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**Abstract**

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs for TGbe LB266:

* 12737, 10983, 12759

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

***TGbe editor: Please note Baseline is REVme\_D2.0 and 11be D2.3***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Commenter | Clause | Page | Comment | Proposed Change | Resolution |
| 10983 | Yanjun Sun | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.45 | This paragraph and the following 2 figures 9-95a and 9-95b are related to the "Allocation Duration field", so it looks more natural to describe them after the text for the "RU Allocation field" | As in comment | Revised  Tgbe editor, please move the following paragraph (located at D2.3P186L28) to the end of subclause 9.3.1.22.9 (MU-RTS Trigger frame format) so that it’s placed after the text on RU Allocation field.  “The Allocation Duration subfield in the User Info field of the MU-RTS TXS Trigger frame indicates the time duration allocated to the non-AP STA within the TXOP obtained by the AP, in units of 16 µs.” |
| 12737 | Liuming Lu | 9.3.1.22.2 Common Info field | 147.10 | 11be has specified latency sensitive traffic with predictable latency, and QoS Characteristics element that defines the characteristics and QoS expectations of a traffic flow including the parameter of Delay Bound. Therefore for the STAs (especilly the member r-twt STAs) that need to deliver Qos data frames of the latency sensitive traffic with delay bound, the urgencies for the delivery of the Qos data frames may be different for the r-TWT TIDs of the same STA or different STAs, and AP needs to schedule the delivery of the Qos data frames of the latency sensitive traffic according to their urgencies based on the current time and the delay bound of the traffic. But the currently specified BSRP trigger frame doesn't consider to aquire the urgency-bases BSR information, which would lead to the imprecisely scheduled dilivery of the QoS data frames of latency sensitive traffic for AP. | Suggest to specify Urgency-based BSRP (U-BSRP) and Urgency-based BSR (U-BSR): 1) U-BSRP contains the information of the given urgency range, such as TimetoDelayExpire Bound, to trigger the BSR which satisfies the urgency condition. 2) U-BSR contains the BSR information within the given urgency range, such as the buffer status of Qos data frames with the given TID(s) of the latency sensitive traffic, which would expire within TimetoDelayExpire Bound | Rejected.  STA and AP can learn the urgency of the traffic (QoS characteristics exchange) and AP can make sure to send BSRP to a set of STAs, and when receives the BSR ensure that the STAs with high priority are triggered first. Hence the urgency is a parameter that the AP can inherently determine from QoS Characteristics element that it has received (or not) from associated STAs. In addition, for initiating/prioritizing urgent uplink traffic, an alternative/existing solution is to manage the prioritization on the STA side instead of relying only on triggered uplink transmissions. |
| 12759 | Patrice Nezou | 9.3.1.22.9 | 169.13 | The TXOP Sharing Mode subfield defines 2 modes. The mode 1 defines functionnalities that are also enabled in mode 2. The mode 1 seems useless. | Several solutions can be applied: Remove mode 1. Or redefine mode 2 for P2P traffics only and UL frames only used to terminate allocated time. | Rejected  The comment fails to identify a technical issue. Mode 1 has been designed to enable exclusively UL transmissions, while Mode 2 has been designed to enable UL transmissions and P2P transmissions. Depending on the configuration the AP can trigger with mode 1 or 2 and still ensure that the STA can send UL on either mode while providing P2P communication only for mode 2. The partial overlap between mode 1 and mode 2 is a design choice. Mode 1 allows the AP to prioritize uplink traffic over p2p traffic. As the AP doesn’t necessarily know the latest buffer status at the STA, mode 2 gives the non-AP STA more flexibility to fully utilized a shared TXOP. |

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 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.***