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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following CIDs received for TGbe LB275:

19894 19895 20005 19896 19897 20008 20079 19742 19744 19807

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 1: Resolution for CID 19742 is based on feedback from Yongho when the document was presented during the TGbe MAC call on 8/28/23.
  + No other resolutions were updated.
* Rev 2: Updated instructions to the editor for CID 19742.
  + No other resolutions were updated.
* Rev 3: Fixed a typo in the resolution column for CID 19742

***TGbe editor: Baseline for this document is 11be D4.0***

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** | **Category** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 19894 | Liwen Chu | T | 9.4.1.4 | 193.24 | The first and second bullets are useless. Definitely a field added by a new 11 amendment in the reserved bit is reserved for the old 802.11 generation spec. If 802.11 spec go this way, several handard pages spec nned to be added | Delete the first and second bullets. | Rejected  The first bullet provides guidance for the case when the field is carried in a Management frame transmitted by a non-AP STA. In such case, the field will be reserved. The second bullet specifies that the field does not apply if the transmitting AP is not affiliated with an AP MLD. Such guidance is consistent with baseline text and other sections of the TGbe spec which differentiates the behavior with respect to legacy (e.g., HE vs non-HE STAs or EHT vs non-EHT). |
| 19895 | Liwen Chu | T | 9.4.1.4 | 193.24 | the frame list is not comlete. All the Management frames that carry the Capability Information need to have this field reserved. | As in comment. | Rejected  No, the field is not reserved if the Management frame is a Beacon frame, or a Probe Response frame transmitted by an AP that is affiliated with an AP MLD. The conditions stated in the four bullets are to be applied together. |
| 20005 | Binita Gupta | T | 9.4.1.4 | 193.56 | Add reference to clause ï»¿35.3.7.2.4 (Advertised TTLM in Beacon and Probe Response frames) for the last bullet point for updating CUF. | Add reference to 35.3.7.2.4. | Accepted |
| 19896 | Liwen Chu | T | 9.4.1.4 | 193.64 | The first and second bullets are useless. Definitely a field added by a new 11 amendment in the reserved bit is reserved for the old 802.11 generation spec. If 802.11 spec go this way, several handard pages spec nned to be added | Delete the first and second bullets. | Rejected  The first bullet provides guidance for the case when the field is carried in a Management frame transmitted by a non-AP STA. In such case, the field will be reserved. The second bullet specifies that the field does not apply if the transmitting AP is not affiliated with an AP MLD. Such guidance is consistent with baseline text and other sections of the TGbe spec which differentiates the behavior with respect to legacy (e.g., HE vs non-HE STAs or EHT vs non-EHT). |
| 19897 | Liwen Chu | T | 9.4.1.4 | 193.64 | the frame list is not comlete. All the Management frames that carry the Capability Information need to have this field reserved. | As in comment. | Rejected  No, the field is not reserved if the Management frame is a Beacon frame, or a Probe Response frame transmitted by an AP that is affiliated with an AP MLD. The conditions stated in the four bullets are to be applied together. |
| 20008 | Binita Gupta | T | 9.4.1.9 | 196.34 | For Status code 139, the description of the code should be revised to indicate Association denied. | Revise as "ï»¿Association denied because the link on which the (Re)Association Request frame is transmitted is not accepted." | Revised  Agree with the comment. Clarified to the TGbe editor that the change needs to be made under the ‘Meaning’ column. In addition, expanded the scope of the change to reassociation case.  TGbe editor, please replace the contents of the cell under ‘Meaning’ as: “(Re)Association denied because the link on which the (Re)Association Request frame is transmitted is not accepted." |
| 20079 | Li-Hsiang Sun | T | 9.4.1 | 197.65 | Buffer size field in PBAC WinStart Update frame should be reserved because the field does not reflect the actual buffer size | update the field description of Buffer Size field in PBAC WinStart Update frame | Rejected  Baseline clause 9.4.1.13 states that all subfields except the TID subfield of the Block Ack Parameter Set field are reserved when the field is carried in a PBAC WinStart Update frame. Therefore, no further changes are needed in the TGbe spec. |
| 19742 | Abhishek Patil | T | 9.4.2.72 | 227.28 | Since the DTIM Period and DTIM Count fields are already included in the STA Info field of the per-STA profile subelement corresponding to a reported AP, it doesn't need to be carried in the Multiple BSSID-Index element when carried within the STA Profile field. | Update the following paragraph in (baseline) clause 9.4.2.72 "The DTIM Period field indicates the DTIM period for the BSSID. This field is not present when the Multiple BSSID-Index element is included in the Probe Response frame." as "The DTIM Period field indicates the DTIM period for the BSSID. This field is not present when the Multiple BSSID-Index element is included in the Probe Response frame or Per-STA Profile subelement of a Basic Multi-Link element that carries complete profile of the reported AP." Add the following NOTE after the above cited paragraph: "NOTE - The DTIM Count and DTIM Period information for a reported AP is provided in the STA Info field of the Per-STA Profile subelement of a Basic Multi-Link element that carries a complete profile of a reported AP (see Figure 9-1001n (STA Control field format of the Basic Multi-Link element))." | Revised  Agree with the comment. In addition to the DTIM Period field, the DTIM Count field is also updated.  TGbe editor, please update the following 4th and 5th paragraphs in (baseline) clause 9.4.2.72 as follows:  "The DTIM Period field indicates the DTIM period for the BSSID. This field is not present when the Multiple BSSID-Index element is included in the Probe Response frame or in the Per-STA Profile subelement of a Basic Multi-Link element that carries complete profile of the reported AP."  “The DTIM Count field indicates the DTIM count for the BSSID. This field is not present when the Multiple BSSID-Index element is included in the Probe Response frame or in the Per-STA Profile subelement of a Basic Multi-Link element that carries complete profile of the reported AP.”  Please add the following NOTE after the updated 5th paragraph:  "NOTE - The DTIM Count and DTIM Period information for a reported AP is provided in the STA Info field of the Per-STA Profile subelement of a Basic Multi-Link element that carries a complete profile of a reported AP (see Figure 9-1001n (STA Control field format of the Basic Multi-Link element))."  TGbe editor, please incorporate the changes as shown for CID 19742 in 23/1395r3. |
| 19744 | Abhishek Patil | T | 9.4.2.312.1 | 244.07 | The sentence is incorrect (subelement format is defined in 9.4.3) and it does not add any value. | Delete the sentence. | Accepted |
| 19807 | Abhishek Patil | E | 9.4.2.312.1 | 244.33 | Reference to subelement format is incorrect | Fix reference to 9-1003. | Accepted |