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Abstract

IEEE 802.11 REVmc BRC Minutes for F2F October – Samsung office – St Johns House, Cambridge, UK

We used the [join.me](http://join.me) teleconference bridge for teleconference access during the Cambridge meeting October 14, 15 and 16, see below. The same dial-in information was used each day.

**The agenda for each time slot was:**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report (first session only)

3. Comment resolution (see below)

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

R0: Initial Post of minutes

R1: Updated Motion 165 – “Motion-AY” tab should have been included and the doc version number was r21. Also updated reference section to 4 missing files.

**1.0 802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House, AM1 Wednesday 14 October 2015.**

* 1. **Called to order** at 10:04am by the chair Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm);
	4. **Review Agenda** 11-15/1203r2
		1. **Oct 14 AM1:** 11-15-1010 - Adrian STEPHENS (110 mins)
		2. **Oct 14 PM1: 1**1-15-1155 - Resolutions for the CCA zoo in 11mc/D4.0 (SBmc1) – Mark RISON
		11-15-0762 - Mark RISON (110 mins)
		3. **Oct 14 PM2 -** 11-15-1037 - Graham SMITH CIDs 6779, 5198 (15 mins)
		11-15-1201 - Resolutions for TPC Comments on 11mc D4 – Graham SMITH (110 mins)
		4. **Oct 15 AM1:** 11-15-1018, 11-15-1019 - Stephen MCCANN CIDs 6760, 6763, plus additional assigned comments,

11-15-1199 – MAC Operation CIDs – Dorothy Stanley

* + 1. **Oct 15 PM1:** 11-15-1010 - Adrian STEPHENS (110 mins)
		2. **Oct 15 PM2:**11-15-tbd – Mike MONTEMURO assigned comments (90 mins)
		11-15-1183 - Neighbor Reports, Extended Capabilities and RM Enabled Capabilities - Ganesh VENKATESAN (15 mins),
		3. **Oct 16 AM1:** 11-15-0762 - Mark RISON (110 mins)
		4. **Oct 16 PM1:**
		5. **Oct 16 PM2: Motions**
		6. Propose change Emily QI Add to Oct 14 PM2 today for one hour
		7. Mike and Ganesh have indicated that they will not be able to call in this week.
		8. Add 11-15/1201 – Graham SMITH; 11-15/1010 – Adrian STEPHENS; and 11-3/95r25 Adrian STEPHENSto Oct 15 PM2
		9. Revisit topics and times at the end of today for Thursday and Friday
		10. PSJ1 – Move to approve agenda: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd Adrian STEPHENS
			1. No objection – motion passes
	1. Social invite for Thursday evening after F2F at Stephens’ home in Cottenham
	2. **Editor Report** – 11-13/95r25 - Adrian STEPHENS
		1. 263 technical comments in the last 5 months
		2. Current projection would be Aug 2016 if we continue at this pace
		3. Review Standards Board OM 5.4.3.2 & 5.4.3.3 & 5.4.3.5
		4. D4.3 is edited through Sept comment processing
		5. Review status of outstanding comment counts
		6. Review list of Comment Resolutions that were approved, but Editor needs more input to incorporate – Editorial Review Required.
		7. Review slide 13 –
			1. 484 assigned to specific people
			2. Review for plan for each specific person
			3. Question on if Vinko is scheduling CID proposals
			4. Discussion on possible prioritization to speed up the processing time
	3. **Review doc** 11-15/1010r15 Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 6044 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Propose to delete the cited sentence
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At cited location, delete “The Length field set to (2 + 13 x Number of Destinations) or to (2 + 19 x Number of Destinations) octets.”
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5025 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Needs more change than cited
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 1006.36 delete “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of dot11PSRequestSuspensionInterval with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1006.42 delete “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of dot11MinBHIDuration variable with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1006.48 delete “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of dot11BroadcastSTAInfoDuration with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1006.54 delete “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of dot11AssocRespConfirmTime with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1006.60 delete “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of dot11MinPPDuration with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1007.03 delete “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of its local dot11SPIdleTimeout variable with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1007.07 delete: “While associated with an AP or PCP, a STA overrides the value of dot11MaxLostBeacons with the value of this subfield when it receives this element from its AP or PCP.”

At 1595.18 insert a new list item c) and subitems and increment the existing list items accordingly: “If an Association Response frame is received with a status code of SUCCESS, a DMG STA shall write to each of the following MIB attributes the value of the corresponding subfield of the DMG BSS Parameter Configuration field of the DMG Operation element received from the AP or PCP to which it requested association:

1. dot11PSRequestSuspensionInterval from the PSRequestSuspensionInterval subfield
2. dot11MinBHIDuration from the MinBHIDuration subfield
3. dot11BroadcastSTAInfoDuration from the BroadcastSTAInfoDuration subfield
4. dot11AssocRespConfirmTime from the AssocRespConfirmTime subfield
5. dot11MinPPDuration from the MinPPDuration subfield
6. dot11SPIdleTimeout from the SPIdleTimeout subfield
7. dot11MaxLostBeacons from the MaxLostBeacons subfield”

Make the same change at 1599.11 (before list items)), substituting “reassociation” for “association” (preserving case)

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5026 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion and proposed changes
			3. Change “wishes to” with “targets”
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised. Make changes under CID 5026 in 11-15/1010r15 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1010-15-000m-revmc-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>. These changes address the issues raised in the comment.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5027 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Deleted cited sentence.

Before the “Vendor Specific” row of table 8-34 (Probe Response) add a new row: “68”, “Relay Capabilities”, “The Relay Capabilities element is present if dot11RelayActivated is true; otherwise not present.”

At 1521.61 (Relay operation, General) add a new paragraph: “DMG relay operation is not supported by an IBSS STA. An IBSS STA shall set dot11RelayActivated to false.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5029 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5031 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised;

At 1030.36 change:

 "It is set to 1 if the STA supports both Link cooperating type and Link switching type. It is set to 0 if a STA supports only Link switching or if the Duplex subfield is set to 1."”

 To

"It is set to 1 if the STA supports both link cooperation and link switching. It is set to 0 otherwise."

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperating type” to “link cooperation”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperating mode” to “link cooperation”.

At 1217.38 change “Link Cooperating” to “Link Cooperation”

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperating subfield” to “Link Cooperation subfield”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperating” to “link cooperation”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link switching type” to “link switching”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link switching mode” to “link switching”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link switching” to “link switching”.

* + - 1. There is concern that this is not complete.
			2. ACTION ITEM #1: Adrian to check with Carlos and Payam what happens if a STA supports all 3?
		1. CID 6405 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Believe that this is a comment that Brian HART had indicated interest in helping with.
			3. Assign CID to Brian Hart
			4. Submission 11-15/1142r0 was prepared for this CID
			5. Review document: 11-15/1142r0 from Brian HART
				1. There is two lines that have changes being requested.
				2. Review comment context
				3. Discussion on possible redundant text
				4. Proposed Resolution: Revised.
				5. At 1049.26 insert new para: “The Transmit Power Envelope subelement is present as described in 10.40.4.”
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6274 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes –
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:07:31Z)
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6088 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Discussion on 3.1 (13.1) use of Infrastructure or ESS’s Infrastructure.
			4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:15:36Z)
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6669 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. An e-mail exchange between Adrian and Mark R. was then discussed.
			3. Cited location is incorrect, the correct location is 23.31
			4. Proposed Resolution REJECTED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:19:22Z) Rejected. The cited occurrences are not incorrect as they stand. Each reflects a distinct type of 40 MHz PPDU
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6668 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Cited text is incorrect – correct location is 27.30
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:21:59Z). At 27.30 delete “transmitted or received using the Clause 21 (Directional multi-gigabit (DMG) PHY specification) physical layer (PHY)”.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 6667 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Concern that this may not be complete – review references to Non-HT PPDUs. – This term introduced in the 11n days, for legacy at the time, but now it is not clear or unambiguous.
			4. Suggestion is to add clause 22, but it would be a partial solution that would improve the text, but we may want to add other clauses in the future.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:31:35Z) Revised. At 36.06, after “Clause 20 (…)” insert “ or Clause 22 (…)”.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6819 (GEN)
			1. Assign to Mark RISON
		8. CID 6531 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:35:30Z) Delete definition of WLAN system at 21.21.

