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Abstract

This document provides proposed comment resolutions for some comments submitted in response to the 802.11 TGbd D1.0 WG letter ballot #251. CIDs: 1023, 1024, 1168, 1196, 1374, 1516, and 1758 are addressed. Added CID 1278

r1: As updated in the TGbd teleconference on 2021-05-25

r2: Updated to include SP results from teleconference on 2021-05-25

r3: Added proposed resolutions for CIDs: 1168 and 1278 are added.

The comments are available in: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1887-05-00bd-tgbd-lb251-comments.xlsx>. The proposed resolutions are grouped by clause, page, and line number.

Status: Highlighting in CID column indicates the status of the discussion on the CID:

Not Discussed (not highlighted)

Discussed additional discussion required (date of discussion(s) is(are) located below CID number)

Discussed / ready for SP (date of discussion(s) is(are) located below CID number)

SP run / ready for Motion (date of the SP is located below the date of discussion)

Motioned (date of Motion is located below the date of the SP)

Resolution Status: Highlighting in the Resolution column indicates:

Yellow highlighted text needs to be discussed

Red highlighted text has been discussed and additional discussion is required

**CIDs for Clause 31.2.3, Page 38, line 65:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 17582021-05-25 | "An NGV STA shall transmit a maximum MPDU length of 7991 octets, though the maximum may be less for certain MCSs." It looks as though an NGV STA shall always transmit a MPDU in 7991 octets in some MCSs, but I believe it's not the intent. | Change it to read "An NGV STA shall support transmitting a maximum MPDU length of 7991 octets in MCSs that | **Revised:**Agree in principle with the commentor.Replace: “An NGV STA shall support receiving a maximum MPDU length of 7991 octets (see Clause 10.11 (AMSDU operation). An NGV STA shall transmit a maximum MPDU length of 7991 octets, though the maximum may be less for certain MCSs.” With: “An NGV STA shall support receiving an MPDU of length equal to or less than the maximum NGV MPDU length in Table 31-1. An NGV STA shall not transmit an MPDU with a length greater than maximum NGV MPDU length as shown in Table 31-1.”Note to Editor: this resolution is the same as that for CID 1023, in this document |

**CIDs for Clause 31.2.3, Page 39, line 1:**

| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10232021-05-25 | The STA is certainly not required to transmit an MPDU with that max lenght. It is required to not exceed that lenght. Please rephrase such as "shall support receiving MPDUs with a lenght that does not exceed 7991). Similarly the STA shall support transmitting MPDUs with a length that is up to 7991 (if you want to add some restrictions then specify subject to aMAXPPDUduration or similar, or maybe the table below)). | As in comment | **Revised:**Agree in principle with the commentor.Replace: “An NGV STA shall support receiving a maximum MPDU length of 7991 octets (see Clause 10.11 (AMSDU operation). An NGV STA shall transmit a maximum MPDU length of 7991 octets, though the maximum may be less for certain MCSs.” With: “An NGV STA shall support receiving an MPDU of length equal to or less than the maximum NGV MPDU length in Table 31-1. An NGV STA shall not transmit an MPDU with a length greater than maximum NGV MPDU length as shown in Table 31-1.”Note to Editor: this resolution is the same as that for CID 1023, in this document |

**CIDs for Clause 31.2.3, Page 39, line 38:**

| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10242021-05-25 | It is not clear what a fixed BlockAck policy is and how that can be supported. Also it is clear that BA policies are not modified, or setup etc. I guess you are referring to blockack agreements. Also the other sentences need some improvement. | As in comment. | **Revised**:Replace: "An NGV STA shall support a fixed Block ACK policy. The Block ACK policy is not setup, modified or torn down. The Block ACK policy does not timeout. An NGV STA shall support the BA buffer size of 32, i.e., the number of MPDUs that can be held in its buffer. Block Acks may be sent without a Block Ack Agreement in place."With:“An NGV STA shall support block ack and does so without exchanging capabilities or creating a block ack agreement. An NGV STA shall have the following block ack configuration:* A-MSDU is supported
* The block ACK policy is HT-immediate block ack
* No timeout
* The number of buffers available is 32
* Each buffer is capable of holding 7991 octets (the maximum size of an A-MSDU)”

