD, optional support for cross-link Management frame signal”ng" | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Rojan Chitrakar 22/1472r5  Notes from Discussion:  <22/1425r5 discussed this CID and SP was deferred for more discussion. The proposed text included cross-link management frame signalling as mandatory but consensus couldn’t be reached to list the feature as a mandatory feature.> |
| 11741 | Gaurav Patwardhan | 35.3.5.4 | 424.20 | Capitali‘e’'i' “n "Common i”fo" | as in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 11759 | Gaurav Patwardhan | 35.3.7.1 | 427.09 | For efficient functioning of a large scale deployment as well as some specific use cases, a non-default TID-to-link negotiation is required. A non-AP MLD does not know whether the AP MLD requires a non-default TID-to-Link mapping. The AP MLD needs to be able to signal that a negotiation is required. | Add signaling to indicate the need to perform such a negotiation. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1429r2  Notes from Discussion:  < Proposals have been presented for such mechanism but the group judged that the advertised TID-mapping mechanism was sufficient.> |
| ~~11767~~ | ~~Osama Aboulmagd~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.31~~ | ~~The sentenc“; "After a non-AP EHT STA receives an MU-RTS TXS Trigger frame its associated”AP"~~ | ~~shou’dn't the wo“d "associa”ed" change “o "associat”ng". Please change. The same issue is repeated several times.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11782 | Osama Aboulmagd | 35.9.4.1 | 512.14 | If a STA is not an EHT STA it is not expected the STA would end its TXOP before the start time of any r-TWT SP. Need to define the behavior is this case | as in comment. Specify the behavior when legacy STA (802.11ac or 802.11ax) exists | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, and then had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022, but no SP was ran as there was no consensus.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r8 |
| 11820 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 3.2 | 54.08 | Good to add MLMR, MLSR. eMLMR as well? | As in comment. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Stephen McCann 22/1196r5  Notes from Discussion:  <It appears to be agreed that definitions for MLMR and MLSR are not required. A new definition for EMLMR was presented at the September interim TGbe session, but no conclusion of how the definition should be updated, could be reached by the members. The discussion continues by email> |
| 11823 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 4.3.16a | 55.63 | Before going over subfeatures of MLD it is good to call out what support is there for MLD itself. | As in comment. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Rojan Chitrakar 22/1472r5  Notes from Discussion:  <This CID which was previously rejected in 22/1425r5 but was requested to be deferred for further discussion and an offline discussion thread was started in the reflector, but there were no responses to the email thread.> |
| ~~11867~~ | ~~Alfred Asterjadhi~~ | ~~35.3.9~~ | ~~433.37~~ | ~~What about the dynamic fragmentation case for a STA affiliated with an MLD. Clarify what the rules are for a STA affiliated with an MLD and dynamic fragmentation.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11917~~ | ~~Alfred Asterjadhi~~ | ~~11.20.6.5.1~~ | ~~329.23~~ | ~~A TDLS STA that sets up operation with a 320 MHz off-channel needs to first operate in the 6 GHz band. I believe TDLS STAs cannot operate in the 6 GHz band without the supervision of an AP.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1422r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11927~~ | ~~Alfred Asterjadhi~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.2~~ | ~~400.62~~ | ~~This sentence is very confusing. Please rephrase it to make it clearer. roppedtulr the if condition is very difficult to decode.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~11928~~ | ~~Alfred Asterjadhi~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~401.41~~ | ~~Several suggestions: to an associated AP that supports its reception (one that has the CAS control Support and RDG bit support to 1). And the CAS control field mentioned here is the one contained in the MPDU.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 11960 | Jarkko Kneckt | 35.3.16.3 | 453.38 | In some cases, a STR STA may have buffered UL data on a single TID. The STA may be transmitting UL data on the TID and during this operation it may receive a trigger frame. The response to such a Trigger frame is complicated to organize in STA and it requires a lot of real time scheduling. Sometimes, the STA may not be able to send data as a response to the Tirgger frame. | Please add a note to explain STR STA difficulties to respond to a Trigger frame if it has UL data only on a TID and if the STA is currently transmitting data on otehr link. The note should explain that in these cases the STA may send as a response to a basic Trigger frame QoS Null frames with BSR A-Control field signaling available buffered UL frames on the TID. The AP should consider that it should continue to trigger the STA for the buffered traffic, but the STA was not able to respond to the Trigger frame. | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, and had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022 but it was decided to not run the SP since there was no consensus.  Insun Jang 22/1400r2 |
| 11962 | Jarkko Kneckt | 35.3.7.1.6 | 430.57 | TWT SP early termination should not be done based on More data bit value. The More data may be set to 1 only for STAs that are in power save mode. If a non-AP MLD has a link in active mode, then more data field may not be set to value 1. This makes More data field unreliable for TWT SP early termination. | Please, define that more data field is not used to early terminate TWT SPs of non-AP MLDs, because AP may only be capable to transmit value 0 to the STAs that belong to non-AP MLD that has one STA in active mode. Such indication would terminate immediately the TWT SP, which makes TWT SP a broken feature. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1429r2  Notes from Discussion:  < A proposal have been presented to fix the issue. It was however judged that the scenario were there would be an issue was not mainstream enough.> |
| 12035 | Massinissa Lalam | 3.2 | 0.00 | A definition of EMLMR is missing, while EMLSR is defined. It is still unclear to me what is the difference between EMLSR and EMLMR devices (number of spatial streams?) because reading the definition of EMLSR as it is I could think it applies the same to EMLMR ... a definition would help understanding the differences. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Stephen McCann 22/1196r5  Notes from Discussion:  <A new definition for EMLMR was presented at the September interim TGbe session, but no conclusion of how the definition should be updated, could be reached by the members. The discussion continues by email> |
| 12056 | Massinissa Lalam | 9.4.2.311 | 210.20 | I ’on't see the need to ha“e "CC”S1" subfield. EHT is not supporting non-contiguous operation (like 80+80, or a new 160+160) for a single BSS. For such deployment, MLO should be preferred. As such CCFS1 subfield and any reference to it should be deleted and CCSF0 description in Table 9-401a should be updated t“: "For 20, 40, 80, 160 or 320 MHz BSS bandwidth, indicates the channel center frequency index for the 20, 40, 80, 160 or 320 MHz channel on which the EHT BSS operat”s.". There is zero reason why we should add an extra octet carrying useless information. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Guogang Huang 22/1267r5  Notes from Discussion:  < One CCFS or Two CCFS had debated for a long time. 11be group had converged to two CCFS. > |
| 12131 | Lei Huang | 9.4.2.311 | 210.22 | When BW = 80 MHz or 160 MHz, 8-bit Disabled Subchannel Bitmap field is enough. | change size of the Disabled Subchannel Bitmap field to 0, 1 or 2 octets. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Guogang Huang 22/1267r5  Notes from Discussion:  <At this stage, most members don’t want to change the format just for saving signaling overhead.> |
