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Abstract

Minutes for 802.11md (REVmd) task group meetings held during the 2017 September 802 Wireless interim in Waikoloa, Hawaii (6 meeting slots).

R1: Corrections/update made

1. **Monday PM2:** TGmd meeting in Waikoloa - 4-6pm HI – 2017-09-11
	1. Called to order at 4pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. **<** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-01-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx>  **>**
* *Monday PM2*
1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
2. Approve agenda, previous minutes
3. Status, Review of Objectives
4. Editor Report 11-920r4
5. MAC CIDs - Mark HAMILTON
6. 11-17-1260 – Gabor BAJKO (20 mins)
7. 11-17-1172r1 – Dorothy STANLEY (5 mins)
8. 11-17-1191r3 – Emily QI
* *Tuesday PM1*
1. 11-17-1192, 1226 – Matthew FISCHER
2. 11-17-1479 - Sean COFFEY (20 Min)
3. Mike MONTEMURRO CIDs
4. 11-17-1445 – Guido HIERTZ
* *Wednesday PM1*
1. Telecon and July CID motions
2. Emily Qi CIDs
3. Mike MONTEMURRO CIDs
* *Wednesday PM2*
1. 11-17-940r2- Stephen MCCANN
2. Mark HAMILTON CIDs
3. Jon ROSDAHL CIDs
* *Thursday PM1*
1. Comment Resolution
2. 11-17-1100r1 -Mark EMMELMAN CIDs
3. Ganesh VENKATESAN CIDs
* *Thursday PM2*
1. Comment resolution
2. Motions
3. AOB
4. Plans for Sept - Nov
5. Adjourn
	* 1. After discussion and minor modifications shown above, the agenda was presented for approval
		2. Moved Mark HAMILTON, 2nd Emily QI
		3. Results: passed by unanimous consent without objection.
	1. **Approve Previous Minutes**
		1. **Motion W1: Approve the minutes of**

TGmd July 2017 meeting, Berlin in 11-17/0857r1: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0857-01-000m-minutes-revmd-july-2017-berlin.docx> > and

TGmd July 28th, August 4th, 11th, 18th, 25th teleconferences in 11-17/1193r5: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1193-05-000m-minutes-revmd-july-and-aug-telecons.docx> >

* + 1. **Moved: Jon ROSDAHL**
		2. **Seconded: Mike MONTEMURRO**
		3. **Results W1**: 12-0-0 Motion Passes
	1. **Status, Review of Objectives**
		1. **<** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-01-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx> **>**
		2. See slide 11-12 of doc 11-17/1199r1
		3. Note that 11ax is considering changing its expected final approval to Dec 2019
		4. This change would result in a 24-month window to produce 11md ahead of 11ax
		5. Review Motions that will be presented on Wednesday
			1. See slide 13-14 of 11-17/1199r1
	2. **Editor Report 11-17/0920r4** – Emily QI
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt> >
		2. Thanks, given to those helping with the editing/comment resolutions and review.
		3. 95 of 368 CIDs have been approved and incorporated into D0.3
		4. 40 CIDs are “Ready for Motion” to be approved this week.
		5. Reviewed status details of the CIDs
		6. Questions –
			1. With the Rolled in 11ah – were there ambiguities that need to be addressed by the TG? – yes, there will be a submission for November or a telecon.
			2. Thanks for the Word doc versions, but is there sources for the figures that need to be edited? – yes, but send requests on the particular figure you need.
		7. **Action Item #1:** Dorothy to poll TGah experts for volunteers to review the Editor Notes on the issues in the sections where 11ah was rolled in.
	3. **Review doc 11-17/1412r0 - MAC CIDs** –- Mark HAMILTON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1412-00-000m-mac-comments-for-discussion.docx>
		2. CID 15 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion on varieties of Optional indications.
			3. Suggestions that we use “optional” rather than “conditional”, but don’t put either in the figure.
			4. One suggestion is to delete “Conditional” and the other is to replace with Optional.
			5. **Straw poll**
				1. Option A: replace Conditional with Optional
				2. Option B: delete Conditional
				3. Results: A:4 and B:5
			6. Mark to check for any other changes that need addressing and will bring back
		3. CID 40 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. The proposed rejection was correct, but for the wrong reason, as it needs to be a sub-element.
			3. More work is needed
		4. CID 106 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Looking for Multiple BSSID expert to help on this.
			3. Discussion on the way the comment was written.
			4. 11v added the Multiple BSSID Rate selection feature.
		5. CID 116 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Figure 10-1 issue to resolve
			3. Believe is that the DCF is no longer a requirement of HCF
			4. Suggest to mark DCF as obsolete.
			5. Concern with deprecating DCF before extracting it from the figure.
			6. Concern for the reuse of the parts that are common to both, and we need to be careful to identify what is needed for the specific cases.
		6. CID 134 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Question on if there are any concerns?

