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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions of comments received from TGah 1st Sponsor Recirculation Ballot (TGah Draft 6.0).

* CIDs: 9059, 9060, 9063, 9061, 9062 (5 CID)

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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9059 | 0.00 | 0 | The reason given for rejecting i-442 asserts that the BRC has no idea what is MAC functionality and what is MAC service interface. This reinforces the commenters assertion that there is inappropriate text in the clause and that the change is inconsistent with the base standard. | Remove all changes to the 802.11 MAC contained in this amendment. Delete clauses 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 from this draft amendment. | Revise-  Agree in principal.  Some paragraphs of the sub-clause 11.51 are not appropritate for clause 11.  TGah editor moves some paragraphs (not related with MLME) of the sub-clause 11.51 to clause 10 according to the the editing instruction on 11-16/453.  Refer the detail from https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/documents?is\_dcn=453&is\_group=00ah&is\_year=2016 |

***TGah Editor modifies sub-clause 11.51 as the following:***

**11.51 Support for energy limited STAs**

An energy limited (EL) STA is an S1G STA with dot11S1GELOperationActivated equal to true that is powered by a small energy supply and is limited in terms of its ability to transmit or receive in certain intervals of time. An EL STA may indicate these limitations to an S1G STA that intends to communicate with it by using the signalling described in this subclause. The procedure described below increases the likelihood that frame exchanges between these two STAs are performed successfully.

An EL STA receiving MLME-ACTIVITYSPECIFICATION.request primitive shall include an EL Operation element in Probe Request, DLS Request, DLS Response, TDLS Setup Request, TDLS Setup Response, and (Re) Association Request frames and may send EL Operation frames.

An S1G AP that sets the STA Type Support in the S1G Capabilities element to 2 (i.e. supports only non-sensor STAs), as described in 11.50.7 (S1G BSS type and STA type), may refuse (re) association or can disassociate an EL STA. The S1G AP that refuses (re) association or disassociates an EL STA shall set the Status Code field in the (Re) Association Response frame or in the Disassociation frame to ENERGY\_LIMITED\_OPERATION\_NOT\_SUPPORTED.

Upon receipt of an MLME-ACTIVITYSPECIFICATION.indication primitive, an S1G STA shall maintain two timer, ELMaxAwakeTimer and ELRecoveryTimer according to the according to the procedures defined in 10.xx (Energy limited STAs operation).

***TGah Editor moves all contents (including figure) after 3rd paragraph of 11.51 to a new sub-clause in clause 10 as the below.***

**10.59 Eenergy limited STAs operation**

An S1G STA keeps two timers, ELMaxAwakeTimer and ELRecoveryTimer, for each EL STA and these timers are initialized upon successful reception of an EL Operation element from the EL STA:

—The ELMaxAwakeTimer is set to 0.

—The ELRecoveryTimer is set to the value of the Recovery Time Duration field of the EL Operationelement.

…

…

…

When the S1G STA cannot complete frames exchanges within ELMaxAwakeTimer, a new back-off procedure is invoked after stopping the current transmission and once the ELRecoveryTimer has expired.

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9060 | 0.00 | 0 | The reason given for rejecting i-440 asserts that the BRC has no idea what is MAC functionality and what is MAC service interface. This reinforces the commenters assertion that there is inappropriate text in the clause and that the change is inconsistent with the base standard. | Remove all changes to the 802.11 MAC contained in this amendment. Delete clauses 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 from this draft amendment. | Revise-  Agree in principal.  Last sentence of the sub-clause 11.50.7 are not appropritate for clause 11.  TGah editor moves the last sentence (not related with MLME) of the sub-clause 11.50.7 to clause 10 according to the the editing instruction on 11-16/453.  Refer the detail from https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/documents?is\_dcn=453&is\_group=00ah&is\_year=2016 |

***TGah Editor moves the last sentence of sub-clause 11.50.7 to sub-clause 10.7.13.3 as the following:***

**11.50.7 S1G BSS type and STA type**

***…***

~~An S1G AP that indicates support for sensor STAs shall not indicate minimum MCS restrictions as specified in 10.7.13.3 (Additional rate selection constraints for S1G PPDUs).~~

