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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes from the 802.11 TGah F2F Meeting in July 2015.

R1: updated to comply with Secretary’s Guidelines.

**Schedule of 11ah in the week**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Monday*** | ***Tuesday*** | ***Wednesday*** | ***Thursday*** |
| *AM1* |  |  | ***AH*** |  |
| *AM2* |  |  |  | *AH (Cancelled)* |
| *PM1* |  | *AH (Cancelled)* |  |  |
| *PM 2* | ***AH*** | ***AH*** |  |  |

**July 13, 2015 (Monday) PM 4:00 – 6:00**

**Notes – 120+ attendees; Secretary for this session – Zander Lei (I2R)**

1. **Yongho Seok (NEWRACOM) is the chair of TGah. Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.**
2. **Chair reviewed the proposed agenda as shown below for the week. The agenda document 11-15/0733r2 was uploaded on the server.** 
   1. Chair asked if there was any objection or new items to be added on.
   2. No objection – agenda approved without objection.
   3. Approved Agenda:
3. Call for secretary
4. IPR and other relevant policy and procedures
5. Approve meeting minutes
   1. May meeting minutes (11-15/0642r0)
6. Address Letter Ballot comments for Draft 5.0
   1. Comment Spreadsheet (11-15/0525r1)
7. Motion for draft text
8. Conference call plan
9. Timeline review
10. **Call for Secretary**
    1. Zander Lei (I2R) volunteered to be the secretary for this session.
11. **IPR and other relevant IEEE policies**
    1. Chair reviewed the administrative items and presented the links for accessing the related documents.

* IEEE Patent Policy - <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
* Patent FAQ - <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf>
* LoA Form - <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf>
* Affiliation FAQ - <http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html>
* Anti-Trust FAQ - <http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf>
* Ethics - <http://www.ieee.org/portal/cms_docs/about/CoE_poster.pdf>
* IEEE 802.11 Working Group Operations Manual – [11-14-0629-08-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0629-08-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx)
  1. Chair reviewed the patent policy and meeting guideline.
  2. Chair presented the Call for Potentially Essential Patents slide. From the IEEE-SA provided slide.
     1. There was one response to the patent call identifying a potentially essential patent holder:
        1. Sean Coffey (Realtek) announced that he was aware Qualcomm has potentially essential patents.
     2. The TGah Chair will notify the 802.11 WG chair.
  3. Chair reviewed other guidelines of the IEEE WG meetings.

1. **Approve meeting minutes**
   1. Chair reviewed briefly the May meeting minutes (11-15/0642r0) and requested approval.
   2. **Motion 1: Move to approve minutes of F2F May meeting (11-15/0642r0)**

Moved by: Zander Lei; Seconded by: Alfred Asterjadhi

Discussions: None

**Motion was passed without objection by unanimous consensus.**

1. **Address Letter Ballot comments for Draft 5.0**
   1. Reviewed the status of the resolutions to comments for LB211 with reference to document 11-15/0733r2. The approving rate of the LB had been reached 95%.
      1. The only pending issue is a request for LOA from Qualcomm related to 4 CIDs.
   2. Recap some details of the 4 CIDs left: 7001, 7002, 7003, and 7012.
      1. Reviewed the discussions in Vancouver and updated the group on the discussions with various group members. He suggested 2 versions of resolutions for the 4 CIDs, one was “rejected” and the other was “revised”.
      2. The reasons were shown in the document 11-15/0733r2.
         1. The two proposed options were listed as follows:
         2. **Straw Poll 1: Do you support the following resolution;**
            1. Proposed Resolution: Rejected  
               The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.   
               Also, please refer to the proposed resolution of TGmc for an intellectual property related issue:

*Comment (CID 5223) - FTM seems to be patent pending technology (WO2015041708 (A1)). No LoA is visible in IEEE database. Proposed Change (CID 5223) - Assure that no protected technology is standardized without LoA.*

*(CID 5223)Resolution - REJECTED (MAC: 2015-06-25 19:26:21Z) the comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.*

* + - * 1. Straw Poll 2: **Do you support the following resolution:**

Resolution: Revised  
The TG accepts the spirit of the comment in so far as technology not subject to an accepted LoA should be avoided. However, it might not be possible to remove all such IPR from the draft. Therefore, as an alternative, the TG will continue a next ballot procedure while considering alternative technologies as part of 802.11ah in a sponsor ballot, as previously suggested by the IEEE-SA SB.

* + 1. Discussion
       1. Objection to the statement of missing “specific wording of the changes” in the proposed reason for rejection. Possible detail given in document 11-15/0896r0 with “deleting draft text” to resolve the 4 CIDs.
          1. Discussion on whether or not document 11-15/0896r0 was not a technical contribution or process proposal
       2. Suggestion to change the second proposed resolution from “revised” to “rejected”, as there was no change to the draft.
       3. Question on if the TG should consider working towards solving the LOA issue, instead of rejecting the comments.
          1. Discussion on possibilities to look for alternatives to features without LOA.
       4. Call for orders of the day (return to the agenda)
    2. The Chair proposed to change the “revised” to “rejected” and would like to run a Straw Poll on the 2 proposed resolutions.
    3. More Discussion:
       1. Concern that the LOA issue was a major and serious issue. The group should look into it and come up with real resolutions.
       2. Speaking in favor of the proposed resolutions; Overview of the past year’s process in approving the proposals; the draft had been in a good technical level. Noting that this was the right course and there were still 6-9 months before a sponsor ballot could be approved. Along the way, LOA issues should be able to be resolved. It was wrong for the group to halt the progress.
       3. Speaking against the proposal. The group was asked to consider the scope of the problem. There are asserted potentially essential patents from Qualcomm without an LOA. It could be very costly for products without LOA. In addition, most technical changes to the draft should be done during Letter Ballot process. Sponsor ballot is only for refinement of the draft.
       4. Speaking against the proposal. Objection to the reasons of the rejection. The proposed resolution given should be considered in order.
    4. The TG was reminded what to/not to discuss in the meeting with respect to the LOA issue, as some might have doubts. The group was reminded that they should not discuss or interpret the essentiality of patents.
       1. The group was reminded further that the straw polls were in order. There was no issue for the Chair to gather the opinion of the group so as to find a direction for the group to resolve the issue.
    5. Continued discussion
       1. A 3rd option was suggested to be added as a new straw poll.
       2. The Chair commented he would like to run the straw polls and get the sense of the group. After that, any other straw polls could be run.
       3. Clarification was asked on whether the 3rd straw poll would be prohibited after Chair’s straw poll.
          1. There are 2 straw polls that the Chair prepared and are on the table, corresponding to the Chair’s 2 suggested options. Additional straw poll may be prepared and in the queue.
       4. Question on if a motion, if the straw poll led to a motion, was technical or procedural.
       5. It was clarified that any resolution to the comment requires a 75% approval rate by the voting members.
       6. It was noted that Straw Polls are used to gather feedback from the group.
       7. Question on what impact Straw Polls would be to the Draft, should the straw poll passed.
          1. It was clarified that there was no impact as this was a straw poll, not a motion.
  1. **Straw Poll #1:** **Do you support the following resolution?**

Proposed Resolution #1: Rejected;  
The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.   
Also, please refer the proposed resolution of TGmc for an intellectual property related issue:

*Comment (CID 5223) - FTM seems to be patent pending technology ( WO2015041708 (A1) ). No LoA is visible in IEEE database.  
Proposed Change (CID 5223): - Assure that no protected technology is standardized without LoA.  
Resolution (CID 5223): - REJECTED (MAC: 2015-06-25 19:26:21Z) The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.*

* + 1. **Straw Poll #1 Results**

**Yes: 62; No: 38; Abstain: 11**

* 1. **Straw Poll #2:** **Do you support the following resolution?**

Resolution: Revised;  
The TG accepts the spirit of the comment in so far as technology not subject to an accepted LoA should be avoided. However, it might not be possible to remove all such IPR from the draft. Therefore, as an alternative, the TG will continue a next ballot procedure while considering alternative technologies as part of 802.11ah in a sponsor ballot, as previously suggested by the IEEE-SA SB.

