IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| REVmc BRC June 3 Telecon Minutes | | | | |
| Date: 2016-06-03 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. | 10871 N 5750 W  Highland, UT 84003 | +1-801-492-4023 | Jrosdahl @ ieee . org |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

Minutes for the IEEE 802.11 REVmc BRC Telecon held June 3rd, 2016 from 10am to 2pm ET

1. **REVmc BRC Telecon June 3, 2016 10:00-13:00 ET**
   1. After trouble with WebEx, we changed to Join.me
   2. The meeting was **called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE), at 10:29 am ET
   3. **Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Gabor BAJKO (MediaTek); Adrian STPHENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Emily QI (Intel); George Calcev (Huawei); Graham Smith (SR Technologies); Jouni Malinen (Qualcomm); Lei Wang (Marvell); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus Wireless); Mark RISON (Samsung); Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm); Osama, Sean COFFEY (Realtek); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna);
   4. **Review Patent Policy:**
      1. No issues noted.
   5. **Review Agenda:** 11-16/757r3 Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0757-03-000m-tgmc-june-2016-teleconference-agenda-planning-document.docx>
      2. Updated agenda is in R4
      3. No objections to the updated agenda
   6. Editor Report
      * 1. Work is progressing incorporating the approved CID Resolutions – no issues to report
   7. **Review doc 11-15/276r13** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-13-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
      2. CID 7592 (EDITOR) and 7593 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Discussion
         3. Discussion on the proposed changes
            1. Retry process discussed
            2. Problems with Join.me caused Mark to have to rejoin.
            3. Discussion on not accepting the deletion, but then we would need to fix up the grammar. The change to the second paragraph is more acceptable, but we don’t need the note in all the cited locations. Changes to the first paragraph is the place to not delete.
            4. The two paragraphs need to be harmonized to be clear on the message. The second paragraph may be non-EOSP flagged frames.
         4. Debate on the actual changes being proposed.
            1. Argument to not change parts that have been there a long time.
            2. Confusion reigned and the prior email exchange does not seem to be reflected here.
         5. Straw Poll #1: I prefer:

a) Changes as proposed in 11-16/276r13

b) Modifications to 2nd Paragraph: “If the AP does not receive an ACK to ... acknowledgement” then add “and that is not the initial attempt in this SP to send a frame with the EOSP subfield equal to 1\_ ...”

* + - * 1. Results of Straw Poll #1: no objections to b)
      1. Still need to leave the first paragraph mostly unchanged, but add a comma after “frame”.
      2. Join.me dropped Dorothy again – she restarted the presentation mode as she uploaded R14 of 11-16/276r14.
      3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-06-03 15:11:32Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r14 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>) under CID 7592. These changes clarify that a failed fragment transmission in one SP can be retried in the following SP, with exception to retry the EOSP frame at least once.
      4. These CIDs were marked ready for motion.
    1. CID 7532 (MAC)
       1. Review history
          1. We had a motion to accept, but the motion failed.
       2. Discussion on why the change should or should not be made.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
       4. Mark ready for motion again
  1. **Review doc 11-16/0149r0** Gabor BAJKO (MediaTek)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0149-00-0000-clarification-on-the-mbssid-feature.docx>
     2. CID 7147 (MAC)
     3. Abstract:

This document provides resolution for CID 7147.

This document suggests changes to REVmc5.0

Problem:  
The mBSSID feature, as currently worded can be interpreted as meaning that if a non-AP STA can support n number of BSSIDs on the same antenna connector, then the mBSSID field would indicate all of those BSSIDs, regardless of whether they are actively beaconing or not.

The current wording could also be interpreted as only the BSSIDs which are 'configured' on the STA to be indicated, which was the original intent of the feature. The suggested changes remove the ambiguity and clarify the intent of the feature.

* + 1. Discussion on what “actively beaconing” implies
    2. A BSS starts beaconing when we see MLME\_START…
    3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-06-03 15:36:55Z): From the point of view of the standard, a BSS exists only when Beacons are transmitted or indicated via the multiple BSSID capability.
    4. Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **CID 7805 (MAC):** 
     1. Review comment
     2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-06-03 15:43:52Z): The proposed change might render existing devices non-compliant.
     3. Mark ready for motion
  2. **CID 7542 (MAC):**
     1. Review comment
     2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-06-03 15:40:40Z): The changes for reassociation were already made.
     3. Mark ready for motion
  3. **CID 7431 (MAC)**
     1. While the comment wasn’t quite specific enough, we have a proposed resolution which seems very specific.  Mark RISON pulled it from a prior motion.
     2. Discussion on the proposed resolution and possible alternate resolutions.
     3. Previous Proposed resolution was pulled from a motion
        1. Adhoc notes: MAC: 2016-02-25 16:36:58Z - Pulled from MAC-BN, assigned to Mark Rison.

REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-23 17:29:57Z): At the following locations: 1623.53, 1623.61, 1626.10, 1626.64, 1627.63, 1630.9, replace:

"State 3 if RSNA establishment is required"

with

", if dot11RSNAActivated is true, State 3"

AND

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

* + 1. The previously proposed change was discussed
    2. Review dot11RSNAActivated MIB variable
    3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-06-03 15:58:10Z): At the following locations: 1623.53, 1623.61, 1626.10, 1626.64, 1627.63, 1630.9, replace:

"State 3 if RSNA establishment is required"

with

", if dot11RSNAActivated is true, State 3"

AND

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

* + 1. Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **CID 7500 (MAC)**
     1. Mark Rison has a resolution in 11-16/276, but he wanted to talk to Brian Hart or Peter E before we finalized it.  Was discussed in Waikoloa.
     2. Mark RISON reports that no clear response has occurred.
     3. Review proposed changes in 11-16/276r14.
     4. The proposed change adds values 33-121 which changes the coverage class area.
     5. Discussion on why is this necessary at this time?
        1. Not a lot of support in the discussion of the proposed solution.
     6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-06-03 16:03:27Z): The BRC considered the proposed change in 11-16/0276r14 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>) and did not agree that he change was needed.
     7. Mark ready for motion
  2. **CID 7349 (MAC)**
     1. Review comment
     2. Review discussion in doc 11/16/276r14 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docxand>>
     3. Discussion on changes proposed.
     4. Issue to address “to achieve this”, which will need expansion.
     5. The note may need to be split into two notes to address group addressed vs individually addressed.
        1. NOTE—To achieve this, the mesh STA suspends any pending transmissions until the beacon has been transmitted, and in the case of a DTIM, suspends any pending individually addressed transmissions until any pending group addressed transmissions have been performed (see 14.14.5).
     6. There was not agreement with the changes as proposed. There was discussion on how to possibly fix the issues, but the time was running short.
     7. Proposed update to the note:

NOTE—To achieve this requirement, the mesh STA suspends any pending transmissions until the beacon has been transmitted. In the case of a DTIM, the AP also suspends any pending individually addressed transmissions until any pending group addressed transmissions have been performed (see 14.14.5).

* + 1. A similar type of change was discussed to be applied to the second paragraph of 14.13.3.1 changes.
    2. Undo the deletion in the first paragraph, leaving only the note that was added there.
    3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-06-03 16:09:02Z): Make the changes shown under "Proposed changes" for CID 7349 in 11-16/0276r15 [(https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx),]((https:/mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx),) which clarify the CAF for non-DMG infrastructure BSSs and MBSSs.
    4. Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review 11-16/764r0** – Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel) presented by Adrian STEPHENS
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0764-00-000m-fix-to-dmg-clustering-calculation.docx>
     2. Abstract: An issue has been identified in the calculation for the centralized DMG clustering mechanism. This document proposes a fix. The discussion is in reference to Draft P802.11REVmc\_D5.3
     3. Review the discussion and the proposed change
     4. This addresses the order of operations in 3 different locations.
     5. Proposal for a motion: Motion: Document 11-16-0764 DMG Clustering Calculation fix
     6. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/741r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0764-00-000m-fix-to-dmg-clustering-calculation.docx>> into the TGmc Draft.
  2. **Motions:**
     1. **Motion #251: MIB changes discussed on May 27th teleconference**

Motion: Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0741-03-000m-draft-5-4-mib-revision.doc>

* + - 1. Moved: Emily Qi Seconded: Adrian STEPHENS
      2. Discussion: None
      3. **Result #251: 9-0-2 Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #252: (MAC Insufficient detail):**

Approve a comment resolution of “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.” for CIDs 7735, 7796, 7158, 7656, 7657, 7533, 7791, 7793, 7695, 7655, 7157.

* + - 1. Request to consider CID 7589 later in the agenda –
         1. CID 7589 was removed from the motion and will be considered later.
      2. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
      3. Discussion – one person asked to abstain
      4. **Result #252: 10-0-1 Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #253** - **CID 7592 and 7593**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7592 “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r14 under CID 7592 [(https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx).]((https:/mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx).) These changes clarify that a failed fragment transmission in one SP can be retried in the following SP, with exception to retry the EOSP frame at least once.” And resolve CID 7593 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r14 under CID 7593 [(https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx).]((https:/mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx).) These changes clarify that a partial BU counts as one BU for the purposes of Max SP Length”

* + - 1. Moved by Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Graham SMITH
      2. Discussion: none
      3. **Results #253: Motion approved by unanimous approval – motion passes**
         1. As a result of the motion the database corrections are noted: Correction to CID 7593 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2016-06-03 15:11:32Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r14 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx) under CID 7593. These changes clarify that a partial BU counts as one BU for the purposes of Max SP Length.

CID 7592 (EDITOR): keeps the prior, except only for 7592 (remove reference to 7593).

* + 1. **Motion #254** - **CID 7532**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7532 as “Accepted”

* + - 1. Moved Mark RISON 2nd: Graham SMITH
      2. Discussion: while some apposed this previously, the intent seems to be clearer now and at least one would abstain.
      3. **Results #254: 9-0-2 Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #255** - **CID 7147**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7147 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “From the point of view of the standard, a BSS exists only when Beacons are transmitted or indicated via the multiple BSSID capability”

* + - 1. Moved Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Jouni MALINEN
      2. Discussion: None
      3. **Results: #255 Motion passes by unanimous consent –**
    1. **Motion #256** – **CID 7805**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7805 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The proposed change might render existing devices non-compliant.”

* + - 1. Moved Mark RISON 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
      2. Discussion: none
      3. **Results: #256: Motion passes by unanimous consent –**
    1. **Motion #257** – **CID 7542**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7542 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The changes in CID 6375 were made for both reassociation and association”

* + - 1. Moved: Mark RISON Jounie MALINEN
      2. Discussion: None
      3. **Results: #257: Motion passes by unanimous consent –**
    1. **Motion #258** - **CID 7431**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7431 as “Revised” with a resolution of “At the following locations: 1623.53, 1623.61, 1626.10, 1626.64, 1627.63, 1630.9, replace:

"State 3 if RSNA establishment is required"

with

", if dot11RSNAActivated is true, State 3"

AND

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

* + - 1. Moved Edward AU 2nd: Jouni MALINEN
      2. Discussion: A request to be able to abstain was made
      3. **Results #258: 7-0-4 motion passes**
    1. **Motion #259** **CID 7500**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7500 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The BRC considered the proposed change for this comment in 11-16/276r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-14-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>> and did not agree that the change was needed.”

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl 2nd: Jouni Malinen
      2. Discussion: A request to be able to abstain was made
      3. **Results #259: 10-0-1 motion passes**
    1. **Motion T1**: Motion to modify the agenda

Motion to extend the time by one hour

* + - * 1. Moved: Adrian Stephens 2nd: Jouni Malinen
        2. Discussion: speaking against the motion – it is very late for some people.
        3. **Results #259: 10-1-0 Motion to extend time passes.**
    1. **Motion #260** **CID 7349**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7349 as “Revised” with a resolution of **“**Make the changes shown under "Proposed changes" for CID 7349 in 11-16/0276r15 [<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>,](%3chttps://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx%3e,) which clarify the CAF for non-DMG infrastructure BSSs and MBSSs.**”**

* + - 1. Moved: Mark Hamilton 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
      2. Discussion: None
      3. **Results #260: Motion approved by unanimous approval – motion passes**
    1. **Motion #261:** **DMG Clustering Calculation Fix – 11-16/764r0**

Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-16/764r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0764-00-000m-fix-to-dmg-clustering-calculation.docx>> into the TGmc Draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Emily QI
      2. **Results #261: Motion approved by unanimous approval – motion passes**
  1. **Review CID 7589** 
     1. This CID was requested to be removed from the motion #252 the “for lack of detail motion” and to review CID today.
     2. Review comment
     3. Review proposed change in 11-16/276r15 for CID 7589.
     4. Discussion on the missing portions of the proposal
     5. Discussion on the direction is good, but not all the text is complete.
     6. The change in “b)” should be for “non-AP STA” only not the PCP STA.
     7. Discussion on how the disassociate is handled.
     8. 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.” –
     9. Will consider a motion now.
  2. **Motion #262** - **CID 7589 (MAC)**

Approve a comment resolution for CID 7589 of “REJECTED; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”

* + 1. Moved: Jouni MALINEN 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
    2. Discussion: Mark RISON indicated he had to drop offline.
    3. **Results #262: Motion approved by unanimous approval – motion passes**
  1. **Check STATUS of CIDs**
     1. Review of database to look for open CIDs
     2. Review the documentation for all the CIDs has been properly posted.
     3. Most of the CIDs today were from MAC – one was EDITOR
     4. Give Mark and Adrian time to update the database to have all resolutions in one file.
     5. Document 11-16/757r4 was posted to allow all to see the motions from today.
     6. Document 11-15/532r46 was posted containing all the proposed resolutions that had been approved.
        1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-46-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
     7. Reviewed prior to being ready for SB recirculation motion
  2. **Motion #263** **(SB recirculation)**

Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the initial Sponsor Ballot on P802.11REVmc D5.0 as contained in documents 11-15-0532r45 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-46-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>> and on the 2016-06-03 TGmc BRC teleconference as indicated in 11-16/757r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0757-04-000m-tgmc-june-2016-teleconference-agenda-planning-document.docx>> ,

• Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 6.0 incorporating these resolutions and

• Approve a 15 day Sponsor Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11REVmc D6.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”

* + 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Jon Rosdahl
    2. Discussion: None
    3. **Result #263: 9-0-0 Motion Passes**
       1. **And there was great Rejoicing!!!**
  1. **AOB:**
     1. Timing of Recirculation.
        1. Expect to be ready by end of next week.
     2. Possible Telecon on the 24th
     3. ACTION ITEM #1: Dorothy STANLEY to prepare Cover letter for Recirc Ballot.
  2. **Adjourned** with Thanks at 1:57pm
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