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Abstract

Minutes from the Sept 2012 REVmc session.

**Wednesday – TG REVmc – September 18, 2012 – 1:30pm**

1. Called to order by Chair-Pro tem: Dorothy Stanley – 1:30pm
   1. Proposed Agenda:

Tuesday PM1

* + 1. Chair’s Welcome, Status, Review of Objectives, Approve Agenda
    2. TG Elections
    3. Editor’s Report
    4. Timeline and Schedule
    5. Comment States, resolution

Wednesday PM1

1. Comment Resolution

Thursday PM1

* + 1. Comment resolution
    2. Motions, as needed
    3. Plans for November
    4. AOB
  1. Reviewed: Patent Slides
     1. No Potential Essential Patent Claims were made.
     2. Noted Meeting Etiquette
  2. TG Elections:
     1. Open Positions: Chair, Vice-Chair, Editor, Secretary
        1. Possible Vice-Chair assignment to Secretary duties
     2. Nominations:
        1. Task Group Chair Volunteer(s)
           1. “The TG Chair shall be appointed by the WG Chair and confirmed by a WG majority approval” Practice is TG motion on recommendation.
           2. Known candidates: Dorothy Stanley
        2. Task Group Vice-Chair Volunteer(s)\* - 2 Positions
           1. “TG Vice-Chair is elected by a TG majority approval and confirmed by a WG majority approval.”
           2. Known candidates: Mark Hamilton, Jon Rosdahl
        3. Task Group Editor Volunteer(s)
           1. The TG Technical Editor shall be appointed by the TG Chair and confirmed by a TG majority approval.
           2. Known candidates: Adrian Stephens
     3. Motion: Motion to accept the slate of candidates:
        1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl, 2nd David Hunter
        2. 15-0-0 motion Passes
  3. Editor’s Report – Adrian Stephens:
     1. 357 comments received by close date, and 3 after that from a Task group.
     2. The comments vary in how specific the comments are.
     3. The Draft status
        1. There are 3 versions of the draft that are in the members area
        2. Draft D0 which is equivalent to the 2012 version.
        3. Draft D0.1 which includes 11ae roll-in
        4. Draft D0.2 which includes 11aa roll-in
        5. Draft D0.3 has the defects corrected (approximately 50 defects were identified).
        6. Request from Editor to the TG chair to post the drafts to the members area.
        7. Request from the floor to add more comments if possible
           1. The chair ruled that the deadline would be when we get the comments already received planned, that would be the end of acceptance of new comments.
           2. Expectation would be end of Thursday’s time slot.
  4. Proposed TGmc Plan of Record

**20 July 2012 – 12 Sept 2012 – Call for Comment/Input**

**29-30 Aug 2012 – NesCom, SASB PAR Approval**

**Sept 2012 – Begin to process input**

**Sept 2012 – 11aa, 11ae integration**

**TBD – First WG Letter ballot**

**Dec 2012 – March 2013 – 11ad integration**

**TBD – Mandatory Draft Review**

**TBD – Form Sponsor Pool (45 days)**

**TBD – Initial Sponsor Ballot**

**Dec 2013 – March 2014 – 11ac integration**

**TBD – integration of additional completed amendments (e.g. 11af)**

**Nov 2014 – WG/EC Final Approval**

**March 2015 – RevCom/SASB Approval**

* + 1. Discussion on if this proposed Plan looks good?
    2. Roll-in of TGad would take about 6 weeks to get edited and reviewed.
       1. March Meeting would be the earlist to get a ballot for it.
    3. First WG Ballot plan:
       1. If we were to go out of this meeting with D0.3, then gather the comments resolutions in parallel.
       2. The issue is that we want to look at the time prior to the Ballot start and the end of Ballot to have time to look at the comments to prepare for the November meeting.
       3. If we go to Ballot on either next Monday or a week or so after that.
       4. We need to allow time for resolutions.
       5. We have a lot of comments that we have received, do we really want to go out for ballot again with none of the comments addressed may not be very nice.
       6. What would the issue be with having the different drafts and comments with different page numbers?
       7. Concern that the comments need to be resolved sooner than later, and that we don’t miss any.
       8. Documents for TGmc are in group identifier as TGm on Mentor
       9. The reason for comment collection and then balloting the draft in parallel was to get more efficient.
       10. More discussion on how to go about the processing of the comments.
       11. Not a lot of support on balloting on only D0.3
       12. Will revisit the ballot plan at the end of the week.
    4. Process Check – Mandatory Review
    5. Final Approval
       1. Current Timeline dates for TGaf is June 2014
       2. TGah completion is targeted for May 2015
       3. TGai shows May 2014, but the editors are still listing the Amendment after TGah.
       4. Possible candidates could include TGaf
       5. 4-5 amendments gives us half as many as TGmb had to deal with.
  1. Comment Status and Resolution:
     1. A Comment Database has been prepared
        1. The database is portioned into 3 groups: Editor, MAC, GEN
        2. Editor – Adrian, MAC – Mark H., Gen – Jon are assigned to compile the proposed resolutions from the group.
        3. Vice Chair Mark Hamilton took the podium for comment processing.
     2. CID 68:
        1. Discussion found the proposed resolution was correct.
        2. **Proposed Resolution:** Accept
     3. CID 71:
        1. Discussion the figure is incorrect, and change to the correct value makes sense.
        2. **Proposed Resolution:** Accept
     4. CID 75
        1. Need to add a new WNM-Notification Type for Vendor Specific type.
        2. Use the convention of 221 (0xDD1) for the Vendor Specific type, and Reserve the other values.
        3. The ANA has the value control – The July Plenary had the ANA has a WFA Reserved as 1.
        4. This would give 221 to Vendor Specific
        5. **Proposed Resolution:** Revised: Allocate 221 and submit to ANA for inclusion Table 8-256. (Editor to update Table 8-256 with the ANA changes from 2012 July Plenary in San Diego.
     5. CID 350
        1. Error in EVM equation.
        2. **ACTION ITEM:** Submission from Vinko to be submitted and present it tomorrow.
     6. CID 308
        1. Reviewed the location on page 481.
        2. TIM Fram
        3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised – Add “When a TIM element is included in a TIM frame, the DTIM Count Field is reserved.” After the cited paragraph.
     7. CID 309
        1. Review comment
        2. TCLAS element useage question.
        3. Go to location on page 671-- see 8.4.2.33
        4. This may apply to both MSDU or MMPDU, but they are in different layers.
        5. MMPDU does not include the MAC header, so this adds to the ambiguity.
        6. Current Filter is unambiguous. Adding the “Or MMPDU” would make the consistent with the rest of the section.
        7. One argument was that we should fix this due to the ambiguity that has been identified.
        8. Another argument was let’s be conservative in our fixes.
        9. Discussion on what Filter Type 3.
        10. We may need a Filger Type for Management Type MMDPU
        11. Qi has a submission that is similar to this topic (11-12-1089) that she submitted to TGah for consideration. The modification is a more general solution, that would take multiple pages to add to the spec. (Covers all MMDPU topics not just this filter types).
        12. Defer this comment and allow Qi to provide a submission for consideration later.
            1. There is another comment that is similar to this one. See CID 78.
        13. Going forward group CID 309 and CID 78 together.
        14. **Action Item**: Qi Wang and Mark Hamilton to work on a proposal for later for CID 309 and CID 78 and CID 310
     8. CID 311
        1. Review the comment –
        2. This is an improvement of a feature that seems redundant for unicast frames.
        3. Issue is unknown benefits of having the STA be notified of unicast frames when it is buffered anyway.
        4. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (MAC: 2012-09-19 03:36:30Z): Perform the modification option in the proposed change..
     9. CID 312
        1. Review the comment –
        2. As Written a Notification is sent for every match.
        3. This may or may not be efficient, but that is what is there.
        4. The filter is in place until it is removed by the STA or if the filter was set to end upon having a match.
        5. **ACTION ITEM:** Qi Wang to provide a submission.
  2. Reminder to check attendance
  3. Next Meeting Slot on Wed PM2 – Start with Vinko’s Presentation, followed by Qi.
  4. Recessed 3:30pm

**Wednesday – TG REVmc – September 19, 2012 – 1:30pm**

1. Called to Order by Chair-Pro tem Dorothy Stanley at 1:30pm
   1. Comment Resolution:
      1. CID 350 – EVM equations
         1. Review comment context
         2. Vinko Erceg - presented – 11-12/1165r0 for discussion on this comment.
         3. Discussion on the missing factor of normalization.
         4. Request to see plots on the original equation and how it compares with “corrected” equation.
         5. Discussion on getting more offline discussion and bring back to REVmc later.
         6. ACTION ITEM: Vinko to gather more feedback – will return and report.
      2. CID 313
         1. Review the comment
         2. Agreement on the changes for TFS Response Elements description.
         3. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (MAC: 2012-09-19 20:58:52Z):
         4. Change the last sentence of 8.5.14.15 from

"The TFS Request Elements field contains one or more TFS Request elements to specify the traffic filters that are requested by the non-AP STA, as defined in 8.4.2.82”

to

"The TFS Request Elements field contains one or more TFS Request elements, as defined in 8.4.2.82, to specify the traffic filters that are requested by the non-AP STA, or zero TFS Request elements to cancel traffic filtering (see 10.23.11.2)."

