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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons on Feb 22 and March 11, 2013

1. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for February 22, 2013
   1. Proposed Agenda - Feb 22, 2013:
2. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Comment Resolution – Remaining “Call for Comment” Comments – Mark Rison
5. AOB
6. Adjourn
   1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:02 am
   2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
      1. None Identified
   3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Jon ROSDAHL, CSR.; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark HAMILTON, Spectralink; Mark RISON, Samsung; Osam ABOUL-Magd, Huawei;
   4. Editor Report
      1. TGad has started to be rolled in.
      2. We are hoping to have a review of the roll-in and try to have the comments by the start of the March Session.
      3. We have a 1.1 draft that has the TGad roll-in included.
      4. We can post now with the defects yet to be fixed, or wait until March after the defects are corrected.
      5. The tentative draft is on Central Desktop.
         1. The chair would like to have the 1.01 doc to give the members ahead of the March meeting.
   5. Review of the list of CIDs that were sent to the Chair from Mark RISON
      1. CID 271: doc 12/1247r3
         1. I'm supposed to update this doc (to take account of the places where the spec talks of "rounding" or "rounded"). However, it might do for pre-D1.0.
      2. CID 269: doc 12/1345r0
         1. I'm supposed to update this doc too. Probably just needs to be punted to D1.0.
      3. CID 267, 165:
         1. I'm supposed to look at the "QoS Data"s in 802.11-2012. However, there's some confusion because the notes and minutes say there are only 17, while I can currently see 70.
      4. CID 234:
         1. Mark and I have come up with a submission on this.
      5. CID 229: doc 13/0144r0
         1. Under discussion today.
      6. CID 218:
         1. Don't have anything for this; needs to be punted to D1.0.
      7. CID 183:
         1. Don't have anything for this; needs to be punted to D1.0.
      8. CID 134:
         1. Don't have anything for this; needs to be punted to D1.0.
      9. CID 125, 25
         1. Don't have anything for 125; needs to be punted to D1.0.
         2. Not sure why 25 (which we've already accepted) is included here.
   6. CID 234: Mark indicated he had not prepared anything specific for today. So we looked at the e-mail thread on CID 234.
      1. Review the e-mail thread discussion
      2. AID 0 in the PVB needs to be set if transmitted, but need not be transmitted.
      3. Review Figure O-2 and Figure O-3
         1. The second row first cell on left should be a “1”
         2. When AID 0 is included, then it must be set in the Partial Bit Map also.
      4. AID description in 8.4.2.6 may need adjustment
      5. Line 19-31 p642 (d0.7) has a potential problem to be checked.
      6. Review Figure O-5
         1. Same issue, need the bit in the cell on 2nd row first on left to be set.
         2. There may be some confusion for the figure and how to indicate what is or is not transmitted.
      7. See 10.2.1.5.1 – (d0.6) page 1200 L9
         1. “Partial Virtual Bitmap of its TIM” is the offending phrase
         2. While it is awkward, it is probably ok.
         3. Lets not fix it now, but allow a new comment on Draft 1 with a proposed resolution be made.
      8. Summary E-mail on CID 234 is in the Adhoc Notes section (see spreadsheet/database).
      9. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

* In 8.4.2.7, after the para which starts "When dot11MgmtOptionMultiBSSIDActivated is false" add a "NOTE---The bit numbered 0 in the traffic indication virtual bitmap need not be included in the Partial Virtual Bitmap field even if that bit is set."
* In the same para, and in the "Method A" and "Method B" paras below, change "in the bitmap" to "in the traffic indication virtual bitmap"
* In the next para, and in the para which ends "Otherwise, an AP uses Method A." below, change "in the virtual bitmap" to "in the traffic indication virtual bitmap"
* In Figures O-2 and O-3 show the AID 0 bit in the PVB as 1 and split the arrow from AID 0 to point at both the Bitmap Control b0 and the PVB b0. Similarly, on O-5, show the AID 0 bit in the PVB as 1.
* In Figures O-1 to O-7 change the captions to:

say "Partial" first

have "Bitmap" in caps

not have "Example" in caps

say "Bitmap" (for O-7)