| 12174 | Takuhiro Sato | 9.4.2.316 | 251.47 | The terminolog“, "35.9 (Restricted TWT(r-TW”))" should be disregarded from the first paragraph in 9.4.2.316 QoS Characteristics element. The result of Motion 360 shows that adding QoS Characteristics element to Restricted TWT was rejected at the point of Draft 1.4. |  | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Duncan Ho 22/1436r2  Notes from Discussion:  <That sentence is describing the QoS characteristics element is used to support QoS traffic transfer, which uses:  1) SCS, which includes the QoS char element  2) R-TWT that allows SP to serve the member TID(s). The STA uses SCS+QoS to convey the QoS of those TIDs  Also, there are no normative text currently to support the ability of an R-TWT Request to include a QoS characteristics element so there should not be any confusion. But there was no consensus among members> |
| 12290 | KENGO NAGATA | 9.4.2.316 | 251.40 | The QoS Characteristics element contains requirements of QoS expectations of a traffic flow as defined; however, there is no mechanism to notify measurement results of the set of parameters corresponding to the contents of the QoS Characteristics element. Therefore, some mechanisms should be determined to know whether the traffic flow fulfills the requirements of the QoS Characteristic element or not. | A new element such as t“e "QoS Characteristic report elem”nt" should be created to notify the results of measurements of each component in the QoS Characteristic element. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022 and in October 19 with SP result 21Y, 14N, 26A. Then had two motions on October 26, 2022:  Motion 453: 30Y, 21N, 37A (failed)  Motion 455: 24Y, 26N, 34A (failed)  Guogang Huang 22/1213r4 and r6 |
| ~~12291~~ | ~~KENGO NAGATA~~ | ~~9.4.2.316~~ | ~~251.40~~ | ~~There is no language related to QoS characteristics element in 35.9. A procedure to transfer QoS traffic in Restricted TWT should be defined.~~ | ~~As in the comment.~~ | ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Duncan Ho 22/1436r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~< >~~ |
| ~~12292~~ | ~~KENGO NAGATA~~ | ~~9.4.2.316~~ | ~~251.40~~ | ~~There is no language related to QoS characteristics element in 35.9. A sequence to inform whether the requirements in the QoS characteristics elements is satisfied or not in 11.25.2 and 35.9.~~ | ~~As in the comment.~~ | ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Duncan Ho 22/1436r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12318 | Guogang Huang | 9.4.2.256 | 0.00 | please clarify the usage of ESS Report element for an AP MLD | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, and then again on October 19, 2022. The SP result is: 16Y, 22N, 21A.  Guogang Huang 22/1225r1 |
| 12328 | Guogang Huang | 35.3.19.1 | 468.40 | Considering the green communication and global warming, a wakeup-based power saroppedtism should be defined for the AP MLD, not just for the NSTR mobile AP MLD. | The commenter will provide contribution. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Guogang Huang 22/1313r0  Notes from Discussion:  < Since the proposed resolution cannot get sufficient support, I’m ok to reject it> |
| ~~12333~~ | ~~Guogang Huang~~ | ~~35.3.22~~ | ~~478.10~~ | ~~Based on the current text and the TID space (0-7), it is possible that multiple SCS streams are mapped to the same TID. For example, SCS stream #1 without a QoS Characteristic element and SCS stream #2 with a QoS Characteristic element are mapped to TID 7. In this case, it is meaningless to use the QoS Characteristics element as a reference for the’AP's scheduling.~~ | ~~Please fix this issue~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1187r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12334 | Guogang Huang | 35.3.22 | 478.29 | Similar to the 5G cellular network, a measurement report should be defined to monitor the expericed packet delivery ration given the delay bound of uplink transmissions belonging to a TID. | Please define a measurement to monitor the packet delivery ratio | Rejected– A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022 and in October 19 with SP result 21Y, 14N, 26A. Then had two motions on October 26, 2022:  Motion 453: 30Y, 21N, 37A (failed)  Motion 455: 24Y, 26N, 34A (failed)  Guogang Huang 22/1213r4 and r6 |
| ~~12335~~ | ~~Guogang Huang~~ | ~~35.3.22~~ | ~~0.00~~ | ~~Based on the current TID space (0-7) used in the SCS mechanism, the SCS mechanism cannot prioritize a particular SCS stream. Please fix this issue or add a note to clarify this limitation for the 11be defined SCS mechanism.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1187r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12359 | Massinissa Lalam | 35.3.16.3 | 453.37 | This pa“t "except as specified in 35.3.16.4 (Nonsimultaneous transmit and receive (NSTR) operatio”)." should be deleted. This subclause describes STR operation. WM access is indenpendent on each link in STR, I ’on't see any exception in the NSTR subclause pertaining to STR links | As in comment | Ready for Motion: Done  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1400r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~12370~~ | ~~Rojan Chitrakar~~ | ~~11.20.6.5~~ | ~~329.15~~ | ~~TDLS off-channel switching to 6 GHz needs to ensure the requested off-channel is safe to be used (e.g. there are no licensed users operating on the channel etc.).~~ | ~~Add rules to ensure that non-AP STA checks that the off-channel in 6 GHz is safe to be used. E.g., one option is to get permission from its associated AP on the existing channel, whether it is allowed to switch to the new off-channel.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1422r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12404~~ | ~~Rojan Chitrakar~~ | ~~35.9.4.2~~ | ~~511.“1~~ | ~~"Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exi”t." why? Only EHT STAs that are members of the r-TWT SP should be exempted.~~ | ~~Modify “s "Non-AP EHT STAs that are members of the corresponding r-TWT SP may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not exi”t."~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Chunyu Hu 22/1471r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12409 | Juseong Moon | 35.3.16.6 | 457.45 | When NSTR link pairs are more than 2, more description roppedied to cover more cases including backoff status. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dmitry Akhmetov 22/1442r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 12414 | Juseong Moon | 35.3.16.6 | 458.14 | When there are multiple EDCAF backoff counters that already reached zero and one EDCAF is chosen with implementation specific method, it is not clear what the expected behavior for the rest of EDCAFs with zero backoff counter. Do they re-invoke the backoff procedure with doubled CW value assuming an internal collision? Clear description on the post procedure of implementation specific one EDCAF selection is required. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dmitry Akhmetov 22/1442r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 12426 | Yongho Kim | 35.3.16.6 | 458.14 | Because end time shall be aligned in case of non-AP S’As' sync transmission, MPDU transmitted on one link might need padding to align the end time with the other l’nk's transmission. Mult-TID A-MPDU with the TID of the selected EDCAF and the other TIDs whose backoff counter reached zero is more efficient than just padding. In order to allow flexibility in forming multi-TID A-MPDU with different ACs, multi-TID A-MPDU construction rule needs to be eased to construct multi-TID A-MPDU regardless of AC priority. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dmitry Akhmetov 22/1442r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 12442 | Ryuichi Hirata | 35.3.7 | 427.04 | For Multi-link load balancing, information of other links such as link utilization, number of STAs, link availability should be indicated in somewhere such as A-Control field, ML element, etc. | as in the comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1429r2  Notes from Discussion:  < BSS load element can already be included to provide such information cross link.> |
