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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution for SB0 CID 8189

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 Taskgroup takes note of the concern made by the commenter. However the commenter has not requested a specific change and this comment is not part of an MBS (‘Must be Satisfied’) comment. |

## Discussion: