**IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CR for CIDs on TID-to-Link Mapping Part 2 | | | | |
| Date: 2022-04-28 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Yongho Seok | Mediatek |  |  | yongho.seok@mediatek.com |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for multiple comments related to TGbe D1.0 with the following CIDs (46 CIDs):

* 7851, 6406, 5249, 6355, 5609, 4109, 5215, 6284, 5246, 5216, 6285, 8191, 6982, 5610, 6951, 8190, 6286, 6527, 6952, 5079, 6761, 7332, 6953, 5247, 6402, 6362, 5248, 6954, 6363, 7412, 7817, 8192, 8193, 4824, 7411
* 4661, 4660, 5158, 5145, 5078, 5955, 5193, 7589, 7590, 7410, 6955 (11 CIDs): Need more discussion

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

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

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbe 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** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5609 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.01 | Statements describe interpretation of TID-to-link Mapping Negotiation Supported subfield values of 0 and 2, but not 1 | Add description of meaning of other non-zero values of TID-to-link Mapping Negotiation Supported subfield. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 5609. |
| **35.3.6.1.3 Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping**  **TGbe Editor: *Change paragraphs below of this subclause as follows (#CID 5609):***  An MLD may support TID-to-link mapping negotiation. An MLD that supports TID-to-link mapping negotiation has dot11TIDtoLinkMappingActivated equal to true and shall set to a nonzero value the TID-to-link Mapping Negotiation Supported subfield in the MLD Capabilities field of the Basic Multi-Link element that it transmits. ~~Otherwise it~~ An MLD that does not support TID-to-link mapping negotiation has dot11TIDtoLinkMappingActivated equal to false and shall set the TID-to-link Mapping Negotiation Supported subfield to 0. If the TID-to-link Mapping Negotiation Supported subfield value received from a peer MLD is equal to 2, the MLD that initiate a TID-to-link mapping negotiation to the peer MLD shall send ~~to the peer MLD~~ only the TID-to-link Mapping element where all TIDs are mapped to the same link set. If the TID-to-link Mapping Negotiation Supported subfield value received from a peer MLD is equal to 1, the MLD that initiate a TID-to-link mapping negotiation to the peer MLD shall send the TID-to-link Mapping element where each TID is mapped to the same or different link set. | | | | | |
| 4109 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.07 | What is "in a multi-link (re)setup procedure ..."? | Replace "In" with "During" | Accepted |
| 6406 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 258.22 | The text should clarify that despite rejection of the proposed TID-to-link mapping (Re)Association may still be successful. Moreover the STA should have the ability during setup to indicate/signal that if the requested TID-to-link is not accepted, (Re)Association is rejected as well. | as in comment | Revised-  The multi-link setup and TID-to-link mapping negotiation are independent each other.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 6406. |
| 5215 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.17 | Very confusing text. Please clarify the text under what condition(s) that the TID-to-link Mapping IE shall not be included in (Re)Association Response frame. | Re-phrase the text to make it understanble | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 5215. |
| **35.3.6.1.3 Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping**  **TGbe Editor: *Change paragraphs below of this subclause as follows (#CID 6406, 5215):***  After receiving the (Re)Association Request frame containing the TID-To-Link Mapping element, the AP MLD shall reply to the (Re)Association Request frame according to 11.3.5.3 (AP, AP MLD, or PCP association receipt procedures), 11.3.5.5 (AP, AP MLD, or PCP reassociation receipt procedures), and 35.3.5 (Multi-link (re)setup), ~~with the following additional rules:~~ and perfom the following TID-to-link mapping negotiation procedure: (#6406)  —The AP MLD can accept the requested TID-to-link mapping in the TID-to-link Mapping element in the received (Re)Association Request frame only if it accepts the multi-link (re)setup for all links on which at least one TID is requested to be mapped. ~~In this case, it~~ The AP MLD that accepts the requested TID-to-link mapping (#5215) shall not include in the (Re)Association Response frame the TID-to-link Mapping element.  —Otherwise, it shall indicate rejection of the proposed TID-to-link mapping by including in the (Re)Association Response frame the TID-to-link Mapping element that suggests a preferred TID-to-link mapping. | | | | | |
| 6355 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 258.62 | It is not clear how AP would schedule UL transmission when TID to link mapping is enabled. The BSR sent to the AP does not have TID per link information and the AP can't know which links need to be triggered to benefit from all the links mapped to specific traffic | The AP should be able to know BSR per TID to be able to decide which link to trigger. Define per TID BSR | Rejected-  The Queue Size subfield in the QoS Control filed can provide the buffer status for a TID. |
| 6284 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.17 | The first bullet does not make sense since TID-to-link mapping and association are two different negotiations. It is not reasonable to bond them together. | please address this issue | Rejected-  There is no technical problem when the TID-to-link mapping negotiation is performed together with the association.  Also, other negotiation procedure (e.g., TWT) is already allowed during the association in the baseline spec. |