| ~~12510~~ | ~~Jeongki Kim~~ | ~~35.2.2.1~~ | ~~405.“4~~ | ~~"The MAC address of a non-AP EHT STA with dot11MultiLinkActivated set to false shall be set to the MLD MAC address of the non-AP MLD that the non-AP EHT STA is affiliated with when dot11MultiLinkActivated is set to tr”e." It seems like non-AP EHA STA should be able to set dot11MultiLinkActivated to true always. If no, the text should be clarified.~~ | ~~Change it “o "The MAC address of a non-AP EHT STA with dot11MultiLinkActivated set to false shall be set to the MLD MAC address of a non-AP MLD if the non-AP EHT STA is affiliated with the non-AP ALD when dot11MultiLinkActivated is set to tr”e."~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1316r1~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Po-Kai Huang 22/1316r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12520~~ | ~~Mao Yang~~ | ~~35.9.4.2~~ | ~~512.41~~ | ~~The original intention of introducing r-TWT is to guarantee the low latency performance. But, the rule th“t "Non-AP EHT STAs may behave as if overlapping quiet intervals do not ex”st" directly contradicts the objective of r-TWT. It leads to collision between EHT STAs at any r-TWT SPs.~~ | ~~Delete this rule.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Chunyu Hu 22/1471r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12606 | Arik Klein | 9.6.13.9 | 261.36 | In case of MLD, BSS termination means that only the affiliated AP which belongs to this BSS is being removed (as described in 35.3.6.2.2 Removing affiliated APs). Therefore the following sentence is not correc“: "The BSS Termination Included (bit 3) field indicates that the BSS Termination Duration field is included, the BSS \*or the AP MLD is shutting do”n\*". Please correct the sentence as proposed | The sentence should be revised as follow“: "The BSS Termination Included (bit 3) field indicates that the BSS Termination Duration field is included, the BSS is shutting down or the AP affiliated with the AP MLD which belongs to this BSS is being remo”ed" | Ready for Motion 22/1228r4: Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Guogang Huang 22/1228r1  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~12607~~ | ~~Arik Klein~~ | ~~9.6.13.9~~ | ~~261.37~~ | ~~In case of MLD, BSS termination means that only the affiliated AP which belongs to this BSS is being removed (as described in 35.3.6.2.2 Removing affiliated APs). Therefore in such a case the non-AP MLD is not disassociated from the AP MLD (since the AP MLD remains and is not shutting down). therefore the following sentence is incorrec“: "The BSS Termination Included (bit 3) field indicates that the BSS Termination Duration field is included, ... and the STA or the non-AP MLD will be disassocia”ed"~~ | ~~Please remove the wor“s "or the non-AP M”Ds" from the sentence.~~ | Ready for Motion 22/1228r4: Done.  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Guogang Huang 22/1228r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12609~~ | ~~Arik Klein~~ | ~~9.6.13.9~~ | ~~262.04~~ | ~~In case of MLD, BSS termination means that only the affiliated AP which belongs to this BSS is being removed (as described in 35.3.6.2.2 Removing affiliated APs) and not the AP MLD. Need to revise the following sentence as propos”d:" The BSS Termination Duration field contains the BSS Termination Duration subelement (see 9.4.2.36 (Neighbor Report element)) for the current BSS or AP MLD ”.."~~ | ~~Please revise the sentence as follow“: "The BSS Termination Duration field contains the BSS Termination Duration subelement (see 9.4.2.36 (Neighbor Report element)) for the current BSS or AP affiliated with AP MLD which belongs to that ”SS"~~ | Ready for Motion 22/1228r4: Done.  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Guogang Huang 22/1228r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12692 | Arik Klein | 35.9.4.1 | 512.16 | It is not clear how the r-TWT SP is not interfered by legacy non-AP STA (i.e. non-AP STA that has dot11RestrictedTWTOptionImplemented set to false) which is not aware to the existence of the r-TWT SPs (and therefore does not defer any transmission when the r-TWT SP begins)? Please clarify this point in the text | As in comment | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, and then had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022, but no SP was ran as there was no consensus.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r8 |
| 12706 | Arik Klein | 3.2 | 0.00 | A definition for EMLMR operation is missing (compared to EMLSR existing definition). Please add a corresponding definition. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Stephen McCann 22/1196r5  Notes from Discussion:  <A new definition for EMLMR was presented at the September interim TGbe session, but no conclusion of how the definition should be updated, could be reached by the members. The discussion continues by email> |
| 12717 | Pascal VIGER | 35.3.22 | 478.07 | The transmission of direct link frames should be enabled by using MU-RTS TXS Trigger frames in an r-TWT period. In that case, the EHT STA is an r-TWT scheduled STA having specified a QoS Characteristics element accordingly. Issue is that P2P recipient is not aware of suroppedtonons, and may be in doze state for TWT SP it is not member of (initiating P2P STA is member of). There is high risk of lost TWT/TXS resource (not used) | Make the recipient P2P STA aware of the TWT membership. It thus can be awake for the service periods to come in this rTWT schedule, hence be available for P2P communication with the initiator peer STA. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dibakar Das 22/1187r1  Notes from Discussion:  < We proposed to reject this CID since (a) the peer STAs can negotiate own TWT SPs and (b) the other peer may be in active mode anyway so that it does not care about wake schedule. During discussions IMO the commenter did not clarify in sufficient details why this is not sufficient. > |
| 12720 | Pascal VIGER | 35.9.2.2 | 511.40 | The transmission of direct link frames is possible by using MU-RTS TXS Trigger frames in an r-TWT period. As already done for UL/DL, please consider a restricted P2P Link bitmap for such a P2P latency sensitive traffic. | as per comment | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 12748 | Patrice Nezou | 35.9.4.2 | 512.25 | An r-TWT scheduling AP may schedule at most one quiet interval that overlaps with a r-TWT SP. Each such quiet interval, referred to as an overlapping quiet interval in this subclause, if scheduled, shall have a duration of 1 TU, and shall start at the same time as the corresponding r-TWT SP. Comment: Usage of quiet element is not sufficient to ensure an accurate starting time of the service period because the support of the quiet element is not mandatory for all STAs. | Additional mechanism is required. | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, and then had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022, but no SP was ran as there was no consensus.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r8 |
| 12749 | Patrice Nezou | 35.9.4.2 | 512.25 | An r-TWT scheduling AP may schedule at most one quiet interval that overlaps with a r-TWT SP. Each such quiet interval, referred to as an overlapping quiet interval in this subclause, if scheduled, shall have a duration of 1 TU, and shall start at the same time as the corresponding r-TWT SP. Comment: It is unfair for legacy STAs to stop their transmission at the beginning of the service period because legacy STAs cannot be registered to transmit low latency traffics during the service period. | A mecanism to address the unfairness should be introduced | Rejected– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, and then had an opportunity for SP on October 27, 2022, but no SP was run as there was no consensus.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r8 |