At 3541.13 insert:

“Definition: in this annex a wireless local area network (WLAN) system is a system that includes the distribution system (DS), access points (APs), and portal entities. It is also the logical location of distribution and integration service functions of an extended service set (ESS). A WLAN system contains one or more APs and zero or more portals in addition to the DS.”

* + - 1. Need to add it to Annex Q as well as in Annex P
			2. In Annex P, we could change “WLAN system” with “WLAN” or “ESS’s Infratrucuture” or “Infratructure”
			3. Locations 3541.14, 3541.15, 3541.21 and 3541.22 all need change “WLAN system” to “ESS’s Infratructure”
			4. Location 3543.20 just change to “WLAN” (delete system).
			5. Review context of 3541.23 with the change applied.
			6. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-14 10:44:27Z) Delete definition of WLAN system at 21.21.

At 3541.14, 3541.15, 3541.21 3541.22 change “WLAN system” to “ESS’s infrastructure”

At 3543.20 delete “system”

At 3544.22 insert:

“Definition: in this annex a wireless local area network (WLAN) system is a system that includes the distribution system (DS), access points (APs), and portal entities. It is also the logical location of distribution and integration service functions of an extended service set (ESS). A WLAN system contains an optional portal and one or more APs in addition to the DS.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6396 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We already have added “clause 22”, so we have part of this in CID 6667.
			3. Need to update the definition of what non-HT PPDU is
			4. Discussion on how to change the definition
			5. Need to have the same resolution for CID 6667.
			6. Updated Proposed resolution 6667 & 6396: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-14 11:04:32Z) Replace definition at 36.04 with non-high throughput (non-HT) physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU): A PPDU that is transmitted not using a TXVECTOR FORMAT parameter equal to HT\_MF, HT\_GF or VHT.
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Time for Lunch
	2. **Recess** at 12:06pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House – PM1 Wednesday 14 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 13:03pm by Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba)
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies) – part;
	4. **Review Agenda**:

11-15-1155 - Resolutions for the CCA zoo in 11mc/D4.0 (SBmc1) – Mark Rison (115 mins)

* 1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1155r0 Mark RISON
		1. CID 6129 (GEN), 6214 (GEN), 6215(~~EDITOR~~ GEN), 6216 (~~EDITOR~~ GEN), 6302 (GEN), 6303 (GEN), 6305 (GEN), 6306 (GEN)
			1. Review comments
			2. Move to GEN 6215 and 6216 from EDITOR
			3. CID 5141 covers TXNAV, so will not be included here. The TXNAV is not part of the “the CS mechanism” as e.g. PIFS recovery can be used when the TXNAV is non-zero.
			4. Review the proposed changes
			5. Change “may be thought” of to “can be thought of” on page 7.
			6. ACTION ITEM #2 Mark R: to check with Payam on page 10 issue: “[Figure 9-17 on page 1270 has “Virtual CS=busy” and “CS=busy”? Do these both refer to NAV only? The text below, in fact, suggests the first is the CS mechanism in general, but the latter is just CCA. (I have no idea why this stuff is buried in a subclause about the DCF anyway.)]”
			7. Need to consider the NAV setting issues.
			8. 2 issues with the CS, 1 – Physically at the end of the NAV, and 2. when the Reception of a frame that set the NAV.
				1. If the NAV is not set correctly, then there won’t be a NAV from that frame.
				2. Busy medium CCA can relate to two different packets.
				3. Discussion at the white board on what the NAV covers and i

(Graham SMITH SR Technologies joined the call 1:45pm local time)

* + - 1. Unhighlight “ Deassertion of CS” change to “CS indicates idle”
			2. Discussion do we need to have more words to look at the requested Chanel width in how CCA is to be checked. Leave as an open question.
			3. CCA timers were originally in the standard to help determine the slot boundaries.
			4. Is it the CCA logic block or something outside the CCA that indicates the length of the PPDU?
				1. Is it the PPDU detection (PD) that knows the duration?
				2. PPDU detection is really two parts, 1. Valid PHY header, 2. Until this duration is completed (PHY STATE Machine) which is not in the CCA block (see diagram Figure 9-x)
			5. Discussion on where the CCA indicates busy or idle
			6. Need to make consistent and use PPDU rather than PSDU. – Need to globally change – or in most cases anyway.
			7. Discussion on PHY Header is successful vs has a valid CRC.
			8. Discussion on the CCA modes – do not remove timers in conjunction with this CID.
			9. Discussion on prefixes of PPDU types
			10. Remove the suggestion to remove the CCA timers.
			11. The point of Mode 5 CCA was to make an improvement on Mode 4
			12. Need to have some more discussion with the PHY experts
			13. ACTION ITEM #3 – Mark RISON. to send an E-mail with this specific issue in the e-mail highlighted with a pointer to 11-15/1155r1 and see if we can get some feedback on the CCA issues.
			14. Discussion on do you hold BUSY, or set it once and then set it IDLE at some time later, or when you quit holding BUSY does not automatically indicate IDLE.
			15. Reviewed through clause 17 in the document.
			16. Need more review and discussion.
			17. Mark RISON thanks the group for the 120 minutes of review time.
	1. Review plan for this afternoon.
	2. **Recess** at 3pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House – PM2 Wednesday 14 October 2015**.
	1. **Called to order** 15:30pm by Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba)
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies) Emily QI (Intel);
	4. **Review Agenda**: 11-15/1203r3

11-15/1180r4 - Emily QI for 1st hour

11-15/1037 Graham SMITH for 2nd hour

11-15/1201 Graham SMITH

* 1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1180r4 Emily QI
		1. CID 5501 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion – not able to find cited text at location cited.
			3. Similar to CID 5495 and 5621
				1. CID 5495: -- REJECTED (MAC: 2015-09-25 15:23:29Z): It is clear from the context that the ProbeDelay referred to is in the MLME-SCAN.request primitive in that the introduction to bullet says "Upon receipt of the MLME-SCAN.request primitive ..."
				2. CID 5621: -- REVISED (MAC: 2015-09-25 15:55:44Z): Replace "until a period of time equal to the ProbeDelay has transpired" with "until a period of time indicated by the ProbeDelay parameter from the most recent MLME-START.request primitive has transpired"
				3. Returning to Proposed resolution for CID 5501: Revised.

At the cited location, change “until a period of time equal to the ProbeDelay has transpired " to “until a period of time indicated by the ProbeDelay parameter from the MLME-JOIN.request primitive has transpired.”

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5211 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Similar Comment CID 5499 (EDITOR)
				1. CID 5499: -- REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-04-28 14:58:37Z) - Replace:

"To change Power Management modes, a STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange as described in Annex G, that is initiated by the STA, and that includes a Management, Extension or Data frame, and that includes an Ack or a BlockAck frame from the AP."

with:

"To change power management modes a STA shall inform the AP by completing a successful frame exchange (as described in Annex G) that is initiated by the STA and that includes a Management frame, Extension frame or Data frame, and also an Ack or a BlockAck frame from the AP."

* + - 1. Proposed resolution: Revised. Change:

 “To change Power Management modes, a STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange as described in Annex G, that is initiated by the STA, and that includes a Management, Extension or Data frame, and that includes an Ack or a BlockAck frame from the AP.”

 To:

“To change Power Management modes, a STA shall transmit a Management, Extension or Data frame to the AP and have received an Ack or a BlockAck frame from the AP.”

* + - 1. Discussion on if “successful” is necessary or not
			2. Did we intend to make a technical change?
				1. Discussion on if we have intended to make a change
			3. Update the Proposed Resolution: to the same as CID 5499.
			4. Updated **Proposed Resolution 5211**: Replace:

"To change Power Management modes, a STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange as described in Annex G, that is initiated by the STA, and that includes a Management, Extension or Data frame, and that includes an Ack or a BlockAck frame from the AP."

with:

"To change power management modes a STA shall inform the AP by completing a successful frame exchange (as described in Annex G) that is initiated by the STA and that includes a Management frame, Extension frame or Data frame, and also an Ack or a BlockAck frame from the AP."

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6246 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change “If the AP denies the usage of FMS for a particular stream, the stream is transmitted at every DTIM interval.” To “The AP delivers the requested stream at every DTIM interval.”
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6816 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Straw poll : Reject 4 yes 1 No
			4. 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.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6427 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Discussion on proposed resolution – worded a bit harshly.
			4. Are the FTM bufferable? – the table indicates in 10-1 is that it is bufferable.
			5. The location guys need to review this again to see if FTM interested folks can identify a solution.
			6. If we state that the FTM in bufferable, then we have to affect the of
			7. Need more discussion – include with the location discussion in November. (PM1 – Wednesday.
		4. CID 6462 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion.
			3. Proposed resolution: Revised; After the first sentence cited add "The AP should transmit the BU from the highest priority AC that is not delivery-enabled and that has a buffered BU."
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6468 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change “A STA may use both WNM-sleep mode and PS mode simultaneously.” To “NOTE-- A STA may use both WNM-sleep mode and PS mode simultaneously.”
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 6473 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Review of PICs did not give any mandatory requirement that TPU needs QoS.
			4. The dot11TDLSPeerUAPSDBufferSTAActivated discussed.
			5. Proposed resolution: Revised; at 1564.42 – after the first sentence, add: “A non-QoS STA shall set dot11TDLSPeerUAPSDBufferSTAActivated to false.”
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. 8 CIDs left to review later – Emily to contact Dorothy for additional time.
	1. **Review doc**: 11-15/1037r3 Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5198
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED

At P1534.38. Edit step c) as follows:

c) Wait for the period of the random delay, decrementing the random delay timer using the same algorithm as for backoff, except that SIFS + aSlotTime should be used as the initial medium idle period within the backoff procedure. If the ATIM Window in use within the IBSS is greater than 0 and the end of the ATIM Window occurs before the random delay timer expires, cancel the remaining random delay and pending Beacon frame transmission and proceed to step f).

At P1534L60 Delete: “A STA that has joined an IBSS shall transmit Beacon frames only during the awake period of the IBSS. This is described in more detail in 10.2 (Power management).”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6779 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Straw Poll:
				1. OPTION A:-

REVISED; At 1543.43 and at P1809 L42replace:

“If dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and the RCPI element was requested, an RCPI element containing the RCPI of the Probe Request frame shall be included. If no measurement result is available, the RCPI value shall be set to indicate that a measurement is not available (see 8.4.2.37 (RCPI element) and Table 16-9 (RCPI values))”

With

“If dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and the RCPI element was requested, an RCPI element containing the RCPI of the Probe Request frame shall be included (see 8.4.2.37 (RCPI element) and Table 16-9 (RCPI values)).
NOTE: If no RCPI measurement result is available, the RCPI value is set to indicate “Measurement not available” (see Table 16-9 (RCPI values)).

* + - * 1. Or
				2. OPTION B – (recommended)

At 1543.43 and at 1809.42 delete:

“If dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and the RCPI element was requested, an RCPI element containing the RCPI of the Probe Request frame shall be included. If no measurement result is available, the RCPI value shall be set to indicate that a measurement is not available (see 8.4.2.37 (RCPI element) and Table 16-9 (RCPI values))”.

* + - * 1. Option C: - No Change
				2. Discussion – Why the constriction was necessary or not.

If multiple power requests come, then you could end up with a different response for the requested element.

Discussion on what changes could be or should be made.

* + - * 1. Results: 3-A, 1 B, 2 C (Vote for all you can live with).
			1. Go with Option A
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised; REVISED; At 1543.43 and at P1809 L42replace:

“If dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and the RCPI element was requested, an RCPI element containing the RCPI of the Probe Request frame shall be included. If no measurement result is available, the RCPI value shall be set to indicate that a measurement is not available (see 8.4.2.37 (RCPI element) and Table 16-9 (RCPI values))”

With

“If dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and the RCPI element was requested, an RCPI element containing the RCPI of the Probe Request frame shall be included (see 8.4.2.37 (RCPI element) and Table 16-9 (RCPI values)).
NOTE: If no RCPI measurement result is available, the RCPI value is set to indicate “Measurement not available” (see Table 16-9 (RCPI values)).

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1201r1 Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5551 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Do not want to include in every beacon, bur when do you include it?
			4. Discussion on when it should be included and how to indicate that in the standard is
			5. Proposed resolution: Revised “At P1639.28, Change cited sentence to

“An AP, PCP, or IBSS STA shall autonomously include a TPC Report element with the Link Margin field set to 0 in Beacon frames, DMG Beacon frames, Announce frames, or Probe Response frames.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5550 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The cited clause is transmit power adaption in general and covers DMG and non-DMG STAs. All STAs can use the TPC Request response frames and DMG STAs may also use the LinkMeasurement Report which includes the TPC Report element and the DMG Link Margin. Hence, although the sentence refers to an alternative procedure to that preceding it, it is still part of transmit power adaption.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. Remaining 7 CIDs need to schedule more time.
			1. PM2 for Thursday (3:30-5:30)
	1. **Recessed** 5:35pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House – AM1 Thursday 15 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 10:00 am by Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba)
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm);
	4. **Review Agenda**: 11-15/1203r4

11-15-1248 – Mesh CID resolutions – Dorothy STANLEY
11-15-1199 – MAC Operation CIDs – Dorothy STANLEY
11-15-0762 - Mark RISON (45 mins)

* 1. **Review Doc** 11-15/11248r1 Dorothy STANLEY
		1. CID 5746 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context and discussion
			3. Discussion on possible resolutions
			4. There is a definition in 13.2.4 that defines mesh STA configuration.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revise; incorporate changes for CID 5746 in doc: 11-15/1248r1 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1248-01-000m-some-resolutions-to-mesh-cids.docx>>; adding reference to mesh STA configuration and changing “configuration” to meshConfiguration
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5861 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
		3. CID 6029 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Similar to CID 6031 –
				1. Resolution for 6031 - REJECTED (MAC: 2015-08-20 14:26:45Z): The text is unambiguous. The primitive being compared is correct and also compared in the prior list items.
			4. Proposed Resolution 6029: The intent of the cited text is to describe when Mesh STA configurations are identical. The cited text is unambiguous and no change is proposed.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6030 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: The intent of the cited text is to describe when Mesh STA configurations are identical. The cited text is unambiguous and no change is proposed.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6391 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Similar to CID 6040 and is corrected in D4.3.
			4. Change “£” to “≤”. – but use notation that will not change when cut and pasting into the database.
			5. Proposed Resolution: At 2137.33, Change “<pound-glyph>” to “less-than-or-equal-glyph”. Note to editor: Same resolution as CID 6040, change made in D4.3.
			6. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc** 1199r0 – Dorothy STANLEY
		1. CID 6204 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Discussion on why this would be good to reduce EIFS, and if you are using CF-end resynchs the STA.
			4. Doc 11-04-0886r0 suggests deleting the cited sentence and the following one. This Comment only asks for the once sentence though.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			6. ACTION ITEM #4: Dorothy will send out an e-mail to indicate that we are proposing to delete the cited sentence.
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6027 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. P2201.38 – indicates 4 rates for clause 17
			4. P2199:41 – Indicates that 1 and 2 mbs or short preamble may be chosen
			5. Discussion on if there is a problem of interoperability for DSSS PHY STAs.
			6. P1383.26 - The Basic Rate Element helps in this discussion
			7. P1386.27 – there is a reference back to the Basic Rate Element description
			8. The cited text is then possibly redundant, and we could delete the paragraph to avoid confusion. (same as in 9.26.2 which is referenced in table)
			9. P1386 is “additionally”, and we may need to know how to set the rate when the rate is not in the basic rate set.
			10. Proposed resolution: Revised: The requirement is indicated at 1383.26 (9.26.2, which is referenced in the table) that either can be used based on the rates in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter of the protection mechanism frame. The indicated text in Table 9-11 is duplicative.

