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Abstract

Resolution to various CIDs.

All the changes are related to 11md D2.2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2000 | 9.4.1.46 | 931 | 19 | The current spec or any of the past amendments do not support operating in 6 GHz. An amendment (e.g., 11ax) that supports 6 GHz operation may make an entry in this table. | Delete the entry for 6 GHz |
| 2178 | 9.4.1.46 | 931 | 19 | 6GHz is not within the scope of 11md and has only been defined in draft 11ax, therefore 6GHz should not have been defined as a valid Band ID value. | Remove Table 9-69 entry corresponding to "Band ID Value =7" and "Meaning = 6 GHz" |
| 2672 | 9.4.1.45 | 931 | 19 | The new added 6 GHz in Band ID field is not reasonable. Because, first the existing amendments in REVmd D2.0 do not support 6GHz. The related Multi-band operation, OCT and FST schemes which use Band ID are assumed to play much impact on the pending 6 GHz discussion in 11ax. Note that 6 GHz discussion in 11md should be taken the 11ax features into account such that the above schemes may not work well, and need more discussion. Second, there is no corresponding Operating Class and Channel Number related to 6GHz in Annex E, so adding 6 GHz Band ID field does not work now. | Remove 6 GHz from Band ID field as per comment |
| 2705 | 9.4.1.45 | 931 | 19 | Remove the 6 GHz band ID from Table 9-69 (Band ID field). Any STA (non-HT, HT, VHT, etc) in defined in 802.11md D2.0 can't use 6 GHz band. According to 802.11ax draft, only HE STA can operate in 6 GHz band. If 802.11md wants that a legacy STA allows to use 6 GHz band, at least please add the operating class and channel number of 6 GHz band in Annex E. Otherwise, please leave that TGax will make the 6 GHz band ID if it is needed. | Remove the 6 GHz band ID from Table 9-69 (Band ID field). |

**Proposed resolution**: Reject

**Discussion**: The inclusion of a 6 GHz entry in the noted table does not imply that operation by a STA is possible in this band. Putting aside regulatory rules in different regulatory domains, for this to happen, at a minimum, Annex E would also have to be modified. Therefore, this entry does not imply that operation in this band is possible – as the commenter correctly noted, channel access to this band is being discussed in the 11ax TG.

Having said the above, what the Band ID field enables is for FST and OCT features to be used by multi-band devices if and when the 6 GHz band is open in regulation and enabled by 11ax. Since 11ax is not making changes to either FST or OCT, the inclusion of the 6 GHz entry in the Band ID table is appropriate. At the end of the day, all the changes will anyways be reflected in the baseline standard.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2113 | 9.4.2.138 | 1297 | 31 | Typically, support for a feature is defined in a way that a bit value of 1 indicates support for the feature. Hence, the term "FST Not Supported" seem strange. | Replace "FST Not Supported" with "FST Supported" and flip the usage of the bit in text. |
| 2114 | 9.4.2.138 | 1297 | 34 | Typically, support for a feature is defined in a way that a bit value of 1 indicates support for the feature. Hence, the term "OCT Not Supported" seem strange. | Replace "OCT Not Supported" with "OCT Supported" and flip the usage of the bit in text. |
| 2638 | 11.32.5 | 2451 | 14 | The "OCT Not Supported" changes will break existing implementations that do not understand them, and will try to transmit an OCT MMPDU to a device that does not support them (but does support the Multi-band element | Delete the first para of the referenced subclause |

**Proposed resolution**: Reject

**Discussion**: as discussed in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-1324-05-000m-fixes-to-multi-band-operations.docx>, this was done to be able to deal with legacy devices that implement OCT and which assume that OCT is always supported. Therefore, with the decision to make this feature optional, this setting of this field had to be 0 (not 1) when it comes to indication of support. See also the first paragraph of (**11.32.5 On-channel Tunneling (OCT) operation**).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2277 | 11.32.2 | 2440 | 65 | Text in clauses 10 or 11 should be clear that FST does \_not\_ need the new channel/band to be associated before transitioning - the association is "moved" from the old channel/band. This is clear in 4.9.4, but should be in main body, too. | Add a third sentence to "General FST rules", "When FST session transition is used, use of Authentication is unecessary, and use of Association is disallowed, between the initator and responder." |

**Proposed resolution**: Revised

**Discussion**: the commenter is correct for the case of transparent FST. This should be incorporated into the proposed change.