Any issue with this (potential) change in behavior/requirement? (What if some existing APs don't ignore this? - although, it is not clear what they do, then)

* + - 1. Discussion on the outcome of the proposed change.
			2. How would someone test for this case?
		1. CID 174, 197, 198 MAC
			1. These CIDs are looking to deprecate features this time for deletion at ta future time.
			2. Question on channels identified in 11j
			3. Anything related to IBSS seems to be broken in many cases.
			4. **Action Item #2**: Dorothy to send notification to Reflector about functionality to be marked as obsolete in the standard
				1. **Post meeting note:** *Action item #2 Complete with email* <http://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11/msg02848.html>
			5. Note that the DFS owner can seem to adjust the quiet channel see 11.9.3
		2. CID 180 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Related to CID 179
			3. (re)association to a “different” AP actions to be clarified.
			4. From Discussion:

This needs further discussion. 1) Not all state is reset (for example, clearly the state for the AP (link) is not reset, any PMKSA is not reset, etc. So, we need to reference the list in 11.3.5.4, somehow, but probably don’t want to replace the list multiple times. This needs some restructuring, in a submission. 2) Are all the state variables reset if the response is not SUCCESS?

* + - 1. Need help in going through the list of what happens and then decide if we should put the list in a table or not.
				1. Call for volunteers – no volunteers identified at this time.
		1. CID 266 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Table 10-13 and Table 10-14
			3. Tables and figures are mandatory
			4. This started as a larger set of text that was boiled down to a table.
			5. Discussion on possible options
			6. ACTION ITEM #6 :Mark HAMILTON to send topic (HT protection mechanism) to reflector for more discussion
		2. CID 283 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the element id vs element order
			3. This sentence has been there a long time.
			4. Not sure cited sentence needs to be removed.
			5. More research to be done.
		3. CID 290 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion of what the Maximum number of spatial streams really means.
			3. When stream negotiation is done, the maximum number of streams is sometimes higher than can be supported, so we need to indicate that at least one mode of operation is going to work on this number of streams.
			4. The rejection reason should be that this is not an upper limit, but rather an absolute value that at least one mode supports.
			5. Will go back and work on reject reason.
		4. CID 326 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. From the Discussion:

According to Wikipedia :) the current use of RTT is correct; the term does not include processing delay. But, many definitions are based on an assumption of zero delay at the far end (radar echo, etc.), and generally are written so that far-end delay would be included.

To change the term to time of flight (TOF) results in the need to talk about a "two-way" TOF (which isn't as well-known a phrase, although it is used commonly for two-way ranging), and somewhat more cumbersome wording.

In REVmd Draft, RTT is explicitly defined in equation 11-5, to not include the far-end delay, so this is an issue with "common belief" definition of the term, and not a technical issue with the spec. Thus referring to TGm for discussion.

* + - 1. Discussion on the generic definition of RTT and TOF correlation.
		1. CID 337 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is a comment from Peter ECCLISINE and asking for feedback: Request to review 11-17/950r1. Feedback is needed.
		2. CID 362 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. CID 363 similar
			3. From Discussion:

A search for "REJECTED\_WITH\_SUGGESTED\_BSS\_TRANSITION" finds more places with the error in Reassoc's table, and also in text in 11.3.8. Might need global search for "frame with/has … Reason Code".

* + - 1. Look for volunteers to help
	1. **Review doc 11-17-1260** – Gabor BAJKO
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1260-00-000m-beacon-report-fragmentation.docx>
		2. Abstract:

During 11n amendment development, it was noticed that if the Beacon Report has to include the entire beacon content, then it may happen that the length of the Beacon Report would be larger than the (255-3) octet maximum length of the Measurement Report field of a Beacon Report (in case when the Reported Frame Body subelement is larger than 227 octets), thus some HT, VHT, or IEs defined in subsequent amendments, perhaps critical, could be missed. To solve the problem, 11n amendment adopted at that time a rule to truncate some of the larger and not critical IEs (3 of them, TIM, IBSS DFS and RSNE) to 4 octets, to make sure that all other (defined by that time) IEs would fit into one Measurement Report (see section 9.4.2.22.7 of 802.11-2016).

The argument that by truncating the above-mentioned IEs solves the problem is by now outdated, as many more IEs have been defined by a multitude of amendments since then.

To overcome the size limitation of a Beacon Report, this proposal proposes to remove the truncation of the IEs and to define how the reporting STAs can fragment the Reported Frame Body subelement of a Beacon Report, and send the fragments in multiple Beacon Report frames.

