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Abstract

This file is 11-16-0123-00-0000 REVmc - BRC Minutes for January 2016 – Atlanta

802.11 REVmc had 4 slot times during the January 2016 802 Plenary in Atlanta, GA.

1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Atlanta, GA – 18 January 2016 – PM2 – 16:00**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 16:00
   2. **Review Patent Policy** – 5 slides reviewed.
      1. No issues noted.
   3. **Introduction of TG officers**
      1. Chair - Dorothy STANLEY – HPE
      2. Vice Chair/Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL – Qualcomm
      3. Vice Chair – Mark Hamilton – Ruckus Wireless (Not Present this week).
      4. Editor – Adrian Stephens – Intel
      5. Editor - Emily QI – Intel
      6. Editor - Edward AU - Huawei
   4. **Review of Objectives**
      1. Ballot is currently open
      2. Encourage to review and comment on ballot
      3. This week to review items not directly related to ballot comments
   5. **Review Agenda – 11-15/**

**Monday PM2**

* Chair’s Welcome, Status, Review of Objectives, Approve agenda
* Editor’s Report
* Presentations
  + 11-15/1274 – ACK frame –Graham SMITH
  + 11-16/117, EIFS CID 5966 Menzo WENTINK

**Tuesday PM2**

* Presentations
  + 11-15/1530 – VHT 160MHz signaling Menzo WENTINK
  + 11-16/106, 107 Probe dwell time – Peter KHOURY

**Wednesday PM2**

* Presentations
  + ARC proposed changes, see 11-15/540 – Joseph LEVY
  + 11-15/1184r5 – OWE – Dan HARKINS

**Thursday PM1**

* Presentations
* Motions
* Plans for Jan – March
* Schedule
* AOB, Adjourn
  + 1. Call for additional presentations
       1. Possible new submission for Thursday – maybe
    2. Current Status of Draft is that it is in recirculation – Draft v5.0
       1. After the ballot closes, we will start resolution
    3. Reminder on the process of comment processing. Presentations on rejected comments can be considered, but do not change the resolution of the comment.
    4. No objection to adopting the agenda as proposed.
    5. Note on Thursday plan
       1. The minutes from Piscataway will be considered as there are some minor edits that need to be made prior to approval.
  1. **Editor Report 11-13/95r26**– Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. Thanks to Emily and Edward for giving up some of their personal time during the holidays to get all the edits completed so the ballot could start.
     2. Review statistics from the initial Ballot (see slide 6)
  2. **Review Sponsor Ballot plan**
     1. -- From Slide 7 – 11-15/1522r1
* **Initial Sponsor Ballot 2015-03-27 through 2015-04-26 on D4.0**
* **Jan 11-26 2016 Initial SB recirculation D5.0**
  + Teleconferences, Feb 22-25 2016 BRC Ft. Lauderdale meeting
  + 2nd recirculation on D6.0: March 2016
    - **April/May 2016**
      * Comment resolution
      * 3rd recirculation April/May 2016 D6.0 unchanged or D7.0
      * 4th recirculation D7.0 unchanged if needed May/June 2016
      * Revcom Submission date: 20 May 2016 for June 28-30 Revcom
      * EC telecon approval June 2016
  + **July 2016 – WG/EC Final Approval (if not in June 2016)**
  + **September 2016 – RevCom/SASB Approval (if not June 2016)**
    - * Revcom Submission date: 05 Aug 2016 for Sept 16 Revcom teleconference
    1. We could try to have D6.0 out of Ft Lauderdale
    2. Expect that the March 2016 Plenary would be light for REVmc BRC.
    3. We will see what the comment load is from the ballot closes on January 26.
  1. **Next BRC Resolution Committee meeting**
     1. Feb 22-25 in Ft. Lauderdale, SR Technologies Host
     2. W Hotel is the meeting location
     3. Close to the Ft Lauderdale airport.
     4. SR Technologies will host a social during the week.
     5. Telecon connections will also be provided
  2. **Review Doc 11-15/1274r2** – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. R2 was updated to reference the D5.0 draft.
     2. The Comment was resubmitted to the recirculation ballot.
     3. Review comment, and proposed changes.
     4. Question of PHY-RXEND.indication may be missing.
        1. Update text to include the primitive back in on page 5.
     5. Discussion for minor changes that would become r3.
     6. So when the ballot closes, a new CID number can included as the resolution for the new CID.
  3. **Review doc:11-16-117r0**, EIFS CID 5966 Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. CID 5966 from the initial Sponsor ballot
     2. Review the proposed changes
     3. Discussion on the NOTE2 statement. – suggest to review to modulation classes
        1. Will make changes offline and bring back later.
        2. Need to make sure that the Modulation statement applies to all the PHYs
     4. After review of the document, it was suggested to have a comment submitted and then the updated document can be used for the resolution to the comment.
  4. **Any other business for this time slot**
     1. Request to review doc 11-16/122r0 – Graham SMITH
        1. Would like some feedback on the submission.
     2. No objection to add to today’s agenda.
  5. **Review doc 11-16/122r0** Graham SMITH (SRT Wireless)
     1. Review comment that was submitted to the recirculation, but has not been assigned a CID.
     2. Discussion on beacon usage.
     3. Discussion on removing the “in the 2.4 GHz band” from tables.
     4. Discussion on the element being included in beacons
     5. The name “DSSS Parameter Set” may not be the best name for this parameter
     6. Duplicate frame format process discussed.
     7. Instead of deleting “in 2.4GHz”, add “at the following locations “The element is optionally present within Beacon frames generated by STAs using a different PHY.”
        1. But maybe we should not have the “using a different PHY”, but rather put a full stop after “optionally present”
     8. Thanks for the discussion
     9. The direction of the change was discussed.
     10. Update and bring back with the comment resolution after the ballot closes.
  6. **Recess at 5:25pm**

