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Abstract

This document provides CR for CIDs: 22048 22209 22293 22431

1. **Introduction**

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. The introduction and the explanation of the proposed changes are 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** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 22048 | Imran Latif |  | 27.3.22.2 | Reconsider Channelization for 6 GHz. Channel center frequencies are defined at every integer multiple of 5 MHz above 5940 MHz. This leaves only 10 MHz of the Guard-Band between U-NII-5 and U-NII-4 which will make the filter design extremely challenging. In addition, with the current channelization, there is no single 80 MHz channel in U-NII-6. Given that U-NII-6 and adjoining U-NII-5 and U-NII-7 bands may operate under different regulatory rules, it would be better to have more self-contained channels within 6 GHz band. | Both of these issues could be addressed by simply moving the starting frequency of the channelization by 10 MHz, i.e., from 5490 to 5950 MHz. A submission clarifying this point has already been made and provided. | Revised – this issue has been already discussed in this group. It was proposed to wait for more information from regulators regarding operating at 6 GHz before making changes to the channelization. The comment should therefore be resubmitted in a future ballot.After the sentence “Insert the following rows and update the “reserved” row appropriately in Table E-4:” page 761 line 16 in draft 5.1, insert the following sentence: “NOTE – channelization may be revised in a later revision, when we have more information on the regulatory context”. |
| 22209 | Mark RISON |  |  | The baseline already uses the abbreviation SRP to refer to Stream Reservation Protocol, so it cannot be used in this amendment to refer to Spatial Reuse Protocol | Change all instances of "SRP" to "Spatial Reuse Protocol" throughout | Revised – agree with the commenter. Change “SRP” to “PSR” throughout the specification. Remove the following definitions in section 3.2:spatial reuse parameters (SRP) opportunity: a spatial reuse opportunity that is established based on thevalue of a Spatial Reuse field in the HE-SIG-A field of a high efficiency (HE) trigger-based (TB) physicallayer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU) and/or the UL Spatial Reuse subfield in the Common Info field of aTrigger frame.spatial reuse parameters reception (SRPR) physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (SRPR PPDU): aPPDU that contains a Trigger frame that has a value in the UL Spatial Reuse subfield of the Common Infofield that is neither SRP\_DISALLOW nor SRP\_AND\_NON\_SRG\_OBSS\_PD\_PROHIBITED.spatial reuse parameters transmission (SRPT) physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU) (SRPTPPDU): a PPDU that is transmitted during a spatial reuse parameters (SRP) opportunity by an HE STAwhen SRP conditions for SRP-based spatial reuse operation are satisfied and that has the SR PPDU subfieldof the CAS Control field equal to 1. Also, make the changes marked as #22209 in this document |
| 22293 | Mark RISON |  | 26.10.2 | In OBSS\_PD spatial reuse, it is now clear how "RSSI is low because device is far away and so there is a largepath loss, so it's OK for me to transmit as long as I don't transmit tooloudly" and "RSSI is low because device is close but has chosen to transmitquietly, so it's not OK for me to transmit, even quietly" are distinguished | Clarify | Reject – OBSS\_PD currently does not differenciate these 2 cases, and does not need to.  |
| 22431 | Naotaka Sato | 763.21 | E.1 | Too early to define the operating class for 6 GHz. | Delete all channel center frequency index from the table. | Revised – this issue has been already discussed in this group. It was proposed to wait for more information from regulators regarding operating at 6 GHz before making changes to the channelization. The comment should therefore be resubmitted in a future ballot.After the sentence “Insert the following rows and update the “reserved” row appropriately in Table E-4:” page 761 line 16 in draft 5.1, insert the following sentence: “NOTE – channelization may be revised in a later revision, when we have more information on the regulatory context”. |
| 22557 | Yusuke Tanaka | 763.27 | E.1 Country information and operating classes | The NPRM was issued by FCC in October 2018, and it proposed to define four U-NIIs in this band. At the same time regulation for use of 6GHz is still under discussion in regulatory athrities, and nothing is decided yet. During the IEEE 802.11 meeting in July 2019, there was dicusion about channelization in this band based on a contribution (19/1199r1), and there were oponions that channelization should be determined after final dicision comes out.The current frequency index was added in D2.3 after 2018 March meeting and does not reflect the latest available information (e.g. NPRM). If It should be alligned with opinions to wait final decision of regulatory authorities (e.g. US R&O), the current frequency index is not useful becasue nothing is decided yet.Frequency index should be blank until final decision comes out, or reflect the latest available information. | Remove contents in column "Channel center frequency index". | Revised – as expressed in the comment, this issue has been already discussed in this group. It was proposed to wait for more information from regulators regarding operating at 6 GHz before making changes to the channelization. Leaving the table as is or making it blank as proposed in this comment does not change this outcome. After the sentence “Insert the following rows and update the “reserved” row appropriately in Table E-4:” page 761 line 16 in draft 5.1, insert the following sentence: “NOTE – channelization may be revised in a later revision, when we have more information on the regulatory context”. |

1. **Proposed changes**

**3.2 Definitions specific to IEEE 802.11**

[…]

***TGax editor: Modify the following definitions in subclause 3.2 Definitions specific to IEEE802.11 (#22209):***

**parameterized spatial reuse parameters (PSR) opportunity:** a spatial reuse opportunity that is established based on the value of a Spatial Reuse field in the HE-SIG-A field of a high efficiency (HE) trigger-based (TB) physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU) and/or the UL Spatial Reuse subfield in the Common Info field of a Trigger frame.

**parameterized spatial reuse reception (PSRR) physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PSRR PPDU):** a PPDU that contains a Trigger frame that has a value in the UL Spatial Reuse subfield of the Common Info field that is neither PSR\_DISALLOW nor PSR\_AND\_NON\_SRG\_OBSS\_PD\_PROHIBITED.

**parameterized spatial reuse transmission (PSRT) physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU) (PSRT PPDU):** a PPDU that is transmitted during a parameterized spatial reuse (PSR) opportunity by an HE STA when PSR conditions for PSR-based spatial reuse operation are satisfied and that has the SR PPDU subfield of the CAS Control field equal to 1.

**3.4 Abbreviations and acronyms**

**[…]**

***TGax editor: Modify the following definition (#22209):***

PSR parameterized spatial reuse

***TGax editor: replace SRP by PSR in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace SRPT by PSRT in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace SRPR by PSRR in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace SRP-based by PSR-based in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace SRP\_AND\_NON\_SRG\_OBSS\_PD\_PROHIBITED by PSR\_AND\_NON\_SRG\_OBSS\_PD\_PROHIBITED in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace SRP\_DISALLOW by PSR\_DISALLOW in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace dot11HEPSROptionImplemented by dot11HEPSROptionImplemented in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace dot11HESRPbasedSRSupportImplemented by dot11HEPSRbasedSRSupportImplemented in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***

***TGax editor: replace SRP\_INPUT by PSR\_INPUT in all occurrances throughput the spec (#22209)***