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Abstract

Minutes from 11-July-2014 Telecon for 802.11REVmc:

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

–        [IEEE Patent Policy](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt)

–        [Patent FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf)

–        [Letter of Assurance Form](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf)

–        [Affiliation FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html)

–        [Anti-Trust FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf)

–        [Ethics](http://www.ieee.org/portal/cms_docs/about/CoE_poster.pdf)

–        [802 LMSC P&P](http://standards.ieee.org/board/aud/LMSC.pdf)

–        [802 LMSC OM](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_OM_v13.pdf)

–        [802 WG P&P](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_WG_PandP_v15.pdf)

–        [IEEE 802.11 WG OM](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0001-03-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx)

1. IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc telecon 11 July 2014
	1. **Proposed Agenda**:

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
2. Editor report; status of D3.0 ballot
3. Presentations

- Comments are in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-34-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls> .
- Available proposed resolutions to date:<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0780-01-000m-lb202-stephens-resolutions.doc>
4. AOB
5. Adjourn

* 1. **Call to order by Dorothy Stanley (Aruba) at 10:03 am ET**
	2. **Patent Policy was reviewed and noted**
		1. **No items from call for Patents**
	3. **Attendance**: Adrian Stephens (Intel), Dorothy Stanley (Aruba), Mark Hamilton (Spectralink), Sigurd Schelstraete (Quantenna)
	4. **Editor Report**
		1. Editor’s status
			1. Established training plan for new editors (Edward and Emily)
			2. Will plan to transition over coming months, depending on how comment resolution goes
		2. D3.0 ballot
			1. 779 comments, about half are editorial, about 50 are trivial technical
			2. So, about 300 solid technical comments
			3. All have assignees to get started, may need to be reassigned by the current assignees
			4. Consider announcing/reminding assignees who they are, during the WG opening pleary (on the snapshot slide)
		3. MDR document status
			1. Need wider audience to really discuss this
			2. Report is completed, but there are points of style that need discussion, these are highlighted in the report
			3. Plan to discuss during Monday TGmc slot, currently
	5. **Doc 11-14/0780r1 (QOS Map Set) – Adrian Stephens**
		1. Projected is r2 as we collect the changes today.
		2. CID 3107 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: To the end of 1.4 Word Usage, add: “When ‘field is' is used in contexts that relate to setting or testing the contents of a field, such as ‘The XYZ field is set to …' and ‘If the XYZ field is equal to 1', these usages should be interpreted as refering to the value contained in the field.”
			3. No objection - mark ready for motion
		3. CID 3088 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Actually a fairly small number of these.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1897.12 change “for per packet BIP processing” to “for per MMPDU BIP processing” At 2182.26 change “several packet lengths” to “several PSDU lengths” At 2272.30 change “AGGREGATED indicates this packet has A-MPDU aggregation. NOT\_AGGREGATED indicates this packet does not have A-MPDU aggregation” replacing “packet” by “PSDU”. Make similar changes at 2375.48.
			4. No objection - mark ready for motion
		4. CID 3069 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is a parameter in SAP primitives.
			3. Length field is missing in Channel Schedule Management element format
			4. Also in RLQP and a Public Action frame.
			5. This is all very confusing and conflicting.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes under CID 3069 in doc 11-14/780r2. These changes remove the cited structure.
			7. No objection – mark ready for motion
		5. CID 3001 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 805.46 delete the “Optional Subelements” field. At 807.01 delete the para starting “The Optional Subelements field format contains…”
			3. Thought perhaps the optional subelements were intended to be included, if only to allow a Vendor Specific subelement.
			4. Changed proposed resolution to instead create a table like Table 8-136, making that explicit.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Add a table defining a vendor specific subelement to 807.05, using Table 8-136 as a template, and copying text at 805.35.
			6. No objection - mark ready for motion
		6. CID 3004 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change “may” to “can” in cited text
			3. No objection - mark ready for motion
		7. CID 3005 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Referencing bits with bit number can be confusing, if that is the bit number withint a bigger context, or just within the field being discussed.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes under CID 3005 in doc 11-14/780r2
			4. No objection - mark ready for motion
		8. CID 3011 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. The description is just odd, inconsistent and confusing (“variable” or “0 or n”, etc.)
			3. The format is not parsable. Can’t tell a next TBTT Offset from the start of an Optional Subelements.
			4. No Optional Subelements are actually defined.
			5. There are clearly no implementations today, given the problems mentioned.
			6. TGai are touching this. Because TGai are using the TBTT Information field, decided to \_not\_ remove the redundant Length field.
			7. Proposed resolution: Revised. Make changes under CID 3011 in 11-14/780r2. These changes remove subelements from the field.
			8. No objection - mark ready for motion
		9. CID 3013 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised. Make changes under CID 3013 in 11-14/780r2. These changes explicitly define the format of the Vendor Specific RLQP-element.
