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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the TGae conference calls held on June 29, 2011, July 6, 2011, July 13, 2011, as recorded by the official secretary of TGae.

**Minutes for TGae June 29, 2011**

1. **08:05 AM PST – Chair calls meeting to order**
2. **Identification of officers and their affiliations**
	1. Chair identifies himself as Mike Montemurro, affiliated with Research in Motion, identified as MM in the minutes
	2. Secretary identifies himself as Matthew Fischer, affiliated with Broadcom Corporation, identified as MF in the minutes
	3. Henry Ptasinski, Broadcom corporation, also TGae editor, identified as HP in the minutes
3. **Roll call**
	1. Officers as noted above
	2. Jouni Malinen, Qualcomm, JM in the minutes
	3. Santosh Pandey, Cisco, SP in the minutes
4. **Agenda:**
	1. Chair: Agenda was sent to the reflector
	2. Agenda includes the following items
		1. Roll call
		2. Approval of agenda
		3. IEEE patent policy -"Refer the correct section or IEEE Patcom URL"
		<http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
		4. Comment Resolution on LB180, spreadsheet is now at rev 2: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-0888-02-00ae-lb-180-comment-resolutions.xls>
		5. Other discussion
		6. Attempt to adjourn before 12:00 EDT
	3. Chair: Any objection to the agenda?
	4. No objection noted
	5. Chair: agenda approved by unanimous consent
5. **Chair: Are there any essential patents?**
	1. No response heard from the floor.
6. **LB 180 Comment Resolution**
	1. MM: see document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-0888-02-00ae-lb-180-comment-resolutions.xls> - note revision 2 now
	2. MM: Guido Hiertz withdrew CID 4030 entirely after an email exchange.
	3. MM: Mark Hamilton withdrew all of his comments with the intent to resubmit them at sponsor ballot.
	4. MM: Mark Hamilton sent some resolutions for CIDs on email. Mixture of group A and group B. He is unable to be on the call today, but we can discuss his proposed resolutions.
	5. CID 4032 – implemented vs activated
		1. MM: Do we accept Mark’s resolution?
		2. HP: don’t want to change the names now, but in sponsor, ok.
	6. CID 4030 withdrawn – Guido’s comment
	7. CID 4031
		1. You are reusing the seq field, use something different to signal the TC.
		2. MM reads the proposed resolution
		3. HP: I like it
		4. MM: any objection to make ready for motion?
		5. No objection noted: so it is written, so it is done!
	8. CID 4009 – need to add “when do11MFQActivated is true … “ as a qualifier
		1. MH says waste of BW to send QMF policy when not needed, so want to agree in principle
		2. HP: inclined to agree, if we make this consistent with ASS\_REQ and ASS\_REP, that would be good – if you want to include it, ok, but not required to include it
		3. MM: resolution?
		4. MF: copy from ASS\_REQ and ASS\_REP
		5. HP: yes
		6. MM: copies and reads proposed text, asks if James Joyce is happy with it
		7. MF: was not listening
		8. HP: editor likes it, consistency is more important than grammatical correctness
	9. CID 4007
		1. MM: reads from email from MH, language which proves that text already covers the case and cites that text
		2. No objection to MH proposed resolution
	10. CID 4008
		1. HP: agree in general, but must delete “note that”
		2. MM: any disagreement?
		3. None noted
	11. MM: No addition comments from MH that included proposed resolution text. We can now do some of those that do not have proposed resolution text. Objections?
	12. None noted.
	13. CID 4033
		1. MM: this is the next CID that needs a resolution
		2. MF: (struggling to find this CID among the various tabs of the spreadsheet) how is the comment spreadsheet organized?
		3. MM: each conf call gets a tab, e.g. A, B, etc.
		4. MF: Is the Canadian alphabet in the same order as the US alphabet?
		5. MM: As far as I know.
		6. HP provides some confusing information about ordering of 11s vs 11mb essentially stating that 11s has old clause numbering and says that we will get to it when it is included in 11mb as our baseline
		7. MM reads a proposed resolution paraphrasing the paraphrasing of what HP said
	14. CID 4034
		1. HP: same resolution as 4033
		2. MM: any objection?
		3. None noted
	15. CID 4037 – send vs transmit
		1. MF: I morally disagree, but I do not disagree with the proposed change
		2. HP, ignoring the statement from MF, discusses baseline usage of the terms to defend the existing text
		3. MM: disagree – based on baseline usage that says “send” is ok here
		4. HP: I assume that he has a similar comment in 11mb
	16. CID 4040 - use of IQMF vs GQMF vs QMF
		1. MF: have we defined only IQMF and GQMF?
		2. HP: we have all three
		3. HP: we can agree with the commenter
		4. HP points out redundancy of “QMF frames” since “F” in “QMF” stands for frame
		5. HP: but, whatever, meh, oy
		6. SP: change caption on 8-3A
		7. HP: there are more places that could be fixed, sponsor ballot
		8. MM: then we agree and move on
	17. CID 4041 “group addressed QoS Data frames” vs “QoS data frames with a group address in the address1 field”
		1. JM: Valid comment, because we have defined “group addressed”
		2. MM: agree – ready for motion
	18. CID 4042
		1. HP: also line 6, same change
		2. MM: ok
	19. CID 4043
		1. MM reads the CID comment and proposed change
		2. MF: Behavour of each counter identifies them as unique
		3. MF: could change “an additional single” to “a”
		4. HP: but still, how do you know that they are different counters?
		5. MF: existing language: “incrementing for each such MSDU or MMPDU” makes them unique
		6. MF: if you really want to make their difference more obvious, change “an additional single” to “a” and change “starting at 0” to “that starts at 0” and change “incrementing by 1” to “is incremented by 1”
		7. JM: I like changing to “that starts at 0”
		8. HP: let’s just change “an additional single” to “a”
		9. MM: ok – minimal change –
		10. MM asks if this is ok for everyone, everyone agrees
	20. CID 4004
		1. HP: agree in principle, change “may” to “can” – this is from MEC
		2. MM: any objection
		3. None noted
	21. MM: 41 remaining comments, 25 editorial, will post an updated spreadsheet later today
7. **Motion to adjourn**
	1. Moved by the chair, to adjourn
	2. No objection.
	3. 09:00 AM PDT - TGae is adjourned.

