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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for comments in clause 25.5.2.6 of TGax Draft 0.1 with CIDs 59, 2652, and 2653.

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.

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 TGax D0.1 Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGax D0.1 Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 59 | 60.1 | 25.5.2.6 | Specify what group-addresses should be used to identify the RUs availabe for random access. Also related to 9.3.1.23. | As in the comment. | Revised.  Agreed to the comment. Specific grop address should be assigned for random access RU.  For this purpose, resolution for CID 558 already resolved this issue in a way that a value of 0 is assigned for random access RU for AID12 subfield of a Trigger frame.  **Note: Already accounted for in D0.5 so no further action is required by the TGax editor.**  TGax editor to make the changes shown in 11-16/0780r1 listed under CID 558. |
| 2652 | 59.62 | 25.5.2.6 | Mechanism for soliciting simultaneous CTS responses from random access channel is needed. Random access channel can be a good candidate for identifying STAs that have uplink buffered BU to send when an AP does not have any information on this. However, this also implies that random access channel will be frequently used at the beginning of UL transmission (before an AP allocating resoures for UL data transmission). Then, it is required for the serving AP to protect the whole UL MU transmission duration from both AP and STAs side when the AP sets up the TXOP. However, as there's no specific STA known before random access channel transmission by its nature, a robust protection mechanism that sets NAV not only from AP side but also from participating STAs side is needed. (If regular MU-RTS/CTS sequence is used, the AP needs to include almost every STA to send CTS frame without knowing if the STA has buffered UL data to send, which is not practical.) | Provide a mechanism that can solicit simultaneous CTS responses from random access channel. | Rejected.  Because a serving AP cannot identify which STAs will participate random access channel, to support a mechanism that can solicit simultaneous CTS responses from multiple STAs for random access channel, the AP may need to indicate broadcast address, which may result in over-protection of the wireless medium. |
| 2653 | 60.28 | 25.5.2.6 | In conventional backoff mechanism, there are multiple contention windows based on the QoS class. However, it is not clear which STA is allowed to participate the random accss and how to differentiate the contention windows based on STA's QoS class or TID. Therefore, how to define OCWmin shall be clarified. | As mentioned in the comment, clarify how to define OCWmin value and the relationship of OCWmin with other QoS parameters in this subclause. | Revised.  Agreed to the comment that current draft spec. does not clearly define how to handle OCWmin value as a function of the access category of the STA’s data.  As aggregation of multiple TIDs in different access categories are already allowed for HE STA, it may not be appropriate to have different OCWmin/OCWmax parameters. Therefore, use of single OCWmin/OCWmax value will make the protocol simple and clean.  TGax editor to make the changes shown in 11-16/1391r0 listed under CID 2653. |

**Discussion:** *None.*

***TGax editor: Modify the fourth paragraph of sub-clause 25.5.2.6.1 on Page 138 Line 23 of Draft P802.11ax\_D0.5 as CID 2653:***

**25.5.2.6.1 General**

…

An HE STA shall use the OCWmin and OCWmax values indicated in the RAPS element within the most recently received Beacon or Probe Response regardless of the access category of traffic the HE STA intends to transmit.

NOTE—If the STA does not receive the RAPS element, the STA does not transmit any HE trigger-based PPDU using random access RUs.

…