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Abstract

Resolved the following **4 CIDs**

24143, 24227, 24487, 24485

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** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24143 | Lalam, Massinissa | 114.10 | It is unclear why 4 octets are reserved in the Per AID TID Info subfield when AID is 2045. Per AID TID Info subfield is already of variable length, so why should this filed be 12 octets long when 8 are sufficient. Either give a better explanation in the following NOTE why ignoring 10 octets is better than 6 or removed those 4 reserved bytes | As in comment | Rejected.Per AID TID Info subfield takes two formats (Figure 9-47c and Figure 9-48d). This helps with the cases where the receiver is not able to understand AID of 2045, where the parsing logic will skip 10 octets by default. |
| 24227 | Wilhelmsson, Leif | 251.50 | "the acknowledgment procedure for MPDUs that were not transmitted within a VHT MU PPDU". It sounds strange to have an acknowledgement procedure for soemthing not sent...Is it possbile to rephrase this to better capture what is intended to be said? | As in comment | Rejected.Comment fails to identify a technical issue and seems to target baseline spec text.  |
| 24487 | RISON, Mark |  | We have a 26.4.4.4 Responding to an HE MU PPDU, HE SU PPDU or HE ER SU PPDU with an HE TB PPDU but we also need a subclause on responding to a non-HE PPDU with an HE TB PPDU, if the non-HE PPDU is a triggering frame (i.e. contains a Trigger frame or TRS Control). The resolution to CID 22321 said "Only the MPDUs sent in HE MU PPDU, HE SU PPDU or HE ER SU PPDU can set the Ack Policy to HTP Ack", which is true, but not relevant to this comment, which is about the need for information on how to respond to a non-HE PPDU with an HE TB PPDU | As it says in the comment | Rejected.Subclause 26.4.4.4 is about acknowledgement rules. Also, refer to Table 9-529 (A-MPDU context) to see the constrains for sending Trigger frame. The table restricts the PPDUs that can carry a Trigger frame (when aggregated with other MPDUs) to only HE PPDUs.Also, please note that when a HE PPDU is sent soliciting an HE TB PPDU, then the Ack policy is set to HTP Ack~~We cannot respond to a non-HE PPDU with acknowledgement carried in HE TB PPDU. See the condition for setting HTP Ack~~: “"The frame is carried in an HE MU PPDU, HE SU PPDU or HE ER SU PPDU that contains a frame that solicits a response in an HE TB PPDU"” in Table 9-13 |
| 24485 | RISON, Mark |  | It is not clear whether two HE STAs that have negotiated a BA buffer size >64 for a given TID can exchange >64 MPDUs for that TID in a HT/VHT PPDU | At 280.37 add a para "An HE STAs whose transmission window is greater than 64 may transmit more than 64 MPDUs in a VHT PPDU to the recipient HE STA." | Rejected.Buffer size negotiated is not limited to the PPDUs that carry the MPDUs. Adding the proposed text will be misleading in the sense that this sentence would need to be updated for future amendements. Also, please note that the spec does not have any explicit statement that would forbid these VHT PPDUs for example from being sent to such an HE STA. |