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Abstract

Minutes for IEEE 802.11 REVmc task group for meetings at the IEEE 802 Wireless Interim in Athens, Greece.

1. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc - Monday Sept 15, PM1 1:30-3:30 pm**
	1. **Called to order** by Dorothy at 1:30pm
	2. **Patent Policy Reviewed**
		1. No issues identified
	3. Introductions of TG officers
		1. Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair; Jon ROSDAHL (CSR) Vice-Chair/Secretary; Adrian STEPHENS (Intel) Editor; Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink) Vice Chair; Emily Qi (Intel), Co-Editor. (Edward AU (Marvell), was identified as another Co-Editor, but was absent this meeting slot.)
	4. **Agenda – 11-14/1016r3**
		1. Review Agenda for the Week:
			1. Monday PM1
			2. Chair’s Welcome, Status, Review of Objectives, Approve agenda, minutes
			3. Editor’s Report, including MDR status
			4. Comment resolution –
				1. Editor CIDs,
				2. MEC Comment 11-14-1108; Dorothy Stanley (Aruba Networks)
				3. 11-14-1104 Mark. RISON (Samsung)
			5. Monday PM2
			6. PHY Comment Resolution –
				1. 11-14-1052 Mingguang Xu (Marvell),
				2. 11-14-1003 Wookbong LEE (LG Electronics)
			7. CID 3209, 11-14-1173 Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek)
			8. Tuesday PM1
			9. Motions – Teleconference comments
			10. 11ad CIDs – CC:
				1. 11-14-1109 Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
				2. 11-14-918, 11-14-919 Payam TORAB (Broadcom)
			11. Tuesday PM2
2. Comment resolution:
	1. CID 3774 – 11-14-1058 Steve MCCANN (Blackberry)
	2. - MDR Action item - 11-14-1150 Steve MCCANN (Blackberry)
	3. 11-14-923 Mike MONTEMURRO (Blackberry),
	4. 11-14-1104 Mark RISON (Samsung);
	5. 11-14-1163 Dan HARKINS (Aruba)
		* 1. Wednesday PM1
3. Motions
4. Location CIDs:
	1. 11-14-952 Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek),
	2. 11-14-930 Brian HART (CISCO)
	3. 11-14-1002 Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm)
5. Additional comment resolution
	* + 1. Wednesday PM2 – 5PM Recess
6. CID 3296 and more 11-14-793 and 11-14-954–Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
7. CIDs 3121, 3122, 3123 – any presentations, see WFA liaison 11-14-1141
8. 11-14-1246 Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
	* + 1. Thursday PM1
9. Motions
10. Comment resolution
11. Plans for November, Schedule
12. AOB, Adjourn
	* 1. Review and discussion of the Agenda
			1. Agenda Approved without objection
			2. Changes may be made as required during the processing of the CIDs.
	1. **Approval of Last Minutes from July and the Telecon Minutes**
		1. Delayed until Wednesday due to some items to be corrected in the Telecon Minutes.
	2. **Editor Report** – **11-14/0095r13** – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. Thanks for those that have helped.
		2. Training Program has been established for new co-editors
		3. Current Draft Version is v3.1
		4. Nearly ready for publishing v3.2
		5. Reference Documents listed on slide 6
		6. Comments by Ad-Hoc status reviewed – see slide 7
		7. Editing Progress reviewed
		8. Question on Slide 7 – CID 3414? Similar comment to 3515, and is being looked at by Wookbong LEE. He will take both CIDs as well as others in 11-14/1003r1.
		9. MDR Status
			1. The review of the document is done by the Editors, and the Group has looked at all the potential controversial issues.
			2. The outstanding issue from the MEC was the references that need to be reviewed later in this meeting slot –see doc: 11-14/1108r0
			3. Issue (ANQP – shall only) that Stephen MCCAAN was researching will also be brought up later in the week.
	3. **Review MEC - 11-14/1108r0**
		1. MEC review identified some changes in the Bibliography
		2. Reviewed each Comment
		3. Comment 1
			1. Proposal to delete the IEEE C95.1 reference in Claus 2.
			2. Proposal to delete the ISO/IEC 8824-1, 8824-2, 8824-3 and 8824-4 references in Clause 2.
				1. Discussion on the need for the ASN.1 usage in the MIB, so there is a reference to the proposed deleted standards.
				2. If we take the sentence from the 802.11-2012 Annex J text that was deleted in REVmc, we can make a more specific reference citation, and then they would stay in Clause 2 as well.
				3. Proposed change update: In Annex C, add a new sentence at P2814L15, insert the following sentence after the existing sentence: “The MAC and PHY MIBs are described in Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1) defined in ISO/IEC 8824-1:1995; ISO/IEC 8824-2:1995, ISO/IEC 8824-3:1995 and ISO/IEC 8824-4:1995.”
			3. Proposal Delete the ISO/IEC 8825-1 and 8825-2 references in Clause 2
				1. These are the encoding rules – not seen as being used in the current revision.
			4. Proposed change for ISO 15802-3 – Proposed change: Move the reference to the Bibliography.
				1. Note bottom of page 131 (5.1.4) had something similar, but not the same thing.
				2. This would need to be replaced with the new 802.1Q not the old 802.1D.
			5. ISO 15802-3
				1. Proposed Change Delete the ISO/IEC 15802-3 reference in Clause 2.
			6. ITU-T Z.100
				1. Proposed Change: Delete the ITU-T Recommendation 1.100 (03/93) reference in Clause 2.
			7. ITU-T Z.105
				1. Proposed change Delete the ITU-T RecommendatoinZ.105 reference in Clause 2.
		4. Comment 2
			1. Review comment
			2. Keeping the date is explicit to the version of the standard. Without the date, it would be the standard with any amendments at the time of evaluation.
			3. Note that in the introduction text of Clause 2 Normative references talks about the Edition
			4. Proposed change: At P3L12, change the text as shown”: for undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments or corrigenda) at the time of publication of this standard applies.
		5. Comment 3
			1. IEEE Std 802.21TM-2008 reference – to keep or not to keep the date.
			2. Proposed no change
		6. Comment 4
			1. 802-2001
			2. Review Comment
			3. Discussion on the value and the meaning of the standard with and without the date.
			4. Proposed Change: Change the IEEE Stds 802-2001 reference to refer to the recently published version: IEEE Std 802-2014 ~~01~~, IEEE Standards for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Overview and Architecture.
		7. Discussion for another change that could be used in Clause 2, but we did not get enough support for the changes.
			1. From the 802-2014 Overview and Architecture doc there was a paragraph we considered:
				1. The following publications contain provisions which, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of this standard. At the time of publication, the editions indicated were valid. All standards are subject to revision, and parties to agreements based on this standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the standards listed below.
				2. We determined it was not a good change for 802.11
			2. There were some off the cuff musings on what the text could say, but it was determined that we should have a better prepared submission if we are to make any further changes.
	4. **Review Editor Comments**
		1. CID 3006 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. The field has been “Highjacked” by .11af
			3. TVHT\_Mode\_4C and TVHT\_MODE\_4N are overloads on the “ShortGI for 80 MHz subfield.
			4. Limit the scope of the discussion to be on the editorial nature rather than the technical nature of it not being used
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Replace “Set to 0 if not supported. Set to 1 if supported. For a TVHT STA, Set to 1 if it supports TVHT\_MODE\_4C” with "For a non-TVHT STA, set to 1 if Short GI for 80 MHz is supported. For a TVHT STA, set to 1 if TVHT\_MODE\_4C is supported. Otherwise set to 0."

