IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| REVmc BRC July 19 and 21 Telecon Minutes | | | | |
| Date: 2016-07-21 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. | 10871 N 5750 W  Highland, UT 84003 | +1-801-492-4023 | jrosdahl@ieee.org |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

Minutes for the IEEE 802.11 REVmc BRC Telecons

R0 = July 19th telecom minutes

R1 = July 21st telecom minutes added.

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)

1. REVmc BRC Telecon July 21st 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); Emily QI (Intel); Hassan Yaghoobi (Intel); Kazayuki SAKODA (Sony); Sean COFFEY (Realtek); Jinjing JIANG (Marvel); Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm); Peter Ecclesine (Cisco); Yuichi MORIOKA (Sony); Yusuke TANAKA (Sony); Mark RISON (Samsung); Assaf KASHER (Qualcomm); George CALCEV (Huawei); Carlos Cordiero (Intel); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel)
   4. **Review Agenda**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0833-05-000m-tgmc-brc-july-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>
      2. **The draft agenda is:**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report – any issues with editing of approved CIDs

3. Appeal to overrule the decision of the chair (ruling Motion 269 as procedural) – Mark Rison

***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*** [***https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-52-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls***](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.”***

***Moved: Adrian Stephens  
Seconded: Guido Hiertz  
Result: 4-3-5 Passes***

**Mark Rison: Appeal the chair’s decision**

**Motion (Overrule the chair (procedural):**

**Move to appeal the chair’s decision that Motion 269 was procedural.**

**Moved: Mark Rison  
Seconded:  
Result:**

4. Comment resolution

1. 11-16-839 - Mark Rison: CIDs 8064, 8168/8169, 8158, also 8075, 8087, 8088, 8134, 8157, 8177, 8179, 8202, 8216, 8243, 8311 for guidance/direction
2. Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm): **8003**
3. Jouni Malinen (Qualcomm): CIDs - Security
4. 11-16-820 – Adrian (30 mins)

5. Motions 11:30am

1. Motion on Hassan presentation 11-16-0822 (60GHz Spectrum addition)
2. Motion on Error in July 19th Motion #268 – MAC AC should have been CA - For MAC CIDs agreed on July 15th teleconference

6. AOB

7. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to adopting the draft agenda proposed above.
  1. **EDITOR Report**
     1. Review panel has been established
     2. First Review Phase is underway.
  2. **Appeal to overrule the decision of the chair** (ruling Motion 269 as procedural) – Mark Rison
     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 in11-16/532r52 <*[*https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-52-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls*](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.”*

