IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| SB0 resolution to misc comments |
| Date: 2015-12-05 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Zander Lei | Institute for Infocomm Research (I2R) | 1 Fusionopolis Way#21-01 ConnexisSingapore 138632 | +65 6408 2436 | leizd@i2r.a-star.edu.sg |

Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to the following comments for TGah 1st Sponsor Ballot (TGah Draft 5.0).

* CIDs: 8496, 8342, 8207, 8344, 8040 (5 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 inst ructions 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.***

**Clause 4.3.13a** (5 CIDs)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Pg. Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 8496 | 9. 6 | While is appears that TGah seems to have followed the style of 4.3.13 to provide its general description, I don't think that it is a good idea to do so. As TVHT is basically a scaled version of a VHT STA. S1G is not a scaled version of any of the existing STAs and hence should not have a description in line with the TVHT STA. Also note that the VHT STA references the HT STA and basically states what additional features it has, hence it should also not be used as a basis for the S1G STA as the S1G STA is not an update to an existing type of STA. Therefore please rewrite this section so that it is in a similar style as 4.3.11. Also note that Section 4 in my opinion is not the place to list which features are normative and optional, simply stating that the STA supports all mandatory requirements of an S1G STA and my support optional requirements of an S1G STA, as identified in Clauses 9, 10, 11, and 24 and may support should be more than adequate. | Rewrite section 4.3.13a so it follows the form of 4.3.11. | Rejected. S1G shares many similar features with VHT, especially for 2MHz, 4MHz, 8MHz, and 16MHz bandwidth. This session is meant to give a general overview and provides additional information especially different from VHT STA.  |
| 8342 | 9. 22 | The draft text of IEEE 802.11mc D4.3 uses the terms "mandatory" and "optional" in descriptions of relationships that are specified elsewhere, not as specifications of normative relationships. As the IEEE Style Manual makes clear, normative relationships are expressed in sentences that use shall/should/may in IEEE standards. Not only is this long line of pseudo-requirements not in keeping with a general description (the title and purpose of clause 4), but it also is not in keeping with IEEE standards. | Remove all text from page 9 line 22 through page 10 line 24. | Rejected. This clause is meant to give a general overview to readers and all the standard expressions, e.g. “Shall/should/may”, appear in later clauses. |
| 8207 | 10.19 | Why are there both a "sensor STA" and a "energy limited (EL) STA"? | Please merge or downselect the two proposals into a single protocol. | Rejected. “EL STA” is different from “Sensor STA”. Their definitions are specified in clause 3.2. In general, EL STA is a special type of Sensor STA with even more constraint on power/energy in transmission/receiption. More details can be found in clause10.51 |
| 8344 | 10. 28 | "sensor services" and "offloading services": these terms are mentioned, without definition, in the General Description introductory clause. Either define them before using them or delete this sentence. | Delete the sentence "The S1G AP can provide either or both of sensor services and offloading services." | Rejected. This subclause is meant to give a general overview to readers and the 2 terms can be understood as generic terms. It is not a clause for normative text and it is not necessary to have all terms defined. For example, “Space time block coding”, “transmit beamforming” etc. are not pre-defined when appeared in the similar clause 4.3.12 of 11mc.  |
| 8040 | 10.31 | "An S1G STA is also a QoS STA, but does not support HCCA." conflicts with (REVmc D4 1336.05):"A non-AP QoS STA shall be able to respond to QoS (+)CF-Poll frames received from an HC with the Address 1 field matching their own addresses." | Add 9.22.3.1 from the baseline and exclude S1G STAs from responding to QoS (+) CF-Poll frames. | Revised. Agree in principle. TGah Editor to make the changes under the heading of CID8040in 11-15/1497r1 |

**[CID 8040]**

**Instruction to TG editor: Please append the following text after the end of 9.22.2.9 (Trancation of TXOP) of TGah D5.0 as follows:**

**9.22.3 HCF controlled channel access (HCCA)**

*Change the second paragraph (line 5) of page 1336 as follows:*

A non-AP QoS STA that is a non-S1G STA shall be able to respond to QoS (+)CF-Poll frames received from an HC with the Address 1 field matching their own addresses.