* Ditto for the title of Annex O
* Change "bit map" (case-insensitively) to "Bitmap"
* Change "bitmap control" (case-insensitively) to "Bitmap Control"
* "Traffic Indicator bit" is used exactly once in the spec, despite the grandiose uppercase letters -- change to "traffic indication virtual bitmap bit"
  + 1. There is still some work to be done on the text.
       1. There should be a submission to show the changes and the context of the changes to make it easier to understand and find consensus.
       2. **Action Item;** Mark Hamilton to prepare a submission detailing the changes talked about here as well as fixing the missing issue.
  1. How to track the outstanding comments was discussed
     1. leave in the database with existing numbers or to make a new comment on D1.0 and it would be given a new number.
     2. We commit to ensure that we include these comments in the current ballot.
     3. Changing just the LB number for the outstanding comments we can change them into LB1 and make them appear as being part of the first LB.
  2. CID 229
     1. Review the Adhoc Notes
     2. 10% allowance of the timers makes a precise equation hard to justify.
     3. Discussion on how to specify what the slot time was and how to determine if we are waiting long enough or too long for the slot time.
     4. Can you determine the variances in the implementations precision in the spec?
     5. The proposed Resolution is not sufficient. The precision of the equations vs just having a more broader (looser) definition be used.
     6. Straw Poll:
        1. Option 1: Should we change the equations with “+aSlotTime” to be more precise,
        2. Option 2: Just add a note to state that “+ aSlotTime” is for a fudge factor to account for timer drift.
        3. Option 1-0 – Option 2-1 – Abstain: 3
           1. If there is no compelling reason to change, then we should not make a change.
     7. It was thought that the previous discussion noted in the AdHoc Notes really was on a different subtly, and it may be the equations that were discussed, but not necessarily this same subject specifically.
     8. We could put in a resolution that there was no compelling reason to make the change now.
     9. There was concern that the Strawpoll may not have been understood. Mark R would like to say that we need to make a change and take either Option 1 or Option 2, but not do nothing.
     10. What would the Note contain?
         1. How would this be viewed in light of the timing 12/1256r10?
         2. This was figuring out what are the components are used.
         3. In this context, we are talking about why we are using aSlotTIme for these timeout cases.
         4. Discussion on the note: Possible Notes:
            1. NOTE- due to variances in timers, aSlotTime is not precises.
            2. NOTE: While a detailed timing analysis indicates that it is not necessary to wait for a slot time, just for the air propagation time and the allowable error on the SIFS time, waiting for a slot time is safe
            3. NOTE - this is an overestimate. An implementation might determine a better (short) timeout value.
            4. NOTE---While a detailed timing analysis indicates that it is not actually necessary to wait for a slot time, just for the air propagation time and allowances for clock differences, waiting for a slot time is safe.
            5. NOTE: It is necessary to wait for the air propagation time and the allowable error on the SIFS time. aSlotTime is a value larger than the required wait time.
         5. If we can wait a shorter time, then the spec, then we should change the spec, As the Notes cannot make change to Normative text.
         6. The fudge factors are on each component of the equation that may be better stated.
         7. Required values for SIFS and SlotTime are defined by Standard, and the rest are defined by implementation, but the combinations have to meet the standard.
         8. We may need to realign ourselves with the proposed changes.
         9. Is the effort to get a more accurate value worth it, but what is the value in doing so?
            1. If we add a note, then we are not changing the requirements.
            2. Having the explanation of why the standard is the way it is in the standard is not generally something we have done.
            3. The value of the Note is to just give an indication of why the aSlotTime was used.
         10. The last Note in the list seemed to be most agreeable if a note were to be added.
             1. The note would be put in a key location – where waiting for an ACK back.
         11. Proposed changes to the NOTE:
             1. .. aSlotTime is used here for simplicity and because it is larger than the time technically required.
             2. NOTE---It is necessary to wait for the air propagation time and the allowable error on the SIFS time. aSlotTime is required here for simplicity; it is larger than the time technically necessary.
         12. The Location of the aSlotTime comment is 9.4.2.8
     11. Ran out of time – Will pick up on reflector discussion and next Telcon.
  3. Adjourned at 12:00 ET.

1. Called to order 8:04am
   1. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark HAMILTON, Polycomm; Jon ROSDAHL, CSR Technologies Inc..
   2. Review Patent Policy – no item identified
   3. Proposed Agenda
      1. Agenda - Monday March 11, 2013: 10am Eastern/7am Pacific

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance  
2. Editor Report, including LB results  
3. Comment resolution - Remaining call for comment comments - Mark Rison  
4. AOB   
5. Adjourn