1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Atlanta, GA – 19 January 2016 – PM2 at 16:00**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 16:01
   2. **Review Patent Policy** 
      1. No issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda for this slot:11-15/1522r2**

* Presentations
  + 11-15-1530 – VHT 160MHz signaling Menzo WENTINK
  + 11-16-106, 107 Probe dwell time – Peter KHOURY
    1. Added review of 11-16/141r0 to this slot’s agenda
    2. No objection to Agenda modification. See R3
  1. **Review Doc 11-16/141r0** – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. Q: Are modes 2 and 3 really deprecated?
        1. A: Yes
     2. Q: should distance between center frequencies be > 80 MHz?
        1. A:  Yes, in practice, this is true.  Could use this instead of “>40MHz” in the table.  But it doesn’t really change anything.
  2. **Review doc 11-15/1530r3** - Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. Contains text changes for proposal related to 11-16/141r0
     2. Review proposed changes
     3. C: please don’t include abbreviation of name of the field in the field itself.
     4. C: it’s OK to use an abbreviation in formulae as long as there is a “where” clause that maps this onto the value of the field.
     5. C: – do not use abbreviations for field names, when using a field name, it should be spelled out.
     6. Question on how to determine primary frequency 80 MHz Channel?
        1. Not quite able to give the actual location in the draft, a search was actioned to be made while the discussion continued.
        2. Table 21-22 has the definition.
     7. CCF\* field or subfield should be checked to ensure that the full correct name is used.
        1. Do not use the abbreviations as titles in the columns.
     8. Table 11-24 has several ambiguous descriptions that need correcting
        1. Need to work with editor for consistency
     9. The use of deprecated needs to be consistently applied
        1. Check with Editor to help with locations/methods
     10. 80+80 MHz needs to have channel number greater than 16 (currently it shows 8).
         1. Prevents any overlapping 80 MHz channels.
         2. It is implied that the channels are non-overlapping, and this allows explicit pointing
         3. There will be second reserved portion reserved that is 9-244a will reserve between 40 and 80 MHz apart.
     11. An updated document will be prepared and posted.
     12. A motion will be considered on Thursday for the updated document (r4)
  3. **Review doc 11-16/0106r1** - Peter KHOURY (Ruckus Wireless)
     1. Initial question was if TGai was consulted as the abstract seemed similar to TGai methods
     2. Management Traffic measured with 9-10% as probe responses
     3. Description of the proposal on how to address the problem.
     4. Reference from TGai was given again to show that it was addressing the same issue described here. However, the current TGai solution is available as soon as the TGai draft is published, and getting this solution out sooner in REVmc, but the delay is minimal as TGai will publish soon after REVmc.
     5. Maybe better to show this to TGai as a discussion point.
     6. Part of TGai goals is to reduce the Probe response overhead, so we need to consider the method they are taking vs this proposal.
     7. Question what the market value of a change being done in REVmc, and whether Wi-Fi Alliance would be willing to test for the new method.
     8. Question on if the FILS work is separable, so that would be another alternative to address if this part could be used independently.
     9. There is work on testing on doing this type of method in the testing.
     10. This can be done with a single extra element to address issue.
     11. Dwell time on slide should show “MaxChannelTime”.
     12. Thanks for First time presenting to 802.11…
  4. **AOB**
     1. Nothing
  5. **Recess at 4:55pm**