*Moved: Adrian Stephens Seconded: Guido Hiertz*

*Result: 4-3-5 Passes*

Mark Rison: Appeal the chair’s decision

* + 1. Motion: Overrule the chair (procedural):
    2. Chair relinquished control of the meeting to Jon ROSDAHL, Secretary, to run the meeting for this business item.
       1. Move to appeal the chair’s decision that Motion #269 was procedural.
       2. Moved: Mark Rison
       3. Seconded: None
       4. Result: Failed due to lack of second.
       5. Return control of meeting to the Chair
  1. **Review doc 11-16/839r1** – 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 8168 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Concern on the full list that is being considered to be removed from
        3. Discussion on the terms that should be included or not.
        4. More review to be done – will bring back later for discussion
     3. CID 8169 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Same issue as in CID 8168 (GEN).
        3. Will consider together when brought back.
     4. CID 8064 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; At 1557.57 delete “. At each TBTT the AP should suspend the decrementing of the backoff timer for any pending non-beacon transmission and transmit the Beacon frame”.
        4. Discussion – proposed change is to just delete a portion the cited sentence.
        5. Discussion on the notes that were added before – ongoing discussion on the history of the changes.
        6. CID 128 was what added the rules citing Clause 10 for TBTT Beacon transmission.
        7. Concern with changing the channel access method at this late time, but this change was possibly made in haste, and this is to complete that change.
        8. StrawPoll:
           1. Revise the CID and Delete the phrase
           2. Not make the change and consider a Rejection
           3. Result: 5-4-6
           4. Proceed with the proposed resolution.
        9. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-21 14:30:24Z): At 1557.57 delete ". At each TBTT the AP should suspend the decrementing of the backoff timer for any pending non-beacon transmission and transmit the Beacon frame” (Note to EDITOR, keep the rest of this sentence, and merge with the prior sentence.)
     5. CID 8075 (Editor)
        1. This is being done by Graham SMITH…defer for now
     6. CID 8087 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Not in doc 11-16/839r0
        3. Request for comments from the group on this CID
        4. Concerns were expressed for making any change, and need to have more review of the implementation dependent parameters and should look to address the larger issue in the next revision.
        5. This CID has a rejection resolution approved by Motion #269 for now, but if a new resolution is prepared, it can be heard at that time.
     7. CID 8088 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Request for comments from the group on this CID
        3. Concerns were expressed for making the change.
        4. This CID has a rejection resolution approved by Motion #269 for now, but if a new resolution is prepared, it can be heard at that time.
     8. CID 8134 (Editor)
        1. Skip for now
     9. CID 8157 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. This CID has a rejection resolution approved by Motion #269 for now, but if a new resolution is prepared, it can be reviewed
        3. Concern that RA cannot be universally changed to DA.
        4. Concern that changing Security should have more review and coordinated proposal.
     10. CID 8177 (Editor)
         1. Request to have more review/response from Mark Hamilton
         2. The database shows the state is “clear”, but was part of a motion, so should have a state of (A, J, V), Adrian to check on the state/motion
     11. CID 8179 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Question on the research that was being done in the background.
         3. More work would be needed if we are to reconsider
         4. This CID has a rejection resolution approved by Motion #269 for now, but if a new resolution is prepared, it can be heard at that time.
     12. CID 8202 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. What is the proper behavior of TSPEC across reassociation?
         3. The parallel spec divergence is a concern.
         4. Concern with doing a change that would result in a complex implementation
         5. Currently this CID is assigned to Mark RISON and Submission Required.
         6. If we reject this CID, then we would need a rationale for rejecting
         7. Get the feeling of the group for direction
         8. Straw Poll:
            1. A) Continue to work on the CID
            2. B) Reject the CID – and not make a change
            3. Results: 0-5-11
            4. We will need a rationale for the rejection.
         9. This is not out of Scope, and there is a reasonable description of the proposed change that was provided, but we need to identify either a technical reason for not making the change, or cannot come to consensus and cite that as the reason and this Straw Poll.
         10. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark HAMILTON to prepare the rationale for the rejection.
  2. CIDs from GEN:
     1. CID 8003 (GEN)
        1. Review comment – Was discussed last Telecon.
        2. Proposed Resolution needed to be revised.
        3. Adrian and Jon prepared updated Resolution:
        4. Concern that the resolution did not address the values vs field question, so an additional line was added.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:13:26Z) - At 2949.52 replace "OUI" with "OUI or CID".

At 2144.11 and 2144.28 replace "OUI and " with "OUI or CID and the"

In reply to the commenter, no change is make on page 1948, because TKIP is a feature that is deprecated.

The other two locations above were the only locations that need to be changed resulting from a review of all uses of the term 'OUI".

