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Abstract

Minutes for REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 22-25, 2016

**The agenda for this week is:**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

The Meeting was hosted by SR Technologies at the W Hotel in Fort Lauderdale, Florida

1. REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 22, 2016
   1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. Review Patent Policy
      1. No items identified.
   3. Attendance:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Osama ABOULMAGD (Huawei); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell); Lei Wang (Marvell);
   4. **Review Agenda**: 11-16/277r2

**The agenda for this week is:**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution (see below)

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

**Agenda for 22 Feb Monday**

**AM1 9-noon** -   
Graham Smith (90 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx> (7278, 7280, 7281, 7282, 7287, 7382, 7397, 7292)
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-00-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0269-00-000m-resolution-cid-7089-d5.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0268-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-7090-d5.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

Mark Rison (90 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
   * 1. Changes documented in 11-277r2
     2. Tues pm2 Social
     3. Review full week’s plan on submission
     4. Review submission list for March that was known at this time.
     5. Plan to assign unassigned CIDs on Wednesday PM1
     6. Request for Stephen MCCANN for Tuesday AM1, and reorder to Stephen MCCANN, Mark RISON and then Graham SMITH.
   1. **Editor Report**: 11-13/95r28 Adrian STEPHENS
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-28-000m-editor-reports.pptx>
      2. Review slide 5-9
      3. Editorial comment breakdown reviewed (slide 9)
      4. Editorial Comment Process – 205/231 comments have resolution edited as well as resolution – most are ACCEPT class.
      5. Slide 11 – Prediction on process time
      6. **Review doc:**: 11-16/237r2 - Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
      7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx> (7278, 7280, 7281, 7282, 7287, 7382, 7397, 7292)
         1. CID 7382 (MAC) 11-16/237r2
            1. Review comment
            2. Review discussion
            3. Proposed Resolution: REJECT; The cited NOTE does not contradict the cited text. The NOTE refers to the immediate data response which cannot be a duplicate, whereas the cited text refers to duplicate frame.
            4. Discuss normative behavior using PS-Poll

PS-Poll cannot be an HT duplicate is one example

* + - * 1. No Objection for the Reject reason at this time.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion
      1. CID 7397 (MAC) 11-16/237r2
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review discussion
         3. There is a possible issue in the DMG case. Need to review that case in the future.
         4. Deleting the note is not directly related to DMG
         5. There is a possible contradiction with DMG, since 0 is stated in the tables to be not used with DMG STAs, but if the field is reserved it’s set to 0
         6. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-22 14:47:35Z)
         7. ACTION ITEM #1: Graham SMITH to send information to Carlos CORDEIRO to get review for DMG condition.
         8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. CID 7292 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Discussion
         3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPT - Note to Editor: Globally replace “SupportedRate” with “OperationalRatesSet” (14 instances)
         4. This should not be a global change, as there are some locations where the AP is generating the request, it should not be changed.
         5. Change to Revised, and list the specific locations and changes.
         6. ACTION ITEM #2: Mark RISON – to make a list and give to Graham. Mark R and Graham to work on detailing the specific changes.

List given in Chat Window from Mark RISON: 176.61, 177.36, 190.1, 190.50, 246.34, 246.60, 247.39, 247.58, 248.41, 249.3 (10 instances)

* + - * 1. Review the list later and the updated resolution.
      1. The remaining CIDs have some more review.
  1. **Review doc:** 11-16/228r1 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-01-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx>
     2. R0 was discussed on Feb 5th Telecom
     3. Graham had the action to update the document and bring back.
     4. CIDs 7087, 7088 (both MAC):
        1. Review updated discussion
        2. The backoff timer decrements in aSlotTime increments
        3. The question on the use of the word “suspend” If the medium goes busy during a slot, then it suspends, and then decrement by aSlotTime.
        4. Discussion on how the backoff timer is decremented and what units
        5. This is THE BACKOFF procedure, and we need to ensure we do not make any mistakes in making any corrections.
        6. The diagram does not show medium busy after the slot boundary is determined.
        7. The text and the diagram do not seem to align
        8. More discussion on the understanding of how the backoff is aligned to slot boundaries.
        9. Need to have a new diagram to show what the problem is.
     5. Need some offline discussion to complete.
  2. **Review doc:** 11-16/269 – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0269-00-000m-resolution-cid-7089-d5.docx>
     2. CID 7089 (MAC) 11-16/269r0
        1. Review updated discussion
        2. Discussion on the updated changes, and editorial suggestions
        3. We have determined that a change to the paragraph may be needed, but we do not have the wording to where we are ready to accept.
        4. ACTION ITEM #3: Mark HAMILTON to work with Mark RISON and Graham SMITH to revise the proposed wording.
  3. **Review doc:**: 11-16/268r0 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0268-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-7090-d5.docx>
     2. CID 7090 (MAC)
        1. Review comment – same as CID 5144 from previous ballot.
        2. Review discussion
        3. See Figure 9-1
     3. Need more time to **Review docu**ment prior to presentation again
  4. **Recess** for 8 minutes
  5. **Review doc:**: 11-16/276r0 – Mark RISON
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
     2. CID 7177 (MAC) –
        1. Review comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. Review Proposed Changes
        4. Question on use of “prefers”
        5. Should we socialize this before accepting – yes
     3. CID 7379 (MAC) 11-16/276r1
        1. Review comment
        2. Review proposed change
        3. Review context
        4. Discussion on if this should be a should or shall?
        5. We had a “can” there before, so “should” should be correct.
        6. The phrase that indicates the use of the table should not be deleted, but rather move to the first sentence.
        7. Discussion “by ‘xxxing’ the appropriate value in the FTM Format and Bandwidth field”…this phrase was the one moved, but then the discussion on if the ‘xxxing’ should be “indicating”, “transmitting” or something else. – “choosing” which was there is not a good choice.
        8. Swap to be “indicate in the FTM Format and Bandwidth field whether it uses a single or two separate RF LOs”
        9. Signaling of LO discussion
        10. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 16:11:19Z): Make changes as indicated in 11-16/0276r1 for CID 7379. This rewords the sentences of this paragraph, consistent with the commenter's proposal.
        11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. Return to CID 7177 (MAC) 11-16/
        1. Discussion on the use of the new feature.
        2. Do we see a value in this feature?
        3. There seems to be possible 2 bit requirement – 1 for capability and 1 for implementation, but if it is a “should” then we only need one bit.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 16:17:10Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> ), for CID 7177. These changes implement the new feature to support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC.
        5. [9:19:06 AM] Mark Hamilton: CID 7396 (MAC):
        6. ACTION Item #4: Mark RISON to send the resolution to the reflector highlighting the feature for discussion and disclosure.
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 7396 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review proposed changes
        3. A Unicast Frame to an AP that is not ack’d is correct, but seems not as intuitive.
        4. This really a “ToDS” field setting that is specific, and can be used to reduce the long list of when an ACK is or is not sent.
        5. We could just say that if the RA is not yours, then don’t ACK…..
        6. This could be another way to indicate a malformed packet
        7. The draft text seems to have the ToDS Set and the proposed text is reversed and that is causing the concern.
        8. Discussion on keeping the reference that was questioned…keep the reference, but need to put it in context.
        9. Consider some more, be careful to not "close the holes in the existing text" and potentially create non-conformance for existing implementations.
     6. CID 7399 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion and context
        3. Discussion on the “LLC Header Strip/Add” process
        4. Question on implementation of this feature?
           1. Not sure it could be implemented with how it is currently specified.
        5. The comment may not be correct to the implication of the correction thought to be be made.
        6. This comment was assigned to Mark RISON
        7. ACTION ITEM #5: Adrian to send request to Carlos CORDEIRO for more information (cc Mark RISON).
        8. This will need to come back later
        9. CID 7399 AdHoc Notes: MAC: 2016-02-22 16:49:09Z - Disagreement in the BRC about what No-LLC means. Mark R will attempt to sort this out with Carlos C, and bring back.
     7. CID 7477 (MAC) 11-16/276r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion and proposed changes
        3. Question on if the 3 parameters are used in other places in the draft.
           1. One of the 3 (aTxPHYDelay) is used in other places in the draft.
        4. Changing the duplicate text at 534.32 to a reference was thought to be better.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 16:55:48Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx) for CID (7477). These move the equation for aRxTxTurnaroundTime to clause 10, and reference it in the table in 6.5.4.2.
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     8. CID 7478 (MAC) 11-16/276r1
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion and proposed change
        3. Discussion on the PS mode
           1. Is there a discrepancy between what is meant, and what it says?
           2. We need to be careful not to make existing STA non-compliant.
  6. **Recessed** at 12:00

