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##### This submission present proposed resolutions for the following 20 CIDs:

15040, 15894, 16219, 15349, 16216, 15943, 18039, 18050, 15114, 16575,

18185, 15041, 15895, 17408, 17309, 17482, 15505, 18110, 18111, 16908

##### The discussion and proposed changes are based on P802.11be D3.0 and P802.11be D3.2.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – Initial version

##### R1 – A few CIDs were green-tagged.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15040 | 1.4 | 51 | 09 | "MLD" is used before the definition. | Please replace "MLD" with "multi-link device (MLD)". |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 51.09 in D3.0:



Agree with the commenter that replaces “an MLD” with “a multi-link device”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 15040:***

Revised.

Replace “an MLD” with “a multi-link device”.

Note to the commenter: It is REVISED rather than ACCEPT because of the change from “an” to “a”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15894 | 3.1 | 53 | 17 | typo "identify" should be "identity" | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 53.17 in D3.0:



Agree that it is a typo.

***Proposed resolution for CID 15894:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16219 | 3.2 | 58 | 40 | The capitalisation of the words in this definition should be removed. | Remove the capital letters. An additional change needs to be made at P58L45 |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 58.40 and 58.45 in D3.0:



Agree with the commenter that capitalization of the words in both definitions should be removed.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16219:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15349 | 3.2 | 59 | 63 | Extra word "the" in definition of nonsimultaneous transmit and receive (NSTR) link pair. | Change "of the an" to "of an" in the final sentence of the definition |
| 16216 | 3.2 | 59 | 63 | Typo "the an NSTR" | Change to "an NSTR" |
| 15943 | 3.2 | 59 | 64 | Remove 'the' in the sentence "Each link of such a pair is a member of the an NSTR link | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 59.63 in D3.0:



Agree with the commenters that “the” from “the an NSTR link pair” is redundant.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 15349, 16216, 15943:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 18039 |  |  |  | 802.11-REVme has balloted D2.0 and is quickly approaching D3.0. Please update the baseline. | Update to the latest baseline document |
| 18050 |  | 1 | 2 | Reference the latest IEEE P802.11- REVme draft D2.1 | As commented |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenters that the specification should reference the latest baseline standards.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 18039, 18050:***

Revised.

Update the baseline standards to IEEEP802.11REVme/D3.0.

Note to the Editor: The update is done in D3.2. No further change is required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15114 | 3.2 | 61 | 12 | The definition of the "EMLMSR operation" is not placed in alphabetical order | Please place it in alphabetical order |
| 16575 | 3.2 | 61 | 12 | The definition of the "EMLMSR operation" is not located in alphabetical order | Please locate it in alphabetical order |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 61.12 in D3.0:



Agree that the definition is not placed in an alphabetical order.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 15114, 16575:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 18185 | 3.4 | 61 | 21 | The term BSS Parameter Change Count is long and used at several locations in the spec. Suggest abbreviating it to BPCC (add a new entry to 3.4 for BPCC) | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 18185:***

Rejected.

As per the editorial style guide (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-1034-20-0000-802-11-editorial-style-guide.docx), abbreviation is not permitted for any field/subfield/element/subelement.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15041 | 9.2.4.8.1 | 152 | 1 | Table 9-34 is too large and overlaps the line numbers. Please correct it. | as in comment. |
| 15895 | 9.2.4.8.1 | 152 | 1 | table 9-34 is too big for the page and needs to be re-formated | format the table correctly |
| 17408 | 9.2.4.8.1 | 151 | 3 | Table is too wide. | Split into two tables with different names: e.g., "Maximum data unit sizes (in octets) and durations (in microseconds) for Classic PHYs" and for S1G, DMG, EDMG "Maximum data unit sizes (in octets) and durations (in microseconds) for Other PHYs". |
| 17309 | 9.2.4.8.1 | 152 | 1 | We seem to have run out of columns for this table. Please find an alternative way of representing the MDU sizes and durations that can fit in a page. | As in comment. |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 15041, 15895, 17309:***

Rejected.

While the commenter is correct that the table is too wide, the editor simply follows the format in the baseline standards. When the draft amendment is standards, the IEEE SA editor may consider reformatting the table.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17408:***

Rejected.

While the commenter is correct that the table is too wide, the editor simply follows the format in the baseline standards. The proposed change in splitting the table into two may require a global change of cross references that are appropriate to be considered in REVme.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 17482 | 9.3.3.13 | 204 | 5 | Commenting is hard since no section number for table 9-71 | Add "9.3.3.13 Action frame format" above table 9-71 |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17482:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The subclause is added in D3.2. No further change is required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15505 | 10.25.1 | 355 | 22 | Change "STA authenticationAuthentication and association" to "STA authentication and association". Do the same thing in clause 35.3.5.1. | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 15505:***

Rejected.

It is a problem of framemarker when cross-referencing texts with strikethrough.

Note to the commenter: When the draft amendment is published, the title of the subclause will not be shown when cross-referencing. Only the subclause number will be displayed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 18110 | 10.25.2 | 356 | 2 | Italicize the word and the 'O' should be subscript | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 356.2 in D3.0:



Agree with the commenter that the term should be italicized and the “O” should be subscripted.

***Proposed resolution for CID 18110:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 18111 | 10.25.7 | 356 | 43 | REVme has fixed this issue. TGbe doesn't need to show the changes to this paragraph. | Remove changes from TGbe and align with REVme |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 356.43 in D3.0:



Agree with the comment.

***Proposed resolution for CID 18111:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The subclause is added in D3.2. No further change is required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16908 | 35.3.16.8.2 | 561 | 49 | No linebreak should be allowed in "- | Make minuses non-breaking |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 561.46 in D3.0:



Agree with the comment.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16908:***

Accepted.