* 1. Editor Report
     1. Reviewed a general overview of comment distribution
     2. “Language – Ensure” was sent to reflector for more comment
     3. There are 9 Editorial comments that need more discussion
        1. May look at today or at least get started on these.
     4. We may or may not have a D1.02 by Next week. – but it is the goal.
  2. High level Report on LB was 88% with about 800 comments.
  3. Start with Editor Discuss may be good place to start with – Mark RISON not in attendance.
  4. Comment Resolution - Editor Discuss Comments –
     1. CID 1612
        1. Review Comment
        2. Multicast – when is it appropriate to change to Group-Addressed?
        3. When do we want to have Multicast vs Group-Addressed.
        4. New Multicast terms were added while the Revision Projects was in the process of removing the Multicast term.
        5. There is not a problem of definition, but counter to the process started in REVma and REVmb started to change the entire Multicast to Group-addressed.
        6. There are MIB variables and abbreviations that would have to be changed if we were strictly swapped.
        7. There may be a subset of the usage that may be properly left and some properly changed.
        8. The changing of the Proper name of fields, frame MIB variables, and parameters. Other uses, e.g. “is set to a multicast address”, could be changed, but it’s a lot of work.
        9. Change Status: - Needs submission – Jon was a stuckie to look at it once, and make a first pass.
     2. CID 1595
        1. Review Comment
        2. “frame” usage? In the PHY.
        3. Frame is used in some cases to be a generic use.
        4. Most instances PPDU could be used to replace “Frame”
        5. Seems that many of the cited usage may have been added from the TGv text.
        6. Some of the TGaa text has some useage of “packet number”.
        7. Definition of “packet” not clear.
        8. PHY – Use both packet and PPDU. PPDU seems to dominate. Packet used elsewhere for some security stuff (IPN). PHY seems to use packet quite freely.
        9. Proposed Resoution: Revised - Replace all “frame” in the PHY clauses with “PPDU”, where it relates to the on-the-air PHY packet/frame/structure. Also check affected definitions (RCPI…).
        10. No objection – comment ready for motion
  5. Discussion on the labelling on the report structure.
     1. change “Resolution Drafted” in place of “Resolved”
     2. Discussion on the use of the Database tool to find assignees/status etc.
     3. Reminders to Assignee should be sent by Adhoc chairs
  6. Return to Comment Resolution –Editor Discuss
     1. CID 1565
        1. Review comment
        2. Use of “beacon” – The current intended use is “Beacon frame” (Formal) or “a beacon” (Informal).
        3. There are 5 instances of “beacon frame”. This is an error and easy to fix. The proposal resolution does suggest that.
        4. Proposed resolution: Revised -Change all “beacon frame” to “Beacon frame”.
        5. No objection – mark ready for motion.
     2. CID 1531
        1. Review comment
        2. There are roughly 300 b<n>used in the context of a bit label, and roughly 600 B<n>. While there are these differences, it is unambiguous in the usage, but do we need to touch the spec in 300 locations?
        3. Is it worth the effort to make the change? This is doable, but it will take a fair amount of editing.
        4. Style guide may be worth updating to help making future amendments more inline with the decision.
        5. This comment should be marked “Needs submission” – needs a convenient way to specify location of changes – e.g. marked up changes in rtf.
        6. The best way to get the changes to the editor is the marked changes in rtf, or the equivelant in word. But if there are more than one on a page, then it is easier to locate the changes. More discussion on the methodigies on locating changes.
        7. There seems to be a much smaller number of lower case “b” that would really need to be changed to upper case.
        8. Proposed Resolution: Revised – Change all “b<number>” to “B<number>” except where this forms part of a hex number.
        9. No objection – mark as ready for motion
     3. CID 1489
        1. Review comment
        2. Desire to have a non-dividing hyphen
        3. There are about 700 instances of “PHY-“
        4. The specific issue was not noted in the comment, but we located a possible isson on page 418, where there is an instance that the hyphen is not a dash, but a hyphen.
        5. Adobe fails to find the location in a search, but the question is whether we need to replace hyphens with hard hyphens. Hard hyphens are thought to mean “non-breaking”.
        6. All the hyphens in the primitives are “hard” i.e. they have been inserted directly, and not by the software. This is an anomaly with Adobe and not a missing hyphen issue.
        7. Page 434 line 29 is one instance where the hyphen is just missing.
        8. Proposed Resoution: Reject – all instances of PHY<hyphen> are “hard” in the sense that they are present in the source, not inserted by frame. That they cannot be found/searched-for when a break is made at the hyphen is a limitation of a particular pdf viewer. (Note there are a few places where hyphens are missing, these are fixed in another comment resolution 1488).
        9. No objection – Marked ready for Motion
     4. CID 1488
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised Add Hyphens to PHYRXSTART and PHYRXEND Globally.
        3. No objection – mark Ready for motion
     5. CID 1491
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Change cited text at 25.40 to: "A Clause 20 (High Throughput (HT) PHY specification) transmission with TXVECTOR parameter FORMAT equal to HT\_MF or HT\_GF and TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to HT\_CBW20."

Change text at 26.31: to "A Clause 20 (High Throughput (HT) PHY specification) transmission with TXVECTOR parameter FORMAT equal to HT\_MF or HT\_GF and TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to HT\_CBW40."

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for Motion
    1. CID 1216
       1. Review comment
       2. No resolution on if we are aligned or not with what for the LLC definition
       3. Assign comment to Mark to take to the ARC SC for discussion.
  1. Start on Monday at the Plenary
     1. Need adhoc chairs to solicit more comment resolution proposals to help make TG REVmc time productive.
     2. There has been a request for discussion of doc 13/102 from Daniel Cohen already.
  2. Adjourned at 11:59am

**References:**

Comment Spreadsheet:
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-00-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>