**10.7.13.3 Additional rate selection constraints for S1G PPDUs**

The following apply for a STA that transmits an S1G PPDU, except for an S1G AP that indicates support for sensor STAs as specified in 11.50.7 (S1G BSS type and STA type):

—If the channel width of the PPDU is equal to CBW1, CBW2, CBW4, CBW8 or CBW16, then the STA should not use a <S1G-MCS, NSS> tuple if the S1G-MCS is equal to 0 and the Min S1G-MCS For n SS subfield in the Basic S1G-MCS and NSS Set field of the S1G Operation element of the receiver STA is equal to 1.

—If the channel width of the PPDU is equal to CBW1, CBW2, CBW4, CBW8 or CBW16, then the STA should not use a <S1G-MCS, NSS> tuple if the S1G-MCS is equal to 0 or 1 and the Min S1G-MCS For n SS subfield in the Basic S1G-MCS and NSS Set field of the S1G Operation element of the receiver STA is equal to 2.

—If the channel width of the PPDU is equal to CBW1, then the STA should not use a <S1G-MCS, NSS> tuple if the S1G-MCS is equal to 10 and the B7 of the Channel Width subfield in the S1G Operation Information field of the S1G Operation element of the receiver STA is equal to 0.

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9063 | 0.00 | 0 | The reason given for rejecting i-432 asserts that the BRC has no idea what is MAC functionality and what is MAC service interface. This reinforces the commenters assertion that there is inappropriate text in the clause and that the change is inconsistent with the base standard. | Remove all changes to the 802.11 MAC contained in this amendment. Delete clauses 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 from this draft amendment. | Revised-  Agree in principal.  Some text (e.g., the non-AP STA... sends the Ack frame after SIFS) of the sub-clause 11.48 is not appropritate for clause 11.  TGah editor remove the MAC sublayer functional description (not related with MLME) of the sub-clause 11.48 according to the the editing instruction on 11-16/453.  Refer the detail from <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/documents?is_dcn=453&is_group=00ah&is_year=2016> |

***TGah Editor modifies sub-clause 11.48 as the following:***

**11.48 Dynamic AID assignment operation**

If a non-AP STA with direct connections receives a STA Information Announcement frame including an AID Announcement element from a peer STA, the non-AP STA updates the peer STA's AID to the received ~~AID and sends the Ack frame after SIFS~~.

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9061 | 0.00 | 0 | The reason given for rejecting i-437 asserts that the BRC has no idea what is MAC functionality and what is MAC service interface. This reinforces the commenters assertion that there is inappropriate text in the clause and that the change is inconsistent with the base standard. | Remove all changes to the 802.11 MAC contained in this amendment. Delete clauses 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 from this draft amendment. | Rejected-  TGah BRC reviewed the sub-clause 11.50 (S1G BSS operation) to find inappropriate texts in MLME clause.  But, the BRC can not identify which operation is considered as the MAC functionality.  11.50 (S1G BSS operation) is describing the BSS operation and almost texts are well aligned with the reference sections, 10.40 (VHT BSS operation) and 10.43 (Basic TVHT BSS functionality) of 802.11 base specification.  It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |

| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9062 | 0.00 | 0 | The reason given for rejecting i-436 asserts that the BRC has no idea what is MAC functionality and what is MAC service interface. This reinforces the commenters assertion that there is inappropriate text in the clause and that the change is inconsistent with the base standard. | Remove all changes to the 802.11 MAC contained in this amendment. Delete clauses 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 from this draft amendment. | Rejected-  TGah BRC reviewed the sub-clause 11.49 (System information update procedure) to find inappropriate texts in MLME clause.  But, the BRC can not identify which operation is considered as the MAC functionality.  10.49 (System information update procedure) is describing the system information update mechanism and almost texts are well aligned with the reference section, 10.2.2.17 (TIM Broadcast) of 802.11 base specification.  It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |