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Abstract

Minutes for REVmc BRC Face to Face meeting July 25-28 in San Diego, California

1. **REVmc BRC Meeting Monday 25 July 2016 13:50-15:50 PM1:**
   1. **Called to order** at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No issues
   3. **Review Agenda**: 11-16/785r3 Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-03-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>
      2. Review Draft Agenda
      3. Monday PM1

* Chair’s Welcome,
* Patent reminder,
* Status, Review of Objectives,
* Approve agenda
* Editor’s Report
* Comment resolution:
  + Doc 11-16/820r7 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
  + CID 8137 Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus Wireless)
  + Doc 11-16-839 (CIDs 8177, 8202) Mark RISON (SAMSUNG)
    1. Tuesday AM1
* Comment resolution –
  + 11-16-933 Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
  + 11-16-820 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
* Motions
  + 1. Tuesday PM1
* Comment resolution –
  + 11-16/839 Mark RISON (SAMSUNG)
* PAR Extension, see doc 11-16/978
  + 1. Tuesday PM2
* Comment resolution –
  + 11-16/855 -CID 8027 - Yusuke TANAKA (Sony)
  + 11-16-820 – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
* Motions
  + 1. Wednesday PM2
* Comment resolution
  + 1. Thursday PM1
* Comment resolution
* Motions
* Plans for July - September
* Schedule,
* AOB,
* Adjourn
  + 1. Agenda Discussion – requests for time:
       1. Move Adrian from Tuesday PM2 to AM1
       2. Assign Assaf to Tuesday PM1
       3. Jouni asked for Tuesday AM1
       4. Kaz asked for time for presentation (11-16/837r0) - assign to Tuesday PM1
       5. Solomon – not ready for today, asked for Wednesday PM2 (11-16/851r2)
       6. Mark HAMILTON – 3 CIDs (8056, 8062, 8061) – assign to Wednesday PM2 – 8202 CID to be taken today. (Note 8202 is assigned to Mark Hamilton not Mark RISON).
       7. Jon ROSDAHL – 2 CIDs Tuesday PM2
    2. See 11-16/785r4 for approved agenda
    3. Motion to approve agenda – Adrian STEPHENS, 2nd Mark HAMILTON
    4. No Objection – Approved by Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes
  1. **Editor Report** 11-13/95r33 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-33-000m-editor-reports.pptx>
     2. Review status of the editing and the comment processing
     3. 9 of 132 Comments left to edit
     4. 123 of 132 comments edited already
     5. Looking to get the review feedback turned in.
     6. We need to complete Comment Resolutions this week to avoid delaying TGai and TGah.
  2. **CIDs assigned to Mark HAMILTON** (Ruckus Wireless)
     1. CID 8202 (MAC)
        1. Review comment and the proposed change
        2. Review the discussion from the previous Telecon
        3. Discussion on the path of divergence that would be extended if the change was made.
        4. Discussion on the proposed resolution rationale
        5. Discussion on Block Ack Info Policy if it is germane to this comment or not.
        6. Reference to the Wi-Fi standard is not materially relevant as it is not that standard that we are commenting on.
        7. Discussion on when the TSPECs are preserved or not.
        8. Straw poll:

1. Make the change
2. Reject the CID – could not come to consensus
3. Abstain
   * + - 1. Results: 1-11-10 – Direction is for reject as could not come to consensus
       1. Proposed Resolution: Reject – could not come to consensus –
       2. Mark H. to make a resolution rationale and bring back.
   1. **Review Doc 11-16/820r7** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-06-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
      2. CID 8069 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Discussion on the Quiet Channel usefulness
         3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:10:33Z):. The BRC agrees that the schedule of quiet periods established by a DFS owner that starts an IBSS persists for the lifetime of the IBSS. The BRC disagrees that this means “Quiet Channel does not work”.
         4. Straw Poll:
4. Reject for the rationale shown
5. Do not reject for the rationale shown
6. Abstain
   * + 1. Results 12-1-9 Proceed with this rejection reason
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8070 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review CID 7271 from previous ballot
        3. Review discussion
        4. Propose to mark it as “Out of Scope”
        5. Does this apply to the IBSS or MBSS
        6. Proposed Resolution REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:16:10Z): The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        7. Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8130 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-25 21:19:36Z)
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8242 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review the context of the change proposed
        3. The removal of this text is to make consistent from previous change
        4. Straw poll:
7. Accept the Comment
8. Reject the Comment
9. Abstain
   * + 1. Results: 16-1-6 – go with Accept
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-25 21:22:18Z)
       3. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8147 (GEN)
        1. Review the comment
        2. Review the proposed rejection rationale.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The intent of this expression is unambiguous. Introducing an N\_SYM with multiple primes would require additional corresponding changes in the 40 or so locations in this clause that use this term, so the proposed change would create inconsistency.
        4. Question on possible change the “=” to “<”
        5. Discussion on N\_SYM value and how it is derived and used.
        6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-25 21:27:24Z)– The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        7. Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8227 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review various reasons for rejection
        3. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:32:53Z): The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8158 (EDITOR):
        1. Handled previously, in motion #269.
     4. CID 8151 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The proposed change might make existing implementations non-compliant.
        3. Discussion on this is really out of scope and not sure that existing implementations exist.
        4. Updated Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:34:25Z): The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 8154 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:36:49Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 8156 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:38:30Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     7. CID 8182 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Context for TID subfield
        3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:38:56Z)
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     8. CID 8155 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:41:57Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     9. CID 8322 (MAC)
        1. Reclassify as Security – assign to Jouni
     10. CID 8330 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on the possible accept or reject
         3. Straw poll:

a) Accept the comment make the change

b) Reject the comment out of scope

c) Abstain

* + - 1. Results 1-13-13
      2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:45:18Z): The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
      3. Mark ready for Motion
    1. CID 8032 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review context
       3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:48:04Z)
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8150 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Reject Rationale
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:55:02Z): The normative requirement at 1334.19 states: “A STA that participates in a successful ADDTS exchange that included a U-PID element … and that receives from the peer STA an MSDU corresponding to the TID … shall insert the octets in the LLC Header Copy field of the U-PID element at the start of the MSDU before delivery of the MSDU.”

While the STA is not required to understand this information, it is required to store and insert it under certain circumstances. This cannot be classified as “ignore”, and the NOTE would therefore be misleading.

* + - 1. Discussion on the use of the U-PID
      2. Straw Poll:

1. Reject as shown
2. Do not Reject as Shown
3. Abstain
   * + 1. Results: 15-1-10 proceed with the Rejection as shown
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8033 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review context
        3. This is similar to CID 8032 – search was done to see if any other cases exist, and none were found.
        4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-25 21:58:14Z)
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   1. **Review doc 11-16/839r1** Mark RISON (Samsung)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>
      2. CID 8177 (EDITOR)
         1. Has been resolved in Motion #265.
         2. Not in this document
      3. CID 8056 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review proposed changes in 1582.40
         3. Discussion on the direction of the changes. If the EOSP bit is not present, then you must send a frame that does have it and use the QoS Null frame.
         4. Discussion on if it is in scope?
         5. Resume to look at the other proposed changes.
         6. Many of the changes are editorial (missing article). “Bit vs subfield” or “field vs subfield”
         7. Straw Poll
4. Revised according to the proposed change
5. Reject – consensus reason or something else possibly
6. More time
7. Abstain
   * + 1. Results: 4-4-2-9 -proceed with proposal on a separate motion.
       2. A Separate Motion to accept the proposed resolution in 11-16/839r2 for CID 8056 (MAC)
       3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-25 22:19:02Z): Make the changes as shown in 11-16/839r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>>, for CID 8056, which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter.
       4. Mark Ready for Motion. -- Separate motion.
     1. CID 8116 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on what the changes may be and what the result of a change may be, and if we would cause new comments.
        3. Discussion on the diagram variable choices
        4. The Use of AIFS[AC] is better choice than using different subscripts.
        5. Straw Poll:
8. Reject the comment
9. Change AIFS(i) to AIFS[AC] and AIFS[AC’]
10. Change AIFS(i) to AIFS[AC] and delete top row
    * + 1. Results: 11-0-7
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-13 08:47:33Z) - AIFS[i] unambiguously indicates indexing of an array of such values. It is not necessary to specify here that the index is an access category, as this is specified elsewhere (e.g. 1276.18 and about 70 other locations). The proposed change introduces its own unexplained notation of an AC<prime>.
        3. Mark Ready for Motion – separate motion
    1. **Recess** at 4:31pm
11. **REVmc BRC Tuesday, 26 July 2016 8-10am AM1**
    1. **Called to order** 8:01am by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
    2. **Review Agenda**
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-04-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>
       2. Request from Payam and Sigurd for time
          1. Add Sigurd time today (11-16/1001)
          2. Add Payam to Tues PM1
       3. No objection - to agenda changes
       4. Updated Agenda will be in in 11-16/785r5
    3. **Review Patent Policy**
       1. No issues identified
    4. **Review Doc 11-016/1001r0** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna)
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1001-00-000m-cid-8147.docx>
       2. CID 8147 (GEN)
          1. Review comment
          2. Review the discussion from yesterday
          3. Review the details of the proposed changes
          4. Review the details of how NSYM Is Calculated.
          5. Proposed resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-26 15:12:25Z)Make the following changes in Draft 6.0:

