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Abstract

This submission proposes the resolutions for 11 CIDs: 15287, 15350, 15631, 15941, 16120, 16213, 16214, 16215, 16217, 16719, and 16883.

This resolution based on the 11be D3.1.

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 D3.1 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbe D3.1 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 15287*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 15287 | 3.2 | 59.01 | The definition of EHT MU PPDU is a typical circular definition. And there's no definition of EHT MU PPDU format. | Specify the definition of "EHT MU PPDU" with referred sub-clauses. | Rejected.  The details for EHT MU PPDU format are described in the clause 36.3.4. So, we don’t need to describe any more in this clause for EHT MU PPDU |

Discussion:



#### *CID 15350*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 15350 | 3.2 | 60.28 | Letter T should not be capitalized in non-Trigger-based. | Change T to lower case. | Accepted. |

Discussion:



#### *CID 15631*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 15631 | 3.2 | 59.61 | "receiver requirement" is not clear because "receiver requirement" is not clearly defined in Clause 36 or cannot refer to. | need to specify "receiver requirement" in Clause 36 to refer it easily. | Rejected.  The receiver requirement used in this text means description defined in subclause 36.3.21 Receiver specification. So, since clause 36 is already referred to here, it does not need to define what the receiver requirement is here. |

Discussion:



#### *CID 15941, 16120*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 15941 | 3.2 | 58.12 | The CH\_BANDWIDTH should be equal to CBW320 since 320 MHz is referred | Change CBW160 -> CBW320 | Accepted. |
| 16120 | 3.2 | 58.05 | Does 320 MHz mask PPDU cover the lower bandwidth PPDU case using 320 MHz transmit spectral mask? | Clarify. If it does cover the mentioned cases, add the missing cases. | Rejected.  The group discussed this issue before and decided to not define the lower bandwidth PPDU case for 320MHz Mask since 320MHz is only defined in the EHT. So, we don’t need to add the other cases. |

Discussion:



#### *CID 16215*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16215 | 3.2 | 59.60 | I think it is very easy to determine that the receiver requirements in clause 36 are not met. For example, if the receiver minimum input level sensitivities in Table 36-67 are not met on one link of a pair (e.g. because they are too low), does this mean that that link pair is a NSTR link pair? I think this definition is meaningless. | The definition needs to be re-written to state what an NSTR link pair is, as opposed to what an NSTR link pair is not. | Rejected.  The NSTR is composed of a link pair and this definition well describes how to set each link of an NSTR link pair. We don’t need to define it further. |

Discussion:



#### *CID 16217*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16217 | 3.2 | 60.20 | Typo "all the" | Change to "all of the" | Accepted. |

Discussion:



#### *CID 16719*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16719 | 3.2 | 60.29 | "with high efficiency (HE) TB PPDU or extremely high throughput (EHT) TB PPDU format" should be "using high efficiency (HE) TB PPDU or extremely high throughput (EHT) TB PPDU format" | As it says in the comment | Accepted. |

Discussion:



#### *CID 16883*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 16883 | 3.2 | 0.00 | We have a definition of non-TB PPDU but not of TB PPDU | Add a definition of TB PPDU | Rejected.  We have already defined the EHT TB PPDU in EHT D3.0. |

Discussion:

