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Abstract

IEEE 802.11 REVmc Task Group Teleconference minutes for Nov 21, 2014 to Jan 6th.
Assignment of comment resolution topics to the scheduled teleconferences:

R0: November 21, 2014:

1. 11-14-1413
2. 11-14-1041
3. 11-14-1104

R1: December 5th

1. 11-14- 1041 – CIDs 3394, 3087, 3014
2. 11-14-1104 - CIDs 3483 and more

R2: December 12th

1. 11-14-1413 CIDs 3232, 3499, 3392, 3692
2. 11-14-1104 – DMG CIDs

R3/R4: December 19th

1. 11-14-1041 – Dorothy STANLEY
2. 11-14-1104 – Mark RISON
3. Start on CID 3211
4. 11-14-1345 – Adrian STEPHENS

R5: January 6th (NOTE NEW DATE)

1. 11-14-1594 - Carlos
2. Remaining Editorial CIDs - Adrian
3. Any additional available CIDs
4. Jan meeting planning

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   [IEEE Patent Policy](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt)  |    [Anti-Trust FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf) |      [802 WG P&P](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_WG_PandP_v15.pdf) |
|   [Patent FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf)  |     [Ethics](http://www.ieee.org/portal/cms_docs/about/CoE_poster.pdf) |       [IEEE 802.11 WG OM](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0001-03-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx) |
|    [Letter of Assurance Form](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf) |     [802 LMSC P&P](http://standards.ieee.org/board/aud/LMSC.pdf) |  |
|    [Affiliation FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html)  |      [802 LMSC OM](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_OM_v13.pdf) |  |

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday November 21, 2014 –**
	1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 10:01ET
	2. **Review Patent Policy** – no issues noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
		* 1. The agenda as previously announced:
			1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
			2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution:

11-14-1413

11-14-1041

11-14-1104

Remaining Editorial CIDs

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to the agenda
	1. **Attendance**: Edward AU (Marvell); Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink); Mark RISON (Samsung); Emily QI (Intel); Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies).
	2. **Editor Report**:
		1. D3.4 Editing of November 2014 approved resolutions nearly completed. Editors and submission authors will review editing.
		2. Several approved comment resolutions need to be revisited – editing instructions incomplete.
		3. Editor objected-to comments – Editors in discussion with commenter.
		4. Adrian to post updated version of 11-13-0233
	3. **Review 11-14/1413r3** – Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
		1. CID 3232 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed proposed resolution. Current text is underspecified; tables should list all included elements.
			2. Discussion on “order”. Requirement exists earlier in the text.
			3. Carlos to develop resolution text to modify tables to include elements.
			4. Review on Dec 12th teleconference.
		2. CID 3392 (MAC)
			1. Cited text duplicates text in 9.5.
			2. Consider deleting text in 9.5
			3. Review on Dec 12th teleconference.
		3. CID 3084 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution.
			2. Agree to reject due to insufficient detail as shown in 11-14-1413r3.
		4. CID3264 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution.
			2. Agree to reject due to insufficient detail as shown in 11-14-1413r3.
		5. CID 3241 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution.
			2. Minor edits to proposed text, agree to revised resolution as shown in 11-14-1413r3.
		6. CID 3499 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution.
			2. Comment is on same table as in CID 3232.
			3. Single resolution to address both comments.
			4. Review on Dec 12th teleconference.
		7. CID 3692 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution.
			2. Identified additional locations with similar text – list items c and g. Need to review to determine if similar changes needed to those sections also.
			3. Review on Dec 12th teleconference.
	4. **Review 11-14-1041r8** Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba Networks)
		1. CID 3087 (GEN)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution.
			2. Discussion – new text unclear; is existing text even needed.
			3. Proposed text edits from Dan Harkins, review on Dec 5th teleconference.
		2. CID 3014 (MAC)
			1. This CID was resolved in November.
			2. Resolution didn’t include changes at 1099.41, 1102.47,1103.27,1104.52
			3. Bring back resolution to include changes at the additional locations and consistent with approved changes.
			4. Discuss on December 5th teleconference.
		3. CID 3512 (GEN)
			1. Reviewed comment and context
			2. Topic was not discussed in ARC.
			3. Agree to reject resolution as shown in 11-14-1041r8, insufficient detail.
		4. CID 3292 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution
			2. Similar comment CID 3069 resolved in 11-14-0780r3 that deleted the cited element. Agree to adopt the same resolution.
			3. Agree to revised resolution: Incorporate the changes in 11-14-0780r3 under CID 3069
		5. CID 3394 (MAC)
			1. Review comment and proposed resolution
			2. Information intended for management system use.
			3. Consensus to not change the format.
			4. Agree to add an example. Mark Rison to draft.
			5. Discuss on Dec 5th teleconference.
		6. CID 3353 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment and context
			2. Agree to the proposed revised resolution as shown in 11-14-1041r8.
			3. Proposed resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-14/1-41r8 for CID3353
	5. **Review Document 11-14/1104** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. CID 3483 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed proposed resolution.
			2. Edits made to proposed text.
			3. Ran out of time, consider on next call.
	6. **AOB:**
		1. Items for next call in 2 weeks, December 5th, 2014:
			1. 11-14-1041 CIDs 3087, 3014, 3394
			2. 11-14-1104 CID 3483
			3. Additional available CIDs
	7. **Adjourned** 12:01pm

(Thanks to Dorothy STANLEY for taking the minutes)

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday 5 December, 2014 –**
	1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 10:04ET
	2. **Review Patent Policy** – no issues noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. December 5th Agenda
			1. The agenda as previously announced:
			1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
			2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution:

 11-14- 1041 – CIDs 3394, 3087, 3014

 11-14-1104 - CIDs 3483 and more

* + - 1. No objections -
		1. **Attendance**: ); Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Jon Rosdahl (CSR); Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink); Mark RISON (Samsung); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies). Osama ABOULMAGD (Huawei); Scott Marin (Nokia); Emily QI (Intel)
	1. **Editor Report**:
		1. Previous editorial comments that had concerns has new a set of proposed resolutions in 11-13/233r44
			1. There are about 20 CIDs that need review or more input
		2. Review of D3.4 is ongoing – 11 Dec due date to provide a D3.4 before Christmas
	2. Review doc 11-14- 1041r9 – Dorothy Stanley
		1. – CIDs 3394, 3087, 3014
		2. CID 3394 – page 29 - MAC
			1. Review discussion history
			2. Review new proposed resolution
			3. Proposed Resolution – CID 3394: REVISED (MAC: 2014-12-05 15:13:48Z): Incorporate changes as shown in 11-14/1041r9 for CID 3394.
			4. No objection to use the revised resolution – mark ready for motion
	3. Review Doc 11-14-1104r7 – Mark Rison
		1. CIDs 3483 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2014-12-05 15:18:10Z): Make the changes described in 11-14/1104r6 under "Proposed changes:" for CID 3483, which allow opportunistic use of this feature by non-VHT STAs.
			3. No objection to the proposed Resolution
		2. CID 3359 MAC, 3360 MAC, 3377 MAC, 3020 Editor
			1. Review Comment
			2. The comment discussion is based on D3.0
			3. CID 3020 would be a reject -
			4. Review the proposed resolution
			5. Small adjustment to add some white space to make it a bit more readable
			6. Discussion on supporting which rates – Eventually we got to a two-way discussion on “is supported by the AP and the non-AP STA”
				1. Will mark this part of the proposal for further discussion
			7. Operational Rate set in D2 was what you could transmit at. – Used to limit some transmission mode – in D3, there was a change to be less prescriptive for the operational rate set.
				1. Debate on if the operational rate set is for limits on the Transmitter or the Reporting of the Receiver
				2. In the Join it calls out that the operational rate set is a receive constraint
				3. One example was in 9.7.5.6 – there is a transmission rate limit – this comment resolution fixes this particular clause
				4. When this was broken was not clear – nor is the final solution.
				5. In 802.11-2012 shows the foundation is on receive not transmit
				6. Resolved to let the changes be as proposed
			8. Discussion of the use of the Basic Rate set vs Operational Rate Set by the DMG or lack thereof
			9. Discussion on 1-127 vs 2-127 for consistency
			10. Proposed Resolution for CID 3359, 3360, 3377 REVISED (MAC: 2014-12-05 15:28:25Z): Make the changes described in 11-14/1104r7 under "Proposed Changes" for CID 3359, 3360 and 3377. These delete the text which links the operational rate set with MCSs and which omits the MLME-START.request primitive (1287.41).
			11. There is one area in yellow that needs to be addressed
				1. The Operational rate set tells you what a device can receive
				2. This was then noted that more discussion that needs to be done on this next week on the telecom
			12. The resolutions for 3359, 3360, 3377 is on hold
			13. Proposed Resolution CID 3020 (EDITOR): REJECTED. Everything ends up in a parameter. The BSSBasicRateSet is a parameter, and the Basic MCS Set field is in the HT Operation parameter or in the (HT Operation row of the) SelectedBSS parameter
			14. No objection to the rejection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 3051 GEN
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED Delete “CF29:M” at 2731.14. Add “CF29:M” to the Status for CF16 at 2629.27. Change “O” to “O.2” at 2630.35.
			3. No objection to proposed resolution – Mark ready for motion
	4. Review Editor Comment CIDS
		1. 11-13/0233r44
		2. CID 3319 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on use of PAD vs Padding
			3. Straw Poll
				1. 1. Keep text as is
				2. 2. Change Pad to Padding throughout
				3. Results: 101122A == 1=3, 3=3, abstain = 1
			4. Rationale for vote discussed
				1. Not seeing this as a needed change
				2. Not a global change necessarily
				3. Not that confusing, but there are only 2 instances that need to change
			5. Editor to look at the changes and bring back a proposal for a particular change.
		3. CID 3331 EDITOR
			1. Similar comment should be resolved the same way as CID 3319
			2. Editor to take it offline
			3. 1214.44 - EOF-PAD; 1848.22 PAD subfield( but it is in the deprecated so ok to not change) – this was discussed in the past, but a new proposal will be brought back later
		4. CID 3384 EDITOR
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR\_A: 2014-09-08 10:54:32Z) Replace "Re(,)" with "Re{.}".
			3. But we may want to have subject matter expert consideration
			4. Discussion on that the change may mean
			5. There are three alternatives – with curly braces, with parenthesis, or “Re(X) is a function which yields the real part of the complex number x”
			6. Discussion on proposed final text
			7. Proposed resolution REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-12-05 16:46:24Z) - Add to 1.5: Re (x) is the real part of the complex number x.

Im (x) is the imaginary part of the complex number x.

And: Throughout the draft remove other definitions of Re(.)

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
			2. *Subsequent to the posting of the minutes for Dec 5th – an e-mail exchange on proposal to refine the Proposed Resolution was noted Dec 8th :*

*Update the resolution as follows:* REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-12-05 16:46:24Z) - Add to 1.5: Re (z) is the real part of complex number z.  Im (z) is the imaginary part of complex number z (not including the factor i).

For example, Re (1 - 2i) is 1 and Im (1 - 2i) is -2.

And:

Throughout the draft remove other definitions of Re(.)

(Editor check 2290.36, 2378.62, 2470.32)

* + 1. CID 3590 EDITOR
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review 4.3.4.5
			3. It was noted reply to the commenter, clause 4 is not strictly limited to informative text although most of it is.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised (Editor 2014-12-05 16:54:54Z) – replace cited text with “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.”
		2. That was the end of the CIDs needing direct input
		3. There are 8 that need a possible presentation (they have been included in D3.4)
			1. CID 3604 – Block Ack – need to revisit to match convention
			2. CID 3280
			3. CID 3748 –
			4. CID 3402 – This is a change of the case of “incapable bit” to “Incapable bit” – need to check to see that changes related were actually made. – The changes noted in D3.4 seem to have taken the case the wrong way. – This was supposed to have 7 instances to be “upper cased”.
			5. CID 3041
	1. We are at time
	2. Review Agenda for next week
		1. December 12th

11-14-1413 CIDs 3232, 3499, 3392, 3692

11-14-1104 – DMG CIDs

* 1. Adjourned 12:01pm
1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday December 12th, 2014** –
	1. Called to order at 10:03AM, by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel), Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink), Mark RISON (Samsung)
	3. **Agenda**
	4. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
	5. Editor report
	6. Comment resolution: Available CIDs and presenters:

11-14-1594 - Carlos - 3232, 3392, 3499, 3692; 11-14-1570

11-14-1041 - Dorothy Stanley - CIDs 3014, 3394, 3512

11-14-1104 - Mark Rison, CID 3211

* 1. Remaining Editorial CIDs - Adrian
	2. AOB
	3. Adjourn
	4. **Patent policy reviewed**
		1. Call for patents – none received
	5. **Editor report**
		1. Review period closed.
		2. Adrian in the process of reviewing comments received (and chasing down anyone who hasn’t completed their assignments yet).
	6. **Presentations/CIDs**
	7. **Presentation 11-14/1594r0** (Carlos CORDEIRO)
		1. Since Mark RISON has submitted comments in e-mail, Carlos would like to review those off-line, and come back to this.
		2. Dorothy shared the annotated version that Mark RISON e-mailed, so we could see his comments in real-time
		3. CID 3232 MAC (and CID 3499 )
			1. The commenter is correct. Added the element to the Beacon
			2. Also needed to add that this element is in the Information Request frame.
			3. Also resolved CID 3499 at the same time, by replacing the open-ended reference at the end of the table, with the specific list of elements.
			4. Mark RISON notes that we don’t need Vendor Specific in the Action field. That row will be deleted, and rest renumbered. Also delete the word “element” from the STA Availability row.
			5. Mark RISON notes that all the fields need to be described in the text, and that is not in the proposed resolution, yet. Carlos agrees, and will work on it off-line.
			6. Need to check that we don’t have the same problem with Information Request/Response that we had with Probe Request/Response, as covered by CID 3355. Carlos will look at this as well.
			7. Considered Mark RISON’s comment (on CID 3499) that DMG Beacon, and some FST frames, have similar text about including “other elements” in a frame without being explicit. What goes in these frames is described in 10.33, for example, where each element lists the frames in which the element is used. Discussion on which approach made sense. Implementations are flexible, the Standard is pretty rigid. Agreed that Carlos will fix these locations as part of CID 3499 for now, and we can consider the bigger picture approach to this at a later time.
			8. Not completed, yet, Carlos will bring back both CID 3232 and CID 3499 after addressing the above.
		4. CID 3692 MAC
			1. Reviewed Carlos’ addition to the proposed resolution to make similar changes in 10.1.4.3.2 and 10.1.4.3.3(g). (He had only changed 10.1.4.3.3(f), previously.)
			2. Mark Rison’s comment is that introducing the concept of multiple Probe Requests and multiple Basic Access procedures is confusing to show up in bullet (c).
			3. Looked at baseline, and bullet (b), which discusses the use of Basic Access procedure.
			4. Mark suggests making the SSID List process its own (new) bullet, which mentions doing the Basic Access procedure before each of the additional Probe Requests.
			5. Also, agreed to lower-case “Basic Access” throughout.
			6. Carlos will update and bring back for final review and approval. Target the Jan 9 telecon. *(Note that the Jan 9 Telcon was changed to Jan 6th)*
		5. CID 3392
			1. This is not in Carlos’ document. Reviewed prior notes, determined this was discussed, and assigned to Mark Rison. He needs some expert help to resolve this. He has e-mailed his questions and analysis. Everyone asked to review that, and respond.
	8. **Presentation 11-14/1570r1** (Carlos CORDEIRO)
		1. No CID for this change.
		2. This issue was found due to interop problems. Important we fix it.
		3. Noted discussion points 1, 2, 3 and 4.
		4. Because the Duration field isn’t long enough when initiating an ISS, the responder has to do a new channel access for the RSS. Implementations are not doing it that way, and shouldn’t need to.
		5. Reviewed proposed changes, as shown in 1570r1.
		6. On last sentence of the document: Note that 9.38.8 is effectively informative, because the clause starts by saying this is an example state machine. So, while Carlos thinks there might be some minor impacts on the state machines with the other changes, it isn’t that critical.
		7. Suggestion to move this example text to an Informative Annex. Or, maybe we should make sure they are completely correct, and make them normative. Carlos will consider, and bring back. He’ll bring this back as a separate issue.
	9. **Presentation 11-14/1041r9** (Dorothy STANLEY)
		1. Will pass for this week. Some updates are ready, but it is more important to get to Mark RISON’s comments while he is available
	10. **Presentation 11-14/1104r7** (Mark Rison)
		1. CIDs 3212, 3213, 3345, 3374 MAC
			1. Noted some other problems found by Carlos in this area, as described at the end of the Discussion section.
			2. Asked for preferences on the way the accuracy of the TSF timer is described (the yellow highlighted text in Mark’s document). Agreement on second option; Mark will update the document to show that version as the proposed change.
			3. Mark will bring back his question in yellow about where Di,n and Om should be defined, on a future ballot. Just delete it for now. No one on today’s call had a comment in response.
			4. Resolution: Revised Incorporate the text changes shown in 11-14/1104r8 for CIDs 3212, 3213, 3345, and 3374.
			5. Approved, ready for motion.
		2. CID 3382 MAC
			1. Discussion about the units on dot11EDCATableTXOPLimit. Noted that it is used in equations in the main body text (cf page 580), so consistent units with other things in those equations are needed. But, the other things don’t have clear, explicit units either, although it could be argued that microseconds is implied.
			2. Since adding/correcting all the default values details in the MIB is repeating text that is in the main body, it would be better to reference the main body and not duplicate and create a maintenance problem.
		3. Mark will cleanup and bring back an updated version.
	11. Next telecon is in one week – Dec 19th.
	12. ADJOURN at 12:01.

