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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following (11) CIDs received for TGax SA Ballot 1:

24552, 24350, 24486, 24311, 24400, 24401, 24351, 24352, 24348, 24349, 24017

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 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** | **Commenter** | **Pg/Ln** | **Section** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24552 | Asterjadhi, Alfred | 349.54 | 26.5.2.2.4 | "The other remaining subfields are set to any valid value" This is not clear. I guess you want to say a valid value so that the soliciting STA constructs a valid HE TB PPDU. | Ensure that the AP provides valid combinations of the values so that the STA constructs a valid HE TB PPDU. | **Revised**  Agree with the comment that the AP should set the values for the rest of the subfield such that it lets the solicited STA construct a valid HE TB PPDU.  **TGax Editor, please replace the bullet on P349L54 of D6.0 with the following:**   * ~~The~~ Each of the other remaining subfields are set to ~~any~~ a valid value that would cause the soliciting STA to construct a valid HE TB PPDU |
| 24350 | RISON, Mark | 350.14 | 26.5.2.2.4 | "the broadcast RU" suggests there can only be one in an HE MU PPDU. But there could be one for associated STAs and one for unassociated STAs, or one per BSS in a multiple BSSID set, etc. | Change to "a broadcast RU". Also at 459.6 and 459.26 | **Accepted**  **TGax editor, please implement the change as suggested by the comment.** |
| 24486 | RISON, Mark | 351.06 | 26.5.2.2.4 | Figure 26-4--Example of User Info field ordering and RU location mapping has a confusing heading (what is shown is the TF, not just the order of the UFs) | Delete "Order of User Info fields in a " at the top of the figure | **Accepted**  **TGax editor, please implement the change as suggested by the comment.** |
| 24311 | RISON, Mark | 428.52 | 26.11.1 | "If an RU is intended for an AP (i.e., the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG is 1), then the  parameter STA\_ID contains only one element that is set to the 11 LSBs of the AID of the non-AP STA  transmitting the PPDU." -- should also be allowed to be 2045 so that an unassociated STA can send a narrow PPDU to an AP | As it says in the comment | **Rejected**  A STA may send a PSDU in an MU PPDU so that AP can determine the sender (AID carried in the SIG B) in case there are any failures. This helps in recovery protocols (e.g., AP could schedule/assign an RU for the STA). However, unassociated STAs do not have a dedicated AID instead they have a generic AID (2045) which doesn’t identify an individual unassociated STA. Therefore, adding the case of unassociated STA sending an MU PPDU with STAID set to 2045 provides no benefit. |
| 24400 | RISON, Mark |  |  | [Resubmission of comment withdrawn on D5.0] AID 2045 should be allowed in an HE MU PPDU from a non-AP STA to an AP, to signal "not from a STA associated with you" | As it says in the comment | **Rejected**  A STA may send a PSDU in an MU PPDU so that AP can determine the sender (AID carried in the SIG B) in case there are any failures. This helps in recovery protocols (e.g., AP could schedule/assign an RU for the STA). However, unassociated STAs do not have a dedicated AID instead they have a generic AID (2045) which doesn’t identify an individual unassociated STA. Therefore, adding the case of unassociated STA sending an MU PPDU with STAID set to 2045 provides no benefit. |
| 24401 | RISON, Mark | 428.52 | 26.11.1 | [Resubmission of comment withdrawn on D5.0] AID 2045 should be allowed in an HE MU PPDU from a non-AP STA to an AP, to signal "not from a STA associated with you" | At the referenced location change "If an RU is intended for an AP (i.e., the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG is 1), then the  parameter STA\_ID contains only one element that is set to the 11 LSBs of the AID of the non-AP STA  transmitting the PPDU." to "If an RU is intended for an AP (i.e., the TXVECTOR parameter UPLINK\_FLAG is 1), then the  parameter STA\_ID contains only one element that is set to the 11 LSBs of the AID of the non-AP STA  transmitting the PPDU or that is set to 2045 if the non-AP STA is not associated to the AP. NOTE---Since the purpose of allowing UL HE MU PPDU transmission is to allow the AP to determine the origin of failing PPDUs, the value 2045 must be used so that an AP will not be misled by failed transmissions from a STA that is not in its BSS." | **Rejected**  A STA may send a PSDU in an MU PPDU so that AP can determine the sender (AID carried in the SIG B) in case there are any failures. This helps in recovery protocols (e.g., AP could schedule/assign an RU for the STA). However, unassociated STAs do not have a dedicated AID instead they have a generic AID (2045) which doesn’t identify an individual unassociated STA. Therefore, adding the case of unassociated STA sending an MU PPDU with STAID set to 2045 provides no benefit. |