* + 1. Discussion:
       1. Question on resolution proposed in Straw Poll 2-- whether there would be any change to the draft.
          1. There is no action to the draft in the proposed resolution. Changes could be deferred to sponsor ballot when more materials/information were available.
       2. Commented that the resolution states “revised” and is confusing as no revision was intended.
       3. Also the last sentence “as previously suggested by the IEEE-SA SB” was misleading, “SA SB” should not be mentioned.
       4. It was noted that the TG could not promise for the future action.
       5. The resolution should be changed from “revised” to “rejected” as no revision was required.
       6. The Chair agreed to rephrase the sentences of the straw poll; however he also noted that he had issued a call for resolution before the meeting for all members to submit contributions on alternative technologies. There had been no contribution received.
       7. It was noted that a call for submission was reflected in the straw poll.
    2. **Amended Straw Poll #2:** **Do you support the following resolution?**
       1. Resolution: Rejected  
          The TG accepts the spirit of the comment in so far as technology not subject to an accepted LoA should be avoided. However, it might not be possible to identify or remove all such provisions that might be covered by IPR from the draft. The TG has issued a call for submission of alternative technologies as part of 802.11ah, as previously suggested by the IEEE-SA SB.
       2. Discussion:
          1. Speaking against the resolution in the straw poll. A sponsor ballot poll involved a different voting group. The group should not move to sponsor ballot without addressing satisfactorily the LOA issue.
          2. Speaking against the resolution: Comment that the resolution was in conflict to the letter ballot process.
          3. Question was asked on how to identify essential patents and related technologies.

It was noted again that the group was not allowed to discuss the identification of potentially essential patents or LOA issues in the meeting.

* + - * 1. Comment that the TG should consider the proposed procedure to address the removal of potential technology proposal be constructive and encourage the group to submit alternative technologies.
        2. Question on what the differences were between the straw poll 1 and the straw poll 2, as both recommended rejection.

Chair replied that the rejection reasons were different.

* + - 1. The group conducted Straw Poll #2 with the following results:
      2. **Results of Straw Poll #2:** Yes: 57; No: 33; Abstain: 17
  1. Andrew Myles (Cisco) requested the following straw poll:
     1. **Straw Poll #3**: Noting that the known lack of accepted LOAs on the draft and potential impact of acceptability such a draft to the IEEE-SA SB, the TG will NOT resolve the outstanding IPR comments at this time. Instead, the TG will develop and execute a process to consider alternative technologies as part of 802.11ah?
     2. Discussion:
        1. Note that this was a straw poll but not a motion. This is to get directions from the group.
        2. Speaking against the straw poll; This does not resolve the original comments.
        3. Speaking against the straw poll; Problems with the language used, either ambiguity or no details, e.g. “lack of accepted LOAs”, “alternative technologies”.
        4. Suggestion on changing the term “consider” to “adopt” and proposed the resolution status as “defer”.
        5. Request to remove the second word “that”.
        6. Comment that they would just like to “consider” at the moment, “adopt” could be used when alternative technologies were ready.
        7. Comment that the straw poll would lead to no progress. The task group should consider highly the TG’s progress and the technical level of the Draft had already reached high. His major concern was the progress of 11ah and it should not be delayed.
        8. Question on whether the status of the resolution would be “accepted” or “rejected”, should the straw poll passed?
           1. It is neither “accepted” nor “rejected”. It was to keep the status quo.
        9. Speaking against the straw poll; strongly urging the group to reject the resolution. It would lead to a halt to the standard process. It would be an open-ended process. It would also have a negative impact to the marketing work in Wi-Fi alliance and send a negative signal to the outside.
        10. Speaking for the straw poll; the 11ah progress was important to market, but IPR issue are also important. The group should strike a good balance. Further commented that while not against 11ah, at this point of time, the priority should be given to the IPR issue. In time, a different analysis or situations might lead to different priorities.
        11. Comment that others were also interested in 11ah and not against the standard.
        12. Speaking against the straw poll: Comment that the IPR issue on the table was much more complex than many might consider. It may take time to get it resolved. The group should be aware of that fact that the group was building up an important ecosystem and the timeline was important to promote 11ah and allow .11 devices to compete with other technologies in the market. This straw poll was an open-ended process suggestion and might take many months or even years to complete the suggested task. It would definitely cause .11 to miss the golden window to enter the IoT market.
     3. **Results of Straw Poll #3:** Yes: 36; No: 51; Abstain: 27
  2. Chair asked Marc Emmelman if he would like to conduct a 4th straw poll with respect to his submission.
     1. He declined, but encouraged the group to consider ways to make progress.
  3. Further discussion noted that the group seemed to have a deadlock in the meeting.
     1. The group was encouraged to come up with proposals to move forward.
  4. The Chair encouraged the group to attend the evening tutorial on the IEEE new patent policy. It would help understand better the updated IEEE policy.
  5. The Chair further commented that the group should consider again how to resolve the comments. Due to the time for this timeslot expired, the group would continue the discussion and possibly make motions in the next 11ah meeting slot.