The text at 1382.54 is retained, as it covers the case when protection is required but no clause 16 or 17 rate is in the BSSBasicRateSet parameter.

At 1386.31 delete “The frames that are used for providing the protection shall be sent at a Clause 16 (DSSS PHY specification for the 2.4 GHz band designated for ISM applications) or Clause 17 (High rate direct sequence spread spectrum (HR/DSSS) PHY specification) rate.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6213 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted;
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

(Mark RISON was called away at this point.)

* + 1. CID 6217 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion –
			3. Agree that Table 8-19 allows this.
			4. Proposed resolution: Accepted
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6233 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. We would need a submission to add the missing text. If it is not provided in time for the next draft, we could reject on that basis.
			4. 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.
			5. Default Resolution if no submission is created.
			6. Mark Submission Required.
		3. CID 6437 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; Cwindow is defined in the figure, “Contention Window”. The figure is an illustrative example, and does not show the case with widely varying values of the contention window.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6439 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. P1267.19 – Note that in 9.3.4.2 there is no reference to CW.
			4. If looking in the past “DFS” time, the medium has been idle, you can transmit.
			5. The figures are correct in stating that there is immediate access after DIFS/AIFSN. This applies when an MSDU arrives for transmission and no backoff in currently
			6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The figures are correct in stating that there is immediate access after DIFS/AIFSN. This applies when an MSDU arrives for transmission and no backoff is currently in operation.

See 1267.19, where there is no mention of contention window.

“In general, a STA may transmit a pending MPDU when it is operating under the DCF access method, either in the absence of a PC, or in the CP of the PCF access method, when the STA determines that the medium is idle for greater than or equal to a DIFS, or an EIFS if the immediately preceding medium-busy event was caused by detection of a frame that was not received at this STA with a correct MAC FCS value.”.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6440 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. When is the back-off done and if it is started after receiving a packet, or when you are ready to send or (correct answer) after the last transmission.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The text refers to “pending MPDUs”, not the SAP interface. Each TXOP is preceded by a backoff but note that the backoff may have occurred after a prior transmission. If additional MSDUs arrive for transmission and the medium has been idle for DIFS/AIFSN at that time, then the transmission proceeds without further delay.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6444 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. 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.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6445 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Proposed resolution: Rejected

Alternate rates that differ slightly may result in a PPDU of the same duration given that durations are quantized to symbol duration. MCSs may vary, for example varying the number of space time streams without changing duration.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6454 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. 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.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6498 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Fragmentation usage is in decline as 11n and 11ac defined aggregation
			4. Proposed resolution: Rejected
			5. The use of fragmentation is expected to decline, as 11n and 11ac support additional aggregation. Do not see the need to add requirements, even if “should”.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Time for Lunch
	2. **Recess** at 12:00pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC Fw2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House – PM1 Thursday 15 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 13:03pm by Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba); Scott MARIN (Self); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)-part; Joe LEVY (Interdigital)-part
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Scott MARIN (Self); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
	4. **Review Agenda**:11-15/1203r4

11-15/1010r14 Adrian STEPHENS

* 1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1010r14
		1. CID 6297 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. P856.21 (Neighbor report);
			4. Proposed resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:08:35Z) Revised. At cited location replace “a Beacon frame” with “Probe Response, Beacon and DMG Beacon frames and Neighbor reports”
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

(Graham SMITH – (SR Technologies) joined the call)

* + 1. CID 6051 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:20:38Z) Change cited definition to read: "robust-security-network-association- (RSNA-) capable: Pertains to a station (STA) that is able to create RSNAs".
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6052 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:22:25Z) Revised. Delete cited definition.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6323 (GEN)
			1. Already assigned to Mark R.
			2. Delete from 11-15/1010
		4. CID 5863 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:25:49Z) Revised. We thank the RAC for their coordination comments. A total of 29 other more detailed comments were received from the RAC. These comments have all been accepted or revised, except where changes are proposed to deprecated or obsolete text.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6400 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:27:33Z) At 53.24 insert an abbreviation: “FFE finite field element”

At 685.22 replace “Element” by “Finite field element (FFE)”.

At 685.25, 685.29, 685.34, 1887.45, and 1887.51, replace “Element” by “FFE”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6410 & 6717 (GEN
			1. Review comments
			2. Review proposed context
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:29:35Z) At 3536.40 replace “(UINT8) (bssidIndex >> 3)” with “(bssidIndex >> 3) & 0xff”

At 3538.08 replace “(UINT8) (aid >> 3)” with “(aid >> 3) & 0xff”

At 3536.41 and 3538.09 delete “(UINT8)” and remove the outermost parentheses;

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6565 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark R has changes for other CCA comments in 11-15/1155r1 that effect this paragraph.
			3. Make the proposed changes consistent so that if 11-15/1155 is not accepted this CID will still be resolved, and if it is accepted, it won’t conflict.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:39:43Z) At 2227.09 change “a high rate PPDU” to “an HR/DSSS PPDU”
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6433 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. The issue is the migration from index to actual power levels.
			4. P2277.57 – TXPWR\_LEVEL – is value from 1 to 8
			5. Review each instance of TXPWR\_LEVEL used
			6. We could make two different changes – at the cited location, we can change to indicate “transmit power level index”
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 12:52:52Z) Revised; at 2277.57, change "The transmit power level" to "The transmit power level index"

Change all "TXPWR\_LEVEL" to "TXPWR\_LEVEL\_INDEX"

In reply to commenter, transmit power and transmit power level are conventionally used as synonyms and we are choosing not to enforce a different interpretations in the standard.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6560 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Straw Poll:
1. To leave MMPDU as is
2. To change it to MLMEPDU
	* + - 1. Results: No-Change
			1. P32.60 has the definition of MMPDU
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-10-15 13:04:19Z) The MMPDU term is defined unambiguously in the standard. It is not clear that changing it as proposed would lessen confusion.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6756 (GEN) & 6610 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Review context of the proposed changes
			4. The intent of the changes is not to make any technical change, but rather make consistent editorial changes.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 13:24:19Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 6756 in doc 11-15/1010r15 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1010-15-000m-revmc-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>; moves the RCPI 16.9 table to Clause 8 and updates references.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6789 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Review proposed changes
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 13:30:25Z)

At 111:10 change "1: 1994" to "1:1994"

Globally change "2: 1998" to "2:1998"

Globally change "ISO-14962-1997" to "ISO 14962:1997"

Globally change "ISO-639" to "ISO 639"

Globally change "ISO -1" to "ISO 3166-1"

Globally change "ISO -2" to "ISO 3166-2"

Globally delete "[ISO.-2]"

Globally change "ISO/IEC - 1" to "ISO 3166-1"

Globally change "ISO/IEC 14977 : 1996" to ISO/IEC 14977:1996"

Globally change "7498-1: 1994" to "7498-1:1994"

At 5.62 add: "ISO/IEC 3166-2, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions— Part 2: Country subdivision code."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6787 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on function
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 13:50:52Z) At 2203.34, replace "X" by "LENGTH x 11/8. Delete the parentheses in ‘(x 8/11) and (x 11/8)’ on the same line."
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5048 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 13:56:10Z) For dot11HoppingPatternTable itself and for each of the OBJECT-TYPE definitions under dot11HoppingPatternTable:
1. Change STATUS to deprecated
2. At the start of the DESCRIPTION insert the following new para (within the quotes): “This attribute is deprecated because the frequency hopping PHY is no longer present in IEEE Std 802.11-<year>.”
	* + 1. CID 6747 (GEN)
				1. Assign to Mark RISON

(Graham SMITH left the mtg)

(Joe LEVY joined the mtg)

* + - 1. CID 5059 (GEN)
				1. Review comment
				2. Renumbering discussed
				3. Annex R is targeted to be moved to either clause 5 or to a separate new clause (potentially new 6)
				4. Ran out of time
	1. **Recess** 3:03pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House – PM2 Thursday 15 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 3:30pm by Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba); Scott MARIN (Self); Edward AU (Marvel) – Part; Graham SMITH (SR Technologies) - Part
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Scott MARIN (Self); Edward AU (Marvell); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies) - part
	4. **Review Agenda**:11-15/1203r4

11-15/1010r14 Adrian STEPHENS

11-15-1201 - Resolutions for TPC Comments on 11mc D4 – Graham SMITH (75 mins)
11-15-0762 - Mark RISON (45 mins)

* + 1. As Graham SMITH is not on phone and Mark RISON has had a family emergency and is not here, so we will continue with Adrian STEPHENS with 11-15/10101r14
	1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1010r14 Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 5059 (GEN)
			1. Continue discussion
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 14:36:36Z) Revised. Delete the placeholder clauses: 14 & 15; Annexes: I, J and K.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6720 (GEN)
			1. Assign to Mark RISON – Submission required
			2. Adhoc Notes has default resolution prepared.
		3. CID 6737 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposal is to remove the dates as we do not actually reference to any specific clause within the cited standards.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-15 14:41:13Z). Globally replace “FIPS PUB 180-3-2008” with “FIPS PUB 180-4” (2 instances). Globally replace “FIPS PUB 197-2001” with “FIPS PUB 197” (3 instances).
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. That completes all of 1010 for first complete pass
			1. Remaining 4 CIDs in 11-15/1010:
				1. 5141, 6226, 6415, 5031
	2. What to process next?
		1. Graham is still not back on the call
		2. Editorial Review comments would be good to work on.
	3. **Review doc**: 11-13/95r25 Adrian STEPHENS
		1. Look at the spreadsheet for the 8 CIDs that need review for the Editor
		2. CID 5208 (EDITOR)
			1. No editing instructions were given
			2. Review minutes indicates it was supposed to be a Rejected comment.
			3. Updated Proposed Resolution: Proposed Resolution: REJECTED: It so happens that multi-band capable non-AP STAs can respond to Probe Requests, so criterion a) 6) is needed. Criteria c) and d) further qualify when a multi-band capable non-AP STA may respond.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion – Editor Tab
		3. CID 5357 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. Check the resolution matched the minutes from July
			3. Table 8-97 checked for context
			4. “Reserved” was also moved into the new column
			5. No action required –
			6. No Objection to the action by the Editor
		4. CID 5812 (EDITOR)
			1. Review issue
			2. Page number is not correct. In proposed change – 2438->2538
			3. Update Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-10-15 15:00:05Z) - On lines 23, 36 and 42, on page 2534 lines 34, 47 and 61, on page 2535 lines 20 and 38, on page 2536 lines 26, 40 and 53, on page 2537 lines 1, 15 and 46, and on page 2538 line 19 replace "For a" with "In a".
			4. No action required by TG, Editor to complete implementation.
		5. CID 5959 (EDITOR)
			1. Review issues
			2. Mathew Fischer is working on the updates/fixes
		6. CID 6319 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Issue
			2. Issue on 3 outstanding Reserved rows
			3. Need to delete the reserved rows as well when deleting the column
			4. Updated Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-10-15 15:08:14Z) - replace “class that includes a value of 13 or 14 in the behavior limits as specified in Annex E,” with “class that includes a value of PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior or PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior in the behavior limits as specified in Annex E,”.

At 666.40, replace “does not include a value of 13 or 14” with “does not include a value of PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior or PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 890.13, replace “a value of 13 or 14” with “a value of PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior or PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 891.09, 891.15, 891.19 and replace “value 16:” with “value DFS\_50\_100\_Behavior:”.

At 1649.17, replace “behavior limits set of 16” with “behavior limits set of DFS\_50\_100\_Behavior”.

At 1649.21, replace “includes the value 16;” with “includes the value DFS\_50\_100\_Behavior;”.

At 1694.18, replace “if the Behavior Limit parameter of the selected row contains the value 13” with “if the Behavior Limit parameter of the selected row contains the value PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior”

At 1694.21, replace “selected row contains the value 14” with “selected row contains the value PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 1694.24, replace “selected row contains neither the value 13 nor the value 14” with “selected row contains neither the value PrimaryChannelLowerBehavior nor the value PrimaryChannelUpperBehavior”.

At 3331.07, delete the “Encoding” column from Table D-2, and delete the "Reserved" rows.

At 3352.43 , replace “STAs operating under the behavior limits set 17” with “STAs operating with a behavior limits set value of ITS\_nonmobile\_operations”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6328 & 6566 (EDITOR)
			1. Review issues
			2. Search term to find stds – search for 802
			3. From the Adhoc Notes: EDITOR: 2015-05-28 11:34:39Z - IEEE-SA indicate the following is the rule:

“When referring to the document it should IEEE Std 802.11 (and there is no need to repeat the TM on every instance, since our rule of thumb is that it should be there on the first instance in the front matter and the first instance it's used in the body of the document). When referring to the technology it should be IEEE 802.11 with the TM only on the first instance of the front matter and body. "

* + - 1. Only include STD in the cases when a reference could be included.
			2. Scope of how many to fix (on the order of 604).
			3. How to proceed – either reject the comment “submission required” or provide a means to find the fixes.
			4. Mark as Submission required and assign to Mark Rison

(Graham SMITH re-joined the meeting)

* + 1. CID 6349 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Editor notes
			2. Looks like a case change question.
			3. Edward need time to review
	1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1201r1 – Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5545 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; At P1638.59 Replace

“When dot11SpectrumManagementRequired is false and dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true, a Power Constraint element and a Transmit Power Envelope element may be included in Beacon, DMG Beacon, Announce, and Probe Response frames.”

With

“When dot11SpectrumManagementRequired is false and dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true, an AP or a PCP may include a Power Constraint element and a Transmit Power Envelope element in Beacon, DMG Beacon, Announce, and Probe Response frames.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5541 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Discussion if the paragraph is actually ambiguous?
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate Changes for CID 5541 in 11-15/1201r1 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1201-01-000m-resolutions-for-tpc-comments-on-11mc-d4.docx> ; this addresses the commenter’s comment.
			5. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5538 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Transmit Power was removed by 11ac to allow for other Regulatory Domain definitions for Transmit Power.
			4. The Beacon may specify multiple instances of other methods for power usage in the elements
			5. This is the fact that there may be more than one Transmit Power Envelope Elements
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes for CID 5381 in 11-15/1201r1 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1201-01-000m-resolutions-for-tpc-comments-on-11mc-d4.docx>>; which adds the first transmit power element instance.
			7. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion

(Edward AU left the meeting)

* + 1. CID 5534 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: The text is clear and unambiguous.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5539 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5530 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised P1636.38 replace “may” with “might”

