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Abstract

This submission proposes resolution for the following CID submitted to 1st SB for P802.11ax (**1 CID**):

* 24081

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

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

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

# 26.11.2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **PP.LL** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24081 | 429.15 | The parameter is no more a flag to show whether the transmission is for uplink or not. The name is misleading. This parameter is used at the 3rd party STA whether it can perform the intra-PPDU power saving. | Change "UPLINK\_FLAG" to such as "ALLOW\_DOZE\_FLAG" throughout the draft.There are two occurrences in 8.3.5.2.2, 1 occurrence in 26.2.2, 1 occurrence in 26.2.3, 2 occurrences in 26.11.1, 5 occurrences including the subclause title in 26.11.2, 4 occurrences in 26.14.1, 3 occurrences in 26.15.2, 2 occurrences in Table 27-1, 1 occurrence in Table 27-18, and 1 occurrence in Table 27-20. That's it. | Reject. Additional optional feature sets the flag to 0 when the packet is for uplink. So, value 1 has no meaning but 0, the inversion side, has. It will be a kind of !STAY\_AWAKE but there is no preceding to add an exclamation point in a flag name. This may stir up an extra argument in the future. And this setting change is only limited to HE ER SU PPDU with TXOP\_DURATION set to UNSPECIFIED and containing an RTS or CTS. Adding these conditions to the flag name is too much. |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Discussion**

The commenter is referring to 26.11.2 shown below and saying that the UPLINK\_FLAG is no more just a flag to show whether the PPDU is for uplink.

The above red underlined part was added to have a 3rd party non-AP STA operating in intra-PPDU power save mode stay awake and process the HE ER SU PPDU sent from a non-AP STA to an AP, which results in the 3rd party non-AP STA to set a NAV and protecting the frame exchange using HE ER SU PPDUs.

The related part is 26.14.1.

It is from an AP to a non-AP STA other than the recipient, so the recipient can skip decoding it.

Original intention: It is from a non-AP STA to an AP, so the recipient which is a 3rd party non-AP STA can skip decoding it.

*But this may fail to protect the frame exchange using HE ER SU PPDUs due to mismatch of the coverage areas, and thus, the exception in 26.11.2 was added.*

The PPDU was sent in an unsupported MCS, so the recipient cannot decode anyway and can skip decoding it.

There is no more MPDUs to decode in the PPDU, so the recipient which can skip the remainder of the it.

Additional optional feature sets the flag to 0 when the packet is for uplink. So, value 1 has no meaning but 0, the inversion side, has. It will be a kind of !STAY\_AWAKE but there is no preceding to add an exclamation point in a flag name. This may stir up an extra argument in the future. And this setting change is only limited to HE ER SU PPDU with TXOP\_DURATION set to UNSPECIFIED and containing an RTS or CTS. Adding these conditions to the flag name is too much.