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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for multiple comments related to TGax D3.0 with the following CIDs (8 CIDs):

* 16838, 15850, 15098, 15104, 15668, 15757, 15832, 16450

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the draft.
* Rev 1: Revised during the discussion.

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **P.L** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16838 | Song-Haur An | 466 | Does N\_RU include the RU that has no user (e.g., STA ID=2046)? | Please clarify because the implication is different depending on the answer. | Rejected –  The commenter is asking a question. N\_RU represents the number of occupied RUS in transmission. And RU identified by STA\_ID 2046 is idle (i.e., not occupied).  Pleaser refer to table 28-16. |
| 15850 | Laurent Cariou | 253.05 | For operating at 6GHz, STAs and APs may be forced to use local max power that are very localized in frequency. There should be a way for APs to inform its associated STAs about those local max power with different frequency bandwidth granularities and rules for STAs to respect those limits. The information provided may be within the operating BW of the AP or outside the operating BW of the AP. | As in comment | Revised –  A similar CID was resolved in 11-18/0097r3. The proposed resolution is to specify that the STAs follow the mandatory rules defined in 11.7.5 (Specification of regulatory and local maximum transmit power levels) if the STA has received Transmit Power Envelope elements and combinations of Country and Power Constraint elements received on that channel from that AP to which the STA is currently associated.  TGax editor to make the changes shown in 11-18/0097r3 under all headings that include CID 15650. |
| 15098 | Abhishek Patil | 317.58 | The terms TWT Scheduling AP or TWT Scheduled STA applies to STAs participating in Broadcast TWT (i.e., send or receive broadcast TWT element) - i.e., Broadcast field = 1. Since Wake TBTT is treated as a form of Individual TWT, it is confusing to refer to the STAs involved in Wake TBTT as Scheduling or Scheduled. Also Fig 27-8 includes Wake TBTT as an example of broadcast TWT operation. | 11ax modifications to TWT element allows defining a parameter set for each variant (i.e., separate Parameter set for I-TWT and for B-TWT). It would be cleaner to define a separate parameter set for Wake-TBTT (consisting of only the fields relevant to this feature). The definition of TWT Scheduling AP and Scheduled STA can be extended to cover Wake-TBTT. Further, remove Wake TBTT from Fig 27-8 and show the operation in a separate figure in section 27.7.6 | Revised –  Proposed resolution is to renamc them as to avoid confusion.  TGax editor: Replace “TWT Scheduled STA” with “TBTT scheduled STA” and “TWT scheduling AP” with “TBTT scheduling AP” throughout 27.8.6 of IEEE802.11ax D3.3. |
| 15104 | Abhishek Patil | 329.51 | TWT Scheduling AP and TWT Schedule STAs are terms used with respect to broadcast TWT. Since Wake TBTT is treated as a special form of Individual TWT, these terms don't apply. | Either update the definition of Wake TBTT to be a variant of Broadcast TWT (or a TWT variant of it's own - preferred option!) or update the terms in this section to TWT Requesting and TWT Responding STA. | Revised –  TGax editor: Replace “TWT Scheduled STA” with “TBTT scheduled STA” and “TWT scheduling AP” with “TBTT scheduling AP” throughout 27.8.6 of IEEE802.11ax D3.3. |
| 15668 | Huizhao Wang | 370.27 | Allowing HE BSS and VHT BSS operate with different bandwidth capabilities to accommondate different operating environments, business needs and flexibilities | Change the text to: "A STA transmitting a VHT Capabilities element and HE Capabilities element should set the Supported Channel Width Set subfield of the VHT Capabilities element to a value that indicates the same channel width capability as the channel width capability indicated in the HE Capabilities element, except when the STA is a 20 MHz-only non-AP HE STA in which case the Supported Channel Width Set subfield of the VHT Capabilities element is reserved.' | Rejected –  It is not clear the relationship of the amendment (HE and VHT) and the bandwidth that they support. The spec currently requires the BWs to be the same since HE STAs are VHT STAs. We do actually have only an exception for the 20 MHz-only devices. |
| 15757 | Jarkko Kneckt | 326.20 | The TWT Information frame is a management frame which handling/reception/parsing the content in the receiving STA takes time. A STA may transmit a TWT Information frame to teminate an ongoing TWT SP. For the receiving device the processing time of the TWT Information frame may be too long for immediate TWT SP termination. The immediate SP termination would be better to do through EOSP or more data bits which handling time is much shorter. | Please change that EOSP (or PM) bit controls the termination of the currently ongoing TWT SP and the TWT Information frame controls the future TWT SPs, i.e. whether the STA be available at future TWT SP. Please allow a STA to terminate the ongoing SP without a transmission of the TWT Information frame. | Rejected –  The comment fails to identify a technical issue and seems to be hinting into an implementation issue which is out of scope of the standard. The proposed change on the other hand suggests the addition of another option for providing an existing functionality. |
| 15832 | Laurent Cariou | 371.22 | a multi-band non-AP STA should be able to provide more capabilities about its collocated non-AP STA in another band (6GHz). The multi-band element is the current solution in 802.11 specification to describe a collocated STA, so this would be the natural solution. The multi-band element should however be modified to include an optional subelement field to be able to include capabilities and other information on 6GHz operation. | Modify multi-band element to include optional subelements field and defines normative text associated to its usage in 27.16.1 | Revised –  A solution that uses RNR element was proposed and discussed as described in 11-18/1227r13 to provide these functionalities.  TGax editor to make the changes shown in 11-18/1227r13 under all headings that include all CIDs. |
| 16450 | Matthew Fischer | 370.52 | Need a mechanism to convey a list of subchannels that are restricted (i.e. no transmissions allowed on those channels) to support a punctured channel mode of operation. Also need some text describing which punctured choices are allowed. | Create an element that can be carried in various management frames and potentially additionally create a management action frame to also carry it, the element conveying transmission-restricted channels. Create an allowed set of punctured channels. | Rejected –  The group tried to reach consensus on this subject as per discussions evolved in 11-18/496r1-r15. Based on those discussions the commenter removed that portion of the proposal that introduced this idea due to no consensus. |

**Discussion: *None.***