**Minutes for TGae July 6, 2011**

1. **08:04 AM PST – Chair calls meeting to order**
2. **Identification of officers and their affiliations**
	1. Chair identifies himself as Mike Montemurro, affiliated with Research in Motion, identified as MM in the minutes
	2. Secretary identifies himself as Matthew Fischer, affiliated with Broadcom Corporation, identified as MF in the minutes
	3. Henry Ptasinski, Broadcom corporation, also TGae editor, identified as HP in the minutes
3. **Roll call**
	1. Officers as noted above
	2. Santosh Pandey, Cisco, SP in the minutes
4. **Agenda:**
	1. Chair: Agenda was sent to the reflector
	2. Agenda includes the following items
		1. Roll call
		2. Approval of agenda
		3. "Are you aware of, and understand the IEEE patent policy", if not "Refer the correct section or IEEE Patcom URL" <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
		4. Comment Resolution on LB180. See document [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-0888-03-00ae-lb-180-comment-resolutions.xls](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-0888-01-00ae-lb-180-comment-resolutions.xls)
		5. Any other discussion
		6. Attempt to adjourn before 12:00 EDT
	3. Chair: Any objection to the agenda?
	4. No objection noted
	5. Chair: agenda approved by unanimous consent
5. **Chair: Are there any essential patents?**
	1. No response heard from the floor.
6. **LB 180 Comment Resolution**
	1. MM: comment spreadsheet now revision 3
	2. MM: CID 4003 - principle
	3. MM: CID 4004 – principle
		1. SP: page 19 L17 – seems to have GQMF only allowed to be sent if has received QMF activated from all members of BSS and group – if STA is not associated with a BSS, then what happens?
		2. HP: if any condition is false, then frame is not GQMF
		3. SP: for unassociated, then third condition is false?
		4. HP: yes
		5. SP: then all unassociated STA will send group addressed mgmt as AC\_VO?
		6. HP: yes
		7. SP: previous comment resolution – sentence left out says that unassociated STA will send all frames at default priorities – and some of those are not AC\_VO – did we delete text that resolved this?
		8. MF: be careful Henry! He’s sucking you into some trick!
		9. HP: we deleted things that said things twice – redundant text and some grammatical problems
		10. SP: what about probe request?
		11. HP: (startled and stunned) ahhhh…
		12. MF: the trap has been sprung!
		13. SP: probe request vs probe response – rules are different
		14. MM: wildcard or group?
		15. SP: wildcard
		16. MM: wildcard using QMF – not sure, but for group addressed, you can use QMF
		17. SP: just pointing out that for QOS vs non-QOS rules are different
		18. MM: what happens if a non-QMF STA receives a QMF from an unassociated STA?
		19. MF: why are we trying to get probe requests to be sent at a lower AC?
		20. HP: whatever we do to MAC header to identify QMF creates the possibility of a legacy STA dropping the frame – resolution for 4003 needs to be revisited
		21. SP: I am ok, but we need to modify the table by say, dropping probe request from the table
		22. MM: no change for now – we need to think about this, say, at sponsor ballot
		23. MM: back to 4004 – agree in principle, any objection?
		24. No objection noted
	4. MM: 4045 – agree?
		1. No objection
	5. MM: 4046 – change “all” to “the” – principle
	6. MM: 4047 – looks like a duplicate of 4045 –
		1. HP: similar, but more correct – use “agree”
		2. MM: ok – ready for motion
	7. MM: 4048 – proposed change ignores IBSS case
		1. HP: yes – so wording is not quite right
		2. HP: add “and if associated” in the proposed change
		3. MM: ok – principle, after suggested changes to proposed change
	8. MM: 4052 – agree
7. **Motion to adjourn**
	1. Moved by the chair, to adjourn
	2. No objection.
	3. 09:02 AM PDT - TGae is adjourned.