(Thanks to Mark HAMILTON for taking the minutes)

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday December 19th, 2014** –
	1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 10:03ET
	2. **Review Patent Policy** – no issues noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
2. Call to order, Patent Policy Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Review Submission for Comment Resolution:
	1. 11-14-1041 – Dorothy STANLEY
	2. 11-14-1104 – Mark RISON

Start on CID 3211

* 1. 11-14-1345 – Adrian STEPHENS
1. Adjourn
	* 1. No objection to adgenda
	1. **Attendance**: ); Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Jon Rosdahl (CSR); Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink); Mark RISON (Samsung); Peter ECCLESINE (Cisco);
	2. **Editor Report**:
		1. Goal to have next version of draft by end of year.
		2. Reviewers are being called to finish reviews
	3. **Review 11-14-1041r10 Dorothy STANLEY**
		1. CID 3087 GEN
			1. Review past discussion on this CID
			2. The proposed Sentence was thought to be a bit better, but not exactly perfect.
			3. There was a question on if there is one option to just delete it because it is stated elsewhere, then we could identify where it is more precisely stated.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate Changes at 110.46 as shown in 11-14/1041r11 under CID 3087
			5. No objection to the resolution – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3014 Editor
			1. Was resolved in Nov, but we did not include an additional comment that was made.
			2. Reviewed Comment
			3. In r10, there is also a “responder STA” that was changed to just “responder”
			4. Granting Enablement is required to be an AP or legal station that grants the enablement.
			5. Discussion on what Enablement means.
			6. 1102.47, and 1103.27 - “and that grants Enablement” was removed.
			7. 1104.52 – an extra “the” was needed.
			8. Proposed Resolution: Revised – incorporate changes as indicated in 11-14/1391r1 for CID 3014 and then apply the changes listed in 11-14-1041r11 for CID 3014.
			9. No objection – mark ready for motion
		3. CID 3041 Editor
			1. Revisit CID
			2. There was a row that was called out and a typo that needs to be fixed.
			3. Change 7 to 6 is required.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make the KCK\_bits, and KEK\_bits for rows 00-0F-AC:8 and 00-0F-AC:9 match those of 00-0F-AC:6; and to make the "Size of MIC" for 00-0F-AC:8 match that of 00-0F-AC:9.
			5. Include 3041 and 3014 CIDs as previously approved CIDs and have new resolutions to be approved in the telecom motions in January
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	4. Change Agenda order
		1. Decided that we would start with 1354r1 and then give remaining time to Mark for 11-14/1104
	5. **Review Doc 11-14/1345r1** Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 3056 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. DO vs DO STA has a subtle difference, removing the DO STA definition makes it more generic and correct.
			3. Note to have the Editor check for “an DO” which should be “a DO” throughout.
			4. A Technical change label was missed in 1674.36. Also a couple “may” that should probably be changed to “might”. No change was agreed to. There are 8 “may decide” in the draft that could be Sponsor Ballot Comment material.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised – make changes in 11-14/1345r1 under CID 3056 – Editor to correct any instances of “an DO” to “a DO”
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3319 and 3331 Editor
			1. Review Previous Discussion on Rejecting which was rejected
			2. From the Discussion:

An initial attempt to reject these comments (“it’s not ambiguous”) was opposed, so an alternate resolution is proposed here.

The intent of these changes are to use “Padding” in the names of fields, and “pad” as a verb describing the act of padding, but to limit the changes to the MAC, and to exclude changes to WEP (which is deprecated) This is an improvement in consistency, however changing “Pad” to “Padding” in the PHY would require changes in PHY figures to accommodate the longer word, and this is the rationale for not changing the PHY.

* + - 1. Question on the difference for EOF Pad vs EOF Padding – CID 3478 addressed this. How would this proposal affect it? Need to align the definition for consistency.
			2. Time check – need to look at 3097 at another time
			3. We need to revisit the Resolution of CID 3478
			4. Suggestion would be to transfer CID 3478 from Mark’s Document to Adrian’s and have it be resolved together. The CID Database would need to be updated for the transfer.
			5. Plan to revisit 3331, 3319 and 3478 on the next telecom as well as 3097 which is a different topic.
	1. **Review Doc 11-14-1104r8** – Mark RISON
		1. Review of what is left from Mark
		2. CID 3359 MAC, 3360 MAC, 3377 MAC
			1. MinPhyRate is the issue for discussion
			2. Discussion on the uplink and the downlink specific cases.
			3. The Notes were a bit hard to read out dented, so we will need the Editor to fix up the presentation in the draft.
			4. Reviewed discussion from Dec 5
			5. Proposed Resolution: (for 3359 and 3377): Revised Make the changes as described in 11-14/1104r9 for CID 3359, 3360, 3377. These delete the text which links the operational rate set with MCSs and which omits the MLME-START.request primitive (1287.41).
			6. Proposed Resolution for 3360: Revised Make the changes described in 11-14/1104r9 under “Proposed changes:” for CID 3359, 3360 and 3377, which address the issue raised by the commenter.
			7. No objection – mark ready for motion
		3. CID 3211 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the aMPDUMaxLength
			3. The proposed resolution has some outstanding concerns. Need to review to get more opportunity for consensus.
			4. Reviewed the actual changes proposed.
			5. Questions –
				1. Concern with duplicating the logic in the MIB description as apposed to just noting where it is defined.
		4. CID 3382 MAC
			1. Review current state of the discussion
			2. The equation in the draft may require that the units in the the MIB may be more important to be in microseconds.
			3. The AP and the STA should have a common understanding and that they have to be on the same units – 32 microseconds is one choice.
			4. The encoding of the frame as defined as being in 32 microseconds, but what happens in the MIB may be more internal implication dependent.
			5. We can try to fix it with calling out units for each variable explicitly.
			6. It may make better to make it consistent throughout.
			7. “is the duration given by” at 580.58 may be a way around this particular issue at this point.
			8. The proposed table could be dropped, and reference the existing table in the draft.
			9. The changes discussed today will be made and then reviewed in a subsequent call.
		5. CID 3368 GEN
			1. Review comment
			2. From the discussion:

The way it is structured in the MIB is that dot11AuthenticationAlgorithmsTable is a set of all the authentication algorithms supported/implemented/defined. This table has a dot11AuthenticationAlgorithm column, which identifies an authentication algorithm, and a dot11AuthenticationAlgorithmsActivated (sic) column, which says whether that authentication algorithm is activated.