1. **Recessed**: The meeting was recessed at 6pm.

**July 14, 2015 (Tuesday) PM 4:00 – 6:00**

**Notes – 120+ attendees; Secretary for this session – Zander Lei (I2R)**

1. **Yongho Seok (NEWRACOM) is the chair of TGah. Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM. Zander was the secretary of the session.**
2. **Chair reviewed the updated agenda as shown below. The agenda document 11-15/0733r3 was uploaded on the server.** 
   1. Call for secretary (Zander was the secretary)
   2. IPR and other relevant policy and procedures
   3. Approve meeting minutes (*approved on Monday*)
   4. May meeting minutes (11-15/0642r0)
   5. Address Letter Ballot comments for Draft 5.0
   6. Comment Spreadsheet (11-15/0525r1)
   7. Motion for draft text
   8. Conference call plan
   9. Timeline review
   10. Chair asked if there was any objection or new items to be added on. None was heard.
3. **IPR and other relevant IEEE policies**
   1. Chair reviewed the administrative items and presented the links for accessing the related documents.

* IEEE Patent Policy - <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>
* Patent FAQ - <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf>
* LoA Form - <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf>
* Affiliation FAQ - <http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html>
* Anti-Trust FAQ - <http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf>
* Ethics - <http://www.ieee.org/portal/cms_docs/about/CoE_poster.pdf>
* IEEE 802.11 Working Group Operations Manual – [11-14-0629-08-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0629-08-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx)
  1. Chair reviewed the patent policy and meeting guideline.
     1. Chair presented the Call for Potentially Essential Patents slide.
        1. No new issues were requested.
  2. Chair reviewed other guidelines of the IEEE WG meetings.

1. **Address Letter Ballot comments for Draft 5.0**
   1. The group continued the discussions on the remaining 4 CIDs: **7001, 7002, 7003 and 7012**
   2. A request to present document 11-15/0924 addressing the 4 CIDs.
   3. 11-15/0924 presented by Sean Coffey (Realtek)
      1. Document 11-15/0924 contained the following 3 straw polls reflecting his preferred ways to move forward.
      2. **Straw poll 1- If the Task Group makes changes to the current draft, would you generally prefer:**

A) Adoption of alternatives to existing text and mechanisms (maintain functionality), or

B) Removal of existing text and mechanisms (maintain compatibility with existing draft)

C) Either / both / no preference

D) Not applicable (against making any changes)

(Please vote for as many as you agree with)

* + 1. **Straw poll 2- If the Task Group makes changes to the current draft, would you generally prefer:**

A) Changes/removals that are necessary to address the issues raised in the 4 remaining CIDs, but no other changes (evaluate the scope and then restrict to it), or

B) Removal of existing text and mechanisms without restriction (no immediate requirement to determine scope)

C) Changes to / removal of existing text and mechanisms without restriction (no immediate requirement to determine scope)

D) No preference

E) Not applicable (against making any changes)

* + 1. **Straw poll 3- If the Task Group makes changes to the current draft, would you generally prefer:**

A) No additions to mandatory requirements in current draft, but possibly subtractions from

B) No subtractions from mandatory requirements, but possibly additions to

C) No changes to mandatory requirements, but possibly changes to optional modes

D) No preference

E) Not applicable (against making any changes)

