IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| Comment Resolution subclause 10 |
| Date: 2021-03-10 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Liwen Chu | NXP |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

This submission resolve the following comments for subclause 10 of 802.11bd D1.0:

* 1406, 1492, 1557, 1753, 1229, 1149, 1252, 1517, 1844, 1253, 1281, 1481

Revisions:

 R3: addressing the deferred CID 1229, 1253

R4: minor change per the discussion

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.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1406 | 29 | 9 | Talking of "without exchange of HT Capabilities or VHT Capabilities" is weird because of course an NGV STA wouldn't do HT/VHT stuff (and also "element" is missing) | Change to "without capability exchange" | Revised TGbd editor to make change as shown in 11-21/0429r2 under CID 1406 |
| 1492 | 29 | 10 | It would be better not to specify a capabilities exchange here. Change "exchange of HT Capabilities or VHT Capabilities" with "negotiation of capabilities," | Change "exchange of HT Capabilities or VHT Capabilities" with "negotiation of capabilities," | Revised TGbd editor to make change as shown in 11-21/0429r2 under CID 1492 |
| 1557 | 29 | 10 | Why does an NGV STA care about exchange of HT Capabilities or VHT Capabilities or not? | Please clarify. | Revised Discussion: what the text want to say is that the capabilities exchange for A-MPDU operation is not needed.TGbd editor to make change as shown in 11-21/0429r2 under CID 1557 |
| 1753 | 29 | 10 | "An NGV STA may transmit A-MPDU without exchange of HT Capabilities or VHT Capabilities with maximum length specified in Clause 31.2.3 (A-MSDU operation, A-MPDU operation, and BA operation)." From this sentence, a question, whether an NGV STA can be an HT STA or a VHT STA, arises. | Clarify somewhere whether the NGV STA is an HT STA or a VHT STA. | Revised Discussion: what the text want to say is that the capabilities exchange for A-MPDU operation is not needed.TGbd editor to make change as shown in 11-21/0429r2 under CID 1753 |

**10. MAC sublayer functional description**

**10.12.2 A-MPDU length limit rules**

***TGbd editor: change 10.12.2 as follows (the text not shown is not changed):***

……

(#1406, 1492, 1557, 1753) An NGV STA may transmit A-MPDU without capability exchange as specified in Clause 31.2.3 (A-MSDU operation, A-MPDU operation, and BA operation) . An NGV STA shall support reception of A-MPDU as specified in Clause 31.2.3 (A-MSDU operation, A-MPDU operation, and BA operation).

***……***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1229 | 39 |  | Clause 31.2.3 explicitly allows nonzero TXOP values. This conflicts with 802.11-2016 Clause 10.2.4.2, which states that TXOP = 0 whenever dot11OCBActivated is TRUE. We should modify 10.2.4.2 to limit the TXOP=0 requirement to the case that dot11NGVActivated is FALSE. With that change, 31.2.3 is free to set TXOP to a nonzero value since it only applies when dot11NGVActivated is True | This comment changes clause 10.2.4.2, which is not currently invoked in D1.0. In IEEE 802.11-2016, in the paragraph following Table 10-1 on page 1298, change "except for TXOP limits, which shall be set to 0" to "except for TXOP limits when dot11NGVActivated is false, which shall be set to 0". | Accepted  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1149 | 29 | 47 | "NGV block ack" is stated only once in 10.25.1. The description of "NGV block ack" is not specified. | Either modify the term "NGV block ack" in 10.25.1 to be aligned with Clause 31.2.3 or define the operation of "NGV block ack" | RevisedTGbd editor to make changes in 11-21/0429r2 under CID 1149 |
| 1252 | 29 | 32 | use of negation for normative behavior is unadvisable, instead ofsaying what is not allowed say what is allowed."A STA shall not transmit an NGV PPDU that has a duration (as determined by the PHY-TXTIME.confirmprimitive defined in 6.5.6 (PLME-TXTIME.confirm)) that is greater" | modify the sentence in the comment to say "a STA shall transmit an NGVPPDU with a duration that is smaller or equal to PLME-TXTIME.confirm (refer to 6.5.6) | RejectedDiscussion: “shall not” is widely used in 802.11 baseline specification. |
| 1517 | 29 | 48 | Is NGV block ack a new block ack variant? If so then I don't think it is defined any where or included in table 9-28 of the baseline | Calrify | RevisedTGbd editor to make changes in 11-21/0429r2 under CID 1517 |
| 1844 | 29 | 48 | Where is the "NGV block ack" specified? At least a reference should be provided here. | Provide a reference to where the "NGV block ack" is specified. | RevisedTGbd editor to make changes in 11-21/0429r0 under CID 1844 |

**10.25 Block acknowledgment (block ack)**

**10.25.1 Introduction**

***TGbd editor: Change the 2nd paragraph as follows:***

(#1149, 1517, 1844)The block ack mechanism is initialized by an exchange of ADDBA Request/Response frames, except for GLK-GCR block ack and block ack between two NGV STAs, or by using the unsolicited block ack extension mechanism. After initialization, blocks of QoS Data frames may be transmitted from the originator to the recipient. A block may be started within a polled TXOP, within an SP, or by winning EDCA contention. The number of frames in the block is limited, and the amount of state that is to be kept by the recipient is bounded. The MPDUs within the block of frames are acknowledged by a BlockAck frame, which is requested by a BlockAckReq frame.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1253 | 29 | 61 | "An NGV STA does not setup or modify block ack parameters.NGV STAs use block ack policy as specified in Clause 31.2.3(A-MSDU operation, A-MPDU operation, and BA operation)."This seems to be normative text but uses non-normative verb.In addition it uses negation for nor good reason which is cannot be tested. | Remove non-normative and negation statements about what STA dont do.specify what the STAs do do. | RevisedDiscussion: what should to be done is defined in 31.2.3. The second sentence is changed to “shall” behavior.TGbd editor to make changes under CID 1253 in 11-21/0429r4  |
| 1281 | 29 | 61 | It is not relevant that an NGV STA does not setup or modify block ack parameters. All that needs to be specified is that an NGV STA shall use the block ack parameters specified in Clause 31.2.3. | Replace the paragraph with:"An NGV STA shall use the block ack parameters and policy specified in Clause 31.2.3 (A-MSDU operation, A-MPDU operation, and BA operation)." | RevisedTGbd editor to make changes under CID 1281 in 11-21/0429r2 |
| 1481 | 29 | 61 | undefined term - in this location and throughout the draft, there is the use of a term "block ack policy" - but in the baseline, there is no such term - in 10.25 of the baseline, there are two terms: "block ack mechanism" and "block ack agreement" - I believe that each of these terms should be used as appropriate here and elsewhere in the document - alternatively, the draft could be attempting to create this new concept, and if so, there needs to be a clear statement that there is such a new concept, called "block ack policy" | replace instances of "block ack policy" with either "block ack mechanism" or "block ack agreement" throughout the draft, as appropriate, for example, in this instance, the correct term would be "block ack mechanism" and in this instance there should also be an article, i.e. "the block ack mechanism" - or, create a clear definition for your new term "block ack policy" | RevisedTGbd editor to make changes under CID 1481 in 11-21/0429r2TGbd editor: Change “block ack policy” to “block ack parameters” through the draft |

**10.25.2 Setup and modification of the block ack parameters**

***TGbd editor: Change the 10.25.2 as follows (the text not shown is not changed):***

***……***

(#1253, 1281, 1481) An NGV STA shall use block ack parameters as specified in Clause 31.2.3 (A-MSDU operation, A-MPDU operation, and BA operation).