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 22, 2016 – 1:36pm**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Lei Wang (Marvell); Emily Qi (Intel)
   4. **Review Agenda**: 11-16/277r2
      1. We will go into the break to make up for having a late start.
      2. Start with Adrian
   5. **Review doc:**11-16/230r1 - Editorial CIDs: Adrian Stephens (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-01-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-1.doc>
      2. CID 7144 (Editor)
         1. Assignee is Emily Qi
         2. Will discuss later
      3. CID 7230 (Editor) – 11-16/230r2
         1. Review comment
         2. See CID 6568 for possible reason for this CID
         3. Review some of the changes being suggested
         4. The dot11xxxProbeDelay should be checked to ensure consistency.
         5. The Directly correlated to a scan, then they may need to be a ProbeDelay, but the others are more for syncing the NAV.
         6. Discuss when ProbeDelay vs Scan should be used.
         7. 1619.15 – NAV sync usage, but it has the dot11RMMeasurementProbeDelay, which is counter to the definition of the MIB variable.
         8. The Editor has scanned the potential changes, and believes he has correctly identified the locations of the changes.
         9. Discussion on potential issues of just accepting
         10. There was a change in the last ballot that changed some variables that now have a new CID that is trying to make a change to make things consistent in the MIB. This is essentially MIB changes to previously agreed changes.
         11. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         12. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
         13. Doc 11-16/230r2 shows the effect of the comment.
      4. CID 7265 (Editor) – from database
         1. Review comment
         2. Review context
         3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-02-22) - Change the two paras to just "The Organization Identifier field identifies (see 9.4.1.32 (Organization Identifier field)) the entity that has defined the content of the particular Vendor Specific element. See 9.4.1.32 (Organization Identifier field) for the definition of j in Figure 9-257." In the figure, change "n-j" to "variable" and delete "(see 9.4.1.32 (Organization Identifier field))"
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 7266 (Editor) – from database
         1. Review comment
         2. Review context
         3. Similar to CID 7265..
         4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-02-22) - Change the three paras (lines 1 to 9) to just "The Organization Identifier field identifies (see 9.4.1.32 (Organization Identifier field)) the entity that has defined the content of the particular Vendor Specific RLQP-element. See 9.4.1.32 (Organization Identifier field) for the definition of j in Figure 9-628." In the figure change "n-j" to "variable"
         5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      6. CID 7268 (Editor) – from database
         1. Review Comment
         2. Looking for how consistent we are using PHY-SAP vs PHY SAP or MAC-SAP vs MAC\_SAP vs MAC SAP….
         3. We may want to look at how to make this consistent.
         4. The Editor is to go look at what changes should be made.
         5. As this is an editorial comment, the Editor can just address it.
         6. No Objection making a change, but concern on the scope of the work
         7. Proposal in order to be similar to 802 O&A: all occurrences of X-SAP, X SAP and X\_SAP to become X SAP.
            1. The main body of the O&A used spaces.
            2. Make them “non-Breaking spaces”
      7. CID 7392 (Editor) 11-16/230
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review proposed changes
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.; Change “Peer Key” to “PeerKey” at 61.24, 61.25, 80.54, 2030.41, 2834.06

Change “TDLS Peer Key” to “TPK” at 2030.48.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7685 (Editor)
       1. Review comment
       2. Make similar to the TXVECTOR changed in CID 7686
    2. CID 7744 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Terms used in 802.1, we should use their terms. If they are locally defined terms, we should use lower case except if used as proper nouns in the case of fields, frames etc.
       3. Question on how 802.1 uses this term…it is upper case in 802.1x.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-02-22 19:25:24Z) - Terms adopted from other standards are used with the capitalization in those other standards. These terms come from IEEE Std 802.1X-2010.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7804 (Editor)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed changes (64 instances)
       3. Discussion on what the changes would mean
       4. Discussion on if there is an “association” inferred in the name.
       5. Mark this Submission Required – Assign to Mark RISON
  1. **Review doc:** 11-16/230r1 – Adrian STEPHENS
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-01-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-1.doc>
     2. Review a list of CIDs that may need more discussion – changes and updates to be captured in 11-16/230r2
     3. CID 7162 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
        1. Review Comment
        2. See also CID 7163
        3. Doc 11-16/287r1 (Stephen MCCANN) is on the server, and we note his proposed resolution was reviewed
        4. The resolution seemed to provide a superset of the needed changes.
        5. Concern with the capitalization of the last 3 proposed changes.
        6. The Query List should be “Query List ANQP-element”
        7. The Query List procedure should be “query list procedures”
        8. Copy the proposed resolution from 11-16/287r1 and make the corrections and post into the resolution for CID 7162 in doc 11-16/230r2.
        9. Also change heading of 11.15.3.2.2 from “Query List Procedure” to “Query list procedure”
        10. Proposed resolution for both CID 7162 (Editor) and 7163 (MAC):

Proposed Resolution for both CID 7162 (EDITOR) and CID 7163 (MAC):

REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 19:46:43Z):

Change the following occurrences of “ANQP query” to “ANQP request”: 977.13. 1810.50, 1819.27

Change the following occurrences of “ANQP query request” to “ANQP request”: 1081.48, 1808.46, 1808.48, 1808.49, 1813.26, 1813.43 (x2), 1813.46

Change the following occurrences of “ANQP query response” to “ANQP response”: 1081.49, 1081.51, 1808.54, 1808.59, 1813.29, 1813.47

Change the following occurrences of “ANQP Query” to “ANQP request”: 1808.41, 1811.8

At 1808.54 change “ANQP query request’s Query List ANQP-element” to “Query List ANQP-element response”

At 1811.21 change “ANQP Query List procedures” to “query list procedure”

At 1808.48 change “ANQP Query List” to “Query List ANQP-element”

Change heading of 11.25.3.2.2 from “Query List procedure” to “Query list procedure”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID7630 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed changes
       3. Update the proposed change instruction to be clear
       4. Proposed resolution: Revised.

At 857.50: delete “A value of 0 for the Filter Offsetindicates that the Filter Value subfield is to be compared to the first octet of the payload prior to encryption following the MAC header.”

At 1842.49 change: “an empty payload” to “no requested or provided elements”.

Change “payload” to "Frame Body field" at 578.55, 578.56, 578.58,

1307.34, 1752.34, 1755.58, 1946.31, 1950.1, 1956.20, 1958.26

Change “payload” to "information" at 1020.37, 1037.51

Delete “payload” at 1806.44, 1806.47, 1934.56

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7605 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Prior Straw Poll conducted last Friday.
       3. Updated here with resolution:
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change “FTM Format and Bandwidth” to “Format and Bandwidth” globally.

This ensure consistency of terminology between fields in this structure.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. Review Editor Reject CIDs:
    2. CID 7757 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context
       3. Discussion on if redundant text identified seems clear to be deleted.
       4. Straw Poll:
          1. Accept or Reject the Comment?

A: Accept – Duplicate – should delete

B: Reject – Do not delete

C: Abstain

* + - 1. Results: A-1 B-0 C-5
      2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
    1. CID 7531 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       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 7547 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The statement is correct. There are many other instances of “unsigned integer” in this context in the standard, so there is no incentive to change this one.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7546 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The cited statement is correct.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready of Motion
    4. CID 7094 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The term “expected” is reasonable in the context of estimating or predicting throughput.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 7513 (Editor) 11-16/230r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The DSE term is used in many contexts as an adjective. Introducing DSD for just one of these would create confusion.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    6. Request **Review doc:** 11-16/230r2
  1. **Recess** at 3:30pm. (for 15 minutes)

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 22, 2016 – 3:45pm**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell); Emily Qi (Intel)
   4. **Review Agenda**: 11-16/277r3
      1. Review PM2 plan
   5. **Review doc:** 11-16/284r0 Emily QI (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0284-00-000m-sb1-proposed-resolutions-for-trivial-technical-comments.doc>
      2. CID 7713 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
         1. Review comment
         2. Review discussion
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1256.61, 1401.2, 2956.47, and 3409.12: change “No Acknowledgement” to “No Acknowledgment”. At 339.42: change “no acknowledgement” to “no acknowledgment”. At 1255.39(2 instances), 1255.48, 1255.52: change “set to No Acknowledgment” to “set to No Ack”
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 7281, 7282, 7287 (Editor)
         1. CIDs 7281 - 7290 are all EDITOR. Graham is doing them all. (Well, pending this discussion with Emily.)
         2. Emily would like to keep these three separate.
         3. All have been included in Graham SMITH’s proposal and they are similar to CIDs 7280-7290
      4. CID 7283, 7284, 7285, 7286, 7288, 7289, 7290 (Editor)
         1. Review issue
         2. Concern that by adding “1-125” in the BSSMembershipSelectorSet would not be scalable. Would you have to change the description also?
         3. ACTION ITEM #5: Graham SMITH to work with Emily and Mark RISON on filling out the full changes to this set of CIDs.
         4. The OperationalSet and the Basic Rate Set need to be considered separately.
      5. CID 7054 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      6. CID 7554 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Proposed Change
         3. Proposed Resolution Accept:
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      7. CID 7258 (Editor) 11-16/284r1
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review context
         3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The “ChannelAvailabilityQuery” included in the Channel Availability Query frame is a set of fields, not elements. “A set of information fields” is correct. No change needed.
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      8. CID 7646 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
         1. Review comment
         2. Similar to CID 7645, so we may have discussed this enough
         3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPT
      9. CID 7308 (Editor) – 7309 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
         1. Review comment
         2. Discussion on the types of element-specify information element.
         3. Similar to CID 7309
         4. 3 elements use most of the instances
         5. Proposed Resolution: Accept for Both – CID 7308 and 7309
         6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
         7. Will revisit if some other error is detected.
      10. CID 7096 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1420.49, remove: "A VHT STA shall set the HT Capabilities element HT Capability Information field L-SIG TXOP Protection Support subfield to 0 during (re)association." At 1417.64, add a para: "A VHT STA shall set the HT Capabilities element HT Capability Information field L-SIG TXOP Protection Support subfield to 0 during (re)association."
          3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      11. CID 7491 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Review context -
          3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Throughout the draft, change “NAV timer” to “NAV”, and change “NAV timers” to “NAVs”.
          4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      12. CID 7144 (Editor) 11-16/284r1
          1. Review Comment
          2. The first instance seemed correct to change from “can” to “may”, but the 2nd instance is not truly a grant of permission. We could delete the sentence and not lose anything. “Can” is stronger than “might”.
          3. Discussion on the use of “can” in the second sentence.
          4. Have we described how to use the REDs procedure?
          5. Change “can include” to “include” at 1552.16
          6. Proposed Resolution: Revised; at 1552.16, change “ can include” to “includes” and at 1552.35, Change “can” to “might”
          7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      13. CID 7098 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Discussion on the use of the reference
          3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 1598.12: Delete: “(see Table 11-2 (Power management modes))”.
          4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      14. CID 7100 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1704.46, change "Receiving a neighbor report" to “Responding to a neighbor report request".
          3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      15. CID 7124 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1705.40, delete: “(i.e., in this case the Neighbor Report Response frame contains zero or more Neighbor Report elements)"
          3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      16. CID 7129 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
          3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      17. CID 7108 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Discuss if TGaf had used 22.6 or not.
          3. Proposed resolution: Revised at 2621.31 change: “All TVHT transmissions in one BCU shall use the VHT PHY parameters for 40 MHz channel defined in 21.3 (VHT PHY), 21.4 (VHT PLME), and 21.5 (Parameters for VHT-MCSs)~~, and 22.6~~  with a sampling clock change to fit into each of the BCU bandwidths and with the number of encoders (NES) always being 1 (for SU-MIMO and per user in MU-MIMO).
          4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      18. CID 7126 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Agree with proposed change
          3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; In Annex C, change all “dot11ChannelUtilizationBeaconInterval” to “dot11ChannelUtilizationBeaconIntervals”, 5 instances.
          4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      19. CID 7130 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; at 3581.22 Change “Definition: in” to “In” – No consensus to move the paragraph.
          3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      20. CID 7103 (Editor) 11-16/284r0
          1. Review Comment
          2. Mark Submission Required – Assign to Adrian STEPHENS
   6. **Review doc:** 11-16/285r0 Emily QI (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0285-00-000m-sb1-proposed-resolutions-for-cids-7188-7614-7588.doc>
      2. CID 7188 (MAC) 11-16/285r0
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 22:23:56Z): At 715.10, delete: "(Setting of the Channel Width subfield and Dynamic Extended NSS BW subfield at a VHT STA transmitting the Operating Mode field)"
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 7614 (MAC) 11-16/285r1
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Proposed change:

Revised.

At 948.25, delete: “The Current Count field is reserved when the FMS Counter field is included in the FMS Status subelement."

At 951.51, make following changes:

|  |
| --- |
| The format of the FMS Counter field is shown in Figure 9-408 (FMS Counter format). The FMS Counter ID field of the FMS Counter field is defined in 9.4.2.75. The Current Count field of the FMS Counter field is reserved in the FMS Status subelement.  The Rate Identification field specifies the data rate as described in 9.4.1.33 (Rate Identification field) to be used for the multicast service. If the value of the Rate Identification field is 0 then the data rate is undefined. |

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 22:26:05Z): Make the changes indicated in 11-16/0285r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0285-01-000m-sb1-proposed-resolutions-for-cids-7188-7614-7588.doc) for CID 7614.
      2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7588 (MAC) 11-16/285r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Implement the 2nd option as proposed by Commenter
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-22 22:30:31Z): Make the changes indicated in 11-16/0285r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0285-01-000m-sb1-proposed-resolutions-for-cids-7188-7614-7588.doc) for CID 7588. These changes reflect the second option the commenter suggested.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. Review Tomorrow’s Plan
     1. See document 11-16-277r3 – Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
        1. AM1: Stephen MCCANN (11-16/287r1), Mark RISON (11-16/276), Graham SMITH (11-16/278)
        2. PM1: Adrian STEPHENS (11-16/260r1)
     2. Start at 9am tomorrow.
  2. Remember to review Adrian’s doc 11-16/230r2
  3. **Recess** at 5:39pm

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Tuesday, February 23, 2016 – 9:05am**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Osama ABOULMAGD (Huawei); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell);
   4. **Review Agenda:** 11-16/277r3
      1. Review Plan for today:

**23 Feb Tuesday  
AM1 9-noon -**   
Mark Rison CIDs (90 mins)

1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx

Graham Smith (90 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

**PM1 1-3pm -**   
Adrian Stephens (120 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>

**PM2 3:30-5:30pm -**Social

* + 1. Stephen MCCANN will not be joining as he was happy with the resolutions from yesterday regarding his submission.
    2. No Objection to the plan – post in R4.
  1. **Review doc:** 11-16/276r1 Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
     2. CID 7396 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review proposed changes
        3. Discussion on Group Address – DA and RA usage
        4. Question on why a “non-AP STA” would not send Ack or BlockAck in response to a group addressed frame.
        5. Discussion of the “of a type” which is the lower case type not Upper Case Type.
           1. 3 instances where “of a type” that could be deleted.
        6. Question on MeshGates and the change at 568.41. Still open question.
        7. Action ITEM #6: Mark HAMILTON – Review the open question and will revisit on Wednesday.
        8. Return to this submission on Wednesday
     3. CID 7478 (MAC) 11-16/276r1
        1. Review minutes from yesterday to restart discussion on this CID.
        2. Change at 1574.36 – start a new paragraph
        3. Discussion on meaning of “suspended for the duration of the PS mode”?
           1. The sentence may need to be expanded to have more detail on what it means to be suspended.
           2. The only MSDU may be responded to the PS-Poll frame.
           3. There was more discussion on what the meaning of suspended means.
     4. CID 7595 (Editor), 7596 (MAC), 7597 (MAC) 11-16/276r2
        1. Review comments
        2. Review proposed changes
        3. The Proposed resolution was updated to include all 3 CIDs in the resolution description.
        4. Need to make change to keep “the value of measurement not available” in the text.
           1. Need to reword the change to accommodate that suggestion.
        5. The Probe request has now been covered, but the Probe response will need to be followed-up on with a different comment.
        6. We need to be sure to stay focused on the scope of the changes.
        7. Proposed Resolution for 7595: REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 7595 in 11-16/276r2 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>, which instead delete the other two paras.
        8. Proposed Resolution: for 7596 and 7597: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 15:01:06Z): Make the changes shown for CIDs 7595, 7596, and 7597 in 11-16/0276 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>,, which effect the requested changes.
        9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 7603 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on the proposed change
        3. ACTION #7: Mark RISON - check on if a STA is able to use FTM modes when the BSS does not support a particular mode when communicating directly between STAs.
        4. Mark will consider the direct communication case, and bring back.
     6. CID 7500 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on the coverage class and the usage of units. 300m is one microsecond.
           1. Waiting 9 microseconds is 900m area of a BSS.
           2. Less than 3 microseconds should not be used.
           3. We do not need to change anything
           4. aSlotTime includes aAirPropagationTime which includes the distance covered by the BSS, and so the time chose may not be as useful.
           5. The Error Term accumulates the error in drift.
           6. The propagation time is if a STA starts to transmit and another STA can hear start to hear those initial bits.
           7. Disagreement of where the definition of aSlotTime is given …in Table 15-5 or in Table 8-78 or equation.
        3. No support for this potential proposed change, the Commenter will go check with some others to look for support for potential change in the future.
     7. CID 7796 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Difference in the TC – Traffic classifier (bits on the air) and an UP – User Priority
           1. Mapping the UP to a TC is done at the MAC-SAP, and then on the receive side takes a TC and maps to the UP.
           2. Comment added to submission: “UP notionally carried across MAC-MAC Transport; UP can be mapped to TC either directly or via classifier; ditto on receive. UP carried across SAP, TC is internal mechanism used to achieve this.”
        4. Mark will consider the direct communication case, and bring back.
     8. CID 7202 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review change
        3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 15:34:05Z): At 1768.30 change "Within a burst instance, consecutive Fine Timing Measurement frames shall be spaced at least Min Delta FTM apart." to "Consecutive Fine Timing Measurement frames to a given peer STA shall be spaced at least Min Delta FTM apart."
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     9. Start at CID 7468 when we return to Submission
  2. **Recess** at 10:38 – 10:55am
  3. **Review doc:** 11-16/278r1 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>
     2. CID 7344 (MAC) 11-16-278r2
        1. Review comment
        2. Issue with the deletion proposed.
        3. Need to add “function” to make the acronym complete if we keep.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 16:03:45Z): At 1612.58, add "function" before "(TSF)".
        5. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7389 (MAC) 11-16-278r2
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. Review how change was proposed
        4. The field in the frame being ignored in some cases and using a local MIB variable instead seems odd and would seem to potentially cause problems.
        5. Discussion on how the GAS\_QUERY\_RESPONSE\_TOO\_LARGE is caused, and where the frame is sent from where to where?
        6. The Query response limit is per advertisement ID
        7. The table is Entry per protocol.
        8. For each Advertisement ID query, there is a limit, effectively the buffer size for this advertisement service. The Querying STA tells the limit. We have to include how the information is indexed to get the right information. It is not a single MIB entry.
        9. Limits as noted, but further limits to what the STA requested.
        10. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 16:40:10Z); at P1805.16, Replace

“If the query response is larger than the configured Query Response Length Limit,”

with

“If the query response received from the Advertisement Server is larger than dot11GASQueryResponseLengthLimit for the matching dot11GASAdvertisementID or is larger than the value of the Query Response Length Limit received from the requesting STA…”

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
      2. ACTION ITEM #8: Graham SMITH to send an email to Stephen MCCANN to review and to provide feedback from GAS interested community.
    1. CID 7431 (MAC) 11-16/278r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review specific changes : Replace “if RSNA establishment is required” With “if dot11RSNAActivated is true” AND Globally Replace “dot11RSNAEnabled” with “dot11RSNAActivated” (16 places)
       3. Discussion on if the MIB variables are the point of the sentences, or is it the generic issue of is this feature required from a decision point of view.
       4. Device capabilities, Advertised capabilities, Policy for both the STA and The AP, etc.
       5. There is consensus on the trivial change to fix the variable name, but more discussion and research needed on the details of the RSN description. – how should “if RSNA establishment is required” be expanded or defined by who, or just leave as is.
          1. RSNA is necessary, but not sufficient.
          2. IF the STA and the AP do not require RSNA then going to state 4 would be ok, but if the AP requires RSNA, then the STA should not go to state 4.
       6. Discussion on how the association is initiated, or how it is determined to be required or not.
       7. See page 635 for the reassociated case.
       8. If we use the broader statement, we allow for the broad case, and not restrict the usage unnecessarily.
       9. Proposed Resolution Option B: REJECT; The Proposed change is over constraining because the decision to use RSNA should also take into account a peer’s capabilities as well as the local policy.
       10. Revisit the context in the draft.
           1. Goto 1623.25 – review steps
           2. Goto 1969.29 – review steps for RSNA selection
           3. The AP is either in the RSN or not. If the MIB variable is set, then the AP only allows STAs with RSN
       11. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 17:29:57Z): At the following locations: 1623.53, 1623.61, 1626.10, 1626.64, 1627.63, 1630.9, replace:

"State 3 if RSNA establishment is required"

with

", if dot11RSNAActivated is true, State 3"

AND

globally replace "dot11RSNAEnabled" with "dot11RSNAActivated" (16 places)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7443 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: accept
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 7473 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed resolution: REJECT - At P1400.43 it is stated that “A DMG STA shall not use HT-delayed block ack.”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7589 (MAC)
       1. Mark Submission Required – Assign to Mark RISON
    4. CID 7592 (MAC)
       1. Start here when we return to submission.
  1. **Recess** at 12:33pm

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 23, 2016 – 1:05pm**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell);
   4. **Review doc:** 11-16/260r0 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>
      2. Start of Mark H notes while Jon was late to join.
      3. CID 7146 (MAC):
         1. Mark H agrees to be the assignee
      4. CID 7046 (MAC):
         1. Adrian found the normative statement to match this, at 1367.35.
         2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At cited location change “and a STA may respond with any frame” to “and a STA can respond with any frame (see 10.22.3.5.1).”
         3. No objection. Ready for motion.
      5. CID 7049 (MAC):
         1. No normative statement found to support this. We can add one.
         2. Accomplish that by deleting the sentence at the cited location, and moving (effectively) to clause 10.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 579.29, delete “. If a QoS Data frame is fragmented, the queue size value may remain constant in all fragments even if the amount of queued traffic changes as successive fragments are transmitted”.

At 1367.64 before “In order to inform” insert a new sentence: “The queue size value may remain constant in all QoS Data frames that carry fragments of the same MSDU even if the amount of queued traffic changes as successive fragments are transmitted.”

* + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
    1. CID 7074 (MAC):
       1. Adrian requests to delay this one, he is talked to Ganesh about it.
    2. CID 7075 (MAC):
       1. Generating a Probe Request is spread out through about 5 places in the Standard, making it hard to find a place to move this.
       2. Straw Poll: Should we:

A: Deleted the cited text

2: Move the cited text to a new subclause in Clause 11.

G: Something else.

* + - 1. We’ve discussed this before (CID 3355), and agreed that this had to be a “should”. Some do not want to delete it. But, since we don’t want to define behavior in clause 9, it would need to be moved – although this case is borderline.
      2. Suggest 11.1.4.3.4A (a new subclause) as a new location. Don’t we need to say more than just one sentence about what a Probe Request \_doesn’t\_ include, to have a new subclause? Maybe add this as a NOTE, somewhere.
      3. Argument in favor of “A”: This is just a “dumb thing to do”, and not really a problem, so just delete it.
      4. Suggestion to add “IV – make it a NOTE somehow” (probably where it is)
      5. Results of Straw Poll.

A: 2; 2: 1; G: 2; IV: 6; V (Abstain): 0

* + - 1. Result Leave with Adrian, to bring back a specific proposal, to make this a NOTE
    1. CID 7062 (MAC):
       1. More work needed. Adrian working with Jouni
    2. CID 7066 (MAC):
       1. Another normative verb (“may”) in clause 9. Suggest moving it to 11.4.4.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Move cited sentence to become a new paragraph at 1640.06.
       3. No objection. Mark ready for Motion.
    3. CID 7069 (MAC):
       1. Another “may” in clause 9.
       2. Seems related to 1645.10 language. The concept in clause 9 seems to already be there, in clause 11.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised:

At 854.61 delete the two sentences: “An incoming MSDU that is not classified to a particular TS may be classified to another active TS based on the frame classifier for that TS. If, however, all of the frame classifiers for the active TS have been exhausted, the MSDU does not belong to any active TS and is classified to be a best-effort MSDU”

At 1645.27 insert the following as a new para: “An incoming MSDU that is not classified to a particular TS may be classified to another active TS based on the frame classifier for that TS.”

* + - 1. Alternative proposal: Revised: At 854.62 delete the sentence: “If, however, all of the frame classifiers for the active TS have been exhausted, the MSDU does not belong to any active TS and is classified to be a best-effort MSDU”

At 854.61 change “may” to “might”.

* + - 1. Concern that we need to say somewhere that matching must be done, against all the possible TCLAS elements.
      2. Proposal: At 1645.27 insert the following as a new paragraph: “An incoming MSDU shall be tested against all classifiers in an implementation defined order, until either a match is detected or a classifier matches.” Concern that this is better, but needs to be merged into the paragraph earlier about TCLAS Processing element of 0, 1 and 2. This next text should apply to all types? Not clear. This needs further work.
      3. Assign to Mark Hamilton, to work on this further.
      4. End Mark Notes:
    1. CID 7007 (MAC) 11-16/260r1
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised change “may” to “can” at cited location.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 7008 (MAC) 11-16/260r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At cited location change “The Tx MCS set may differ from the Rx MCS set” to “The Tx MCS set is not defined to be equal to the Rx MCS set”
       3. If Equal then easy to understand, but if Not Equal or may Differ seems a bit more confusing if they are the same.
          1. Changing to “not equal” or “differing” or not necessarily the same.”
          2. Does 1 1 mean they are different, or does that indicate that they may not be the same, but not telling if they are or are not.
          3. Another option is “The Tx MCS set is defined and not necessarily equal”.
          4. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 19:14:19Z): At cited location change "The Tx MCS set may differ from the Rx MCS set" to "The Tx MCS set is defined and is not necessarily equal to the Rx MCS set"

At 895.21 change "The Tx MCS set is defined to be equal to the Rx MCS set" to "The Tx MCS set is defined and is equal to the Rx MCS set"

* + - * 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7075 (MAC)
       1. Review proposed text from Mark RISON

“NOTE---Although this is not useful, some implementations might include an element ID that corresponds to an element that will be included in the Probe Response frame even in the absence of the Request element, or will be excluded from the Probe Response frame even in the presence of the Request element, as described by the notes in Table 9-34 (Probe Response frame body).”

* + - 1. More work will be done on this.
    1. CID 7022 (MAC) 11-16/260r1
       1. Review comment
       2. Need more input from the Commenter
       3. It was noted that “The whole para is missing “fields’” after the field name (4 instances). There’s a separate comment for 1805.15”
       4. Proposed resolution: Revised: Revised. At 973.47, change “The Query Response Length Limit may be set to a value larger than the maximum MMPDU size in which case the Query Response spans multiple MMPDUs.” to: “If the Query Response Length Limit is larger than the maximum MMPDU size, the Query Reponses will span multiple MMPDUs.”

Also editor to insert missing “value of the “and “field” around “Query Response Length Limit” on this page and at the end of 1805.15.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7077 (MAC)
       1. Asking Ganesh
    2. CID 7092 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1050.10 change “Indicates” to “In a non-TVHT STA, indicates” At 1050.16 in the “Definition” cell, insert the following new para: “In a TVHT STA, indicates support for TVHT\_MODE\_4C.”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7093 (MAC)
       1. Assign to Matthew Fischer
    4. CID 70034 (MAC) 11-16/260r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1111.23 change “It may be present when switching to a 20 MHz channel (in which case the Secondary Channel Offset field is set to SCN).” To “It can be present when switching to a 20 MHz channel (in which case the Secondary Channel Offset field is set to SCN); see 11.40.4.”
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 7095 (MAC) 11-16/260r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At cited location delete “NOTE—In these cases,”.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    6. CID 7097 (MAC) 11-260r1
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change “, the beam tracking initiator may consider the beam tracking request as failed” to “the beam tracking request has failed”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    7. CID 7106 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-23 19:43:24Z) Insert the following new subclause at 1344.23:

"10.19a Transmission of NON\_HT formats by an HT STA that is not a VHT STA

In order to transmit a non-HT PPDU, an HT STA that is not a VHT STA sets the CH\_BANDWIDTH and CH\_OFFSET in the TXVECTOR to achieve the required non-HT PPDU format (see Table 19-2 (PPDU format as a function of CH\_BANDWIDTH and CH\_OFFSET parameters)).

For 20 MHz bandwidth transmissions in a 40 MHz channel the STA shall set the CH\_OFFSET parameter to CH\_OFF\_20U if the SECONDARY\_CHANNEL\_OFFSET parameter of the PHYCONFIG\_VECTOR was SECONDARY\_CHANNEL\_ABOVE, or CH\_OFF\_20L otherwise."

Delete the Para at 2330.39

* + - 1. There may be two more locations – what about 2506.9, 2504.27? – Check for related comments –
      2. There are also CIDs 7135, 7404, 7405, and 7408 that should include in discussion when it comes up tomorrow.
    1. CID 7111 (GEN) 11-16/260r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion of the RFC definition
       3. Need to adjust the proposed change
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-23 19:54:13Z) Revised.

At 2952.64, change "-2097151..2097151" to "-536870912..536870911"

At 2953.08, delete "This field contains the fixed point Part of Attitude."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7131 (MAC)
       1. Assign to Mark Hamilton
    2. CID 7113 (Editor) and CID 7114 (MAC)
       1. Assign to Matthew Fischer
    3. CID 7112 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. There is an ongoing question on the use of the MIB for product usage.
       3. The MIB is similar to the SAP – and is the only way to describe some things in the standard. There are lots of descriptive things in the MIB that needs to be saved and not lost, and so we may not need not worry about the shalls for now.
       4. Are all the “shalls” reflected in text as well? No. not all.
       5. The discussion is that we can reject the comment or we need a volunteer to prepare submission to move the “shalls”..
          1. No volunteer identified.
       6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-02-24) 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.
       7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 7107 (GEN)
       1. Assign to Adrian Stephens as this may get fixed with CID 7106.
    5. CID 7150 (MAC)
       1. Assign to Mark Hamilton
  1. **Review Agenda** for Wednesday
     1. Graham – 278r2
     2. Adrian – 230r1, 273
     3. Sigurd cids 90 mins
     4. PM1:
        1. Edward
        2. Assign unassigned comments
        3. Additional CIDs
     5. PM2
        1. Dan Harkins
        2. Mark Hamilton
     6. Thursday
        1. AM1:
           1. Move motions to 11:30am
  2. **Recessed** at 3:16pm

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 24, 2016 – 9:05am**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Jinjing Jiang (Marvell); Sigurd Schelstraete (Quantenna);
   4. **Review Agenda**: 11-16/277r4
      1. Review Plan for today:

**AM1 9-noon** –

Graham Smith (60 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx> starting with CID7592

Adrian, as necessary (30 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>
2. 11-16-273

Sigurd CIDs (90 mins)

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-00-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>
   * 1. Edward asked for 264r2 to be also reviewed -- assign to PM1.
   1. **Review doc:** 11-16/278r1 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx> starting with CID 7592
      2. CID 7592 (MAC) 11-16/278r2
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Discussion
         3. Discussion on the Service Period definition – The Service Period ends when the fragments are delivered, or it was dropped (timeout on retries for example).
         4. If BU is not completely delivered, the SP is not ended.
         5. For example: if the BU was a single MPDU and it timed out, the MPDU is dropped. So if the complete MPDU is not delivered, i.e. a fragment is delivered, but not all, the BU is simply dropped and that is by definition when the SP ends.
         6. The extra discussion on changes in 10.3.3.4
         7. Proposed Resolution: REJECT; The BU is queued for transmission. It might take several channel access and or fragments to complete the transmission of the BU as one or more fragments either successfully or ending in failure. It is not necessary to further specify or further constrain the operation of the AP’s transmit queues.
         8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 7593 (MAC) 11-16/278r2
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Discussion
         3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 14:38:56Z): "An unscheduled SP ends after the AP has attempted to transmit . . .” The transmission attempt either completes successfully or is abandoned. So, by definition, there is no partially transmitted BU left.
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      4. CID 7598 (MAC) 11-16/278r1
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Discussion
         3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 14:51:54Z)
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 7599 (MAC) 11-16/278r2
         1. Review comment
         2. Review Discussion
         3. Discussion on possible change
         4. Move 1581.40 sentence to the 1581.34 changing “can” to “shall”.
         5. Then adjust the sentence for grammar and precise correctness.
         6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-24 15:02:46Z): At P1581.34 Insert after the first sentence of g)

"The AP shall respond after a SIFS either with a Data or Management frame, or with an Ack frame, in which case the corresponding Data or Management frame is delayed."

And delete at P1581.40

"The AP can respond with either an immediate Data or Management frame or with an Ack frame, while delaying the responding Data or Management frame."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7600 (MAC) 11-16/278r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. This is the same as CID 7599
       3. This would be the same Resolution.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-24 15:06:49Z): At P1581.34 Insert after the first sentence of g)

"The AP shall respond after a SIFS either with a Data or Management frame, or with an Ack frame, in which case the corresponding Data or Management frame is delayed."

And delete at P1581.40

"The AP can respond with either an immediate Data or Management frame or with an Ack frame, while delaying the responding Data or Management frame."

(Note to Editor this is the same resolution as for CID 7599.)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7635 (MAC) 11-16/278r2
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context p1565 and p1566
       3. Proposed Response: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 15:13:10Z): The processing of probe responses and the timing of any such processing is implementation specific.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 7640 (MAC) 11-16/278r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Discussion on the multi-band non-AP STA discussion.
       4. AdHoc Notes added: MAC: 2016-02-24 15:33:11Z - Reviewed 11-16/278r1 for CID 7640. This concept appears to have been inserted by 11ad, intentionally. But, the re-write of this text into multiple subclauses and bullet lists has complicated tracking the history. This will need more research.
       5. Ran out of time –
  1. **Recess** at 10:32am –10:37am
  2. **Review doc:** 11-16/291r0 Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-00-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 7403 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 15:47:42Z) Accept resolution as proposed (Including the occurrence on page 2505.39) and In addition: PHYCONFIG.request(PHYCONFIG\_VECTOR) should be PHY-CONFIG.request(PHYCONFIG\_VECTOR), i.e.: hyphen between “PHY” and “CONFIG”. This typo appears in about 5 places in the text. Ask editor to make the replacement.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7404 (GEN) 11-16/291r0
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 15:51:11Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7404 in doc 11-16/291r1. – This makes the effective change, but by making changes in 19.2.5 and 21.2.5.2.

Note: CID 7408 is same resolution.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7408 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
       1. Review Comment – same as CID 7404
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 15:56:58Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7404 in doc 11-16/291r1<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-00-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>>, This makes the effective change, but by making changes in 19.2.5 and 21.2.5.2.
       3. Note: CID 7404 is the same resolution.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 7412 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. CID 7411 is a similar comment and was classified as Editorial Trivial Technical (see 11-16/230) – would want to resolve them similarly.
          1. The Proposed Resolution for 7411 is “Revised. At 2504.51 insert “PHY operates as if a “before “Clause 17”. at 2504.52 change “is” to “was”.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 2505.59 insert “PHY operates as if a “before” Clause 19”. At 2505.60 change “is” to “was”. Editor to change the reference to Table 20-1 on page 2505.59 (should be Table 19-1).
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7422 (GEN) 11-16/291r0
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 16:10:56Z)
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 7294 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review context on p2301.
       3. Each PHY has values that were documented in respective Tables per PHY for example see table 17-21 and figure 17-4.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Reject – submission required to justify changing these established values. BRC assumes the current values include some implementation overhead in addition to preamble length.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. Return to 7422 (GEN)
       1. Refer to page 2583, note we have the location for the change.
       2. The phrase “VHT PPDU” seems to imply the higher modulations only.
       3. No change to the proposed resolution.
    6. CID 7295 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
       1. Review comment
       2. Similar to CID 7294 – use same resolution.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 16:27:43Z) – submission required to justify changing these established values. BRC assumes the current values include some implementation overhead in addition to preamble length.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    7. CID 7296 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Similar to CID 7294 and 7295
       3. This case there may be an error, but no submission to justify the new number.
       4. Discussion on how the processing delay should be calculated and added in the equation.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 16:29:44Z) submission required to justify changing these established values. BRC agrees that minimal preamble length for MF is larger than 33 but there is no consensus on a correct modified value.
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    8. CID 7386 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on if the cited variables were incorrectly typed.
       3. There is not a number of antennas that we can point at, the deletion is not going to make it worse as they names being deleted don’t exist.
       4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 16:46:26Z)
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    9. CID 7387 (GEN) 11-16/291r0
       1. Review Comment
       2. Same as CID 7386
       3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPT
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    10. CID 7526 (GEN) 11-16/291r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Expand the changes in the document to show what “Canonicalise” (sic) results into.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 16:53:31Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7526 in doc 11-16/291r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-01-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>>, which explicitly shows the expanded proposed change.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    11. CID 7587 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 16:55:59Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    12. CID 7701 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 17:00:15Z) Keeping "at the antenna" is consistent with other places in the document, however the sentence can be clarified as follows:

Change :

"A combination of CS and energy above threshold. CCA shall report busy at least while a HR/DSSS PPDU with energy above the ED threshold is being received at the antenna."

To:

"A combination of CS and energy above threshold. CCA shall report busy at least while a HR/DSSS PPDU is being received with energy above the ED threshold at the antenna."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7702 (GEN)
       1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 17:06:20Z) Keeping “at the antenna” is consistent with other places in the document, however the sentence can be clarified as follows:

Change:

“CCA shall report busy at least while a PPDU with energy above the ED threshold is being received at the antenna.”

To:

“CCA shall report busy at least while a PPDU is being received at the antenna with energy above the ED threshold.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Recess** at 12:05pm

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 24, 2016 – 1:05 pm**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell);
   4. **Review doc:** 11-16/264r2 Edward AU (Huawei)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0264-02-000m-comment-resolution-for-cid-7707.docx>
      2. CID 7707 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Was addressed last Friday
         3. Added to resolution: Change “dot11RSNAStatsCMACICVErrors” to “dot11RSNABIPMICErrors” in lines 796.11 and 1954.33.
         4. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 18:19:44Z) Delete "dot11RSNABIPMICErrors" in lines 2943.1 and 3354.45.

Change "dot11RSNAStatsCMACICVErrors" to "dot11RSNABIPMICErrors" in lines 796.11 and 1954.33.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc:** 11-16/263r1 Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0263-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-cids-7660-7661-and-7664.docx>
     2. CID 7661 (MAC) 11-16/263r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 18:23:29Z)
     3. CID 7664 (MAC) 11-16/263r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 18:25:28Z)
     4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc:** 11-286r1 Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0286-01-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1.docx>
     2. CID 7109 (GEN) 11-16/286r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. MIB issues with compliance tables
        3. IETF rules state you don’t change tables, and you have to create a new table.
        4. When Amendments are created, they are not supposed to change the table. So to clean up, we should make a new table14 to have the correct set of variables defined.
        5. The use of the attribute is used in Beacon frame body.
        6. Question on if the dot11SMTbase13 was published before?
           1. Dot11SMTbase13 is the current REVmc table to put the changes for REVmc changes.
        7. Discussion on the structure of the dot11SMTbase13
           1. Propose to delete comments at 3359.40 and 3359.42
           2. Reword comments to be more accurate.
        8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 18:45:43Z) Add "dot11EstimatedServiceParametersOptionImplemented" in line 3361.11.

At the lines at 3359.40-45, change the sentences to

“-- dot11SMTbase13 includes all changes made between IEEE Std 802.11-2012 and IEEE Std 802.11-<year>.

-- Amendments to IEEE Std 802.11-<year> should not make any modifications to dot11SMTbase13. The first amendment needing to modify the dot11SMTbase object should deprecate dot11SMTbase13 and define a replacement to hold changes.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7110 (GEN) 11-16/286r1
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion on the compliance group requirements
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 18:50:17Z) These attributes are in dot11FineTimingMeasurement group, which is in the dot11WMNCompliance compliance statement.
       4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 7356 (GEN) 11-16/286r1
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 18:53:51Z)
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7440 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 18:55:03Z)
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 7405 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. We discussed this during Sigurd's presentation in AM1.
       3. Why don't we keep this sentence consistent with the way Sigurd's presentation changed the similar sentences?
          1. Reviewed 11-16/291 (Sigurd's presentation) to understand the differences.
          2. Sigurd's presentation was on a paragraph about non-HT PPDUs. Edward's is on a very similar paragrpah, but about HT PPDUs. HT PPDUs do have the CH\_OFFSET parameter in the TXVECTOR, so the change on this paragraph does make sense.
       4. Discussion on harmonizing the proposal with CID 7402
       5. Clause 19 has the CH\_Offset, but Clause 21 does not seem to have one.
       6. Discovered clause 21 PHY does not have a CH\_OFFSET parameter in the TXVECTOR. So, Edward will do off-line work to align with Sigurd's presentation.
       7. More work on this CID and CID 7135.
  1. **Review doc:** 11-16/288r2 Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-02-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx>
     2. CID 7574 (GEN) 11-16/288r3
        1. There is a cut-n-paste error in the document. Referred back to the real comment text, from the database.
        2. Review comment
        3. Discussion on the description of the bits.
           1. Only 2 MIB variables that use “bit x” definitions.
           2. The value “77” being deleted is the question
        4. Change “sub-field” to “bit map “was the consensus.
        5. Noted that the rest of the DESCRIPTION mentions specific bits, so why not keep the "77 bit"
        6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:13:09Z) Change "subfield" to "bitmap"
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7575 (GEN) 11-16/288r3
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:14:55Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7575 in doc 11-16/288r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-03-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx> which updates the MIB variable.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7127 (GEN) 11-16/288r3
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on how to measure power
        3. Proposed Resolution REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:24:56Z) : Incorporate the changes for CID 7127 in doc 11-16/288r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-03-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx> changes "The power" to "The difference in signal power"; and changes "The power difference between the interfering channel and the desired channel" to "The difference in signal power between the interfering and the desired channel" is several places.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 7406 (GEN) 11-16/288r2
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:28:03Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 7407 (GEN) 11-16/288r2
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:29:41Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
        4. Note: CID 7225 and 7226, related to CID 7407 as well..
     7. CID 7401 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on why changing “the” to “a”.
        3. Determine to take proposed change but not change article.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; on line 2221.54, change “dot11CurrentFrequency” to “dot11CurrentChannel”.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
        6. This was discussed together with CID 7402.
     8. 7402 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. This clause was changed to allow other PHYs to use it.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:39:50Z) - on line 2249.52, change "dot11CurrentFrequency" to "dot11CurrentChannel". In line 731.63, change "The Information field" to "The CurrentChannel field"
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc:** 11-16/230r Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-02-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-1.doc>
     2. We have processed most of the CIDs, and we had an Action item to review offline, and then discuss during this slot time.
     3. After discussion on the document it was determined that we could agree to motion the full document tomorrow.
  3. **Review doc:** 11-16/273r0 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>
     2. CID 7217 – Asking Jouni/Dan
     3. CID 7245 (MAC) 11-16/273r1
        1. Review comment
        2. CID 7244 is related – deals with timeouts
        3. A lot of the explicit timeout entries were removed where the protocol did not explicitly have a timeout defined.
        4. CID 7240 also has some relevance.
        5. Discussion on the proposed change to At 163.46, after “AUTHENTICATION REJECTED”, add “, REJECTED\_SEQUENCE\_TIMEOUT”
        6. Change to be consistent naming without underscores.
        7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-24 20:00:51Z): REVISED. At 163.46, after "AUTHENTICATION REJECTED" add ", AUTH FAILURE TIMEOUT"
        8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7495 (MAC) 11-16/273r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: : REJECTED (MAC: 2016-02-25 03:59:24Z): As stated at 534.62, RIFS is the shortest time separating transmissions from a single transmitter. The definition of SIFS relates to the smallest interval between a frame and its response.  These are necessarily from different transmitters, and hence RIFS does not apply.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 7451 (MAC) 11-16/273r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 7505 (MAC) 11-16/273r1
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Delete “public” at 686.22, 1126.32, and 1140.46 and correct grammar as necessary.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     7. Only one comment ready to process left when we come back to this document.
  4. **Recess** at 3:08pm

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; February 24, 2016 – 3:30 pm**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. Review Patent Policy
      1. No items identified.
   3. Attendance:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell); Lei Wang (Marvell); Dan Harkins (HPE)
   4. Review Agenda – 11-16/277r4
      1. Adjust slightly to finish the one last Comment in 11-16/273r0
         1. No Objection to finish 11-16/273 and then continue with Dan
   5. **Review doc:** 11-16/273r0 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>
      2. CID 7662 (MAC) 11-16/273r0
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Context, showing 3 is reserved.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace “, 2 or 3” with “, or 2” on page 716 whenever it occurs in the “Supported Channel Width…” column.

At 717.22, replace “3” in the “Channel Width” column with “0, 1, 2, or 3”.

These changes achieve the intent of the comment’s proposed changes without introducing new rows.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc:** 11-16/279r1 Dan Harkins (HPE)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>
     2. CID 7466 (GEN) and 7467 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution for both CIDS: Revised- incorporate changes as shown in 11-16/0279r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc:** 11-16/280r1 – Dan Harkins (HPE)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0280-01-000m-cids-4776-and-4777.docx>
     2. CID 7469 (GEN) and 7474 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate changes as shown in 11-16/0280r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0280-01-000m-cids-4776-and-4777.docx)...Which affect the changes requested by the commenter.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  3. **Review doc:** 11-16/281r1 Dan Harkins (HPE)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0281-01-000m-resolution-of-cid-4859.docx>
     2. CID 7551 (MAC), CID 7552 (GEN), CID 7606 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. There was a problem with the document that was presented and what was posted. CID 7551 was not correct in the document that was posted, so we will discuss that CID later with a different document.
        3. Discussion on the change of MGTKSA to mesh GTKSA or MTKSA to mesh TKSA. – Agreement on these three changes.
        4. Straw Poll on keeping or deleting pairwise
           1. Result – Keep =2; Delete =2; Abstain = 4;
           2. Remove “pairwise” in paragraphs 12.6.1.1.9 and 12.6.7
        5. Proposed resolution for CID 7552 and CID 7606; Revised; incorporate the changes in 11-16/281r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0281-01-000m-resolution-of-cid-4859.docx>) and remove “pairwise” in paragraphs 12.6.1.1.9 and 12.6.7
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  4. **Review doc:** 11-16/282r1 Dan Harkins (HPE)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0282-01-000m-some-security-comments.xls>) NOTE: not the latest version.
     2. CID 7551 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Context p1960.39
        3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 21:06:09Z): The comment does not identify an issue in the draft Standard.
        4. After discussion it was deemed to have the reject resolution as noted.
        5. Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7358 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7375 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 7458 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the proposed change does not give enough detail for the editor
        3. Review 12.10 for context for possible wording.
        4. Need to create text for replacement.
        5. Proposed Resolution Revised. At 2063.39 , replace "When used with AKM 10 from Table 9-132 (AKM suite selectors)" with " When using AKM suite selector 00-0F-AC:10
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 7520 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Question on the use of “random()”
        3. There is a difference between pseudo-code and code that can be complied in “C”.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The Cited text is in pseudo-code. No Further description is needed.
        5. After debate, it was determined to Mark Ready for Motion
     7. CID 7527 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. The comment notes an RAS Syndrome = Redundant Acronym Syndrome.
           1. Debate on if the names do or do not qualify for RAS Syndrome.
        3. The proposed rejection does not seem accurate.
        4. The document 11-16/281r1 is a copy of the full comment database, and still has Adrian STEPHENs as the author on the title page. A request for an update with only those CIDs that are relevant and an updated Title page was requested.
        5. The concept of changing “XXK key” to “XXK” is not a big problem.
        6. There are Key Holder that should not drop the name “Key”.
           1. Key Lifetime should also not change.
        7. Identifying which ones to specifically change will need to be done to avoid a global change.
        8. Mark This CID as “Submission Required” – Assign to Mark RISON
     8. CID 7534 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Question about the format of the counter?
           1. 1914.29 gives the format of the counter.
           2. If the format of the counter is given, then why not give the format for the base?
        3. This is pseudo code again, The counter format was to give an idea of the size of the integer used to ensure convergence.
        4. The comment is on pseudo code, and the proposed rejection was thought to be good enough.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Reject: This is an algorithmic description of taking a password and producing an element. The format of base is the same as the password. No technical problem has been identified.
        6. The chair identified this to be marked ready for motion after lengthy discussion.
        7. Mark Ready for Motion
     9. CID 7535 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Question on the line number of the comment
        3. Proposed Resolution: Reject: the format has no interoperability implications and is solely up to the implementation.
        4. Mark Ready for Motion
     10. CID 7545 (GEN)
         1. Review comment
         2. Discussion on the type of pseudo code?
         3. Step through the comment:

"LGR(num, p)" at 1916.7 and 1916.14 should be "(num | p)" with italics, and there should be a "where" to explain the (a | p) notation.

