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##### This submission present proposed resolutions for the following 19 CIDs:

16720, 16726, 16761, 16800, 16837, 16865,

16870, 16813, 17017, 17110, 17567, 16887,

17131, 16873, 15506, 16792, 18186, 15096,

17576

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

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – Initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16720 | 35 |  |  | "that is equal to true" (or ... false) should be "equal to true" (or ... false). 5x in Clause 35 | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

At 561.61 in D3.0:



At 562.1 in D3.0:



At 562.22 in D3.0:



At 621.49 in D3.0:



At 621.54 in D3.0:



***Proposed resolution for CID 16720:***

Accepted.

Note to the commenter: In D3.2, there are only two instances of “that is equal to true” at 640.51 and 640.55.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16726 |  |  |  | "a MU" should be "an MU" | Make the change throughout |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16726:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The locations in D3.2 are 514.49, 515.1, 618.60, and 848.49.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16761 |  |  |  | "non- AP" should not have a space | Fix at 295.30, 484.35 |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16761:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The extra space at both locations were resolved. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16800 |  |  |  | "ACK policy" should be "ack policy" (3x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16800:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 560.24, 560.29, and 663.30.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16837 |  |  |  | "management frame" should be "Management frame" when not adjacent to "protection" | Change at 508.20, 511.4/10, 513.29, 514.61, 524.12/25, 545.5, 546.8/9, 563.37, 635.14 |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16837:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 537.60, 540.56, 540.62, 547.46, 549.11, 556.48, 575.46, 576.53, 576.54, 590.8, 654.14, and 671.52,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16865 |  |  |  | "Support For 320 MHz in 6 GHz" should be "Support For 320 MHz In 6 GHz" | Change throughout |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16865:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The locations in D3.2 are 661.37 and 662.5.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16870 |  |  |  | "operation update type" should be "Operation Update Type subfield" throughout | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16870:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The proposed changes were resolved. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16813 |  |  |  | I think that per the baseline it should be "DTIM beacon" not "DTIM Beacon" or "DTIM Beacon frame" | Change throughout (inc. figures) |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16813:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 223.6, 255.60, 551.44, 561.64, 562.55, 563.24, 567.12, 567.15, 567.18, 567.20, 567.46, 567.49, 567.59, 579.22, 579.53, and 1034.50.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 17017 | 35 |  |  | "shall set the value of" should be "shall set" (5x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17017:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 612.18, 612.20, 638.30, 643.52, and 654.6.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 17110 | 35 |  |  | "and with the following additions" should be just "with the following additions" | As it says in the comment (5x) |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17110:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 643.65, 644.23, 644.31, 644.42, and 649.12.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 17567 | 9.4.2.170.2 | 240 | 11 | BTW baseline language "the TBTT Information Length subfield is set to 3, other values are reserved" has two sentences connected by a comma and should be fixed. Maybe 11be and 11me editors could discuss this among themself and fix the baseline? | Editorial referral and fix |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17567:***

Revised.

Replace “If the TBTT Information Field Type subfield is 1, the TBTT Information Length subfield is set to 3, other values are reserved.” with “If the TBTT Information Field Type subfield is 1, the TBTT Information Length subfield is set to 3. Other values are reserved.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16887 |  |  |  | The term is "non-HT duplicate PPDU" not "non-HT duplicated PPDU" | Change throughout |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16887:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 891.60, 891.63, 892.1, and 897.47.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 17131 | 35 |  |  | "if exists" should be "if it exists" (5x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17131:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, there are only 3 locations that are 542.60, 546.42, and 597.23.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16873 |  |  |  | "Status Code is" should be "Status Code subfield is" | Change throughout |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16873:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: In D3.2, the locations are 332.54, 333.16, 343.55, 343.60, 348.46, 539.23, 558.46, and 558.56.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15506 | 10.25.2 | 355 | 52 | It's confusing to split a simple case into two subbullets. | Keep the original 11ax's text. |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 355.52 in D3.0:



***Proposed resolution for CID 15506:***

Rejected.

The commenter fails to identify any confusion resulting from the text change.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 16792 |  |  |  | Is it "TID-to-Link" or "TID-To-Link" or "TID-to-link" (or even "TID to link") | FInd out and consistently implement the official hyphenation/capitalisation policy |

***Discussion:***

While REVme is yet to reach consensus on whether hyphenated terms in uppercase context have all initial letters capitalised or only the very first one, let us focus specifically on “TID-to-Link” vs. “TID-To-Link” vs. “TID-to-link” and make sure the term is consistent throughout the specification as follows:

1) When the phrase is related to element/field, use “TID-To-Link”. Note that the phrase “TID-to-Link” is used extensively in clause 6 and many of them should be replaced by “TID-To-Link” because the name of the service primitive is related to the TID-To-Link Mapping element.

2) When the phrase is not related to element/field, use “TID-to-link”.

Note to the commenter: The commenter has a related comment in REVme and it will be a topic to be discussed in a future Editor’s meeting. Once the Editors make the decision, we may update the term “TID-to-link” accordingly.

***Proposed resolution for CID 16792:***

Revised

In D3.2,

* replace “TID-to-Link” with “TID-To-Link” at 83.14, 521.55, 553.59, 1033.60
* replace “TID-to-link” with “TID-To-Link” at 342.44, 342.45, 344.3, 344.6, 548.33 (three times), 549.59, 549.63, 549.64, 550.2 (twice), 550.5, 550.9, 550.12, 550.16, 550.23, 550.29, 550.30, 550.33, 550.34, 550.35, 550.39, 550.40, 550.43, 550.46, 550.48, 550.50 (twice), 550.63, 551.24, 551.31, 554.13, 554.26, 554.35, 554.39,
* replace “TID-to-Link” with “TID-to-link” at 553.52, 1033.51

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 18186 | 3.4 | 61 | 21 | The term TID-to-Link Mapping is long and used at several locations in the spec. Suggest abbreviating it to T2LM or TTLM (add a new entry to 3.4 for T2LM/TTLM) | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

There are no more than 482 instances of “TID-to-link mapping” (including cross references).

Many of them are related to field/element/frame that cannot be abbreviated as per the IEEE 802.11 editorial guidance.

***Proposed resolution for CID 18186:***

Revised.

Replace “TID-to-Link mapping” with “TTLM” whenever the phrase is not related to field/element/frame.

Add an entry “TTLM TID-to-link mapping” in subclause 3.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 15096 | Contents | 10 | 62 | In contents section, when the subclause number has 2 or more digits, a blank is often missing between subclause number and subclauses title. There are multiple occurences, especially in newly added subclauses. | Please add a blank |

***Discussion:***

As per the guidance from the IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual, Section 5.4.3.3. “Comments addressing grammar, punctuation, and style, whether attached to an Approve or a Do Not Approve vote, may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. It should be borne in mind that proposed standards are professionally edited prior to publication”.

***Proposed resolution for CID 15096:***

Rejected.

The standard will be professionally edited prior to publication. The issue identified by the commenter may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 17576 | 9.4.2.199 | 243 | 5 | Inconsistent usage of commas after "otherwise": sometimes present, sometimes not. | Define a convention hten apply it consistently in the 11be (and 11me) drafts |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution for CID 17576:***

Revised.

In D3.2, append a comma after “otherwise”/”Otherwise.