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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions of MAC Miscellaneous comments received from TGax LB230.

(The proposed change is based on TGax Draft 2.3.)

* CIDs: 13669, 11139, 11140, 11152, 14094, 11501, 14326 (7 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 TGax Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGax 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** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13669 |  | 9.2.4.6.4.2 | Reading 27.10.4.3, it is not allowed to transmit an A-MPDU which is a Trigger frame + Action frame soliciting an Ack frame. To solicit an HE TB PPDU with an A-MPDU not containing data frames, the AP needs to set the UMRS Control field to the Action frame and construct an S-MPDU. (The other way will be to include a data frame.) However, this is not explained in 9.2.4.6.4.2 at all. | Add a sentence in 9.2.4.6.4.2 as follows: "To solicit an HE TB PPDU with an A-MPDU containing an Action frame but not containing data frames, an AP shall set the UMRS Control field in the Action frame." | Rejected-  Clause 9 can’t have any normative sentence. |
| 11139 | 185.39 | 10.3.5 | "When TXOP duration-based RTS is disabled" -- how is this condition known/established? | Relate this condition to observables, such as device capabilities, or MIB variable values.  Ditto at line 41. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGax editor makes changes as shown in the as specified in 11-18/0726r0. |
| 11140 | 185.52 | 10.3.5 | "is exempt from these requirements" - which requirements. The previous para has a single requirement, so presumably it is some unspecified number of preceding paras. | Define which requirements are included in this note, or delete the note. | Revised-  Agree in principle.  TGax editor makes changes as shown in the as specified in 11-18/0726r0. |
| 11152 | 194.30 | 10.22.1 | "HCCA is not used by DMG and HE STAs."  This is too compact. In the HE case, an HE STA is by definition a QoS STA. So what constraints on the QoS STA behavior are implicit in this statement that should be explicit? | Add exceptions to the places that describe signalling of HCCA capability, and generation and response to HCCA frame sequences. | Rejected-  The HCCA has been explicitly described in clause 3.  If a statement about the HCCA frame exchange sequence is needed, please ask to change the definition in clause 3. |
| 14094 | 221.21 | 27.2.1 | The commenter agrees with the principles of this subclause. Furthermore, the transmission power used within the TXOP will have effect on the interference in such dense scenario. As such, the specification should define a way for STAs to determine the need of RTS/CTS based on tx power. | Further define a way to turn RTS/CTS on/off based on the transmission power. | Rejected-  The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |
| 11501 | 221.52 | 27.2.2 | TXOP duration-based RTS/CTS mechanism is very clear. E.g. if txop is 10 ms and it is big enough to hold 5 DATA/ACK exchange -- is the STA required to use RTS in front of every DATA/ACK exchange or only beginning of txop? The former makes sense more to me. Then to fix this issue, let's change the duration to be the duration of DATA+SIFS+ACK time rather than TXOP. | as in the comment | Rejected-  In the TXOP duration-based RTS/CTS mechanism, RTS/CTS frame exchange is occurred at the beginning of the TXOP, not every DATA/ACK frame exchange.  Additionally, the comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |
| 14326 | 221.52 | 27.2.2 | TXOP duration-based RTS/CTS is not a well designed mechanism. The threshhold should be in PSDU length rather than the TXOP duration. | as in the comment | Rejected-  The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. |

***TGax editor: replace "When TXOP duration-based RTS is disabled" with "When dot11TXOPDurationRTSThreshold is 1023 or it is not present" at Page 205 Line 39.***

***TGax editor: replace "When TXOP duration-based RTS is enabled" with "When dot11TXOPDurationRTSThreshold is not 1023" at Page 205 Line 41.***

***TGax editor: replace “these requirements” with “requirements related with dot11RTSThreshold and dot11TXOPDurationRTSThreshold” at Page 205 Line 53.***