"while ( LGR(qr | p)" at 1915.56 should lose the LGR, and there should be a where to explain the (a | p) notation; ditto for the qnr three lines down

"is not equal to" at 1915.56 and 1915.60 should be "!="

"if LSB(save) == LSB(y)" at 1915.24 should have outer parens in the test

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: Revised; change "," at 1916.7 and 1916.4 to "|". As to the rest, LGR is in section 3 so people who might not be familiar with the notation (x | y) would not understand what was intended. Losing LGR would make this comment bait. Addressing the “is not equal to” this is an algorithmic description not a formal language. At 1915.24 add parenthesis after the “if” and after the “y)”,
      2. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7570 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; the cited text is not incorrect.
       3. Review the cited locations for possible change.
       4. Example at 1994.52 does not have the extra “to generate a key of length Length”.
          1. Not worth fighting over either way.
       5. Updated Proposed Resolution: Accept
       6. Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Return to doc 11-16/273r1** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. CID 7217 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. We had skipped before to allow question to be sent to Jouni/Dan, as Dan is on the call review comment.
        3. Discussion on the need to delete the TDLS
        4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-24 22:07:05Z)
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 7062 (MAC)
        1. A request was sent to Jouni to review, but we will review.
        2. Review Comment
        3. Discussion on if the phrase “In an IBSS only a single AKM….”
           1. Should a comma come after IBSS or only?
           2. Is this a statement of fact, or is this giving a requirement?
           3. See 12.6.5 – RSNA Policy selection in an IBSS and for DLS
        4. Is there a limit in the IBSS situation for the number of AKM suite selectors?
        5. After extended discussion, we determined that there is more research needed.
  2. **Review doc:** 11-16/290r0 Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx>
     2. CID 7131 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review Discussion
     3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-25 04:07:42Z): Make changes as indicated in 11-16/0290r0 for CID 7131.  These clarify/correct 2 uses of ACM\_STA, but without replacing ACM\_STA with AP as those are not the same concept.
     4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  3. **Recess 5:38pm**

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Thursday, February 25, 2016 – 9:29am**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Lei Wang (Marvell); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Stephen MCCANN (Blackberry); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell); Emily QI (Intel)

* 1. *Officially Thank SR Technologies for hosting us this week*
     1. *Acclamation of approval and thanks*
  2. **Review Agenda – 11-16/277r5**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0277-05-000m-tgmc-brc-agenda-fort-lauderdale-meeting.docx>
     2. Draft Agenda:

(60 mins)TGmc Mark Rison CIDs – disagreement on “ submission required” designation:

1. 7192, 7255, 7277, 7292, 7320, 7334, 7347, 7352, 7377,   
   7399, 7400, 7421, 7427, 7483, 7486, 7499, 7529, 7532,  
   7596, 7597, 7626, 7665, 7675, 7678, 7746, 7780, 7795

Additional CIDs – Sigurd (90 mins)

Motions (30 mins)

* + - 1. Plan to have motions at 11:30am
      2. No objection to agenda plan today.
  1. **Review CIDs requested to be pulled or concerned with** being in a motion today:
     1. CID 7411 (EDITOR) and CID 74121 (GEN)
        1. Review proposed changes to ensure aligned.
        2. Rationale is that the change does not address comment.
        3. Discussion on what the underlying issue was – no consensus on what the text should be done.
        4. We will pull CID 7411 and CID 7412 from the motions.
     2. CID 7268 (Editor) and CID 7229 (EDITOR)
        1. This was in the 230 tab, and 7229 is in the ED Motion – Editorials tab
        2. No issues with the addition of these two proposed resolutions.
     3. CID 7466 (GEN), CID 7467(GEN):
        1. Concern “doesn't say what the resolution does (e.g. ", which adds a description of the term ikm")
        2. Add to the Proposed Resolution of both: “These changes define the indicated term.”
     4. CID 7575 (GEN):
        1. doesn't say that it updates it in the way requested by the commenter
        2. Change Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 19:14:55Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7575 in doc 11-16/288r3 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-03-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx> which updates the MIB variable in the manner requested by the commenter.
     5. CID 7294 (GEN), CID 7296 (GEN):
        1. Request to pull with the contention that it has been previously established that the delay is not implementation-dependent
        2. Discussion on how much time it takes
        3. Discussion on how the numbers were calculated.
        4. Discussion to remove the implementation specific delay components.
        5. Sigurd arrived, so we stop discussing these and Graham SMITH and Mark R agreed to make a new submission to address these CIDs.
  2. **Review doc 11-15/291r1** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-01-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 7451 (MAC)
        1. Reviewed yesterday – still think ACCEPT is the correct resolution.
        2. This was in 11-16/273r1
     3. CID 7452 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on what change may be needed.
        3. Question on if there is redundant information
        4. Lots of changes to remove the Parameter RXVECTOR from the primitive.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-25 15:06:47Z): Delete "upon receipt of a valid PHY header or"
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7474 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Mark “Submission required” and assign to Mark RISON –
     5. CID 7700 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. There is a mess, and the proposed change is not necessarily complete.
        3. The PHY\_CS/CCA timer needs a better description.
        4. This needs to describe how the CCA is being reset and not just a “resetting the PHY”
        5. While the text says it resets a statemachine, we do not have a statemachine to reset.
        6. The clear problem is that this clause says reset timers and statemachine’s that don’t exist.
        7. Background – this was a repeat comment from the last ballot round: See 11-15/1477r0 for the details. Also see 11-15/1400 analysis of the CID
           1. There was a discussion on this, and no consensus to resolve.
        8. Mark “Submission required” and assign to Graham SMITH
     6. CID 7166, 7167, 7168 (MAC), and 7169 (MAC): 11-16/291r2
        1. Review comment
        2. (transferred 7169 to MAC from GEN)
        3. Review discussion
        4. Note that this comment sent is from resolution proposed by CID 5879
        5. Proposed reject reason: Not sufficient motivation to make a change
        6. Discussion what portion of the Beamforming description needs to be updated?
        7. REVmc had incorporated technical changes as the draft has evolved.
        8. There is an issue with the headers and footers, and need to be updated.
        9. Flip-flopping is not a good path. We made a choice, now we should not change back without a compelling reason.
        10. Concern that this issue is being discussed with limited visibility
        11. This topic was discussed during the WG ballot processing time
        12. Commenter is pointing out 4 Technical concerns –
        13. Discussion on if the comment addressed the full concern then we can resolve the comment and be complete.
        14. We have two different opinions – one to address, and one to reject.
        15. Request to defer to March.
        16. The chair wanted to get a sense of the group and conduct a Straw Poll:

After more discussion the straw poll was not started.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; CID 5879 was duly discussed and agreed during comment resolution. The issue was shared and discussed with the group in at least four different submissions:
* MU Beamformee capabilities indication in VHT, IEEE document 802.11-15/0057
* Text proposal for Beamformee STS Capabilities , IEEE document 802.11-15/0058
* Discussion of CID 5879, IEEE document 802.11-15/0668
* CID 5879, , IEEE document 802.11-15/1509

The proposed modification is purely a capability indication and no change in functionality is required. Moreover, it was shown explicitly that the change is fully backwards compatible with current devices.

In the second part of the comment, the commenter appears to argue that the 11mc project can only deal with technical corrections and that the implementation of CID 5879 goes beyond that *(“In addition, the original description is technically correct, nothing needs to be fixed. That is, the changes proposed by CID 5879 resolution do not belong to technical corrections, as for 11mc project.”*). This is not correct. TGmc has made substantial changes and additions to the base document in addition to the incorporation of approved amendments and fixing errors. As such, this is insufficient motivation for reverting CID 5879.

The first part of the argument revolves around the processing of the beamforming matrix at AP side. The changes made in CID 5879 have no bearing on this and the exact determination of the beamforming matrix by the AP has always been outside the scope of the standard. Moreover, the AP controls the number of streams that a STA will feed back. As such, it can continue to operate as it did before and no extra processing or complexity results from the changes made with the resolution of CID 5879, contrary to what is suggested in the comment.