P1636.39 replace “the algorithm” with “an algorithm”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5531 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Only option is EIRP.
			4. Discuss potential revision of P1636.50
			5. Ran out of time - - Graham had to leave the mtg
	1. **Review plan for tomorrow**: - 11-15/1203r4 – Dorothy STANLEY
		1. Update successful presentations into a new version r5
		2. Update actions for today
		3. Start Friday Morning with Stephen McCann and Mark R
		4. For PM1, Adrian will start with his other doc – 11-15/1207r1
		5. For PM2: Motions, Mark R (60 Mins) Dan (20 Mins)
			1. Motion Number will start with 163 on Friday.
			2. (163) Motion for Duplicate CID resolutions
			3. Review documents that are posted for target motions
				1. (Motion 164) 11-15/665r12 – GEN – “Gen Bangkok B”, “GEN Telecon Sept-Oct”
				2. (Motion 165) 11-15/565r20 – MAC – “Motion MAC AX”
		6. Dorothy to Post 11-15/1203r5
	2. **Recessed** at 5:35pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House, AM1 Friday 16 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 10:04am by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Stephen MCCANN (Blackberry) – part; Edward AU (Marvell); Scott MARIN (Self)- part.
	4. **Review Agenda** 11-15/1203r5

11-15-1018 - CID 6760, 6763 - Stephen McCann

11-15-1019 - l CID ready to propose motion? - Stephen McCann

11-15-1253 - CIDs 62, 6373, 6374 - Stephen McCann

11-15-0762 - Mark RISON (45 mins)

* + 1. 11-15/1019 all the CIDs were already all marked ready for motion, no need to present again.
		2. No objection to the modified Agenda
	1. **Review doc**: 11-15/1203r2 Stephen McCann
		1. CID 6760 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-10-16 09:08:33Z) Reject. The format of the NAI Realm is clearly defined in clause 8.4.5.10 being either IETF RFC 4282 or UTF-8. Regarding “strings” it is not possible to state whether they are all NUL-terminated or not, as they have differing definitions within the document
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6763 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-16 09:12:45Z) : Incorporate changes for CID 6763 in doc 11-15/1018r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1018-03-000m-some-gen-comment-resolutions.doc>; which adds “lowercase” and removes “server” in four locations.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review Doc** 11-15/1253r0 Stephen MCCANN
		1. CID 5862 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Use of a forward reference is a better solution - pointing to 13.14.2 and 13.14.3.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes for CID 5862 in doc 11-15/1253r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1253-00-000m-mac-power-management-comment-resolutions.doc> >; which makes a forward reference in clause 8 to 13.14.
			5. Mark Ready for Motion – However, ACTION ITEM #5: Stephen to check with Guido on the resolution, between now and November.
		2. CID 6373 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes for cid 5862 in doc 11-15/1253r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1253-00-000m-mac-power-management-comment-resolutions.doc> > that makes a change to 566.54 which changes the reference.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6374 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Not sure what the commenter means by “normal rules”
			3. Thought was that in July we had a discussion and Payam had planned to bring some details to resolve this CID.
			4. In July only a document 11-15/938r0 by Payam TORAB that was describing the unscheduled powersave in DMG. Which introduces a new element.
			5. 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.
			6. Mark Ready for Motion – Mark RISON wants to check further on this CID.
		4. Remaining 3 CIDs: 6200, 6201, 6500 – will provide proposed resolution later.

(Stephen MCCANN left the meeting)

* 1. **Review doc**: 11-15/762r10
		1. CID 6562, 6563, 6075 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Question on making sure “sufficient number” is explained – it is in the note.
			4. Change “for all” to “from all recipients”
			5. MIB variable deprecated as it is not referenced in the draft any longer.
			6. Need to move the notes about “where are the rules of DMGIBSSen then?”
			7. IBSS Changes are still in progress, so we are happy with the Infrastruture BSS changes.
			8. Discussion on how to convert the changes we are happy with into resolutions for CID 6563, and pull 6562 and 6075 into a separate section for different discussion.
		2. CID 6389 (MAC)
			1. Not ready for discussion
		3. CID 6506 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review status of the discussion of this CID in the past.
			3. Was subject to a motion in May, but was pulled for more discussion
			4. Review proposed changes:
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-10-16 10:24:35Z) Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 6506 in 11-15/762r11 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx>, which harmonise the wording for the OFDM, HT, VHT and TVHT PHYs (which are the only PHYs subject to regulatory energy detection).
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6824 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. The proposed changes will make the removal of TKIP in the future cleaner.
			4. Concern at 1982.6 – can the EAPOL\_Key frame indicate whether the TKs were installed, or whether the procedure just terminates after step e).
			5. Step e) should not have a “whether” , and then step f) can then check to see that it has occurred.
			6. Question on if there is an option to “not install” in step e, so Mark R. will go and research that question.
				1. P1971.56 – Install bit definition
				2. Mixed case will also go away when WEP is removed, so the one case where the Install bit is not set.
			7. Step f) can now be restated to match description in p1983.33.
				1. The Supplicant sends an EAPOL-Key frame to confirm whether or not the temporal keys were installed.
			8. Proposed Resolution: Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 6824 in 11-15/762r11 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx>, which align the wording throughout the document so that there is one TK per SA, and push TKIP’s “a TK is two TKs” confusion behind a clearly-labelled cordon sanitaire.
			9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

(Scott MARIN joined the mtg)

* + 1. CID 6573 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion – concern with the extra abbreviation size may make the combination unclear.
			3. This was discussed before in REVmb – and no change was made then.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; change the PICs identifier abbreviations identified in item (old) to Item (New) in the table under CID 6573 in doc 11-15/762r11 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx>>,
		2. CID 6716 (EDITOR)
			1. Already done – Resolved in Motion 153
		3. CID 6582 (Editor)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Question on usage of Unicode in Pseudo code discussed.
			4. Ran out of time – will return to this when we start up again.
	1. **Recess** at 12:01pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House, PM1 Friday 16 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 13:00 (1pm) by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Scott MARIN (Self)-
	4. **Review Agenda**: 11-15/1203r5

1207r1 Adrian STEPHENS

* + 1. No objection to modified agenda
	1. **Review doc**:11-15/1207r1 Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 6223 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on reasons which rejection reason to use.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected the comment does not adequately demonstrate a need for such a change.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. CID 6227 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review 11.5.1.1.7 Mesh TKSA definition
				1. Is this a pairwise key or not?
			3. The name of the item is not indicative of the key method being used.
			4. Discussion to defer until we have more people with knowledge and opinions are part of the discussion.
		3. CID 6234 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. No “BSS” in the name of the fields.
			3. p1846 describes what the tuples are
			4. Discussion on the options did not find consensus as the name of the set being the same as a field was not thought to be a bad thing or is it a bad thing.
			5. Remove CID from submission – Assign to Dorothy STANLEY
		4. CID 6236 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion from the submission: I have some sympathy with the sentiment of the comment, but none for wasting any more of my time fixing an unused MIB. I presume the current model, if we can dignify the co-evolution of the MIB and MLME with that term, is that the PHY tells the SME what it can do using the MIB variable, and then the SME tells the MAC what to use/advertise, which might be the same, might be a subset and must not be a superset. How the SME decides to do this is unspecified
			3. 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.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6245 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. An Alternate 2 Resolution: at 1869.9 insert “The robust Management frames are Disassociation, Deauthentication, and robust Action frames.”
			3. Alternate 1 Proposed Resolution: Rejected; Rejected. p105.05 suffices: “The robust Management frames are Disassociation, Deauthentication, and robust Action frames.”
			4. Discussion on how to reconcile with other changes already agreed.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1869.07 add: “The robust Management frames are Disassociation, Deauthentication, and robust Action frames.”