1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Atlanta, GA – 20 January 2016 – PM2 at 16:00**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 16:01
   2. **Review Patent Policy** 
      1. No issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda** for this slot:11-15/1522r3

* Presentations
  + 11-15-1184r5 – OWE – Dan HARKINS
  + ARC proposed changes, see 11-15-540 – Joseph LEVY
    1. Request to add 11-15/1530 and 11-16/117 by Menzo WENTENK
    2. Request to add 11-15/828 – Peter ECCLESINE
    3. Request to review 11-16/151 instead of 11-15/540 Joe LEVY
    4. No objection to updated Agenda
  1. **Review document 11-15/1184r5** – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
     1. Presentation of document
     2. Suggestion of better to do OWE in 802.11 rather than IETF.
     3. Similar to what is described in RFC 7435
     4. Review the proposed text changes.
     5. Question – in 11u we had something that used a 911 call key …is this similar?
        1. No it is better, but the 911 scenario will be a good use of this.
     6. ANA-1 notation may cause a bit of confusion, request to use a different key next time, but the editors all agreed it is ok.
     7. Adding new features may cause a delay to the ballot cycle. Concern that the speed from now until publication is shorter than a normal feature review.
     8. Concern on how to flag when to use the protocol
     9. This protocol has been used since 1977, so it is not a new or lightly reviewed protocol
     10. Concern on the Man in the Middle attack
         1. There are tools for the PSK crackers today, so this is actually better in that it precludes some of the weakness identified there.
     11. Concern with perception of weak encryption in 802.11
         1. There is methods in 802.11 that are exploited by tools today, but that is not what foreign countries were concerned with.
     12. Doing this here is better than in IETF
         1. Yes, it could be implemented with Vendor Specific elements, it may be better to move forward now as the IETF has a group that may start in April on this solution
     13. This does not replace PSK, but it does address deployment issues.
         1. This solution may be done in IETF if we don’t do it here, and the WFA would not be a good place to do this implementation as the WFA solution would be more private.
     14. Concern on the potential delay
     15. A Class of Hotspot that this may be a very useful solution for, and this class is the largest percentage of hotspots. –
     16. Concern expressed about the Man in the Middle attack
     17. Support for the proposal as a similar implementation was done on a propriety system where it worked well.
         1. Could this be compared to a few more security methods rather than just against the open PSK like SAE?
            1. SAE is the replacement for PSK, but OWE is not the replacement of PSK.
            2. Note that the introduction is not what is planned for the draft, only the changes proposed.
     18. Does the AP or the STA determine to use this method?
         1. What is the transition plan for this method?
         2. The roll-out would mean that the STAs would eventually would all support this.
     19. The use case seems reasonable, if you need more security then Hotspot 2.0 and use of 802.1x would be the solution for that.
     20. Getting this into the draft would actually allow outside groups to move quicker to adopt this.
     21. Strawpoll: Do you support introducing OWE into the REVmc draft? (YES/NO)
         1. Yes - 9 No - 5 Abstain – 12
     22. A motion may be considered on Thursday PM1
  2. **Review doc 11-16/0151r0** Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
     1. Review document
     2. Over 1 year in preparation of the figures
     3. Doc 11-15/540r8 has the history of how we got here.
     4. Review new Figure 5-1 – new text box added.
     5. Review new Figure 5-2 - role specific box added
