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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution for CIDs 8189, and 8286.

Revisions:

- Rev 0: Initial version of the document

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 TGah Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGah Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGah Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGah Editor” are instructions to the TGah editor to modify existing material in the TGah draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGah editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGah Draft.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 8199 | Myles, Andrew |  | Resolution of the last WG ballot was delayed based on questions related to missing LoAs on significant features in the draft. Ultimately, additional information was provided that provided a higher level of confidence that LoAs had been submitted for these features.However, this increased confidence was based on an interpretation of the current rules that has not yet been confirmed by the IEEE Standards Board. | No changes are proposed at this time, although I would encourage all those who assert they own standards essential IPR related to 802.11ah to submit LoAs under the new IEEE-SA IPR policy.However, I reserve the right to change my vote to "disapprove" if a new interpretation of current IEEE-SA IPR policy with respect to the 802.11ah LoA situation suggests that the claimed LOAs are invalid. | REJECTED: - The commenter has not requested a specific change. This comment is not part of an MBS comment. |
| 8286 | Fischer, Matthew |  | Despite the existence of at least one document asserting otherwise, it is not clear whether an acceptable LoA has been submitted by Qualcomm in relation to a long list of standards essential patents previously indicated by Qualcomm with reference to the TGah draft standard. In particular, the letter delivered from Qualcomm counsel to the IEEE 802.11 WG which supposedly provided assurance that an LOA exists to cover the IP in question, does not in fact provide any direct evidence or clear connection between the current and future Qualcomm IP related to the TGah draft and any LOA on file with 802.11. While the letter seems to state that such a connection exists, no evidence of that connection is therein provided, other than a vague statement suggesting that the readers of said letter should simply "trust us". Additionally, the LOA of reference is a blanket LOA and the wording of a blanket LOA appears to apply to all future IP relating to the standard in addition to existing IP. Again, the letter delivered from Qualcomm provides no direct assurance that this aspect of the LOA is or will be satisfied nor is there any way to independtly confirm any of the Qualcomm assertions without visibility to the exact terms of the vaguely referenced but unobservable agreement between Qualcomm and the formerly independent entity CSR. Again, the current state of affairs is one in which effectively, without direct evidence, a representative from Qualcomm has said "trust us".The SASB will take the lack of a clear LOA for the Qualcomm IP into account when determining whether or not to approve a standard. Accordingly, TGah participants should consider alternative technologies to replace the material covered by the Qualcomm patents. | The WG should follow the advice of the IEEE-A SB and consider alternative technologies for all features covered by the asserted standards essential patents. | REJECTED:  - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |

## Discussion: