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**Abstract**

This document contains proposed resolutions for assorted REVmc comments received on sponsor ballot 1.

CIDs: 6199, 6186, 5966, 5967, 6181, 5965, 5968

History:

R0: initial revision

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **6199** | 10.23.11711.6 | "A VHT STA with a TDLS link that is not an off-channel direct link shall use as its primary channel the channel indicated by the Primary Channel field in the HT Operation element." -- what if there isn't an HT Operation element (i.e. non-HT BSS or peer is not HT-capable)? | Clarify (perhaps say "shall use the primary channel of the BSS"?) |

**Discussion**

The comment is correct in that the BSS does not have to be an HT BSS. The proposed resolution is generally acceptable.

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. On page 1711.6 change "A VHT STA with a TDLS link that is not an off-channel direct link shall use as its primary channel the channel indicated by the Primary Channel field in the HT Operation element." to "A VHT STA with a TDLS link that is not an off-channel direct link shall use the primary channel of the BSS."

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **6186** | 10.23.61714.52 | It is not clear whether two HT non-VHT STAs may establish a 40 MHz direct link when the BSS is a 20 MHz-only BSS | Clarify (e.g. does "The channel width of a TDLS direct link with a primary channel equal to the base channel shall not exceed the channel width of the BSS to which the TDLS peer STAs are associated, except when the TDLS Wider Bandwidth subfield" apply in this case or only for VHT STAs?) |

**Discussion**

The cited language indeed applies to the example of two HT non-VHT STAs, but the current text does not specifically need to be modified to make that clear (because the setting of the TDLS wider bandwidth subfield is not tied to HT or VHT specifically. However, the cited sentence should be modified to read "The channel width of a TDLS direct link on the base channel shall not exceed the channel width of the BSS to which the TDLS peer STAs are associated, except when the TDLS Wider Bandwidth subfield".

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. At 1714.52, change

"The channel width of a TDLS direct link with a primary channel equal to the base channel shall not exceed the channel width of the BSS to which the TDLS peer STAs are associated, except when the TDLS Wider Bandwidth subfield"

to

"The channel width of a TDLS direct link on the base channel shall not exceed the channel width of the BSS to which the TDLS peer STAs are associated, except when the TDLS Wider Bandwidth subfield".

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **5966** | 9.22.2.31324.15 | EIFS can be avoided at devices that do not implement dynamic EIFS (yet) by requiring that a TXOP is always terminated with a transmission of an ACK at the lowest rate within the PHY. (Dynamic EIFS is defined in 9.3.7, P1042L13.) | Require that the TXOP holder terminates a TXOP with an ACK at the lowest rate within the PHY (i.e. at 6 Mbps for 11ac). |

**Discussion**

Terminating TXOPs with an ACK at 6 Mbps can indeed reduce unnecessary occurrences of EIFS, but the transmission of a terminating ACK does not have to be mandated. It can be optional.

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. In 9.22.2.8 (TXOP limits) at P1331 L51 add a new item as follows:

"− Transmisson of an ACK frame at the lowest basic rate or MCS."

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **5967** | 8.4.2.157.31042.53 | In some cases it is desirable to be able to signal that the maximum supported NSS for 80+80 MHz or 160 MHz packet bandwidth is half the maximum supported NSS for 80 MHz packet bandwidth. However, the Supported VHT-MCS and NSS Set does not currently support this. | Add the option of signaling half-Max Nss support for 80+80 and 160 MHz packet bandwidth. |

**Discussion**

This CID is addressed by document 11-15/654r8, for CID 5960.

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. Apply changes as proposed in 11-15/654r8.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **6181** | 8.6.13.41157.36 | The HT Operation element is not included if the BSS supports HT. This prevents a 40 MHz TDLS link being set up in a 20 MHz HT BSS, and leads to ambiguities if the BSS also supports VHT | Delete ", and the BSS does not support HT" at the referenced location. Also delete "but the BSS is not" in "The HT Operation element shall be present in a TDLS Setup Confirm frame when both STAs are HT capable but the BSS is not." in 10.23.1 |

**Discussion**

The HT operation element is not included in this case because HT operation is governed by the HT operation element of the BSS. However, this exclusion is currently not required for the VHT element when VHT is supported in the BSS, although the same reasoning can be applied.

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. At element 11 (VHT operation), add "the BSS does not support HT, " between "the status code is SUCCESS, " and "and the TDLS direct link is not established in 2.4 GHz band".

