IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| Minutes for REVmc BRC Face to Face meeting May 17-19 - Waikoloa |
| Date: 2016-05-18 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. | 10871 N 5750 WHighland, UT 84003 | +1-801-492-4023 | Jrosdahl @ ieee. org |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

REVmc BRC Face to Face Meeting May 17-19, 2016 at the Hilton Waikoloa Hotel, Waikoloa, HI.

1. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 17, 2016 13:30-15:30 – PM1**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 1:32pm
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda 11-16/511r3** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-03-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
		2. **Tuesday PM1**
			1. Chair’s Welcome, Patent reminder, Status, Review of Objectives,
			2. Approve agenda
			3. Motion to affirm Vice chairs
			4. Editor’s Report
			5. 11-16/554 Menzo WENTINK CID 7698, 7658, 7674
			6. Adrian CIDs – including CID 7111 +2 (LCI)
			7. 11-16/703 Carlos ALDANA, CIDs 7742
			8. Sigurd **SCHELSTRAETE** CIDs 7106, 7584
			9. Graham SMITH CIDs
		3. **Tuesday PM2**
			1. CIDs 7074, 7077, 7207, 7818 (Ganesh) 45 mins
			2. CIDs 7209, 7211, 7626, 7787 – Carlos CORDEIRO
		4. **Wednesday PM1**
2. Matt FISCHER CIDs
3. Mark HAMILTON CIDs: 7146, 7324, 7824
4. Graham SMITH CIDs
5. 11-16-580 Solomon TRAININ CID 7165 –
	* 1. **Wednesday PM2**
6. Motions
7. Guido CIDs: 7219, 7372, 7611
8. 11-15-1184 – Dan (Opportunistic Wireless Encryption), 11-16-562 (Suite B clarification)
9. CIDs 7061, 7420, 7421, 7462, 7727, 7783 – Jouni 11-16-710
	* 1. **Thursday AM1**
10. 11-16-670 – Hiroyuki – DMS Extended MCS set base MCS & length calculation
11. CID 7396 7210, 7212, 7240,7244,7317,7448,7503,7812– Mark RISON –delayed block ack impact question
	* 1. **Thursday PM1**
12. Comment resolution
	* 1. **Thursday PM2**
			1. Motions – minutes, CIDs, presentations
			2. Comment resolution
			3. Plans for May - July
			4. Schedule, AOB, Adjourn
		2. **Motion #W1:** Motion to approve Agenda:
			1. Carlos CORDIERO 2nd: Menzo WENTINK
			2. No Objection – unanimous approval – **motion passes**
	1. **Motion #W2: Vice Chair/Secretary Re-affirmation**

Move to reaffirm TGmc Vice Chairs and Secretary:

* Mark HAMILTON as Vice Chair
* Jon Rosdahl as Vice Chair and Secretary
	+ 1. Moved: Sean COFFEY Seconded: Emily QI
		2. Motion approved without objection – **Motion Passes**
	1. **Review Minutes Motion** to be made on Wednesday
		1. Ask the TG to review for motion on Wednesday
		2. List of Prior Minutes:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0250-00-000m-revmc-brc-minutes-march-2016-macau.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0506-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmc-brc-april-1-2016.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0542-00-000m-revmc-brc-april-15-telecon-minutes.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0546-00-000m-revmc-brc-april-21-telecon-minutes.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0550-01-000m-minutes-for-revmc-brc-face-to-face-meeting-april-25-28-cambridge.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0574-03-000m-revmc-brc-may-6-and-9-telecon-minutes.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0601-00-000m-revmc-brc-may-13-telecon-minutes.docx>

* 1. **Editor Report – 11-13/95r30** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-30-000m-editor-reports.pptx>
		2. Current Draft is 5.4 and is in the member’s area.
		3. D5.4 was required to address a CID that referenced it for the MCS changes
		4. Review status of Comment processing (see slides 5-8)
		5. Review Assignments for remaining CIDS:
		6. Review Prediction Slide 12
			1. Still close to original prediction of being done by end of April
	2. **Review doc 11-16/554r4** Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-04-000m-extended-nss.docx>
		2. Abstract: This document proposes changes to extended NSS support. Changes shown are relative to REVmc draft 5.2.

The proposed changes in this document are as follows:

1. OMN channel width 160 and 80+80 MHz is now signaled through a new 160 MHz field, at 80 MHz in the existing OMN channel width field. This change is proposed because 80 MHz devices have been observed to have parsing issues with the now deprecated 80+80 and 160 MHz signaling in the VHT Operation element, and the same issue is speculated to exist in the OMN signaling. This has not been experimentally established though, but a change is proposed regardless, as a conservative approach. An independent by-product of this change is that the 1-bit 160 MHz field replaces a 2-bit Dynamic Extended NSS BW field. This reduction in size was possible because 1/2 or 3/4 NSS is merely an implementation capability rather than a dynamic capability between which switching would be needed.
2. A new center frequency CCFS2 is defined to signal the 160 or 80+80 MHz center frequency for NSS support at less than max NSS. CCFS2 is hidden for legacy devices that do not support extended NSS. CCFS2 is inserted into the HT Operation element, which has many reserved bits, and which is already used in the determination of the channel width and center frequency (through STA channel width an secondary channel offset).
3. The number of tables related to Extended NSS has been reduced, which effectively is an editorial change.
4. The VHT Operation element table (Table 9-246) is lined up with the formatting of the new OMN table (Table 9-74), but there is no change to the options listed in the original Table 9-246 (editorial change).
	* 1. Review changes proposed
		2. Question on RxNSS
			1. Is 9.4.2.158.3 only relative when dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWCapable is true? – That is always true, but the added text in that box should be a NOTE.
		3. Change new text at end of box to a Note.
		4. Note 13 is an implication, but not normative, so we need to know what correct type of the text is. The intent of the Notes was to be informative, but there were Notes added that must be required. The adding of these Notes, was done due to a thought that the Notes were Normative, but we could make a table entry to make the normative entries.
		5. ACTION ITEM #1: Menzo to work with Adrian and the Editors to move the Notes to allow for Normative text.
		6. Note 10 – should be “CCFS1 and CCFS2”.
		7. Missing column infor for table 9-167 –
		8. ACTION ITEM #2: Menzo to “add two columns, reserved in IBSS and reserved in MBSS”
		9. Change to 9-167 - Change to “Max VHT NSS’
		10. Doc 11-16/711r0 is a companion document with proposed comment resolutions prepared – will address some issues that do not require an explicit change in this submission.
		11. Table 9-246 and 9-167 are nearly the same set of information.
		12. Table 9-246 is really a subset of table 9-167, but there is one line in 9-246 that is not in 9-167, and the tables are referenced for different events.
		13. **Straw poll #1:** To have one or two tables:
			1. One table: 11
			2. Two Table: 1
			3. **Straw Poll Results #1**: desire to have One Table
		14. Reviewed 10.7.12.1 changes
		15. Discussion on the “except” and the change of the order of True and False cases.
			1. It was deemed to be correct, and further review can be done before a motion later this week.
		16. Table 11-25 – one row has zero in both Setting of the Channel Center Frequency 1 and Channel Center Frequency 2 columns, so for the 160 MHZ (deprecated) and 80+80 MHZ (deprecated) we are not changing the values that were applicable when there wasn’t the CCFS2 column.
		17. Add double quotes to mark the table names in the Note 1 and Note 2.
		18. ACTION ITEM #3: Menzo WENTINK to create a new R5 which will need to be created and brought back later in the week.
	1. **Review doc 11-16/711r0** Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0711-00-000m-resolutions-for-extended-nss-comments.docx>
		2. CID 7658 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 17:40:48Z). Dot11TVHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling is not actually used in the normative definition and is deleted per CID 7698. Therefore, dot11TVHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling can be replaced with dot11TVHTExtendedNSSBWCapable.

At 79.32, replace "dot11TVHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling" with "dot11TVHTExtendedNSSBWCapable" and "dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling" with "dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWCapable".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7672 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Accepted. Type 0 NSS support affects both regular and beamformed PPDUs, while Type 1 allows to reduce beamformed NSS support separately. Since it is not expected that this will be done much in practice, it would be fine to have extended NSS support to be defined only in relation to Type 0 NSS support.
			4. This CID was pulled before, so we included the rational for the accept
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7674 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Implement changes in document 11-16/554r5 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> > which deletes the cited references.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7675 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment:
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Implement changes in document 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> >, which cleans up table 9-73.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7691 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution:** Revised. Make changes proposed in 11-16/554r5 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> >, which effectively implements what the commenter proposed.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7694 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Make changes proposed in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> > which effectively implements what the commenter proposed.
			3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7698 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Change VHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling to capable for 2919.62
			3. Delete the proposed change for “At 2919.64 renumber 165 to 164.
			4. Need to release the ANA database for the numbers being released
			5. P79L33: review the TVHT renaming that needs to address the deletion
			6. CID 7658 addresses this issue.
			7. The MIB being deleted was never really used in public as it was part of the REVmc process to add and now delete.
			8. **Proposed Resolution** REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-17). Dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling is not actually used, so it can be deleted from the MIB.

