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Abstract

IEEE 802.11 REVmc Task Group Teleconference minutes for February 20th and 27th, 2015

R0: February 20th, 2015

R1: February 27th, 2015

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 February20, 2015 –**
	1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 1005 EST
	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:

11-13-0233r52

4. SB Planning

5. AOB

6. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to the agenda
	1. **Attendance**: Edward AU (Marvell); Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei); Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink); Mark RISON (Samsung); Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel);
	2. **Editor Report**:
		1. LB 206 has closed and 46 comments were received. The ballot passed with a number of voters changing their vote to “Yes”.
		2. Reviewed the editor’s report in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-17-000m-editor-reports.ppt> .
		3. We must prepare resolutions to all of the comments, independent of whether they are marked “must be satisfied”.
		4. Have received new “must be satisfied” comments associated with No votes. The disposition of these comments is reported to the EC, and their presence requires that we recirculate the comments and their resolutions (and any changes made to the draft).
		5. Discussion of schedule impact of rejecting all of the comments now, versus recirculating a changed draft. Schedule difference is 3 months minimum.
			1. Scenario 1: Resolve comments with no change to the draft, then recirculate the unchanged draft during or after the March meeting (and the comments). Ask for conditional approval from the EC in March. Could start the ballot in April.
			2. Scenario 2: Resolve the comments with changes to the draft, then recirculate D5.0 with changes, then resolve any subsequent comments without changes to the draft: Recirculate D.5.0 without changes out of May meeting. Resolve any comments received in July. EC approval in July. July SB. 3 month slip.
			3. Scenario 3: Resolve the comments with changes to the draft, then recirculate D5.0 with changes, then resolve any subsequent comments with changes to the draft. Recirculate D.6.0 with changes out of May meeting. Resolve any comments received in July. Recirculate a changed D7.0 out of July. Resolve comments in Sept. EC ballot in Oct. Likely Nov SB.
		6. Comment: 11ac experience was to reject comments and go to SB; believe TG and WG expect and desire to go to SB now. Suggest chair contact voters and ask if they would consider withdrawing any comments now. Chair agrees to do this.
		7. Need to review the comments. Comment rejection reasons can include: rejected for reason of “Out of scope” – not the subject of changed text or text affected by changed text, “Insufficient detail” – Resolution does not have sufficient detail so that the text changes that would satisfy the commenter can be determined. If a comment is not out of scope, it might be rejected on the merits of the comment, or the TG could consider the proposed resolution, or other resolutions, and not come to consensus to make a change; in the latter case, the “Considered, no consensus to make the change” would be the resolution.
	3. **Review 11-15/0233r52** – All – Reviewed all 46 received comments to determine if comments are valid or not and determine potential rejection reasons. Action Item: Adrian to prepare an updated comment spreadsheet reflecting the discussion below and including proposed resolution language for the cited reasons from 11-13/0230r1.
		1. CID 4001
			1. Reviewed comment, which is “No comments”. This is an invalid comment as it does not identify a defect in the draft.
		2. CID 4002
			1. Reviewed the comment. It is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		3. CID 4003
			1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
		4. CID 4004
			1. Reviewed comment. Proposed resolution does not contain sufficient detail to determine a resolution that would satisfy the commenter.
		5. CID 4005
			1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
		6. CID 4006
			1. Reviewed the comment. The Style Guide does not require an enumerated list. Reject on that basis.
		7. CIDs 4007, 408, 409, 4010
			1. Reviewed the comments. The comments are on unchanged text and are out of scope.
		8. CIDs 4011, 4012
			1. Reviewed the comments. The cited text is unrelated to changes made in the surrounding text – out of scope.
		9. CIDs 4013, 4014, 4015
			1. Reviewed the comments. The comments are on the front matter text, which is out of scope for review.
		10. CID 4016, 4017
			1. Reviewed the comments. Comments are out of scope – on unchanged text.
		11. CID 4018
			1. Reviewed the comment. Insufficient detail in the proposed resolution to identify the changes that would satisfy the commenter.
		12. CIDs 4019, 4020, 4021, 4022, 4023, 4024
			1. Reviewed the comments. All are valid. Refer to editing error – extra “)” TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		13. CID 4025
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is out of scope, it is not on draft text.
		14. CID 4026
			1. Reviewed the comment. Insufficient detail in the proposed resolution to identify the changes that would satisfy the commenter. Commenter present and indicated that he could provide specific changes. Propose “insufficient” detail resolution as that is the current state. Revisit if needed.
		15. CID 4027
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		16. CID 4028
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		17. CID 4029
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		18. CID 4030
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		19. CID 4031
			1. Reviewed the comment. Insufficient detail in the proposed resolution to identify the changes that would satisfy the commenter.
		20. CID 4032
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		21. CID 4033
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		22. CID 4034
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		23. CID 4035
			1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
		24. CID 4036
			1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid – related to an existing unsatisfied comment. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
		25. CIDs 4037, 4038, 4039, 4040, 4041, 4042, 4043, 4044
			1. Reviewed the comments. Comments are valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the changes.
		26. CID 4045
			1. Reviewed the comment. The cited occurrence does comply with the style guide. Reject on that basis.
		27. CID 4046
			1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
	4. **AOB:**
		1. Next call is in 1 week, February 27th
			1. Continue discussion of proposed resolutions.
			2. Review draft ExCom report
			3. AOB
	5. **Adjourned** 1158 EST
1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday 27 February, 2015 – To be provided**
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