Globally rename “Short GI for 80 MHz” field to “ShortGI for 80 MHz/TVT\_Mode\_4C”

* + - 1. Discussion on what the use of the bits and some rationale for the overload.
			2. Straw poll:
				1. Do you support the Global renaming of the field?

Yes: 5 No: 3

* + - 1. There are only 4 instances of the text that reference the field.
			2. Mark ready for motion – put in the full change including the global rename as the straw poll supported it.
		1. CID 3020 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. Mark RISON has a proposal in 11-14/1104 that affects this part of the draft, so assign this CID to Mark R. for inclusion in his submission.
			3. His submission also has CIDS 3359, 3360, 3377
		2. CID 3067 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if we want to undo the “value” insertions by .11ac, or replace “value is” with “contains” at: 588.13, 588.17.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Delete "value" at at: 588.13, 588.17.
			4. No objection to proposed change
		3. CID 3068 EDITOR -> MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the value of the use of the binary vs decimal value.
			3. Move To MAC for proposal for deleting the table
			4. ?? took action item to look for implementation that could be done differently for this field value.
		4. CID 3097 EDITOR
			1. Review comment.
			2. Proposed action: No objection to making changes speculatively, and then review the comment
		5. CID 3236 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; For consistency, ensure all "CTS-to-self" used as a noun, in the context of a frame, is followed by "frame".

In 3.2 (definitions specific to 802.11) add:

Clear to send (CTS) to self (CTS-to-self) frame: A CTS frame in which the RA field is equal to the transmitter's MAC address.

+ Make same changes for CTS-to-AP

Directional multi-gigabit (DMG) clear to send (CTS) to self (CTS-to-self) frame: A DMG CTS frame in which the RA field is equal to the transmitter's MAC address.

* + - 1. Some discussion on the proper place to put the definition.
			2. Discussion on the scope of the actual change. The places where it is, is a noun in the context of a frame,
			3. Discussion on adding definition also in Clause 8.
			4. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-09-15 12:18:59Z) - For consistency, ensure all "CTS-to-self" used as a noun, in the context of a frame, is followed by "frame".

At the end of 8.3.1.3 add:

A CTS-to-self frame is a CTS frame in which the RA field is equal to the transmitter's MAC address.

A CTS-to-AP frame is a CTS frame that is not transmitted in response to an RTS frame and in which the RA field is equal to the MAC address of the AP with which the STA is associated.

At the end of 8.3.1.14 add:

A DMG CTS-to-self frame is a DMG CTS frame in which the RA field is equal to the transmitter's MAC address.

* 1. **Recess** at 3:30(15:30)
1. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc – Monday Sept 15, 2014 - PM2 – 16:00-18:00**
	1. **Called to order** at 4pm by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	2. **Review Agenda**
		1. PHY Comment Resolution – 11-14-1003 Wookbong LEE (LG Electronics)
		2. CID 3209, 11-14-1173 Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek)
	3. **Review Doc 11-14/1003r1**
		1. CID 3015 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-15 13:03:10Z): At line 57 of page 633 replace,

"These elements are absent when the Category subfield of the Action field is Vendor-Specific, Vendor-Specific Protected, or Self-protected."

with

"These elements are absent when the Category subfield of the Action field is Vendor-Specific, Vendor-Specific Protected, or Self-protected or when the Category subfield of the Action field is VHT and the VHT Action subfield of the Action field is VHT Compressed Beamforming."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		1. CID 3025 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: "REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-15 13:07:41Z): Make changes as shown in 11-14/1003r1 for CID 3025."
			3. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		2. CID 3027 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		3. CID 3028 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the use of “willnot” vs” does not” vs “shall Not”
			3. Decided to go with “shall not”
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-15 13:14:55Z): Replace "will not" with "shall not".
			5. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		4. CID 3064 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Need input from Brian H. On this one. He is here this week, waiting to revisit later.
		5. CID 3065 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if we like the “For other PHYs”
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change “Otherwise.” To “. For Clause 22 and Clause 23 PHYS”
			4. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		6. CID 3134
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if the STBC could be sent from the VHT or the HT STA
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-15 13:26:35Z): Make changes as shown in 11-14/1003r2.
			4. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		7. CID 3396 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. We have a single PHY – see how it relates to Clause 22
			3. If we change from 18 then it should be reference to Clause 22 rather than Clause 20.
			4. Let’s revisit later and see if this should be Clause 18 or 22.
		8. CID 3472
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on one or more that may be not quite.
			3. Error condition discussion
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2014-09-15 13:46:05Z) - Accept (Two Changes) Change #1

In line 60-61 of page 544, replace sentence

"The RXERROR parameter can convey one or more of the following values: NoError, FormatViolation, CarrierLost, or UnsupportedRate."

with

“The RXERROR parameter can convey NoError or one or more values indicating an error condition."

Change #2

In Table 7-3 (page 532), add "Filtered" in value of RXERROR" row.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		1. CID 3480 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the PPDU
			3. See 1036L54 – This may need more thought
			4. Proposed resolution: CID 3480: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-15 13:53:38Z): Make changes as shown in 11-14/1003r2 for CID 3480.No Objection – Mark ready for motion
		2. CID 3484 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion – fix initial proposed grammar
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 3484: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-15 14:11:39Z): Make changes as shown in 11-14/1003r2 for CID 3484.
			4. No objection - Mark Ready for motion
		3. CID 3414 and 3515 EDITOR - GEN
			1. Review Comments
			2. Proposed Resolution Revised: Find and replace “DATA-RATE”(1 instance), “DATA\_Rate” (1 instance), and “DATA\_RATE” (5instances) with “DATARATE”
			3. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
		4. CID 3396
			1. Revisit the CID
			2. Discussion on how a frame passes from 18 to 22.
			3. Review Text for context
			4. No consensus on if we change 18 or 22.
		5. There are two CID left outstanding in this document. Come back on Thurs PM1 to revisit these last two CIDs (3396 & 3064).
		6. We should mark Wookbong LEE as the Assignee for these CIDs.
	1. **Review 11-14/1173** – Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek)
		1. 10.24.14 Proxy ARP discussion
		2. ARP Announcement is a broadcast into the network.
		3. Proposed Text: “When an AP receives an ARP Announcement (IETF RFC 5227) from a STA currently associated to the BSS, the AP may update its Hardware to Internet Address mapping and shall not forward the ARP announcement to its BSS.
		4. Also we would need to know if the reference is 925 vs 826. 826 may be important due to the ARP request
		5. We can change the reference to be IETF RFC826 and IETF RFC 925.
		6. We can replace the last sentence with “When a AP receives an Unsolicited Neighbor Advertisement message from a STA currently associated to the BSS.
		7. Discussion if the message is transmitted over the air vs over the wire.
		8. Is the purpose of the “Unsolicited Neighbor Advertisement” something that you are sending or that you are receiving
		9. Return on Tues PM1
	2. **Recess** at 6pm
1. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc -- Tuesday Sept 16, PM1 1:30-3:30 pm**
	1. **Called to order** at 1:30pm by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	2. **Patent Policy Reminder**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda for this slot**: see 11-14/1016r5
		1. 11ad CIDs –
2. Carlos CORDEIRO: 11-14-1109,
3. Payam TORAB: 11-14-918, 11-14-919
	* 1. Editor CIDs and MDR 11-14/781r10
		2. Mark RISON, 11-14-1104
		3. No objection to agenda change
	1. **Review Document 11-14/1109r1** Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
		1. RX DMG Antennas subfield issue
			1. Concern with the verbiage for how to describe how to get the number
			2. After discussion it was deemed that r2 should be posted.
		2. Allocation of A-BFT
			1. Delete the second sentence in second paragraph
			2. There is no MIB variable for this either.
		3. Typo in 10-24 table
		4. Incorrect IFS
			1. MBIFS instead of SIFS.
		5. An R2 will be posted, and a motion for tomorrow PM1 will be considered.
	2. **Review 11-14/918 and 11-14/919** Payam TORAB (Broadcom)
		1. CID 3261 and CID 3262 are covered by these submissions.
		2. No change from San Diego for 11-14/918, so it will not be presented.
		3. Review of 11-14/919 proceeded.
		4. Key Change is on page 5 (basically change a shall into a should).
		5. The other changes are primarily for clarification, but do not change anything technically.
		6. Discussion on does this sentence requires an Announce frame to each associated STA.
		7. Discussion on how to capture the intended concept in two or one sentence.
		8. Several Text alternatives were looked over:
			1. In a PCP Doze BI, the PCP should schedule an ATI and should transmit an Announce frame to each associated STA.
			2. In a PCP Doze BI, the PCP may schedule an ATI. The PCP should transmit one or more Announce frames to each associated STA during the period of MaxLostBeacon.
			3. In a PCP Doze BI, the PCP should schedule an ATI. The PCP should transmit an Announce frame to each associated STA during the ATI.
			4. In a PCP Doze BI, the PCP should schedule an ATI. The PCP should transmit an Announce frame to associated STA during the ATI.
		9. After several iterations, the last one seemed agreeable to the group.
		10. Change the note from “is responsible” to “provides”. This is to avoid looking like we are making a requirement in the Note.
		11. Also remove the word “Particularly”
		12. CID 3261 –
			1. Proposed Resolution: Revised incorporate the text changes in 11-14/0918r0.
		13. CID 3262
			1. Proposed Resolution: Revised incorporate the text changes in 11-14/0919r2.
		14. No objection – mark ready for motion
		15. This gets all the 11ad Issues that were known outstanding.
	3. **Editor MDR** – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. 11-14/781r10
		2. New items in D10 are highlighted in light blue on Purple that could not be read very well from a distance of a few feet.
		3. Changes related to ADDBA frame
			1. Review proposed changes
			2. No objection
			3. There are some changes that were not reviewed explicitly, but that is all the concerning ones.
	4. **Editor CIDs** Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 3342 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. (+CF-Ack) is the most comment version
			3. The commenter issue is if there is to be a space before/after the “+” in the expressions
				1. There are about 58 “+” that have no space before.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised Globally Change “[]+[]CF-Ack” to “ +CF-ACK”
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 3358
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-08-14 10:28:07Z) - At the end of 1.5 add: <circle-plus-symbol> represents bitwise exclusive OR (XOR).

Delete statement specifying meaning of <circle-plus-symbol> at:

1303.24, 1879.47, 1884.28,

1885.62, 2301.33, 2411.51;

Replace XOR with <circle-plus-symbol> at:

1028.02, 1028.29, 2186.28, 2186.34, 2187.13 (x2), 2388.2

Delete statement specifying "mod" operator at:

1303.26

Note, leaving the symbol at 1886.60 for consistency with surrounding text.