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **5965** | 8.4.2.28835.09 | Techniques that rely on the freshness of sounding information, such as downlink MU MIMO, will benefit from TXOPs that are longer than 2 ms. Although the values in this table apply only to STAs and an AP can set its own TXOP limits, these values may still be used to set a default value for the AP also. Therefore, in order to allow for longer TXOPs, it should be allowed to exceed the TXOP limit in exchange for a larger CW. | Allow exceeding the TXOP limit in exchange for a larger CW. |

**Discussion**

Trading a longer TXOP time for less TXOPs through the contention window is generally acceptable, but there should be an ultimate maximum TXOP limit to avoid issues with latency sensitive traffic. When CWmin and CWmax of a node are multiplied by a factor 2, the effect on the success rate is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#nodes** | **5** | **10** | **20** | **40** | **60** |
| success rate for 1x | 0.170 | 0.078 | 0.035 | 0.016 | 0.010 |
| success rate for 2x | 0.089 | 0.041 | 0.018 | 0.007 | 0.005 |
| TXOP ratio 2x:1x | 52% | 52% | 51% | 45% | 48% |
| success rate others 1x | 0.170 | 0.078 | 0.035 | 0.016 | 0.010 |
| success rate others 2x | 0.192 | 0.082 | 0.036 | 0.016 | 0.010 |
| TXOP ratio others | 113% | 106% | 103% | 102% | 101% |

When one of the nodes is a video node (VI), and CWmin and CWmax of one of the other nodes are multiplied by 2, the effect on the success rate is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#nodes (1 VI)** | **5** | **10** | **20** | **40** | **60** |
| success rate for 1x | 0.087 | 0.044 | 0.022 | 0.010 | 0.007 |
| success rate for 2x | 0.044 | 0.024 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.003 |
| TXOP ratio 2x:1x | 50% | 55% | 56% | 53% | 51% |
| success rate others 1x | 0.087 | 0.044 | 0.022 | 0.010 | 0.007 |
| success rate others 2x | 0.098 | 0.047 | 0.022 | 0.010 | 0.007 |
| TXOP ratio others | 112% | 106% | 102% | 101% | 102% |
| success ratio VI 1x | 0.511 | 0.404 | 0.325 | 0.270 | 0.249 |
| success ratio VI 2x | 0.532 | 0.407 | 0.327 | 0.272 | 0.245 |
| TXOP ratio VI | 104% | 101% | 101% | 101% | 100% |

The TXOP limit should likely not be allowed to be exceeded by more than a factor 2.

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. Add the following sentence at the end of clause 9.22.2.8 (TXOP limits), at P1332 L10:

"The TXOP limit may be multiplied by a factor *n* when the associated CWmin and CWmax are also multiplied by *n*, where *n* shall be between 1 and 2."

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | Identifiers | Comment | Proposed Change |
| **5968** | 8.3.3.9632.53 | Probe Request and Probe Response have been growing in szie, which is undesirable in particular at low rates sucuh as 1 Mbps. | Reduce the size of Probe Request and Probe Response, for example by including only a couple supported rates and by defining a shorthand notation for frequently used configurations. |

**Discussion**

Probe request frames can indeed be very long, while their purpose is to evoke the transmission of probe responses by nearby APs. In order to be able to send a probe response, the AP only needs to know a couple supported rates, there is no need to include any further capabilities. But, if necessary, a shorthand notation can be defined for commonly used sets of capabilities and abbreviated by a pseudo rate. For example, for the HT and VHT PHYs the respective membership selector can be used with the MSB equal to 0 (i.e. not contained in the basic rate set).

**Proposed resolution**

Revised. Add the following paragraph at the end of 10.1.4.3.2 (Active scanning procedure for a non-DMG STA), at P1540 L57:

"The elements included in a Probe Request frame may be limited to an SSID element, a Supported Rates element, and optionally a DS element. The Supported Rates element may indicate a reduced set of supported rates. The Supported Rates element may include Membership Selector values with the MSB set to '0' (e.g. not a basic rate) as a shorthand for support of the mandatory portions of a specific PHY."

Add the following paragraph at the end of 10.1.4.3.5 (Contents of a probe response), at P1544 L9:

"When the received Probe Request frame contained a Membership Selector with the MSB set to '0', then the capability indication in the Probe Response frame may be limited to the same Membership Selector, as a shorthand for support of the mandatory portions of the specific PHY."