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Abstract

This document proposes comment resolutions for GEN CIDs:

1033, 1268, 1374, 1392, 1489, 1516, 1542, 1791, 2040, 2188, 2252 and 2360 (REVme D1.0).
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| | **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1033 | 1.1 | 1 | Surpassing 6K pages begs the question: "Should we divide the draft into volumes?" | As in comment | Rejected:  The comment does not identify a specific technical problem.  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. | GEN | | 1268 | 331.54 | 4.9.2, 6.4 | What is MSGCF and should it be maintained in the spec? Isn't ESS management provided by the DS? | Remove clauses 4.9.2 and 6.4 | Revised:  Add the following text to the start of clauses 4.9.2 (P331L56) and 6.4 (P845L46):  “MSGCF is obsolete” | GEN |   **1268 Discussion**  The MSGCF is an interface that allows ESS management information to be passed between 802.11 and 802.21 entities. It can be probably be made obsolete.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1374 |  |  | The next major revision to 802.11 (the REVme results) should include amendments TGaz, TGbb, TGbc, TGbd, and TGbh. | Include "roll-up" of the listed amendments, before proceeding to SA ballot (or at least before publishing). | Rejected:  The comment does not identify a specific technical problem.  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. | GEN |   **1374 Discussion**  Although this is valid comment, there is insufficient detail as to how the “roll-up” should occur.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1392 | 490.19 | 6.3.19.1.2 | "This parameter is valid only when the Key  Type value is Pairwise, when the Key Type  value is Group and the STA is in IBSS, or  when the Key Type value is PeerKey." -- need to cover PBSS or MBSS too. Also should be "in an IBSS" | Change to "This parameter is valid only when the Key  Type value is Pairwise, when the Key Type  value is Group and the STA is in an IBSS or PBSS (but not an MBSS), or  when the Key Type value is PeerKey." | Revised:  Please see the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/ 11-22-0627-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-GEN-CIDs.docx> tagged #1392. | GEN |   **1392 Discussion**  The suggested change is reasonable, but it’s easier to show the specific changes.  **Resolution**  Revised:  ***Editor: Please make the following changes to the table at the top of P490L19***  **6.3.19.1.2 Semantics of the service primitive**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Name** | **Type** | **Valid Range** | **Description** | | Address | MAC address | Any valid  individual MAC  address | This parameter is valid only when the Key  Type value is either:   1. Pairwise, 2. Group and the STA is in an IBSS or PBSS (but not an MBSS), or 3. PeerKey. |   A similar change also needs to be made to the tables on P491L46, P494L30, P751L35 and P752L21.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1489 | 351.00 | 5.1.1.4 | "When an MSDU is received from the MAC SAP with one of the following service class indications, and the recipient STA is a QoS STA:  -- QoSAck, the MSDU is transmitted using one or more QoS Data frame(s) with an ack policy other than No Ack."" -- this is not true for groupcasts, unless all intended recipient STAs are QoS STAs" | "Change to "When an MSDU is received from the MAC SAP with one of the following service class indications, and the recipient STA is a single QoS STA or all recipient STAs are QoS STAs:  -- QoSAck, the MSDU is transmitted using one or more QoS Data frame(s) with an ack policy other than No Ack."" and below change ""When an MSDU is received from the MAC SAP and the recipient STA is not a QoS STA, the MSDU is  transmitted using one or more non-QoS Data frame(s)."" to "Otherwise, the MSDU is  transmitted using one or more non-QoS Data frame(s). " | Revised:  Please see the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/ 11-22-0627-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-GEN-CIDs.docx> tagged #1489. | GEN |   **CID 1489 Discussion**  The suggested change is reasonable, but it’s easier to show the specific changes.  **Resolution**  Revised:  ***Editor: Please make the following changes to P351L35***  **5.1.1.4 Interpretation of service class parameter in MAC service primitives in a STA**  In QoS STAs, the value of the service class parameter in the MAC service primitive (see 5.2 (MAC data  service specification)) may be a noninteger value of QoSAck or QoSNoAck.  When an MSDU is received from the MAC SAP with one of the following service class indications, and the  recipient STA is a single QoS STA or all recipient STAs are QoS STAs: (#1489)  — QoSAck, the MSDU is transmitted using one or more QoS Data frame(s) with an ack policy other than No Ack.  — QoSNoAck, the MSDU is transmitted using one or more QoS Data frame(s) with an ack policy of No Ack.  Otherwise, the MSDU is transmitted using one or more non-QoS Data frame(s). (#1489)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1516 |  | 4.3 | 2x "attached bridge port" suggests that the other ~30 "bridge ports" are detached | Delete "attached " at 294.7 and 307.50 | Rejected:  Not all uses of “bridge port” are either “attached” or “not attached”. There are several uses of ""bridge port" as a distinct logical entity:  Deleting the adjective “attached” from “bridge port” is an incorrect change. | GEN |   **CID 1516 Discussion**  Within the draft, not all uses of ""bridge port"" are "attached" or "not attached". There are several uses of ""bridge port" as a distinct logical entity:  (p363.24 "For a GLK STA, the *bridge port* provides the priority.") or  (p363.54 "...indicates this action to the LLC sublayer entity or *bridge port* using an MA-UNITDATASTATUS.indication primitive with transmission status set to Successful.")  or as a IEEE 802.1Q bridge port:  (p363.22 "This point-to-point LAN is presented by the convergence function as a unique Internal Sublayer Service SAP, which is ultimately mapped to an *IEEE 802.1Q bridge port*.")  