| 5246 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.18 | For the condition "only if .... all links on which at least one TID,..", should we consider to accept all links? E.g., TID 1 is requested on link 2 &3, but the AP MLD didn't accept the link 3 for ML setup while link 2 is OK. In this case, the requested TID-to-link mapping may be acceptable since MSDUs with TID 1 can be transmitted on link 2. | As in the comment, please clarify the condition | Rejected-  The example is correct.  Accepting all links is aligned with the TID-to-link mapping neogiation procedure. |
| 5216 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.22 | What is the procedure for non-AP MLD to reject the suggested "preferred TID-to-link mapping" from AP MLD? | Please add text for the case that non-AP STA rejects the suggested TID-to-link mapping from the AP MLD | Rejected-  The preferred TID-to-link mapping is present only when the TID-to-link mapping negotiation is rejected.  Since the TID-to-link mapping negotiation is already rejected, no other text is needed. |
| 6285 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.22 | If this is rejection for TID-to-link mapping, is there any related status code of this rejection? | as in the comment | Rejected-  The comment fails to identify a specific issue to be addressed. It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |
| 8191 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.22 | "it shall indicate rejection of the proposed TID-to-link mapping by including in the (Re)Association Response frame the TID-to-link Mapping element that suggests a preferred TID-to-link mapping". The AP MLD also can set the Status Code to <ANA> (DENIED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING) without any suggestion of preferred TID-to-link mapping | as in comment | Rejected-  If the Status code is not set to SUCCESS, the multi-link setup fails.  If the AP MLD can’t not accept the requested TID-to-link mapping, it can use the default mode. |
| 6982 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.32 | If an Initiating MLD can transmit Request frames with a rejected mapping (by the Responding MLD) without any restrictions, the Initiating MLD may try to request the rejected mapping again and again.  It is obvious that an Initiating MLD shall not transmit Request frame with a rejected mapping by the Responding MLD until TBD time point(or TBD duration). Please add the restriction(s) for the negotiation procedure. | A restriction should be added to prevent repeated negotiation failures. | Rejected-  Other negotiation protocol (e.g., TWT) can also continues the rejected request.  Additional restriction should be implementation specific. |
| 5610 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.46 | Description of TID-to-Link mapping negotiation does not specify how a requesting MLD should respond to a Mapping Response frame with a Status Code of <ANA> (PREFERRED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING\_SUGGESTED. Behavior is inferred in text on line 56, but is not explicit. | Add text or note indicating that after receiving response with status code other than SUCCESS, requesting MLD may initiate a new negotiation. | Rejected-  Anytime, an MLD can initiate a TID-to-link mapping neogotiation. |
| 6951 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.49 | Need to clarify the following: 1. What is the suggested(preffered) link of a TID in case that the TID is missing in the TID-to-link mapping element in an unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response frame? 2. Suggested link(s) of a TID shall be a setup link(s) of the two MLD | As in the comment | Rejected-  If the TID is missing in the TID-to-link mapping element in an unsolicited TID-To-Link Mapping Response frame, there is no suggested link.  In 35.3.7.1.1, please see the following:  “When both MLDs have explicitly negotiated a TID-to-link mapping by following the procedure defined in 35.3.7.1.3 (Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping), a TID can be mapped to a link set, which is a subset of setup links, spanning from only one setup link to all the setup links, with restrictions defined in 35.3.7.1.3 (Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping).” |
| 8190 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.51 | "An MLD shall not send an unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response frame that includes the TID-to-link Mapping element and sets the Status Code to 0 (SUCCESS)", An MLD also shall not set Status Code to <ANA> (DENIED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING) | changes to: An MLD shall not send an unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response frame that includes the TID-to-link Mapping element and sets the Status Code to a value other than<ANA> (DENIED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING) | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Fixed the missing Status Code.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 8190. |
| **35.3.6.1.3 Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping**  **TGbe Editor: *Change paragraphs below of this subclause as follows (#CID 8190):***  An MLD may suggest a preferred TID-to-link mapping to a peer MLD by sending an unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response frame that includes the TID-to-link Mapping element and sets the Status Code to 134 (PREFERRED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING\_SUGGESTED). An MLD shall not send an unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response frame that includes the TID-to-link Mapping element and sets the Status Code to either 0 (SUCCESS) or 133 (DENIED\_TID\_TO\_LINK\_MAPPING). | | | | | |