**Minutes for TGae July 13, 2011**

1. **08:03 AM PST – Chair calls meeting to order**
2. **Identification of officers and their affiliations**
	1. Chair identifies himself as Mike Montemurro, affiliated with Research in Motion, identified as MM in the minutes
	2. Secretary identifies himself as Matthew Fischer, affiliated with Broadcom Corporation, identified as MF in the minutes
	3. Henry Ptasinski, Broadcom corporation, TGae editor, identified as HP in the minutes
3. **Roll call**
	1. Officers as noted above
	2. Santosh Pandey, Cisco, SP in the minutes
	3. Adrian Stephens, affiliated with Intel Corporation, AS in the minutes
	4. Mark Hamilton, affiliated with Polycom, MH in the minutes
4. **Agenda:**
	1. Chair: Agenda was sent to the reflector
	2. Agenda includes the following items
		1. Roll call
		2. Approval of agenda
		3. "Are you aware of, and understand the IEEE patent policy", if not "Refer the correct section or IEEE Patcom URL" <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
		4. Comment Resolution on LB180. See document [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-0888-03-00ae-lb-180-comment-resolutions.xls](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-0888-01-00ae-lb-180-comment-resolutions.xls)
		5. Any other discussion
		6. Attempt to adjourn before 12:00 EDT
	3. Chair: Any objection to the agenda?
	4. No objection noted
	5. Chair: agenda approved by unanimous consent
5. **Chair: Are there any essential patents?**
	1. No response heard from the floor.
6. **LB 180 Comment Resolution**
	1. MM: 14 comments remaining in 11-11-0888r4
	2. MM: propose walking through the remaining comments
	3. HP: I only see 9 unresolved
	4. MM: I have always had difficulty with mathematics
	5. MM: CID 4053
		1. MM: P34 L6 D4.0 – QMF interaction with mesh STAs -
		2. AS: an MBSS is a BSS
		3. MM: could delete, “, or MBSS”
		4. AS: yes
		5. AS: can a QMF STA be a member of an MBSS and if so, are there special requirements under those circumstances?
		6. MM: we sound like we are disagreeing with the comment
		7. AS: his point is that mesh STAs cannot talk to non-mesh STAs, so the description for mesh STAs needs to be in a different subclause – but our position is that a mesh STA falls under the same rules as an IBSS STA
		8. MH: Given this agreement on our part, then if the commenter can identify any specific missing behavour, then he could propose that there is a necessary change
		9. HP: we could clarify what “peer QMF STA” means – in an MBSS, do we need to state that a “peer” is another MBSS STA? I say no, because the baseline includes a restriction regarding mesh STA interactions – i.e. that they can only communicate with other mesh STAs
		10. MM: propose DISAGREE – (as found in spreadsheet)
	6. CID 4055
		1. MM: reads comment
		2. MM: Looks like a question for TGmb
		3. MH: has the phrase been used before?
		4. MM: yes – in 4.5.3.4
		5. MH: in the base, not in TGae draft
		6. HP: in the base – D9.0 -- 10.4.8.1.26 - may change at any time during the lifetime of the association
		7. MF: how about just putting “(re)” in front of “association”?
		8. MM: prefer not to make a change
		9. AS: define “lifetime of association” – as starting at successful completion of (re)association and ending at ???? - i.e. reassociation creates a new association, thereby ending an existing one
		10. MM: proposed DISAGREE – lifetime is interpreted as time between receipt of reassocation response and the end of association through ???
		11. AS: a new association is created between a pair of STAs whenever an association or reassociation is successfully completed between those two STAs, and only one association may be outstanding between two STAs
	7. CID 4056
		1. MM: accept in principle – see spreadsheet for exact changes
