IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| 11mc Mesh comment resolutions  |
| Date: 2015-10-15 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Guido Hietrz | Ericsson |  |  | Guido.hiertz@ericsson.com  |
| Dorothy Stanley | HP (Aruba Networks) | 1322 Crossman Ave Sunnyvale, CA 94089 | +1 630-363-1389 | dstanley@arubanetworks.com  |

Abstract

This document contains proposed resolutions to some MAC “Mesh” category
CIDs: 5746, 5861, 6029, 6030, and 6391.

R0 - Initial resolutions were prepared by Guido Hiertz.

R1- Agreed to all resolutions in Cambridge 2015-10-15 AM time-slot.

**CID 5746- MAC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5746 | 2088.29 | 13.4.3 |  |  | "Configuration": there is nothing called "Configuration" in the definition of mesh peering instance (which does have, for instance, "peerLinkID"), so what is this thing and where is it defined? | Either define the "Configuration" parameter, type, or whatever it is, or delete the standalone "Configuration" term from the mesh specification in this standard. |

**Discussion:**

**The cited text is below:**

****

We believe the term "configuration" is well specified in the context of WLAN Mesh. Clause 8.4.2.97 explains the "Mesh Configuration element" and Clause 13.2.4 explains the "Mesh STA configuration" that consists of "the mesh profile (see 13.2.3 (Mesh profile)), the Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element, the Extended Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element, the HT Operations element (if present), and the VHT Operations element (if present)." To satisfy the commenter, we propose to be more precise in replacing the generic term "configuration" with "mesh configuration".

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Change text at the cited location as shown below:

OPN\_RJCT—PeeringOpen\_Reject(peerMAC, peerLinkID, meshConfiguration, reasonCode) event

indicates that a Mesh Peering Open frame from peerMAC for the mesh peering instance identified

by peerLinkID is rejected due to incomplete or erroneous mesh STA configuration (see 13.2.4), as indicated by

meshConfiguration, with reasonCode being the specific reason for rejection of the Mesh Peering Open

frame. See 13.3.6.2 (Mesh Peering Open frame processing).

**CID 5861 - MAC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5861 | 2163.56 | 13.14.3.1 |  |  | The paragraph reads:"When a mesh STA is in deep sleep mode for any of its mesh peerings, the Mesh Power Save Level subfield in the QoS Control field in group addressed Mesh Data frames and the Mesh Power Save Level subfield in the Mesh Capability field in the Mesh Configuration element shall be set to 1. When a mesh STA is not indeep sleep mode for any of its mesh peerings, these subfields shall be set to 1."It seems that the field is set to 1 anytime, which does not make sense.Based on 13.14.2.3, it sounds like the latter should be 0 (i.e. nonpeer mesh power mode is active). | Replace" When a mesh STA is not in deep sleep mode for any of its mesh peerings, these subfields shall be set to 1." with" When a mesh STA is not in deep sleep mode for any of its mesh peerings, these subfields shall be set to 0." |

**Discussion: The cited text is below:**



**Proposed resolution: Accepted**

**CIDs 6029 (MAC)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6029 | 2078.47 | 13.2.4 |  |  | The original text stated just the parameters to be compared, but it has not determined the situation when to do the comparison. The new text restricts the comparison to a certain situation. This restriction should be removed in order to keep the flexibility of doing the comparison when necessary. | change text into: "The basic rate set parameters are identical." If you want to keep the specifics of the new text, add them as a specific situation / example. ("During Mesh Peering Management, these are the BSSBasicRateSet parameter of the MLME-START.request and the basic rate set indicated by the Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element and Extended SupportedRates and BSS Membership Selectors element, if present, received in the MLMEMESHPEERINGMANAGEMENT.indication." |

**The cited text is below:**

****

Offline discussion with the commenter: The commenter agreed that the current text is more precise and should be kept.

Also note: this CID is similar to CID 6031 discussed 2015-08-14, resolved as:

*Rejected: The text is unambiguous and no change is proposed to the cited text. The primitive being compared is correct and also compared in the prior list items.*

**Preposed Resolution: Rejected**

The intent of the cited text is to describe when Mesh STA configurations are identical.

The cited text is unambiguous and no change is proposed.

**CID 6030 (MAC)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6030 | 2078.52 | 13.2.4 |  |  | The original text stated just the parameters to be compared, but it has not determined the situation when to do the comparison. The new text restricts the comparison to a certain situation. This restriction should be removed in order to keep the flexibility of doing the comparison when necessary. | change text into: "For HT mesh STAs, the basic MCS set parameters are identical." If you want to keep the specifics of the new text, add them as a specific situation / example. ("During Mesh Peering Management, these are the Basic MCS Set field of the HT Operation parameter of the MLMESTART.request and the HT Operation element received in the MLMEMESHPEERINGMANAGEMENT.indication." |

**The cited text is below:**

****

**Discussion:** The commenter agreed that the current text is more precise and should be kept.

**Proposed resolution: Rejected**

The intent of the cited text is to describe when Mesh STA configurations are identical.

The cited text is unambiguous and no change is proposed.

**CID 6391 (MAC)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6391 | 2137.33 | 13.10.11.3 |  |  | The pound operator is not a well-known one | Define the pound operator in subclause 1.5 |

**The cited text is below:**

****

**Discussion:**

The cited location is line 33, the comment seems to be on the “PERR element **£**” operator.

This is the only location of “£” in the document. Suspect a typo.

Original text in the “Number of Destinations” Value entry in 802.11s-2011 was:



**Initial proposed resolution is below, believe this does not resolve the comment on “**£”

Revised: Add the following to the End of Clause 1.5:

#k is the index k that identifies the k-th element in a sequence of n elements, with 1 ≤ k ≤ n and {n,k} ∈ ℕ.

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

At 2137.33, Change “<pound-glyph>” to “<less-than-or-equal-glyph>”

Note to the editor: Same resolution as CID 6040, change made in D4.3.

**References:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-18-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-20-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>