* + 1. Discussion:
       1. There was concern on how to identify the technology covered by potentially essential patents. How to identify and how to replace or address the feature in the standard.
       2. Potentially just requesting self-identification of potential essential patents is what the call at the beginning of each meeting is.
       3. What to do with the information after it is identified was then discussed. How to determine if a feature is solely owned by the named holder or if it was jointly owned, then how to split out the technology covered.
       4. Concern on the precedence that such effort might set, and the delay that may affect the delivery of the standard was discussed.
       5. Concern on how the changes that may be needed to the draft after the straw poll was discussed.
    2. Chair recessed for five minutes since the computer of secretary did not work temporarily
    3. Without further questions, the group conducted the straw polls with the following results:

**Straw poll 1: If the Task Group makes changes to the current draft, would you generally prefer:**

A) Adoption of alternatives to existing text and mechanisms (maintain functionality), or

B) Removal of existing text and mechanisms (maintain compatibility with existing draft)

C) Either / both / no preference

D) Not applicable (against making any changes)

(Please vote for as many as you agree with)

**A) 33 B) 11 C) 40 D) 60**

**Straw poll 2: If the Task Group makes changes to the current draft, would you generally prefer:**

A) Changes/removals that are necessary to address the issues raised in the 4 remaining CIDs, but no other changes (evaluate the scope and then restrict to it), or

B) Removal of existing text and mechanisms without restriction (no immediate requirement to determine scope)

C) Changes to / removal of existing text and mechanisms without restriction (no immediate requirement to determine scope)

D) No preference

E) Not applicable (against making any changes)

**A) 42 B) 13 C) 26 D) 10 E) 65**

**Straw poll 3: If the Task Group makes changes to the current draft, would you generally prefer:**

A) No additions to mandatory requirements in current draft, but possibly subtractions from

B) No subtractions from mandatory requirements, but possibly additions to

C) No changes to mandatory requirements, but possibly changes to optional modes

D) No preference

E) Not applicable (against making any changes)

**A) 48 B) 3 C) 0 D) 6 E) 70**

1. **The group continued to discuss a way forward**
   1. Discussion on the process of when an LOA is requested and the response to such requests.
      1. Some were concerned it was taking too long.
   2. Request of the 802.11 WG Chair Adrian Stephens to clarify:
      1. Adrian responded to the request and confirmed that there had been no accepted LOA from Qualcomm for TGah. He sent letters to Qualcomm for LOA three times but received no direct response. As a reference, there was also no accepted LOA for TGai from Broadcom.
   3. Question on if there had been any LOA submitted since IEEE patent policy updated?
      1. Adrian (802.11 WG Chair) replied that there was no information on LOA submission. The information was available only after LOA was accepted. At the time of this meeting, there was none accepted LOA for 11ah based on new IEEE patent policy.
   4. Discussion on what to do next, the LOA issue is not going to be easy to solve.
   5. Discussion on how fast to proceed – some continue, some hold back.
   6. Discussion on the process of LOAs – calls for LOA, then allow holders to respond. Not always fast, and not always prior to Sponsor Ballot – See history of 802.11.
   7. Discussion on Wi-Fi Alliance new program for 11ah.
   8. Request to have motions to try to move forward.
   9. Discussion on whether or not to proceed with motions.
   10. Discussion on the importance of having LOA, and the process of not forcing a holder to submit one.
   11. The Chair reviewed the current Letter ballot status and stressed that the current Draft has more than 95% approval rate. Qualcomm had submitted LOA and it took time to complete the process and address pending issues. He urged the group to vote for Sponsor Ballotting the latest draft.
   12. Discussion on how to proceed if we have outstanding comments.
   13. Adrian (IEEE 802.11 WG Chair) concurred the statement that “do not approve sponsor ballot before resolving all the comments in the letter ballot”.
   14. **Motion #2: move to adjourn TGh meeting** 
       1. Moved by: Andrew Myles Seconded by: Sean Coffey
       2. Discussions: None
   15. **Results**: Yes: 46 No: 50 Abstain: 0 **Motion failed**
   16. **Motion #3:** move to adopt the following comment resolution for CID 7001, 7002, 7003, 7012:

Resolution: Rejected;The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.

