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Abstract

This document provides proposed comment resolutions for clause 6 CIDs submitted in response to the 802.11 TGbd D2.0 WG letter ballot #254. CIDs: 2216, 2213, 2214, 2253, 2257, 2258, and 2269.

The comments are available in: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1296-00-00bd-tgbd-lb254-comments.xlsx>.

Status: Highlighting in CID column indicates the status of the discussion on the CID:

Not Discussed (not highlighted)

Discussed additional discussion required (date of discussion(s) is(are) located below CID number)

Discussed / ready for SP (date of discussion(s) is(are) located below CID number)

SP run / ready for Motion (date of the SP is located below the date of discussion)

Motioned (date of Motion is located below the date of the SP)

Resolution Status: Highlighting in the Resolution column indicates:

Yellow highlighted text needs to be discussed

Red highlighted text has been discussed and additional discussion is required

**CIDs for Clause 6.3.126, Page 27, lines 7:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2216 | While I still disagree that we need a new SAP primitive for what is a local (implementation specific) behavior, if the MLME-CANCEL primitives are kept in the MLME SAP, then they need some normative text describing their use. Currently there is zero reference to what these primitives do, when/how they are used, etc. | Add text in a normative behavior clause (probably clause 31) to explain the use of these primitives. | Revised:  The MLME-CANCELTX primitives are intended to be used by higher layer entities (e.g., IEEE Std 1609) to control/manage the 802.11 queues, allowing the higher layer to remove stale MSDUs that are currently in the queues and to receive conformation that the MSDUs have been removed.  Modify 6.3.126.2.3 to be:  “The primitive is generated by SME when the SME receives a request (from a higher layer entity) to remove MSDUs from the transmit queues.”  And  Modify 6.3.126.3.3 to be:  “The primitive is generated by the MLME to inform the SME that an MLME-CANCELTX.request primitive has been completed, so that the SME can inform the requesting entity (a higher layer entity).” |

**CIDs for Clause 6.3.126.2.2, Page 27, lines 39:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2253 | There are only four valid access category indices, 0 through 3. The table of access category indices in 6.3.126.2.2 incorrectly states that the valid range is 0-4. | In the table in this clause, change the valid range from "0-4" to "0-3" | Revised:  Agree with the commenter that there are only 4 access categories, however allowing 5 values for the AccessCategoryIndex allows 0-3 to map to the each of the 4 access categories (as in Table 9-283) and 4 to represent all access categories. This should be clearly specified.  Therefore, modify the AccessCategoryIndex Description to be:  “Specifies the access category index for which MSDUs are to be removed from the transmit queue. Index 0-3 is the value of the access category in Table 9-283 and index 4 indicates all access categories. |

**CIDs for Clause 6.6, Page 31, lines 26:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2213 | NGV radio environment report appears to be a management function. This should be added to the MLME, not creating a new SAP (which it appears to be doing, by only by implication). Further, it should definitely \_not\_ be adding to the MAC SAP data plane, which is what MA-xxx primitives are. | Move this entire subclause text to be a new sublcause within 6.3, and change the primitive from "MA-RADIOENVIRONMENT" to "MLME-RADIOENVIRONMENT" (or "MLME-NGV-RADIOENVIRONMENT" pehaps?).  Per another comment, this should probably be a request/response primitive, with the request starting the periodic measurement process including providing the period for the measurement, which would eliminate the MIB attributes for the duration, and clarify the interaction that starts the measurements. | Revised:  Agree in principle with the commentor.  Moved the radioenvironment primitive to be an MLME-RADIOENVIRONMENT primitive and provided a request/response type primitive. These primitives will allow higher layer entities to configure periodic measurements of the radio environment to be made by the STA and allow these measurements to be reported back to a higher layer entity via the SME.  Change: “6.6 NGV radio environment report” to be: “6.3.128 NGV radio environment measurement”  Change: “6.6.1 Introduction  The mechanism provides periodic reports on the radio environment for use in rapidly varying radio environments.” to be “6.3.128.1 General This primitive provides a report on the STA’s radio environment.  Move clause 6.6.1.1 to be 6.2.128.2, 6.6.1.1.1 to be 6.3.128.2.1, 6.6.1.1.2 to be 6.3.128.2.2, and 6.6.1.1.3 to be 6.3.128.2.3.  Change: “MA-RADIOENIRONMENT.indication” to “MLME-RADIOENVIRONMENT.indication.” |

**CIDs for Clause 6.6.1, Page 31, lines 31:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2214 | What is a "rapidly varying radio environment"? Do other PHYs (MACs) besides 802.11bd have such an environment, ever? | Clarify what this term is trying to describe, and how/if this applies to other MAC/PHY (and if not, why not). Similar change to match, on page 61 (in 31.6 first sentence). | Revised:  Agree with the commenter that the term “rapidly varying radio environment” is not defined. However, it is not necessary for the term to be used in the clause.  Delete “for use in rapidly varying radio environments” |

**CIDs for Clause 6.6.1.1.2, Page 32, lines 32:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 2257 | A maximum value for the StationCount should be indicated in the valid range column of the table | Change the valid range of the StationCount parameter from "≥ 0" to "0 ≤ StationCount < 65536" | Revised:  Agree with the commentor that the valid rage of the StationCount parameter should be specified and that the range of 0-65536 is acceptable. However, the format proposed is not consistent with the table.  Replace “≥ 0” with “0-65 536” |
| 2258 | A maximum value for the StationCount should be indicated in the valid range column of the table | Change the valid range of the StationCount parameter from "≥ 0" to "0 ≤ StationCount < 65536" | Duplicate comment see CID 2257 |
| 2269 | A maximum value for the StationCount should be indicated in the valid range column of the table | Change the valid range of the StationCount parameter from "≥ 0" to "0 ≤ StationCount < 65536" | Duplicate comment see CID 2257 |
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