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**Abstract**

This submission contains resolutions for CIDs 7047, 7056, 7065, 7072, 7076 (total of 5).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Resolution** |
| 7047 | 77.30 | 9.4.2.298 | "Table 9-322h23fb—Format And Bandwidth subfield" - the entries in the table impliy sort of a backward compatibility, as in a larger value signalled indicates support of all smaller values, is that accurate? | Clarify if a value signals only support of that specific value or all smaller values | **Revise.**  Submission 11-21-1944r2 addresses the same issue brought up by different CID and adopted by the group. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1944-02-00az-sa1-comment-resolution-for-seven-cids.docx>   TGaz editor, no further action needed beyond incorporation of 11-21-1944r2. |
| 7056 | 84.03 | 9.4.2.299 | Is the Secure LTF Parameters element included in the I2R LMR? If yes, why? Either way this should be carified. | Add a statement clarifying if the Secure LTF Parameters element is included in the I2R LMR. | **Revised.**  Agree with commenter, submission 11-21-1944r2 adopted changes to the text to clarify that the I2R LMR shall be included in the case of secure LTF measurement in the I2R LMR frame.   Refer to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1944-02-00az-sa1-comment-resolution-for-seven-cids.docx>   TGaz editor, no further action needed. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Resolution** |
| 7065 | 87.20 | 9.4.2.302 | Figure 9-788edt—AOD Feedback field format : Consider splitting the reserved field to align to the 32 bit boundary; I know there is also an interest to group reserved bits, but most CPUs work on byte and 32 bit boundaries | Suggested to split the reserved bits into two subfields of 4 bit (before AOD Elevation Accuracy) and 1 bit at the current location; or alternatively move all reserved bits before AOD Elevation Accuracy subfield | **Revise.**  TGaz editor make the following change to figure 9-788edt: switch between the AOD Elevation Accuracy field and the Reserved field such that the Reserved field shows at bit numbers B28 to B32 and the AOD Elevation Accuracy field shows between B33 and B39. |
| 7072 | 89.11 | 9.4.2.303 | Figure 9-788edw—PASN Parameters element Comeback field format : The size of the Comeback After subfield shows "0 or 2" - when is the size '0' ?? | Change size to '2' or add a statement explaining when the size is '0' | **Revise.**  TGaz editor make changes as shown below in  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0168-00-00az-TGaz-SAB1-Group-CR-part2.docx> |

**CID 7072 Resolution:**

**TGaz editor make changes to P802.11az D4.0 P.89 L.11 as follows:**where the Comeback After subfield is time in TUs after which the non-AP STA is requested to retry the PASN authentication. The Comeback After subfield is set to 0 indicates that the operation can be retried with the Cookie of nonzero length in the Cookie subfield. The Comeback After subfield Reserved in a PASN authentication frames from a non-AP STA.. (#1460, 16 #5019)

**TGaz editor change figure 90788edw in P802.11az D4.0 P.89 L.10 as follows: Change Comeback After field size in Figure 9-788 to 2 (i.e. delete 0 or) in the Comeback After field size.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/**  **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Resolution** |
| 7019 | 21.22 | 3.2 | Ranging NDP: A Ranging null data PPDU (NDP) announcement - not correct, and NDP-A would be announcement, while a HE Ranging NDP would be a thing | Remove | **Revised**.  TGaz editor delete "announcement" from P.21L.22. |
| 7020 | 21.33 | 3.2 | Zero power guard interval - not sure why this needs a definition | Remove or actually include information in the defition that is not given in the name | **Revise**.  Commenter is correct, the actual definition for zero power GI is provided in P.237L.10. This is a repetition. TGaz editor delete P.21L.33 zero power GI definition. |
| 7034 | 51.35 | 9.3.1.22.10.3 | Note - detail not necessary here | Remove | **Revise.**  Agree with the commenter, normative behaviour is provided for this field in clause 11.21.6.3.4 added by submission 11-21-1841r5.  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1841-05-00az-comment-resolution-sa1-he-ltf-repetitions.docx>  In P.168L.13 (11.21.6.3.4) there is a typo in the TF field name.  TGaz editor change P.168L.13 “STA Info field” to “User Info field”. |
| 7040 | 73.14 | 9.4.2.29.6 | "time 0 per RSTA’s TSF" - this means to meaningfully use this feature, the ISTA has to first acquire the RSTAs TSF from a beacon or similar | It would be good to have support for this feature without the need to first acquire TSF from the beacon | **Reject.**  The comment failed to identify an error or suggest a solution to an identified problem. |
| 7043 | 75.33 | 9.4.2.29.8 | "The use of the Ranging Parameters element is described in 11.21.6 (Fine timing measurement (FTM) procedure)." - this reference is a bit general | Change reference to 11.21.6.3 or 11.21.6.3.3 | **Reject**  Ranging parameters is described in multiple subsections of the FTM procedures (11.21.6) and so the appropriate subclause would be 11.21.6 and not the subcluase specific to negotiation 11.21.6.3 or 11.21.6.3.3 |