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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs: 2313, 2342, 2352, 2359 and 2351.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2342 | 31.6.1 | 55 | 13 | A WUR non-AP should have a remedy in case the WUR AP chooses to transmit to it using HDR and if HDR doesn't work well as a part of the WUR negotiation process. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised—Agree in principle with the comment. An optional Recommended WUR Parameter subfield, which includes a Recommended WUR Wake Up Frame Rate field, and the associated procedures have been added in 802.11ba Draft 2.1.No further changes are needed. |
| 2352 | 9.4.2.273 | 31 | 8 | A non-AP STA should be able to opt to receive a WUR frame at low data rate. High and low data rates are defined in the draft, but a non-AP STA has no remedy if the AP decides to transmit to in high data rate. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and subclause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised—Agree in principle with the comment. An optional Recommended WUR Parameter subfield, which includes a Recommended WUR Wake Up Frame Rate field, and the associated procedures have been added in 802.11ba Draft 2.1.No further changes are needed. |
| 2359 | 4.3.15a | 22 | 2 | A WUR non-AP STA that supports reception of WUR PPDU with High Data Rate may fail to receive the WUR frame in bad channel conditions. In such situations, it would be better for the WUR AP to switch to Low Data Rate; however currently there is no mechanism for WUR STAs to provide feedback to the WUR AP. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised—Agree in principle with the comment. An optional Recommended WUR Parameter subfield, which includes a Recommended WUR Wake Up Frame Rate field, and the associated procedures have been added in 802.11ba Draft 2.1.No further changes are needed. |
| 2313 | 31.9 | 62 | 60 | A STA should have remedy if a WUR channel assigned to it by the AP is not desired, due to channel conditions etc. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised—Agree in principle with the comment. An optional Recommended WUR Parameter subfield, which includes a Recommended WUR Channel Offset field, and the associated procedures have been added in 802.11ba Draft 2.1.No further changes are needed. |
| 2351 | 9.4.2.273 | 31 | 43 | A non-AP STA should have the capability to indicate the preferred WUR channel to its AP since there may be quite a bit of frequency selectivity for a 4 MHz wide channel. Currently, a non-AP STA doesn't have any remedy if it is assigned a bad channel by its WUR AP. | Picking up on comments made in the previous letter ballot on D1.0, the TG did not properbly address the issue raised in the comment, nor does the TG provide an indication that the text commented on has been deleted and hence the comment does not apply. (Note, page and line and sublause number refer to D1.0). In fact, as stated in the TGba minutes (11-19/226r0), the intend of the task group was to "Move to resolve CIDs that have no approved resolution as rejected with a reason read "TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" in the interest of releasing draft 2.0". Also, the statement ""TGba is unable to reach consensus on a resolution" was added to the motion text there was one person speaking against the motion." was only added to the motion after objection to the original motion trying to reject comments in bulk with the reason of releasing a new LB.The TG is asked to give the original comment due consideration and debade the proposed comment resolution as included in 11-18/1794r10. The referenced document includes an actionable comment resolution. | Revised—Agree in principle with the comment. An optional Recommended WUR Parameter subfield, which includes a Recommended WUR Channel Offset field, and the associated procedures have been added in 802.11ba Draft 2.1.No further changes are needed. |