 **Note** CIDs 1282, 1430, and 1040 have the same resolution (see 11-21-0171r6). |

**CIDs for Clause 3, Page 15, line 10:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 15162021-05-25 | has V2X defined anywhere? I know it is a public slang but need to define precisely hat does it mean. | Add V2X defintion and abbreviation | **Reject:**A definition for V2X is not required as V2X is a well know technical term that is commonly used in the technical publications. Also, V2X is defined at first use: in the amendment Abstract: “… vehicle to everything (V2X) …” (page 2, line 2) and in the Introduction “… vehicle to everything (V2X) …” (page 3, line 12). |

**CIDs for Clause 3.2, Page 15, line 48:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 11962021-05-25 | The definition of non-NGV PPDU is restricted to "the 5.9 GHz" band. That restriction should be removed. Whereever NGV and non-NGV (10 MHz OCB) PPDUs share spectrum they should be coexistent. FCC rules will soon prohibit both types of PPDUs from the US 5.9 GHz band, but there may be other spectrum they can use. | Omit "in 5.9 GHz band" from definition of non-NGV PPDU | **Rejected:**Non-NGV PPDUs are legacy 802.11 5.9 GHz band 10 MHz PPDUs (802.11p based PPDUs) and the term is used in the NGV specification to address coexistence requirements for NGV and non-NGV transmissions. If future bands are defined for NGV, there is no reason to discuss legacy PPDUs as there are no legacy PPDUs outside the 5.9 GHz band. |
| 1168 | The definition of non-next generation V2X STA could apply to any 802.11 STA, which it not the assumed intent. | Assume this is meant to apply to what is commonly called "802.11p." Definition should be restricted to a STA that has the OCB bit set (dot11OCBActivated), whether NGV or non-NGV. | **Rejected:**Non-NGV PPDUs are legacy 802.11 5.9 GHz band 10 MHz PPDUs (802.11p based PPDUs) and the term is used in the NGV specification to address coexistence requirements for NGV and non-NGV transmissions. If future bands are defined for NGV, there is no reason to discuss legacy PPDUs as there are no legacy PPDUs outside the 5.9 GHz band. |

**CIDs for Clause 5.4, Page 21, line 21:**

| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1278 | If the MA-RADIOENVIROMENT.indication is a new service primitive between the LLC layer and the MAC layer similar to the MA-UNITDATA primitive, it should be defined in the MAC data service specification clause, not in a new clause. If it is new type of primitive between the MAC layer and an other layer (e.g. a 1609 layer) it should be clearly stated as to the purpose of the primitive and its use. | Move the clause to be in clause 5.2 or fully define the use of the primitive as the 5.2 primitives are defined in clause 5.2.1. | **Revised:**Agree the clause does not belong where it is. Resolutions of CIDs: 1372 and 1841 deleted clause 5.4 and moved its content to clause: 6.x MA-RADIOENVIRONMENT.indication.See 11-21/0697 for details. |

**CIDs for Clause 6, Page 23, line 1:**

| **CID** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13742021-05-25 | There is no normative text describing how or when the MLME-CANCELTX primitives would be used. The changes to clause 6 need to be removed (or connected to normative behavior somehow). In any regard, this appears to be entirely a local behavior/implementation detail, with no reason this needs to be specified in our (interoperability) specification. | Remove all changes to clause 5. | **Reject:**These primitives are introduced to allow a higher layer entity (outside the scope of 802.11) to manage and control the behavior of the STA. The introduction of these primitives is not an attempt to prescribe implementation, but a necessary addition to allow for external control of STA behavior. |

**References:**