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Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11REVmc BRC Telecon on June 26, 2015 (10-noon ET).

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TGmc, teleconference on Friday June 26, 2015 –**
	1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 10:05 ET
	2. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANELY (HP), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Emily QI (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus), Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm), Dan HARKINS (HP), Sigurd SCHELSTAETE (Quantenna), Graham SMITH (SR Technologies), Stephen MCCANN (Blackberry)
	3. **Review Patent Policy** – Reviewed patent policy slides. No issues noted. No response to the call.
	4. **Review Agenda:**

1. Call to order, patent policy, and attendance. Review and approve agenda

2.    Editor Report

3.    Motions

a.    Approve the comment resolutions in 11-15-0655r3 "Hillsboro-B" tab (4 comments discussed in Portland) and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft

 i.    Moved:

 ii.    Seconded:

 iii.    Result:

b.    Approve the comment resolutions in 11-15-0565r7 “Motion MAC-AP” tab (Portland comment resolution) and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft, except for CIDs 5896 and 5903.

 i.    Moved:

 ii.    Seconded:

 iii.    Result:

c.    Resolve

 i.    CID 5896 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes 11-15/760r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0760-03-000m-some-initial-sb-comment-resolutions.docx>) for CID 5896, and

 ii.    CID 5903 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes 11-15/760r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0760-03-000m-some-initial-sb-comment-resolutions.docx>) for CID 5903