These locations are all referencing the OUI (or CID) values not fields.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. CIDS Assigned to Jouni
     1. CID 8143 (GEN):
        1. Reviewed change and context.
        2. Agreed with Accepted.
        3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:17:04Z).
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     2. CID 8050 (GEN):
        1. Text is proposed to be added to the cited location, to match the CCMP text.
        2. Agreed with change.
        3. There is more text being added somewhere else that also needs to be aligned.
        4. Mark R will try to remember to note this, at the time that we consider the change with the addition.
        5. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:20:09Z).
        6. Mark Ready for motion.
     3. CID 8099 (GEN):
        1. Reviewed proposed change.
        2. Is the phrase "operates OCB" correct wording?
           1. No clear prior wording as an example, but it seems to be okay.
        3. Agreed to accept.
        4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:23:11Z).
        5. No Objection - Mark Ready for motion.
     4. CID 8081 (GEN):
        1. Reviewed proposed resolution.
        2. Agreed to accept.
        3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:25:05Z).
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion.
     5. CID 8210 (GEN):
        1. Review comment and proposed rejection
        2. Agreed with rejection.
        3. Reviewed the rejection explanation proposed.
        4. Agreed to this rationale.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:26:16Z) The EAPOL frames use (for most parts) conventions defined in IEEE 802.1X and as such, big endian byte order is used in these KDEs. It would indeed be too late to change this now with multiple deployed implementations using the existing definition.
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion.
  2. CIDs assigned to Mark Hamilton
     1. CID 8137 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. We had discussed this before and agreed to reject, but Mark HAMILTON had been assigned to prepare a resolution.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-21 15:32:12Z) - ; While checking MPDU integrity before doing scoreboarding would perhaps help with one particular type of DoS attack, it has sufficient problems to make this overly restrictive for implementations. For example, it is likely that Block Ack scoreboarding and normal ACK generation are done at the same point in the stack, especially for HT-immediate Block Ack. Since this implies that there is only a SIFS time duration to complete the frame reception, it puts significant burden on an implementation to check the MPDU Header and FCS, perform Address 1 checks and duplicate detection, and (with the proposed change) the MPDU Decryption and Integrity check, in time to send the ACK. Further, the text in 4.5.4.4 (Data confidentiality), last paragraph, makes it clear that frames which fail integrity check are still acknowledged, to prevent wasting WM bandwidth on retries of frames that are being discarded. Thus, the proposed change would trade one problem for a different problem. The proposed change would likely make some existing implementations noncompliant with the standard.
        4. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
  3. Motions:
     1. **Motion #270 Motion (60GHz Spectrum addition)**

Move to incorporate the text changes indicated in 11-16/822r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0822-00-000m-extension-of-mmwave-operating-class.docx>> into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON Seconded: Carlos Cordiero
      2. Discussion:
         1. Why are we adding to the Global Class two new channels that were being added in only one region of the world.
         2. There is a similar to Channel 169 and we made changes to the Global and the European tables…offline discussion on the history was offered by Peter to help Mark R.
      3. **Result: 12-0-5 Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #271 Error in July 19th Motion #268 – MAC AC should have been CA - For MAC 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-CA” tab in 11-16/565r49 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-49-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>> (Corrects typo in motion 268)
       1. Moved Adrian STEPEHNS 2nd: Emily QI
       2. Discussion – none
       3. Results: Passed by Unanimous consent without objection
  1. **Review doc 11-16/855r1 Yusuke Tanaka**
     1. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0855-01-000m-resolution-for-cid8027.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0855-01-000m-resolution-for-cid8027.docx)
     2. CID 8027 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. What is the need for SNS7? Why not just SNS6 for both
           1. Two rows for same behavior is confusing
        4. Would we need to make this optional to account for possible existing devices?
        5. Discussion on how to determine the sequence number frame space, with a QOS-Data frame it is in the MAC header, and is unique and easy to find, but is that the same for Mess GCR and non-Mess GCR, can you see it from the MAC header?
           1. There is a unique address that can identify where it came from,
           2. Discussion on how to determine which space is being used.
        6. Discussion on if we have any legacy devices, this change may cause them trouble in determining the different spaces.
           1. If there are existing STAs, they would not work right as there will be holes in the sequence numbers.
        7. Concern with Scope and changes being suggested.
        8. This Comment was resolved with Motion #266 as out of Scope
        9. If other comments or updates to this proposal can be heard next week – proposed time would be Tuesday PM2 (July 26).
  2. Final call for any presentations
     1. Please let Dorothy know if you have any presentations to request agenda time for July Plenary week..
  3. Adjourned 12:00 ET
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