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Abstract

This document proposes a resolution for CIDs 114, 1492, 1715, 1491, 1493 and 8 (comments on P802.11ac/D0.1).

Changes in the text refer to: Draft P802.11ac/D0.4.

Comments on RIFS (CID 114, 1492, and 1715)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 114 | Au, Edward (Kwok Shum) | 9.9.1.4 | 52 | 5 | TR | For the rule in clause 9.2.0b.4.2 that a VHT STA shall not transmit frames separated by a RIFS, the sentence "(or RIFS, under the conditions defined in 9.3.2.4.2 (RIFS))" should be deleted. | Delete the sentence "(or RIFS, under the conditions defined in 9.3.2.4.2 (RIFS))" | Agree in principle. The use of RIFS is deprecated for VHT STAs.  | MAC |
| 1492 | Lv, Kaiying | 9.9.1.4  | 52 | 5 | TR | the term "STA" here is not clear | change "STA" to "TXOP holder" | Agree. Changed the text accordingly.  | MAC |
| 1715 | Cheong, Minho | 9.9.1.4 | 52 | 6 | TR | Is it correct to include RIFS here, because RIFS is deleted in VHT. |  | Agree in principle. The use of RIFS is deprecated for VHT STAs. | MAC |

Discussion

Agree in principle.

Since the use of RIFS is already deprecated for VHT STAs, a VHT STA shall not transmit frames separated by a RIFS. Although it is already specified in 9.3.2.4.2 of TGac Draft 0.4, we propose to specify it in the sentence for clarity.

**Proposed resolution**:

***Change the following sentence in Section 9.19.2.4 of TGac Draft D0.4: (P72L5)***

If a TXOP holder has in its transmit queue an additional frame of the ~~same~~ primary AC ~~as the one just transmitted~~ and the duration of transmission of that frame plus any expected acknowledgment for that frame is less than the remaining TXNAV timer value, then the TXOP holder may commence transmission of that frame a SIFS (or RIFS, if the TXOP holder is not a VHT STA and if the conditions defined in 9.3.2.4.2 (RIFS)(#731) are met) after the completion of the immediately preceding frame exchange sequence.

CID 1491 and 1493

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1491 | Lv, Kaiying | 9.9.1.4 | 52 | 17 | TR | the VHT STA should be contained | change "the HT STA" to "the HT or VHT STA" | Agree. Changed the text accordingly. | MAC |
| 1493 | Lv, Kaiying | 9.9.1.4  | 52 | 19 | TR | the VHT STA should be contained | change "the HT STA" to "the HT or VHT STA" | Agree. Changed the text accordingly. | MAC |

Discussion

Agree.

**Proposed resolution**:

***Change the following sentence in Section 9.19.2.4 of TGac Draft D0.4: (P72L20)***

The TXNAV timer is a timer that is initialized with the duration from the Duration/ID field in the frame most recently successfully transmitted by the TXOP holder. The TXNAV timer begins counting down from the end of the transmission of the PPDU containing that frame. Following the BlockAck response, the HT or VHT STA may start transmission of another MPDU or A-MPDU a SIFS after the completion of the immediately preceding frame exchange sequence. The HT or VHT STA may retransmit unacknowledged MPDUs within the same TXOP or in a subsequent TXOP.

CID 8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | Aboul-Magd, Osama | 9.9.1.4 | 52 | 41 | TR | The statement "a multiple frame transmission is granted to an EDCAF not a STA" is confusing. It could imply that multiple frame transmissions could happen from the same EDCAF from multiple stations. | replace "not a STA" to "of a STA" | Agree. Changed the text accordingly. | MAC |

Discussion

Agree.

There is one EDCAF per AC in a STA and a multiple transmission is granted to “one of the EDCAFs in a STA”, so replacing “not to a STA” to “of a STA” makes the sentence more clear.

**Proposed resolution**:

***Change the following sentence in Section 9.19.2.4 of TGac Draft D0.4: (P72L46)***

Note that, as for an EDCA TXOP, a multiple frame transmission is granted to an EDCAF of a STA, so that the multiple frame transmission is permitted only for the transmission of a frame of the same AC as the frame that was granted the EDCA TXOP, unless the EDCA TXOP obtained is used by an AP for a PSMP sequence or a MU-MIMO transmission.