* + - 1. Objection to have the rejected direction as the default.
         1. Deferring without a direction is requested.
         2. Objectors requested to provide submission to support the change being requested.
      2. These 4 CIDs will be on a separate tab in the MAC comment file with the reject as proposed.
      3. The Discussion was starting to repeat, so we will move on and consider in Macau.
  1. Return to **Discussion on CIDs that have potential issues**:
     1. CID 7526: (GEN)
        1. please pull (the wording is not consistent, as requested by the commenter)
        2. The text was showing the expected expansion.
        3. The interpretation of the expansion is not consistent with the commenter
        4. Mark Submission required – Assign to Mark RISON
        5. Pulled from the motion for today.
     2. CID 7404 (GEN) CID 7408 (GEN):
        1. please pull (I think the cross-reference in the proposed resolution text is broken)
        2. There is an issue with the url for the resolution. – This has been corrected in the data base.
        3. CID 7408 has same error in the url, and has been corrected.
        4. Discussion on the table cited.
        5. The reference to the table needs to be corrected.
        6. Discussion on the changes to explain the rationale for the changes
        7. The table cited should have been 19-2 not 19-7.
        8. Update Resolution for 7408 and 7404:
     3. MAC-BM Tab: CID 7465 (MAC)
        1. The CID 7646 may address the concern.
        2. So do not need to pull this cid.
     4. MAC-BM Tab CID 7465 (MAC) -- will the editors apply the simplification agreed in CID 7647 to the change for CID 7465?
     5. MAC-BM Tab CID 7086 (MAC) –
        1. object and would like more wording changes
        2. Assign 7086 to Mark RISON – Submission required.
     6. MAC-BN TAB:
        1. CID 7431 -- need more time to consider
        2. CID 7593 -- need more time to consider
        3. CID 7635 -- need more time to consider
        4. CID 7177 -- have tweaked it so would like to update the resolution
        5. CID 7592 -- need more time to consider
        6. Assign all 5 CIDs to Mark RISON – Submission Required.
  2. Document 11-277r6 is being uploaded to ensure all have access to the material to be considered.
  3. **Motions**:
     1. **Motion 194:** Approve the comment resolutions in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-35-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls> in the following tabs:

-ED Motion - doc 230, except for CID 7411

-ED Motion – Editorials

-ED Motion – Editorials Rework

-ED Motion – Trivial Technical

And

-Resolve CID 7686 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes under CID 7686 in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-03-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-1.doc. These changes clarify the different interpretations of the "Tx VHT-MCS Map" field based on the value dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWCapable.” and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian Stephens Seconded: Edward Au
      2. Result: 10-0-0 Motion passes
    1. **Motion 195:** Approve the comment resolutions in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-23-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> in the following tabs:

-GEN – Feb telecon  
-GEN – FLL - B  
-GEN – FLL – A, except for CID 7412, 7466, 7467, 7575, 7294, 7296, 7526, 7404, 7408

and  
Resolve CID 7466 as “REVISED” with a resolution of “incorporate changes as shown in 11-16/0279r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>). These changes define the indicated term.”  
  
Resolve CID 7467 as “REVISED” with a resolution of “incorporate changes as shown in 11-16/0279r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>). These changes define the indicated term.”

Resolve CID 7575 as “REVISED” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes for CID 7575 in doc 11-16/288r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-03-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx> ) which updates the MIB variable in the manner requested by the commenter.

Resolve CID 7404 and 7408 as “REVISED” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes for CID 7404 in doc 11-16/291r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-01-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>>, changing “21-7” to “21-2”, This makes the effective change, but by making changes in 19.2.5 and 21.2.5.2.and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl 2nd Stephen MCCANN
      2. Discussion:
         1. CID 7495 to be pulled and assigned to Graham SMITH with Submission Required.
         2. Discussion on ensuring the correctness of the URLs in the cited cids was checked.
      3. Result: 9-0-1 Motion passes
  1. **Recess** at 12:00

1. **REVmc BRC Face to Face in Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Thursday, February 25, 2016 – 1:00pm**
   1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items identified.
   3. **Attendance**:
      1. **In Person Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus Wireless)
      2. On phone at some point in the slot: Mark RISON (Samsung); Peter ECCLESINE (CISCO); Emily QI (Intel)
   4. Continue with approved Agenda – 11-16/277r6
   5. **Motions**:
      1. **Motion 196**: Approve the comment resolutions in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-35-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> on the Tabs

- Motion MAC-BM except for CIDs 7086

- Motion MAC-BN except for CIDs 7431, 7593, 7635, 7177, 7592

- Motion MAC 11-160230r2

And incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + 1. Moved: Edward AU 2nd: Graham Smith
    2. Result:5-0-0
  1. Propose to not take the proposed Motion #197 from the Agenda doc 11-16/277r6 until March
  2. Assigning Unassigned Comments
     1. Capturing the CID assignments in 11-277r7
        1. About 30 were assigned to Adrian
  3. Review doc: 11-15/828r8 Peter ECCLESINE (Cisco)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0828-08-000m-sb0-ecclesine-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 7170 (MAC) 11-15/828
        1. Review comment
        2. 11-15/0828r8 has CIDs 5969 and 5970, which is what we are reviewing. (It doesn't directly mention CID 7170.)
     3. Review the changes proposed
     4. Discussion on editorial improvements
        1. Take the editorial and small technical items offline.
     5. Continue with the discussions on improvements
     6. Suggestion to reference the new CID 7170, and then leave doc 11-15/828r8 for the older CIDs
  4. **Review doc:** 11-15/292r0 Peter ECCLESINE (Cisco)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0292-00-000m-sb1-ecclesine-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 7220 (MAC) 11-16/292r1
        1. Review comment
        2. The concept was to accept the requested change, but the comment did not expressly setup the change, so this will be a REVISE
        3. Document to be updated and add CID 7170 for the next revision.
        4. Discussion on improvements
        5. Discussion on how the Channel switch mode operates
        6. Text from BRAN radar TT.pdf file:

BRAN TR 103 318 radar mitigation report

* SE24 charged TC BRAN with creating a technical report on mitigations for radars operating in 5350-5470 MHz and 5725-5850 MHz. The French FH radar is similar to ITU-R M.1638-1 radar 23. The task is to describe mitigations, while SE24 will perform analysis to verify their adequacy.
* Additional mitigation techniques to enable sharing between RLANs and Radiolocation Systems in the 5 350 MHz to 5 470 MHz and 5 725 MHz to 5 850 MHz bands 5 GHz RLAN sharing with Radar
* To develop a Technical report that describes new mitigation techniques to enable spectrum sharing with new Radiolocation systems as outlined in the CEPT and ITU-R studies. In addition, the report will study the feasibility of RLANs implementing these new mitigation techniques. The report should at least include an analysis of the following possible additional mitigation techniques: (1) Enhanced Dynamic Frequency Selection (E-DFS) for new FH and other radar (2) Dedicated Radar Signal Detectors/Collaborative Detection (3) Reduced EIRP in combination with bandwidth restrictions
  + - 1. DFS protocol discussed in context of the changes.
      2. Suggest that it is a non-DMG, non-MESH STA in a BSS…..
      3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-25 19:33:41Z): Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/0292r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0292-01-000m-sb1-ecclesine-resolutions.docx). This clarifies the behavior of Channel Swtich Mode equal to 1 in the various BSS types.
      4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Discussion on assigning CIDs**
     1. CIDs 7190, 7193, 7197, 7199, 7671, 7679, 7680, 7682, 7683 - assign to Matthew FISCHER.
     2. CID 7543, 7743, 7774, 7775, 7776, 7777, 7778, – Adrian STEPHENS
     3. CID 7324, 7378, 7553, 7658, 7807, 7816, 7317 (all MAC) assign to Mark HAMILTON
     4. CID 7437(GEN), 7438(GEN), 7767(Editor), 7355(GEN), 7698(GEN) assign to Edward AU
     5. CID 7649(GEN), 7346(MAC) – Dorothy STANLEY
     6. CID 7038, 7039, 7043, 7212, 7434, 7435, 7580, 7581, 7822 , 7279, (MAC) – assign to Graham SMITH
     7. CID 7176(MAC) Pyam
     8. CID 7316, 7590(MAC) – Emily QI
     9. CID 7468, 7812, 7276 – assign to Mark Rison
     10. CID 7577, 7805 – assign to Sigurd
     11. CID 7676 – Assign to Peter E.
     12. CID 7276 – Assign to Carlos Aldana
     13. CID 7219 – Assign to Guido
  2. **Adjourned at 3:09pm**
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0277-01-000m-tgmc-brc-agenda-fort-lauderdale-meeting.docx>
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0284-00-000m-sb1-proposed-resolutions-for-trivial-technical-comments.doc>
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0277-03-000m-tgmc-brc-agenda-fort-lauderdale-meeting.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-00-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-01-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>

Wednesday:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0277-04-000m-tgmc-brc-agenda-fort-lauderdale-meeting.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0278-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0291-00-000m-miscellaneous-tgmc-cid-resolutions.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0264-02-000m-comment-resolution-for-cid-7707.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0263-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-cids-7660-7661-and-7664.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0286-01-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-02-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-03-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-02-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-1.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-01-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0280-01-000m-cids-4776-and-4777.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0281-01-000m-resolution-of-cid-4859.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0282-01-000m-some-security-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx>

Thursday:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0277-04-000m-tgmc-brc-agenda-fort-lauderdale-meeting.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-34-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-35-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-23-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0279-01-000m-resolution-of-cids-4773-and-4774.docx>).

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0288-03-000m-resolution-for-some-gen-comments-in-sb1-part-ii.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-35-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0828-08-000m-sb0-ecclesine-resolutions.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0292-00-000m-sb1-ecclesine-resolutions.docx>