| 12777 | Romain GUIGNARD | 9.4.2.199 | 207.29 | The restricted TWT Traffic Info field is used during the TWT agreement setup to specify which TID(s) are identified as latency sensitive traffic streams in the UL and DL direction. However, it is not stated how to specify which TID(s) are latency sensitive in P2P case. | Could you please define signaling to support P2P case in TWT agreement setup or could you clarify the usage of the existing signaling for the P2P case? | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 12787 | Romain GUIGNARD | 35.9 | 510.51 | The broadcast TWT setup is performed between a requesting STA and the AP. In case of P2P communication during a SP between the requesting STA and its peer STA, it is not clear how this peer STA is enrolled in the bTWT agreement. Indeed, if the peer STA is not informed about the TWT agreement, the peer STA could be in doze state and not be able to receive the data from the requesting STA. | The standard should propose a mean to inform a P2P communication receiver STA that it will be involved as a receiver during a bTWT SP. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| ~~12798~~ | ~~Laurent Cariou~~ | ~~35.3.4.2~~ | ~~415.20~~ | ~~MLDID do’sn't need to be present either if the requested AP MLD is the AP MLD of the AP whose address is indicated in A1 or A3, even if this AP is a transmitted BSSID or if it is not in a MBSSID set.~~ | ~~Add the rule for this case as well.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12799 | Laurent Cariou | 35.3.4.2 | 416.33 | It is important to control if the ML probe response is sent as unicast or broadcast. As we have 2 ways to address the AP, we can use one mode (sending a probe with A1 set to the address of the AP) to request a Unicast ML Probe response and the other mode (sending a probe with A1 set to broadcast and A3 set to the address of the AP) to allow the ML probe response to be sent in broadcast manner. Also make it consistent between 2.4/5/6GHz | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2  Notes from Discussion:  < Proposal has been presented but didn’t reach consensus so far.> |
| ~~12806~~ | ~~Laurent Cariou~~ | ~~35.3.10~~ | ~~434.22~~ | ~~There is an issue when an AP is removed. We currently use directly the critical update flag in this case, and not the BSS parameters update. If there is a change in BSS parameters update together with the inclusion of the ML reconfig element, the STA can miss it. Also, if the STA misses the beacon on which there was a critical update flag, it can not determine if there had been a critical update. Everything can be easily solved if we increment BSS parameters update in this case (link remove), as we do for any other update for a particular AP affiliated with an AP MLD.~~ | ~~Add a new condition for critical update in 11.2.3.15, which will be as follows: Inclusion of a Reconfiguration Multi-Link element by an AP affiliated with an AP MLD that will be removed following procedure defined in 35.3.6.2.2 (Removing affiliated APs)~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1539r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12814~~ | ~~Laurent Cariou~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~463.59~~ | ~~When a non-AP MLD that is in EMLSR mode receives the initial control frame (e.g., MU-RTS) that includes multiple users and during the TXOP when the non-AP MLD is not included in the frame exchanges anymore and the AP affiliated with the AP MLD only transmits data/management frames to the other non-AP MLDs, the non-AP MLD switches back to the listening operation by identifying that the frames in the PPDU is not addressed to the non-AP MLD. However relying on the address information in the MAC frames in the PPDU is problematic because the PPDU that is only destined for the other STAs could be using higher MCS than the one that the non-AP MLD can decode and also decoding time of the address information could vary depending on the type of frame and implementations (might need to wait for the FCS). This problem can be solved by limiting the type of PPDU when transmitting data/management frames to HE MU PPDU or EHT PPDU so that the non-AP MLD can just decode the PHY preamble and know whether the PPDU is for the non-AP MLD or not and decide to switch to the listening operation.~~ | ~~Add a sentence to limit the data/management frames to be transmitted in the HE MU PPDU or EHT PPDU during frame exchanges after successful initial control frame transmission by an AP affiliated with an AP MLD to a STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD in EMLSR mode.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8 and September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12819~~ | ~~Laurent Cariou~~ | ~~35.3.25~~ | ~~480.58~~ | ~~This subclause do’sn't incorporate the Link Removal Imminent field. Some changes are needed in this subclause in order to be accurate.~~ | ~~Apply the changes described in the comment. A proposal is defined in doc 1208r12~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Laurent Cariou 22/1254r4~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12821~~ | ~~Laurent Cariou~~ | ~~35.8.2~~ | ~~509.63~~ | ~~As’we've defined a may to negotiate a TWT agreement on one link A through frame exchanges on another link B, we should also allow the joint negotiation of TWT agreements with overlapping SPs roppedple links (particularly useful for eMLSR non-AP MLDs or dual radio non-AP MLDs) and allow the negotiation of TWT agreements with non-overlapping SPs on multiple links (particularly useful for single radio non-AP MLDs that have the constraint of not being able to operate at the same time on both links).~~ | ~~Define such joint TWT negotiation. Note that we need to be careful on the reference link of the timing parameters for the TWT elements when there are multiple links that are being negotiated~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1526~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1526r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 12826 | Laurent Cariou | 9.3.1.8 | 134.01 | With MLO, especially in the NSTR case, there can be cross-link interference that impacts the reception of all or a portion of a PPDU. The packet losses are, in this case, due to the in-device interference, and not to the channel conditions. It would be important in this situation to not be double-punished by having also the rate selection adgorithm selecting a lower MCS for upcoming PPDUs (while the interference will likely not be present at that time). An easy remedy would be to use one or some reserved bits in the BlockAck frame in order to indicate that the packet failures in the eliciting PPDU were due to an in-device interference (cross link interference) or not. Note that this obviously could be helpful for other types of interference. | define a new field in the BlockAck frame to indicate whether the eliciting PPDU suffered from in-device interference or not | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1240r0  Notes from Discussion:  < Should be proposed for next generation.> |
| 12834 | Laurent Cariou | 9.4.2.199 | 206.23 | With widespread usage of XR traffic, P2P transmissions requiring low latency will likely be sgnificant. At the same time the network also needs to protect other transmissions within its BSS from being interrupted by P2P transmissions. However, r-TWT does not explicitly mention whether the SP is to be used for P2P traffic. | Clarify whether P2P transmissions are covered in the case when Broadcast TWT Reccomendation field value = 4. If not, cover this. Also add corresponding signaling from a non-AP STA requesting an AP to allocate resources for P2P traffic. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 12837 | Laurent Cariou | 35.9 | 510.55 | A netw’rk's ability to serve time-sensitive traffic is affected by unmanaged P2P transmission. While 11be has defined tools such as TXS to manage P2P transmissions on same channel, there is no requirement for the AP or STA to use this feature. As such any STA can simply transmit P2P traffic on the same channel at which an AP has setup r-TWT SPs and disrupt the latter. | Define a mechanism such that the network advertizes channels with sufficient BW in which it promises not to operate and which can be used for P2P transmission. In exchange, the P2P STAs either do not operate on the channels/ service periods in which the network is serving low latency traffic or operates in them using after being scheduled by the AP(e.g., TXS). | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| ~~12982~~ | ~~Chunyu Hu~~ | ~~26.5.2.2.1a~~ | ~~396.20~~ | ~~Chan“e "”or" “o ”in" “n "an RU for a 40 MHz HE TB P”DU", and similarly in other sentences in this subsection.