At 105.05: delete “The robust Management frames are Disassociation, Deauthentication, and robust Action frames. Action frames specified with “No” in the “Robust” column of Table 8-46 (Category values) are not robust Management frames and are not protected.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6290 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. The places requested for a change where the proposal does not change is due to not wanting to affect the TIM.
			4. Discussion on the TIM bitmap usage
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised.; At 173.20, 180.31, 187.26, 1940.30 change “1—2007 (inclusive)” to “Non-DMG: 1—2007 <newline>DMG: 1—254”

Delete "The value of the AID is in the range 1--2007." at 568.61

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6350 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion with others identified that no change was desired.
			3. Prefer to keep distinction
			4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected, Re-association to the same PCP enables a STA to change its capabilities/operational parameters while retaining its association. In addition, inclusion of this mechanism for DMG STAs maintains a consistent implementation across PBSS and infrastructure BSS in DMG and between DMG and non-DMG.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6357 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. From Guido HERTZ via e-mail:

• A neighbor mesh STA is a mesh STA that is in communication range. A neighbor mesh STA may be a mesh STA of the same MBSS or of a different MBSS. Therefore, the set of neighbor mesh STAs contains all mesh STAs that a mesh STA shares the wireless medium with. E.g., neighbor mesh STAs can mutually set the NAV.

• A neighbor peer mesh STA is a neighbor mesh STA that a mesh STA has peered with. All peer mesh STAs belong to the same MBSS. Once two mesh STAs have peered and as long as they are in mutual communication range they can exchange MSDUs.

• A peer mesh STA is a mesh STA that has peered with. Once two mesh STAs have an active peering the mesh STAs can exchange frames as long as they are also neighbor mesh STAs. If mesh STA's neighbor peer mesh STA "walks" away it becomes a peer mesh STA. The peering is still active but the two mesh STAs cannot exchange MSDU anymore as they are no longer in range over a single instance of the wireless medium. Once a peer mesh STA walks back in range it immediately becomes a neighbor peer mesh STA and communication can be established again. Being a peer mesh STA means that credentials etc. have already been exchanged.

I believe the current text is fine, because:

• The term "neighbor STA" explains that "A STA that is in direct communication range over a single instance of the wireless medium." This is the physical proximity.

• The term "peer mesh STA" explains the "agreement" that the commenter asks for. The standard reads "A mesh STA to which a mesh peering has been established."

• A neighbor peer mesh STA is the union of "peer mesh STA" and "neighbor STA." A neighbor mesh STA is a mesh STA that fulfils the conditions of being a neighbor STA and being a peer mesh STA.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The comment fails to identify a specific issue with the balloted draft. 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.

In reply to the commenter,

• The term "neighbor STA" explains that "A STA that is in direct communication range over a single instance of the wireless medium." This is the physical proximity.

• The term "peer mesh STA" explains the "agreement" that the commenter asks for. The standard reads "A mesh STA to which a mesh peering has been established."

• A neighbor peer mesh STA is the union of "peer mesh STA" and "neighbor STA." A neighbor mesh STA is a mesh STA that fulfils the conditions of being a neighbor STA and being a peer mesh STA.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6424 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1238.55 delete: “A transmission is successful either when an Ack frame is received from the STA addressed by the RA field of the transmitted frame or when a frame with a group address in the RA field is transmitted completely.”

In subclause 3.2 insert (in alphabetic order)

“successful transmission: A transmission and the reception of its expected acknowledgement or a transmission for which no acknowledgement is expected.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6430 (MAC)
			1. Assign CID to Carlos CORDEIRO
		2. CID 6432 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Review proposed changes
			4. Proposed resolution Revised. Make changes under CID 6432 in 11-15/1251r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-02-000m-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>>. These changes were a result of a survey of uses of “most recent”, which identified two incorrect uses.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6443 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Why not change 1251.55? – the “correctly received” is defined explicitly in this location.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes under CID 6443 in 11-15/1251r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-02-000m-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>>. These change remove any unnecessary “correctly received”.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6457 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Rejected. Frame priority is protected by the GCMP AAD construction and the GCMP nonce construction ensures uniqueness of the nonce by including the A2 field and PN which the transmitter is required to manage as a single counter for all frames using the same key. The comment did not identify any technical reason for the proposed change and the proposed change would result in the existing implementations being incompatible with the new design.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6460 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Discussion on does mandatory mean it has to be included in the operational rate set?
			4. Can an AP use a subset of the Mandatory rate in the operational rate set?
			5. The Operational Rate set can be a subset of the Mandatory rate set.
			6. The contents of the proposed note was discussed.
			7. Discussion on rate sets:
				1. The Basic rate set is any of the rates supported by the AP
				2. The AP’s operation rate set is any of the rates supported by the AP, and a superset of the basic rate set.
				3. The mandatory rates of the PHY have no effect on the selection of the basic rate set or the AP’s operational rate set.
				4. A non-AP STA can choose any of the rates it supports in its operational rate set.
				5. The mandatory rates of the PHY have no effect on the selection of the non-AP STA’s operational rate set.
			8. ACTION ITEM #6: Mark R. check to identify changes, and Adrian to check with more people
		6. CID 6475 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. CID 1482: Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2013-07-18 04:33:25Z): In answer to the commenter, it is OK to signal EOSP part way through an MSDU, the AP is required to attempt transmission of at least one BU, but might stop at any point after that, even part way through a BU.
			3. Proposed resolution: Rejected. The comment asks questions, but does not identify an issue. 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.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6483 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Interesting that the text for note at 648.11 is worth noting in light of the discussion on CID 6460 we just had….take a copy and include it in the earlier CID as part of the discussion/debate there.
			4. Operational Set is not always equal to the supported rate sate, but is a subset of the supported rate set.
			5. More discussion may be needed
			6. See 202.03 Operational Rate Set is the receive rates, and is a superset of the basic rate set.
			7. Need more people to be involved in this discussion
		8. CID 6484 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; 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.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 6485 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Needs submission, or reject
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject; 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.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 6488 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Request was sent asking about non-HT Block Ack, but has not had a lot of response from his request.
			3. Need specific text changes for the places to mark deprecated.
			4. If we determine we do in fact wish to deprecate this feature
			5. ACTION ITEM#7: Adrian to resend email and a decision will be taken in November 2015.
		11. CID 6536 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Review changes
			4. Similar CIDs:
				1. CID 6795 is a comment to add “Network”
				2. CID 3372 was rejected “"network" in this context is descriptive and does not cause harm to the text and is not detrimental to the standard.”
			5. Need to let Adrian and Mark work offline to merge the resolutions for CID 6795 in 11-15/762r10.
		12. CID 6543 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Assign to Mark RISON, Mark Submission Required
		13. CID 6570 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Related to CID 141
			3. Proposed Resolution: Proposed Resolution: Reject; 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.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess** at 2:58pm
1. **802.11 REVmc BRC F2F Cambridge, UK, St. Johns House, PM2 Friday 16 October 2015.**
	1. **Called to order** 15:30 (3:30pm) by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HP-Aruba), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Mark RISON (Samsung), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Scott MARIN (Self); Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Dan HARKINS (HP-Aruba);
	4. **Review Agenda** 11-15/1203r5

a) Motions
b) 11-15-0762 - Mark RISON (60 mins)
c) 11-15-1184 – Dan HARKINS (4:30pm)