| 6286 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.57 | "In addtion, an AP MLD...", this sentence is not exact, an AP MLD does not only need to consider the traffic flow affiliated with the non-AP MLD, but also need to consider the traffic flow of other associated non-AP MLD | as in the comment | Rejected-  The spec does not say that an AP MLD does only need to consider the traffic flow affiliated with the non-AP MLD. |
| 6527 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.59 | Even if an MLD may suggest a preferred TID-to-link mapping, this is relatively static. It may appear constraints that are transient. There shall be provided a way to suspend temporarily or favorise a link among a set of enabled links. | A BSR shall inform the AP scheduler of an amount of data with regards to a given link. Typically, a BSR with a Link indication and a 0 data amount can be considered as suspended until further BSR advertizement. This temporary information is useful for subsequent UL scheduling over the appropriate link as expected by the reporting MLD. | Rejected-  The non-AP MLD can always suspend the link by entering to the power save mode.  No other mechanism is needed. |
| 6952 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.60 | It is missing what an AP need to do when it was figured out a non-AP MLD has constraints. | Clarify AP's operation after the AP figures out constraints of the non-AP STA. | Rejected-  If the MLD can’t accept the requested TID-to-link mapping, it can reject.  There is no reason to state all possible secenario as additional requirement. |
| 5079 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.63 | The non-AP MLD needs to accept the TID-to-Link mapping the AP includes in the TID-to-Link mapping element sent in the (Re)Association Response so that SLAs for throughput, latency, jitter given to the non-AP MLD can be guaranteed. | Change "A multi-link multi-radio (MLMR) non-AP MLD should accept a TID-to-link mapping initiated by its associated AP MLD." to "A non-AP MLD shall accept a TID-to-link mapping initiated by its associated AP MLD." | Rejeccted-  It is not guaranteed that a non-AP MLD can always accept the TID-to-link mapping request initiated by an AP MLD. |
| 6761 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.63 | In case of MLMR non-AP MLD, as the mapping initiated by its associated AP MLD should be accepted, is it mandatory that the non-AP MLD send a response to the request? | In that case, the AP MLD may use directly an unsollicited response frame with status code 0 | Rejected-  The comment fails to identify a specific issue to be addressed. It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |
| 7332 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.63 | MLMR is not defined | please add the MLMR in the acronyme list if you intend to reuse it, otherwise remove the "(MLMR)" . | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor change “A multi-link multi-radio (MLMR) non-AP MLD should accept a TID-to-link mapping initiated by its associated AP MLD.” to “A multi-radio non-AP MLD should accept a TID-to-link mapping initiated by its associated AP MLD.” |
| 6953 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.01 | If an MLD fails to receive Teardown frame successfully, two MLD may maintain different TID-to-Link mapping each other. An MLD should transit to default TID-to-link mapping mode after it has received acknowledgement(for the teardown frame) from the peer MLD. | As in the comment | Rejected-  Sending a frame includes that the acknowledgement is received. |
| 5247 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.03 | If a setup link was disabled before teardown, the link will be also enabled again after teardown? Since the default mapping makes all setup links all enabled links. | Please clarify the comment. The STA intends to keep disabled, it is good not to be enabled again although it is default mapping | Rejected-  When the MLD is operating in the default mapping mode, it does not means that all setup links shall be enabled. |
| 6402 | ﻿35.3.6.1.3 | 260.06 | Several editorial mistakes in the paragraph | Rephrase as "If an MLD has successfully negotiated the TID-to-link mapping with a peer MLD, both the MLD and the peer MLD shall update uplink and/or downlink TID-to-link mapping information according to the negotiated TID-to-link mapping. In case TID-to-link mapping of a specific TID is missing in the negotiation, the most recent TID-to-link mapping of this TID remains unchanged and valid." | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Fixed the editorial errors.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 6402. |
| 6362 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.07 | "the" in "negotiated the TID-to-link mapping" is extra. Please change as below. "... peer MLD shall update an uplink and/or downlink TID-to-link mapping information according to the negotiated TID-to-link mapping. " | as in comment | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Fixed the editorial errors.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 6362. |
| 5248 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.11 | NOTE 2 is not clear. Default mapping applies to all TIDs | Please clarify NOTE 2 as in the comment | Revised-  Under default mapping mode, all TIDs are mapped to all setup links for DL and UL, and all setup links are enabled.  However, the TID-to-link mapping negotiation is per-TID behavior. Accordingly, NOTE 2 is modified.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 5248. |
| 6954 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.11 | There is no definition for default mapping of a TID. (What we have is default mode of TID-to-link mapping) | Please clarify Default mapping mode of a TID. -Mapped to all (setup) links | Revised-  Agree in principle.  The default mapping in NOTE 2 is removed and the sentence is revised.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 6954. |
| 6363 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.15 | "n" in "Link Mapping Of TID field" is missed. Please fix as below. "... mapping in which the bit position i of the Link Mapping Of TID n field in the TID-to-link Mapping element is ..." | as in comment | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 6363. |
| 7412 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.16 | "n" is missing between "the Link Mapping Of TID" and "field" | change to "the Link Mapping Of TID n field" | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 7412. |
| 7817 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.16 | It should be "...of the Link Mapping of TID field n in the TID-to-link Mapping element..." | As commented. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 7817. |
| 8192 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.16 | "Link Mapping Of TID field", word "n" is missing before the word "field" | changes to: Link Mapping Of TID n field | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 8192. |
| 8193 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.16 | "the Link Mapping Of TID field in the TID-to-link Mapping element", not specify the TID-to-Link Mapping element is carried in which frame. | Clarify that the TID-to-link Mapping element is in TID-to-link Mapping Request frame or Association Request frame. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 8193. |
| 7851 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 0.00 | If the negotiation is not successful, it shall clearly indicate that the existing TID-to-Link mapping shall be remained. | Please add a rule for this case | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGbe editor to make the changes shown in 11-22/0601r1 under all headings that include CID 7851. |
| **35.3.6.1.3 Negotiation of TID-to-link mapping**  **TGbe Editor: *Change paragraphs below of this subclause as follows (#CID 6402, 6362, 5248, 6954, 6363, 7412, 7817, 8192, 8193, 7851):***  If an MLD has successfully negotiated the TID-to-link mapping with a peer MLD, both the MLD and the peer MLD shall update ~~an~~ uplink and/or downlink TID-to-link mapping information according to the negotiated ~~the~~ (#6402, 6362) TID-to-link mapping. In case ~~that a~~ TID-to-link mapping of a specific TID is missing in the negotiation, the most recent TID-to-link mapping of this TID remains unchanged and valid. If an MLD has failed to negotiate the TID-to-link mapping with a peer MLD, the most recent TID-to-link mapping of all TID remains unchanged and valid. (#7851)  NOTE 2—If there is no successfully negotiated TID-to-link mapping for missing TID, ~~the default mapping is applied to~~ this TID is mapped to all setup links for DL and UL.(#5248, 6954)  When an MLD has successfully negotiated with a peer MLD an uplink and/or downlink TID-to-link mapping in which the bit position *i* of the Link Mapping Of TID *n* (#6363, 7412, 7817, 8192) field in the TID-to-link Mapping element in the (Re)Association Request frame or TID-To-Link Mapping Request frame (#8193)is set to 0, the TID *n* shall not be mapped to the link associated with the link ID *i* in an uplink and/or downlink.  When an MLD has successfully negotiated with a peer MLD an uplink and/or downlink TID-to-link mapping in which the bit position *i* of the Link Mapping Of TID *n* field in the TID-to-link Mapping element in the (Re)Association Request frame or TID-To-Link Mapping Request frame (#8193) is set to 1, the TID *n* shall be mapped to the link associated with the link ID *i* in an uplink and/or downlink. | | | | | |
| 4824 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.17 | Whats the range of "n" and "I" here ? | Clarify | Rejected-  The comment fails to identify a specific issue to be addressed. It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.    Also, see 9.4.2.314 TID-To-Link Mapping element. |
| 5249 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 258.59 | To update TID-to-link mapping, based on current design, we have to perform tear-down and re-setup procedure. However, we can simply update TID-to-link mapping by sending a request frame including udpated information or an additional explicit indication without tear-down. | As in the comment, we need to design the simple update method without tear-down | Rejected-  Tear-down and re-setup procedures are not needed to update TID-to-link mapping. |
| 7411 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.23 | STA MLD wants to update(or change/re-mapping) the negotiated TID-to-link mapping after setup. In current procedure, we have to perform teardown and request again. It is better to design another simple method to request an update to AP MLD. (e.g., expliict indication of update) without the teardown. | As in comment | Rejected-  Tear-down and re-setup procedures are not needed to update TID-to-link mapping. |
