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Abstract

This document presents a proposed resolution to CID 14022 on the 4th recirculation sponsor ballot of REVmb.

# Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14022 | 439.46 | 8.2.4.5.4 | Editor's Note: Change by .11s leaves unspecified any constraint on individually-addressed QoS Null frames when dot11MCCAActivated is true.  Acknowledged Individually-addressed QoS Null are allowed when MCCAActivated is true. So the note is misleading. | Remove the editor's note and apply more fish. |

# Discussion

The pre-11s text (REVmb D9.0) was clear. For the row in Table 8-6 with values [0,0], it said, “For QoS Null (no data) frames, this is the only permissible value for the Ack Policy subfield.”

However, there is some vagueness in the pre-11s text about whether group addressed QoS Null frames can occur. No text was found specifically mentioning such a scenario. Further, Table 8-6 for row [1,0] says, “This combination is also used for group addressed frames that use the QoS frame format.” Since row [0,0] is clear that [1,0] must not apply to QoS Null frames, it can concluded that no group addressed QoS Null frames were anticipated.

An 802.11s expert clarified that 11s added the concept of [1,0] (“No Ack”) as an alternate ack policy for group-addressed QoS Null frames. Only that situation was intended; namely that for usage within Mesh, and only for group-addressed QoS Null frames, was the No Ack policy intended. This is consistent with the addition of a group addressed QoS Null frame being used to abandon a group MCCAOP reservation when there is no group addressed traffic to transmit (see 9.9a.3.9.1 of 802.11s).

Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that 11s intended to add the concept of a group addressed QoS Null frame, and such a frame would logically need the No Ack policy. But, this would be the only necessary change or exception to the pre-existing rules.

Thus, the change needed here is to add an allowance for the No Ack policy to be used for group addressed QoS Null frames.

One alternative would be to make exactly that be the distinction: individually addressed QoS Null frames must set the ack policy subfield to [0,0] and group addressed QoS Null frames must set to [1,0].

This seems to be the cleanest, and most straightforward solution. Since any group addressed QoS Null frames would logically use No Ack policy, just as group addressed non-null QoS data frames already do.

This resolution needs no mention of mesh usage, or MCCAActivated conditions.

# Proposed Resolution

In Table 8-6, in the row for values [0,0], change “If dot11MCCAActivated is false, this is the only permissible value for the Ack Policy subfield for QoS Null (no data) frames.” to “This is the only permissible value for the Ack Policy subfield for individually addressed QoS Null (no data) frames.”

In Table 8-6, in the row for values [1,0], change, “If dot11MCCAActivated is true this value is permissible for the Ack Policy subfield for group addressed QoS Null (no data) frame.” to “This is the only permissible value for the Ack Policy subfield for group addressed QoS Null (no data) frames”.