* + - 1. Agree with the change of “may” to “can” but there was discussion on the proposed changes
			2. We ran out of time to discuss in any detail.
	1. **Next Telcon** is scheduled Jan 9th.
		1. Try to look at CID 3382
		2. Try to do some planning for January
			1. We may end up starting to decline opened ended Comments as we need to go to LB out of January.
		3. We discussed times for the next telcon
			1. Wed or Thurs seemed bad for many.
			2. Tuesday seemed more likely for numbers
			3. 1pm Eastern time for the call.
		4. **Change Next Telcon date to January 6, 2015**
	2. Adjourned 12:05pm
1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Tuesday January 6th, 2015**
	1. **Draft Agenda:**

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
2. Editor report
3. Comment resolution: Available CIDs and presenters:
 11-14-1594 - Carlos

Remaining Editorial CIDs - Adrian

Any additional available CIDs

1. January meeting planning

4. AOB
5. Adjourn

* 1. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR), Dick Roy (SRA), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel); Mark Hamilton (Spectralink); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Viewer 7 (?); Mark RISON (Samsung); View 9 (?);
	2. Paten Policy reviewed
		1. No items identified
	3. Agenda –
		1. Add an item for discussion for Dick Roy LDP timeline
		2. Approved as amended without objection
	4. Editor report
		1. We did get a draft reviewed prior to the end of the year.
		2. Question on the Ballot Pool invite:
			1. The Ballot Pool invite has been sent and it is open for 45 days.
			2. We have 6 months from close of invite to get the ballot initiated.
			3. Everyone interested in being a part of the ballot will need to register for the pool.
		3. D3.4 will be reviewed tomorrow for posting later this week.
	5. Review 11-14-1594r1 – Carlos CORDEIRO
		1. CID 3692 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Make same type of change in both the DMG and the non-DMG sections to make them consistent.
			3. Discussion on the change to improve ambiguities in 10.1.4.3.2.
				1. Do we need to send one or more Probe Request for each SSID in the list or just one or more Probe Request for some of the SSIDs in the list.
			4. Discussion on how to clarify
			5. Need to identify the specific behavior before we can agree on the text.
			6. Is the behavior that we send a Probe Request to the broadcast address and then at least one more if we have an SSID List?
			7. How do we determine which SSID is to be used when a list is available?
			8. After discussion, we changed the “one or more” to “zero or more”. The proposal makes the “c” into “c and d” and “c” will be needed each time, and “d” only when an SSID list is present.
			9. Then we walked through the DMG cases
			10. The Optionally was moved into the “c” equivalent paragraph (#1) and that seemed to make it clearer.
			11. Proposed Resolution: Revised – Incorporate the changes as noted in 11-14/1594r2 for CID 3692.
		2. The other 2 CIDs will be addressed on Tuesday PM1
			1. Note that 11-14/1618 will also be presented by Carlos that slot
			2. Search for CIDs assigned to Carlos (3 GEN and 3 MAC)
			3. For the CIDs assigned to Carlos will be scheduled for Tuesday PM1 in Atlanta
	6. CID 3392 MAC
		1. Carlos had a resolution proposed, but Mark RISON had an alternative proposal that he would like to present.
			1. Mark R had sent some e-mail to gain closure on this issue, but has not been able to find consensus.
			2. IF we do not find consensus, we will reject this CID.
		2. This also will be scheduled for Tuesday PM1
	7. Review 11-14/1345r2 - Editorial Comments needing REVmc input
		1. CID 3331 EDITOR
			1. Change of Pad to Padding in specific cases
			2. CID 3478 had been revised, and show the differences for end of frame (EOF) pad…
			3. But we have an issue reconciling the two flavors of resolution.
			4. Changing Pad to Padding in the name of fields.
			5. More work needs to be done on this CID 3478 (which was resolved, but potentially inconsistent with what is being proposed in CID 3331 and 3319.
			6. AI: Adrian to bring proposed resolution and target presentation for all 3 CIDs in Atlanta
		2. CID 3097 EDITOR
			1. Not in this document
