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Abstract

Minutes for the IEEE 802.11 REVmc BRC Telecons

R0 = July 19th telecom minutes

1. REVmc BRC Telecon July 19th 2016
	1. **Called to order** at 10:04am ET by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Patent Policy** Reviewed
		1. No issues noted
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HPE), Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Allert VAN ZELST (Qualcomm); Assaf (Qualcomm); Dick Roy (SRA); Emily QI (Intel); Edward AU (Huawei); Guido HIERTZ (Ericsson); Kazayuki SAKODA (Sony); Mark RISON (Samsung); Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry); Lei WANG (Marvell); Paul NIKOLICH (Self); Sean COFFEY (Realtek); Solomon TRANIN (Intel); Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Jinjing JIANG (Marvell);
	4. **Review Agenda**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0833-04-000m-tgmc-brc-july-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>
		2. Approved agenda:
			1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy
			2. Editor report - any issues with editing of approved CIDs

3. Comment resolution

* + - * 1. CIDs 8284 and 8291 - 11-16-830, 838 – Guido HIERTZ (Ericsson):
				2. ANQP CIDs -11-16-834 – Stephen MCCANN/Mike MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
				3. CIDs 8035, 8036, 8037, 8040 – Solomon TRANIN (Intel)
				4. CID 8170 – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
				5. CIDs 8064, 8168/8169, 8158, also 8075, 8087, 8088, 8134, 8157, 8177, 8179, 8202, 8216, 8243, 8311 for guidance/direction
				6. 11-16-839 - Mark RISON (Samsung)
				7. CID 8003 – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
				8. 11-16-820 – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel) (30 mins)
			1. Motions
			2. AOB
			3. Adjourn
		1. Jon has only CID 8003 ready for today.
		2. Discussion on the agenda to include motions
			1. At 11:30 motion we will have motions for CIDs last Telecon and a

Motion to resolve outstanding Insufficient Detail Comments

* + 1. Approved agenda to be posted in 11-16/833r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0833-05-000m-tgmc-brc-july-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>>
	1. **Editor Report** –Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. Up to date on editing the CIDs already approved.
		2. A panel of reviewers will review changes (more than one per CID change)
	2. **Review Doc 11-16/830r0** Guido HIERTZ (Ericsson)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0830-00-000m-resolution-for-cid8284.pptx>
		2. Abstract:

CID 8284 raises the question of how Association IDs known from infrastructure BSSs are used in Mesh WLAN. Defined as 16 b value the effective range of AIDs is limited to [1 … 2007]. This limitation stems from the (Partial) Virtual Bitmap table in TIM beacon frames.

The present document addresses the comment and answers the question if REVmc/D6.0 needs to be modified.

* + 1. Review submission
		2. Concern on referring to code rather than standard for justification.
		3. CID 8284 (MAC)
			1. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes on slide 6 in 11-16/830r1 which adds the requested clarification by the commenter
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Doc 11-16/838r0** - Guido HIERTZ (Ericsson)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0838-00-000m-resolution-to-cid-8291.pptx>
		2. Abstract:

The commenter criticizes that the current text in 9.6.17.3 misses a reference to a section that indicates when to include a

PREQ,

PREP,

PERR, or

RANN

element into a HWMP Mesh Path Selection frame. This presentation provides a resolution to the comment.

* + 1. CID 8291 (MAC)
		2. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes on slide 3 in 11-16/838r0 which adds the requested clarification by the commenter
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Doc 11-16/834r0** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0834-00-000m-anqp-update-for-advice-of-charge-and-net-auth-type.docx>
		2. Abstract:

 This document proposes some updates to the “Advice of Charge” and “Network Authentication Type” ANQP messages based on feedback from the Wi-Fi Alliance Passport project.

This uses Draft P802.11REVmc\_D6.0.pdf as a baseline and proposes resolutions to CIDs 8048 and 8049.