**Proposed changes**:

*Insert the following paragraph after the 3rd paragraph in (11.32.2 General FST rules)*

When transparent FST session transition is used, use of Authentication is unnecessary, and use of Association is disallowed, between the initiator and the responder.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2285 | 9.4.2.20.16 | 1028 | 46 | 9.4.2.20.16 uses an "AID field" (in the text) but nothing is said about how it is used/formatted. The assumption is to refer to the AID field definition in 9.4.1.8, but that talks about a 16 bit field and this is only 1 octet. Same thing in 9.4.2.21.15. Probably should be more like 9.4.2.127.1. This text should say this field contains the AID (shorter) assigned to the xxxx STA. | At P1028.46, replace the sentence with, "The AID field contains the AID assigned to the Target STA by the AP or PCP." Same thing at P1077.1. |

**Proposed resolution**: Accept

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2286 | 9.6.19.12 | 1615 | 23 | RLS Request frame Action field (format) and following subclauses - are these all elements or just values (per "AID field")?? Does it say that somewhere? | Add, "formatted per 9.4.1.8 (AID field)" to the end of each setence describing these AID fields, in RLS Request, Response, Announcement, and Teardown subclauses. |

**Proposed resolution**: Revised

**Discussion**: agree with the comment, however there is no AID field in the RLS Response frame. Therefore, the proposed resolution needs to be amended.

**Proposed changes**:

*Insert* “formatted per 9.4.1.8 (AID field)” *to the end of the description of the Destination AID, Relay AID and Source AID fields in (9.6.19.12 RLS Request frame format), (9.6.19.14 RLS Announcement frame format) and (9.6.19.15 RLS Teardown frame format)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2591 | 11.32.5 | 2453 | 30 | "As defined in this standard, process the OCT MMPDU parameter of the primitive as if the MMPDU had been received over the air, with the exception that an Ack frame, if any, shall not be sent as a response to the reception of the MMPDU.(M70)" -- some MMPDUs might acked with something else (especially 11ah seems to have a zoo of acknowledgement mechanisms) | Change "an Ack frame" to "an acknowledgement" in the cited text at the referenced location |

**Proposed resolution**: Accept

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2707 | 9.6.7.47 | 1546 | 1 | The public action OCT Request frame is a new feature of the OCT. How does the STA figure out whether an AP supports the public action OCT Request frame? When a multi-band AP supports only the OCT defined in 802.11-2016, the AP does not respond to the public action OCT Request frame. | Remove the public action OCT Request frame or clarify how an AP indicates the support of the public action OCT Request frame. |

**Proposed resolution**: Reject

**Discussion**:

1. This frame was defined for use pre-association. Prior to the introduction of this change, the use of OCT was limited to post-association. As such, all legacy devices that implement OCT will never transmit this frame. More importantly, existing implementations of OCT are patchable by SW upgrades – so, they will support this frame in practice.
2. Deleting this frame will remove a key use case for OCT, which is its use for active scanning pre-association.
3. With respect to the question “How does the STA figure out whether an AP supports the public action OCT Request frame?”: this is why an OCT Not Supported field was added – see first paragraph of (**11.32.5 On-channel Tunneling (OCT) operation**). As specified in 11.32.5, every STA that supports OCT will be required to also support this frame.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2073 | 11.32.5 | 2453 | 16 | This paragraph was added as part of M70, but it is not required and is, in fact, limiting the use of OCT. There is no reason why to prevent the flexibility of mixing robust/non-robust tunneled OCT MMPDU with robust/non-robust On-channel Tunnel Request frame. | Delete this paragraph, namely, "An On-channel Tunnel Request frame shall not be transmitted as a Public Action frame unless the tunneled MMPDU does not require management frame protection." |
| 2217 | 11.32.5 | 2453 | 16 | I don't see any reasons why robust management frames shouldn't be allowed with this public action frame. I understand that it was thought that the only use case for sending robust management frames was when the STA was associated so was using the non public action frame. But there are actually use cases where the STA can also be unassociated and would still want to exchange robust management frames with an other AP. | Suppress this sentence and solve the only potential issue which would be to ensure in order distribution of robust management frames, for which simple solutions can be defined. |

**Proposed resolution**: Accept

**Proposed changes**:

*Delete the following paragraph in 11.32.5*: "An On-channel Tunnel Request frame shall not be transmitted as a Public Action frame unless the tunneled MMPDU does not require management frame protection."