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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions of MAC miscellaneous comments received from TGah Draft 4.0.

* CIDs: 6009, 6010, 6016, 6068, 6125, 6127, 6018, 6209, 6210 (9 CIDs)

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

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

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

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6009 |  |  | The resolution for CID 5061 in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1372-09-00ah-tgah-lb205-comments-on-d3-0.xlsx states that the termionology / used wording is in line with text found in IEEE 802.11 REVmc. Based on this argument, the proposed change was rejected.    TGah has added the text (respectively changed the paragraph of the baseline) that was commented on in the previous comment. Hence the comment was valid.    The fact that 11mc used unspecific, unclear, or errorneous wording is not a justification for 11ah to repeat the text and claim that changes to this new text, added by 11ah, should be made in 11mc.    Hence, the comment was not properbly addressed. | Accept the proposed change per previous comment | Revised-  As a comment resolution of CID 6085, the corresponding paragraphs were deleted.  Refer the following resolution of CID 6085:  “Discussion:  The commenter is right: VHT variant HT Control field in 5GHz band and S1G band can have different definition without the help of S1G subfield.  TGah editor make changes shown in 11-15/0389r0 under the headings that includes CID 6085” |
| 6010 |  |  | The resolution for CID 5067 in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1372-09-00ah-tgah-lb205-comments-on-d3-0.xlsx states that the termionology / used wording is in line with text found in IEEE 802.11 REVmc. Based on this argument, the proposed change was rejected.    TGah has added the text (respectively changed the paragraph of the baseline) that was commented on in the previous comment. Hence the comment was valid.    The fact that 11mc used unspecific, unclear, or errorneous wording is not a justification for 11ah to repeat the text and claim that changes to this new text, added by 11ah, should be made in 11mc.    Hence, the comment was not properbly addressed. | Accept the proposed change per previous comment | Revised-  Specifying [; otherwise not present] is not a mandatory from 802.11 Style Guide.  But, specifying the false condition of MIB variable is no harmful.  So, agree in principle.  But, because the resolution of CID 6026 in 11-15/0265r4 already implemented the suggested changes, any other implementation is not needed. |
| 6016 |  |  | The resolution for CID 5109 in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1372-09-00ah-tgah-lb205-comments-on-d3-0.xlsx states that the termionology / used wording is in line with text found in IEEE 802.11 REVmc. Based on this argument, the proposed change was rejected.    TGah has added the text (respectively changed the paragraph of the baseline) that was commented on in the previous comment. Hence the comment was valid.    The fact that 11mc used unspecific, unclear, or errorneous wording is not a justification for 11ah to repeat the text and claim that changes to this new text, added by 11ah, should be made in 11mc.    Hence, the comment was not properbly addressed. | Accept the proposed change per previous comment | Revised-  The previous resolution of CID 5109 submitted from LB205 was “REJECTED” with the following reason.  - Discussion: the minimal frame format is copied from IEEE 802.11 Revmc draft. The commenter should raise the issue in 11mc.  It looks like that a previous resolution was misleading the meaning of the minimal frame format in REVmc.  An interpretation in REVmc is little different with the wording of TGah.  See the below wording copied from REVmc.  “The first three fields (Frame Control, Duration/ID, and Address 1) and the last field (FCS) in Figure 8-1 (MAC frame format) constitute the minimal frame format and are present in all frames, including reserved types and subtypes.”  TGah editor replaces “For PV1 MPDUs, the minimal frame format” with “For PV1 MPDUs, the MAC frame format”. |