* On page 2603, line 7, replace N\_SYM with N\_SYM,init
* In (21-108), replace “N\_SYM = ” with “N\_SYM,init =”
* In (21-109), replace N\_SYM with N\_SYM,init
* On page 2603, line 33, replace N\_SYM with N\_SYM,init
  + - 1. Discussion on the need for the change
      2. Discussion on the use of “N\_SYM,init”
      3. Straw Poll

1. Make proposed change
2. Keep the Reject prepared yesterday
3. Abstain
   * + 1. Results 7-2-9 make the proposed change
       2. Update the CID and move to new Comment Group from yesterday.
       3. Mark Ready for motion -
   1. **Review Doc: 11-16/933r1** – Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0933-01-000m-some-revmc-d6-comments.docx>
      2. 60 minutes limit for presentation
      3. CID 8326 (MAC), 8327 (MAC) and 8051(MAC)
         1. Review the TOPIC Public Action frame addressing (page 23)
         2. Review the options proposed
         3. Discussion on what happens when the GAS frame is received with the AP BSSID included.
         4. Discussion on the implications of the alternatives
         5. Discussion on making current devices non-compliant or not.
         6. Alternative proposals:

Alternatives on how to handle these three comments:

1. accept changes proposed in CID 8326 and CID 8327, i.e., allow AP BSSID to be used, and reject CID 8051 (no note is needed anymore with the AP BSSID allowed); leave Wildcard BSSID as an allowed value to avoid making deployed (if any) implementation compliant
2. reject changes proposed in CID 8326 and CID 8327, i.e., maintain requirement for Wildcard BSSID (which was added by 802.11n and is present in 802.11-2012) and accept CID 8051 to add the note to help implementers figure out how to produce interoperable devices; this expect vendors to fix their deployed devices over time
3. reject all three CIDs with reasoning pointing out that the comments are out-of-scope for this recirculation (“The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.”)
   * + 1. Straw Poll:
4. Alternative 1
5. Alternative 2
6. Alternative 3
7. Abstain
   * + - 1. Results: 5-3-2-5 – let’s look at Alternative 1
       1. Review Alternative 1 for details
          1. Clarifies the behavior
          2. CID 8326 (MAC) – Accept results reviewed.
          3. Need to make it a Revised as we need to change the “May be set” to “Shall be set” and add “or the Wildcard BSSID” to the end of the paragraph being changed.
          4. CID 8327 (MAC) – revised; this change needs to be wordsmith as this needs to be corrected to be better worded.
          5. CID 8051 (MAC) – rejected – use either out of scope or alternative rationale related to the changes of the other two CIDS
       2. Needs to have more time to work on this. Plan to bring back tomorrow.
     1. CID 8113 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment and the discussion
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-26 15:45:07Z). On page 1969 line 22, replace “Lifetime” with “Lifetime, as defined in 12.6.16”.
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8115 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment and the discussion
        2. ACTION ITEM #4:Check with Mark H offline about another comment that potentially modified GTKSA (of some kind rekeying behavior) (Note the other CID was later identified as CID 8111 (GEN))
        3. Will bring back tomorrow
     3. CID 8325 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. The 5th bullet has a 2nd sentence, and there is not the same detail for the IGTKdata, this seems odd
        3. ACTION ITEM #5: Jouni will check whether (and why not) the matching phrase about "and shall contain the data for the …GTK" is not included in the new bullet.….need more time to investigate
        4. Will bring back later.
     4. CID 8324 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review the proposed changes
        3. Another location of “blank” p2146.3
           1. Need to review and see if a similar change
        4. Will come back with the redline changes
     5. CID 8322 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on if the “optional” is parse-able
        3. Proposed resolution for CID 8322 (MAC):

REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-26 16:03:55Z):. On page 999 line 45 (Figure 9-488):

- replace "Key Replay Counter" with "Key Replay Counter (optional)"

- replace "GTKdata" with "GTKdata (optional)"

* + - 1. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
    1. CID 8321 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 16:05:43Z)
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8052 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment and the discussion
       2. Proposed resolution for CID 8052(MAC):

Revised. On page 2139 line 16, insert the following text at the end of the "The peer mesh STA's MGTK extracted" paragraph:  
"When management frame protection is used, the peer mesh STA's IGTK extracted from the Mesh Peering Open frame shall be added as an IGTKSA in which the peer's MAC address equals the Authenticator MAC address and the Direction vector equals ‘receive’."

* + - 1. Is this change really critical?
         1. No
      2. This is technically out of scope, so we can reject due to scope.
      3. Updated Proposed Resolution for CID 8052 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 16:11:28Z): The comment is out of scope. The cited text has not changed.
      4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8006 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. This may be also reasonable to be able to reject due to scope.
       3. There were some changes in the last ballot, and this is one that may have been missed.
       4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 16:15:08Z)
       5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. Schedule for Jouni to return expected Tuesday PM2 (towards the end).
  1. **Review Doc 11-16/839r1** Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>
     2. CID 8168 (GEN) and 8169 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Discussion on the possible issues that this change may cause
        4. There are some things that can change in a reassociation, but the comment is pointing out those that are not to be changed, or rather it is not allowed to change, so no need to be in the request.
        5. Discussion on the parameters that are being deleted.
        6. Straw Poll

1. Support changes
2. Not Support Changes
   * + 1. Results: 4-2-10 – proceed with preparing the changes and mark ready for Motion
       2. Proposed Resolution for CID 8168 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-26 16:27:42Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 8168 in 11-16/839r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>> which implements the commenters suggestion.
       3. Proposed Resolution for CID 8169 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-26 16:27:42Z) Incorporate the changes for CID 8169 in 11-16/839r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>> which implements the commenters suggestion.
       4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8179 (EDITOR)
        1. Already motioned from MAC (Motion #269), for insufficient detail. Re-visit.
        2. Review discussion discussing the rationale for making a change (removing the Note).
        3. Discussion on how the TID and A-MPDU are created.
        4. Proposed resolution: Revised: Delete the NOTE in 10.13.6 (p1339.25)
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8172 (EDITOR)
        1. Already motioned from MAC (Motion #269), for insufficient detail. Re-visit.
        2. Review comment
        3. Two changes proposed 1 duplicates the information, but puts it in the common format, the 2nd option states the information once, and then makes reference to add “The format and interpretation of each Extended Supported Rate octet is the same as that of a Supported Rate octet in a Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors**(#3508)** element (see 9.4.2.3).
        4. Discussion on the possible editorial changes that may be needed.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; incorporate the changes under “proposed changes” for CID 8172 in 11-16/839r2 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx> which implements the commenter’s suggestion.
        6. Mark Ready for Motion
   1. **Motions:** 
      1. **Motion #SD1:** **Prior Minutes:**
         1. Move to Approve Prior Minutes

[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0717-00-000m-minutes-for-revmc-brc-face-to-face-meeting-may-17-19-waikoloa.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0759-00-000m-revmc-brc-may-27-telecon-minutes.docx)

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0759-00-000m-revmc-brc-may-27-telecon-minutes.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0765-00-000m-revmc-brc-june-3-telecon-minutes.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0825-01-000m-revmc-brc-july-8-and-15-telecon-minutes.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0854-01-000m-revmc-brc-july-19-and-21-telecon-minutes.docx>

* + - 1. Moved Mark Hamilton 2nd: Stephen MCCAN
      2. Result: Approved without objection – Unanimous Consent – **Motion #SD1 passes**
    1. **Motion #272** **Approve CIDS from** **July 19 & 21 teleconferences**

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

“Motion-MAC-CB” tab in 11-15/565r50 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-50-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>>

“”GEN-21July” tab in 11-15/665r40 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-40-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>

“Editorials - motion 20160715” tab in 11-15/532r54 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-54-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Graham SMITH
      2. Discussion: None
      3. Results: 17-0-0 **Motion #272** **Passes**
    1. **Motion #273:** **Editorial Pulled Tab**

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

“Editorials - pulled” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-54-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls> , except for CID 8116 and in the resolution to CID 8292, change “144.52” to “1144.52”.

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS; 2nd Menzo WENTIK
      2. Discussion:
         1. Objection to the motion –

CID 8292 (EDITOR)

The Resolution has an incorrect reference to 144.52 which is wrong and should be 1144.52.

Discussion on the possible removal of the 2nd paragraph of the resolution.

Change the Motion to correct the Resolution:

No objection to correct the cited reference, no other change.

