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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for comments 9065 related to TGah D6.0.

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.***

# PARS I

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 9065 | Rolfe, Benjamin |  | Comment i-286 is rejected because the commenter due to lack of a specific technical change to the draft being provided. The commenter raises serious and valid concerns regarding adherence to IEEE-SA policies regarding draft content. As the resolution does not explain how those concerns have been addressed, either directly or by reference, this voter is left with the impression the concerns are valid and unresolved, raising signficant doubt that the draft is practical to implement and in compliance with the criteria for approval of a project request by the 802 EC. | Withdraw the draft from sponsor ballot and rescind the withdraw the PAR. This will clearly resolve any potential violations of IEEE policy wrt this draft. Alternately, provide references to appropriate documents that are openly available to address the original commenter's concerns. | 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. |

**Discussions:**

Quoting Comment i-286 from previous SB phase:

*"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."*

Quoting proposed change for that Comment i-286:

*“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.”*

Quoting the proposed resolution for that Comment i-286:

*“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.”*