| 4661 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 258.62 | Tid2link mapping is a pairwise negotiaiton, which is not scalable if there are hundreds of clients per AP (espeically if the hundreds of clients appear at once) | AP needs to be able to include a must-be-accepted AP-defined tid2link mapping, e.g. in Beacon/Probe Resp and/or (Re)Assoc Response frames. | Discussed in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1793-03-00be-cc36-cr-for-enterprise-grade-tid-mapping.docx |
| 4660 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.11 | From 20/1841 and general intuition, MLO is worthless under light load and worse than no-MLO under high load. Therefore MLO needs to be selectively enabled according to load, where the AP MLD is the best judge of the current operating scenario. The STA, given its coex challenges, needs to express its needs and have them accounted for but fundamentally this requires the AP to have final say in the tid2link mapping negotiation. | Give the AP final say in the tid2link mapping negotiation. Make negotiaiton of tid2link mapping mandatory. | Discussed in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1793-03-00be-cc36-cr-for-enterprise-grade-tid-mapping.docx |
| 5158 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.49 | The unsolicited TID to Link mapping response is missing. This covers the case of load balancing. Please add text to cover the case. (Use unsolicted TWT response protocol as an example - 26.8) | As in the comment | Discussed in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1793-03-00be-cc36-cr-for-enterprise-grade-tid-mapping.docx |
| 5145 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.27 | An AP MLD may have good overall knowledge of traffic and channel status. Therefore, when a non-AP MLD does not request TID-to-link mapping in the Association Request frame, it would be beneficial to allow an AP MLD to request TID-to-link mapping in the Association Response frame. In the current spec, an AP MLD can initiate TID-to-link mapping negotiation only using a separate TID-To-Link Mapping Request frame. | Define the AP initiated TID-to-link mapping negotiation from the Association Response frame. | Need more discussion. |
| 5078 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.24 | After an AP MLD indicates rejection of the proposed TID-to-Link mapping by including the TID-to-link mapping element containing a suggested mapping in the (Re)Association Response frame, there is no normative behavior defined for the action that the non-AP MLD takes. | Add normative text stating that the non-AP MLD shall accept the preferred TID-to-Link mapping specified in the (Re)Association frame. | Need more discussion. |
| 5955 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.49 | That An MLD(MLD1) suggests a preferred TID-to-link mapping to a peer MLD(MLD2) is unclear. For exmple if MLD2 initiates a new TID-to-link mapping which is different from the preferred TID-to-link mapping whether MLD1 would reject the request, or MLD1 still considers the the request. The unclear specification would reduce the efficiency of the TID-to-link mapping negotiation. | Suggest to further specify the types of unsolicited TID-to-link Mapping Response for preferred TID-to-link mapping, for exmple for the Dictate TID-to-link Mapping Response if an MLD initiates a new TID-to-link mapping which is different from the preferred TID-to-link mapping in Dictate TID-to-link Mapping Response the peer MLD would reject the request. | Need more discussion. |
| 5193 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.17 | For the TID-to-link mapping negotiation, there are two manners to indicate whether the TID-to-link mapping is accepted or not. One is through a Status Code field. The other is through whether the TID-to-link Mapping element is included within the Response frame. I suggest to reserve only one manner. | Option 1. Put the Status Code field into the TID-to-link Mapping element Option 2. Remove the Status Code field from the TID-To-Link Mapping Response frame. No TID-to-link Mapping element is included within the TID-To-Link Mapping Response frame when the TID-To-Link Mapping negotiation is accepted; One or two TID-to-link Mapping elements are included with the TID-To-Link Mapping Response frame when the TID-To-Link Mapping negotiation is rejected | Need more discussion. |
| 7589 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.22 | If rejecting either one of the proposed TID-to-link mappings, all the preferred TID-to-link mappings including the acceptable ones should be provided, as the rejection cannot tell which TID-to-link mapping is accepted and which one is not. | As in comment. | Need more discussion. |
| 7590 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 259.32 | One or two TID-to-mappings can be requested in a TID-to-link Mapping Request frame. So, the response to accept or reject the request should be applicable when there are two TID-to-mappings like in the Association procedure, i.e., accept when all the requests are accepted, and reject if one the requests is not acceptable while suggesting preferred mappings. | As in comment. | Need more discussion. |
| 7410 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.23 | If STA MLD want to make a disable link to enable link after association, how to handle to switch the state of the link(s). | It is needed to clarify the process. | Need more discussion. |
| 6955 | 35.3.6.1.3 | 260.09 | A set of setup links may be changed after the Reassociation or Reconfiguration procedure is completed. So, it is recommended to clarify impact of the setup link set change on TID-to-link mapping. | Please clarify mapped TID set to a newly added link. And, clarify what is a mapped link set of a specific TID if a setup link that the specific TID mapped to only. | Need more discussion. |