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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons:

1. 2014-02-07 – GEN Comments: May vs Might, Personal vs Directional, Keep alive PS-Poll,
2. 2014-02-14 - cancelled
3. 2014-02-21 – 11ad Comments, Adrian Assigned Comments, Recycled comment review
4. 2014-02-28

Note that teleconferences are subject to IEEE policies and procedures; see:

[IEEE-SA PATENT POLICY](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt)  
[IEEE CODE OF ETHICS](http://www.ieee.org/web/membership/ethics/code_ethics.html)   
[IEEE-STANDARDS ASSOCIATION (IEEE-SA) AFFILATION FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html)   
[IEEE-SA ANTITRUST AND COMPETITION POLICY](http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf)   
[IEEE-SA LETTER OF ASSURANCE (LOA) FORM](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf)   
[IEEE-SA STANDARDS BOARD PATENT COMMITTEE (PATCOM) INFORMATION](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/index.html)   
[IEEE-SA PATENT FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf)   
[IEEE 802 LAN/MAN STANDARDS COMMITTEE POLICIES & PROCEDURES](http://www.ieee802.org/policies-and-procedures.pdf)   
[IEEE](http://www.ieee802.org/PNP/2008-11/LMSC_OM_approved_081114.pdf) 802.11 Working Group Policies and procedures

1. Minutes for the TG REVmc teleconference on February 7, 2014
   1. Proposed Agenda:
2. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Comment Resolution and available presentations
   1. CID 2488, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-09-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>
   2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0206-00-000m-keep-alive-should-include-ps-poll.docx>
   3. "May with Might" tab comments, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1160-05-000m-lb199-gen-adhoc-comments.xls>  and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0209-00-000m-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>
   4. “Personal vs Directional” tab comments, see<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1160-05-000m-lb199-gen-adhoc-comments.xls> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0221-01-000m-lb199-gen-comment-resolutions.docx>
   5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1345-02-000m-pre-ballot-802-11-2012-resolutions-for-pics.docx>
5. AOB
6. Adjourn
   1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:04 am; Items 3.4 and 3.5 above were added to the agenda.
   2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
      1. None identified
   3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark RISON (Samsung), Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
   4. Editor Report – Adrian STEPHENS
      1. D2.4 which incorporates the 11ac amendment will be posted shortly. The editorial review panel comments have been incorporated (about 80 comments)
   5. Comment resolution: CID 2488, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-09-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>
      1. CID 2488 – agree to rejected resolution: “Existing devices support current regulations: 13ms max; it is not necessary to signal conformance to the existing rules.
      2. Discussion on notes from prior meeting re: 11ac ANA entries. Editor reviewed ANA status: All 11ac ANA assignments are made. Also, while an addition might be made to the ANA registry, the published standard is definitive.
   6. Review of 11-14/0206r0, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0206-00-000m-keep-alive-should-include-ps-poll.docx> . The text was discussed in the January meeting.
      1. Discussion: would the change make existing implementations non-compliant? Few if any existing implementations exist. Understanding is that implementations under development behave as per 11-14-0206.
      2. Agree to incorporate the text changes in 111-14-0206. Chair will include this in the telecon motion at the March meeting.
   7. "May with Might" tab comments, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1160-05-000m-lb199-gen-adhoc-comments.xls>  and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0209-00-000m-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>
      1. Review of all CIDs in 11-14-0209 completed, and agreed resolutions are posted in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0209-01-000m-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx> . CIDs are: 2257, 2279, 2278, 2273, 2272, 2270, 2269, 2223, 2260, 2295, 2256, 2254, 2248, 2247, 2244, 2243, 2239, 2264, 2305, 2397, 2396, 2394, 2393, 2311, 2310, 2309, 2281, 2307, 2284, 2302, 2301, 2300, 2299, 2298, 2297, 2400, 2308
      2. Discussion: CIDs for which changes were made to the proposed resolution:
         1. CID 2273 – Insert “might”. Agree to Revised resolution: ““Services might include virtual local area network (VLAN) mapping… and tunnel establishment”
         2. CID 2272 – Some rewording of the proposed changes to the first sentence. Agree to Revised resolution in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0209-01-000m-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>
         3. CID 2223 – Discussion: Change to “Revised”, change “may be” to “is”
         4. CID 2260 – Edits to proposed revised resolution: At P61L51 change “may” to “can” At P61L53, delete “may” L55, change “may” to “might”
         5. CID 2295 – Discussion: change to “Revised” resolution : “At 87.43, Change “may” to “might”
         6. CID 2256 – Discussion – Change to “Revised” resolution: “Change from “The duration a STA may transmit” to “The duration the STA transmits” And From “These transmissions may also be subject” to “These transmissions might also be subject to”
         7. CID 2298 discussion: changed to Revised
         8. CID 2309 discussion: changed to Revised
         9. CID 2244 discussion: changed to Accepted
         10. CID 2254 discussion: changed to Revised
   8. “Personal vs Directional” tab comments, see<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1160-05-000m-lb199-gen-adhoc-comments.xls> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0221-01-000m-lb199-gen-comment-resolutions.docx>
      1. CIDs 2212, 2200 (GEN) – Agree to Rejected resolution: “Personal is a descriptive term that reflects the anticipated use cases.”
      2. CID 2204 (GEN) – Agree to Rejected resolution: “The CBAP applies to all DMG BSSs, whether PBSS, infrastructure BSS or IBSS, when EDCA is used. The definition is as stated in the CBAP definition, and no further clarification is needed. Personal is a descriptive term that reflects the anticipated use cases.”
      3. CID 2201 (GEN) – Agree to Rejected resolution: “The access period applies to all DMG BSSs, whether PBSS, infrastructure BSS or IBSS, with associated channel access rules. The definition is as stated in the “access period” definition, and no further clarification is needed. Personal is a descriptive term that reflects the anticipated use cases.”
      4. CID 2183 – Discussion, needs more work. Several published 11ad references are not correct. 8.4.2.137 changes to 8.4.2.127.2. At 2383.10, delete the 10.3 reference. Adrian has also done work on this comment and will generate the proposed resolution.
   9. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1345-02-000m-pre-ballot-802-11-2012-resolutions-for-pics.docx>
      1. Mark RISON reviewed the changes he made to the document based on the discussion in the January 2014 meeting. Agreement with the direction of the changes.
   10. AOB
       1. Reminder: next call is scheduled for Feb 14th (since cancelled) same time: 10am Eastern.
       2. Expect to review resolutions in document 11-14-0207 (Adrian) and “GEN Review” tab in 11-13-1160 (Dorothy) on the next call.
   11. Adjourned at 11:40 ET.
7. **Teleconference for 14 February 2014 was cancelled.**
8. Minutes for the TG REVmc teleconference on February 7, 2014
   1. Proposed Agenda:

