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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions on the following 6 CIDs related to 9.3.1.22.1.1 Common Info field for CC36.

CIDs: 4501, 4808, 5791, 6689, 6690, 6691

# 

Revision Notes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R0 | Initial revision |
| R1 | Updated the proposed text changes according to offline discussion and 11be D1.1 |
| R2 | Further updated the proposed text changes according to offline discussion |
| R3 | Replace “HE non-AP STA” by “non-EHT HE non-AP STA” |

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 TGbe D1.1 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbe D1.1 Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

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

## CID 5791

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page. Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 83.3 | 9.3.1.22.1.1 | Common Info field of Trigger frame has HE variant and EHT variant. However, it is unclear how a STA differentiates these two variants. | At the beginning of this subclause, insert the following paragraph: "The Common Info field has two variants: HE variant and EHT variant. An EHT non-AP STA shall interpret the Common Info field of a received Trigger frame as the EHT variant. | Revised  Agreed it is necessary to clarify how a STA interprets these two variants (equivalently how thest two variants are used).  **Instruction to the editor**, please incorporate the changes as shown in 21/1233r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1233-03-00be-cc36-cr-on-9.3.1.22.1.1.docx>), under CID 5791. |

**Proposed Text Change:**

**TGbe editor**: ***at P93L62 of 11be D1.1,*** ***please insert the following as the first paragraph of 9.3.1.22.1.1 Common Info field*** (CID 5791)

The Common Info field in a Trigger frame is interpreted differently by non-EHT HE non-AP STAs and EHT non-AP STAs. A non-EHT HE non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as HE variant. An EHT non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as HE variant if B54 and B55 in the Common Info field are equal to 1; and interprets the Common Info field as EHT variant otherwise.

## CID 4501

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page. Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 83.9 | 9.3.1.22.1.1 | The spec specifies the common info format for the HE vairant and EHT variant. However, it is not clear how a receiver interpert the common info filed. | Add some clarification text like EHT variant common info field is backward compatible to the HE variant common info filed. HE STA always interpret the common field as HE variant while the EHT STA always interpret the common field as the EHT variant. | Revised  Agreed it is necessary to clarify how a STA interprets these two variants (equivalently how thest two variants are used).  Instruction to the editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 21/1233r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1233-03-00be-cc36-cr-on-9.3.1.22.1.1.docx>), under CID 5791. |

## CID 4808

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page. Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 83.14 | 9.3.1.22.1.1 | The main difference between the HE variant and the EHT variant Common Info field seems to be about the content of the bits 54-62. If so, either find a way to combine the two Common Info fields into a single figure or, have normative sentences describing when the HE and EHT variant Common Info field is used. | As in comment. | Revised  Considering more reserved bits in the Common Info field may be used for 11be R2, it is better to keep the two variants of Common Info field for improving readability. However, it is necessary to clarify how a STA interprets these two variants (equivalently how thest two variants are used).  Instruction to the editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 21/1233r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1233-03-00be-cc36-cr-on-9.3.1.22.1.1.docx>), under CID 5791. |

## CID 6689

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page. Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 83.9 | 9.3.1.22.1.1 | Is it necessary to create two different variant names for the Common Info field? I can't find a single reference to "HE variant of the Common Info field" in the entire D1.0. If we indeed go this route, then all occurrence of the "Common Info field" must be changed to either one of the two variants to be consistent, which looks like a lots of work. Majority of the subfields have the same meaning for both variants, so it may be simpler to simply call out the actual subfields that differ between the two variants (e.g. the UL HE SIG-A2 Reserved) and explain the difference. For e.g., which common Info field variant is the following sentence referring to: "The UL Length subfield of the Common Info field indicates the value of the L-SIG LENGTH field of the solicited TB PPDU"? | Either qualify all occurrence of the "Common Info field" in the subclause and elsewhere as either one of the two variants, or do away with the variants. | Revised  Considering more reserved bits in the Common Info field may be used for 11be R2, it is better to keep the two variants of Common Info field for improving readability. However, it is necessary to clarify how a STA interprets these two variants (equivalently how thest two variants are used).  Basically, an HE non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as HE variant. If B54 and B55 in the Common Info field are equal to 1, an EHT non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as HE variant. Otherwise, the EHT non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as EHT variant.  Based on the above clarification, it is unnecessary to qualify all occurrence of the "Common Info field" in the subclause.  Instruction to the editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 21/1233r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1233-03-00be-cc36-cr-on-9.3.1.22.1.1.docx>), under CID 5791. |

## CID 6690

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page. Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 84.01 | 9.3.1.22.1.1 | Is it necessary to create two different variant names for the Common Info field? There is only a single reference to "EHT variant of the Common Info field" in the entire D1.0. If we indeed go this route, then all occurrence of the "Common Info field" must be changed to either one of the two variants to be consistent, which looks like a lots of work. Majority of the subfields have the same meaning for both variants, so it may be simpler to simply call out the actual subfields that differ between the two variants (e.g. the UL HE SIG-A2 Reserved) and explain the difference. | Either qualify all occurrence of the "Common Info field" in the subclause and elsewhere as either one of the two variants, or do away with the variants. | Revised  Considering more reserved bits in the Common Info field may be used for 11be R2, it is better to keep the two variants of Common Info field for improving readability. However, it is necessary to clarify how a STA interprets these two variants (equivalently how thest two variants are used).  Basically, an HE non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as HE variant. If B54 and B55 in the Common Info field are equal to 1, an EHT non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as HE variant. Otherwise, the EHT non-AP STA interprets the Common Info field as EHT variant.  Based on the above clarification, it is unnecessary to qualify all occurrence of the "Common Info field" in the subclause.  Instruction to the editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 21/1233r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1233-03-00be-cc36-cr-on-9.3.1.22.1.1.docx>), under CID 5791. |

## CID 6691

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page. Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 84.01 | 9.3.1.22.1.1 | Is it necessary to create two different variant names for the Common Info field? How does a non-AP STA receiving a TF figure out which variant is it? For an HE non-AP STA, it will always be an HE variant Common Info field since it doesn't understand existence of the Special User Info fields etc. For an EHT non-AP STA, is it always an EHT variant Common Info field or the variant depends on the setting of some fields, e.g. the Special User Info field Present bit? Please clarify. As a reference, the Frame control field is not called a non-S1G variant, or a S1G variant, even though the format is different based on the host PPDU. | Evaluate whether it is necessary to have the two variants else simply call out the relevant subfields that differ between the two variants (e.g. the UL HE SIG-A2 Reserved) and explain the difference where necessary. | Revised  Considering more reserved bits in the Common Info field may be used for 11be R2, it is better to keep the two variants of Common Info field for improving readability. However, it is necessary to clarify how a STA interprets these two variants (equivalently how thest two variants are used).  Instruction to the editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 21/1233r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1233-03-00be-cc36-cr-on-9.3.1.22.1.1.docx>), under CID 5791. |