Note, symbol <circle-plus> is re-purposed at 2086.29, 2102.6, 2103.61, 2105.15, 2106.31, 2110.20, 2119.28. No change is proposed although it would probably be better to find an alternate symbol.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		1. CID 3367
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Replace all “[IEEE Std] 802.11 authentication” with “authentication”.
				1. Discussion on whether the adjective was needed or not.
				2. “Authentication” being lower case vs upper case may also lead to confusion on which authentication is being suggested.
				3. Dot11 authentication was suggested, but no consensus
				4. Must have “IEEE Std” when noting 802.11…so change resolution.
			3. Updated Resolution: Ensure all “802.11 authentication” is preceded by “IEEE Std” & address case in figure 10-12.
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 3371
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change 1368.18: "NonERP infrastructure or independent BSS" to "NonERP infrastructure BSS or NonERP IBSS". (resolves also ambiguity of binding of NonERP).

At 1641.41 change "independent BSS" to "IBSS".

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 3383
			1. Review Comment
			2. A submission is required as there are at least two specific items.
			3. Mark RISON agreed to look at creating a submission to resolve.
		2. CID 3386
			1. Review Comment
			2. A submission is required
			3. Mark RISON agreed to look at submitting a submission to resolve
		3. CID3404
			1. Review Comment
			2. There are 242 possible items, but many are false positive
			3. Discussion on the amount of work and concern how this may be addressed. If a submission has not been submitted, then this will be a reject if no submission as insufficient detail. Assigned to Mark RISON.
		4. CID 3420
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Discussion on who had agreed to look at this before.
			4. Assign to James GILB
			5. Dorothy to follow-up.
		5. CID 3440 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission Required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. The submission author should attempt to get TGmc guidance before putting a lot of effort into proposing this change.
			5. If there are numerous definition of an operator, then it should be in 1.5.
		6. CID 3452 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. Ad-Hoc notes would look good in the minutes – see comment file.
			3. Submission Required – Assign Mark RISON
		7. CID 3453 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission Required – Assign Mark RISON
		8. CID 3353 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: REVISED (EDITOR) - Replace the definition with:

"A format that consists of a type, a length, and a value."

* + - 1. No objection - Ready for motion
		1. CID 3558 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. The issue of “non” not being a defined term
			3. Review definition in question.
			4. non-40MC is a term is thought to have been added to resolve a comment.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; this definition, although perhaps obvious, is not incorrect.
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3559 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; this definition, although perhaps obvious, is not incorrect.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3560
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; this definition, although perhaps obvious, is not incorrect.
			3. Mark ready for motion
		4. CID 3563
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 2200 – Long discussion before
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: This is a reiteration of a previous comment (CID2200). The Group has discussed the naming of this BSS in the prior ballot resolution cycle. There is no consensus to change the position.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 3566
			1. Review Comment
			2. The terms in brackets and the note may be deleted, but does that make a technical change.
			3. The Received signal power definition is not necessarily (RCPI “minus” ANPI).
			4. Need to expand the acronym to help make clear.
			5. The issue is that this is a term definition, and so we do not need to define how to calculate the term, but the definition, and then how to get the value later in the text.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revise: Delete the second sentence and Note from this definition
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 3590
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if the cited sentence is informative or declarative and if it was grammatically correct or not.
			3. One option would be to delete the cited sentence
				1. There was concern that the loss of the sentence would not be favoured.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revise Change cited sentence to “A CCSS is suited to an area and a frequency band having the following propagation characteristics: a) the BSAs of the SAPs within a CCSS cover the area and b) transmissions within the area are isolated to a high degree.
			5. Ran out of time – need to discuss this more
	1. **Recess** 3:30pm
1. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc -- Tuesday Sept 16, PM2 4:00-6:00 pm**
	1. **Called to order** at 4:00pm by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Attendance recording**
		1. No issues noted.
	3. **Review Agenda** for this slot:
	4. Comment resolution:
2. CID 3774 – 11-14-1058 Steve MCCANN (Blackberry)
3. MDR Action item - 11-14-1150 Steve MCCANN (Blackberry)
4. 11-14-923 Mike MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
5. 11-14-1104 Mark RISON (Samsung);
6. 11-14-1163 Dan HARKINS (Aruba)
	1. **Review 11-14/1058r0** Stephan MCCANN
		1. CID 3774
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed resolution
			3. The changing of the clause titles to uppercase should not be done, so an r1 will need to be created.
			4. Confusion on whether these are attributes/elements/parameters/variables.
			5. Located several “element” that needed to be changed to MIB attribute.
			6. Need to allow for checking offline to make sure we have them all caught.
			7. Stephen to bring back an r1.
			8. Discussion on the table Information name capitulation.
	2. **Review 11-14/1150r0** Stephen MCCANN
		1. MDR action item #1
		2. Review clause being reviewed.
		3. Proposed Text change seemed ok.
		4. This came from the MDR, and the updated text will be included in the MDR document.
	3. **Review 11-14-923r3** Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
		1. Continue from last place we were reviewing this submission during the last Telecon
		2. CID 3218 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Adjust the proposed resolution.
			3. The Figure 10-46 description is wrong.
			4. Improvement of the cited sentence was believed.
			5. Add to the modification: And in figure 10-46, change “loop1,n” to “loop <1, inf>”
			6. Proposed resolution: MAC: 2014-09-16 13:45:47Z): Make changes as shown in 11-14/923r4.
			7. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		3. CID 3322 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. After discussion we determined the proper resolution.
			3. Approved Resolution is on page 10 in the table
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-16 13:55:01Z): Make changes as shown in 11-14/0923r4, for CID 3322 (in the table).
			5. The next revision of the file will need to be unambiguous to identify the approved resolution.
		4. CID 3345 MAC
			1. Discussion on if the sentence “The accuracy of the TSF timer shall be no worse than +0.01%.” applies to AP or to STA.
			2. Debate on if it could be applied to both the AP and the STA
			3. Move the sentence to the beginning of the clause and use “a” instead of “the” would make it apply to both.
			4. Proposed Resolution: [8:14:50 AM] Mark Hamilton: CID 3345: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-16 14:12:32Z): Move "The accuracy of the TSF timer shall be no worse than +/- 0.01%" at 1521.50 to the beginning of the subclause. Changing the sentence to "The accuracy of a STA's TSF timer …"
			5. Agreement to proposed resolution – mark ready for motion
		5. CID 3355 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission required – assign Mark RISON
			3. Proposed Resolution was to reject, Mark wanted to provide more information.
			4. Concern with changing the text and the implication of any change.
		6. CID 3374 MAC
			1. Review comment –
			2. Discussion on if the AP is 0.01% too fast, and the STA is 0.01% too slow, then it would seem that the total would be 0.02%
			3. We need to determine what the rationale is for the 0.01%.
			4. Submission required – Assign to Mark RISON.
		7. CID 3504 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Remove the “d” paragraph, At 281.26, insert at the start of the second sentence. “In the case that a response is received from the responder STA.”
			3. There are 3 more instances of “set to provide.” That need to be fixed as well. (1603.1, 1609.54, 1617.5)
			4. This CID did not get updated in the Database and is open.
		8. There are some more comments in the file, Mike to check and get the number left to the chair and time to finish will be allocated.
	4. **Review doc 11-14/1104r1** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. MAC CIDS, PIFS CIDS and
		2. CID 3023 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review prepared Discussion
			3. Commenter’s silly comments must not have a silly response from the CRC
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-16 14:37:56Z): Change the NOTE to read "In contrast to reception, support for short GI transmissions by a STA cannot be determined by other STAs."
			5. No objection mark ready for motion
		3. CID 3313 and 3314 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Prepared discussion
			3. Discussion on whether we should make any change as the feature has been deprecated.
			4. Concern that we do not need to change deprecated areas, but this is in a section that may not be identified as deprecated.
			5. It would seem to apply in more general cases as it appears. A change was proposed, but we did not
			6. Assign to Dorothy for final proposed resolution.
		4. CID 3318 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Review prepared discussion
			3. Proposed Add a NOTE:
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-16 14:55:21Z):
			5. Add the following after the first paragraph of 8.2.5.2:

