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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution for CIDs received in LB275 (11be D4.0).

19354, 19366, 19633, 19632, 19820, 19825, 19905

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

**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 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbe 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** | **Clause** | **Pg/Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 19354 | 9.4.2.198 | 236.48 | EHT STA must consider does not belong in a note, nor in clause 9 since it is procedural. Worse, this is implies the need for a burdensome workaround to a spec dev shortcut. | 1) Weaken the language and xref clause 35 language where it probably should be expressed as "should" normative language outside a note. Or (preferred) 2) Just fix the problem properly by defining a new subfield to convey B26:B63. Will be easier for everyone in the long run! | Rejected. Setting these bit appropriately is critical for the Sub-TU interval. Clause 35 provides normative text |
| 19366 | 9.4.2.198 | 236.48 | "EHT STA must consider" does not belong in a note, nor in clause 9 since it is procedural. | Weaken the language and xref clause 35 language where it probably should be expressed as "should" normative language outside a note. | Rejected. Setting these bit appropriately is critical for the Sub-TU interval. Clause 35 provides normative text |
| 19633 | 35.8.3.1 | 685.55 | The term "first R-TWT SP" should be clarified with reference to what. For example, when the Beacon frame includes new R-TWT schedule(s), does the first R-TWT SP mean the scheduled R-TWT SP that happens first after receiving/transmitting the Beacon frame? and what happens during an R-TWT schedule after a rollover of B26-63 of the TSF given that the TWT field does not carry this value. Please clarify the term "first R-TWT SP". | As in the comment | Agree in principle. We clarify the first R-TWT SP.Tgbe editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-23/1849r3 tagged as 19633 |
| 19632 | 35.8.3.1 | 685.55 | The Interpretation of the Target Wake Time subfield need to be harmonized across the spec based on this rule for R-TWT | As in the comment | Agree in principle. Same resolution as CID 19633Tgbe editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-23/1849r3 tagged as 19633 |
| 19820 | 35.8.3.1 | 614.25 | The last paragraph states the rule for determination of start time of R-TWT SPs for AP. Corresponding rule for R-TWT scheduled STAs should be added to be complete | as in comment | Agree in principle. Same resolution as CID 19633Tgbe editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-23/1849r3 tagged as 19633 |
| 19825 | 35.8.3 | 612.45 | R-TWT setup and announcement rules should be revised to facilitate the case then start time and wake interval of the schedule is desired to be specified in microsecond level instead of TU level, to facilitate latency sensitive traffic with us level periods. | Please add any additional rules needed | Agree in principle. Same resolution as CID 19633Tgbe editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-23/1849r3 tagged as 19633 |
| 19905 | 35.8.3.1 | 614.24 | IT is not clear the maening of "the first R-TWT SP start time of the corresponding R-TWT agreement". | Clarify it. | Agree in principle. Same resolution as CID 19633Tgbe editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-23/1849r3 tagged as 19905 |

### Discussion: None

### Proposed Text:

**35.8.3.1 Rules for R-TWT scheduling AP**

[…]

(#19633)When an R-TWT scheduling AP announces an R-TWT schedule whose TWT Wake Interval is not an integer multiple of 1 TU, it shall set the Target Wake Time field in the TWT element in transmitted Management frames to (#19633)TSFReference\_SP [10:25], where TSF Reference\_SP is the timestamp that corresponds to the start time of the first R-TWT SP (#19905), if it were to happen immediately after TSF time 0of the corresponding R-TWT schedule.

(#19633)For an R-TWT schedule whose TWT Wake Interval is not an integer multiple of 1TU, the R-TWT scheduling AP (#19820)and R-TWT scheduled STA shall determine the start time of subsequent R-TWT SPs that happen after the first R-TWT SP (next R-TWT SP start time) in a periodic R-TWT schedule based on the start time of the first R-TWT SP and the TWT wake interval of the corresponding R-TWT schedule.