			3. No objection - mark ready for motion
		10. CID 3024 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised:
				1. At cited location delete: “and the negotiated header shall be added by the peer MAC before delivery at the peer MAC-SAP”.
				2. At the end of the cited para add:
				3. “A STA that participates in a successful ADDTS exchange that included a U-PID element with the No-LLC field equal to 1 and that receives an MSDU corresponding to the TID indicated in the ADDTS exchange shall add the header indicated by the U-PID element before delivery of the MSDU at the MAC-SAP.”
				4. And to maintain uniformity, make the following stylistic change:
				5. “Following a successful negotiation through an ADDTS exchange that included a U-PID element with the No-LLC field equal to 1, before transmission the MAC shall strip the LLC header from all MSDUs corresponding to the TID indicated in the ADDTS exchange.”
				6. to read:
				7. “A STA that participates in a successful ADDTS exchange that included a U-PID element with the No-LLC field equal to 1 shall strip the LLC header from an MSDU corresponding to the TID indicated in the ADDTS exchange before transmission of the MSDU.”
			3. No objection - mark ready for motion
		11. CID 3036 EDITOR (Trivial Technical)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised. Make changes under CID 3036 in 11-14/780r2. These changes replace the cited usages with defined terms.
			3. Investigated the Reason Result Code of “Continuation frame”. Decided this mechanism is probably broken (how are lost frames detected, for example), but fixing it is outside the scope of this comment.
			4. Noted that the second replacement of value 0 (bottom of page 11 of 11-14/780r1) should be REQUEST (not SUCCESS) to match the one above.
			5. No objection - mark ready for motion
		12. CID 3332 EDITOR (Trivial Technical)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes in document 11-14/780r2 under CID 3332. These add a TXTIME calculation for Clause 16.
			3. No objection - mark ready for motion
		13. CID 3116 and 3153 EDITOR (Trivial Technical)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Note that are actually three issues in this text: the reported problem, the terminology “inactive” and the concept of the PHY “holding” the CCA signal.
			3. Decided to get rid of text in subbullet (b) describing CCA signal as “an exposed test point”
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes in 11-14/780r2 under CID 3116. These changes address the error reported, and also address CCA terminology for consistency with later subclauses.
			5. No objection - mark ready for motion
		14. Starting at CID 3361, the rest of the comments are believed to truly be Trivial Technical that don’t seem to need active review by the group. Went through them very quickly.
		15. CID 3361
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		16. CID 3341
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		17. CID 3399
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		18. CID 3398
			1. Fixed one of the “4”s to be a “2”
			2. No objection - mark ready for motion
		19. CID 3104
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		20. CID 3066
			1. Clarified moving to create a new 8.4.4.
			2. No objection - mark ready for motion
		21. CID 3070
			1. A previous comment we just discussed actually deletes this, already. But, no problem doing it twice. Will add a note about the duplication, to help out the editors.
			2. No objection - mark ready for motion
		22. CID 3354
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		23. CID 3073
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		24. CID 3075
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		25. CID 3425
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		26. CID 3201
			1. Moved to MAC and assigned to Brian Hart
		27. CID 3130
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		28. CID 3343
			1. There are “TSF value” in the current spec, but a whole lot more “TSF timer”, so we’ll stick with the latter.
			2. No objection - mark ready for motion
		29. CID 3495
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		30. CID 3106
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		31. CID 3010
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		32. CID 3509
			1. Corrected the corrected references to actually be correct.
			2. No objection - mark ready for motion
		33. CID 3090
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		34. CID 3091
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		35. CID 3092
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		36. CID 3016
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		37. CID 3149
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		38. CID 3017
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		39. CID 3021
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		40. CID 3022
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		41. CID 3498
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		42. CID 3026
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		43. CID 3667
			1. Moving to PHY group, and asked Vinko to look at it. Will transfer to GEN.
		44. CID 3095
			1. Asked Carlos C. to help on this one. Will transfer to GEN.
		45. CID 3681
			1. No objection - mark ready for motion
		46. Stopped for time. Pick up next time at CID 3692.
	6. **Reviewed agenda for next week’s face-to-face (11-14/747)**
		1. We have 6 sessions, we could perhaps add Thursday PM2 if needed.
		2. 11ad on Tuesday PM2
		3. Location on Wednesday PM1
		4. WFA liaison and 11b discussion on Wednesday PM2
		5. WBA Location liaison on Wednesday PM2
	7. **Reviewed Plan of Record schedule**
		1. D5.0 in September is probably a stretch, but we’ll see how it goes.
		2. Likely means RevCom and publication is into 2016
		3. If we form Sponsor pool in August, it is good for 6 months. Maybe September (close) is better. That gives us until Feb to get the first Sponsor ballot out. Shooting for November at the latest, but it gives us some extra time to have until Feb.
		4. Dorothy will update the POR and present next week
	8. **Adourned at 12:00 ET**