	8. CID 4057
		1. AS: propose disapprove – “BSS” includes infra, adhoc, mesh, therefore adding infrastructure is redundant
		2. MM: so it is spoken, so it is written, so it is tentatively approved, and so it shall come to pass
	9. CID 4058
		1. AS: similar comments in TGmb – resolution of those comments is REJECT because there is nothing in the PAR that says that we cannot modify the SME behavour
		2. AS: in other words, SME is a creation of 802.11, so it is within our scope
	10. CID 4006
		1. SP: if any STA needs to have an independent policy, then this rule needs to remain in place
		2. HP: generally agree, but how can an AP make a STA revert to the BSS-global policy?
		3. MF: how often would you need to do that?
		4. HP: could be a transient reason, say, diagnostics
		5. MH: move it to sponsor ballot
		6. SP: you can always send an individualized policy that matches the global policy
		7. MM: propose DISAGREE – desire to allow AP to maintain different policies, QMF policy frame is required to do this
	11. CID 4005
		1. MM: QMF policy in beacon cannot be used for group mgmt frames – why not?
		2. MM: how about just adding a third condition, as in the previous case?
		3. HP: propose to delete the third condition from the previous case
		4. MM: accept in principle, add a third condition – beacon reception case
		5. MF: what about case of ucast mgmt frame sent by STA to another STA, when the transmitting STA is a member of an infrastructure BSS? Not covered by cases shown.
		6. MH: we should fix this in sponsor
		7. MM: same resolution as earlier proposed, additional modifications during sponsor, because this is complex and we don’t know how to fix it without giving it some serious thought
	12. CID 4063
		1. MM: all STAs in MBSS must be mesh STAs – similar to previous comment CID 4053 –
		2. MM: propose resolution matching that of CID 4053
		3. AS: not sure that commenter is correct – this subclause is specific to mesh – can always add a first sentence to the subclause – “this subclause refers to MBSS” – or, could use “those STAs operating in an MBSS” as a qualifier
		4. MM: have lots of cases of “operating in an MBSS”
		5. HP: we could add qualifiers – three places found, begin 3rd, 4th, 5th paragraphs – should cover all cases
		6. AS: looks like another one needed within 4th paragraph at “peer QMF STA”
		7. HP: don’t think so
		8. AS: ‘tis so
		9. HP: ‘tis not!
		10. AS: ‘tis so!
		11. HP: ‘tis not!
		12. AS: your mother!
		13. HP: your mother!
		14. AS: You still need to add the qualifier at L36 and at ????
		15. MM: ok
		16. MH: looking back at line 16 – that says within an MBSS, so no change
		17. MM: so it is a DISAGREE?
		18. AS: if DISAGREE, then the reason is that from the heading of the subclause, it is clear
		19. MH: starts “within an MBSS,”
		20. MM: so which?
		21. HP: DISAGREE, cite heading name
		22. MH: fine, but there are three problems here – e.g. further complication throughout the text – would have to say “non-mesh” in lots of places
		23. AS: dropping
		24. MM: thank you for joining and contributing
		25. MM: ok – heading of subclause makes it MBSS only – in other parts of draft, QMF STA is inclusive of mesh STAs
		26. MH: subclause above specifically states “in an IBSS” or “in an infrastructure BSS” – and the resolution does not mention that there might be explicit exceptions to the blanket statement
		27. MM: I’ve added such
	13. CID 4065
		1. MM: accept
		2. MH: ok
	14. MM: upload and aim for approval during first session in San Francisco, then get approval to move to sponsor during mid-week plenary session
7. **Motion to adjourn**
	1. Moved by the chair, to adjourn
	2. No objection.
	3. 09:00 AM PDT - TGae is adjourned.

**References:**