The context for the "Attached" are here:  (p29.7 "In a GLK MBSS, mesh STAs can communicate with nonmesh STAs via a GLK mesh STA with an *attached bridge port* and from there to the bridged LAN.")  (p307.50 "The first type is an infrastructure general link that connects a non-AP GLK STA *attached bridge port* of an IEEE 802.1Q MAC Relay Entity with an GLK AP attached bridge (two of these general links are shown in the figure).""  Therefore the proposed deletion of the word “attached” is not justified.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1542 |  | 6 | BSSMaxIdlePeriod should not be passed in .requests since it is taken from dot11BssMaxIdlePeriod (see 11.21.13 BSS max idle period management). (And if it were passed in the SAP it would have to be optional, since it's not allowed to be 0 in some cases) | Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod," at 410.21 | Revised:  Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod" at P410L21 and also the “BSSMaxIdlePeriod” row within the table at P411L6. | GEN | | 1791 |  | 1.5 | It is not clear whether "silently" discarding applies just to not responding over the air, or also applies to not generating any observable response of any kind (e.g. diagnostic message over the portal) | In 1.5 add "Silently discarding a frame means that the behaviour shall be indistinguishable outside the STA from not having received the frame at all." | Rejected:  It is not possible for the context of this comment to be determined. In addition, clause 1.5 “Terminology for mathematical, logical, and bit operations” is not an appropriate place to add such a definition. | GEN | | 2040 |  | 6.5.4.2 | aCMMGPPMinListeningTime and other PHY characteristics are missing from 6.5.4.2 | In 6.5.4.2 add "NOTE---There are other PHY characteristics." | Rejected:    The addition of the proposed note does not clarify any text and does not provide any extra benefit to the draft. | GEN | | 2188 | 2211.00 | 10.23.2.5 | Event a) does not exist in the referred 10.23.2.8, so it is not possible to follow the "as described" reference. | "Maybe this is a reference to 10.23.2.2 event a) instead, but then there is mention of CW there. | Revised:  Please see the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/ 11-22-0627-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-GEN-CIDs.docx> tagged #2188.. | GEN |   **CID 2188 Discussion**  Within clause 10.23.2.5, the cited text is:  *“NOTE 1—In the case of rule e), the STA selects a new random number using the current value of CW[AC], and the retry counts are not updated [as described in 10.23.2.8 (Multiple frame transmission in an EDCA TXOP); backoff procedure invoked for event a)].”*  Clause 10.23.2.8 does not have an event a) and therefore the comment is correct.  Clause 10.23.2.2, as mentioned by the proposed resolution states:  *“The backoff procedure shall be invoked by an EDCAF (11ax)if any of the following events occurs:*  *a) An MA-UNITDATA.request primitive is received that causes an MPDU corresponding to the*  *EDCAF’s AC to be queued for transmission such that all of the following are true:*  *1) One of the transmit queues associated with that AC has now become non-empty*  *2) Any other transmit queues associated with that AC are empty*  *3) The backoff counter has a value of 0 for that AC*  *4) The medium is busy on the primary channel as indicated by any of the following:*  *— Physical CS*  *— Virtual CS*  *— A nonzero TXNAV timer value*  *— For a mesh STA that has dot11MCCAActivated true, a nonzero RAV timer value”*  Although there is no mention of CW in this text, implying that the proposed resolution should have said *“…no mention of CW there*”.  However, there is this later text in clause 10.23.2.2. that states:  *“If the backoff procedure is invoked for reason a) above, CW[AC] and QSRC[AC] shall be left unchanged.”*  …satisfying the requirement that CW is mentioned. However, the original reference in NOTE 1 above is still not correct, as there is no mention of the “*retry count*”.  When action e) is reviewed within clause 10.23.2.5, it states:  *“Restart the channel access attempt by invoking the backoff procedure as specified in 10.23.2 (HCF*  *contention based channel access (EDCA)) as though the medium is busy on the primary channel as*  *indicated by either physical or virtual CS and the backoff counter has a value of 0.”*  Which implies that it is not the retry counter that should be mentioned in the note, but the backoff counter. This would then verify that the original reference should be clause 10.23.2.2 as it mentions in a) 3)  *“The backoff counter has a value of 0 for that AC”.*  Hence the correct referenced clause is 10.23.2.2, but the “retry counter” should be “backoff counter”.  **Resolution**  Revised:  ***Editor: Please make the following changes to Note 1 on P2211L34***  “NOTE 1—In the case of rule e), the STA selects a new random number using the current value of CW[AC], and the backoff counter is not updated [as described in 10.23.2.2 (EDCA backoff procedure); backoff procedure event a)].”   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 2252 | 180.00 | 1.1 | "The scope states that ""this standard is to define one medium access control (MAC) and several physical layer (PHY)  specifications "", which is the scope of the PAR. However, with the introduction of Clause 26 for 11ax and Clause 29 for 11ba, two additional MACs are introduced, which would be out of the scope of the PAR. Hence 802.11 could change the scope of the PAR or incorporate Clauses 26 and 29 into Clauses 10 and 11." | Please incorporate the Clauses 26 and 29 into Clauses 10 and 11. | Rejected:  The comment does not identify a specific technical problem.  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. | GEN | | 2360 | 4212.00 | 26.8.3.2 | Please clarify [10:25] or add the reference to that | as in comment | Rejected:  Clause “1.5 Terminology for mathematical, logical, and bit operations” defines the usage of “A[b:c] is the bit string consisting of bits b to c of A”.  Therefore no clarification or reference is required. | GEN | |
|  |