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance  
2. Editor report  
3. Comment resolution

- 11ad comments, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0236-00-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx>   
- 11-14-0230, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0230-00-000m-lb199-cid2156-resolution.doc>   
- Approved January comments requiring further input - Adrian  
11-14-0207 - to be posted

4. AOB  
5. Adjourn

* 1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:04 am ET;
  2. Agenda approved without objection
  3. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
     1. None identified
  4. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS, (Intel); Mark RISON (Samsung); Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel); Mark HAMILTON (SpectraLink) ; Jon Rosdahl (CSR)
  5. Editor Report – Adrian STEPHENS
     1. D2.5 has been reviewed and will be posted to the members area for use in March Meeting
  6. Comment Resolution:
     1. - Start with 11-14/236r0 Carlos Cordeiro – 11ad comments see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0236-00-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx>
     2. Then proceed to 11-14-0230, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0230-00-000m-lb199-cid2156-resolution.doc>
     3. **Review 11-14/236r0**
        1. CID 2084
           1. Review Comment
           2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        2. CID 2097 MAC
           1. Review Comment
           2. Proposed Resolution: Revised – make changes as noted in 11-14/236r0 for CID 2097 MAC
           3. No objection – mark ready for motion
        3. CID 2077 MAC
           1. Review Comment
           2. Proposed Resolution: Revised – make changes as noted in 11-14/236r0 for CID 2077
           3. No Objection – mark ready for motion
        4. CID 2103 MAC
           1. Review Comment
           2. **Discussion:** to follow the same write up as in the next paragraph and next-to-next paragraph, propose to simplify the text and only refer to MID and BC subphases.
           3. **Change “a MID subphase with” with “both”**
           4. Proposed Resolution: Revised – make changes as noted in 11-14/236r0 for CID 2103
           5. No Objection – mark ready for motion
        5. CID 2082 MAC
           1. Review Comment
           2. **Discussion:** The figure number should be 9-59 at P1314L61. Also, for some reason Figure 9-59 is shown before Figure 9-58
           3. **Proposed Resolution:** Revised: *Change the title of Figure 9-59 to* “Example of skipping the BRP setup subphase (SLS in DTI)”
           4. No Objection – mark ready for motion
        6. CID 2104 MAC
           1. Review comment
           2. The cited location did not have the “=” error noted in the comment, but it was in 9-58
           3. Proposed resolution: Revised – make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2104
        7. CID 2180 and 2181 GEN
           1. Review Comment
           2. Proposed Resolution: accept (for both)
           3. No objection – mark ready for motion
        8. CID 2133 MAC
           1. Review Comment

