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Abstract

Minutes of the IEEE 802.11 ARC Standing Committee Teleconference 7 October 2014

.

**Tuesday 7 October 2014 ARC SC Teleconference**

**Chair: Mark Hamilton, Spectralink**

**Vice-Chair/Secretary: Joseph Levy, InterDigital**

**Attendees: Adrian Stephens, Jon Rosdahl, Peter Ecclesine, Mark Rison**

**Meeting call to order by Mark Hamilton 11:00 AM (EDT), 7 October 2014**

**Agenda:**

Agenda topic, is the MIB attributes Design Patterns, in particular:

- Review proposal for “Pattern A”: Is this the right sort of way to capture the patterns?

- Discuss any patterns that involve \_*both\_* a \*Implemented and a \*Activated attribute for a given feature

- Any ideas for additional Patterns, or volunteers to take a stab at drafting one/more?

- Discuss what retro-active changes we can make to the MIB, where we think existing usage does not fit a useful pattern

**Administrative:**

The Chair reviewed the 802.11 Administrative information regarding policies.

**Call for Patents:**

The Chair reviewed the Patent policy and called for potentially essential patents – there was no response to the call.

**Discussion:**

This meeting was called to discuss work associated with the 802.11 TGmc MIB attributes discussions as described in: 11-14/1060r0 – mc mib-atributes-design-background, and to review the analysis and progress captured in 11-14/1281r1.

A comment was made that MultiDomainCapability is a good example of where the Implemented attribute is useful, separately from the Activated attribute, because the Implemented attribute tells an external management entity that the device has the feature implemented, so the management entity knows to try to activate it.

But, that led to asking if the management entity couldn’t simply use the existence of the Activated attribute to tell that it was implemented. Would a read of the attribute tell the entity that it was on/off, as opposed to an error return, if it is implemented? Generally think so, but this needs to be researched off line.

How much can we even change the MIB, once we decide a set of rules/patterns that we like? We concluded that we have a pretty free hand to make changes, because nobody actually implements it directly. Where a change would affect the over-the-air behavior, we have to be much more careful; we should probably refer any such work to REVmc for them to publicize and consider.

It was noted that 11h stuff went into the MIB to talk about 5GHz DFS/non-DFS operation. A non-DFS device could never set or use the related MIB attributes. A DFS-capable device could turn on and off the related attributes, even dynamically as it changes sub-bands. So, those attributes are not really ‘static’ in the sense described in 11-09/533r1.

Is 11-09/533r1 missing an ‘entity’: the external SNMP agent? We’ll consider this some more.

What does “MAX\_ACCESS” in the MIB mean? If something is read only, is that absolute? Or, should it be talking about whether it can be written by an entity \_other\_ than the ‘owner entity’ as described in 11-09/533r1? We’ll consider this some more as well.

**Adjourned 12pm EDT**