NOTE 1—Estimated times might prove to be inexact, if the TXOP responder has a choice of PHY options (e.g. BCC v. LDPC, use of STBC, use of short GI, PHY header/preamble format options) or MAC options (e.g. use of HT Control)). Heuristics such as the TXOP responder’s previous choices and channel conditions might be used to minimise the inexactitude.

Number the existing NOTE as NOTE 2

* + - 1. Consensus to resolution – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 3321 and CID 3323
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review Prepared Discussion
			3. Ran out of time
	1. **Recess** for now until tomorrow at 1:30 – note room change for Wednesday.
1. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc -- Wednesday Sept 17, PM1 1:30-3:30pm**
	1. **Called to order** at 4:00pm by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Attendance recording**
		1. No issues noted.
	3. **Review Agenda** for today’s timeslot:
2. Motions – Teleconference CIDs, minutes
3. Location CIDs:
	1. 11-14-952 Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek),
	2. 11-14-930 Brian HART (CISCO)
	3. 11-14-1002 Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm)
4. 11-14-1014 Ganesh VENKATEAN (Intel)
5. 11-14-1273 Dan HARKINS (Aruba) & Kazuyuki SAKODA (Sony Corporation)
6. Editor CIDs
	1. **Motions:**
		1. **Motion #65** Minutes

**Approve prior meeting minutes:**

San Diego minutes: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0845-01-000m-revmc-minutes-for-july-2014-san-diego.docx>

Teleconference minutes: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1004-06-000m-tgmc-telecon-minutes-aug-sept-2014.docx>

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Ganesh VENKATEAN
			2. Results: Unanimous Consent – motion passes
		1. **Motion #66** Teleconference CIDs

Approve resolutions to comments in The “Motion MAC-AC” and “Motion MAC-AD” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-36-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> and The “Gen SD - B” and “Gen Telecon-Aug” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0975-02-000m-lb202-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
			2. Results: 12-0-1 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #67 – Editorial CIDs (Monday & Tuesday)**

Approve resolutions to comments in the “Editor motion f2f 2014-09-16” and Editor motion f2f 2014-09-15 ”, tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-40-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>

* + - 1. Moved: Mike MONTEMURRO 2nd: Emily QI
			2. Results:13-0-1 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #68 – Monday & Tuesday CIDs**

Approve resolutions to comments in The “Motion MAC-AE” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-36-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls>

* + - 1. Moved: Mike MONTEMURRO 2nd: Emily QI
			2. Discussion – This tab is not ready for motion yet.
			3. Table the Motion – until the tab can be verified.
		1. **Motion #69 – 2014-02-07 Telecon missed item**

Incorporate the following text change into the TGmc draft:

At 1733.23, “A non-AP STA is considered inactive if the AP has not received a Data frame, PS-Poll frame, or Management frame (protected or unprotected as specified in this paragraph) of a frame exchange sequence initiated by the STA for a time period equal to or greater than the time specified by the Max Idle Period field.”

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Ganesh VENKATESAN
			2. Result: 11-0-0 – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #70 – MEC Reference changes**

Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1108-01-000m-mec-reference-comment.docx>

* + - 1. Moved: Ganesh VENKATESAN 2nd: Mike MONTEMURRO
			2. Results: 10-0-0 – motion passes
		1. **Motion #71 – 11ad clarification (Carlos Cordiero)**

 Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1109-02-000m-alignment-of-dmg-field-definition.docx>

