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Abstract

This document contains the potential resolutions to following comments on D4.0[1] on P802.11REVaxD4.0[2]:20111 and 21574.

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** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 21574 | 9.4.1.11 | 123 | 59 | In baseline spec, when a robust action category uses a name of "XXX", corresponding non-robust action category uses the name of "Unprotected XXX", e.g., Unprotetced S1G vs. S1G, Unprotected DMG vs. DMG, Unprotected WNM vs. WNM. This is because an action frame of an "Unprotected XXX" category is always sent unprotected, while an action frame marked as a robust category may still be sent unprotected, e.g., when at least one party (AP or non-AP STA) isn't capable of PMF. 11ax D4.0 went the opposite way by naming the robust category as "Protected HE" and the non-robust category as "HE", which may cause inconsistency or confusion. For example, an HE BSS Color Change Announcement action frame, under the "Protected HE" category, is transmitted unprotected when one party isn't capable of PMF, which is inconsistent with the title of the category. So, a general recommendation is to change the "HE" category to "Unprotected HE" and change the "Protected HE" category to "HE". Finally, the reference to "Table 9-524a" on P212L54 is wrong and should be "Table 9-524e". | First, change the two "HE" on P123L59 to "Unprotected HE". Then, change all instances of "HE Action" within Clause 9 and before P212L40 to "Unprotected HE Action". Then, change all instances of "Protected HE" within Clause 9 to "HE". Finally, change "Table 9-524a" on P212L54 to "Table 9-524e". | **There is no set requirement that this approach needs to be followed and has no bearing on the normative behaviour****Reject the first partsof the comment. Accept the editorial change in the last part of the comment.** **Instruct the editor to change Table 9-524a to 9-524e at cited location (D4.0 Page 212, Line 54).** |
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