**Discussion:**

The use of “shall adopt” in this case is incorrect. The STA does not “adopt” as such, but instead obtains those parameters as transmitted by the PCP/AP and uses that information to determine its behavior.

Hence, there is no need for the noted sentence to be normative.

Also, need to correct reference in the same paragraph

Shall adopt is generally used to describe things in the IBSS where timing is needed. The cited texted may not be the general IBSS case. (yes this is not the IBSS case).

* + - * 1. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2133
        2. No objection – mark ready for motion
      1. CID 2144 MAC
         1. Review Comment
         2. **Discussion:** The first occurrence of “PBSS information” is premature, since it will be defined later in the same paragraph. So, propose to remove the first reference to “PBSS information” and defined it later. By doing so, the second paragraph can also be simplified.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2144
         4. No objection – mark ready for motion
      2. CID 2149 MAC
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2149
         3. No objection – mark ready for motion
      3. CID 2113 MAC
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Revised – *Remove the indicated paragraph*
         3. No objection – mark ready for motion
      4. CID 2159 MAC
         1. Review Comment
         2. **Discussion:** There is already quite some introductory material in clause 9.36.1. In fact, many of the paragraphs in this subclause are very explanatory. Adding more explanatory text will do little to help. Perhaps, one of the areas that might somewhat lacking is the relation between DMG antenna and sector. Since P1301L44 already has some text to this point, propose to change that paragraph to highlight this fact.
         3. Proposed resolution: Revised – *Add the sentence to the start of the paragraph in P1301L44 as follows:* A STA can have one or more DMG antennas. A DMG antenna can be used to create sectors through which a STA can transmit or receive frames.
      5. CID 2053
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2053
         3. No objection – mark ready for motion
      6. CID 2110 MAC
         1. Review Comment
         2. **Discussion:** this duration reflects the minimum amount of time necessary to perform the measurements. There are other 3 places in the same subclause that require the same change below.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised - *Insert the following new parameter in Table 10-24 in subclause 10.39*

aMinPPDUDurationForDMGMeasurement; 5.27 µs

and *Replace all instances of “*5.27 µs*” in section 9.38.3 by “*aMinPPDUDurationForDMGMeasurement*”*

* + - * 1. Discussion on where the number was calculated – still seem to have a magic number, so we need to know how the number was derived.
        2. We need to find the rational for this derivation. Was there a submission that shows how this was derived.
        3. Save this comment for discussion for next week.
        4. Possible resolution to be included in an R2..
      1. CID 2055 MAC
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2055
         3. No objection – mark ready for motion
      2. CID 2184 GEN
         1. Review Comment
         2. Capitalization issue captured
         3. The changes were checked against D2 as well.
         4. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2184
         5. No objection – mark ready for motion
      3. CID 2183 GEN
         1. Reviewed comment
         2. There was some work from Dorothy and Carlos and we need to look the proposed resolutions together – Carlos will delete from this doc and we will assign the CID to Adrian
      4. CID 2108
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/236r1 for CID 2108
         3. No objection – mark ready for motion
      5. This leaves only CID 2110 open from this document.
    1. **Review Doc11-14/230r0** 
       1. CID 2156 MAC
          1. Review comment
          2. Discussion:

The figures are wholly inadequate to explain DMG operation which has these new aspects:

* PTP TSPECS
* Allocations
* Forwarding deletion of allocation by PCP/AP to peer STA
  + - * 1. Adrian proposes to essentially undo the changes made by .11ad in 10.4.9, by moving the old material into a new subclause, by moving the new material into a new subclause, by adding figures to support the description of the new material, and by reviewing and correcting the operation described in the new material where it is incomplete or ambiguous.
        2. Note that the same problems that obtain in 10.4.9 probably exist in “more important” parts of TS operation. I have not investigated this because the comment is solely on TS deletion, and I’m in no particular mood for a diet of worms today.
        3. Issue with “/” and so we need to replace the slashes with commas and conjunctions in the R0 proposal.
        4. Question on “considered” and if the sentence is correct.
        5. Change “Considered inactive” to “deleted” in both locations, and removes the comment in the proposal.
        6. Change the “Basic TS Deletion” for 10.4.9.1 to a longer name.
        7. Proposed Resolution: Revised - make changes as noted in 11-14/230r1 for CID 2156
        8. No objection – mark ready for motion
    1. **Recycled comments:**
       1. Review the following CIDS 2476, 2044, 2348, 2351, 2472, 2367, 2376, 2416
       2. CID 2476
          1. Review issue – Comment marked Revised, document says Reject, should have been marked Rejected
          2. Need to change resolution to Reject
          3. Will need to clear the motion number and bring back as an Editor comment with the reject back to the group.
          4. No objection – mark ready for motion with the editor comments
       3. CID 2044
          1. This should be a reject as the action field is there.
          2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – An action field, as shown in Figure 8-65 starts with the Cat field and includes everything after it specified by the specific frame format.”
          3. No objection – mark ready for motion
       4. CID 2348
          1. Review comment again
          2. This is ok, the editor will review and correct as approved.
          3. There are two “may” in the sentence.
       5. CID 2351
          1. Review comment again
          2. Both “may” were there,
          3. This is ok, the editor will review and correct as approved.
       6. CID 2472
          1. There is a more complex issue here.
          2. Editor note: The example: "(e.g., a HT STA does not continue use of HT and does not include an HT Operations element in its beacons)" is only true when it has received a Beacon that does not contain an HT Operations element.  
             Also "a HT STA does not continue use of HT" is too sweeping. Surely the HT STA can use HT format PPDUs talking to an HT peer, provided it respects the channelization of the now non-HT IBSS, and protects these transmissions appropriately.  
             Please consider qualifying the example.
          3. The may not be any action needed for the first comment.
          4. Why can you not allow the non-HT STA remain part of the basic rate set? The e.g. may be too week.
          5. The only safe thing to do is for the IBSS to reduce to the least common denominator. We could list out all the corner cases, but it would not be a conclusive set of what is allowed, and would definitely be too complicated to do this.
          6. This then had a longer discussion on what can or should be documented.
          7. There was disagreement in how this was handled, but the Editor will make the changes and those in disagreement will provide a new submission with alternate wording.
       7. CID 2367
          1. Review comment and issue – Editor IR
          2. Editor Note: EDITOR: 2014-02-11 14:35:26Z- Note to reviewers, commenter's page line numbering is wrong, but relative positions are right.  
             Note to TGmc, replacing "message" with "frame" has created a number of frame types that don't actually exist, such as a enablement confirmation frame, or an enablement frame. Please reconsider this resolution and change these names to actual names of frames.
          3. There is a list of locations where the changes need to be made (14 instances).
          4. The editor is reviewing the possible changes.
          5. The “DSE Enablement” is being added prior to the “frame” word that was changed from message.
          6. In c) 2) we would change “reason result code in the enablement confirmation (#2367)frame” to “Reason Result Code Field of the received DSE Enablement frame”
          7. Change “(de)enablement frame” to DSE (Dee)Enablement frame”.
       8. CID 2376 and 2416 are still left to review
  1. Ran out of time
     1. Adrian to check the Webex Link listed on the calendar.
     2. Jon will not be able to attend the call next week.
  2. Adjourned at 12:03 Eastern Time
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