			2. Presented from the database
			3. Marked for review due to “The allocation uniquely identified by the source DMG STA MAC address, Allocation ID, and Destination AID” this contains a technical error.
			4. AI: Adrian to talk with Carlos to add this correction with the other DMG CIDs on Tuesday PM1 in Atlanta.
	8. Editorial CID 3420
		1. Review CID and expectations
		2. Propose a rejection for insufficient detail.
		3. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The comment fails to identify a specific issue to be addressed. It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
		4. Mark ready for Motion
	9. Editorial CID 3383
		1. Review comment
		2. Will Mark R have a submission ready by Atlanta?
			1. Mark did not respond to question.
		3. We will decline if no submission in Atlanta
	10. Editorial CID 3386,
		1. Similar to CID 3383
	11. Editorial CID 3431
		1. This may be different, but is the same – no submission then we will reject.
	12. CID 3440, 3444, 3452, 3453
		1. These also are in the same bag –
		2. An update is expected next week from Mark R.
	13. CID 3095 GEN
		1. This was assigned to Assaf, but then we said that Carlos C would help with this one also.
		2. AI – Dorothy to add to the list for Tuesday PM1 in Atlanta (and will notify both Assaf and Carlos).
	14. CID 3471 MAC
		1. Assigned to Brian Hart
		2. Notification was sent
	15. CID 3087 GEN
		1. Assigned to Dan HARKINS, this was covered on a telecom
		2. Ready for motion – see Gen Telecon- DEC tab.
	16. CID 3121, 3122, 3123 GEN
		1. Graham’s Comments
		2. He has a submission he presented before, but it does not deal with the CIDs directly.
		3. All three CIDs will be withdrawn
		4. Graham to send an e-mail to this effect via reflector.
		5. We will have a presentation in Atlanta on this topic on Wednesday PM2
	17. CID 3209 MAC
		1. Working on still with Mark H.
	18. CID 3060 Editor
		1. This has been completed
	19. CID 3124 GEN
		1. Submission 11-14/1518
		2. Will present on Wednesday next wek
	20. CID 3352 GEN
		1. Assigned to Jon R
		2. Jon to bring up for discussion next week
	21. CID 3521 MAC
		1. Assigned to Mark H
		2. Planning to bring to Atlanta
	22. CID 3508 MAC
		1. Assigned to Mark H
		2. From TGak
		3. Planning to bring to Atlanta
	23. CID 3211 MAC
		1. Assigned to Mark H
		2. Dorothy has been communicating with George VLANTIS, and he may withdraw his comment
		3. Dorothy to recheck
	24. CID 3523 MAC
		1. Assigned to Mark H
		2. Still an outstanding issue
		3. Mark R and Mark H have some portion of the CID ready, but not all of it.
	25. CID 3439 MAC
		1. Assigned to Mark RISON
		2. We had a reject proposed, then it was assigned to Mark R, and we have not seen a submission yet. (possible 1104r4?)
	26. CID 3390 MAC
		1. Assigned to Mark RISON
		2. Submission still waiting
	27. The remaining CIDs will have the assignees contacted
	28. LPD Timeline – Dick Roy
		1. Presentation given in Nov to show LPD changes in the 5.9 Band
		2. Question on how to best move this forward into REVmc and TGah?
		3. Dick will be at an ETSI meeting next week, need assistance.
		4. 11-14/1521 could be presented and if there is support, it could be done now, or we could have a comment submitted during the first sponsor ballot cycle.
		5. Discussion on concern that we may get a set of no votes that could delay the start of Sponsor Ballot, but if we wait, we can work out the issue during the Sponsor Ballot cycle. - In general, we want to not make any potentially controversial change when trying to close out a ballot.
		6. In Sept, NITSA needs to mandate from a stable draft the rules for LPD.
		7. Possible plan – Present to the WG at the Wednesday Mid-week plenary to see if there is consensus for making the change now rather than later.
		8. IF this generates any NO votes then it would cause an additional cycle.
		9. A Sponsor will need to be found to present this on Wednesday – Suggest that a motion be taken rather than a strawpoll.
		10. Bottom line is that the decision for when it is added into REVmc will be made in REVmc, but getting the WG support in a motion is an input to the task group.
	29. January Meeting Planning:
		1. 8 slots
	30. Adjourned 3:01pm ET
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