* + - * 1. Ran out of time, so the motion did not get executed.
  1. **Recess** at 10:01am

1. **REVmc BRC meeting 26 July 26, 2016 13:30 to 15:30 PM1**
   1. **Called to Order** by the chair, Dorothy Stanley at 13:33
   2. **Review Agenda in 11-16/785r4**.
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-04-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>
      * Comment resolution –
        + Assaf 11-16-888, 11-16-980
        + Kaz – 11-16-837
      * PAR Extension, see 11-16-978
      1. No objections
   3. **Review doc 11-16/888r2** - Assaf Kasher (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0888-02-000m-resolution-to-dmg-power-save-cids.docx>
      2. CID 8043 (EDITOR)
         1. Was previously motioned (#266) as “Out of scope” – re-visit
         2. Why replace the NOTE, not modify it? Answer: We need to make this clear in normative text. But, the original NOTE was more general. OK, after discussion.
         3. Needs some grammatical fixes. Will take off-line to polish the grammar.
         4. Agree in general. Will come back to it, after a chance to polish.
      3. CID 8044 (MAC):
         1. Proposed change: Replace the cited sentence with: “A STA that is in PS mode, and has not performed unscheduled power save, and following a wakeup schedule receives or transmits an ATIM frame during the awake window may enter the doze state when it has successfully transmitted to and received from all corresponding peer STAs for this beacon interval a QoS Data frame with the EOSP subfield set to 1; otherwise it shall stay active until the end of the current beacon interval.”
         2. Agreed in concept. Text needs some grammar clean up before the motion.
         3. Mark Ready for Motion, with a note that the grammar will be cleaned up, before Moving.
      4. CID 8045 (MAC):
         1. Reviewed comment and proposed resolution. Agreed.
         2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-26 20:54:31Z): Replace the cited sentence with, "A STA in PS mode that is awake during an awake window shall listen for these announcements to determine if it needs to change its power state."
         3. Ready for motion.
   4. **Review Doc 11-16/980r0:** Assaf Kasher (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0980-00-000m-resolution-to-cid-8002.docx>
      2. CID 8007 (EDITOR):
         1. This was previously motioned (#266) as “out of scope” – Re-visit
         2. Reviewed the proposed change in 11-16/980.
         3. The box for “BRP train response …” is missing in the new figure.
         4. Agreed, with that change.
         5. Assaf will upload an R1, with the box added to the figure
         6. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Incorporate the changes shown in 11-16/980r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0980-01-000m-resolution-to-cid-8002.docx>>, which implements the changes to the figure as suggested by the commenter.
         7. Ready for motion.
   5. **Review Doc 11/16/837r1** - Kazuyuki Sakoda (Sony)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0837-01-000m-cid-8085-8031-resolution-text.docx>
      2. CID 8085 (GEN):
         1. After discussion on the July 10 teleconference, have discussed off-line with interested individuals, and updated.
         2. dot11MCCAMinTrackStates could actually written by an administrator, and is a control variable for the current behavior, up to the limits of the implementation. dot11MCCAMaxTrackStates is the capability variable. Limited by the implementation’s capability.
         3. So, having both variables makes sense. But, could rename them to be more meaningful.
         4. Suggest renaming to dot11MCCATrackStatesCapable, and dot11MCCATrackStatesActive. Document shows the changes needed to accomplish this. The changes also fix up some places where the existing names were used incorrectly (swapped).
         5. Discussion about the best name to choose, to make sure this doesn’t draw new comments.
         6. The way the values are used and limited in the parameter description is confusing.
         7. This probably needs more work, or at least more time to understand. Suggest we reject this as out of scope.
         8. No objection to out of scope.
         9. REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-26 21:15:45Z) The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
         10. Ready for motion.
      3. CID 8031 (MAC):
         1. Subclause 14.7 does not describe the entirety of what’s needed for mesh security. Some aspects are in 11.13 and 9.4.2.118. The proposed change adds these concepts to the text in 14.7 so it is complete.
         2. Question about scope on this comment, 14.7 seems unchanged. Yes, but changes were made to some mesh security sections, so it does seem related.
         3. REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-26 21:20:52Z): Makes changes as shown in 11-16/837r1 (), for CID 8031. These changes effectively implement the suggestion of the commenter.
         4. No objection.
         5. Ready for motion.
   6. **Review Doc 11-16/996r1** - Payam Torab (Broadcom):
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0996-01-000m-dmg-power-save-cid-8329-8334.docx>
      2. CID 8329 (MAC):
         1. The Triggered Unscheduled PS feature was added (in Waikoloa?) as a new optional feature.
         2. The feature included 3 main parts, one of which is the capability to retrieve BUs through the reverse direction (RD) protocol. This part is believed (by the commenter) to be unnecessary. So, the proposal provides the details to remove this part. The rest of the feature is believed to be good and worth keeping.
         3. The proposal also fixes that the Buffered AC subfield aspect could apply to any DMG STA (not just AP or PCP), and fixes some typos and other cleanup.
         4. Objection to the removal of the reference to Annex G. DMG support in Annex G is the subject of debate, but removing the reference is not the way to avoid the problem. But, Annex G defines frame exchange *sequences*, and this text is specifically talking about using a frame exchange, within a frame exchange sequence (TXOP), to change the power save state.
         5. Other concern about this change, and concern about letting the PM bit be changed within a TXOP. Need to more time to consider this. This document, by deleting the reference to Annex G, is allowing the change of the PM bit within a frame exchange sequence.
         6. Quick check of the group, does anyone think the current draft allows changing the PM bit during a frame exchange sequence like that shown in the figures on page 3 of the submission. Some members said they believe this is not allowed currently; the PM bit must be constant across a frame exchange sequence. Probably the text in 11.2.6.2.2 and 11.2.6.3.2 should have said “successful frame exchange *sequence* (as described in Annex G)”.
         7. Noted that in U-APSD, the PM bit never has be set to 0, so the toggling is not needed.
         8. No consensus to make these changes. Suggestion is to reject for insufficient detail.
         9. Prepare this with a rejection, for insufficient detail. If off-line discussion comes up with a consensus before the motion, we’ll consider it.
         10. No objection.
         11. Editor: Note that in Figure 9-7 there is an “!” that should be an “I”.
         12. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 22:11:26Z): 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.
         13. Ready for motion.
      3. CID 8334 (MAC):
         1. Adding clarity that ATIMs can be sent without channel access between them.
         2. Need to have some limit on how many times this can be done. Maybe mention that the TxOP Limit still applies? Don’t think that’s needed, it doesn’t say anywhere that it wouldn’t apply.
         3. Will work off-line to improve the text, and bring back.
      4. CID 8335 (MAC):
         1. Insufficient detail.
         2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 22:12:08Z): 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.
      5. CID 8332 (MAC):
         1. Considered the proposed change provided in the comment.
         2. The draft text is overly broad with the “otherwise set to 0”
         3. Agree with proposed change.
         4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 22:15:16Z)
         5. Ready for motion.
   7. **Reviewed PAR extension document – 11-16/978r0**:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0978-00-000m-tgmc-par-extension-document.docx>
      2. Our current PAR goes through the end of December. We may not need this extension; hopefully we’ll finish by then. But, in case we don’t, we need this to be sure we can continue work.
      3. Reviewed the answers to the template questions.
      4. Clarify that the percentages in 3.1 are showing the ballot passing results.
      5. Edited the response to the question whether the document was already adopted by another source. Noted that we do plan to submit it to ISO/IEC.
      6. Dorothy will post an 11-16/978r1, for consideration by the group.
   8. **Plan for next slots**
      1. PM2 we will consider 11-16/855, then Adrian’s resolutions, Jon’s resolutions, and Jouni’s resolutions.
      2. Plan for motion on the PAR extension in PM2
      3. Plan for motion on the Editorials-pulled resolutions in PM2.
   9. **Recessed at 15:29**.
2. **REVmc BRC meeting 26 July 26, 2016 16:00 to 18:00 PM2**
   1. **Called to Order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 4:03pm
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No Issues
   3. **Review Agenda** for this slot time
      1. 11-16/785r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-05-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>>
      2. Move Jon to Wed PM1
      3. Approved Agenda changes – No Objection
   4. **Review CID** 8027 (Editor)
      1. Previously Rejected – Out of Scope – Motion #266
      2. No change for now
   5. **Review doc 11-16/820r7 –** Adrian Stephens (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-07-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
      2. CID 8097 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 8107 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Propose to accept
         3. Discussion on why this is not a change that is acceptable
         4. Is the “Valid” in the context of the Frame Exchange?
         5. There are 4 instances of “Valid Response”.
         6. Discussion on the proposed change:.
            1. Change "a valid response MPDU" to "a response that is valid in the course of a frame exchange sequence (see Annex G)" at the referenced location
         7. Alternatives:
            1. Revised; After “a valid response MPDU” Insert “(see Annex G)”
            2. Rejected. The Cited text is not incorrect. It is not necessary to introduce a reference to Annex G at this point.
         8. Straw Poll
3. Accept
4. Revised; After “a valid response MPDU” Insert “(see Annex G)”
5. Rejected. The Cited text is not incorrect. It is not necessary to introduce a reference to Annex G at this point.
   * + 1. Result 0-9-4
       2. Proceed with the Revised option and Mark Ready for Motion
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:22:02Z): After "a valid response MPDU" insert "(see Annex G)"
       4. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8053 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. A frame exchange is, in this case, two frames. A non-HT duplicate frame sent by an originator, and a non-HT duplicate frame sent by a responder can substitute for an RTS/CTS. In this case the originator’s CH\_BANDWIDTH is limited by the response (i.e., second) non-HT duplicate frame as shown at 1357.12.
        3. Discussion on if both frames have to be a non-HT frame.
        4. Discussion on the Comment – There are 3 questions in the comment, not asking to do something.
        5. Straw Poll
6. Accept the proposed change (accept)
7. Do not accept the proposed change
8. Abstain
   * + 1. Results: 2-7-7 No consensus to make the change.
       2. The Proposed rejection reason was not accurate, so it was not deemed usable.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:34:13Z): The BRC could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comment. A straw poll to accept the change failed 2/7/7. There was a long discussion on the topic and no consensus was evident.
       4. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8131 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. Alternative options for rejection – 1) it is on unchanged text so out of scope could be used 2)
        4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:37:22Z): Depending on PHY capabilities, a PSDU can hold either a frame or an A-MPDU, the text at the cited location " ... of an A-MPDU or frame in a PSDU of length ..." is correct. There is no layering violation in this case, because the PSDU can transport objects from different layers.
        5. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
     2. CID 8132 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Question on Scope – Discussion
        3. Straw Poll:
9. Accept
10. Reject the comment for out of scope
    * + 1. Results – 8-3 Proceed with the “accept”.
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:40:43Z)
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
      1. CID 8193 (MAC)
         1. Review comment and discussion
         2. Discussion on DMG Devices that use Bloc Ack rules
         3. a DMG STA is a non-HT STA – even though it uses HT-immediate BA.
         4. Discussion on the “immediate vs delay”
         5. More work is needed, to determine what the implementations are doing in this case.
      2. CID 8293 (Editor)
         1. This was processed before in Motion #266 as Out of Scope.
         2. Concern voiced that this was not out of scope
         3. Review the context of the redline document – no change
         4. Leave in current state.
      3. CID 8331 (EDITOR)
         1. This was processed before in Motion #266 as Out of Scope.
         2. CID 8331 (MAC):
            1. This was processed before in Motion #266 as Out of Scope.
      4. CID 8058 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:53:28Z)
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 8045 (MAC)
         1. Previously Marked Ready for motion
      6. CID 8044 (MAC)
         1. Remove from document – assigned to Solomon
      7. CID 8065 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:56:13Z)
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      8. CID 8109 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review discussion
         3. Is there a timeout in this primitive?
            1. The condition being cited exits and the timeout is handled internal to the primitive.
         4. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:58:21Z): At 1628.30 after "a valid response" insert "(i.e., has not received an MLME-SA-QUERY.confirm primitive within the dot11AssociationSAQueryMaximumTimeout period)"
         5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      9. CID 8066 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-27 00:02:04Z)
         3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      10. CID 8110 (MAC)
          1. Review comment
          2. Same change we made before
          3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-27 00:02:45Z): At 1632.30 after "a valid response" insert "(i.e., has not received an MLME-SA-QUERY.confirm primitive within the dot11AssociationSAQueryMaximumTimeout period)"
          4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      11. CID 8077 (MAC)
          1. More work needed.
      12. CID 8096 (EDITOR)
          1. Review comments
          2. Similar to 8092 (EDITOR) which was accepted by motion #267.
          3. From discussion: If we accept comment 8096, we have to change the resolution of the commenter’s own conflicting comment 8092. If we reject 8096, the changes proposed in 8092 are correct.
          4. Review the context of the cited Table
          5. Making the suggested change would cause more changes in the MIB than just change the name, but all the supporting changes would add more inconsistencies.
          6. Discussion on the variable name changes.
          7. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The dot11SupportedMCSTxTable and dot11SupportedMCSTxTable are not specific to the HT PHY (see 3264.06).
          8. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
      13. CID 8188 (Editor)
          1. Review comment
          2. Review discussion
          3. Discussion on if it is or is not in Scope.
          4. We did add a “Backoff Timer” in the last draft.
          5. Need more time.
    1. **Review doc 11-16/933r2** Jouni MALENIN (Qualcomm)
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0933-02-000m-some-revmc-d6-comments.docx>
       2. CIDs 8051 (MAC), 8327 (MAC), 8326 (MAC):
          1. Review the updated redline changes since this morning.
          2. Discussion on use of Wildcard BSSID and the implication of making some devices non-compliant.
          3. If we have non-interoperable devices then we should make a change to make it better.
          4. Review the Redline proposed changes.
          5. Question on the use of “whose”
          6. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Adopt the redline changes for CID 8326/8327/8051 from 11-16/933r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0933-02-000m-some-revmc-d6-comments.docx>> which implements changes to resolve the comment.
          7. Still more offline work is needed.
       3. CID 8115 (GEN)
          1. Review Comment
          2. Proposed resolution REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-27 00:30:04Z) On page 1970 line 47, delete the Lifetime item.
          3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
       4. CID 8325 (MAC)
          1. Review comment
          2. During our previous discussion – we noted that the description for IGTKdata was not the same level of detail as GTKdata
          3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-27 00:31:32Z): On page 2146 line 16, add a new item to the list after the GTKdata field item:

"-- If management frame protection is used, the IGTKdata field shall be present and shall contain the data for the IGTK from IGTK source. The components of the IGTKdata are specified in 9.4.2.118 (Authenticated Mesh Peering Exchange element)."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8324 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-27 00:33:21Z):

On page 2146 line 2, replace "The Selected Pairwise Cipher Suite field shall be left blank" with "The Selected Pairwise Cipher Suite field shall be set to four octets of zero."

On page 2147 line 1, replace "The Selected Pairwise Cipher Suite field shall be left blank" with "The Selected Pairwise Cipher Suite field shall be set to four octets of zero."

On page 2147 line 11, replace "The GTKdata field shall be blank" with "The GTKdata field shall not be present".

Add the following item after the page 2147 line 7 (GTKdata): "-- The IGTKdata field shall not be present."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8005 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review proposed changes
       3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-27 00:34:36Z)
       4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8144 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review the context
       3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-27 00:39:58Z)
       4. No Objection Mark Ready for motion
    3. CID 8059 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review the history of the proposed changes in the comment.
       3. The prior motion to accept these changes failed 6-3-1.
       4. Prefer any further change be considered in REVmd.
       5. Straw Poll:

1. Incorporate the text changes for the pseudo code
2. Not incorporate the changes
3. abstain
   * + 1. Result: 1-12-5
       2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Some of the requested changes are already present in the balloted draft. The changes to the Tx pseudo code were previously discussed in the previous ballot and the motion to accept them failed. The group did not have consensus to accept the changes in this ballot either. The Straw Poll results were 1-12-5.
       3. Mark Ready to Motion
   1. **Motions** –
      1. At the end of the morning meeting slot, the group ended while processing Motion #273:
         1. **Motion #273:** **Editorial Pulled Tab**

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

“Editorials - pulled” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-54-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls> , except for CID 8116 and in the resolution to CID 8292, change “144.52” to “1144.52”.

* + - * 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS; 2nd Menzo WENTIK
        2. Discussion continued with the objections to the Motion

CID 8292 – discussion on the change proposed that was rejected.

Proposed to remove the last paragraph and replace with a text change

* + - 1. Motion to Table –
         1. Moved by Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Jouni MALINEN
         2. Results: 8-0-7 Motion to Table Passes – **Motion #273 is tabled**.
    1. **Motion #SD2:** **Motion PAR Extension (WG)**

Approve sending the PAR extension information for P802.11REVmc cited below to NesCom.

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI 2nd: Menzo WENTINK
      2. Result 18-0-0 – **Motion #SD2 Passes**
    1. **Motion # 274** – **CID 8056**

Approve the comment resolutions to CID 8056 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes under CID 8056 in 11-16-839r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>>”

* + 1. Moved: Mark RISON 2nd: David Hunter
    2. Discussion: None
    3. Result: No Objection to Unanimous Approval – Motion **# 274** Passes
  1. **Recess** at 6:01pm

1. **REVmc BRC meeting 27 July 26, 2016 16:00 to 18:00 PM2**
   1. **Called to Order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 4:05pm
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No Issues
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. Review the updated Agenda – 11-16/785r7
      2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-07-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>
      3. Wednesday

* Comment resolution
  + 11-16-820 Adrian
  + 11-16-851, 11-16-1005 Solomon
  + 11-16-996r2, CID 8330 Payam
  + Mark Hamilton CIDs – 8062, 8061
    1. No objection to the updated Agenda
  1. **Review doc 11-16/820r8** – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-08-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
     2. CID 8188 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review the status of the discussion from last time
        3. Fix up for a global change would not work cleanly
        4. Discussion on the history of the use of Timer vs Counter
        5. Discussion on the use of Timer vs counter continued
        6. Straw Poll –