     6. Review role definitions: STA, AP, Mesh STA, Mesh gate,
     7. No questions
     8. Prepare a motion for Thursday for inclusion to the draft.
  3. **Review doc 11-15/1530r4** – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. Review changes from what was presented yesterday in r3 (editorial in general)
     2. Point out the minor technical change was to have the center frequencies were greater than 80 MHz apart.
     3. The table 11-24a will need to be adjusted by the editors
     4. A motion to adopt the text will be made on Thursday
  4. **Review doc 11-16/117r2** – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. Review changes to the proposal from r1
     2. There is a potential issue in 4.9 band may have an issue with the OFDM not identifying quarter clock or half clock.
     3. Review when this would not apply.
     4. In general this take care of the Short Block Ack at 24 Mbps
     5. The table is for the cases when it is necessary, it not necessary in other cases.
     6. The condition of causing an EIFS is that the STA sees the PHY header, but not a valid FCS.
     7. EIFS is there to protect a hidden node, but this is really a spurious EIFS.
  5. **Review doc 11-15/828r5** – Peter ECCLESINE (Cisco)
     1. Review of 3 comments (5972, 5970, and 5969) from sponsor ballot.
     2. DFS Guidance and channel switching
     3. Review changes proposed
     4. AP gives guidance to those STAs that are in the physical local area, but if we send this over the DS, then we have a problem with the information shared.
     5. If an STA is in a BSS, it can hear its AP or not...if not then it is not in the BSS.
     6. The DFS Guidance frame is transmitted over the DS from the beaconing STA to other STAs. The “over the DS” should be deleted.
        1. Transmitting over the DS, then you need to use element types.
        2. In the TDLS, it was STA to STA and was tunnelled over the DS.
     7. Unsure about why there is an ethertype included.
     8. If this had to go from STA to STA via an AP, then the proposed method would be valid, but as this is AP to STA, then only the Public Action frame is necessary.
     9. Need to delete Annex H and the EtherType stuff.
     10. More discussion on the point of AP and STA and the AP is the DFS owner, so the AP should be able to use the measurement action frames to talk to the STAs.
     11. The need to get the AP and the associated STAs to move – no, that is not the main goal.
     12. The only transmissions are made due to DFS owner, and other STAs are not going to TX unless authorized.
     13. We need to describe the roles and behaviours of the DFS owner and the surrounding entities.
     14. The DFS Master can send out an enabling frame.
     15. STAs when transmitting must indicate which DFS Master has enabled them to transmit
     16. While there may be a FCC KDB that describes something similar to the TGy operation, there is not a description in the standard for the 5 GHz bands.
     17. The DFS Guidance tells the associated STAs where the AP will be likely to go if it goes away. That is a major part, but a STA must passively listen to the AP for the enabling signals.
     18. The STA that is not associated, it could build a table for the APs that it has heard, but that does not seem to be the behavior we are discussing
     19. The DFS behaviour is all described in this submission as “may”, so that seems a bit confusing as the DFS seemed to be a mandatory function.
     20. The Use case is not well defined and the solution did not come across clearly.
     21. Request to go back and revise the submission
     22. Suggest to have a more real world example
     23. The concept of the ownership that is beyond the BSS needs to be described better.
     24. Public Action Frames are defined to allow AP to communicate to unassociated STAs.
     25. Encourage more conversation with Peter, and this will come back during the recirc comment discussion.
  6. **Recess 5:50pm**