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022 with 22/1189r3, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12985~~ | ~~Chunyu Hu~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.43~~ | ~~Not clear wh“t "if the RDG/More PPDU ”.." is a condition or is the action to terminate the allocated time. Nees to better explain the intended mechanism to terminate the allocated time.~~ | ~~One way to fix it, if this is intended, is to change this sentence to be: The non-AP EHT STA may transmit a QoS Data or QoS Null frame to an associated AP to terminate the allocated time, with the frame carrying a RDG/More PPDU subfield in a CAS Control subfield of the HE variant HT Control field and having that subfield set to”0."~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~12986~~ | ~~Chunyu Hu~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.09~~ | ~~The descripti“n "shall ignore the NAV that is set by the”AP" ’sn't quite accurate or not clear: accordingly to the current rule in 10.3.2.4, a STA ’on't set its NAV upon receiving the MU-RTS frame from AP addressed to itself. In this case, what NAV to ignore (since none is set)?~~ | ~~See comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13007~~ | ~~Chunyu Hu~~ | ~~35.3.19.1~~ | ~~468.44~~ | ~~How is the primary link designation is done? Does it need to be signaled/advertised to (un)associated STAs? If not, is the primary link selection permanent throughput the lifetime of the BSS?~~ | ~~Need to develop text to address the problems raised in the comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1233r8~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yetroppeding Lu 22/1233r8~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13013 | Chunyu Hu | 35.9 | 511.51 | The r-TWT usage can be extended to better support and protect the direct (tethered) link to deliver latency sensitive traffic. | As in comment | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 13086 | Chittabrata Ghosh | 35.9 | 510.51 | The current TDLS setup do’sn't accommodate the r-TWT schedule among the peer STAs so that the rTWT SP can be scheduled and announced directly between the TDLS peer STAs. This is specially helpful when two TDLS peer STAs switching to off-channel and AP do’sn't have knowledge of the traffic between TDLS peer STAs. Please define such a procedure in the spec. | as in comment | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 13109 | Chittabrata Ghosh | 9.4.2.316 | 254.28 | Need to clarify what is the expectation for the MSDU Delivery ratio, when the Delay Bound parameter is not specified. | As in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Duncan Ho 22/1436r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~13179~~ | ~~Mark RISON~~ | ~~12.6.2~~ | ~~347.49~~ | ~~“All APs affiliated with an AP MLD shall advertise the same RSNE and RSNXE if included” needs a comma~~ | ~~Change to “All APs affiliated with an AP MLD shall advertise the same RSNE, and RSNXE if included”~~ | ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13191~~ | ~~Mark RISON~~ | ~~12.7.2~~ | ~~351.27~~ | ~~What does “Length” refer to? Ditto at 351.47, 353.22~~ | ~~Just change the length to “variable”~~ | ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13198~~ | ~~Mark RISON~~ | ~~12.7.2.2~~ | ~~364.33~~ | ~~“For MLO, when present, the MLO GTK KDE (see 12.7.2 (EAPOL-Key frames)) for any of the setup links” – what does “when present” refer to? MLO? And can it really be the GTK for any of the links; doesn’t it have to be for each of the links? Ditto next 2 bullets~~ | ~~Change to “For MLO, an MLO GTK KDE (see 12.7.2 (EAPOL-Key frames)) for each of the setup links”~~ | ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13226 | Binita Gupta | 35.9 | 510.51 | There are many AR/VR and cloud gaming use cases with topologies where latency sensitive traffic for the application is transmitted over a peer-to-peer/tethered link between a non-AP STA and a peer STA. To provide improved e2e performance for such applications, it is desirable to enhance rTWT to support LST over the p2p link so that rTWT benefit of TxOP protection can also be leveraged for LST transmitted on the p2p link and AP can schedule TxOP sharing (using MU RTS TXS Trigger) for p2p traffic during rTWT SPs requiring support for p2p traffic. | Add support for p2p traffic for rTWT and TxOP Sharing for p2p link during rTWT SPs. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| 13245 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.316 | 254.15 | The definition of the Burst Size field uses peak data rate, however the peak data rate parameter is not defined. The Burst Size can be defined as the maximum burst arriving at the MAC SAP within the Delay Bound time duration. | Modify Burst Size duration to use Delay Bound instead of peak data rate. Also indicate that the Delay Bound field is present and nonzero if the Burst Size field is present. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Duncan Ho 22/1436r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13246 | Binita Gupta | 9.4.2.316 | 254.28 | Need to clarify what is the expectation for the MSDU Delivery ratio, when the Delay Bound parameter is not specified. | As in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Duncan Ho 22/1436r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13249 | Binita Gupta | 35.3.22 | 478.26 | This req is applicable for TWT scheduled STA or TWT requesting STA, not for rTWT scheduled STA. Hence the text needs to be updates to remove the TID reference, since TIDs are specified only for the rTWT setup. | As in comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dibakar Das 22/1187r1  Notes from Discussion:  < The sentence is intended to refer to regular TWT operation which is not identified using any TID. However, removing the reference to this TID triggered a wider discussion about clarifying the meaning of the baseline text (i.e., how AP ensures its SI aligns with TWT wake intervals, whether QoS Characteristics need to be exchanged before TWT setup etc.) and different members have different opinion about it.> |
| ~~13252~~ | ~~Binita Gupta~~ | ~~35.2.1.2~~ | ~~399.57~~ | ~~A non-AP EHT STA should be able to exchange both non-TB PPDUs and TB PPDUs with a peer STA on a p2p link during TXOP sharing for Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode 2 e.g. when the STA acts as Mobile AP/Soft AP and sends a trigger to the p2p peer, it can exchange TB PPDUs with peer over the p2p link. Update the text throughout 35.2.1.2 to allow TB PDDU exchange over p2p link for Triggered TXOP Sharing Mode 2.~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13256~~ | ~~Binita Gupta~~ | ~~35.3.1~~ | ~~405.34~~ | ~~The r“q "The MAC address of a non-AP EHT STA with dot11MultiLinkActivated set to false shall be set to the MLD MAC address of the non-AP MLD that the non-AP EHT STA is affiliated with when dot11MultiLinkActivated is set to tr”e." will require to reassign non-AP STA MAC address after the dot11MultiLinkActivated is set to false if the STA MAC address was set different than the MLD MAC address, as is allowed in the MLD architecture. Clarify why we need to enforce this requirement, if at all needed. Also if needed, clarify that this only applies to non-AP STA which had dot11MultiLinkActivated was set to true.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Po-Kai Huang 22/1316r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13306 | Muhammad Kumail Haider | 35.9.2.2 | 511.17 | STAs should be able to use r-TWT operation to provide protection for latency sensitive traffic on their p2p links as well, as it aligns with 802.11be direction to expand support for low-latency traffic and support p2p link traffic. Support of a ’TA's p2p traffic during r-TWT SPs should be expanded and necessary provisions made. | Add a new Broadcast Recommendation value to explicitly indicate p2p traffic delivery during r-TWT SPs and add necessary provisions/traffic delivery rules in 35.9 | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, and then again on October 27, 2022 with SP result: 37Y, 19N, 20A.  Chunyu Hu 22/1463r3 |
