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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions of comments received from TGax LB238.

(The proposed change is based on TGax Draft 4.2.)

* CIDs: 20910, 20912, 20749, 20829, 20940, 20938, 20129, 21100, 21138, 21361, 21362 (11 CIDs)

NOTE2: In 11-19/770r3, CID 20743, 21513, 20237, 20606, 20713, 20913, 20690 are deferred from the May F2F meeting. CID 21138, 21361, 21362 are transferred from TGax editor.

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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20743 | 419.01 | 26.15.2 | Re CID 16120: transmission of HE MU PPDUs by non-AP STAs has no appreciable value. The suggestion made in CID 12627 is dubious and there is no evidence of any market interest in the feature | Change the Rx Partial BW SU Using HE MU PPDU From Non-AP STA subfield in the HE PHY Capabilities Information field (Figure 9-772c and Table 9-321b) and at 419.1 in 26.15.2 change "a 20 MHz HE MU PPDU with a single 106-tone RU to a peer STA unless it has received from the peer STA an HE Capabilities element with the Rx HE MU PPDU From Non-AP STA subfield in the HE PHY Capabilities Information field equal to 1" to "an HE MU PPDU" and delete following NOTE | Rejected-  The comment fails to identify a technical issue. |
| 21513 | 419.45 | 26.15.2 | "A Control frame sent as a response to an HE SU PPDU that does not contain a Trigger frame or frame carrying a TRS Control field should be carried in a non-HT PPDU unless the most recent received PPDU sent by the responding STA to the soliciting STA after association was an HE ER SU PPDU in which case the Control frame should be carried in an HE ER SU PPDU." In addition to an HE SU PPDU, the non-HT PPDU should need the same rule. For example, an AP sends a RTS frame in a non-HT PPDU format and a STA responds with a CTS in an HE ER SU PPDU format. | Change "A Control frame sent as a response to an HE SU PPDU that does not contain a Trigger frame or..." to "A Control frame sent as a response to an HE SU PPDU or a non-HT PPDU that does not contain a Trigger frame or..." | Accepted |
| 20237 | 419.47 | 26.15.2 | The statement is wrong | Change the text as below:  "unless the most recent received PPDU sent by the soliciting STA to the responding STA..." | Revised-  Current statement is correct.  But, For more clarification, the wording is changed.  TGax editor makes changes as specified in 11-19/0770r3 for CID 20237. |
| ***TGax Editor: Change the subclause 26.15.2 (PPDU format selection) as follows (#20237):***  — A Control frame sent by an HE STA as a response to an HE ER SU PPDU that does not contain a Trigger frame or frame carrying a TRS Control field should be carried in an HE ER SU PPDU unless the most recently received PPDU sent by ~~the responding STA~~ a recipient of the HE ER SU PPDU to the ~~soliciting~~ HE STA after association was not an HE ER SU PPDU in which case the Control frame should be carried in non-HT PPDU.  — A Control frame sent by an HE STA as a response to an HE SU PPDU that does not contain a Trigger frame or frame carrying a TRS Control field should be carried in a non-HT PPDU unless the most recent received PPDU sent by ~~the responding STA~~ a recipient of the HE SU PPDU to the ~~soliciting~~ HE STA after association was an HE ER SU PPDU in which case the Control frame should be carried in an HE ER SU PPDU. | | | | | |
| 20606 | 420.07 | 26.15.2 | "An HE STA should send an Ack frame in the same PPDU format as the soliciting PPDU if the soliciting PPDU is a VHT PPDU or HT PPDU containing an FTM frame." -- this is outside the scope of the TGax PAR and should be left to TGm or TGaz. Also, there is no such thing as an FTM frame | Delete the cited text at the referenced location. Also delete the proposed bullet g) in 10.6.6.1 | Revised-  The cited text is in the scope of the TGax PAR.  In previous letter ballot, TGax had debated how to support the FTM operation for the HE STA.  And, as the conclusion, the HE STA has this recommendation.  But, if the TGm decides that all STAs (including the legacy HT/VHT STA) follows this recommendation, the cited text can be removed from TGax draft.  But, regarding the last comment, the FTM frame should be changed to the Fine Timing Measurement frame.  TGax Editor replaces “FTM frame” with “Fine Timing Measurement frame” throughout the TGax Draft 4.2. |
| 20713 | 420.51 | 26.15.3 | Re CID 15958: the resolution missed the point of the comment. The comment was about the Tx 1024-QAM Support < 242-tone RU at the AP, not about the Tx 1024-QAM Support < 242-tone RU at the non-AP STA. The point is that an AP must not tell a STA to use narrow RUs with 1024-QAM if it has told the STA that it doesn't support them. Also, editorials | Change "An HE AP shall not set UL MCS subfield of the User Info field in a Trigger frame to 10 or 11 for a 26-, 52- , or 106-tone RU allocation unless the User Info field is addressed to a non-AP HE STA from which the HE AP has received an HE Capabilities element with the Tx 1024-QAM < 242-tone RU Support subfield in the HE PHY Capabilities Information field equal to 1." to "An HE AP shall not set the UL MCS subfield of a User Info field in a Trigger frame to 10 or 11 for a 26-, 52-, or 106-tone RU allocation unless it has set the Rx 1024-QAM < 242-tone RU Support subfield in the HE PHY Capabilities Information field of the HE Capabilities element to 1 and the User Info field is addressed to a non-AP HE STA from which the HE AP has received an HE Capabilities element with the Tx 1024-QAM < 242-tone RU Support subfield in the HE PHY Capabilities Information field equal to 1.". Also, in the para above change "if it has received from the recipient STA" to "if it has received from that STA" | Revised-  Agree with the comment.  But, the issue is more general.  The AP shall not set any subfields of a Trigger frame to a value that is not supported by the AP.  TGax editor makes changes as specified in 11-19/0770r3 for CID 20713. |
| ***TGax Editor: Change the subclause 26.5.2.2.4 (Allowed settings of the Trigger frame fields and TRS Control subfield) as follows (#20713):***  An AP shall not set any subfields of the Common Info field of a Trigger frame to a value that is not supported by all the recipient non-AP STAs of the Trigger frame and the AP.  …  An AP shall not set any subfields of the User Info field of a Trigger frame to a value that is not supported by either the recipient non-AP STA of the User Info field or the AP. An AP shall not set any subfields of a TRS Control subfield to a value that is not supported by either the recipient non-AP STA of the TRS Control subfield or the AP. When an RU is allocated to only one non-AP STA the Starting Spatial Stream subfield for that non-AP STA shall be set to 0. | | | | | |
| 20913 | 422.09 | 26.15.2 | "TX parameter switching" is an undefined concept, and the NOTE has nothing to do with the preceding text anyway | Delete the NOTE at the referenced location | Revsied-  Clarify the NOTE.  TGax editor makes changes as specified in 11-19/0770r3 for CID 20913. |
| ***TGax Editor: Change the following NOTE in the subclause 26.15.3 (MCS, NSS, BW and DCM selection) (#20913):***  NOTE—~~TX parameter switching occurs in subsequent TXOPs.~~ A STA that solicits a Control frame from a peer STA accounts for the TX parameter of the Control frame to calculate the expected duration of the ~~TXOP~~ control response frame from the peer STA in a same TXOP or a subsequent TXOP. The responding STA determines that the most recent PPDU sent to the soliciting STA is successfully received if it receives an immediate acknowledgment by the soliciting STA in response to the PPDU. | | | | | |
| 20690 | 422.17 | 26.15.4.1 | The "at that bandwidth" deletions made in 18/2085 in "Otherwise, If the Operating Mode field is received from the first HE STA, the <HE-MCS, NSS> tuple is supported by the first STA on receive as defined 9.4.2.241.4 (Supported HE-MCS And NSS Set field) and by Equation (9-ax2). If the OM Control subfield is received from the first HE STA, the <HE-MCS, NSS> tuple is supported by the first STA on receive as defined 9.4.2.241.4 (Supported HE-MCS And NSS Set field) and by Equation (9-ax2)." (note other instances left behind) and "Otherwise, if the Max HE-MCS For n SS subfield (n = NSS) in each Tx HE-MCS Map For b subfield for b \member {<= 80 MHz, 160 MHz, 80+80 MHz} indicates support, then the <HE-MCS, NSS> tuple is supported by the first STA on transmit as defined in 9.4.2.241.4 (Supported HE-MCS And NSS Set field)." are wrong because the set is defined above as being for each "bandwidth (<= 80 MHz, and 160 MHz or 80+80 MHz)" | Revert the "at that bandwidth" deletions made per 18/2085 | Revised-  Agree in principle.  Revert the "at that bandwidth" deletions made per 18/2085.  TGax editor makes changes as specified in 11-19/0770r3 for CID 20690. |
| ***TGax Editor: Change the subclause 26.15.4 as follows (#20690):***   * Rate selection constraints for HE STAs * Rx Supported HE-MCS and NSS Set   …   * Otherwise, * If the Operating Mode field is received from the first HE STA, the <HE-MCS, NSS> tuple at that bandwidth is supported by the first STA on receive as defined 9.4.2.241.4 (Supported HE-MCS And NSS Set field) and by Equation (9-ax2). * If the OM Control subfield is received from the first HE STA, the <HE-MCS, NSS> tuple at that bandwidth is supported by the first STA on receive as defined 9.4.2.241.4 (Supported HE-MCS And NSS Set field) and by Equation (9-ax2). * Tx Supported HE-MCS and NSS Set   …   * Otherwise, if the Max HE-MCS For *n* SS subfield (*n* = NSS) in each Tx HE-MCS Map For *b* subfield for *b*  { 80 MHz, 160 MHz, 80+80 MHz} indicates support, then the <HE-MCS, NSS> tuple at that bandwidth is supported by the first STA on transmit as defined in 9.4.2.241.4 (Supported HE-MCS And NSS Set field). | | | | | |
| 21138 | 418.45 | 26.15.2 | An HE STA may transmit an HE SU PPDU to a peer HE STA if the HE SU PPDU does not carry a Control frame that is not solicited by other frame. The sentence does not appear to be understandable. | Please clarify (by avoiding double negation, or at least providing an example). | Revised-  “An HE STA may transmit an HE SU PPDU to a peer HE STA if the HE SU PPDU does not carry a Control frame that is not solicited by other frame.”  This is “may” statement.  And, if-condition is not a requirement to send an HE SU PPDU.  The RTS frame that is not solicited by other frame can be sent in an HE SU PPDU.  So, the cited sentence is meaningless.  TGax Editor removes the second sentence (i.e., An HE STA may transmit an HE SU PPDU to a peer HE STA if the HE SU PPDU does not carry a Control frame that is not solicited by other frame.) of the first paragraph of 26.15.2 (PPDU format selection). |
| 21361 | 418.47 | 26.15.2 | An HE STA may transmit an HE SU PPDU to a peer HE STA if the HE SU PPDU does not carry a Control frame that is not solicited by other frame | Not very clear. Request to add more details | Revised-  “An HE STA may transmit an HE SU PPDU to a peer HE STA if the HE SU PPDU does not carry a Control frame that is not solicited by other frame.”  This is “may” statement.  And, if-condition is not a requirement to send an HE SU PPDU.  The RTS frame that is not solicited by other frame can be sent in an HE SU PPDU.  So, the cited sentence is meaningless.  TGax Editor removes the second sentence (i.e., An HE STA may transmit an HE SU PPDU to a peer HE STA if the HE SU PPDU does not carry a Control frame that is not solicited by other frame.) of the first paragraph of 26.15.2 (PPDU format selection). |
| 21362 | 419.53 | 26.15.2 | A Control frame that is not solicited by another frame shall be carried in an HT PPDU, VHT PPDU, HE SU PPDU or HE ER SU PPDU if the PPDU is encoded using STBC | Not very clear. Request to add more details | Rejected-  The control frame that is not solicited by another frame corresponds to the RTS, NDPA frames and so on.  Such frames shall be carried in an HT, VHT, HE SU, HE ER SU PPDU because the PPDU is encoded using the STBC.  The current text is already enough detail. |