At 2881.58 delete the dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling entry.

At 2919.20-51 delete the dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling entry.

At 2919.62 add "dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWCapable might be false when dot11VHTOptionImplemented is false.

Note to the Editor: Inform ANA of the deletion of this MIB variable"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7187 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We need something stronger than a note to make the suggested implication.
			3. **Proposed Resolution:** Revised. HT PPDUs can utilize 2x NSS support at 20 and 40 MHz channel widths. Implement changes proposed in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> >, where a NOTE is added to clarify this.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7665 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Make changes proposed in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> >, which effectively implements what the commenter proposed.
			3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7671 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The **Proposed Resolution** Instruction needs to be adjusted: Revised. Add "Subject to any extended NSS BW support constraint." as the last item in the Encoding cell of the Rx STBC entry in Table 9-245 (Subfields of the VHT Capabilities Information field) - at 1050.38.
			3. This needs a “See Note” to resolve this CID.
			4. Updated **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. At 1050.38 add “See Note 3”

AT 1055.25 add “NOTE 3 – Subject to any extended NSS BW support constraint.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7679 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
			3. Better to say “non-TVHT VHT STAs” – change made in R5
			4. **Proposed Resolution** Revised. Implement changes in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx>>, which makes a change in the direction of the proposed change in the comment
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7680 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7682 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment and proposed changes
			2. **Proposed Resolution:** Revised. Implement changes in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx>>, which makes a change direction of the proposed change in the comment
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7683 (MAC).
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: **Proposed Resolution** Revised. Implement changes in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx> >, which makes a change in the direction of the proposed change in the comment
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7684 (MAC)
			1. Review the Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution: Proposed Resolution** Revised. Implement changes in 11-16/554r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx>>, which deletes this table.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. ACTION ITEM #4: Menzo to post R1 of 11-16/711 and R5 of 11-16/554
	1. **Review doc 11-16/260r06** – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-06-000m-sb1-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-2.doc](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-06-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc)
		2. CID 7111 (EDITOR)
		3. Review Comment and the change that need to be updated. – was in motion 195
		4. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. At 2952.64, 3055.15, 3182.06, 3184.63, 3296.14: change “-2097151..2097151” to “-536870912..536870911”

At 2953.08, 3055.25, 3182.17, 3185.07, and 3296.26: delete “This field contains the fixed-point Part of Altitude.”

* + 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review CID 7804 (EDITOR)** (one of two “++” CIDs)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Discussion on the proposed Rejection reason
		3. Discussion on the FST session and if it is managed independently of (re-) association, so the proposed change is unnecessary and misleading.
			1. The assertion was agreed to be possibly valid, but would like to have that text in the draft.
		4. **Straw Poll #2**
			1. Yes = Reject No = Alternative or Abstain
			2. **Results Straw Poll #2**: 6-1-3 for accepting the Rejection
		5. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:26:39Z) - An FST session is the state resulting from the operation of the FST session setup protocol. The FST session is managed independently of (re-)association, so the proposed change is unnecessary and misleading.
		6. Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-16/689r0** Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0689-00-000m-cid-7742-resolution.doc>
		2. CID 7742 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-16.689r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0689-00-000m-cid-7742-resolution.doc>> these changes clarify the expected behavior for various AP and STA Combinations regarding ASAP and non-ASAP FTM session.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review 11-16/703r0** Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0703-00-000m-modification-to-ftm-figure.doc>
		2. Review Proposed change:
		3. The figure was not done by element ID order, would like to ask that the figure change to the descending order.
		4. Discussion on the priority of the change, and if it is good or not to make the change.
		5. Need more text to be added to this document to address the order of the element descriptions.
		6. ACTION ITEM #5: Carlos to add text to address the order of the element descriptions.
	4. Recess at 3:30pm
1. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 17, 2016 16:00-18:00 – PM2**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 4:01pm
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda 11-16/511r4** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-04-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
		2. Changes to Agenda:
			1. Have Carlos CORDEIRO start and then move to Graham SMITH.
		3. No Objection to agenda change
	4. **Review doc 11-16/650r1** Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0650-01-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx>
		2. Abstract: This document includes proposed resolutions to 11ad related CIDs: 7209, 7626, 7211, 7152 and 7787. The discussion is in reference to Draft P802.11REVmc\_D5.3.
		3. CID 7209 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 02:08:46Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-16/0650r1 <(<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0650-01-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx> > for CID 7209. This clarifies that the bits are reserved.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7626 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. From the discussion: As part of CID7179, in D5.3 this paragraph has been changed to “The following rules describe operation of the ATIM frame(#2069) and frame transmission to STAs in PS mode in an IBSS”, basically removing “DMG BSS”. The problem this change caused is that section 11.2.6 (Power management in a PBSS and DMG infrastructure BSS) states under 11.2.6.4 “ATIM frame transmissions and MSDU transmissions follow the rules defined in 11.2.3.5 (ATIM frame(#2069) and frame transmission).” Thus, with the change as part of CID7179, there is now an inconsistency.

Options to resolve this problem:

1. Revert the change of CID7179
2. Create a new subclause to cover IBSS and DMG BSS
3. Use an approach similar to that used in the Security subclause (e.g.., 12.6.8) that uses a rule of the form “…. with the PCP taking the role of the AP”, but now applied to a BSS.
	* + 1. The proposed resolution should be along the lines of option (2).
			2. The heading of 11.2.3 was in IBSS power management, so a portion will be moved in this proposal.
			3. In 11.2.3.5, what assumptions are based on IBSS?
				1. Changes from CID 7179 would need to be undone.
				2. This will cause CID 7179 to have a new resolution:
			4. Need to reprocess 7179 with a revised resolution that is the same as CID 7626.
			5. **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7626 (MAC) and CID 7179 (EDITOR): REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 02:22:03Z):; Renumber and rename “11.2.3.5 ATIM frame(#2069) and frame transmission” as a new subclause “11.2.7 ATIM frame and frame transmission in an IBSS, DMG infrastructure BSS and PBSS”

Change all references to section 11.2.3.5 to 11.2.7

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7787 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment and proposed changes
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Incorporate the changes for CID 7787 in doc 11-16/650r1 <<(<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0650-01-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx>> which adds the missing four frames and adds a two frames in the rate selection.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7211 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-18 02:30:05Z) In P2495L19, change the field name from "Reserved" to "Differential Encoder Initialization" and replace the text in the description column with "Used to initialize the differential encoding. Possible values are 0 or 1."
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7152 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution** REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-18 02:38:04Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7152 in doc 11-16/650r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0650-01-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx> > which corrects the cited paragraph and adds text for A DMG STA initiating the FT initial mobility domain association procedures
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/714r0** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0714-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-7081-7434-7581-7771-7788-d5-0.docx>
		2. Abstract: This submission proposes resolution for CIDs 7081, 7434, 7581, 7771, 7788 on D5.0
		3. CID 7081 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
				1. Discussion to reorder the new sentence.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: CID 7081 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 02:46:37Z): At 1271.12. Change "The SIFS may also be used by a PC for any types of frames during the CFP (see 10.4 (PCF))" to "The SIFS may also be used within a TXOP or by a PC for any types of frames during the CFP (see 10.4 (PCF))"
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7434 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-05-18 02:50:31Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7581 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 02:50:45Z):: At 877.15 Replace “ EDCA services are” with “the EDCAF is”
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7771 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Change
			3. Discussion on the EIFS text was precise enough language.
			4. ACTION ITEM #6: Menzo and Graham to check if VHT needs EIFS and update the resolution. Note “If covered by” language may need to be changed.
		7. CID 7788 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on “CWindow” value and why it is in the diagram.
			3. Discuss the proposed change and then determined that the CID should be rejected.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-05-18 03:01:59Z):; The CWindow is there to indicate the presence and use of the contention window in the backoff procedure.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review document 11-16/0122r1** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0122-01-000m-resolution-for-d5-comment-on-dsss-parameter-set.docx>
		2. This document was motioned prior to the CIDs being assigned with a Motion 192.
		3. CID 7137 (MAC)
			1. This CID was resolved with the Motion 192: Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-15-1274r3 and 11-16-122r1 into the TGmc draft.
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: CID 7137 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 03:08:11Z): Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/0122r1.

Note to Editor, this change was already done, by Motion 192.