* + 1. CID 8049 (MAC) and 8049 (MAC)
			1. Review comments and proposed changes
			2. Question on if there was a new field, or new field inside an existing field.
				1. There are no implementations known that use this field, but this correction is expected for those that may use it.
			3. Backward compatibilities is an issue for adding this change.
				1. Agreed that this is to be concerned with.
			4. Editorial change “NAI Realm” on page 5 should be “NAI realm”
				1. Question on the use of “roaming”
				2. “roaming” is not descriptive, would like more expansion.
				3. Delete “its own “roaming” charge”
			5. Length field in 9-623 should be 2 octets not 1
			6. In 9.4.5.23 there are a couple typos “dfefined” and “previsouly” which should be corrected.
			7. Proposed Resolution: incorporate the text changes in 11-16/834r1 which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter.
			8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/851** Solomon TRANIN (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0851-00-000m-cid8040.docx>
		2. CIDs 8035, 8036, 8037, 8040 (MAC)
		3. Only CID 8040 (MAC) to have proposed change, the others to be rejected.
		4. Discussion: There are places that can be seen as contradicting each other in definition of BF procedure. Intention of the text referred below (P1508L32) is to allow continuation of following BF phase immediately after previous that the word allocation means interval of the entire BF. It is not completely clear that the allocation is not covered by duration of BF frames as defined in 9.3.1.16, 9.3.1.17, 9.3.1.18.
		5. Review the proposed changes
		6. Discussion on what limits the duration of the BF Training Procedure.
			1. Change to add reference to definition
			2. Need “the” before duration – and multiplication symbol for the 2”x” MBIFS.
		7. Proposed resolution CID 8040 (MAC): Revised Incorporate the changes in 11-16/851r1 which incorporates the changes suggested by the commenter
		8. For CID 8035, 8036, 8037 (MAC)
			1. Part of the MAC file, Out of Scope tab, not motioned yet.
			2. Proposed resolution: Reject; 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. No objection - Mark ready for Motion
	2. **Review Doc 11-16/831r3** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0831-03-000m-resolutions-for-cids-8055-and-8170.docx>
		2. CID 8170 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Concern that the CW is not properly described, and that in the cited diagram it may need some added text, but not the changes proposed.
			4. Discussion on the removal of “CWindow” from diagram
			5. CW is not the backoff, but rather a range used for the picking the backoff.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISEDAt P 1293.3 In Figure 10.15 make the following changes (see below):Delete “CWindow” from the figure including the key.Delete “Backoff” from Station B row.
			7. Discussion on the change.
				1. The white box is backoff, and the shading is the remaining backoff.
				2. This diagram has a key to explain the box shading.
			8. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. **Review Doc 11-16/839r0 –** Mark Rison (Samsung)
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0839-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d6-0-sbmc2.docx>
			2. CID 8158 (MAC)
				1. Review Comment
				2. Review Discussion
				3. Question on the reference to the ”RA field”
				4. Risk on adding “intended receiver(s)” Concern on the stability of the draft with the change.
				5. Mark R. to change the resolution and bring back.
	3. Motions:
		1. **Motion #268: MAC, GEN CIDs agreed on July 15th teleconference**

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

* “Motion-MAC-AC” tab in 11-16/565r49 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-49-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>>
* “”GEN-July15” tab in 11-16/665r38 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-38-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>
* CID 8002 on the MIB tab in 11-15/0665r38 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-38-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>
	+ - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL Seconded: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion: None
			3. Result: 12-0-1 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #269:**  **(Remainder of Insufficient detail – confirm which will have proposed resolutions):**

Resolve CIDs 8067, 8075, 8080, 8087, 8088, 8145, 8157, 8158, 8172, 8179, 8190, 8196, 8203, 8205, 8261, 8260, 8265, 8271, 8282, 8285, 8297, 8314, 8316, 8320 in the “Insufficient Detail” tab in 11-16/532r52 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-52-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>> as “Rejected”, with a resolution of “The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Guido HIERTZ
			2. Discussion:
				1. The list of CIDs do not have sufficient detail independent of any future submission
				2. The intent is to have a proposed resolution in place to avoid running out of time.
				3. Concern that this would preclude other submissions if they were on this list of CIDs.
				4. Presentation for some of these CIDs have been prepared last week, but need time to present these submissions.
				5. In the past we have made this type of motion at the end of the process when time has expired, rather than at the beginning of the comment resolution discussion.
				6. Changing the order of this type of motion is a demotivation.
				7. Question on 8082 vs 8088, why is this not the same.

8080 seems to have proposed change, why on this list?

Because the proposed change has “either” in it and not a complete proposal.

* + - * 1. Question on how to Note my strong Objection to this motion. Noted in the minutes: Mark RISON is strongly objecting to this motion.
			1. **Motion to table the motion:**
				1. Moved: Mark Rison 2nd: Guido
				2. Result: 3-5-4 Motion fails
			2. **Results: 4-3-5 Motion passes**
				1. This was ruled as procedural as the cid proposed changes are not actionable by the editor without extra discussion / determination**.**
			3. **An Appeal of the chair was made by Mark RISON**
				1. Request to understand the limitations of this motion**:**
				2. Chair ruled that proposals would be allowed on these CIDs, but that we now have a resolution on record for these CIDs and no further action is required.
				3. Chair ruled that we would hear the appeal on Thursday.
			4. We are out of time.
	1. **Adjourned** 12:01 ET (12:01pm)
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