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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for the following CIDs:

R0: initial the draft

R1: Revised based on feedback during the meeting in 16th. Jan.

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 TGbh D2.0 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbh D2.0 Draft. (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGbh Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGbh Editor” are instructions to the TGbh editor to modify existing material in the TGbh draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGbh editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGbh Draft.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page/Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 74 | 7/17 | "Device identification" is already used in the base standard (e.g. "Device Identification Information field", "Device Identification Information Value fields"). This definition in 11bh conflicts with the usage in the base standard. Also, the term does not clearly indicate that this ID is assigned by the network, which is a key aspect of the ID. | Define a new term "network-assigned device identifier" and acronym "NADI" and update the draft to use this term throughout. | **Rejected--**  The baseline has the terms of “Device Identification Information field” and “Device Identification Information Value fields”, but not sufficient conflict with “Device Identification” |
| 65 | 17/8 | The description is confusing:1) the description of "non-access-point (AP)" is unclear, 2) the description of "to identify itself to a known network" is unclear. | Suggest to change "device identification (ID): [device ID] An ID that a network can provide to a non-access-point (AP) station (STA) to allow the non-AP STA to identify itself to a known network at a future time." to "device identification (ID): [device ID] An ID that a network can provide to a non-access-point (non-AP) station (STA) to allow the non-AP STA to be identified by the known network at a future time." | **Note: The resolution is under the table** |

**CID 65**

**Discussion:**

Item1: See the following writing style in baseline,the term shall be “non–access point (non-AP) station (STA)”

**infrastructure authorization information**: The information that specifies the access rights of the user of a non–access point (non-AP) station (STA). This information might include the rules for routing the

user traffic, a set of permissions about services that a user is allowed to access, quality-of-service configuration information, or the accounting policy to be applied by the infrastructure.

**non–access point (non-AP) station (STA):** [non-AP STA] A STA that is not contained within an

access point (AP).

Item2: the commenter propose to replace “**identify itself to a known network**” with “ **be identified by the known network**”, the two phrase seems no much difference.

**Revised--**

**TGbh editor: please replace “** non-access-point (AP) station (STA)**” with “**non–access point (non-AP) station (STA)**” in L7P17**