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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the TGae conference calls held on October 5, 2011, as recorded by the official secretary of TGae.

**Minutes for TGae October 12, 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, Unaffiliated, 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
   3. Mark Hamilton, Polycomm, 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. IEEE patent policy -"Refer the correct section or IEEE Patcom URL"  
         <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
      4. Comment Resolution on SB1, spreadsheet is now at rev 10:
         1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-1177-10-00ae-tgae-sb-1-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. **SB1 Comment Resolution**
   1. MM: we need to review revised comments in Tab B, Tab C and comment CID 5012 – let’s begin with Tab B
   2. CID 5039
      1. HP: commenter change does not match 5097 in same area – propose adopting 5097 as resolution for 5039
      2. MM: ok – any objection?
   3. CID 5040
      1. HP: “equal to” added
   4. CID 5145
      1. HP: cited text has been deleted
   5. CID 5106
      1. HP: change of sense to “transmitted”
   6. MM: let’s move to Tab C?
   7. SP: no – we need to see CID 5151
   8. HP: no, that one is already fixed
   9. MM: Ok – tab C
   10. CID 5165
       1. HP: making consistent with other comments – description box changes
       2. HP: which whom or what is the subject?
       3. MH: we send policy change because we want the recipient to change the policy that he uses to send to the sender of the policy change
       4. HP: no – we send a policy change because we want to change the policy that we are using
       5. MH: does dot-request also need a change?
       6. HP: yes – do we do all of these changes in one comment?
       7. MM: we have four comments
       8. MM: in each of the comments, we could say “editor to make other primitives consistent”
       9. HP: Policy change request, this parameter describes QMF policy that the STA is requesting to use
       10. MF: which “the STA”? how about “the STA invoking the primitive”
       11. MH: introductory text has same problem
       12. MM: do we mark the comment and move on?
       13. MH: looks good to me –
       14. HP proposes a modification to the introductory text as recorded in tab C CID 5165
       15. MH likes the proposed change
       16. HP suggests additional changes along these lines for all primitives – changes recorded in tab C CID 5165
       17. MH: are we certain that the four-way exchange of these primitives ends with a change?
       18. MM: yes, response transmits a QMF policy frame
       19. MH: see P 36 L 14
   11. CID 5167
       1. HP: address of peer MAC entity to which QMF policy is sent in response – I added the clause “to a QMF policy change request” as a clarification from some other comment
   12. CID 5169
       1. HP: changed “the peer is” to “the peer STA is” – “peer STA” is gradually becoming the dominant form
   13. CID 5171
       1. HP: should be “is required”
       2. MH: we have lost intent of the comment – “complete”
       3. HP: complete vs partial disappeared – do not need “complete” anymore
       4. MH: I missed a memo
       5. MM: you were there!
       6. MH: and taking notes, even!
       7. HP: the intent of the comment was to clarify complete vs partial, and that no longer matters – so I say “revised”
   14. CID 5175
       1. HP: wording change – indicate -> specifies -> describes
   15. CID 5173
       1. HP: new term – want to use the old term
       2. CID 5176
          1. HP: needed the word “set” somewhere
       3. CID 5192
          1. HP: commenter claims that the text does not cover the case of QMFActivated true – but there is no condition on the variable, so it does NOT only cover the false case – I say reject
          2. MH: comment is with regard to association or lack thereof
       4. Subclause 9.2.4.2 – D5.04 P 28 L 20
          1. HP: should use priority of frame that is to follow
          2. HP: do we put a note in the text as an instruction to the WG editor?
          3. MH: do we have another round?
          4. MM: yes
          5. HP: so save for the next round?
          6. MM: yes
       5. CID 5012
          1. MM: proposed change was to add another sentence – shall send group probe request at AC\_BE
          2. MM: there were comments during draft development – but at this point, it could be rejected
          3. HP: we have group addressed probe request is AC\_BE
          4. MM: reject – with “covered in the table”
       6. CID 5019
          1. HP: my proposal is to delete part of text to be consistent with other comments
       7. CID 5147
          1. HP: several comments – we do not have a “NOT” where we should have in the bulleted list – new proposed change is consistent with other comments
       8. CID 5194
          1. HP: original resolution here not consistent with others, 5080 resolution should be copied here – you cannot just say “see this list of other resolutions?”
          2. MM: No.
          3. HP: let’s use the resolution of 5147 – copy it here to 5194
       9. CID 5077
          1. HP: needs addition of a “NOT”
       10. CID 5197
           1. HP: not clear what he means, but this new proposed change tries to address it
       11. MM: and now for a magic trick with the spreadsheet
       12. MM: looks ok
       13. MM:
7. **Motion number 29**
   1. **Move: Approve resolutions of all comments on Tab C of 11-11-1177r11**
      1. **Moved by: Henry Ptasinski**
      2. **Seconded by: Matthew Fischer**
      3. **Discussion**
      4. **VOTE**
         1. **YES - 3**
         2. **NO - 0**
         3. **Abstain - 0**
   2. **Motion passes 3-0-0**