| 24351 | RISON, Mark | 429.05 | 26.11.1 | "For an AP with dot11MultiBSSIDImplemented equal to true, if the RU is intended for more than one  associated STA on any of its BSSs, the parameter STA\_ID is set to 2047." should be qualified w.r.t. individually addressed RUs, like the other cases | Change to "For an AP with dot11MultiBSSIDImplemented equal to true, if the RU is intended for more than one  associated STA on any of its BSSs that is not a recipient of an individually addressed RU, the parameter STA\_ID is set to 2047." | **Accepted**  **TGax editor, please implement the change as suggested by the comment** |
| 24352 | RISON, Mark | 429.11 | 26.11.1 | There is a zoo of broadcast RUs (0, 2045, 2047, BSSID index). An HE MU PPDUs shouldn't use more than one of the ones for associated STAs | After "A non-AP STA shall not transmit an HE MU PPDU where the TXVECTOR parameter STA\_ID includes  more than one entry in the range 1 to 2007." add "An AP shall not transmit an HE MU PPDU where the TXVECTOR parameter STA\_ID includes  more than one entry that is 0, 2047 or a BSSID index." | **Revised**  TGax had discussed this topic in the past and had concluded that this subclause doesn’t need to explicitly state that the RUs for 0, 2047 and BSSID Index need to appear only once. Please see resolution to CID 15955 in doc 18/1815r3. In order to remove any ambiguity, a note is added at the end of the clause with a reference to 26.5.1.2.  **TGax editor, please add the following note at the end of subclause 26.11.1:**  “NOTE – An HE AP does not include in the TXVECTOR more than one parameter STA\_ID with the same value unless the value is 2046 (see 26.5.1.2).” |
| 24348 | RISON, Mark |  |  | The definition of "broadcast RU" is not clear. 26.5.4.5 suggests a broadcast RU is or at least can be one with STA-ID == 2045 but 26.5.1.2 suggests the STA-ID == 2047. The definition in 3.2 suggests it can be 0 or 2047. 26.11.1 indicates the STA\_ID can be 0 or a BSSID index or 2045 or 2047. Need to specify what a broadcast RU is | As it says in the comment | **Rejected**  The definition of ‘broadcast RU’ in clause 3.2 covers the case of 0, BSSID-Index, 2045 and 2047. The reference to broadcast RU in various subclause of clause 26 is consistent with this definition. |
| 24349 | RISON, Mark |  | 26.5 | The definition of "broadcast RU" is not clear. 26.5.4.5 suggests a broadcast RU is or at least can be one with STA-ID == 2045 but 26.5.1.2 suggests the STA-ID == 2047. The definition in 3.2 suggests it can be 0 or 2047. 26.11.1 indicates the STA\_ID can be 0 or a BSSID index or 2045 or 2047 | In 26.5.1.2 delete "(parameter STA\_ID equal to 2047)". In 26.5.4.5 change "in a DL HE MU PPDU on a broadcast RU with STA-ID 2045" to "in a DL HE MU PPDU in an RU with STA-ID 2045" | **Rejected**  The definition of ‘broadcast RU’ in clause 3.2 covers the case of 0, BSSID-Index, 2045 and 2047. The reference to a specific broadcast RU is required in the context of the sentence. For example, in D6.0 P367L14, it clarifies the broadcast RU is meant for unassociated STAs. On P343L21 it clarifies that a STA receiving a broadcast RU specific to it’s BSS ignores a broadcast RU meant for all BSSIDs in the multiple BSSID set. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Pg/Ln** | **Section** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24017 | Bims, Harry | 221.12 | 9.6.7.36 | The text says the FILS Discovery frame optionally includes 3 information elements: Reduced Neighbor Report element, FILS Indication element, and Roaming Consortium element. However, there is no text describing when any of them are optionally included or not included. | Please add text describing when each of the three Information Elements:  a) Reduced Neighbor Report element  b) FILS Indication element  c) Roaming Consortium element    is present in the FILS Discovery frame, and when they are not present | **Revised**  Agree with the comment. Added condition describing when each of the element is carried in the frame.  Note, description of Roaming Consortium Element is missing in baseline (REVmd) spec. This should be addressed in REVmd spec as the impact is not limited to 11ax spec.  **TGax editor, please make changes as shown in doc 11-20/317r0** |

* FILS Discovery frame format

*TGax editor, please make changes to the following table in this sub-clause as showing below*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * FILS Discovery frame format | | |
| Order | Information | Notes |
| 1 | Category |  |
| 2 | Public Action |  |
| 3 | FILS Discovery Information field |  |
| 4 | Reduced Neighbor Report  element | The Reduced Neighbor Report element is optionally present if dot11FILSActivated or dot11HEOptionImplemented or dot11HE6GOptionImplemented is true, otherwise it is not present. |
| 5 | FILS Indication element | The FILS Indication element is optionally present if dot11FILSActivated is true, otherwise it is not present. |
| 6 | Roaming Consortium element | The Roaming Consortium element is optionally present if dot11FILSActivated is true, otherwise it is not present. |
| 7 | TIM element | The TIM element is optionally present if dot11HEOptionImplemented is true, otherwise it is not present. |
| 8 | TWT element | The TWT element is optionally present if dot11HEOptionImplemented is true, otherwise it is not present. If present, the Broadcast field of the TWT element is 1 |
| 9 | OPS element | The OPS element is optionally present if dot11HEOptionImplemented is true, otherwise it is not present. |