d) Plan for next meetings

* 1. **Motions**:
		1. **Motion 163: Duplicates**
			1. **Move to instruct the editor to resolve each comment marked as “duplicate” with the approved resolution of the comment that it is a duplicate of.**
			2. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS ; 2nd: Jon ROSDAHL
			3. Discussion: this is the set of CIDs that were inadvertently uploaded twice. This allows the CID to receive the same resolution for both entries of the same CID.
			4. Result: 6 Yes: 0 No: 0 Abstain - **-Motion Passes**
		2. **Motion 164: GEN comments**
			1. **Move to approve the comment resolutions in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-12-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-12-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx) **in the “GEN Bangkok B” and “GEN Telcon Sept-Oct” tabs and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.**
			2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Adrian Stephens
			3. Discussion: Question about the extra line of info in the resolution field.
				1. It is simply a short summary description of the changes being made by the resolution in a document
			4. Result: Result: 6 Yes: 0 No: 0 Abstain - **-Motion Passes**
		3. **Motion #165: MAC comments**
			1. **Move to approve the comment resolutions in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-21-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-21-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls) **in the “Motion MAC-AX” and “Motion MAC-AY” tabs and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft. With the exception of CID 5054, 5860, 5967, 6209, 6235, 5212.**
			2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
			3. Discussion: No discussion
			4. Result: : 6 Yes: 0 No: 0 Abstain - **-Motion Passes**
	2. **Discussion on excepted CIDs:**
		1. CID 5054
			1. Concern with Capitalization Motion #166: 5054
			2. Wish to discussion to ensure RSN Capabilities
			3. Reassign to Adrian STEPHENS
		2. CID 5860
			1. Review resolution:
			2. Concern that the explanation text is garbled in the resolution.
		3. CID 5967
			1. Concern with resolution not being clear – and oppose it on technical grounds –
				1. Note: same as resolution to CID 5960.
		4. CID 6209
			1. Proposed Resolution – concern that the some of the steps are upper case
			2. The editor will take care of that if necessary
		5. CID 6235
			1. Should have been assigned to Mark Rison
			2. Submission is in 11-15/762
		6. CID 5212
			1. More clean-up is requested on the resolution
			2. Suggestion: the plural is a bit awkward (one ADDTS Request frame is sent for multiple ACs?), and the definite article is suspect too. How about changing not to: “The ADDTS Request frame may be sent for ACs regardless of the ACs’ ACM settings." to: “An ADDTS Request frame may be sent for an AC regardless of the AC's ACM setting.".
			3. Assigned to Adrian STEPHENS
	3. **Motion #166**: 5860, 5967, 6209
		1. **Move to approve the comment resolutions in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-21-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-21-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls) **for CIDs 5860, 5967, and 6209.**
		2. Discussion: None
			1. Results: Result: : 4 Yes: 1 No: 0 Abstain - **-Motion Passes**
	4. **Review doc** 11-15/762r10
		1. CID 6563 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. We had discussed this earlier today – remove the other 2 CIDs to allow for this one CID to be resolved.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 6563 in 11-15/762 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx>, which address IBSS issues (only).
		2. CID 6582 (Editor)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 6582 in <this document>, which use proper glyphs for ==, !=/<>, >=, <= where not in ASCII text and where not in Boolean contexts.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6754 (Editor)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion –
			3. Propose to move 9.35.3 to a new subclause in 8.
				1. Concern that behaviour is being described and would not be correct for clause 8.
				2. Claim is that this is similar to the non-mesh on p614
				3. If we remove one sentence about behaviour, then it may be correct.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Move Subclause 9.35.3 Frame addressing in an MBSS to a new Subclause 8.3.5, deleting “In this subclause, addressing of the Mesh Data and Multihop Action frames and MSDU/MMPDU forwarding behavior are described.” in the first para.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6771 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Need to clarify the set to value – not consistent in the draft, but fix as we find them.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: REVISED

Change “retry bits in the MAC headers of MPDUs” to “the Retry subfield in the MAC headers of MPDUS to 1” at 1240.58.

Change “the Retry bit” to “the Retry subfield” at 1265.26, 1765.64, 1766.5.

Change “the retry bit” to “the Retry subfield” at 1364.14, 1364.15, 3179.54.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6795 (EDITOR)
			1. Working to harmonize a new resolution with Adrian
		2. CID 6788 (~~MAC~~ GEN), 6819 (GEN), 6298 (~~MAC~~ GEN), 6561(GEN)
			1. Review Comments
				1. Note while CID 6467is listed in the same section of the submission as the other 4 CIDs, it is not resolved at this point in the document, but is included here to remind people that it exists and is similar to the other CIDs
			2. Review Proposed changes
			3. Concern for “informally” be deleted – it was
			4. Discussion on the direction of the resolutions.
			5. ACTION ITEM #8: Mark HAMILTON: Move 6788 and 6298 to GEN
			6. If others have feedback please send to Mark R.
		3. Mark RISON. to upload R11.
	1. **Review Doc** 11-15/1184r2 - OWE– Dan HARKINS
		1. Review document
		2. Abstract: This submission proposes an opportunistic encryption scheme for 802.11.
		3. Was presented to WNG in Bangkok
		4. IETF presentation was also made on this proposal.
		5. New Clause suggested: 4.10.3.5 Opportunistic Wireless Encryption
		6. The proposed 11.5.10.3 – needs to replace the added text to make it possible to use PMKSA or OWE. This is to setup a way to migrate from OWE to PMKSA.
		7. Authentication frames are not used is a question to address letter.
		8. What is the market relevance of this idea?
			1. Do we believe it would be deployed quickly?
			2. When presented to WNG a straw poll was 61 for let’s do, 0 don’t do it, and 12 don’t care.
		9. Has the WFA considered this concept?
			1. This is coming from the IETF, but it is the WFA that would need to certify this feature.
			2. Would like to have a WFA liaison from WFA to show relevance
		10. The end-user experience is improved – to not have to provide the key from the end-user. Make a secure connection that can then allow for network monetization.
		11. Request to add more background to describe the use case
		12. Why the need for the WFA Liaison?
			1. The WFA is the marketing looking organization and the idea was to find out their sentiment on the value of this feature.
			2. We don’t usually ask for WFA approval of features in 802.11
		13. The bottom line is to find some indication of industry interest.
		14. Changes to this document will be posted soon
	2. **Next Meetings:**
		1. Next scheduled telecom Oct 30
		2. Would like to Add additional Telecon on Oct 28th(No Jon), and Nov 6th (No Mark R)
			1. This is to process the number of CIDs that have resolutions already noted.
			2. The times would be 10-noon ET
		3. Discussion on when the OWE presentation should be considered again
			1. Oct 28th may be rushed, but would be better for a larger audience in the November Plenary
			2. Discussion on the merits of straw poll or vote during the Mid-week plenary
	3. ***Thanks to Mark RISON and Samsung for Hosting the Session this Week.***
	4. **Adjourned** 5:06pm
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1155-00-000m-resolutions-for-the-cca-zoo-in-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx>

1. **Wednesday PM2:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1180-04-000m-sb0-resolutions-for-ps-comments.docx>

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1037-03-000m-resolutions-for-more-assigned-comments-gs.docx

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1037-04-000m-resolutions-for-more-assigned-comments-gs.doc

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1201-00-000m-resolutions-for-tpc-comments-on-11mc-d4.docx>

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1201-01-000m-resolutions-for-tpc-comments-on-11mc-d4.docx

1. **Thursday AM1:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1203-04-000m-2015-09-10-tgmc-brc-teleconference-agenda.docx>

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1248-00-000m-some-resolutions-to-mesh-cids.docx

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1248-01-000m-some-resolutions-to-mesh-cids.docx

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1199-00-000m-resolutions-to-some-mac-operation-cids.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1199-01-000m-resolutions-to-some-mac-operation-cids.docx>

1. **Thursday PM1:**

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1010-14-000m-revmc-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-2.docx

1. **Thursday PM2:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1010-14-000m-revmc-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-2.docx>

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1010-15-000m-revmc-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-2.docx

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1201-00-000m-resolutions-for-tpc-comments-on-11mc-d4.docx

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1201-01-000m-resolutions-for-tpc-comments-on-11mc-d4.docx

1. **Friday AM1:**

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1203-05-000m-2015-09-10-tgmc-brc-teleconference-agenda.docx

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1018-03-000m-some-gen-comment-resolutions.doc

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1019-02-000m-some-mac-comment-resolutions.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1253-00-000m-mac-power-management-comment-resolutions.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx>

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx

1. **Friday PM1:**

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1203-05-000m-2015-09-10-tgmc-brc-teleconference-agenda.docx

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-01-000m-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-02-000m-sb0-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>

1. **Friday PM2:**

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1203-05-000m-2015-09-10-tgmc-brc-teleconference-agenda.docx

https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1203-06-000m-2015-09-10-tgmc-brc-teleconference-agenda.docx

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-12-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-21-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1184-02-000m-owe.docx>