| ~~13318~~ | ~~Muhammad Kumail Haider~~ | ~~ï»¿35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.40~~ | ~~Please clarify whether in TXOP Sharing Mode 2, only non-TB PPDUs may be exchanged between non-AP STAs? It is implied by the sentence and the motivation of this restriction is not clear, if so.~~ | ~~Please clarify~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13348 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.4.2 | 415.04 | The rules to decide whether MLDID is included are nroppedtant. When the MAC header indicates the non-transmitted BSSID, the MLD ID shall not be carried in Probe Request ML IE since the target MLD is identified by MAC header. When the MAC header indicates a BSSID that do’sn't support Multiple BSSID, the MLD ID should also not required since the MAC headroppedttes the MLD already. When the MAC header indicates the transmitted BSSID and the MLD of transmitted BSSID is solicited, the MLD ID is not needed. When the MAC header indicates the transmitted BSSID and the MLD of non-transmitted BSSID is solicited, the MLD ID is needed. | As in comment or always indicate the MLD ID even if the MAC header identifies the MLD being solicited. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2  Notes from Discussion:  < Proposal has been made to clarify the 2 sentences for inclusion of MLD ID but no consensus reached so far.> |
| 13349 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.4.2 | 415.11 | it is not necessary to allow broadcast address in A1 and solicited’AP's BSSID in A3. | always set A1 to be the BSSID of the solicited AP. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2  Notes from Discussion:  < The group agreed to have 2 addressing options. No consensus to only define one option.> |
| 13361 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.5.4 | 424.22 | The inclusion of EML Capabilities subfield transmitted by non-AP MLD is not mandatory requirement. | As in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13362 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.5.4 | 424.57 | The inclusion of the EML Capabilities subfield shouldbe optional. | As in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13373 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.11 | 436.07 | The channel switching rules in 11be D2.0 ’on't work with channel puncture | update the text according to the comment. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1344r2  Notes from Discussion:  < The issue is treated with other CIDs, proposal in doc 1344 didn’t reach consensus.> |
| 13395 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.16.3 | 453.33 | The eMLSR also has some restriction. The exception shouroppedlue it. | Fix the issues mentioned in the comment | Ready for Motion: Done  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1400r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~13442~~ | ~~Liwen Chu~~ | ~~35.8.2~~ | ~~509.48~~ | ~~the subclause allows the TWT agreement establishing f“r "link”s)" through one TWT Request. The TWT Wake Start Time should be clarified sinroppedtrnt link(s) may have different TSF time values. Otherwise please chan“e "link”s)" “o "l”nk" through troppedtuse and also do the related change in management frame transmission subclause since that subclause assumes that the TWT agreement of multiple links can be done through single TWT negotiation .~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1526~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1526r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13446 | Liwen Chu | 35.9.4.1 | 512.09 | The TXOP rules are not wnough: 1, what happens if the AP has TXOP for non low latency traffic at the beginning of rTWT SP? The acceptable behavior could be either stopping the TXOP at the beginning of r-TWT SP or starting to tranmit the DL low latency traffic (or scuedule the UL low latency traffic transmission) at the remaining TXOP from the start time of r-TWT SP. 2, whan happens if the TBTT is in r-TWT SP? The behavior could be 1), disallow such case, 2) schedule troppedtonion of the Beacon at the TBTT, or 3) schedule troppedtonion of the Beacon until the low latency traffic is totally service. 3, whan happens if the DTBTT is in r-TWT SP? 4, what happens if the backoff timer of non low latency traffic becomes 0 before the low latency traffic is fully serviced in AP or r-TWT STA? | fix the issues mentioned in the comment | Ready For Motion: Done  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment  This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Chunyu Hu 22/1470r6  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13470 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.10 | 433.49 | The description “f "when a critical update occurs to the operational parameters for that AP as defined in 11.2.3.15 (TIM Broadca”t)" is not correct. Not all critical update needs to update of BSS Parameters Change Count. | update the text to fix the issue. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Ming Gan 22/1539r2  Notes from Discussion:  <A resolution for this CID was presented and was asked to be deferred for offline discussion.> |
| 13473 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.10 | 433.37 | The description “f "when a critical update occurs to the operational parameters for that AP as defined in 11.2.3.15 (TIM Broadca”t)" is not correct. Not all critical update needs to update of BSS Parameters Change Count. | update the text to fix the issue. | Rejectd -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Ming Gan 22/1539r2  Notes from Discussion:  <A resolution for this CID was presented and was asked to be deferred for offline discussion.> |
| ~~13490~~ | ~~Liwen Chu~~ | ~~9.6.13.9~~ | ~~262.03~~ | ~~Based on P261L50, BSS Termination Duration is also used for link removal announcement.~~ | ~~update the text per the comment~~ | ~~Ready for Motion 22/1228. Done~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Guogang Huang 22/1228r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13591~~ | ~~Yongho Seok~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~464.“9~~ | ~~"When a STA of the non-AP MLD initiates a TXOP the following appli”s:" When a STA of the non-AP MLD initiates a TXOP on one of the ELMSR links, the AP MLD shall not send any frame to the non-AP MLD on the other EMLSR link. Please add the missing rules when the non-AP MLD operating in the EMLSR mode is a TXOP holder.~~ | ~~As in the comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13593~~ | ~~Yongho Seok~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~463.“3~~ | ~~"...the STA affiliated with the non-AP MLD shall be capable of receiving a PPDU that is sent using more than one spatial stream on the link in which the initial Control frame was received”.." Please specify how many spatial stream shall be supported in the EMLSR mode. Especially, when the STAs affiliated with the non-AP MLD declare different supported spatial streams for each link, just saying more than one spatial stream is too general.~~ | ~~As in the comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13602~~ | ~~Yongho Seok~~ | ~~35.3.9~~ | ~~433.“6~~ | ~~"A STA affiliated with an MLD shall not use the nondynamic fragmentation procedure described in 10.4 (MSDU, A-MSDU, and MMPDU fragmentatio”)." Please describe the dynamic fragmentation procedure. Otherwise, remo“e "nondyna”ic" in the cited sentence.~~ | ~~As in the comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13633~~ | ~~Rubayet Shafin~~ | ~~35.9~~ | ~~510.51~~ | ~~11be includes multi-link operation. However, how restricted TWT will operate on multi-link devices (MLDs) is not clear. In general, mechanism for Broadcast TWT, which is a basis for restricted TTWT, for MLDs need to be defined.~~ | ~~Commenter will present a contribution on this.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Rubayet Shafin 22/1051r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13643~~ | ~~Rubayet Shafin~~ | ~~35.9~~ | ~~510.51~~ | ~~For the scenario where a restricted TWT schedule, which is not a trigger-enabled TWT, is established on a link between an AP MLD and a non-AP MLD that forms NSTR link pair(s) between the same AP MLD and non-AP MLD, while UL PPDU is being transmitted during the restricted TWT SP on the that link, if DL PPDU is being transmitted on another link that forms the NSTR link pair with the first link, then the overlapped portions of UL PPDU and DL PPDU will suffer from interference due to NSTR constraints. This may affect the latency-sensitive traffic flow during restricted TWT SP.