Change Figure 8-484 to say "zero or more" TFS Request elements.

In 10.23.11.2, change "TFS elements" to "TFS Request elements" (four occurrences)

* + - 1. No objection to the proposed Resolution.
    1. CID 314
       1. Review the comment
       2. This comment has a principle specified, so a submission would be needed.
       3. Discussion on what WNM-Sleep mode is
       4. What is the difference in Sleep mode filtering and TFS filtering?
       5. Changing of PM bit from 1 to 0 gets some traffic but leaves filtering in place.
       6. After a discussion, there was consensus to take it offline and prepare a resolution.
       7. Generally agreed with direction. Need specific text submission. See CID 263.
       8. **ACTION ITEM:** Qi Wang to provide a submission.
    2. CID 315
       1. Review the comment – similar to CID 308
       2. So not need to add more text
       3. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (GEN: 2012-09-19 21:38:35Z) Comment is resolved by the text added in the previous section by CID 308.
    3. CID 316
       1. Review the comment – TFS sub-elements
       2. TCLAS element usage discussed
       3. The intention of the TCLAS processing elements defines the logical relationship
       4. The TFS request frame would have to add a TCLAS processing element if you have more than one TCLAS element.
       5. Agree to the need to make the change, now need to decide if we wordsmith the sentence…
       6. Discussion on the final wording.
       7. Review what was there again to ensure we keep focused on the outcome agreed to in the discussion.
       8. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (MAC: 2012-09-19 21:47:20Z): Replace

"Using multiple TCLAS elements in a TFS subelement is the equivalent to a logical AND operation on the match condition of each TCLAS element."

With

"Processing of multiple TCLAS elements in a TFS subelement is determined by the content of the TCLAS Processing element as defined in 8.4.2.35."

* + 1. CID 317
       1. Review the comment – See 10.23.13
       2. Need more research on this issue.
       3. GEN: 2012-09-19 22:13:28Z During the discussion, the TG determined that there may or may not need any text change.
       4. **Action Item:** Qi and Jouni will work to get a submission if necessary.
    2. CID 312
       1. Review the comment – and the minutes from yesterday’s discussion
       2. Discussion on why the existing text is valid.
       3. Concensus on this topic was not found.
       4. **Action Item:** Qi will work to get a submission if necessary.
    3. CID 311
       1. Review the comment – review the minutes
       2. No issue after reviewing the resolution from yesterday.
  1. Call for other comment that we may want to resolve
     1. We need to determine what our plan for going forward will be tomorrow.
  2. Remember that we are in the same room on Thursday—Gardenia A.
  3. Recessed at 3:30pm

**Thursday – TG REVmc – September 20, 2012 – 1:30pm**

1. Called to Order by Chair-Pro tem Dorothy Stanley at 1:30pm
   1. Reminded about attendance and Patent Policy
   2. Agenda for today:
      1. Comment Resolution
         1. Plan for one hour
      2. Motions as needed
      3. Plans for November
      4. Continue Comment Resolutions if time allows
   3. Review Comment Status and Plan for Today
      1. Youngho Seok – CID 372
      2. Stephen McCann – CID 335, 336
      3. Jouni Malinen – 52, 53
      4. Vinko – 350 update
      5. Gen Comments – Jon Rosdahl
      6. Mark Rison 119, 120, 121, 122
      7. Spend one hour on these
   4. Comment Resolution
      1. CID 372
         1. Presentation of 11-12.1174r0 to introduce the comment
         2. Discussion on presentation and comment.
         3. Question of how the MAC address should be displayed in the draft.
         4. **Proposed Resolution:** Counter - REVISED (GEN: 2012-09-20 20:45:19Z) - Change From

"The Individual/Group Address bit (LSB of octet 0) of dot11GCRConcealmentAddress shall be set to 0."

To

"The Individual/Group Address bit (LSB of octet 0) of dot11GCRConcealmentAddress shall be set to 1."

