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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following CIDs received for TGbe LB271: 17314 17129 16203 17316 17317 17130 17133 17318 17132

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 1: Fixed the reference to (this) document in the resolution column.
* Rev 2: Minor updates based on feedback received when the doc was presented during TGbe MAC ad-hoc PM1 (5/12/23).

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.

***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** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 17314 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 35.15.1 | 641.09 | What about the VHT BSS OP? I take that cant be 80plus80. Remove "HE". | As in comment. | Revised  The paragraph was updated and the term HE was removed as suggested by the comment.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17314.** |
| 17129 | Mark RISON | 35.15.1 | 640.08 | "The announced HE BSS operating channel width by an EHT AP shall not be 80+80 MHz." is weird | Change to "An EHT AP shall not announce an 80+80 MHz HE BSS operating channel width." | Revised –  Agree. Amended as suggested and removed “HE” as per suggestion by CID 17314.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17129.** |
| 16203 | Ming Gan | 35.15.1 | 641.46 | This paragraph is confusing, is HE PPDU related to EHT Capabilities element? | Please clarify it | **Revised**  Agree in principle that the statement is confusing. In 11be the EHT Capabilities element has included a Maximum MPDU length exponent, which is not present in the HE Capabilities element, which was done to align maximum MPDU capabilities along the links. Hence for the 2G4 case all PPDUs are subject to this same constraint. Proposed resolution removes the paragraph and simply generalizes the preceding paragraph that covers the 2G4 case to simply refer to PPDU instead of EHT PPDU.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 16203.** |
| 17316 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 35.15.1 | 641.46 | Kind of odd that HE PPDU is called out here and tied to EHT Caps. Is there anything special for HE PPDUs compared to e.g., HT PPDUs? | Please clarify. | Revised –  Agree in principle with the comment. Proposed resolution and rationale behind the change is the same as for CID 16203, essentially removing this paragraph and generalizing the paragraph that describes the same for EHT.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17316.** |
| 17317 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 35.15.1 | 643.30 | Should this note 2 be in the Table? If not then please make sure it is placed under the paragraph of relevance. Also move the next paragraph to the beginning of this subclause since they are discussing similar functionalities. | Please clarify. | Revised –  There is no paragraph of relevance for which the appending of this note would help. Hence proposed resolution is to simply remove it. All these are already covered under MLD framework so no need for such note.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17317.** |
| 17130 | Mark RISON | 35.15.1 | 643.49 | "set 20MHz-Only Limited Capabilities Support subfield" missing article | As it says in the comment | Revised –  Agree. Amended as suggested.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17130.** |
| 17133 | Mark RISON | 35.15.1 | 643.55 | "20 MHz-Only Limited Capabilities Support subfield" missing article | As it says in the comment | Revised –  Agree. Amended as suggested.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17133.** |
| 17318 | Alfred Asterjadhi | 35.15.1 | 643.48 | This paragraph is very difficult to understand. Eg. What is that exists the element? Or does it want to say (if present?). And also can there be an MLD with two or more Lite STAs? | Please clarify. | Revised –  Agree in principle with the comment. Paragraph is re-organized for better clarity. And to answer the question: yes, there can be an MLD with two or more lite STAs, however if at least one of the affiliated STAs has wide BW support then none of the other affiliated STAs can be lite.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17318.** |
| 17132 | Mark RISON | 35.15.1 | 643.53 | "per the maximum supported channel width being equal to 20 MHz" -- I don't understand what this means | Clarify | Revised –  Agree with the comment. Paragraph is amended to clarify the intent.  **TGbe editor: please implement changes as shown in 11-23/645r2 tagged 17132.** |

#### EHT BSS operation

###### Basic EHT BSS operation

***TGbe editor: Please update the following paragraph in this subclause as shown below:***

An EHT AP shall not announce an 80+80 MHz BSS operating channel width [17129, 17314].

***TGbe editor: Please update the following paragraph in this subclause as shown below:***

[16203]In the 2.4 GHz band, an EHT STA shall not transmit a PPDU to a recipient EHT STA that carries a frame that is not an EHT Compressed Beamforming/CQI frame (see [35.7.3 (Rules for EHT sounding](#bookmark130) [protocol sequences)](#bookmark130)) and that exceeds the maximum MPDU length capability indicated in the EHT Capabilities element or in Reconfiguration Multi-Link element with operation update type equal to 0 last received from the recipient EHT STA.

***TGbe editor: Please delete the following paragraph in this subclause as shown below:***

[16203, 17316]

***TGbe editor: Please delete the following NOTE in this subclause as shown below:***

[17317]

***TGbe editor: Please update the following paragraph in this subclause as shown below:***

A 20 MHz-only non-AP EHT STA with dot11EHT20MzOnlyLimitedCapabilitiesSupport equal to true shall set the 20MHz-Only[17130] Limited Capabilities Support subfield in its EHT Capabilities element to 1 and shall indicate a supported channel width of 20 MHz in any transmitted HT Capabilities element, VHT Capabilities element, HE Capabilities element, or EHT Capabilities element. A 20 MHz-only non-AP EHT STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD that includes at least one > 20 MHz affiliated non-AP STA shall set the[17133] 20 MHz-Only Limited Capabilities Support subfield in its EHT Capabilities element to 0.[17318, 17132]