~~ | ~~Please provide text to handle the NSTR constraints as depicted in the comment when an rTWT schedule is established on a link of an NSTR link pair.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Rubayet Shafin 22/1051r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13644~~ | ~~Rubayet Shafin~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~461.55~~ | ~~While a non-AP MLD is communicating with its associated AP MLD and is operating under the EMLSR mode, how it is possible for the non-AP MLD to establish one or multiple peer-to-peer links with another peer non-AP MLD is not clear based on the latest IEEE 802.11be specification. Also, the P2P setup procedure, while operating in the EMLSR mode, is currently missing in the spec.~~ | ~~Please provide text on the procedures to transition into P2P mode when the non-AP MLD has been in EMLSR mode with its associated AP MLD.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1434~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13645~~ | ~~Rubayet Shafin~~ | ~~35.3.17~~ | ~~461.55~~ | ~~Assuming two non-AP MLDs have already set up peer-to-peer link(s) over one or multiple links between the two non-AP MLDs, the procedure for turning on the EMLSR mode for the P2P communication between the two non-AP MLDs is not defined. Moreover, the procedure for EMLSR operation for P2P communication between two non-AP MLDs is currently missing in the spec.~~ | ~~Procedures for turning on EMLSR mode and EMLSR operation between two non-AP MLDs communicating over the P2P links needs to be described in the spec.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1434~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Minyoung Park 22/1434r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13648 | Rubayet Shafin | 35.3.17 | 461.55 | For the scenario where multiple TWT agreemenroppedtles or restricted TWT schedules are established on multiple links between an AP MLD and a non-AP MLD, and if those links are also included in the EMLSR links and if the TWT service periods (SPs) on those links are overlapping in time or nearly overlapping in time, then, due to the nature of EMLSR operation, the r-TWT frame exchanges on either of the links may not be successful. | The spec needs to provide text to address the issue EMLSR operation with multiple overlapping r-TWT SPs on multiple links. | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Minyoung Park 22/1434r1  Notes from Discussion:  <The technical debate was on whether the spec needs additional rules for the case when TWT SPs are overlapped on the EMLSR links and the group couldn’t reach consensus.> |
| 13690 | Yunbo Li | 35.3.5.4 | 424.60 | same contents in NOTE and NOTE 3, can remove one of them. | Remove NOTE or NOTE 3. | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13732 | Yunbo Li | 35.3.5.4 | 425.30 | The bull“t "the STA shall include the MLD MAC address of the MLD with which the STA is affiliated in the Common Info field of the elem”nt" roppedtant. Because MLD MAC Address field is mandatory to carry. | remove that bullet | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~13736~~ | ~~Yunbo Li~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.2~~ | ~~401.08~~ | ~~Since AP is allowed to transmit a PPDU if the last PPDU transmission by AP ended less than aSIFSTime before the end of the allocated time, how about the case that less than aSIFSTime plus a duration of shortest PPDU? In this case, the allocated STA can not do any transimission, the spec should allow AP do the transmission. It do’sn't add any extra complexity, but will leave less possibility forropprid party STA to jump in, and also improve the system efficiency a little bit.~~ | ~~chan“e "aSIFST”me" “o "aSIFSTime plus 2”us". 24us is the PPDU duration of a possible shortest frame. E.G. CTS at highest Ctrl MCS rate of 54 Mbps~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yunbo Li 22/1265r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13741~~ | ~~Yunbo Li~~ | ~~35.3.8~~ | ~~431.56~~ | ~~The scoreboard update rules shall be provided to solve below two issues that discussed during last round of CC: 1) some MPDUs first be received through link1 (WinStartR in link1 at this time), then some following MPDUs are received through link2, after that an MPDU1 with WinStartR + 2^11 < SN1 < WinStartR is received from link1, MPDU1 will be dropped according to existing scoreboard updated rule in single link, but which is acctuly should not roppedped. 2) some MPDUs first be received through link1 (WinStartR in link1 at this time), then some following MPDUs (include MPDUs with WinStartR + 2^11 < SN1 < WinStartR) are received through link2, after that an MPDU2 with WinStartR < SN2 < WinEndR is received from link1, bits within [WinStartR, WinEndR] will be feedback to the originator MLD. But some bits that are set to 1s are recoding the reception status of last round of MPDUs, which will feedback to originator MLD incorrectly.~~ | ~~Complet the scoreboard update rule to solve the issues in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13765~~ | ~~Yuchen Guo~~ | ~~11.2~~ | ~~328.06~~ | ~~There is a practical need for the TDLS transmission between two STAs that are associated with different APs of the same Multiple BSSID set, but the current TDLS operation does not support that~~ | ~~Please add the procedure to enable the scenario~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1422r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13771~~ | ~~Yuchen Guo~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.42~~ | ~~a“d "in the received MU-RTS TXS Trigger fr”me" aft“r "the TXOP Sharing Mode subfield va”ue". Same for Line 49.~~ | ~~At 402.42 and 402.49, a“d "in the received MU-RTS TXS Trigger fr”me" aft“r "the TXOP Sharing Mode subfield va”ue".~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13773~~ | ~~Yuchen Guo~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.59~~ | ~~The MU EDCA is only used after UL transmission? what about P2P transmission?~~ | ~~Please clarify, or add corresponding rules for P2P transmission~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dmitry Akhmetov 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13783 | Yuchen Guo | 35.3.4.2 | 415.37 | Currently the information of the transmitting link shall always be solicited, however, in some scenarios, the information of the transmitting link is not needed. Please add rules to allow the non-AP MLD to optionally solicit the information of the transmitting link. No–e - the transmitting link means the link on which the ML probe request is transmitted. | As in the comment | Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Laurent Cariou 22/1428r2  Notes from Discussion:  < This proposal has been presented also in previous ballots and didn’t reach consensus.> |
| ~~13793~~ | ~~Yuchen Guo~~ | ~~35.3.12~~ | ~~440.50~~ | ~~According to Motion 146, #SP343 in doc 20/1935, 802.11be will define a ML (multi-link) SM power save mode. Currently the text for ML SM PS mode is missing~~ | ~~Please add the corresponding text for ML SM PS mode. The commenter will will a contribution to add the text.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Reject– -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yuchen Guo 22/1250r0~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13823~~ | ~~Yuchen Guo~~ | ~~35.3.23~~ | ~~479.06~~ | ~~This sentence is covered by the previous paragraph.~~ | ~~Either delete this sentence, or make some wording change to make it more accurate. E.g“, "All STAs affiliated with an MLD shall set the Mirrored SCS field of the Extended Capabilities elements that they transmit to the same va”ue"~~ | ~~Pending SP: From Dibakar: For 13823, I think it was already motioned in. The proposal was to delete a duplicate text which is removed in draft 2.2.~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1187r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13834~~ | ~~Sanghyun Kim~~ | ~~35.8.2~~ | ~~509.48~~ | ~~It is missing how an MLD negotiate the TWT agreement for the multiple links using a single TWT element.~~ | ~~Please define a procedure negotiating multiple TWT agreements using a single TWT element.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1526~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1526r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13840 | Sanghyun Kim | 35.3 | 404.49 | There are some radio measurement procedures that are affected by the constraints of the measuring STA. For example, a STA operating on an NSTR link might see busy channel more frequently than the other STA due to in-device interference. | To avoid errors in measurement results, it is necessary to provide radio measurement procedures for the EHT STAs that have constraints. (e.g. operating on an NSTR link pair, operating on an EMLSR link pair etc.,) | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 14, 2022, and then in October 27, 2022. SP result: 8Y, 29N, 29A.  Sanghyun Kim 22/1426r2 |
| ~~13845~~ | ~~Sanghyun Kim~~ | ~~35.2.1.2~~ | ~~399.52~~ | ~~It is recommended to allow to use protection mechanism(such as RTS/CTS exchange) between the non-AP STA and the peer STA.~~ | ~~As in comment.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1189~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Sanghyun Kim 22/1426r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13871~~ | ~~Ming Gan~~ | ~~35.8.2~~ | ~~509.61~~ | ~~The case of multi-link indicated by one TWT element is missing~~ | ~~please complete the missing case~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1526~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Ming Gan 22/1526r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13908~~ | ~~Ming Gan~~ | ~~35.3.8~~ | ~~431.56~~ | ~~if there is local scoreboard, the description about full status and partial status is missing~~ | ~~please complete the missing case~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1336~~  ~~Rejected – A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 9, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Abhishek Patil 22/1336r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13934~~ | ~~Ming Gan~~ | ~~35.3.16.8.2~~ | ~~460.11~~ | ~~please add mib variable to indicate whether the STA is able to obtain a TXOP during blindness period or not~~ | ~~add mib variable for this STA~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1188r1~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1188r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13956 | Geonjung Ko | 35.3.16.6 | 457.45 | Start time sync procedure is used for a non-AP MLD associated with an NSTR mobile AP MLD, regardless of whether the non-AP MLD is operating on an NSTR link pair. | Extend the procedure to a non-AP MLD associated with an NSTR mobile AP MLD. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 12, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dmitry Akhmetov 22/1442r4  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~13962~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.2~~ | ~~400.61~~ | ~~The AP would set its NAV, if it receives a P2P frame sent during the allocated time. Thus, when the AP receives the TXOP return signaling, the AP is difficult to use the remaining TXOP.~~ | ~~The AP should ignore its NAV that was set based on the P2P frame.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13963~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.10~~ | ~~"within the time allocation" is to indicate the period that the NAV is ignored, but the sentence has ambiguity to be interpreted as the period that the NAV is set.~~ | ~~Change the sentence to remove ambiguity. e.g. "the STA that sends the responding CTS shall ignore the NAV within the time allocation signaled in the MU-RTS TXS Trigger frame, if the NAV is set by the AP."~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13964~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.09~~ | ~~The description is not clear. "the NAV" here is the STA's NAV that is set based on a PPDU sent by the AP.~~ | ~~Change "the NAV that is set by the AP" to "the NAV that was set based on a PPDU sent from the AP".~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13965~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.10~~ | ~~Change "the NAV that is set by the AP" to "the NAV that was set by the AP".~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13967~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~403.10~~ | ~~The STA should not ignore the NAV after the STA sent the TXOP return signaling.~~ | ~~The STA can ignore the NAV until the STA transmits the TXOP return signaling.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13973~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.2~~ | ~~401.05~~ | ~~If the last PPDU transmission by the AP ends less than a PIFS and larger than SIFS before the end of the allocated time, the AP may transmit a PPDU a PIFS after the end of the allocated time. It results a gap larger than PIFS.~~ | ~~Modify the rule not to make a gap larger than PIFS.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yunbo Li 22/1265r1~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~13975~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.43~~ | ~~The relationship between the if condition and the behavior is unclear.~~ | ~~The non-AP EHT STA may transmit a QoS Data or QoS Null frame with the RDG/More PPDU subfield set to 0 in CAS Control subfield of the HE variant HT Control field to an associated AP to terminate the allocated time.~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Dibakar Das 22/1189r3~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 13984 | Geonjung Ko | 35.3.5.4 | 424.20 | Change "Common info" to "Common Info". | As in comment | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| 13985 | Geonjung Ko | 35.3.5.4 | 424.55 | Change "Common info" to "Common Info". | 35.3.5.4 | Pending SP: Majority Support. Done.  Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 8, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Insun Jang 22/1399r2  Notes from Discussion:  <> |
| ~~13989~~ | ~~Geonjung Ko~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~402.44~~ | ~~Need a restriction that the TXOP return signaling may be sent when the TXOP Sharing Mode subfield is equal to 2.~~ | ~~35.2.1.2.3~~ | ~~Pending SP~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Yunbo Li 22/1263r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| 14031 | kaiying Lu | 35.2.1.2.2 | 400.13 | AP behavior after the TXOP return should be defined. | As in comment. | Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.  This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.  Yunbo Li 22/1263r2  Notes from Discussion:  <The paragraph at P400L57 of 802.11be draft 2.1 already clarifies that an AP is allowed to do the transmission after the TXOP return occur. No additional behavior is needed.> |
| ~~14032~~ | ~~kaiying Lu~~ | ~~35.3.19~~ | ~~468.25~~ | ~~Nonprimary link power save management needs to be clarified.~~ | ~~Commenter will provide comment resolution~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/1357~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 7, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Morteza Mehrnoush 22/1357r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~14071~~ | ~~Liuming Lu~~ | ~~9.4.2.316~~ | ~~251.41~~ | ~~Currently 802.11be has not defined enough parameters of QoS Characteristics element for the latency sensitive traffic. And the potential support for the future TSN applications needs to be considered for the specification of the extended parameters of QoS Characteristics element.~~ | ~~Suggest to specify the extended parameters of QoS Characteristics element for the latency sensitive traffic. TSN paramerters can be used as a reference to specify the extended parameters of QoS Characteristics element.~~ | ~~Pending SP 22/???~~  ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 15, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Duncan Ho 22/1436r4~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |
| ~~14100~~ | ~~Li-Hsiang Sun~~ | ~~12.7.2~~ | ~~351.05~~ | ~~OCI KDE should have a corresponding MLO KDE defined because RNR in ML probe response is not protected~~ | ~~As in comment~~ | ~~Rejected -- A proposed resolution for “this CID” was discussed as part of the comment resolutions in “document”, however the group could not reach consensus on a proposed change that would resolve the comment.~~  ~~This CID is discussed on September 13, 2022, but no straw poll is conducted yet.~~  ~~Michael Montemurro 22/1356r2~~  ~~Notes from Discussion:~~  ~~<>~~ |