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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following 7 CIDs received for TGbe LB266:

10847, 11190, 11191, 11566, 11740, 12805, 13391

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 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.***

**List of CIDs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 10847 | Jinsoo Choi | 35.3.4.2 | 416.64 | A STA can get the benefit of getting the critical update information of other APs by defining a soliciting method for it, otherwise the STA shall awake to obtain the updated critical parameters from those AP's beacons which will occur inefficiency from power saving aspect for STAs in doze state. For example, we can use MLD probe request for retrieving the required critical update information. | As in comment | Rejected  This method related to the comment has been discussed in the group for very long time, especially through doc. 22/61r4, but which didn't reach to any consensus. |
| 12805 | Laurent Cariou | 35.3.5.4 | 424.03 | This first sentence clarifying that we can setup one or more links should be in subclause 35.3.5.1 | as in comment | Revised  As commented, it is proper for the commented paragraph to move the subclause 35.3.5.1 (Multi-link setup procedure) since it is a general procedure and is not really related to usage and rules of ML IE. However, the contents in the commended paragraph were already mentioned in that subcluase and seems to be redundant. Therefore, the commented paragraph was simply removed  **TGbe editor, please make changes as shown in doc 11-22/2196r0 tagged as CID 12805** |
| 11190 | Joseph Levy | 35.3.5.4 | 424.03 | The statement that "A non-AP MLD may initiate a multi-link setup with an AP MLD .." is very strange way of describing this critical process. Multi-link setup is an essential part of non-AP MLD (re)associate with an AP MLD. A non-AP MLD can not associate with an without multi-link setup. | Clearly state that multi-link setup is a critical part of non-AP MLD association. | Revised  By CID 12805, the commented paragraph was removed  **TGbe editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 22/2196r0 under CID 12805** |
| 11191 | Joseph Levy | 35.3.5.4 | 424.04 | The description of multi-link (re)setup is very convoluted, confusing, and could be described in a simpler and clearer manner. A non-AP MLD uses (re)association to accomplish multi-link setup. The non-AP MLD chooses a channel supported by the target AP MLD and sends a (Re)Association Request frame containing a Basic Multi-Link element. The AP MLD then replies on the same channel used by the non-AP MLD, with a (Re)Association Response frame, containing a Basic Multi-Link element. The Basic Multi-Link elements continue the requested MLD channels (links) and supported MLD channels (links), respectively. | Clarify and simplify the rules and requirements for mulit-link setup. | Revised  By CID 12805, the commented paragraph was removed  **TGbe editor, please incorporate the changes as shown in 22/2196r0 under CID 12805** |
| 11566 | Xiaofei Wang | 35.3.5.4 | 424.32 | If just one link is being requested during MLD association, it is easier to just conduct regular AP/STA assocation, in order to avoid transmitting ML element to save overhead. | as in comment | Rejected  Based on the current spec in D2.3, an AP MLD and a non-AP MLD always include Basic ML IE during (Re)Association Request/Response frame exchange, which means multi-link setup.  Reference:  In Table 9-62,  The Basic Multi-Link element is present if dot11MultiLinkActi-vated is true and the Association Request frame is sent to an AP affiliated with an AP MLD; otherwise it is not present.  In Table 9-63,  The Basic Multi-Link element is present if dot11MultiLinkActi-vated is true and the Association Response frame is sent to a non-AP STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD; otherwise it is not present. |
| 11740 | Gaurav Patwardhan | 35.3.5.4 | 424.05 | The sentence "When a non-AP MLD initiates a multi-link (re)setup with an AP MLD, a STA that is affiliated with the non-AP MLD shall transmit an (Re)Association Request frame on the link that it desires to use as part of the multi-link (re)setup." does not exclude the case where a non-AP MLD can add a link by sending a (Re)Association Request frame on the new link which it desires to be a part of the existing multi-link setup. Please clarify | as in comment | Rejected  This method related to the comment has been discussed in the group in doc. 22/1709 and 22/2042, which didn't reach to any consensus.  Based on current spec, we need to do multi-link teardown and then would try to do an association request, including the additional link the non-AP MLD wants to operate |
| 13391 | Liwen Chu | 35.3.16.1 | 452.06 | The spec shouldn't mandate medium contending independently. What it should mandate is the minimum coordinate medium access among the STAs of a MLD. |  | Rejected  Essentially, we don’t have any coordination level between affiliated STAs in MLD. Moreover, it is not easy to define it at this stage in terms of many ML operations including channel access.  In addition, we already enabled any exceptions  Referred text  “A STA, which is affiliated with an MLD, shall contend for the WM on its link independently from the other STA(s) affiliated with the same MLD, unless explicitly stated otherwise in the subclauses below.” |

**Proposed spec text:**

*TGbe editor: The baseline for this document is 11be D2.3*

*TGbe editor: Please modify the subclause 35.3.5.4 (Usage and rules of Basic Multi-Link element in the context of multi-link (re)setup and authentication between two MLDs) as follows:*

35.3.5.4 Usage and rules of Basic Multi-Link element in the context of multi-link (re)setup and authentication between two MLDs

(#12805)

A STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD that initiates a multi-link (re)setup with an AP MLD shall include a Basic Multi-Link element in an (Re)Association Request frame it transmits.

NOTE 1—When a (Re)Association Request frame is sent from a non-AP EHT STA with dot11MultiLinkActivated set to false, the Basic Multi-Link element is not carried in the (Re)Association Request frame (see Table 9-62 (Association Request frame body(#10532)), Table 9-64 (Reassociation Request frame body(#10532)), and 35.3.1 (General)).