* + - 1. Moved: Ganesh VENKATESAN 2nd: Emily QI
			2. Results: 11-0-0 – Motion Passes
	1. **Review Doc 11-14/1024** Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek), ,
		1. CID 3151 & 3269 MAC
			1. Review Comment topic
			2. Proposal for resolving is to creating a new sub-element in Location Configuration Information Report.
			3. Review of change – Minor Editorial – Should “Note” be “NOTE—“
			4. Size of field – 2 or Variable – in the text it says just “variable”
				1. In the figure just have variable
				2. Question if the reference of “as defined” is correct.
			5. Discussion on the figure name
			6. 8.2.4.24.10 has an issue, but not part of this submission.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised, Incorporate the changes as detailed in 11-14/1024r1
			8. No objection – Mark ready for motion
	2. **Review Doc 11-14/952r3** Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek)
		1. CID 3105 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed changes are acceptable – but there are some extra changes that this submission identifies.
			3. The Proposed Resolution should have all the changes listed.
			4. Note that the Exponential text cannot be used as the MIB has to have only ASCII text- plain text.
			5. You could put in some more “notes to commenter”, but need to be explicit of what is to be changed and what is not changing.
			6. Gabor to go and make revision and return for review.
		2. CID 3401
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised, Change 'ver' to 'Version' in Figure 8-118.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 3071
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the comment
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject, the commenter did not provide enough details on how should the location structures be merged.
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	3. **Review doc 11-14/930r0** Brian. HART (CISCO),
		1. CID 3012 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3031 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. This will get all the expected changes, the document showed some other text in the proposed resolution, but that will not be referenced in the Comment Resolution.
		3. CID 3074 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Question on how the order of the new paragraphs show up in what order.
			3. The proposed resolution makes a change for the order and puts in all the elements both optional and mandatory in the table.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 11:35:25Z): Incorporate the text changes in 11-14/930r0.
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion
		4. CID 3201 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 11:37:11Z): Change from 16 to 15 at the cited location.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 3203 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; [5:42:58 AM] Mark Hamilton: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 11:40:36Z): Incorporate the text changes for CID 3203 in 11-14/930r0.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		6. CID 3204 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: [5:45:11 AM] Mark Hamilton: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 11:45:12Z): Incorporate the text changes for CID 3204 in 11-14/930r0.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		7. CID 3208 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mostly this is just tidying up the language
			3. “Even if the …” question if this is correct sentence.
			4. Result code – Success (should not be “Override”)
			5. There was concern if another submission was changing the “Override” or not.
			6. This may be better to be a NOTE, but not definitive point.
				1. Change to a note
				2. A new R1 will need to be posted for this one.
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 11:51:18Z): Incorporate text changes for CID 3208 in 11-14/930r1.
			8. No objection – mark ready for motion
		8. CID 3265 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 11:55:21Z): Incorporate the text changes for CID 3265 in 11-14/930r1.
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for motion
	4. **Review doc 11-14/1002r1** Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm)
		1. Discussion on the way the document was arranged, and what would be the right way to resolve the comments.
		2. The proposed resolutions are combined in the submission and not identified separately.
		3. CID 3033, 3206, 3207, 3266, 3267, 3468
			1. Review Comments and text was provided in the submission so that all these CIDs resolutions will be “Revised; incorporate the changes in 11-14/1002r1.”
			2. CID 3266 has already been resolved so is not included in this set.
			3. Proposed Resolution:: CIDs 3033: 3206, 3207 , 3267, 3468: REVISED (MAC: 2014-09-17 12:00:43Z): Incorporate changes as shown in 11-14/1002r1.
			4. CID 3470 – REJECTED (MAC: 2014-09-17 12:13:56Z): This adds unnecessary overhead to the FTM procedure that may be of little value.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **Review 11-14/1273r1** Dan HARKINS (Aruba) & Kazuyuki SAKODA (Sony Corporation)
		1. This change was to fix one that had been applied to D3.1, and an error was identified, this submission fixes the error.
		2. No concerns – Chair to prepare a motion for Thursday PM1 for inclusion in draft.
	6. **Review doc11-14/1014r0** Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel)
		1. CID 3060 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Not able to show the expected information. Asked to bring back later.
	7. **Review doc 11-14/1276r1** Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel)
		1. Abstract: This submission addresses the following:
1. Incorrect conditions when the TX-START.confirm (Cl. 7.3.5.6) indication is generated
2. Text repeated in Cl. 16 (P2193L14-27), 17(P2219L32-41), 18(3277L57-3278L2), 20(3389L59-P3390L39), 21(P2455L1-14) is now moved to Cl.
	* 1. Time ran out and Thursday PM1 will review further.
	1. **Recess** at 1:32pm until PM2
3. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc -- Wednesday Sept 17, PM2 4:00-5:00pm**
	1. **Called to order** at 4:00pm by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Attendance recording**
		1. No issues noted.
	3. **Review Agenda**:
4. 11-14/1141 WFA liaison letter
5. 11-14/1246 Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
6. CID 3296 and more 11-14/793 and 11-14/954
7. CIDs 3121, 3122, 3123 – any presentations, Editor CIDs
	1. **Review doc:11-14/1141 WFA Liaison letter**
		1. Net-net – The Wi-Fi Alliance has consensus that the issues raised by the question of the use of non-OFDM rates are involved, but, after further consideration, has decided, in response to the liaison letter, not to express a position for or against any change to the IEEE 802.11 specification. The Non-OFDM Liaison Marketing Task Group has now completed its operation
	2. **Review doc:11-14/1246r2** Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
		1. Review submission – This submission readdresses what we had resolved with CID 3309 in July, and this identifies some issues that should have been included. The changes that area being identified here are built on the prior resolution.
		2. This document addresses the Uplink issues where before we fixed the downlink.
		3. From Discussion: During the July 2014 session, new SAPs for estimated throughput of an existing or potential connection were described within document 11-14-0792 proposing a resolution for CID 3309. As part of the discussion of that document, two major concerns arose about the general nature of the proposal. The first was the question of directionality of the estimate of throughput and the second question was concerning the accuracy of the estimate and the consistency of estimates across implementations.
		4. The AverageMSDUSizeDownlink/ AverageMSDUSizeUplink value of -1 and 0 were debated as to the what they mean and how they would be used.
		5. Discussion on the need for some maximum limits or how to indicate that what is being calculated is the best guess.
		6. Discussion on average RSSI – discussion on use.
		7. The size of the MSDU in the calculation was discussed.
		8. Note that DATA should be uppercased
		9. The middle column may not be needed in 8-www
		10. More review of the document should be done. Try for some time in Thursday PM1. (last slot of the week).
	3. Review the plan for tomorrow.
	4. Recess at 5:01pm
8. **IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc - Thursday Sept 18, PM1 1:30-3:30 pm**
	1. **Called to order** by Dorothy at 1:30pm
	2. **Patent Policy Reviewed**
		1. No issues identified
	3. Review agenda 11-14/1016r10