1. Make changes
2. Reject comment
3. Abstain
   * + - 1. Result – 2-15-0 – go in the direction of a reject.
       1. Proposed Resolution: Reject – The change suggested as the commenter introduces terminology conflicts. For example at 1275.57 “the STA’s backoff timer has expired” would become “the STA’s backoff counter has expired”, and the concept of expiration of counters is not well defined.
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8317 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. A DMG STA must necessarily have a DMG PHY. The cited definition is correct. The same argument applies to DMG AP.
        3. Discussion on the definition for types of STAs. No Definition of HT or VHT STAs.
        4. Straw Poll:
4. Accept (delete definition of DMG STA, DMG AP and DMG BSS)
5. Reject the comment
6. Abstain
   * + 1. Results: 1-14-4 – preference is to go with the rejection
       2. Updated Proposed Resolution: The cited definition is correct. The CRC had no consensus to make any change to address the questions raised by the comment. A straw poll to make the proposed change failed 1/14/4.
       3. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8029 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review context of the change
        3. Discussion of the proposed changes
        4. One Typo – “TGTK” should be “IGTK”
        5. Discussion on the validity of the existing text vs the change
        6. The current text is not complete, but the changed text would not be complete, and so no change would be a safer path.
        7. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8207 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the “expected to vs can”
        3. Discussion on the change to return back to the previous change.
        4. Straw Poll
7. Accept the comment
8. Reject the comment
9. Abstain
   * + - 1. Results: 1-15-2
       1. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The proposed change introduces passive voice (hiding the actor) and an anthropomorphic verb. Neither are necessary. The use of passive voice and anthropomorphic language is undesirable, because members of the ballot group have caused such instances to be removed in the past. There was no consensus in the BRC to address the linguistic inconsistency. A straw poll to make the change indicated by the commenter failed 1/15/2.
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8263 (EDITOR)
        1. Review the comment
        2. Review the proposed change
        3. Straw Poll
10. Accept the comment
11. Revised -Make a change that just deletes ESP
12. abstain
    * + - 1. Results: 12-2 -6
        1. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        2. Mark Ready for Motion
      1. CID 8125 (EDITOR)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. CID 8250 (EDITOR)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 8076 (EDITOR)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on the possible change may be ok, but the comment is out of scope.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected.  The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
         4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      4. CID 8010 (EDITOR)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review the proposed change
         3. Discussion on the title being different from the sub-clause.
         4. Option 1: Accept
         5. Option 2: Revised. After “in an IBSS” at the cited location add “, DMG infrastructure BSS and PBSS”
         6. Option 3: Revised; Make change as specified, and change “, DMG infrastructure BSS and PBSS” to “and in a DMG BSS”
         7. Discussion on the options:
         8. Straw Poll:
13. Option 1
14. Option 2
15. Option 3
16. Abstain
    * + 1. Results: 0-12-2-1 – proceed with Option 2
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. After “in an IBSS” at the cited location add “, DMG infrastructure BSS and PBSS”
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
      1. CID 8178 (EDITOR)
         1. Review the comment
         2. Discussion on the options of when to update the Dialog Token
         3. Discussion on the wording of the change
         4. Discussion on the change being not clear enough
         5. Propose Resolution: Revised; At cited location change: “Fine Timing Measurement frame for which the Ack was not received, except for an updated Dialog Token. If the Dialog Token is set to 0, it is not update when the Fine Timing Measurement frame is retransmitted.”

to “Fine Timing Measurement frame for which the Ack was not received, except for updating the Dialog Token if it was nonzero.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc 11-16/851r2** Solomon TRAININ (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0851-02-000m-cid8040.docx>
     2. CID 8040 (EDITOR)
        1. We already motioned (#272): Incorporate the changes in 11-16/851r1 which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter.
        2. Proposed changes were reviewed.
        3. Review the changes from the R1
        4. Discussion the black text is from the baseline and not changed.
        5. Discussion on how clause 9 is not to have behavior text.
        6. Updated Resolution: Revised Incorporate the changes in 11-16/851r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0851-03-000m-cid8040.docx> > which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter.
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc 11-16/1005r0** - Solomon TRAININ (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1005-00-000m-awake-window-access-cid8328.docx>
     2. CID 8328 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion: Proposal of the CID covers BTI that there is no need to define backoff rule for BTI, it is already exist (see 1292L53).
        3. Review the Proposed Changes and make grammatical changes.
        4. Discussion on how to make the final changes.
        5. Discussion on “decremented” vs some other verb to use.
        6. Need to indicate the changes.
        7. Proposed Resolution; REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 00:22:44Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-16/1005r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1005-01-000m-tgmc-awake-window-access-cid8328.docx>), which accomplishes the intent of the commenter.
        8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. 2 CIDs still left assigned to Solomon CID 8041, 8044
  3. **Review doc 11-16/996r3** Payam TORAB (Broadcom)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0996-03-000m-dmg-power-save-cid-8329-8334.docx>
     2. CID 8329 (MAC)
        1. Review comment and the proposed changes
        2. Changes from R2 vs r3 reviewed.
        3. Note that we are revisiting this, after discussion yesterday where we had marked this one as rejected for insufficient detail.
        4. Discussion on correction of some grammar bug that was in there.
        5. Two places where “Block Ack” should be “BlockAck”
        6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 00:48:05Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-16/996r4 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0996-04-000m-dmg-ps-cid-8329-8334.docx>), which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter.
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion in a new Comment Group
     3. CID 8334 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Editing was added as the discussion was presented.
        3. Discussion on why this one case being singled out for TXOP to multiple STAs.
        4. Concern on the change to the wording being done in real time.
        5. The Original note should be left, and a new note may be considered.
        6. Proposed new Note was crafted and discussed.
        7. Concern that no change may be better path
        8. Straw Poll:

1. Make a change to indicate ATIM behavior
2. Make No Change
3. Abstain
   * + - 1. Results: 3-4-8 – Suggestion is to prepare a rejection for insufficient detail.
       1. Proposed Resolution:
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
   1. **Recess** at 5:59pm
4. **REVmc BRC meeting Thursday, July 28, 2016, 8:00-10:00 AM1**
   1. Thanks for the notes from Graham SMITH
   2. **Called to Order** at 8:03am by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   3. **Review Patent Policy** and Call for LOAs
      1. None forthcoming.
   4. **Review Agenda**
   * Comment resolution
     + Adrian
     + Jon
   * Draft motions
   1. Start with Adrian CIDs
      1. 16/820r9 on server, changes will be r10
      2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-09-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
      3. CID 8085
         1. Originally “assigned to Kaz”.
         2. Was rejected and is in 26 July Tag.
      4. CID 8222,
         1. Concerning R7 Spoke with Matt Fischer who indicated would attend a future meeting to address.
      5. CID 8193
         1. Pending input.
         2. A reject has been constructed.
         3. Previous discussion recorded in 820.
         4. Suggested to Delay until DMG implementers present.
         5. Solomon appeared and indicated that the comment should be Accepted.
         6. CID 8193 MAC. Marked ready for Motion – ACCEPTED
      6. CID 8077
         1. Marked for input from Ganesh but suggested to “reject due to scope”.
         2. CID 8077 Ready for Motion REJECTED with standard “out of scope” reason
      7. CID 8236
         1. Editor comment.
         2. Discussion on “static” and comment is on unchanged text.
         3. CID 8236 Ready for Motion, REJECTED with “out of scope” reason
      8. CID 8089
         1. Proposal in document is REVISED at cited location replace “L-LENGTH with LENGTH field in L-SIG”. VJ was happy either way. Chair asked if comment is in scope?
         2. CID 8089 Ready for Motion, REJECTED with “out of scope” reason
      9. CID 8254
         1. Spaces or not in the MIB.
         2. About 50% of each format.
         3. CID 8254 Ready for Motion, REJECTED with “either form is valid”
      10. CID 8220
          1. Replace 8b/1B with “8” in R7
          2. CID 8220 Ready for Motion REVISED with resolution shown in 16/820r9.
      11. CID 8274
          1. Ready for Motion, REVISED with resolution shown in 16/820r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-09-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>> .
      12. CID 8171 (MAC)
          1. Review comment
          2. What does ‘mandatory mean with respect to “rates” supported rates and mandatory rates?
          3. Discussed before as CID 7586 (also CID 6460).
          4. Proposed change is to add a note. 16/820r9 includes detailed discussion and proposes “Revised” adding a new NOTE plus a reply statement to the commenter.
          5. Menzo and Graham suggested edits.
          6. CID 8171 Ready for Motion REVISED with resolution shown in 16/820r10 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-10-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>>
      13. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1271.14 insert a new paragraph:

“NOTE—A STA’s operational rate set does not necessarily contain all the mandatory rates. However a STA has to be capable of receiving using a mandatory rate (as required by the rules in 10.7) even if it is not present in this set.”

In reply to the commenter:

1. It is not necessary to make a similar statement for the BSSBasicRateSet, because as this is a subset of the operational rate set, the note therefore also applies to it.

2. It is not necessary to make the statement about the Basic HT-MCS Set and basic VHT-MCS and NSS set because 1315.30 explicitly handles the case when they are empty – which would not be the case if they were required to contain the mandatory HT-MCSs or mandatory VHT-MCS and NSSs.

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review Editorial Pulled** CIDS:
     1. CID 8030 (EDITOR)
        1. Review status of CID and prior discussion
        2. Review Comment and the context in the draft.
        3. This is on unchanged text – can reject for out of scope.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8126 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-05 10:27:17Z) - "(T)VHTLTF" is used consistently as a subscript. This is unambiguous. No change is needed.
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8195 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Prior Proposal: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-07-05 09:52:46Z) - Change to "measurement pilot interval" at 865.61, 872.20, 1713.39, 3077.28 (adding a "the" before too as necessary).
           1. Commenter indicated that this was not correct.
        3. In reply to the commenter, no change is necessary at 158.12, for consistency with local usage.
        4. We have not changed the “Measurement Pilot Interval”, can reject due to scope.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 8197 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Prior proposal: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-11 12:53:56Z) - The cited table contains, as its title suggests, the conditions for subelements within the Location Parameters Element field. The Measurement Report Element field is not embedded in the Location Parameters Element, and is not a subelement. So the proposed change is incorrect.
        3. There was objection to the rejection rational, so we may look at just rejecting as out of scope.
        4. It is technically out of scope.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 8211 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discuss the meaning of “over-eggs the pudding”
        3. Prior Proposal: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-11 12:55:47Z) - The terminology generally used is that a BU is something capable of being buffered, and a buffered BU is something that has been buffered. As this refers to the latter the text at the cited location is correct.
           1. There was an objection to the rational.
        4. It is technically out of scope.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 8212 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment – similar to 8211
        2. Prior proposal: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-11 12:56:28Z) - The terminology generally used is that a BU is something capable of being buffered, and a buffered BU is something that has been buffered. As this refers to the latter the text at the cited location is correct.
           1. There was an objection to the rational
        3. This on unchanged text.
        4. It is technically out of scope.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     7. CID 8218 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Prior proposed resolution: REVISED (EDITOR\_Q: 2016-07-06 23:13:40Z) change "byte" to "octet" at 1074.63, 1164.19, 2484.36 (2x).

Make no change at 3550.34, 3553.36, 3554.9, 3579.51, and 3624.15. At these locations, "byte" is refers to one of data types in the code.

* + - * 1. There was an objection to proposed resolution
      1. Review the locations where Byte needed to be Octet
         1. Places to change: 3350.34, 3579.51, 3624.15,
         2. Places to not change: 3553.36, and 3554.9 – “byte” refers to a related variable name.
      2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR): 2016-07-06 23:13:40Z) change "byte" to "octet" at 1074.63, 1164.19, 2484.36 (2x), 3550.34, 3579.51, 3624.15. Adjust case as necessary.

Make no change at 3553.36, 3554.9. At these locations, "byte" refers to a related variable name.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8224 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Prior proposed resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-07-05 12:52:44Z) - Make changes as stated and also change "MAC Header" in figures 9-1, 9-23, 9-26, 9-32, 9-53 9-58 and 9-59
       3. Review list of changes
          1. Rework required noted in Editor notes field.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-07-05 12:52:44Z) - Make changes as stated and also change "MAC Header" in figures 9-1, 9-23, 9-26, 9-32, 9-53 9-58, 9-59, 9-20, 9-21, 9-22, 9-24 and 9-25
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8230 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. REVISED (EDITOR\_A: 2016-07-06 00:03:59Z) Replace

"For group addressed Management frames received in an MBSS for whom "Group Addressed Privacy" is indicated in Table 9-47 (Category values), the group addressed frame protection service shall take the following actions:"

with

"For group addressed Management frames that are specified with "Yes" in the "Group Addressed Privacy" column of Table 9-47 (Category values), the group addressed frame protection service shall take the following actions:" (changing the quotes to smart quotes).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8252 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Prior Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR\_Q: 2016-07-10 00:31:00Z) - Change "FMS Counters" to "FMS Counter fields" at 946.1.

Add "field" after "FMS Counter" at 946.1 (rightmost) and 946.16. At 946.6, 1594.23 (2x) lowercase "Counter". At 1594.19, 1594.23, 1595.5 (2x), 1595.7, 1595.11, 1595.56, 1596.17 lowercase "Stream"

* + - * 1. Objection was raised on the resolution.
      1. Discussion on FMS Counters field vs FMS Counters.
      2. Look to see if the comment is in scope.
         1. Review locations cited.
      3. It is technically out of scope.
      4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
      5. This was speculatively edited already, a Note to undo this edit was made to the editors.
      6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8292 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Previously discussed – review history
       3. Review the proposed change to “outside the scope of this Standard.”
       4. After review change to Accept
       5. Proposed Resolution: Accept
       6. Notes to Editor to undo the speculative edit and reedit per the approved resolution.
       7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8294 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Prior Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-07-05 13:32:20Z) - Delete the "expressed" in all the "expressed in units of"s, except make no change at: 578.31, 579.11, 806.58, 1163.05, 1210.32, 3161.30

and change "and is expressed" to "," at: 658.06, 1006.16, 3069.05

* + - 1. Review for Scope –
      2. Request to review proposed resolution and keep the resolution, but update the rational for the revised response.
      3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-07-05 13:32:20Z) - Delete the "expressed" in all the "expressed in units of"s, except make no change at: 578.31, 579.11, 806.58, 1163.05, 1210.32, 3161.30 and change "and is expressed" to "," at: 658.06, 1006.16, 3069.05

No change is made at: 578.31, 579.11, 806.58, 1163.05, 1210.32, and 3161.30 because this would create an awkward or ungrammatical result.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8307 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review objection to prior resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-07-07 13:25:31Z) - These are indeed "characteristics", and deleting this word leaves a meaningless sentence.

Note that the other related PHY clauses are modified by other comments (from the same commenter!) to add the word "characteristics" where missing.

* + - 1. Note that the prior resolution should have been marked as a Reject, not Revised.
      2. Review for scope –
      3. It is technically out of scope.
      4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; The comment is out of scope. i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
      5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8116 (EDITOR)
       1. We have a resolution prepared, and it is marked ready for motion
       2. No change needed – will be the subject of a separate motion.
  1. **Out of Scope – Pulled EDITOR CIDS**
     1. CID 8279 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review prior CID (CID 7038) resolution.
        3. Reject due to Insufficient detail
        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. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8315 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Looked at the cited change document 11-16/0276 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>>
           1. The reference doc has 170 pages and not referenced to this CID.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Reject due to Insufficient detail
        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.

The referenced document has 107 pages, and the comment here does not identify which of those changes relate to this comment.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **PHY CID EDITOR**
     1. CID 8286 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review cited change locations.
        3. Question on the difference to ERP-OFDM vs OFDM?
           1. Need to identify the difference.
           2. A note to check the changes and bring up later if there is a problem.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **CIDS assigned to Jon**
     1. CID 8122 (GEN)
        1. Review
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 16:58:12Z) - The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8283 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review rational for why it was pulled and response.
        3. Proposed Resolution Reject - The comment is on unchanged text from D5.0 and D6.0. The ballot resolution committee does not agree with the commenter that a change is needed.
        4. Need to have a straw poll to add results to the Reject Resolution.
  3. **Recess** at 10:01AM

1. **REVmc BRC meeting Thursday, July 28, 2016, 10:30-12:30 AM2**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 10:33am
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No Issues Noted
   3. Thanks for the notes from Mark HAMILTON.
   4. **Review Agenda** is in 11-16/785r7.
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-07-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>
      2. Draft Agenda – Comment Resolution:

* Carlos Cordeiro – 11-16/1041
* Jouni Malinen – 11-16/933
* Adrian Stephens
* Mark Hamilton
* Jon Rosdahl
* Mark Rison
* Motions
  + 1. No objections to the modified Agenda
  1. **Review doc** 11-16/1041r0 - Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1041-00-000m-resolution-to-some-11ad-related-cids.docx>
     2. CID 8038 (MAC):
        1. Reviewed comment.
        2. Proposed resolution is to accept. But, there are more locations to change.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 17:39:16Z): In P1610L01, insert “BRP” in the list of frames

In P1612L56, insert “BRP” in the list of frames

* + - 1. This accomplishes the commenter’s intent.
      2. No objection. Ready for motion.
    1. CID 8042 (MAC):
       1. Effectively the same as CID 8038.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 17:39:16Z):
* In P1610L01, insert “BRP” in the list of frames
* In P1612L56, insert “BRP” in the list of frames
* Note to editor, this is the same resolution change as CID 8038.
  + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
    1. CID 8008 (MAC):
       1. Reviewed comment.
       2. Agreed with proposed resolution.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 17:44:06Z): Incorporate the text changes shown in 11-16/1041r0 for CID 8008. This makes changes effecting the commenter's intent.
       4. No objection. Ready for motion.
  1. **Review doc 11-16/933r4**  - Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0933-04-000m-some-revmc-d6-comments.docx>
     2. CIDs 8326 (MAC), 8327 (MAC) and 8051 (MAC):
        1. Reminded of the previous discussion on this topic.
        2. Resolution has been drafted based on the straw poll results on Monday.
        3. The changes ended up being relatively extensive in this section. So, straw poll to check if the group wants to make these changes, or reject the comment at this point.
        4. Make changes: 7 Reject comments: 1 Abstain: 7
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-26 15:33:23Z): Make the changes shown in 11-16/0933r4, for CIDs 8051, 8326 and 8327. This makes the changes requested by the commenter in CIDs 8326 and 8327.
        6. No objection. Ready for motion.
     3. CID 8111 (GEN):
        1. Suggesting a Revised resolution which makes the same changes the commenter suggested, but is a little more clear for the Editors.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Do the proposed changes: On page 1967 line 4, replace “PMKSAs are cached for up to their lifetimes” with “PMKSAs have a certain lifetime”. On page 1968 line 13, replace “Mesh PMKSAs are cached for up to their lifetimes” with “Mesh PMKSAs have a certain lifetime”. On page 1968 line 32, replace “PTKSAs are cached for the life of the PMKSA or PMK-R1 security association” with “PTKSAs have the same lifetime as the PMKSA or PMK-R1 security Association, whichever comes first”. On page 1971 line 15, replace “STKSAs are cached for the life of the SMKSA or until the STSL ends, whichever comes first” with “STKSAs have the same lifetime as the SMKSA or the STSL, whichever comes first”. On page 1971 line 34, replace “The TPKSA is cached per the lifetime indicated in the TPK handshake or until the TDLS direct link is torn down, whichever comes first” with “The TPKSA has the lifetime indicated in the TPK handshake or the lifetime of the TDLS direct link, whichever comes first”. These changes implement the changes requested by the commenter.
        3. No objection. Ready for motion.
     4. CID 8112 (GEN):
        1. The change seems safe and correct.
        2. Noted a typo in the proposed change, that there is only one bulleted list at the cited location.
        3. Some concern with the phrase “It has a certain lifetime”, if it isn’t clear what that lifetime is. Due to this, would rather not make the changes that can raise a new issue, at this point.
        4. Check for whether this is on changed text and in scope. All changes appear to be on unchanged text (or changes nearby are unrelated). Need to look at 12.5.3.3.6, and changes there. Those changes do add the word lifetime, but the issue in 12.6.1.1 does not seem to be related to this change. Not complete agreement on this opinion.
        5. Straw poll: Make no changes (group can’t reach consensus): 8 Make the changes: 1 Abstain: 8
        6. We’ll reject the comment with the standard “group could not come to consensus” reason, noted the straw poll above.
        7. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The BRC did not have consensus to accept the proposed changes. Straw Poll results were 8-1-8 on July 28th. (Make no change/Make a change/Abstain)
        8. Mark Ready for motion
     5. CID 8146 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 18:14:30Z)
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 8176 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Discussion on if the cited text is or is not garbled.
           1. Believe this is not garbled, it is a list of items.
           2. Suggest reject. Explain that the text is not garbled.
           3. But, the sentence lists three things, and only has “the TDLS responder STA shall” on the first two. This is confusing.
        4. Proposed Resolution in 11-16/933r4 is “Rejected. The identified text is not garbled; it is a list of actions that the TDLS responder STA shall do if any of the following checks fails”.
        5. Straw Poll: Support the rejection reason proposed in 11-16/933r4: 7 Do not support this reason: 3 Abstain: 4.
        6. Result 7-3-4 proceed with the proposed rejection
        7. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 18:19:02Z) The identified text is not garbled; it is a list of actions that the TDLS responder STA shall do if any of the following checks fails.
        8. Mark Ready for motion.
     7. CID 8175 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. On page 2042 line 31, replace “delete existing TPK handshake key state” with “delete existing TPK handshake state”.
        4. Question on the scope of the CID.
        5. Straw poll

1. Make change as proposed
2. Reject comment due to Scope
3. abstain
   * + 1. Results: 6-3-9 – move forward as revised.
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8303 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        4. Straw poll:
4. Make a change (all or some subset)
5. Reject the comment – lack of agreement
   * + 1. Results: 5 – 2 – proceed with discussion on the probably changes.
       2. Only the changes on page 2025 seem to be of concern.
       3. We have two options
          1. Option 1 – Accept
          2. Option 2 – Revised without changes on 2025 and 2014
       4. After discussion Option 1 was more agreeable.
       5. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 18:32:44Z)
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8283 (GEN)
        1. We had started reviewing in last meeting slot – Jouni had a suggestion for the proposed resolution revision.
        2. Discussion on the requirement for having “drawn from a uniform distribution”
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-28 18:39:20Z).

At 983.51, 1924.39, 2032.1, add "drawn from a uniform distribution"

after the cited term.

At 2015.32, replace

"Generates 256-bit random number that is sent as a peer nonce"

with

"Generates a 256-bit random number following the recommendations of

12.7.5 (Nonce generation). That number is sent as a peer nonce".

At 2029.19, replace

"The initiator STA also generates a 256-bit random number that is sent in the Key Nonce field."

with

"The initiator STA also generates a 256-bit random number following the recommendations of 12.7.5 (Nonce generation). That number is sent in the Key Nonce field."

At 2031.10, replace

"STA\_P generates a 256-bit random number that is sent as the peer Nonce KDE"

with

"STA\_P generates a 256-bit random number following the recommendations of 12.7.5 (Nonce generation). That number is sent as the peer Nonce KDE"

* + - 1. Straw Poll:

1. Reject comment
2. Adopt proposed Resolution
   * 1. Results: 5-7 slight preference for making the change
     2. Proceed with proposed resolution and Mark ready for Motion.
   1. **EDITOR CIDS**
      1. CID 8034 (EDITOR)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. CID 8287 (EDITOR)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   2. **MAC CIDs**
      1. CID 8202 (MAC)
         1. We had proposed to reject, but needed a complete resolution.
         2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-24 20:27:01Z): The CRC could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comment.

Straw polls held:

July 21st Straw Poll:

A) Continue to work on the CID

B) Reject the CID – and not make a change

Results: 0-5-11

July 26th Straw Poll:

a) Make the change

b) Reject the CID – could not come to consensus

c) Abstain

Results: 1-11-10 – Direction is for reject as could not come to consensus

Concerns raised during discussion:

- WFA's WMM Spec (a parallel spec) divergence is a concern

- Concern with doing a change that would result in complex implementation.

- Reassociation is recognized as a good (sometimes the only) way to renegotiate some aspects of the association's U-APSD state.

- The commenter's point about the combination of TS Info Ack Policy and TSs may have validity, but it is more complicated, as other ack policy TSs should not be affected by reassocation to the same AP.

- The proposed solution makes a broader change than needed.

- Would potentially cause more interoperability issues.

* + - 1. Discussion on if the concerns noted were relevant or not
         1. They are the concerns that were presented.
      2. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8061 (MAC) and 8062 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Reference is to CID 7589 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.docx>>
       3. We did not reach consensus when we discussed this in the past (June 3)
       4. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-28 06:31:19Z): The BRC could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comment. This was discussed on June 3, based on document 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>>. The changes add a fairly large new facility to the MLME interface, and no consensus could be reached.
       5. The proposed changes have been available since June 3, and a request to review the change
       6. Straw Poll:

1. Support reject reason
2. Do not support reject reason
3. abstain
   * 1. Results 7-1-5 – proceed with rejection reason
     2. Mark both CIDs (8061 and 8062) ready for motion.
   1. **CIDS for GEN**
      1. CID 8153 (GEN)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review discussion history
         3. Unsure of the need for RXVECTOR.
         4. Need some more homework.
      2. CID 8095 (GEN)
         1. Review comment
         2. Discussion on antenna connector vs antenna
            1. There is a definition of Antenna Connector in the spec.
         3. Straw Poll
4. Accept the comment
5. Reject – fail to consensus
6. Abstain
   * + - 1. 1-6-9
       1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 19:08:12Z) - The BRC did not have consensus to accept the proposed changes. Straw Poll results were 1-6-9 on July 28th.
   1. Motions:
      1. **Motion # 275** **Monday & Tuesday CIDs**

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

* “Motion-MAC-CC” tab in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-50-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls except for CID 8329](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-50-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls%20except%20for%20CID%208329), and in the resolution to CID 8031, insert the full document URL
* “”GEN-25July” and “GEN-26July” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-41-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
* “Editorials - motion 20160726” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-55-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
  + - 1. Moved: Adrian Stephens 2nd: Sean Coffey
      2. Results: 15-1-0 **Motion # 275** **passes**
    1. **Motion #276: CID 8116**

Approve the comment resolutions to CID 8116 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “AIFS[i] unambiguously indicates indexing of an array of such values. It is not necessary to specify here that the index is an access category, as this is specified elsewhere (e.g. 1276.18 and about 70 other locations). The proposed change introduces its own unexplained notation of an AC<prime>.”

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Menzo WENTINK
      2. Discussion:
         1. Objection to claim of “unambiguously” as there are two AIFS[i] with different values.
         2. Speaking in favor the motion
         3. Review the history of the CID from Monday.
      3. Results: 10-1 4:  **Motion #276 Passes**
  1. **Mark RISON Assigned CIDs** 
     1. Review list of CIDs assigned: 8142, 8279, 8173, 8318, 8108, 8068
     2. CID 8142 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on the proposed change
        3. Discussion on dropping the 2nd half of the proposed change.
        4. Will need more detail for resolution.
  2. Recess at 12:31pm

1. **REVmc BRC meeting Thursday, July 28, 2016, 13:30-15:30 PM1**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy at 1:33pm
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No issues
   3. **Review agenda**
      1. We have 12 CIDs left to process
      2. Review list of speakers
   4. **Review doc 11-16/1036r1** – Solomon TRAININ (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1036-00-000m-cid8041.docx>
      2. CID 8041 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review the proposed changes.
         3. Discussion on the scope of the changes – i.e. does this apply only to DMG.
            1. This is for DMG, so not applicable
         4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 20:39:03Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-16/1036r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1036-00-000m-cid8041.docx>>. This effects the changes the commenter requested.
         5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   5. **Review doc 11-16/888r5 -**Assaf KASHER (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0888-05-000m-resolution-to-dmg-power-save-cids.docx>
      2. CID 4044 (MAC)
         1. Review proposed grammar updates since we last talked about this CID.
         2. Discussion on the clarity of the change. This was argued to be either not correct, or at best unclear.
         3. Concern expressed that the change was not complete or clear.
         4. The paragraph is very dense, and we may want to make a list or sub-list to make the paragraph clear.
   6. **Review Doc 11-16/839r3** - Mark RISON (Samsung)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>
      2. CID 8142 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Started discussion earlier today.
         3. Review the proposed changes in context.
         4. Which frames need ACK is noted in G3.
         5. Straw poll:
2. We should make the proposed changes
3. We should not make the changes
4. Abstain
   * + 1. Result – 1-6-6 – proceed with a reject reason of lack of consensus.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-28 21:10:05Z): The BRC could not come to consensus to make a change. A straw poll was taken on July 28, results: 1-6-6.
       3. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8173 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. No submission – mark rejected due to insufficient detail.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 21:13:18Z) The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined
        4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8318 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the proposed change
           1. Disagreement if it is clear or not.
        3. This was discussed during D5, and the BRC did not agree to make a change.
           1. Assertion that the BRC ran out of time, and so we should reconsider it now.
        4. Straw Poll
5. Accept the comment
6. Reject the Comment
7. Abstain
   * + 1. Result 1-8-2 - -reject the comment –
       2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-28 21:14:22Z): At P1351.11, it indicates that "When the backoff procedure is invoked ..." So, this is where the procedure starts.
       3. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8108 (MAC)
        1. Review comment -- “valid response”
        2. Resolve similar to CID 8107
        3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 21:19:32Z): After "a valid response" insert "(see Annex G)"
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 8068 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Reject for lack of sufficient
        3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-28 21:20:34Z): The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   1. **GEN CIDs**
      1. CID 8153 (GEN)
         1. Continue the discussion on RXVECTOR.
         2. Discussion of the parts of RXVECTOR that may be needed in PHYend.Indication.
         3. What information may be needed in PHYend.Indication that is not in PHYStart.Ind?
            1. Unkonwn for sure
         4. Straw poll
8. Accept the Comment
9. Reject the comment
10. abstain
    * + 1. Results 1-6-6 – proceed with the BRC did not agree to make a change.
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED The BRC could not come to consensus to make a change. A straw poll was taken on July 28, results: 1-6-6 (Accept/Reject/Abstain)..
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
      1. CID 8123 (GEN)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 21:30:33Z)
         3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. CID 8223 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Insufficient detail
         3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-28 21:31:50Z): 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. Mark Ready for Motion
      3. 8259 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. What is the difference between PPDU\_Dur and DPDUR?
            1. The difference is PHDUR (*PPDUR = DPDUR – PHDUR)*
         3. Discussion on equation R-1.
         4. There is a long list of “Where” variables are listed over the page break.
         5. Unsure of we can cleanly make any change at this point.
         6. Straw Poll
11. Accept the comment and make the change
12. Reject the comment
13. abstain
    * + 1. Straw Poll Results:1-8-4 – proceed with reject
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 21:44:01Z) The BRC could not come to consensus to make a change. A straw poll was taken on July 28, results: 1-8-4 (Accept/Reject/Abstain)
        3. Mark ready for Motion
      1. CID 8222 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on if the same equation for both inbound and outbound.
         3. The equation is to estimate Throughput – inbound or outbound is not discriminated.
         4. Unsure of we can cleanly make any change at this point.
         5. Straw Poll
14. Accept the comment and make the change
15. Reject the comment
16. abstain
    * + 1. 2-8-3 – proceed with reject
        2. Proposed Resolution REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-28 21:44:01Z) at 3623.40 the text indicates the equation can be used for either inbound or outbound.
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. **CID 8044 (MAC)**
       1. Last comment to resolve
       2. Proposed Replacement text was presented by David HUNTER:
          1. “ A STA may enter the doze state when all of the following are true – the STA:

* Is in PS Mode
* Has not performed unscheduled power save
* Has received or transmitted, under a wakeup schedule, anATIM Frame during the schedule’s awake window
* Has successfully transmitted to and received a QoS Data frame with the EOSP subfield set to 1 from every corresponding peer STA for this beacon interval.

Otherwise the STA shall stay active until the end of the current beacon interval. “

* + 1. Discussion on the replacement and if it captured the existing and proposal in (11-16/888r5)
    2. The third bullet needed to be corrected – “following”
    3. If we have more technical understanding and clarifying the text will get more people to incorporate the text.
    4. Straw poll

1. Accept Assaf’s proposed text
2. Reject the comment
3. Abstain
   * 1. Result: 0-7-3 – Proceed with a reject resolution – no consensus
     2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-28 22:05:21Z): The BRC could not come to consensus to make a change. A straw poll was taken on July 28, results: 0-7-3 (Accept/Reject/Abstain).
     3. Mark Ready for Motion
   1. **Revisit CID 8043 (MAC)**
      1. Was previously motioned (#266) as “Out of scope” – re-visit
      2. Review 11-16/888r5 that has a proposed resolution to the CID.
         1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0888-05-000m-resolution-to-dmg-power-save-cids.docx>
      3. Discussion on support for making the change as suggested in the document and those that were concerned it was not correct.
      4. Two things occur with this change – “awake window and remove DMG restriction. (so it would apply more generically)
      5. Discussion on what “awake window” is being referenced
      6. It was thought that we should have “Awake Window” and remove “non-DMG”.
      7. Proposed Resolution REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 22:16:15Z): At P1617L45.53 change "ATIM window" to "ATIM window/Awake Window" and delete "non-DMG"
      8. Mark Ready for Motion
   2. **Revisit CID 8008**
      1. There was a concern in 11-16/1041r0
      2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1041-00-000m-resolution-to-some-11ad-related-cids.docx>
      3. Would like to add “2x” to aslotTime due to a tolerance consideration.
      4. In 10.3.2.3.9 is the definition, and it does not specify a tolerance.
      5. No change agreed to be made
   3. **Review doc 11-16/834r3** – Michael MONTEMURRO
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0834-03-000m-anqp-update-for-advice-of-charge-and-net-auth-type.docx>
      2. After this was presented, there were some minor updates that needed to be applied.
      3. Review the changes from R1
      4. Concern if we may get this wrong.
      5. We have approved R1, and the concern is that R1 may have had more review than R3.
      6. Is there any objection to update CID 8049 and 8048 with R3 as the document to use?
         1. No Objection
         2. Updated Proposed Resolutions: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-28 22:39:55Z): Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/834r3 which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter
   4. **Recess** at 3:30pm
4. **REVmc BRC meeting Thursday, July 28, 2016, 16:00-18:00 PM2**
   1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 4:00pm
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No Issues
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-10-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>
      2. No objection to agenda for slot
   4. **Motions:**
      1. **Motion #277 Wednesday and Thursday CIDs**

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

* “Motion-MAC-CD”, “Motion-MAC-CE” and ““Motion-MAC-CE” “tabs in 11-16/565r54 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-54-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>>
* “”GEN-28July” and “GEN-28July-1” tabs in 11-16/665r43 <[https://](NULL)[mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-43-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-42-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx)
* “Editorials - motion 20160727” , “Editorials - motion 20160728” and “Editorials - motion 20160728-2” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-58-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
  + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Emily QI
      2. Discussion: None
      3. Results: 9-0-0: **Motion #277 Passes**
    1. **Motion #278: SB Recirculation**

Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the initial Sponsor Ballot on P802.11REVmc D6.0 as contained in documents 11-15-0665r43 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-43-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>> , 11-15-0565r54 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-54-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>> , and 11-15-0532r58 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-58-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>

Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 7.0 incorporating these resolutions and

Approve a 10 day Sponsor Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11REVmc D7.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl 2nd: Adrian STEPHEN
      2. Discussion –
         1. speaking in favor –
         2. question if all CIDs are complete – answer is yes
      3. Results: 11-0-0 **Motion #278 Passes**
  1. **Thanks to the Editors in advance for the work ahead of them.**
  2. **Plan for now to September Meeting**:
     1. Objectives: Third/Fourth recirculation and comment resolution
     2. Conference calls 10am Eastern 2 hours
        1. With 10 day notice
     3. Schedule review
     4. Availability of 11mc in the IEEE store
        1. D6.0 is available , see <http://www.techstreet.com/ieee/products/1867583>
     5. Forward to ISO JTC1/SC6 WG1
        1. D5.0 forwarded; D6.0 & D7.0 will be forwarded upon SB approval
  3. **Review Plan of Record: (11-16/0785r11 - Slide 8)**
     1. D7.0 August/September Third/Fourth (unchanged) Recirculation
     2. October 2016 – WG/EC Final Approval Oct 4th telecon
     3. December 2016 – RevCom/SASB Approval
  4. **TGmc SB Planning (11-16/0785r11 - Slide 9)**
     1. August/Sept 2016
     2. July 30 – Aug 15 editing and review of editing
     3. 3th recirculation D7.0 August 15-30
     4. On or before Sept 9: Complete comment resolution (goal unchanged draft)
     5. 4th recirculation D7.0 unchanged Sept 10 - 20: 10 day recirculation of unchanged draft
     6. October 4th: EC teleconference approval – requests for unconditional approval for TGmc
     7. October 17th deadline for submission to Revcom
     8. December 2016 – RevCom/SASB Approval
  5. **Adjourned at 4:12pm**
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>

7. Thursday AM2:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-07-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1041-00-000m-resolution-to-some-11ad-related-cids.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0933-04-000m-some-revmc-d6-comments.docx>

<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/16/11-16-0276-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>

8. Thursday PM1:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1036-00-000m-cid8041.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0888-05-000m-resolution-to-dmg-power-save-cids.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1041-00-000m-resolution-to-some-11ad-related-cids.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0834-03-000m-anqp-update-for-advice-of-charge-and-net-auth-type.docx>

9. Thursday PM2:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0785-10-000m-tgmc-agenda-july-2016.pptx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-54-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-43-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-58-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>

<http://www.techstreet.com/ieee/products/1867583>