* + - 1. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review document 11-16/0563r3** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0563-03-000m-cid-7085-d5.docx>
		2. CID 7085 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on aMACProcessingDelay
				1. Definition of aMACProcessingDelay is the time left over to obtain aSIFSTime after removing the other addendums.
				2. Discussion on why this is value has always been a debated value and how we have come up with the value.
				3. We should look at a future time to change to a list of functions that need to be done within that time.
			3. For Today, we do not have a change that is agreed to be made, so the proper thing for now is to reject the CID.
			4. The Backoff process is done wrong in most implementations, and has caused issues as it is done differently in different implementations.
			5. The aMACProcessingDelay is defined such that the equation for aSIFSTime is the correct value. Note that Each PHY defines a specific S
			6. **Proposed Resolution**: CID 7085 (MAC: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-05-18 03:22:41Z): See P534.47 where the aMACProcessingDelay variable is defined. The equation is accurate, and necessary for that definition.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review document 11-16/269r0** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0269-00-000m-resolution-cid-7089-d5.docx>
		2. Abstract: This submission proposes resolution for CID 5422 and 5423 on D4.0 Due to lack of time, the resolution as provided in 15/1274r0 was not fully discussed and hence was rejected. Revision 15/1274r1 has a resolution written as a result of the limited comments that were made on 1274r0 and was posted after the discussion.

This Revision 15/1274r2 has changed the references to apply to D5.0. A Comment was submitted on D5.0 referring to these original CIDs on D4.0 and this version is submitted as a resolution to that “new” comment.

* + 1. CID 7089 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment history and the proposed change in expanding the paragraph into two paragraphs.
			2. Grammatical change for a “this” that needs a noun…add “condition”
			3. This is almost pseudo code, but still text.
			4. Discussion on the first paragraph that needs to have extraneous text removed.
			5. The two paragraphs are to cover the successful case and the unsuccessful case.
			6. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-18 03:37:24Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-16/0269r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0269-01-000m-resolution-cid-7089-d5.docx>>, which splits the one large paragraph into three, and clarified the text.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. Review CID 7043 (MAC) which was assigned to Graham SMITH
			1. Not sure why it was assigned to Graham
			2. This is a normative verb in clause 9 that needs to be resolved.
			3. ACTION ITEM #7: Assign to Adrian STEPHENS for resolution proposal
	1. **Review Editorial CIDs** – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. CID 7821 (EDITOR); CID 7797 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17); The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7766 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Question on how the resolution should be prepared.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) 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
		3. CID 7759 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7723 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17); The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7712 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:10:42Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7705 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The cited document is on the last draft (4.0) but not relevant in the reject reason. Update the reject reason to the boiler plate insufficient detail.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 7696 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 7681 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Menzo document may have addressed this already, but the comment itself is not an editorial CID.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-05-18 04:09:55Z) - Make changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx>.  These changes replace the table with an improved format.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 7678 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:14:28Z) - Making the change indicated in the comment would create duplication with material already at the destination.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 7641 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 7629 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:14:51Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined
			3. .No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 7627 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. In particular the proposed change does not indicate where to move the cited text.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		13. CID 7591 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		14. CID 7395 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Rejected (Editor: 2016-05-17) The Comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. Recess 6:02pm
1. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 18, 2016 13:30-15:30 – PM1**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 1:30pm
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda 11-16/511r5** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-05-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
		2. Agenda Changes:
			1. Move Sigurd **SCHELSTRAETE** and Carlos ALDANA to Wed PM2
			2. Add Mark RISON to Wed PM1
		3. No Objection to Agenda Changes
	4. **Review Document 11-16/724r1** Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0724-01-000m-lbs2-various.docx>
		2. CID 7222 (MAC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. A beamformer needs to put in a response. What value it can use is not clear.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Accept.
			4. No Objection. Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 7223 (MAC):
			1. Similar to CID 7222. But, this one is about VHT beamformer.
			2. Proposed Resolution has specific text proposed, as requested.
			3. Reword the resolution to clarify the “Within …” phrase, as it goes into the database.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Revise – add the text – “A VHT beamformer may use the following worst-case parameters to estimate the duration of the expected frame(s) that contain(s) the feedback response(s): lowest rate in basic VHT-MCS set, no grouping.” Within subclause 10.34.5.2 Rules for VHT sounding protocol sequences as a new paragraph, immediately following the paragraph that begins with “A VHT beamformer that transmits a VHT NDP Announcement frame with more than one STA Info field should transmit any Beamforming Report Poll frames used to retrieve”
			5. No Objection. Ready for Motion, with the assumption it will be rephrased into the database.
		4. CID 7762 (MAC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Believe the opposite of what the commenter is assuming. So, suggest Rejected.
			3. Should we clarify the paragraph somehow, to be clear which it is, once we decide? Not sure how to do that.
			4. A VHT STA is an HT STA, so not sure where there is confusion. HT PPDUs are not VHT PPDUs, though. Believe this is all well-defined.
			5. Could add a NOTE if that would be helpful.
			6. **Proposed Resolution**: Reject – the subclause is not for HT STA, it is for any STA that supports HT functionality. Currently, only HT and VHT STA can advertise support for +HTC, and both of these STA types can use the procedures in this subclause.
			7. No Objection. Ready for motion.
		5. CID 7763 (MAC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is the same as CID 7762, except in a different subclause.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Reject – the subclause is not for HT STA, it is for any STA that supports HT functionality. Currently, only HT and VHT STA can advertise support for +HTC, and both of these STA types can use the procedures in this subclause.
			4. No Objection - Ready for Motion.
	5. **Review document 11-16/580r3** Assaf KASHER (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0580-03-000m-dmg-cid-7165.docx>
		2. CID 7165 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. This was presented on a conference call, and changes requested, which are being presented here.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/580r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0580-03-000m-dmg-cid-7165.docx>>. These changes permit a STA to use reverse grant mechanism and stay in doze, which provides a fine granularity power management mechanism.
			4. One editorial change, to make “Reverse direction protocol” use a lower-case ‘r’ in the penultimate paragraph.
			5. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion.
	6. **Review document 11-16/532r42** on the Editorials tab - Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
		2. CID 7159 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:18:40Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection. Ready for motion.
		3. CID 7214 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:18:24Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection - Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 7352 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:18:11Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. Discussed if the commenter provided sufficient detail.
			4. No Objection. Ready for motion.
		5. CID 7384 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. The paragraph is in the SA Query Procedures subclause. Moving it will require adapting it to the form of description of 11.3
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:16:26Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. In particular, it is not a simple move, but an adaption of the SA Query procedures to the form of description of the (Re-)association procedures in 11.3.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON; he’d like to try to produce the needed change details.
			5. ACTION ITEM #8: Mark RISON to produce an alternative proposal by Thursday,
				1. Will leave the Proposed Resolution in case a different submission is not forthcoming on Thursday.
		6. CID 7385 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. The commenter provided resolution requires interpretation of what the term is referring to.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:15:56Z) - 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 . Ready for motion.
	7. **Review doc 11-16/532r42,** Terminology tab. (Adrian STEPHENS)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
		2. CID 7204 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:20:29Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection. Ready for motion.
		3. CID 7636 (EDITOR):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-05-17 23:20:09Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection. Ready for motion.
		4. CID 7074 and CID 7077 (EDITOR):
			1. Both are assigned, and being worked on by Ganesh, but not ready.
	8. **Review document 11-16/276r9** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
		2. CID 7396 (MAC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Clarified that HT-delayed BA is not being covered here, and that’s fine.
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Make the changes shown under CID 7396 in 11-16/276r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>>.
			4. No Objections. Ready for motion.
		3. CID 7500 (MAC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the impact of the air propagation time and CCA.
			3. Review Proposed change
			4. The Table was added because the coverage class value needed to be referenced to a single table which as the “x 3” factor.
			5. The formula should give reasonable non repeating values.
			6. Discussion on the coverage class calculations
			7. Discussion on the mix class of STA in a BSS, and how the coverage class applies.
			8. If Mixed BSS and the AP supports coverage class, and implements the middle level, then some STAs will choose the wrong value.
			9. Discussion on the proposed new values – some STAs would not understand the new values, and would ignore this case.
			10. We should optimize to show that a capability exchange would probably be needed to ensure the full BSSS could operate with the chosen value.
			11. This change is only for the 3.5 to 3.6 band according to the PICs.
			12. See 2684.11 – 2765.32 – Mandatory in 3.5GHz band: CF3.
			13. Maybe a typo in the PICS, but no conclusion was made.
			14. This value is not a dynamic variable, so a STA that does not understand this parameter may not associate, but it could be an issue with the coverage class.
			15. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised. Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 7500 in 11-16/0276r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>>, which effect the requested change, allowing specification of coverage classes up to 900 m in 10 m increments.
				1. More Work on this on –
				2. ACTION ITEM #9: Mark RISON to talk with Peter and prepare an update to this resolution.
		4. CID 7349 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion –
			3. A long list of Questions was provided and the determination was that more discussion was necessary prior to considered, and may be rejected by the end of the week.
			4. ACTION ITEM #10: Mark RISON to revsolve the outstanding questions an update the resolution.
		5. CID 7210 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. “Reserved” means set to zero on Transmit and ignore on receive.
			4. 5 MSBs can be reserved as they are not needed for the 1-2007 range of values.
			5. Question on what the problem that this is trying to solve?
				1. Concern that marking reserved now and then look to reuse in the future could cause a problem, so no change is purported to be change.
			6. Legacy devices were to set the 2 MSB to 1 in the 802.11-2012 standard.
			7. Review the Draft 4.0 text (which is the same as the 2012 standard.) so the change we made in D5.0 to remove the “setting 2 MSBs to one” has already caused a potential non-legacy support issue. Adding the extra text marks the bits as reserved, but now could be ignored.
			8. Mesh case maybe using a larger number.
			9. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED At 661.58 after “A non-DMG STA assigns the value of the AID in the range 1–2007” append “; the 5 MSBs of the AID field are reserved”.
			10. Need more thought before we make this change
			11. ACTION ITEM #11: Mark to get with Matthew FISCHER to look if the number size is bounded.
	9. **Review doc 11-16/714r4**– Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0714-04-000m-resolutions-for-cids-7081-7434-7581-7771-7788-d5-0.docx>
		2. CID 7771 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Discussion on how to cover DMG.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-19 01:23:45Z):: Incorporate the changes in 11-16/714r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0714-05-000m-resolutions-for-cids-7081-7434-7581-7771-7788-d5-0.docx>> which updates the modulation of the PPDU using EIFS.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	10. **Review doc 11-16/228r** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-09-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx>
		2. CID 7087 (MAC) CID 7088 (MAC) and 7541 (MAC)
		3. Review Comments
		4. Review proposed change
		5. The Figure changes discussed – some concern that figure changes may or may not be needed. More Review needed.
	11. **Recessed** at 3:30pm
2. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 18, 2016 16:00-18:00 – PM2**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 1:30pm
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda 11-16/511r6** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-06-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
		2. Review Agenda on slide 3
		3. Agenda updated:

Motions

Guido CIDs: 7219, 7372, 7611

11-15-1184 – Dan(Opportunistic Wireless Encryption),

11-16-562 (Suite B clarification) Dan HARKINS

11-16-710 -- Jouni CIDs 7061, 7420, 7421, 7462, 7727, 7783 – Dan HARKINS will present

* + - 1. Add Sigurd **SCHELSTRAETE**(CID 7106, 7584) and Carlos ALDANA – 11-16/703
			2. No Objection to the Agenda updates
	1. **Motions:**
		1. Motion #W3: **Approve Prior minutes**:

Move to approve prior REVmc BRC Minutes:

* + - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0250-00-000m-revmc-brc-minutes-march-2016-macau.docx>
		- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0506-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmc-brc-april-1-2016.docx>
		- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0542-00-000m-revmc-brc-april-15-telecon-minutes.docx>
		- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0546-00-000m-revmc-brc-april-21-telecon-minutes.docx>
		- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0550-01-000m-minutes-for-revmc-brc-face-to-face-meeting-april-25-28-cambridge.docx>
		- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0574-03-000m-revmc-brc-may-6-and-9-telecon-minutes.docx>
		- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0601-00-000m-revmc-brc-may-13-telecon-minutes.docx>
			1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl 2nd: Emily QI
			2. **Approved by Unanimous consent without objection – Motion passes**
		1. **Motion #219:** **CID 7532 (OMN extension to non-VHT):**

Move to approve the comment resolution to CID 7532 in the “Motion CID 7532” tab in 11-15/0565r41< <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-41-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>>

* + - 1. Moved: Mark RISON 2nd: Guido HERTZ
			2. Discussion:
				1. Speak against the motion for lack of perceived value

Change would allow HT to use OMN, but not certain we have only change required in this resolution to be able implement this feature.

* + - 1. Speaking for the motion, this is possible to use in the HT case and would support the passing of the motion.
			2. **Results #219: 5-5-12 Motion Fails**
			3. We will need to prepare an alternate resolution.
		1. **Motion on CID 7177 (Support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC):**

Move to approve the comment resolution to CID 7177 in the “Motion CID 7177” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-41-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>

* + - 1. Discussion:
				1. Prior to making the motion question on using a different bit definitions.
			2. The motion was not made, and **was deferred**.
			3. **No Objection to defer motion**
		1. **Motion #220:**  **Motion (DMG NAV setting):**

Motion to incorporate the text changes in11-16/566r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0566-01-000m-nav-setting-fixes-in-dmg-network.docx>> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Assaf KASHER 2nd: Emily QI
			2. Discussion: None
			3. **Result: 12-0-9 Motion Passes**
		1. Motion (Resolves issue in document 406):

Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/567r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0567-02-000m-bss-intention-in-dmg-discovery-beacon.docx>> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Question on the version number –
				1. Language corrections were made to R2.
				2. The second to last paragraph was modified to correct grammar and to clarify which column in the table, (reference was also added).
				3. Concern on the conditions that are embedded in the paragraph.
				4. The text for the changes was reviewed, but there was some concern on the text that changed and did not have clear structures.
			2. **Defer this motion** to later to allow R1 and R2 differences to be discussed offline.
			3. **No Objection to defer motion**
		1. **Motion #221**: **DMG Awake window fixes**):

Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/569r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0569-02-000m-awake-window-access-fixes-in-dmg-network.docx>> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Changed from R1 to R2 made in the moving of the motion
			2. Moved: Assaf KASHER 2nd: Emily QI
			3. Discussion: None
			4. **Results #221: 11-0-12 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #222: GEN and MAC Tabs**

Motion: Approve the comment resolutions in the following document and tabs indicated and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “Motion MAC-BT” Tab in 11-15/565r42 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-42-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>>, changing the CID indicated in the resolution to CID 7277 from “CID 7396” to “CID 7277”.
* “GEN-April F2F – B” Tab in 11-15/665r31 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-31-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>
* “Editor – may telecons” in 11-15/532r42 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>
* “Editor – Waikoloa” in 11-15/532r42 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>
	+ - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion:
				1. 7678 would like more discussion – Pull from Motion

Review the proposed change.

The proposed change would duplicate at the proposed location, it may be better to delete and provide new text.

The cited Table may have been changed by another submission.

* + - 1. Motion to Amend: “Except for CID 7678” to the Editor – Waikoloa”
				1. Moved Mark RISON – 2nd Stephen PALM
				2. Discussion: on why the CID should be pulled.
				3. **Results motion to amend: 7-2-14 Motion Passes**
			2. **Motion #222** as amended:

Motion: Approve the comment resolutions in the following document and tabs indicated and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “Motion MAC-BT” Tab in 11-15/565r42 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-42-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>>, changing the CID indicated in the resolution to CID 7277 from “CID 7396” to “CID 7277”.
* “GEN-April F2F – B” Tab in 11-15/665r31 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-31-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>
* “Editor – may telecons” in 11-15/532r42 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>
* “Editor – Waikoloa” in 11-15/532r42 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>> Except for CID7678
	+ - 1. **Results #222: 19-0-4 Motion Passes**
			2. We will need updated spreadsheets for the CIDs resolutions prepared this week for the motions tomorrow from the adhoc groups (GEN, MAC, EDITOR).
		1. **Motion #223:** **Suite B clarification**

Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/562r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0562-01-000m-suite-b-akm-update.docx>> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Presentation of the change being proposed.
			2. Moved: Dan HARKINS 2nd: Mike MONTEMURRO
			3. Discussion: none
			4. **Results #223: 14-0-7 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #224:** **Motion re: Decoupling MU Beamformee:**

Move to Resolve CIDs 7166(MAC), 7167(MAC), 7168(MAC), and 7169(MAC): as “Rejected” with a reason of:
“The comment does not indicate an error in the change introduced by the resolution to CID 5879. The change made by CID 5879 is in scope of a revision project.
Regarding specific changes made related to decoupling MU Beamformee Sounding capability from MU PPDU reception capability, the exact determination of the beamforming matrix by the AP has always been outside the scope of the standard. The AP controls the number of streams that a STA will feed back. As such, it can continue to operate as it did before the text changes and no extra processing or complexity results from the changes made with the resolution of CID 5879. The change is fully backwards compatible with current devices.”

* + - 1. Presentation of the 4 CIDs and the proposed changes that are being rejected was made.
			2. Moved: Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE 2nd: Emily QI
			3. Discussion:
				1. Speaking against the motion, the change added last time should be reversed as it is not fixing any specific problem, instead is contrary to future plans.
				2. Speaking in favor of the motion, the rationale given is clear as to the reason to reject these 4 CIDs. Also the future changes would have to address any differences at the time it was changed.
				3. Speaking against the motion – 11AX is discussing something like this and this could be in conflict due the large number of capabilities. Unsure if the change is supported in the market place, and concerned that it was not made clear when it was made.
				4. Speaking for the Motion – changing text based on possible future changes in another amendment. This change was made with the process, and the change should remain. Future change could be done later, but having a more thorough research done.
			4. **Results #224: 10-11-8 Motion Fails**
				1. Another Resolution will have to be made, and the Chair will make a resolution to indicate that the Group could not come to consensus.
		1. **Motion #225:** **CID 7160 (GEN) (OWE):**

Resolve CID 7160 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11/15/1184r7 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1184-07-000m-owe.docx>>. These changes effect the commenter’s Proposed Resolution.”

* + - 1. Summary of the presentation was made by Dan HARKINS
			2. Moved: Dan HARKINS 2nd: Guido HIERTZ
			3. Discussion:
				1. Since the initial presentation, text has been added to the preamble to explain what OWE does and does not do.
				2. Speaking in favor of the motion to increase the level of security you can get without user intervention. No Claim of security replacement, but just improved over no security.
				3. Speaking against the motion – large change at the last minute is a concern with little time to fix any possible errors. REVmc may be published in less than 6 months, and no time to review.
				4. Speaking in favor of the motion: we should never have allowed open networks, and this is the step that we should take. While not perfect, this is opportunistic to provide better security than open, but not replacing the secure modes defined. Even something like DNS that would be protected with this method.
				5. Speaking in favor of the motion: No claim of full security, but rather if it is hacked, then we are no worse off than we were without it.
				6. Speaking in favor of the motion: This is a simple Diffe-Hellman exchange, so it is not new protocol, but is just being added to the .11 standard.
			4. **Results #225: 10-5-12 – Motion Fails**
				1. Another Resolution will have to be made, and the Chair will make a resolution to indicate that the Group could not come to consensus.
		1. **Motion #226:** **Motion on CID 7377 (Secure PSK):**

Move to approve the comment resolution to CID 7377 in the “GEN-April F2F - A” tab in 11-15/665r31 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-31-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Mike MONTEMURRO
			2. Discussion:
				1. Speaking against the motion – the wording will end up with wrong implication.
				2. Speaking for the motion – regardless of which PSK used, it is subject to a dictionary attack. Lots of examples that PSK is vulnerable.
				3. Speaking for the motion- The change makes the sentence clear
				4. Speaking against the motion – The protocol itself is secure if the proper password is selected, and so it not in general insecure.
				5. Speaking against the arguments given for voting against the motion
			3. **Results #226: 8-3-14 Motion Fails**
				1. Another Resolution will have to be made, and the Chair will make a resolution to indicate that the Group could not come to consensus
	1. **Guido’s CIDs**
		1. CID 7219 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Accept
			3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7372 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Delete Lines 12 and 15 and make list item “b)” a new paragraph
			3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7611 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review doc 11-16/602r0
				1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0602-00-000m-resolution-to-cid-7611.docx>>
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 03:24:34Z); Incorporate the changes in 11-16/602r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0602-00-000m-resolution-to-cid-7611.docx> > which affect the change suggested by the comment
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-16/710r0** presented by Dan HARKINS (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx>
		2. CID 7061 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 03:28:45Z)- incorporate the changes in 11-16/710r0 <[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx%20) > making the changes in the direction of the comment
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7420 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on removing the first sentence.
			3. The Chair made an R1 on behalf of Jouni
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: incorporate the changes in 11-16/710r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-01-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx>> making the changes in the direction of the comment
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7421 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-18) incorporate the changes in 11-16/710r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-01-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx>> making the changes in the direction of the comment
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7462 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 03:28:45Z)- incorporate the changes in 11-16/710r0 <[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx%20)> making the changes in the direction of the comment
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7727 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: : REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 03:28:45Z)- incorporate the changes in 11-16/710r0 <[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx%20)> making the changes in the direction of the comment
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 7783 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed change
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; incorporate the changes in 11-16/710r0 <[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0710-00-000m-security-comments-assigned-to-me.docx%20)  > making the changes in the direction of the comment
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review doc 11-16/709r1** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE(Quantenna)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-01-000m-cids-7106.docx>
		2. CID 7106 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Similar issue with CIDs 7311, 7312, 7313 (GEN)
			4. There was a change made by CID 7404 in this section that would need to be reopened and resolved with this same proposal.
			5. Also in 21.2.5.3 has a similar change related to CID 7404 and 7408 (EDITOR)
				1. This was resolved with 11-16/291r1.
				2. Review the changes that were made by 11-16/291 that were in the cited paragraphs and we would now delete those paragraphs.
			6. Review table 21-2
				1. for the Non-HT Modulation cases.
				2. Top of table 21-2 – deleted comma not marked.
				3. 2nd HT\_MF or HT\_GF – should have “the transmission shall use the primary 20MHZ channel.”
				4. Discussion on the combination and if the 4th column is an output or a valid parameter?
			7. **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7106, 7311, 7312, 7313 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 03:44:09Z); incorporate the changes in 11-16/709r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-01-000m-cids-7106.docx>>, which removes the MAC mandatory requirements from the PHY section.
			8. **New updated** **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7404 and 7408 (EDITOR): REVISED; incorporate the changes in 11-16/709r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-01-000m-cids-7106.docx>>, which deletes the cited text.
				1. This will cause these two CIDs to be motioned again.
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. Recessed at 6:00pm
1. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 19, 2016 08:00-10:00 – AM1**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 08:00
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda**: doc 11-16/511r7 Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-07-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
		2. Modified Agenda:
2. 11-16/670r1 – Hiroyuki MOTOZUKA – DMS Extended MCS set base MCS & length calculation
3. 11-15/273r13– Adrian STEPHENS - CID 7043
4. 11-16/276r10 – Mark RISON - CID 7210, 7212, 7240, 7244, 7317, 7448, 7503, 7812
5. 11-16/412r3 Brian Hart - CID 7523
	* + 1. No Objection to modified agenda
	1. **Review doc 11-16/707r1** Hiroyuki MOTOZUKA (Panasonic)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0707-01-000m-dmg-base-mcs-and-length-supplementary-slides.ppt>
		2. Abstract from the submission:

The current text in draft D5.4 of REVmc defines the Base MCS and Length field in the PHY SC header for extended MCS.

But the formula for Length field value causes duration calculation error for some Ns (number of PSDU octets.)

The submission 11-16/0670r5 proposes modified text and formulae to fix it.

This submission includes supplementary slides for 11-16/0670r5. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0670-05-000m-base-mcs-and-length-calculation-for-extended-mcs-set.docx>>

* + 1. Presentation of 11-16/707r1
		2. Review changes shown in 11-16/670r5.
		3. Discussion on edits required
			1. Equation on page 2 needs a number
			2. The number of data octets limit for PSDU discussed.
				1. The sentence was moved, not a new limit
			3. Bottom of page three – Bit ordering was called out even though it is defined elsewhere.
			4. The inclusion of this extra sentence causes some confusion if it is not changing the definition. Should be removed.
				1. It is doubly redundant, so should be removed.
			5. In table 20-18 and 20-20 has similar mapping, and the last column in 20-18 should be removed. As it is overlapping information.
			6. The Editor will take care of the minor grammar issues when incorporating
				1. If others have editorial items, they can send to Hirouki for inclusion and to send to Editors.
		4. ACTION ITEM #12: Hiroyuki MOTOZUKA Will post an R2 before noon today, and the chair will prepare a motion.
	1. **Review doc 11-16/273r11** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-13-000m-sb1-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-3.doc](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-13-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc)
		2. CID 7043 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised.

At 1776.36, insert the following new text:

“A STA that receives a BSS Transition Management Request frame with the Preferred Candidate List Included subfield of the Request Mode field equal to 0 may ignore the BSS Transition Candidate List Entries field of the frame.”

At 1189.54: change “may ignore the BSS Transition Candidate List Entries field” to “can ignore the BSS Transition Candidate List Entries field (see 11.24.7.3 (BSS transition management request)).”

* + - 1. This change just moves text to a different place.
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/276r10** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
		2. CID 7212 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and the proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 7212 in 11-16/276r10 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> >, which clarify that “mode set Quiet Channel elements” (i.e. Quiet Channel elements with the AP Quiet Mode field equal to 1) only apply to infrastructure BSSs.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7240 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 7240 in 11-16/276r10 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> >, which instead deletes (Re)AssociateFailureTimeout again.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7244 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed change options
			3. Discussion on the deprecate instructions
				1. At 2883.13 change “current” to “Deprecated”
				2. At 3359.52 delete “dot11AuthenticationResponseTimeOut”
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; At 2883.13 change “current” to “Deprecated” and At 3359.52 delete “dot11AuthenticationResponseTimeOut”
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7317 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Discussion of the proposed change options
			4. Straw Poll #3:
				1. Option 1, Option 2, Option 4
				2. **Results Straw Poll #3: 5-4-3**
			5. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Delete cited sentence.
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7448 (MAC) and 7812 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CIDs 7448 and 7812 in 11-16/276r10 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>>, which remove the test modes and tidy up the Supported Rates wording.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 7503 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Change
			3. Should change “HT\_MF PPDU” to “HT-mixed format PPDU” and “HT-GF” to “HT-greenfield format”
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Delete the row at 1413.40 and change the row at 1413.44 to:

As the first PPDU in the TXOP, send one of:

* a non-HT PPDU containing a frame that requires an immediate response
* an HT-mixed format PPDU containing a frame that requires an immediate response in a non-HT PPDU

PPDUs after the first PPDU exchange may be HT-greenfield format PPDUs and/or be separated by RIFS.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7210 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Discussion on the difference from yesterday’s discussion. Use of “Reserved”” vs “Undefined” or “set to zero”
				1. No clear definition of “Undefined”
				2. “Reserved” means set to zero on transmit and ignore on Receive.
				3. We want to have a way to mark things RESERVED, and not for future use.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED; At 661.58 after “A non-DMG STA assigns the value of the AID in the range 1–2007” append “; the 5 MSBs of the AID field are reserved”.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7540 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
			3. Discussion of is this a repeat of what is in 6.1.7 or not?
				1. The addition of the Note
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 7540 in 11-16/276r10 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> >, which clarify that “QoS Data frame” is anything with b7 of FC set.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7592 (MAC) 7593 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. These comment were proposed to be rejected but were pulled. Here is an alternative resolution.
			3. Discussion on the Max SP Length – the notes are not at odd.
				1. The Max SP Length is units of BUs.
			4. Question on if this happens in practice and if fragments are continued, but the previous discussion was that this is not the case.
			5. Any failed packet, fails and is not continued.
			6. The unscheduled SP ends with the sending of ESOP.
				1. Discussion on the action of the ESOP bit
			7. Alternative **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7592 (MAC): Revised; At 1581.41 add a “NOTE—The SP does not end until the transmission of this BU either has succeeded or is presumed failed (when maximum retries are exceeded).”
			8. Alternative **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7593 (MAC); Revised; At 1576.59 add a “NOTE—An unscheduled SP does not end until the transmission of the last BU in the SP either has succeeded or is presumed failed (when maximum retries are exceeded).”
			9. Mark CID 7592 (MAC) Ready for Motion
			10. More discussion needed on 7593 (MAC) – Request to restore the prior Resolution – Still open
		4. CID 7747 (MAC) and 7748 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 7747 and 7748 in 11-16/276r10 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> >, which clarify the exact rules for MPDU ordering in A-MPDUs for a DMG STA.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion in a **separate TAB**
		5. CID 7428 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 19:49:43Z) In the definition at the cited location, after “transmitted” add “by a Clause 15, Clause 16, Clause 17 or Clause 18 PHY, or ”.
			4. No Objection \_ Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7480 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-19 19:52:08Z); At the cited location add “NOTE—” before the cited text and change to the NOTE font size.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/412r3** Brian HART (Cisco) presented by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0412-03-000m-tgmc-rm-cids-7563-7523-and-7444.doc>
		2. CID 7523 (MAC),
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Deleting the last phrase of the last note would be necessary
			4. The last phrase of the new last paragraph could be deleted or changed into a note.
			5. Concern on the behavior limits being a bit mislead, and could cause a STA some delay in getting the behavior limits, but they are not strongly used.
			6. Some more discussion during the break to look at the final changes.
	2. Next session is PM1
	3. Recess at 10:01am
1. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 19, 2016 13:30-15:30 – PM1**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 08:00
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda**:11-16/511r8 Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-08-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
		2. Approved Agenda
2. 11-16/412r4 – Brian HART - CID 7523
3. 11-16/731r0 – Ganesh VENKATESAN - CIDs 7074, 7077,
4. 11-16/733r0 - Ganesh VENKATESAN - CIDs 7207, 7818
5. 11-16/298r6 - Dan HARKINS - CID 7553
6. 11-16/290r8 - Mark HAMILTON - CIDs: 7146, 7324, 7827, 7139,
7. 11-16/703 - Carlos ALDANA –
8. 11-16/276r10 - Mark RISON – CIDs: 7368,7544, 7555, 7573,7589,7732
9. 11-16/740r0 - Graham SMITH – CIDs: 7465. 7082
10. Graham SMITH – CIDS: 7087, 7088, 7541, 7700,
11. Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE - CID 7106
	* 1. No Objection to the updated Agenda
	1. **Review doc 11-16/412r4** Brian HART (Cisco) presented by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0412-04-000m-tgmc-rm-cids-7563-7523-and-7444.doc>
		2. CID 7523 (MAC),
			1. Indicate the changes made over lunch
			2. Identify a couple minor editorial (capitalization) changes
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-16/412r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0412-05-000m-tgmc-rm-cids-7563-7523-and-7444.doc>>
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-16/731r0** Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0731-00-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7074-and-7077.doc>
		2. Review document
		3. The extensions in HT are in conflict with the direction of 11ax.
		4. CIDs 7074 (MAC), 7077 (MAC):
			1. A few editorial fixes: Add “HT variant” in front of “HT Control”. Delete the “in the HT Control field of the received MPDU” in the first line, as unnecessary. Add “drop” before “eligibility” on the second line. Change “under insufficient resources condition” to “if resources are insufficient”. Change “recover from the insufficient resources” to “recover from the lack of resources”. Change “Note that this may not” to “Note that this might not”. Change “will” to “might” in the next sentence.
			2. ACTION ITEM #13: Ganesh will upload an R1 with these changes.
		5. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 01:05:43Z): Incorporate text changes as shown in 11-16/731r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0731-01-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7074-and-7077.doc>>
			1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion with R1
	3. **Review doc 11-16/733r0** Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0733-00-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7207-and-7818.doc>
		2. CID 7207 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Reviewed Changes
			3. Some detailed cleanup in the tables noted. Suggest putting the before and after tables side-by-side and fix up.
			4. On the right side of Figure 6-16, move the .indication down to below where “t3” is known.
			5. Ganesh will re-work off line, and bring back an R1.
			6. ACTION ITEM #14: Ganesh will upload an R1 that includes these changes.
			7. 7818 (MAC)
			8. Review Comment
			9. Review Proposed Changes
			10. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-16/733r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0733-00-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7207-and-7818.doc> > which adds text clarifying that GCR does Block Ack reordering
			11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Review doc 11-16/298r6** Dan HARKINS (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0298-06-000m-ds-assigned-cids-march-2016.docx>
		2. CID 7553 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Discussion of the 12.6.10.3
			4. Suggestion to add a sentence that says “a mesh PMKSA cannot be cached” The idea is to make the change at the end of the new paragraph.
			5. Discussion on the caching of the PMKSA
			6. Need to upload an R7
			7. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; incorporate the changes for CID 7553 in 11-16/298r7 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0298-07-000m-ds-assigned-cids-march-2016.docx>> which addresses the caching of mesh PMKSA.
			8. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **Review doc 11-16/290r8** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus Wireless)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx>
		2. CID 7324 (MAC)
			1. This was marked ready for motion, but was pulled and put into Motion MAC-BQ Pulled Tab in the MAC AdHoc spreadsheet. Then Mark HAMLITON picked up the discussion, but started the CID again later in the document.
			2. Review the proposed changes in the second instance of the CID in the document.
			3. The problem is that the octets may or may not be able to be human readable. Deletion of the parenthetical otherwise discussed, as well as removing the “natural language”.
				1. Discussion on changing to “the character encoding”
				2. Change “Otherwise the character encoding of the octets in this SSID element is unspecified.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised; incorporate the changes for CID 7324 in 11-16/290r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx>> which clarifies the cited sentence.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7146 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if this is a Clause 10 issue or not.
			3. See Figure 5-1 – does this apply to a relay function that is not on the diagram?
				1. The figure has flow that is depicted up and down
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED. In the case of a DMG Relay in PHY relay mode, the behavioral aspects occur within the PHY layers of the relay STA, and thus do not appear in this (MAC layer) figure. In the case of a DMG Relay in MAC relay mode, the store-and-forward operations occur within the “STA stack”, further down than the ‘role-specific behavior’ block. Thus, this behavior is a configuration or mode of the STA stack itself, and any architectural figures and associated text should be within the appropriate subclause. Any changes to accomplish, if needed, are outside the scope of this comment.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7139 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. No real response in trying to gain extra discussion or research
			3. Discussion on what rules of which TIDS or MPDU are allowed in an A-MPDU.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
		5. CID 7827 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review R.3.2 for context. And Figure R-1
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-05-20 00:50:29Z); 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
	6. **Review document 11-16/703r2** Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0703-02-000m-modification-to-ftm-figure.doc>
		2. Review the updated changes to the figure.
		3. Discussion on the merit for making the changes
		4. Separate motion to incorporate the R2 of this document during the motion time.
		5. Concern of a possible statement that claims ascending order, as this is an unpublished draft, we can fix things now easier than if it was done in a published standard.
	7. **Review document 11-16/276r10** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
		2. CID 7544 (MAC), CID 7555 (MAC) and CID 7368 (GEN)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review context of each CID
			3. Discussion on if there was any technical change included in these CID changes.
				1. Offline discussion seemed to indicate agreement on **Proposed Resolution**.
			4. **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7544 (MAC): Accepted
			5. **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7555 (MAC): Accepted
			6. **Proposed Resolution** for CID 7368 (GEN): ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-05-20 01:04:49Z)
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7573 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The name of GMP is Galois/Counter Mode Protocol
			3. Discussion on the history of how we may have gotten to the different names.
			4. No Objection to update the document for this name, and bring back to PM2.
			5. ACTION ITEM #15: Mark to update the doc and bring back
		4. CID 7589 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and the proposed changes
			3. Need more work, if not done by PM2, will reject
			4. ACTION ITEM #16: Mark to update the doc and bring back
	8. **Review Doc 11-16/740r0** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0740-00-000m-resolutions-to-cids-7465-and-7082-for-d5.docx>
		2. CID 7465 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Concern on the Basic is the long preamble, and the other preamble. This text is in the area where basic with a little b is used.
			3. Review page 2231.63 for context.
			4. Change Cited sentence to “One mode of the HR/DSS PHY uses the same PHY…”
			5. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-20 01:26:02Z); At 2231.22 change “The basic” to “One mode of the”
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7082 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on what the old and new sentence was trying to say.
			3. Discussion on possibly of just delete the sentence.
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: Revised ; Delete the first sentence of paragraph at 1271.14 (D5.0).
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	9. **Recess at 3:30 pm**
12. **REVmc BRC face to face meeting at Waikoloa, HI on May 19, 2016 16:00-18:00 – PM2**
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 4:02
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Review Agenda**: Doc – 11-16/511r9
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-09-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
	4. **Motions**:
		1. **Motion #227: GEN and MAC Tabs**

Approve the comment resolutions in the following document and tabs indicated and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “Gen-Waikoloa-A” and “Gen-Waikoloa-B” Tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-33-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> except CID 7106, 7313, 7312 and 7311
* “Motion MAC-BU” and “Motion MAC-BV” Tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-43-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> – except for 7747 and 7748
	+ - 1. Need to pull 7106, 7313, 7311 and 7312 because the resolution needs to have url version fixed.
			2. Review MAC CIDS, there were 10 URLs missing on MAC-BU tab (CID 7396)
			3. Request fix MAC-BV CID 7503 underscore to Hyphen should be made
			4. Request to remove CID 7747 and 7748 –
			5. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS, 2nd: Jon ROSDAHL
			6. Discussion: None
			7. **Results #227: 20-0-2 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #228:** **Resolves issue in doc 406**

Move to incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0567-04-000m-bss-intention-in-dmg-discovery-beacon.docx> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Assaf KASHER 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
			2. Discussion: None
			3. **Result: Adopted by Unanimous consent without objection – motion passes**
		1. **Motion #229: DMG Base MCS and Length Calculation for Extended MCS Set):**

Move to incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0670-05-000m-base-mcs-and-length-calculation-for-extended-mcs-set.docx> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Hiroyuki MOTOZUKA Seconded: Carlos CORDEIRO
			2. Discussion – Was the changes discussed during the presentation included?
				1. Yes all the requested/discussed changes are included in R5
			3. **Results 24-0-1 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #230: CID 7160 (GEN) (OWE):**

Resolve CID 7160 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The BRC discussed the comment and Proposed Resolution at length and did not come to consensus to make the changes necessary to resolve the comment. Motions to adopt (versions of) the document were taken on May 18 2016 (result 10-5-12), March 16 2016 (result 16-7-7). While there was strong support for including the changes, the level of support did not reach 75%. Concerns raised included the need for the addition and the risk of adding 4 pages of text late in the process. Points raised in support include the need for replacing open authentication, opportunistically and the use of a well-known, vetted 30 year old, Diffie Hellman algorithm, and supporting IETF opportunistic encryption, see RFC 7435. ”

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI Seconded: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion: Concern that there is a need for this feature and we should not reject it, but we are at the point to make progress we need to reject to complete our work.
			3. **Results #230: 10-2-10 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #231: Motion re: Decoupling MU Beamformee:**

Move to Resolve CIDs 7166, 7167, 7168 (MAC), and 7169 (MAC): as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The BRC discussed the comment and Proposed Resolution at length and did not come to consensus to make the changes necessary to resolve the comment. Motions to reject the comment were taken in March (Motion #201 result 10-6-6) April (Motion #207 5-2-0), May 18 2016 (Motion #204 result 10-11-8). Comments opposing the changes proposed by the commenter: “The comment does not indicate an error in the change introduced by the resolution to CID 5879. The change made by CID 5879 is in scope of a revision project. Regarding specific changes made related to decoupling MU Beamformee Sounding capability from MU PPDU reception capability, the exact determination of the beamforming matrix by the AP has always been outside the scope of the standard. The AP controls the number of streams that a STA will feed back. As such, it can continue to operate as it did before the text changes and no extra processing or complexity results from the changes made with the resolution of CID 5879. The change is fully backwards compatible with current devices” Comments in favor of the changes proposed in the comment: as in comment.

* + - 1. Moved: Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE 2nd: Ganesh VENKATESAN
			2. Discussion: None
			3. **Results #231: 11-1-10 Motion Passes**
		1. Motion on CID 7177 (Support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC):

Move to approve the comment resolution to CID 7177 in the “Motion CID 7177” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-41-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>

* + - 1. Defer until we review doc 11-16/276 for a resolution that may provide a bit that will be used for this resolution.
			2. No Objection to deferral
		1. **Motion #232: Motion on CID 7553(MAC) (Clause 4 mesh PMKSA):**

Move to approve the comment resolution to CID 7553 as “Revised” With a resolution of “REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 01:07:48Z): Incorporate the text changes under “CID 7553” in 11-16/298r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0298-05-000m-ds-assigned-cids-march-2016.docx>>, changing “A mesh PMKSA may not be” to “A mesh PMKSA shall not be “into the TGmc draft. These changes correct the cited text and add mesh PMKSA definition text.”

* + - 1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion: Noted that the text should be changed from “may not” to “Shall not”
			3. **Results #232: 8-0-13 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #233:** **Motion (FTM field order):**

Move to incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0703-02-000m-modification-to-ftm-figure.doc>

* + 1. Moved: Carlos ALDANA Seconded: Jonathan SEGEV
		2. Discussion: None
		3. **Results #233: 17-0-7 Motion Passes**
	1. **Review Document 11-16/733r1** Ganesh VENKATESAN
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0733-01-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7207-and-7818.doc>
		2. CID 7207 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review changes made since this morning in R0
			3. Review the table and figure
			4. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 02:44:06Z):L Incorporate the text changes shown for CID 7207 in 11-16/733r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0733-01-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7207-and-7818.doc> ). This adds the changes to the Timing Management subclause.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-16/709r1** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE(Quantenna)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-01-000m-cids-7106.docx>
		2. CID 7106 (GEN), CIDs 7311 (GEN), 7312 (GEN), and 7313 (GEN):
			1. Review Comments
			2. These CIDs were pulled from motion as an update to 11-16/709r1 was made.
			3. Highlighted changes show the changes made since r1 in preparation for R2.
				1. Document 11-16/0709r2 being displayed
				2. “shall assume values” was not good wording
				3. New sentence was in passive voice, using “assume” and the actor is the MAC and this is in a PHY Clause and we have been removing that specifically for these CIDs
			4. Discussion on the validity of the proposed changes
			5. Discussion on if we can live with R1 and leave the resolutions as originally proposed.
				1. The new changes were discussed more.
				2. One option: CH\_OFFSET Value in the Clause 19 TXVECTOR shall be consistent with Table 21-2
				3. Better option: The PHY shall use a value of CH\_OFFSET in the Clause 19 TXVECTOR that is consistent with Table 21-2.
			6. Post 11-16/0709r2 -
			7. **Proposed Resolution** CIDs 7106, 7311, 7312, 7313(GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-20 03:11:14Z) incorporate the changes in 11-16/709r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-02-000m-cids-7106.docx>>, which removes the MAC mandatory requirements from the PHY section.
			8. Also update CID 7404 and CID 7408 (EDITOR) Resolutions as well to use R2.
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review doc 11-16/732r1** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0732-01-000m-resolution-of-cid-7700-d5.docx>
		2. CID 7700 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Update the document to have the changes to the proper clauses, there was a copy of the cited sentence in the wrong location.
			4. Change 555.12 and 555.48.
			5. This primitive is a request by the MAC sublayer to the local PHY entity to reset the PHY to the state appropriate for the end of a received frame and to turn IPI reporting on and off by means of the IPA-State parameter.
			6. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 03:15:46Z):

At 555.12

Change

"The effect of receipt of this primitive by the PHY entity is to reset the PHY CS/CCA timers to the state appropriate for the end of a received frame and to initiate a new CCA evaluation cycle."

to

"The effect of receipt of this primitive by the PHY entity is to reset the PHY to the state appropriate for the end of a received frame and to initiate a new CCA evaluation cycle."

At 554.48

Change

"This primitive is a request by the MAC sublayer to the local PHY entity to reset the CCA state machine and to turn IPI reporting on and off by means of the IPI-STATE parameter."

to

"This primitive is a request by the MAC sublayer to the local PHY entity to reset the PHY to the state appropriate for the end of a received frame and to turn IPI reporting on and off by means of the IPI-STATE parameter."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Motion #234: Motion Thurs PM2 CIDs**

Move to resolve:

* CID 7207(EDITOR) as “Revised” with a resolution of “REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 02:44:06Z): Incorporate the text changes shown for CID 7207 in 11-16/733r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0733-01-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7207-and-7818.doc). This adds the changes to the Timing Management subclause.
* CIDs 7107(GEN), 7311(GEN), 7312(GEN), 7313(GEN), 7404(EDITOR), and 7408(EDITOR), as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/709r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-02-000m-cids-7106.docx>>
* CID 7700(EDITOR) as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11-16-732r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-00-000m-cids-7106.docx>>, which deletes the cited text.”
	+ 1. Moved: Ganesh VENKATESAN Seconded: Assaf KASHER
		2. Discussion: none
		3. **Result: 15-0-4 Motion Passes**
		4. **REVmc Secretary Note:** CID 7106/7107 - We resolved it in discussion above, but Motion #234 cites CID 7107 instead.  The database resolves CID 7107 with motion #234, but that is not the right resolution – CID 7101 should still be open.  The Motion deck shows CID 7107, but other than the motion, the discussion and the submission 11-16/709 has CID 7106, 7311, 7312, 7404, 7408.  We will need to re-motion 7106 and 7107.
	1. **Motion #235**: **“MAC-BW”, “Editor Waikoloa 2” and “Editor Waikoloa pulled” tabs**

Motion: Approve the comment resolutions in the following document and tabs indicated and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “Motion MAC-BW” Tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-45-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>
* “Editor Waikoloa 2” and “Editor Waikoloa pulled” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-44-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls> except for CIDs 7408 and 7404
	+ 1. Moved: Adrian Stephens Seconded: Emily QI
		2. Discussion: None
		3. **Result: 16-0-2 Motion passes**
	1. **Review doc 11-16/228r12** Graham Smith (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-12-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx>
		2. CID 7087 (MAC) and 7088 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review issue with cited location which are inconsistent
			3. Discussion: (Basically a REJECT This is too big a change near the end of the process. However there is one simple error that needs to be corrected.)
			4. At 1351.61: Following AIFSN[AC] × aSlotTime + aSIFSTime – aRxTxTurnaroundTime of idle medium after the last indicated busy medium as indicated by the CS mechanism that is not covered by a) to d).
			5. **Proposed Resolution:** REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 03:48:52Z): At 1351.61 replace "idle" with "busy"
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7541 (MAC)
			1. Review the possible RESOLUTION for 7541 REVISED (basically and accept but cited location is wrong) At 1351.22 Add “The backoff procedure starts with this step.”
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-05-20 03:46:19Z): The change requested is not necessarily correct or complete.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion.
	2. **Review document 11-276r11 -**  Mark RISON (SAMSUNG)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
		2. CID 7747 (MAC) 7748 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. **Proposed Resolution** REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-19 21:47:49Z): Make the changes shown under "Proposed changes" for CID 7747 and 7748 in 11-16/276r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> ), which clarify the exact rules for MPDU ordering in A-MPDUs for a DMG STA.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7573 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the name change to be consistent with Galois/counter mode
			3. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-20 03:55:19Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 7573 in 11-16/276r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>>
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. 7732 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. **Proposed Resolution**: REVISED; Change the body of 12.3.1 to read just “Except for Open System authentication, all pre-RSNA security mechanisms are obsolete. Support for them might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Motion #236: 2nd set of Thurs PM2 CIDs (2nd set):**

Move to resolve:

* CIDs 7087(MAC), 7088(MAC) as “Revised; incorporate the text changes in 11-16-228r13”
* CIDs 7747(MAC) and 7748(MAC) as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11-16-276r11< <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>> , which clarify the exact rules for MPDU ordering in A-MPDUs for a DMG STA.”
* CID 7573(GEN) as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11-16-276r11< <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>>”
* CID 7732 (GEN) Proposed Resolution: REVISED, Change the body of 12.3.1 to read just “Except for Open System authentication, all pre-RSNA security mechanisms are obsolete. Support for them might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”.
	+ 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS Seconded: Sean COFFEY
		2. *REVmc Secretary note:* The motion deck has CID 7087 and 7088 being resolved with the following:

“Revised” incorporate the text changes in 11-16-228r13”,

But the earlier minutes and the data base show that this resolution was to be set to

 “REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-20 03:48:52Z): At 1351.61 replace "idle" with "busy" “

Which matches the text changes in 11-16/228r13.

* + 1. **Result #236: 11-0-2 Motion passes**
	1. **Time Extension:**
		1. Asked for time to extend meeting for one motion – No Objection
	2. **Motion #237: CID 7541(MAC)**

Move to resolve:

* CID 7541 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “the proposed change is not necessarily correct or complete in all contexts”
	+ 1. Moved: Sean COFFEY Seconded: Adrian STEPHENS
		2. Discussion: none
		3. **Results #237: 9-1-5 Motion Passes**
	1. **Adjourned at 6:03pm**
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	7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0703-00-000m-modification-to-ftm-figure.doc>
1. **Tuesday PM2:**
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-04-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0650-01-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx>
	3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0714-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-7081-7434-7581-7771-7788-d5-0.docx>
	4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0122-01-000m-resolution-for-d5-comment-on-dsss-parameter-set.docx>
	5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0563-03-000m-cid-7085-d5.docx>
	6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0269-00-000m-resolution-cid-7089-d5.docx>
	7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0554-05-000m-extended-nss.docx>
2. **Wednesday PM1:**
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-05-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0724-01-000m-lbs2-various.docx>
	3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0580-03-000m-dmg-cid-7165.docx>
	4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-42-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
	5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
	6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0714-04-000m-resolutions-for-cids-7081-7434-7581-7771-7788-d5-0.docx>
	7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0714-05-000m-resolutions-for-cids-7081-7434-7581-7771-7788-d5-0.docx>
	8. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-09-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx>
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		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0506-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmc-brc-april-1-2016.docx>
		3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0542-00-000m-revmc-brc-april-15-telecon-minutes.docx>
		4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0546-00-000m-revmc-brc-april-21-telecon-minutes.docx>
		5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0550-01-000m-minutes-for-revmc-brc-face-to-face-meeting-april-25-28-cambridge.docx>
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	4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0566-01-000m-nav-setting-fixes-in-dmg-network.docx>
	5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0567-02-000m-bss-intention-in-dmg-discovery-beacon.docx>
	6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0569-02-000m-awake-window-access-fixes-in-dmg-network.docx>
	7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-42-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>
	8. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-31-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
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	16. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-01-000m-cids-7106.docx>
4. **Thursday AM1:**
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-07-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0707-01-000m-dmg-base-mcs-and-length-supplementary-slides.ppt>
	3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0670-05-000m-base-mcs-and-length-calculation-for-extended-mcs-set.docx>
	4. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-13-000m-sb1-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-3.doc](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-13-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc)
	5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
	6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0412-03-000m-tgmc-rm-cids-7563-7523-and-7444.doc>
5. **Thursday PM1:**
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0511-08-000m-tgmc-agenda-may-2016.pptx>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0412-04-000m-tgmc-rm-cids-7563-7523-and-7444.doc>
	3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0412-05-000m-tgmc-rm-cids-7563-7523-and-7444.doc>
	4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0731-00-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7074-and-7077.doc>
	5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0733-00-000m-resolutions-to-cid-7207-and-7818.doc>
	6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0298-06-000m-ds-assigned-cids-march-2016.docx>
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	11. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-02-000m-cids-7106.docx>
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