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##### This submission presents proposed resolution to CIDs 8091, 8072 and 8073. Changes indicated by instructions.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 8091 | 4.3.14 | 77 | 37 | "The IEEE Std 802.11 VHT STA operates in frequency bands below 6 GHz excluding the 2.4 GHz band." suggests a VHT STA can be an 11ah, 11af, 11y or 11p STA, but this seems incompatible with or at least confusing w.r.t. "A VHT STA is an HT STA." | Delete the cited text and add ", but does not operate in the 5 GHz band" to the end of the next para, just before the full stop |

***Discussion:***

Referring to the first two paragraphs in clause 4.3.14, I would agree with the commenter that the description here is not clear especially on the scenario when a VHT STA is an HT STA.

******

However, the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.

***Resolution***

*Reject.*

The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 8072 | 6.3.4.2.2 | 159 | 42 | "The capabilities to be advertised for the BSS." is misleading since it's the capabilities for the STA not the BSS. Ditto for HT Capabilities in the next row | Change the cited text to "The STA capabilities to be advertised." In the cell below change the first sentence to "The STA's HT capabilities to be advertised. " |

***Discussion:***

Referring to clause 6.3.4.2 (MLME-JOIN.request), there are two primitive parameters, CapabilityInformation and HT Capabilities, with the following description:



 

The commenter argues that the description for these two parameters is not correct. Instead of being advertised for the BSS, it specifies the parameters that are used to indicate requested or advertised optional capabilities.

Indeed, there is also a primitive parameter VHT Capabilities with the following description for your reference:



However, the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.

There are two way forward options for the group to decide:

Option 1:

* Reject the resolution with the following reason: “the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.”

Option 2:

* Revised with the following changes:
* At line 159.42, replace “The capabilities to be advertised for the BSS.” with “The STA capabilities to be advertised.”
* At line 159.46, replace “The capabilities to be advertised for the BSS.” with “Specifies the parameters in the HT Capabilities element that are supported by the STA.”

***Resolution***

*Reject.*

The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 8073 | 6.3.11.2.2 | 203 | 51 | "The additional HT capabilities to beadvertised for the BSS." -- no, that's not what the parameter carries | Change the cited text to "Provides additional information for operatingthe HT BSS." |

***Discussion:***

Referring to clause 6.3.11.2.2 (MLME-START.request), there is a primitive parameter, HT Capabilities, with the following description:



However, the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.

There are two way forward options for the group to decide:

Option 1:

* Reject the resolution with the following reason: “the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.”

Option 2:

* Revised with the following change:
* At line 203.39, replace “The capabilities to be advertised for the BSS.” with “Specifies the parameters in the HT Capabilities element that are supported by the STA.”

***Resolution***

*Reject.*

The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 8002 | C.3 | 2949 | 00 | Per Table 9-133 (p. 832), the AKM Suite OUI field can be either an OUI or CID. | Add "or CID". |

***Discussion:***

Referring to the cited text, CID is missing as per Table 9-133.



***Resolution***

*Accept.*