1.    Moved:

2.    Seconded:

3.    Result:

4.    Comment resolution

a.    Security CIDs – Dan Harkins, see 11-15-0764, 11-15-0763

b.    Editorials needing input

c.    11-15-762 – Mark Rison

d.    RAC: CIDs 6896, 6897, 6898; 6877

e.    Additional available CIDs

5.    AOB

a.    Plans for Waikoloa

6.    Adjourn

* + 1. Dorothy showed an updated agenda (but substantially the same), with more CIDs pulled into separate motions/actions, based on recent e-mails.
		2. No comments, agenda approved
	1. **Editor’s report**
		1. No formal report docusment this week.
		2. Editors have been very busy reviewing each others’ edits.
		3. See document 532r8 for motions and current state of editing.
		4. Have edited about 650 comments (all Editorial)
		5. About 11 comments could use further discussion
		6. There is a list of “needs submission” or “assigned” Editorials, in Adrian’s email
	2. **Motions:**
		1. **Motion #134 Approve the comment resolutions in 11-15-0655r3 "Hillsboro-B" tab (4 comments discussed in Portland) and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft**
			1. Moved: Adrian Stephens
			2. Seconded: Stephen McCann
			3. Discussion – none
			4. **Result: Y: 8 N: 0 A: 0 Motion PASSES**
		2. **Motion #135 Approve the comment resolutions in 11-15-0565r7 “Motion MAC-AP” tab (Portland comment resolution) and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft, except for CIDs 5896 and 5903; 5190, 5191, and 5192; 5049, 5185, 5179, 6244, 6398, 6356, 6354, 6349, 6316, 6283, 5885, 5887, 5888, 5889, 5890, 6184.**
			1. Moved: Mark Hamilton
			2. Seconded: Stephen McCann
			3. Discussion – none
			4. **Result: Y: 8 N: 0 A: 0 Motion PASSES**
		3. **Motion #136 Resolve CIDs 5190, 5191, 5192 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes in 11-15/761r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0761-02-000m-anqp-update-for-venue-advice-of-charge-and-local-content.docx)”.**
			1. Moved: Stephen McCann
			2. Seconded: Adrian Stephens
			3. Discussion – none
			4. **Result: Y: 8 N: 0 A: 1 Motion PASSES**
	3. Review document 11-15/760r3
		1. CID 5896
			1. Discussion with Youhan pointed out that this is only about HT sounding PDUs, so Sigurd modified resolution to be more clear.
			2. Mark R this is still very confusing, based on the title of the subclause
			3. Adrian, we really need to refer to TX or RXVECTOR fields, since this is a MAC clause, and we can’t reference PHY fields directly
			4. Do VHT have sounding PPDUs? Some confusion, but it seems yes (see 22.3.12). Probably should rename this subclause then.
			5. Propose to rename the section to say it for HT, and then delete the sentence cited in the comment.
			6. The definition “sounding physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU)” is therefore also confusing.
			7. Sigurd will work on this off-line.
			8. Assign to Sigurd. Consider in Waikoloa.
		2. CID 5903
			1. Is this subclause about sounding PPDUs or NDP? First sentence, at least, seems to cover both.
			2. Propose add more structure to the subclause to clarify HT-related versus general. Might be easier to just delete the first sentence. Some felt the first sentence was helpful, though.
			3. Is the correct term “rules” or “protocol” for this mechanism?
			4. Noted that the second sentence references itself.
			5. Proposed resolution: Revised: Change title of subclause 9.34.1 from “NDP rules” to “HT NDP sounding protocol”
			6. **Motion #137 Resolve CID 5903 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Change title of subclause 9.34.1 from “NDP rules” to “HT NDP sounding protocol”**
				1. Moved: Sigurd Schelstaete
				2. Seconded: Adrian Stephens
				3. Discussion – none
				4. **Result: Y: 8 N: 0 A: 1 Motion PASSES**
	4. **Status of other CIDs that were pulled from Motion 135**
		1. Carlos and Mark Rison are working on these. Will come back in Waikoloa
	5. Comment resolution
		1. CID 6838 (MAC)
			1. Comment from Gloria Gwynn, that we have discussed in the past. June 5 feedback to Gloria was that this information would be best in an Annex.
			2. Gloria has decided to withdraw the comment. IEEE 1609 will address this in their own documents.
			3. So, we Reject the comment, as there is no mechanism to withdraw it.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Reject. “The current text indicates default values, meaning that changes to the values can be made.”
			5. Mark ready for motion
	6. Review document 11-15/763 (Dan Harkins (HP))
		1. We left off at CID 6285, in 11-15/763r2
		2. Revisit CID 6345 (MAC)
			1. Without the added level of parens, rely on people agreeing on precedent rules of modulo and ‘+’. Agree having the parens is better.
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised. make it "r = (random() modulo (p - 1)) + 1"
			3. Mark ready for Motion. Revisit in Waikoloa
		3. CID 5728
			1. This is in a deprecated section.
			2. Not fixing things in Obsolete clauses makes sense. But deprecated sections can still be implemented (just not recommended), so shouldn’t we fix these?
			3. Propose: Rejected: The cited text is contained in the deprecated clause defining TKIP (See page 130 line 1)
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6455
			1. Wiki is not a sufficiently robust reference source.
			2. Been implemented for years without problem, seems like people understand it. Not agreement that this is a sufficient test for changes to the Spec.
			3. Do we need another definition? “monotonically” and “incrementing” are well understood terms, is the combination well enough understood?
			4. Propose reject: “Wiki is not an authoritative source for IEEE Std 802.11 and 1,1,1,1 are not values for a “monotonically incrementing” integer because it is not incrementing.
			5. Straw Poll on this resolution: Y: 6 N: 2 A: 1.
			6. Update the database with this resolution. Mark ready for Motion.
	7. Editorial comments resolution
		1. CID 6160
			1. Style manual does not seem to support have a text phrase embedded in an equation. But, the rules for Roman type in an equation includes usage for “words” in the equation (not variables), so it is ambiguous.
			2. Propose: Rejected: IEEE-SA style guide 15.3 includes “Function names and abbreviations are Roman (sin, cos, sinc, sinh), as are units or unit abbreviations (e.g., deg, Hz.) complete words (e.g., in out) and abbreviations of words (e.g., max, min), or acronyms (e.g., SNR).” All the terms in this equation are arguably “words”, so no change is warranted.
			3. Is Guido willing to volunteer to propose specific changes, intead? ACTION Adrian will contact Guido.
			4. No objection to proposed Rejection, in the meantime.
		2. CID 6282
			1. Should we reference ITU-T for this CRC32? In 8.2.1 we describe it as an “IEEE 32-bit CRC”. We also define it in 8.2.4.8, ourselves.
			2. These are used in different fields. At least in the FCS and the WEP ICV.
			3. Agreed we should use only one definition/reference.
			4. Adrian will research further off-line and bring back.
		3. CID 6584
			1. Discussed related CID 6707 in Portland.
			2. Open question was whether an ordering requirement was intended, but missed accidentally where it is missing.
			3. Agreed that we don’t believe the absence of ordering requirement was intended.
			4. Does it break any existing implementations, or make them non-compliant?
			5. No objection to making these changes in the TFS Request and Response cases, too (the ones where the ordering requirement was missing).
			6. Adrian will take this direction and update the comment resolutions and bring back.
		4. CID 6651
			1. Setting this to 3 might need to be maintained for backwards compatibility with devices in the field.
			2. Maybe we don’t want to say “Reserved” since that means “shall be set to 0” per our general definition.
			3. Considered “Undefined otherwise”. But, we don’t want anyone to set it to 1 or 2.
			4. Propose: Revised: Replace cited sentence with “Otherwise this subfield is set to 0 or 3 upon transmission, and ignored upon reception.”
			5. No objection. Mark ready for motion
	8. Review document 11-15/769 (Dan Harkins (HP))
		1. Jouni pointed out this problem, in the REVmc draft compared to the 802.11-2012 version.
		2. Correction is to add back text that was erroneously left out (the “if (found==0)” change)
		3. Other item is a bug in the search for quadratic residue and quadratic non-residue.
		4. Check: other places have (random() modulo (p – 1)) + 1. This different on purpose? Yes.
		5. Do we also need to add a definition (or reference) for the LGR function?
		6. Ask Dan to review further. Bring back in Waikoloa.
	9. **Review plan for Waikoloa**
		1. No teleconference between now and Waikoloa
		2. 7 sessions
		3. 11ad on Tues PM1, and Location on Wed PM1, as usual
		4. Graham Smith, CCA 11b (11-15/516) on Wed PM2.
		5. Teleconferences after Waikoloa
		6. Face to face meeting in Cambridge in August, announcement has gone out.
	10. Adjourned at 12:00 ET.
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