* + - 1. Move comment to Motion Gen-A group.
    1. CID 335
       1. Review the comment
       2. The plan would be to remove the restrictions on the requirement of Redirect URL field to be optional, and not tied directly with the Network Authentication Type Indicator definitions.
       3. It may be possible that the comment could be completed with just making type 3 as optional. The use case was not clear in what is needed for what.
       4. As this may be a list of fields, you could solve this by adding the type 2 if the Redirect URL field is really needed, and not have any change in the spec.
       5. The purpose of today’s discussion is to get feedback and a submission will be provided in the future.
       6. While no change may be needed, there may need to be a note’
       7. **Action Item:** Stephen McCann to provide a submission for this one.
    2. CID 336
       1. Request to defer for now. More research wanted.
    3. CID 51, 53 and 52
       1. Review comment – Typo needs correction. –CID 51
       2. Review Comment – Missing line for CID 53
       3. Review Comment – Validity Check – CID 52
       4. Security problem was identified need to change from “greater than zero” to “greater than one”.
       5. Review 11-12/1076r0 for details on the security issue.
       6. Proposed Resolution for all three comments is in 11-12/1076r0
       7. CID 51 and CID 52 would be just an accept, but 53 would need to be Revised
       8. Backward compatibility is thought to not be an issue.
       9. **Proposed Resolution:** Accept for CID 51 and 52
       10. **Proposed Resolution** CID53: REVISED (MAC: 2012-09-20 21:12:55Z): Change, as per 11-12/1076r0.
    4. CID 350
       1. Review the Doc 11-12/1165r1 for context and Proposed Resolution of the comment. R0 was presented yesterday, and has been updated with consultation with several other PHY experts.
       2. Very minor change
       3. Discussion on equation components.
       4. This would allow test equipment to use the settings for EVM to be the same as 11n and 11ac.
       5. The equation update would make the cited equation with similar to Equation 20-89. This changes the equation to be like it was in 2003
       6. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (GEN: 2012-09-20 21:25:01Z) implement the changes as described in 11-12/1165r1.
    5. We are at the hour mark, change topics.
  1. Next Steps Discussion
     1. Plan of Record reviewed (11-12/1061r2 slide 9)
     2. Question for today is would we want to start LB now or later?
     3. We do not have a detailed plan for how it fits in the meeting planning.
     4. Concern with delay. –
     5. Not concerned with Delay as much as processing the comments in timely manner.
     6. Somewhere in the middle on why to go out of November
     7. Going out of November would hit the holidays and be a hostile issue.
     8. Getting TGad in before January is not likely
     9. If we go out in Jan with Ballot 1, then in March we process Comments and add the resolutions with the version that has TGad rolled in, and Draft 2 would have comments received and with TGad to go out for ballot recirc.
     10. Whether or not we go out in November would be revisited then after we see the progress and the expected work that would be done.
  2. Conference Call Choices:
     1. Possible choice is Friday?
     2. 10am ET 1 or 2 hours
     3. Sept 28, Oct 5, 12, 26 and Nov 2
     4. Discussion on alternative times
     5. It is Friday…no good times
     6. Checked other time alternatives
     7. Grumbled and agreed to keep the proposed times.
  3. Comment Resolution:
     1. GEN Comments: Comment Group: Obsolete
        1. Finding all references is non-trivial
        2. May be sentiment to remove it, but the references need to be checked carefully.
        3. A Submission would be necessary to ensure safely removal of many of the obsolete items
        4. Discussion Annex J.
        5. CID 2
           1. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2012-09-20 21:57:32Z)Accept Deletion of Annex J
        6. CID 291
           1. **Proposed Resolution**: Accept.
     2. CID 25
        1. Review comment and context
        2. **Proposed Resolution**: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2012-09-20 22:10:47Z) Note Figure is 8-481 D0.2. The Sentences are just below the figure as well near the Editor's notes.
     3. CID 296
        1. Review the comment –
        2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (GEN: 2012-09-20 22:15:58Z) The Management model does not define externally observable behaviour and as such does not affect the Regulatory Requirements.
     4. CID 210
        1. Review comment
        2. More study is needed.
        3. The value of 0-127 does not make sense, but the idea that 0-64 is correct was not in consensus, More study should be done and reported back to the group.
        4. **ACTION ITEM:** Mark Rison to gather more info and report back.
  4. Motions
     1. **Motion #1:** Approve Comments resolutions to

CIDs 308, 311, 68, 313, 71, 75, 316, 315

As in 11-12-1082r2

* + - 1. Moved: Jouni Malinen 2nd David Hunter
      2. Result 12-0-0
      3. Motion Passes
  1. Not enough time to prepare a motion for the other CIDs discussed today,
  2. Adjourned at 3:30pm
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