| 6018 |  |  | The resolution for CID 5454 in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1372-09-00ah-tgah-lb205-comments-on-d3-0.xlsx states that the termionology / used wording is in line with text found in IEEE 802.11 REVmc. Based on this argument, the proposed change was rejected.    TGah has added the text (respectively changed the paragraph of the baseline) that was commented on in the previous comment. Hence the comment was valid.    The fact that 11mc used unspecific, unclear, or errorneous wording is not a justification for 11ah to repeat the text and claim that changes to this new text, added by 11ah, should be made in 11mc.    Hence, the comment was not properbly addressed. | Accept the proposed change per previous comment | Revised-  I agree in principle.  According to the 802.11 Editorial Style Guide,  the use of “value of <field> field” is deprecated. So the following should not be used:  “A STA that received an MPDU with the value of the Retry subfield of the Frame Control field equal to 1 shall determine if the MPDU is a duplicate using the duplate cache.”  As suggested by the commenter of CID 5454 in LB205, change the wording as the following.  TGah editor  On page 308 line 37 replace "An AP with a value of true for dot11PageSlicingSupported that has any STA(s) associated that has a value of true for dot11PageSlicingSupported whose AID is contained in the:" with "An AP whose dot11PageSlicingSupported value is true and that has at least one associated STA whose dot11PageSlicingSupported value is true and whose AID is contained in the:".  On page 362 line 57 replace "A STA that has a value of true for dot11DynamicAIDActivated is defined" with "A STA whose dot11DynamicAIDActivated is true is defined".  The other parts already have been updated.  (page 345 line 41, page 345 line 47) |
| 6068 | 154.04 | 8.4.2.197.2 | The COLOR subfield shall be located in the S1G Operation element, not in the S1G Capabilities element as the COLOR is a parameter signaled by an AP.  If the COLOR subfield is located in the S1G Capabilities element, the value of COLOR is fixed when the AP starts the BSS. The AP cannot notice associated STAs a change of the value of COLOR (See. 10.47). If the AP performs channel switching, the current value of COLOR may be already used by OBSSs in the new channel, and the merit of COLOR may be lost. | 1) Remove the COLOR subfield from the S1G Capabilities info field by:   - Delete the COLOR subfield from Figure 8-575a26 and Table 8-258a5.   - Reassign the Link Adaptation per Normal Control Response Capable subfield and change the size of the S1G Capabilities info field to 9 octets (Figure 8-575a25).  2) Add the COLOR subfield to the S1G Operation Information field as proposed in 11-15/252.  3) Modify the last paragraph of clause 9.20a (P269L14) as follows:  "An AP shall include the value within the range 0 to 7 that it is using for the TXVECTOR parameter COLOR in non-1MHz, non-NDP frames in the COLOR subfield of the S1G Operation Information field of the S1G Operation element in all frames that contain that element." | Rejected-  The comment is misleading. Beacon and Probe Response frame can include the S1G Capabilities element.  From Sub-clause 10.47, it does not say that only update on S1G Operation element is considered as a critical update.  "An S1G AP can classify other changes in the S1G Beacon frame as critical updates and among these updates can be included those that are described in 10.2.2.17 (TIM Broadcast)."  When the COLOR in the S1G Capabilities element has been updated, the AP can update the Change Sequence.  In the other sense, a dynamic COLOR leads to increased complexity and may have adverse effects because STAs among other things may perform filtering based on the COLOR. |
| 6125 | 146.43 | 8.4.2.195 | This is valid only inside an S1G Beacon frame. Add "S1G" prior to "Beacon". | As in comment. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Add "S1G" prior to "Beacon". |
| 6127 | 154.08 | 8.4.2.197 | An extra "3" in the length of the COLOR field. Remove one of them. | As in comment. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Remove extra "3" in the length of the COLOR field (second 3). |
| 6209 | 278.00 | 9.22.5.3 | It is not clear when the procedures described in section 9.22.5.3 and 9.22.5.7 are used and what the relationship between these procedures is. For example, should RAW with RA frame or slot assignment procedures be used concurrently or separately? | Please clarifiy when and how to use these procedures and what the relationship between them is. | Rejected-  Sub-clause 9.22.5.3 describes a RAW slot assignment procedure for STAs that are allowed to access the medium within a RAW based on the RPS element.  Sub-clause 9.22.5.7 is describing when the RA frame is transmitted and what is the behavior of the receiving STA of the RA frame. |
| 6210 | 278.00 | 9.22.5.3 | In the caption of figure 9-29b the following text is included "RAW (not) restricted to STA whose AID bits in the TIM element". It is unclear which kind of RAW this text is referring to | clarify which RAW types/options are being considered as "RAW (not) restricted to STAs whose bits in the TIMelement are equal to 1". Provide more description. | Rejected-  See the following sentence in the page 278 line 14.  “Otherwise, if the RAW is not restricted to STAs whose AID bits in the TIM element are equal to 1 (the RAW Type field is equal to 0 and the Bit 0 of the Raw Type Options field is equal to 0),”  The corresponding wording is already clarifying the comment. |