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Abstract

This document provides resolution to CID 3378.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3378 | 84 | 46 | 9.19.2.5 | This sentence is now broken ("All the MPDUs … was successful") | Clarify what is now meant | Agree in principle |

**Editor’s Notes:**

The editor has the following notes as of 9/20/2011:

*The editor is unclear on the technical reason for the changes to this bullet. In my opinion, there was nothing wrong with the original statement and it applied to all VHT transmissions (including MU). The change seems to require that all MPDUs in the final transmission are delivered successfully. How is that possible without at least one PPDU being returned by the recipient? Not to mention the MU or boradcast case. Perhaps all that is needed is the word "successful" be changed to "completed".*

**Discussion:**

This comment is on one of the events from which a backoff procedure will be invoked. The text in TGac Draft D1.0 reads

b) All the MPDUs in t~~T~~he final PPDU transmission by the TXOP holder initiated during the TXOP for that AC was successful and the TXNAV timer has expired.

Note the sentence in the existing standard reads

b) The final transmission by the TXOP holder initiated during the TXOP for that AC was successful and the TXNAV timer has expired.

I agree with the editor that the newly added text makes no technical differences; a final transmission won’t be considered successful if one or more MPDUs were in error. Therefore, it is better to maintain what is in the current spec.

Communication with the commenter reveals that he was actually complaining about the grammer. However, he is also wondering whether the intention of the sentence is as below.

b) The final transmission by the TXOP holder initiated during the TXOP for that AC was successful (where each A-MPDU needs to be successfully transmitted in the case of an MU PPDU) and the TXNAV timer has expired.

However, it is not necessary that all A-MPDUs in an MU PPDU are “for that AC” (i.e. the TXOP holder). So there is a conflict in the sentence. In addition, Robert’s concern still applies; without receiving any kind of ACKs/BAs, there is no way to know whether the transmission was successful or not. And the sender won’t wait until it receives all the BAs to do the backoff.

It is agreed during the teleconference on 10/13/2011 that we can keep the description of the event unchanged as in the current spec.

**TGac editor: Change the sentence at P84 L46 as below, as it appears in the existing standard.**

b) The final transmission by the TXOP holder initiated during the TXOP for that AC was successful and the TXNAV timer has expired.