1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Atlanta, GA – 21 January 2016 – PM1 at 13:30**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 13:30
   2. **Review Patent Policy** 
      1. No issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda for this slot:11-15/1522r4**

* Motions – minutes, 11-15/1530, 11-16/117, 11-15/1184, 11-16/151
* Presentations
  + 11-16/173r1
* Plans for Jan – March
* Schedule
* AOB,
* Adjourn
  + 1. Agenda was approved without objection
  1. **Motion #A1: Previous Minutes**
     1. Approve prior meeting minutes

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1502-01-000m-revmc-brc-minutes-for-f2f-dec-ieee-sa-hosted-piscataway.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1492-00-000m-revmc-brc-minutes-30-nov-2015.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1477-00-000m-revmc-brc-telecon-minutes-nov-20.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1216-00-000m-revmc-brc-minutes-for-november-dallas.docx>

* + 1. No matters arising from minutes or discussion on minutes.
    2. **Approved without objection - Motion Passes**
  1. **Motion #188** **160MHz signalling**
     1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-15/1530r4 into the TGmc draft.
     2. Moved: Menzo WENTINK 2nd Edward AU
     3. No discussion
     4. **Result: 18-0-1 Motion Passes**
  2. **Motion #189 – EIFS**
     1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/117r3 into the TGmc draft.
     2. Moved: Menzo WENTINK 2nd: Michael MONTEMURRO
     3. No discussion
     4. **Result: 14-0-4 Motion Passes**
  3. **Motion #190 – OWE**
     1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-15/1184r5 into the TGmc draft.
     2. Moved: Jouni MALIEN 2nd: Guido HIERTZ
     3. Discussion:
        1. Speaking against the motion, Concern on security, concern on amount of review, Concern on location of how a feature like this is incorporated.
        2. Speaking for the motion: this is a small change with a clear benefit, and this is the correct place to be incorporated to allow for control by 802.11
        3. Speaking for the motion: the concerns identified yesterday were addressed. The deployment should be similar to open, but it is secure.
        4. Speaking for the motion: there is a market need, and this is a good way to work with the Wi-Fi to meet the described needs
     4. **Result: 10-7-5 Motion fails (lack of 75%)**
  4. **Motion #191 – ARC changes Clause 5**
     1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/151r0 into the TGmc draft.
     2. Moved: David KLOPER 2nd: Jon ROSDAHL
     3. No Discussion
     4. **Results: 15-0-4 Motion Passes**
  5. **Motion #192 – ACK & DSS Parameter Set**
     1. Move to incorporate the text changes /n 11-15/1274r3 and 11-16/122r1 into the TGmc draft.
     2. Moved Graham SMITH 2nd: Edward AU
     3. No Discussion
     4. **Results: 19-0-4 Motion Passes**
  6. **Review doc 11-16/173r1 Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)**
     1. This document tries to resolve a comment that has been put into the open Recirculation Ballot.
     2. The changes incorporated into R1 was to change some “the” to “this” and other minor editorials.
     3. Review proposed changes
     4. Concern in 12.7.6.3.4 that the paragraph may need to be changed to a bulleted list.
     5. Message 2 description - On page 3, change “or an association”…to “and this Message 2 is not part of an association ….”
     6. In the Message 3 area there is a “Message 2” that needs to be changed to 3.
     7. In 12.7.6.4 a), there is a a sentence that needed to be corrected –
     8. Question on “FT protocol” usage –
        1. This is is talking about the successful completion of the FT protocol
     9. In 12.7.6.4 a)- Add “and verifies that” after “Message 2 and”
     10. As there were some live edits, an R2 shall be created and posted.
  7. **Motion #193 – Doc 11-16/173r2**
     1. Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/173r2 into the REVmc draft.
     2. Moved: Jouni MALINEN 2nd: Michael MONTEMURRO
     3. Discussion:
        1. The saved file has the header still showing the change in header, but that is none material.
        2. Question on where the key changes were made.
           1. See 12.7.6.4 a)
        3. Can the editor just change the bulleted list as an editor instruction?
           1. May be that we get two comments one to add, and one to edit.
        4. Remember that these will be incorporated into D5.1 which will be after D5.0 that is out for ballot now.
     4. **Results: 14-0-4 Motion Passes**
  8. **Discussion on plans for January to March 2016**
     1. Proposed Telecons: Feb 5th and 19th
     2. Face to Face BRC – Feb 22-25 in Ft. Lauderdale, SR Technologies hosting
     3. Review Plan of Record:
* **December 2015/Jan 2016 Initial SB recirculation**
* **Feb 2016 BRC Ft. Lauderdale meeting planned**
* **July 2016 – WG/EC Final Approval**
* **September 2016 – RevCom/SASB Approval**
  + - 1. Discussion on possible options.
* **Initial Sponsor Ballot 2015-03-27 through 2015-04-26 on D4.0**
* **Jan 11-26 2016 Initial SB recirculation D5.0**
  + Teleconferences, Feb 22-25 2016 BRC Ft. Lauderdale meeting
  + 2nd recirculation on D6.0: March 2016
* **April/May 2016**
  + Comment resolution
  + 3rd recirculation April/May 2016 D6.0 unchanged or D7.0
  + 4th recirculation D7.0 unchanged if needed May/June 2016
  + Revcom Submission date: 20 May 2016 for June 28-30 Revcom
  + EC telecon approval June 2016
* **July 2016 – WG/EC Final Approval (if not in June 2016)**
* **September 2016 – RevCom/SASB Approval (if not June 2016)**
  + Revcom Submission date: 05 Aug 2016 for Sept 16 Revcom teleconference
    1. Ballot Status – 158 comments have been submitted to date.
    2. Will request D5 to be put in the IEEE Store.
  1. Thanks to all that participated – look forward to more help in completing the balloting process.
  2. Adjourned 2:30pm
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1477-00-000m-revmc-brc-telecon-minutes-nov-20.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1216-00-000m-revmc-brc-minutes-for-november-dallas.docx>

Submissions:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0173-01-000m-ft-4-way-handshake.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0173-02-000m-ft-4-way-handshake.docx>

Motion on files:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1530-04-000m-vht160-operation-signaling-through-non-zero-ccfs1.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0117-03-000m-eifs-comment.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1184-05-000m-owe.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0151-00-0arc-proposed-updates-for-revmc-to-5-1-5.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1274-03-000m-resolutions-cids-5422-5423.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0122-01-000m-resolution-for-d5-comment-on-dsss-parameter-set.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0173-02-000m-ft-4-way-handshake.docx>