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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following CID received for TGbe recirculation SA ballot:

* 23103, 23177, 23020, 23089, 23090

**Revisions:**

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document. Proposed resolution for 23103, and 23177.
* Rev 1: Added proposed resolution for 23020.
* Rev 2: Added proposed resolution for 23089 and 23090. Green Tagged the resolution of these last two newly added CIDs since they are editorial in nature.

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** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 23103 | Benjamin Rolfe | AG.14.1 | 1066.51 | Use of normative language "may" in an informative clause. | Change "may" to "can" | Accepted |
| 23177 | Kazuto Yano | 9.6.2.6 | 303.58 | In Figure 9-1178, "New Transmit Power Envelope Element" should be "New Transmit Power Envelope element". | As in comment. | Accepted |
| 23020 | Srinivas Kandala | 9.3.3.9 | 188.36 | The HT Capabilities element is present when dot11HighThroughputOptionImplemented is true and the STA is not a STA 6G, except if the STA is an EHT STA in which case the STA follows the rules defined in 35.3.4.5 (Probe Request frame content for a non-AP EHT STA).  Does this mean:  1) HT caps present if HT AND (!6G OR (EHT per 35.3.4.5))?  or  2) HT caps present if (HT AND !6G) OR if (EHT per 35.3.4.5)?  I think 35.3.4.5 is basically saying "may omit" for stuff like HT Caps if not MLO, and "shall omit" if MLO.  So for non-MLO probes:  1) HT caps present if HT AND (!6G OR (EHT AND choose to include))  or  2) HT caps present if (HT AND !6G) OR if (EHT AND choose to include)?  And for MLO probes:  1) HT caps present if HT AND (!6G AND !MLO)  or  2) HT caps present if (HT AND !6G) AND !MLO  which is the same.  Since an EHT STA is an HE STA, and an HE STA is an HT STA in 2G4,  this only matters for 5G (20M-only) and 6G, and only for non-MLO  probes. I'm guessing the answer is:  1) HT caps present if HT AND (!6G OR (EHT AND choose to include))  because it would be weird to include HT caps if you're not HT?  So maybe the proposed change is for the cell to say:  The HT Capabilities element is present when dot11HighThroughputOptionImplemented is true and the STA is not a STA 6G.  Otherwise, the HT Capabilities element may be present when dot11HighThroughputOptionImplemented is true and the STA is an EHT STA and the rules defined in 35.3.4.5 (Probe Request frame content for a non-AP EHT STA) permit its inclusion?  Similarly for the VHT Capabilities row  at 189.7 in 9.3.3.9 | Clarify on the questions raised in comment | Rejected –  The comment fails to identify a technical issue.  In response to the question: the condition specifies that the HT Caps IE is present if the dot11HT MIB is true and the STA is not 6G unless the STA is an EHT STA (applies to any band) in which case the presence follows the rules in 35.3.4.5, wherein the rules specify that the HT Caps may be omitted if the non-AP EHT STA is sending a Probe request that is not a multilink probe request and shall be omitted if the non-AP EHT STA is sending a probe request that is a multi-link probe request. So essentially, in the terminology of the comment itself:  For non-MLO Probes the HT Caps IE is optional present if dot11HT MIB is true, and STA is EHT  For MLO probes the HT Caps is not present (STA is obviously EHT). |
| 23089 | Stephen McCann | AG.18 | AG.18 | Typo: missing "an" | Change the clause title to "Example of an R-TWT announcement by an AP belonging to a multiple BSSID set".  Additionally change the title of Table AG-1 to "An example of Management frame contents for an R-TWT announcement transmitted by an AP" | Accepted  Note: Changes are shown in 11-24/1019r2 for ease of review. |
| 23090 | Stephen McCann | AG.18 | AG.18 | The text "respective associated STAs" does not make sense, as its not referring to any STAs. It would if a STA1 and a STA2 were mentioned explicity. The 2nd half of this paragraph can be improved. | Change the sentences starting at P1073L41 to P1074L1, as follows: "The example shows 3 cases where AP1 and AP2 have, or have not, set up active R-TWT schedules (R1 and R2), as part of their R-TWT membership with their associated STAs. For notational convenience, RTSIV refers to the value of the Restricted TWT Schedule Info subfield carried in the corresponding TWT element." | Accepted  Note: Changes are shown in 11-24/1019r2 for ease of review. |

**AG.18 Example of an R-TWT announcement by an AP belonging to a multiple BSSID set**

Table AG-1 describes an exemplary Management frame transmitted by an AP (AP1) that belongs to a multiple BSSID set. The multiple BSSID set has two BSSIDs, one transmitted BSSID and one nontransmitted BSSID, corresponding to AP1 and AP2, respectively. The example shows 3 cases where AP1 and AP2 have, or have not, set up active R-TWT schedules (R1 and R2), as part of their R-TWT membership with their associated STAs. For notational convenience, RTSIV;

refers to the value of the Restricted TWT Schedule Info subfield carried in the corresponding TWT element.

**Table AG-1—An example of Management frame contents for an R-TWT announcement transmitted by an AP**