1. **Motion number 30**
   1. **Move: Having approved all comment resolutions for all comments received on sponsor ballot on P802.11ae Draft 5.0, as contained in document 11-11-1177r11, instruct the editor to prepare Draft 6.0 incorporating these resolutions and approve a 15-day sponsor recirculation ballot asking the question “should P802.11ae Draft 6.0 be forwarded to REVCOM?”**
      1. **Moved by: Matthew Fischer**
      2. **Seconded by: Henry Ptasinski**
      3. **Discussion**
      4. **VOTE, Roll call:**
         1. **Santosh Pandey, YES**
         2. **Matthew Fischer, YES**
         3. **Henry Ptasinski, YES**
      5. **Motion passes 3-0-0**
2. **Editor report**
   1. HP: Need to do some renumbering
   2. HP: Need Adrian’s spreadsheet for renumbering, expect it Thursday morning PDT
   3. HP: Expect to have draft available tomorrow (Thur October 13) afternoon
3. **Motion to adjourn**
   1. **Moved by the chair, to adjourn**
   2. **No objection.**
   3. **09:13 AM PDT - TGae is adjourned.**

**Minutes for TGae October 5, 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, Unaffiliated, 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. IEEE patent policy -"Refer the correct section or IEEE Patcom URL"  
         <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
      4. Comment Resolution on SB1, Tab B, spreadsheet is now at rev 7:
         1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-1177-07-00ae-tgae-sb-1-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. **Chair: Future plans**
   1. Finish comment resolution, approving Tab B, assign remaining comments, publish results on Friday Oct 7, discuss remaining comments on call Oct 12
   2. Approve a recirc ballot at the end of call Oct 12
   3. Editor prepares draft, recirc start and then completion before November Plenary meeting
7. **SB1 Comment Resolution**
   1. MM: editor’s comments
   2. HP: applied Tab A approved resolutions, and half of Tab B pending resolutions, 7 of Tab A need resolution revision, 4 of Tab B also need discussion. Here they are, starting with Tab A:
   3. CID 5018
      1. HP: resolution accept first two sentence changes, add a shall for transmission as GQMF
      2. HP: AP advertising QMF capable does not mean that BSS is QMF – need to qualify condition
      3. HP: one proposal is to add a flag that is set by the AP to indicate if the entire BSS membership is QMF capable or not – not doing that right now – maybe next round
      4. MM: so resolution is to keep it being based on the Capability bit
      5. MM: moving to Tab B, ready for motion
   4. CID 5002
      1. HP: related to 5018, somewhat different, but resolution can be the same – propose copying resolution for 5018 to 5002
   5. CID 5146
      1. HP: same thing – copy resolution of 5018
   6. CID 5071
      1. HP: update the resolution – figure has been removed
   7. CID 5073
      1. HP: New resolution: Assigned by ANA
   8. CID 5083
      1. HP: New resolution: conflict with 5200, so take the resolution from 5200
   9. CID 5201 – last of Tab A
      1. New resolution: cited text has been deleted
   10. HP: now moving to Tab B resolution changes:
   11. CID 5151
       1. HP: new resolution: rejected – QMF policy parameter is within the BSS Description parameter, and as such, is only added to the BSS description parameter table (i.e. and not as a new parameter)
   12. CID 5141
       1. HP: with dialog token zero becomes - with Dialog token equal to 0
   13. CID 5023
       1. HP: revised – change is requested to use to is required to use in 6.3.83.2.2.
       2. HP: change is requested to use to is required to be used in 6.3.83.2
       3. HP: change is requested to use to is required to use in 6.3.83.5.2
   14. CID 5021
       1. HP: revised, change when a valid QMF policy frame is received, to when a valid QMF policy frame with Dialog token equal to 0 is received
   15. HP: on Tab B, reached through CID 5036
   16. MM: will now post an updated spreadsheet based on these changes, and will propose a motion on the updated spreadsheet 11-11-1177-08
   17. MF: motion will happen when?
   18. MM: in a few minutes.
8. **Motion**
   1. **Move to approve the comment resolutions in Tab B of document 11-11-1177r8**
   2. **Moved by Henry Ptasinski**
   3. **Seconded by Matthew Fischer**
   4. **Discussion: None**
   5. **Vote:**
      1. **Henry Yes**
      2. **Santosh Yes**
      3. **Matthew Yes**
   6. **Motion PASSES, 3-0-0**
9. **Unassigned Comments**
   1. MM: I can take clause 6 and 9 comments
   2. MM: Clause 11, anyone?
   3. MF: I volunteer.
   4. HP: Tab B and Tab C
   5. HP: would like to have all proposed resolutions applied by next call start time
   6. MM: any changes needed from latest MB draft?
   7. HP: did that already, 10.01, 10.02, hoping against a 10.03
   8. MM: do we have to base ourselves from a balloted draft?
   9. HP: don’t know – we have used either at different times, and recall this happening in other groups, too – would not want to revert to 10.0, because 10.01 has big changes in subclause 10.11
   10. HP: unless someone complains, we stick with 10.02 and eventually 10.03
   11. MM: agreed
   12. No dissent from the rabble
   13. MM: we will have to slow down at some point to avoid getting ahead of TGmb
   14. HP: their timeline?
   15. MM: finish in January
   16. MM: TGae recirc in November, another in January, so that keeps us just behing TGmb and allows for REVCOM in March for TGae
   17. HP: if they get delayed, then that impacts our schedule?
   18. MM: well – it just means that we might have to adjust our draft again
   19. MM: Dorothy intends to start locking down text agressively
10. **Motion to adjourn**
    1. **Moved by the chair, to adjourn**
    2. **No objection.**
    3. **08:47 AM PDT - TGae is adjourned.**
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