* + 1. Moved by: Rolf de Vegt Seconded by: Joseph Levy
    2. Discussion on motion:
       1. Speaking in favour of the motion: Urging the group to keep the ball rolling and make progress. LOA was under discussions and it took time to solve as the IEEE policy was newly updated.
       2. Speaking against the motion: Asking the group to consider keeping balance between making progress and LOA issues. In addition, once the group moves into sponsor ballot, the decision would be made by a different voting group, i.e. sponsor-ballot voting pool.
          1. The rejection reasons were not valid as a submission was made in response to some of the CIDs with actionable steps.
    3. **Results**: Yes: 48 No: 48 Abstain: 5  **Motion failed**
  1. Discussion:
     1. Comment that the group’s opinion seemed to be split based on the motion and the previous straw polls. He suggested reporting to the SA and getting them updated. Hopefully SA could provide some guidance on resolving the LOA issue.
     2. Paul Nikolich (IEEE 802 Chair) and Adrian (IEEE 802.11 Chair) recommended the group utilize Wednesday AM1 to develop a letter to SA Board. Before doing this, the group would need a motion to change the agenda
  2. **Motion 4: Move to amend the agenda for Wed AM1 to develop a letter to SA board for the LOA issue**
     1. Moved by: Joseph Levy Seconded by: Paul Nikolich
     2. Discussion:
        1. Speaker against the motion: Concern noted on developing letters to SA board.
     3. Results: Yes: 21 No: 20 Abstain: 23 **Motion failed**

1. Peter Ecclesine (Cisco) requested point to order to end the session, as the meeting time was up.
2. **Recess**: The TG Chair declared recess till Wednesday AM1 at 6:01pm.

**July 15, 2015 (Wednesday) AM1 8:00 – 8:20  
Notes – 50+ attendees; Secretary for this session – Zander Lei (I2R)**

1. **Yongho Seok (Newracom) is the chair of** 802.11 TGah. Chair called the meeting to order at 8.00 AM. Zander Lei (I2R) was the secretary for this session.
2. Chair reviewed the agenda in 11-15/0733r5 for this session.
   1. Chair asked if there was any objection to the agenda.
   2. There was no objection heard on the agenda.
3. Chair reviewed the patent policy and meeting guideline.
   1. Chair presented the Call for Potentially Essential Patents slide.
      1. None were heard.
   2. Chair reminded the group that the letter of assurance available on website, any questions can be directed to the Chair.
   3. Chair reviewed other guidelines of the IEEE WG meetings.
4. **Conference call plan**
   1. The following plan had been proposed and fixed without objection

**Sept 9, 8PM ET for 2 hour**

1. **Timeline review**
   1. Chair reviewed the timeline document 285r11. He commented that the 4 comments related to LOA had not been resolved during this week. Due to this, the planned sponsor ballot had to be postponed to a next plenary meeting. The projected EC approval time and the Revcom approval time needed to be updated accordingly. Chair asked if there was any question on the timeline.
   2. It was pointed out that there was a typo in “**Initial Recirculation Sponsor Ballot**” in the document 11-11/0285r11, where “2015” should be “2016”. Chair corrected and updated it to revision 12. The proposed changes to the timeline were shown as follows.
      1. **Initial Sponsor Ballot:** from July 2015 to November 2015
      2. **Initial Recirculation Sponsor Ballot:** from November 2015 to March 2016
      3. **EC Approval:** from January 2016 to July 2016
      4. **Revcom Approval:** from March 2016 to July 2016
   3. Chair asked if there was any objection to the proposed timeline. None was heard.
   4. The timeline had been updated as in 11-11/0285r12.
   5. Chair commented that the sponsor ballot pool formed in April would be expired in November.
      1. Jon Rosdahl (CSR)(IEEE 802.11 Vice-Chair) indicated that the sponsor ballot pool would need to be reformed and suggested that it be done in September or later depending on progress.
2. **As there was no other business, Chair adjourned the meeting for the week at 8:20am.**