1. Motions

2. Comment resolution

3. Plans for November, Schedule

4. AOB, Adjourn

* 1. Motions
		1. **Motion #72** Editorial CIDs (Telecon)
			1. Approve resolutions to comments in The “Editormotiontelecon20140801”, “Editormotiontelecon20140808 ”, “Editorials for motion”, tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-40-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>
			2. Moved Mike MONTEMURRO 2nd Vinko ERCEG
			3. Results: 22-0-0 -- motion passes
		2. **Motion #73** CIDs this week
			1. Approve resolutions to comments in The “GEN Athens A” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0975-03-000m-lb202-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
			2. The “ANA” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-40-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>
			3. Moved Ganesh VENKATESAN 2nd: Stephen MCCANN
			4. Results: unanimous Consent – motion passes
		3. **Motion #68** – Mon, Tues CIDs
			1. Was a previously tabled motion
			2. Motion amended and updated (change to r38)
			3. Approve resolutions to comments in The “Motion MAC-AE” tab in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-38-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-36-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls)
			4. Moved: Mike MONTEMURRO 2nd: Emily QI
			5. Result: 23-0-0 --Motion Passes
		4. **Motion #74** – LinkID Handling (Dan & Kaz)
			1. Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1273-01-000m-how-not-to-compare-linkids.docx>
			2. Moved Kaz SUKODA, 2nd Guido HIERTZ
			3. Results 23-0-0 -- Motion passes
	2. **Review 11-14/1003r2** Wookbong LEE (LG Electronics)
		1. We looked at r1 earlier in the week, and the discussion was to make an R2, but it is still being generated during the discussion today.
		2. CID 3064 GEN
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the proper wording to reject the comment.
			3. The text that is there is ok, no change required
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2014-09-18 10:50:11Z) The Text from 802.11 REVmc d3.0 is correct.
			5. No objection mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 3396 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion to want to track the support for clause 18
			3. Need Note to accommodate the deletions that are being requested.
			4. Discussion on the Note Text.
			5. This CID will motion this week, and more discussion will take place.
		4. Request that Document 1003r2 be posted immediately to provide for previously motioned Resolutions
	3. **Motion #75** CID 3064
		1. Resolve CID 3064 as Rejected with a resolution: “the Text from 11mcD3.0 is correct”
		2. Moved Wookbong LEE 2nd Brian HART
		3. Result: Unanimous consent – Motion passes
	4. **Review 11-14/1283r1** Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. CID 3166, 3176, 3189 and 3190 GEN
			1. Review comments respectfully
			2. All comments relate to VHT-SIG-B
			3. From Discussion:
				1. The commenter has accurately pointed out that operation of segment parsing and deparsing need to be clarified for VHT-SIG-B. As was previously discussed in 11-13-0983r1, VHT-SIG-B utilizes segment parsing and deparsing just like the VHT-Data symbols. The equations in section 22.3.8.3.6 is, however, lacking indices in some of the variables needed to clearly indicate that the modulated constellations between the two segments are not identical to each other. This lack of segment index is causing confusion that segment parser/deparser may not be used in VHT-SIG-B. Proposed resolution, thus, is to add the segment index *iSeg* in the equations in section 22.3.8.3.6 to avoid further confusion.
				2. During the discussion, it was also discovered that the segment parser/deparser operation has a potential interoperability issue. The VHT PHY is designed such that the VHT160 and VHT80+80 PPDUs are interoperable with each other if the two 80 MHz frequency segments of the VHT80+80 are placed adjacent to each other. For example, each frequency segment of the VHT80+80 PPDU utilizes the frequency tone allocation of VHT80 PPDUs. And the frequency tone allocation of the VHT160 PPDU is identical to placing two VHT80 tone allocations side by side. This allows STAs to demodulate VHT160 PPDUs using two 80 MHz demodulators designed to receive VHT80+80 PPDUs, and vice versa.
				3. VHT160 and VHT80+80 PPDUs use the segment parser (section 22.3.10.7) to separate out each stream of the stream parser output into two 80 MHz frequency subblocks. This allows subsequent frequency domain processing, such as interleaver, to be performed per 80 MHz (reusing the VHT80 definitions). For VHT160, output of the constellation mapper (in case of BCC encoded PPDUs) or the LDPC tone mapper (in case of LDPC encoded PPDUs) from the two frequency subblocks are combined into a single 160 MHz segment using the segment deparser (section 22.3.10.9.3). As shown in the screen capture of section 22.3.10.9.3 below, bits from the frequency subblock 0 are mapped to the lower half frequency (tone indices 0 ~ *NSD*/2-1 ) while bits from the frequency subblock 1 are mapped to the upper half frequency (tone indices *NSD*/2 ~ *NSD* ). Hence, the lower half of the 160 MHz spectrum always gets assigned the frequency subblock 0 regardless of whether the Primary80 below or above the Secondary80 in frequency.
			4. Proposed change described.
			5. Proposed resolution for all 4 CIDs: Incorporate changes as shown in 11-14/1283r1
			6. No objection – Mark ready for motion
	5. **Motion #76** 80+80 issue Youhan Kim (Qualcomm)
		1. CIDs 3166, 3176, 3189 and 3190 as “Revised”, with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in the “Proposed Text Updates” section in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1283-01-000m-vht-phy-cids-3166-3176-3189-3190.docx> “
		2. Moved: Youhan KIM 2nd: Carlos ALDANA
		3. Results: 21-0-1 Motion Passes.
	6. **Review 11-14/1173r1** Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek)
		1. CID 3209 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Having reviewed the document on Monday and the change reviewed today are since then.
			3. We have had several reviewers that ok the text, but there may be one more person that was requested to review it.
			4. Editorial issues were noted.
			5. Request to have a Proxy Neighbour section
			6. ARP announcement frames are not Proxy ARP frames in general
			7. The ARP announcement being sent to the BSS, it also needs to be sent to the DS. Implication that the AP has blocked the Announcement from the STA, but that should be explicit
			8. There seems to be some more work to do.
			9. Will schedule for a Teleconference
	7. **Review 11-14/1058r1** Stephen MCCANN (Blackberry)
		1. CID 3774 MAC
			1. Review changes from R0 to R1
			2. Unique names in the table were used for Clause names.
			3. Consistent use of “The Following MIB attributes are used””
			4. Consistency of the use of MIB variables
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised: incorporate the changes in 11-14/1058r1
	8. **Motion #77** – Annex V CID 3774
		1. Resolve CID 3774 as “Revised”, with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11-14/1058r1.
		2. Moved Stephen MCCANN 2nd: Guido HIERTZ
		3. Results: Unanimous consent – motion passes
	9. **Review 11-14/1246r3** CID 3309 - Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
		1. Yesterday we looked at r2, this has been updated based on the comments received from yesterday.
		2. Revision Notes for R3:

R3: changed ave MSDU size values -1=not specified, 0=no MSDUs

Changed “bits per second” to “MSDU bits per second”

Changed uplink to outbound and downlink to inbound

Within 10.44a, in the outbound section, added that if RSSI at the recipient side is not available, that RSSI at the transmitting side is used

Changed AMSDU to A-MSDU, AMPDU to A-MPDU

 Changed DATA to Data

Deleted the “name” column of the encoding table for the Data Format bits of the ESP IE

 Added Clause 21 (DMG) to the RSSI field description

* + 1. Discussion on the changes
		2. There are instructions for creating the curves. The Editor asked why it was not drawn by the author, and the response was that it would be easy for an 11-yr old to draw these curves, so that the curves should easily be drawn.
		3. Discussion on some of the specific curve values (3db per bit).
		4. Discussion on RTS/CTS
		5. Concern that the proposal does not match in all cases.
		6. How to improve what we have today and get a more refined RTS/CTS useage.
		7. Vendor Specific ID is not a good solution as an alternative to this
		8. Discussion on the need to include the expectations of the model and the requirements that is to be included.
		9. ESP requirement of being in Beacons and Probe Responses
		10. The Authors were advised that there may be time to work on this more between this F2F and November.
		11. Concern that this change is more grand that should be in a maintenance project.
			1. The Chair noted that this presentation was in order, and that the group would determine if it would or not be included.
		12. Estimates vs actual –
		13. Would like to take a vote on whether to include this proposal.
	1. **Motion #78** Further EST edits
		1. Incorporate the Text Changes in 11-14/1246r3 Note to editor: apply changes in 11-14/0792r7 (CID 3309) first.
		2. Moved: Matthew FISCHER 2nd: Stephen MCCANN
		3. Discussion:
			1. 792r7 has already been accepted and is to be applied to the draft.
			2. Speak against the motion as this is technically broken – the RSSI …then lost the rest of the statement due to some side noise.
			3. Speak For motion – Believe it is a valid motion
			4. Speak for the motion – figures seemed good
			5. In a previous comment a question on valid values has now been check and no longer at issue.
		4. Results: 8-13-7 Motion Fails
	2. **Announcement from ARC SC** on Annex R – Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink)
		1. See 11-14/1218r1
		2. From Annex R abstract

11-14/497 recommended that 802.11 consider making the DS SAP normative text. Currently, the DS SAP is described/defined in Annex R of 802.11-2012, and Annex R is an informative annex.

* + 1. Annex R (currently informative), comprises the following topics:
			1. A one-page description of the service, including Figure R-1. (Figure R-1 is the subject of other comments, see 11-14/1213)
		2. A definition of the SAP and its primitives:

a) DS-UNITDATA.request

b) DS-UNITDATA.indication

c) DS-STA-NOTIFY.request

* + 1. Figure R-1 has been considered confusing (see 11-14/1213)
		2. SAP (and primitives) are described as moving MSDUs across/within the DS. This is the subject of comments/discussion in REVmc
			1. More than just MSDUs must be conveyed, to preserve information needed by the APs, mesh gates (and perhaps portals) such as addressing and priority.
		3. Proposal:
			1. Change Annex R to be normative, but only:

After Figure R-1 has been considered by ARC SC

What is conveyed by the DS (more than just MSDUs?) has been considered by REVmc

* + - 1. Should the Annex move (earlier in the order), to keep the normative annexes together?
			2. Should the text stay an Annex at all (or move into main body)?

Probably a new clause. Maybe between clauses 5 and 6, or just after 7. Maybe after clause 13.

* 1. Plans for November
		1. Objectives: Complete comment Resolution
		2. Conference Calls 10am ET 2 hours
			1. Oct 3, 24, 31
		3. No AdHoc Meeting scheduled
		4. Review 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
* Jan – First WG Letter ballot - without 11ad
* Dec 2012 – March/May 2013 – 11ad integration
* Sept 2013 – Letter ballot on D2.0
* Dec 2013 – May 2014 – 11ac, 11af integration – **D3.0 in May 2014**
* July 2014 – Mandatory Draft Review
* Form Sponsor Pool: Open Sept 15th or so, close end Oct 2014 – (45 days); good for 6 months (end of April 2015)
* **Nov 2014 – D4.0 Recirculation, follow with D5.0 changed if needed, D6.0 unchanged**
* **EC unconditional SB approval March 2015**
* **Initial SB March 2015**
* **Nov 2015/March 2016 – WG/EC Final Approval**
* **March 2016 – RevCom/SASB Approval**
	+ - 1. Plan to move the Forming of Sponsor Pool out to Nov to ensure it will be valid when the Sponsor Ballot is started.
		1. **Availability of 11mc in the IEEE store**
			1. D3.0 is available
		2. **Forward to ISO JTC1/SC6 WG1**
			1. D3.0 after successful ballot; enables submission to ISO prior to October ISO meeting
	1. **Adjourne**d at 3:30pm
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