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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons April 2013: April 5.

1. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for April 5, 2013
   1. Proposed Agenda – Apr 5, 2013:
2. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Comment Resolution - review available resolutions, MAC+GEN comment assignments, if needed
5. AOB
6. Adjourn
   1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:02 am; no agenda changes.
   2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
      1. None Identified
   3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark HAMILTON; Carlos ALDANA, Qualcomm.
   4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
      1. TGad defect resolution underway, mainly editorial; reviewers have identified additional technical changes; consider those changes either before or as submitted comments on the next ballot.
      2. Editor plans to have a draft incorporating the editorial defects and approved editorial comments soon – D1.3.
      3. D1.4 will incorporate approved technical comments, available before the May meeting.
      4. Speculative edits re: MPPDU are still in the draft.
   5. Comment Resolution
      1. Draft comment resolutions available in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0391-00-000m-additional-mac-comment-resolutions-orlando-assignment.docx> . Includes CIDs 1263, 1269, 1392, 1480, 1694, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706, and in
      2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-03-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> . Includes CIDs 89, 1008, 1134, 1135, 1424.
      3. Agree to begin with 11-13-391-00 comments, then 11-13-0361-03 comments.
   6. CID 1263: Agree with proposed Accept.
   7. CID 1269: Agree with proposed Revised.
   8. CID 1392: Agree with proposed Revised.
   9. CID 1480: Agree with Reject.
      1. Discussion – does 11ac change the restriction?
      2. Add reference to 11ac text.
      3. Modify reject reason, adding “Note that in 11ac D5.0 P77L8, the restriction to non-overlap is within a Sub-band triplet sequence” are not used within the same Subband Triplet Sequence field”. Can have overlapping between two sub-band triplet sequences.”
   10. CID 1694: Agree with proposed Reject.
       1. Difficult to distribute regulatory responsibility.
       2. Radar bit use is referenced in clause 10.
       3. Do we make existing equipment non-compliant?
       4. Potentially can distribute the responsibility; prefer to not prohibit.
       5. OFDM bit and Unidentified Signal bits are not referenced in Clause 10.
       6. Could add text – general use; provide hint.
       7. Only have channel selection described for 11n.
       8. Bits likely added by those wanting to avoid non-802.11 systems. Avoid channels with values set. Don’t believe we need to specify use – for example AP channel selection algorithms not specified – protect from non-802.11 systems.
       9. Add to reject reason “The OFDM Preamble, Unidentified Signal bits can be used by implementations as an input to channel selection algorithms; channel selection algorithms are not specified.”
   11. CIDs 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706: Agree with proposed Accept.
   12. CID 89: Discussion on improved text alternatives; no agreed resolution.
       1. Why does the ACK frame need to be different from the Block ACK?
       2. Modify text changes to reduce ambiguity:
       3. Many complicating cases, unsure that either piece of text is correct; have counterexamples to each piece.
       4. Propsed text: “"…a non-AP STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange described in Annex G, initiated by the non-AP STA, including a management, extension or data frame, and that includes receiving an acknowledgment (ACK frame or BlockAck frame) from the AP."
   13. CID 1008: Agree to resolution of “Revised”
       1. Text describes the TIM element in the Beacon frames.
       2. This is a UAPSD issue, not a mesh issue.
       3. Agree with the logic of the proposed text change.
       4. Might be better to organize as a list of essential differences. Not at this time.
       5. Agree to resolution as follows:
       6. REVISED (MAC: 2013-04-05 15:27:45Z):  
          Replace, "Bit number N is 0 if there are no individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs buffered for the STA whose AID is N. If any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered and the AP or the mesh STA is prepared to deliver them, bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 1."  
          with  
          "Bit number N indicates the status of buffered, individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for the STA whose AID is N. If the STA is not using APSD, and any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered and the AP or the mesh STA is prepared to deliver them, then bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 1. If the STA is using APSD, and any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered in at least one nondelivery-enabled AC (if there exists at least one nondelivery-enabled AC), then bit number N in the traffic-indication vitual bitmap is 1. If the STA is using APSD, all ACs are delivery-enabled, and any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered in any AC, then bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 1. Bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 0, otherwise."
   14. CID 1134: Agree to resolution of “Revised”
       1. Can you have an HC in any other kind of BSS?
       2. Not in 11ad.
       3. “In a BSS” not necessary. Will be in a BSS by definition.
       4. HC only exists in an infrastructure BSS.
       5. Not incorrect to add, but tautological, since an HC only exists in an infrastructure BSS.
       6. Cannot use in the “Outside a BSS” case, not in an IBSS.
       7. HC is collocated with an AP – stated in the definitions.
       8. Agree to resolution as follows:
       9. CID 1134: REVISED (MAC: 2013-04-05 15:37:25Z):  
          Replace   
          "The TXOP Limit subfield is an 8-bit field that is present in QoS Data frames of subtypes that include CF-Poll and specifies the time limit on a TXOP granted by a QoS (+)CF-Poll frame from an HC in a BSS."   
          with   
          "The TXOP Limit subfield is an 8-bit field that is present in QoS Data frames of subtypes that include CF-Poll and specifies the time limit on a TXOP granted by a QoS (+)CF-Poll frame from an HC in an infrastructure BSS."
   15. CID 1135: Discussion on improved text alternatives; no agreed resolution.
       1. Need to clarify effect on DMG STAs.
       2. See 4.3.3 PBSS – only established by DMG STAs, but Infrastructure and non-DMG are not mutually exclusive tersm.
       3. 11ad introduces a new scheduling mechanism; in a 60GHz infrastructure BSS, have an AP, use 11ad channel access mechanisms (not 11e). QOS Data frames can be sent by a QOS STA and by a DMG STA.
       4. Means no HCCA in DMG STA; 11ad by definition non-QOS.
       5. Mark Hamilton to further investigate, proposed updated text.
   16. CID 1424: Location comment; indicated presentation was heard in the January meeting. Likely to discuss location comments in May. Telecon time available upon request.
   17. Adrian, Mark and Jon to remind the “Needs Submission” comment owners of their comment assignments.
   18. No other business. Reminder: next call is April 12th.
   19. Adjourned at 12:00 ET.
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