* + 1. Review doc 11-17/1260 proposed changes
		2. Provides for fragmenting large elements in the Beacon Report.
		3. Could GAS frames be used? – the frame body was used in the GAS frame.
		4. Discussion that the GAS frame fragmentation is similar to what is proposed here, but this is done this way to address backward compatibility.
		5. How does this compare with the Fragment ID? – that is for new elements not for the existing elements. Discussion that this may need more checking that there is something that can be addressed with what is there now.
		6. It was purported that there did not seem to be an existing way without the change.
		7. The deleted text may cause some issues with backward compatibility, but the contention is that it will not be an issue, but if the deleted text will cause differences with the truncation STAs are currently doing.
		8. Another option would be to give option to both.
		9. Discussion on the ramification of the fragmentation and the issue of truncated elements. The impact on frame size is also to be considered.
		10. Could the Beacon Request give the information to allow for the fragmented response?
		11. Not complete consensus on the proposal.
		12. More data would need to be included to help understand the ramifications.
	1. **Review doc 11-17-1172r1** – Dorothy STANLEY (5 mins)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1172-01-000m-missed-tgmc-jtc1-sc6-comment.docx>
		2. Review document and proposed change
		3. Will bring for motion on Wednesday.
	2. **Review doc 11-17-1191r3** – Emily QI
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1191-03-000m-cc25-proposed-resolutions-for-editorial-comments.doc>
		2. CID 210 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. More than 3 instances for consideration.
			3. 6 locations need to be addressed.
			4. Simplifies and clarifies the sentences
			5. Concern that there is not a definition of a successful PSDU, there is a definition of successful MPDU and FRAME, but not PSDU.
			6. The changes may cause loss of clarity and meaning.
			7. It would be better to correct the middle instance cited to include the “PSDU” that is declared as missing.
	3. Next meeting is Tuesday PM1 in Queens 6
	4. Recess at 6:00PM
1. **Tuesday PM1:** TGmd meeting in Waikoloa – 1:30-3:30pm HI - 2017-09-12
	1. Called to order at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. **<** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-02-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx> **>**

Tuesday PM1

11-17-1192, 1226 – Matthew FISCHER

11-17-1479 - Sean Coffey

Mike MONTEMURRO CIDs

11-17-1445 – Guido HIERTZ

* + 1. CID 133 was marked ready for motion and will be motioned on Wednesday, request to pull from the motion tomorrow and would like to discuss later in the week. – Thursday PM
		2. No objection to the presented Agenda –
	1. **Review doc 11-17/1226r0** – Matthew FISCHER
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1226-00-000m-cr-txbf-fb-nr-cid-161-162.docx>
		2. CID 161 and 162 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution for 161 and 162: Accept
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-17/1192r3** – Matthew FISCHER
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1192-03-000m-cr-esp.docx>
		2. CID 259, 56, 55, 54, 31, 215 (all MAC); and 213, 216, 217 (all PHY), and 212 (GEN):
			1. All in 11-17/1192r3
			2. Review Comments
			3. Graham has a pending submission, so hold off on CID 55 for now.
			4. The Proposed Resolution will be along the line of incorporate the changes in 11-17/1192rx.
			5. CID 31 has noted a possible presentation from commenter
			6. CID 30 – Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2017-09-13 00:06:47Z):– nothing is missing. MPDUs are aggregated into AMPDUs, and MPDUs have a MAC header with a type and subtype and TID. A-MSDUs are built from MSDUs which do not have a MAC header and therefore do not have type or subtype but by definition will eventually be placed into an MPDU of some sort with a type of DATA and any of various subtypes.
			7. CID 214 - Proposed Resolution: Reject – there is a definition above the equation for A\_MSDU\_B which is based on a minimum function to determine the maximum mutual support for AMSDU.
			8. Discussion:
				1. The inbound vs outbound direction was discussed.
				2. Differentiation of the airtime in the specified direction was discussed.
				3. The AP sets the EDCA parameters for those attached STAs.
				4. Question on if the element is extensible. – check Table 9-77 in the draft.

Yes may be an error in the table for Element ID Extension 11.

* + - * 1. Discussion on the changes and the effect on legacy STA or rather the lack of implementation currently.
			1. Where to go from here?
				1. Let’s review the proposed edits
				2. Ask for those interested to help polish the resolutions.
				3. Each CID needs a description of the changes that are clear.
				4. All of the resolutions indicate that changes are marked, but not all are marked.
				5. Request to keep CIDs separate if possible in the future.
				6. Thanks, given to the author for the work done.
			2. Concern on the implementations based on the 802.11-2016 standard.
	1. Review Doc 11-17/1479 – Sean Coffey
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1479-00-000m-cca-sensitivity.pptx>
		2. Abstract:

All OFDM-based PHYs in 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz have the same basic requirement for CCA sensitivity, though with significantly different surrounding definitions. There are some problems:

1. The definitions are still ambiguous, and either underspecify receiver behaviour or may be impossible to meet
2. As written, the current requirements are far too loose
	* 1. CID 77 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission on the various definitions
			3. Discussion on the need or ability to make the change.
			4. Summary of what is in the standard and the inconsistencies should be addressed. There are other groups that take our standard to make tests in test labs and these ambiguities cause trouble.
			5. Discussion on the condition of the standard and if the sensitivity levels are defined sufficiently.
			6. Comparison on the 11ax and CCA where it seems to be going the other way.
			7. Discussion on the direction – regardless on the direction, we should at least remove the ambiguities and then determine the right levels to have in the standard.
		2. Unlikely to have agreement on proposed text in November, and may not be available by January. We will mark CID 77 as Submission required, and then if we find CIDs that do not have submissions, will be rejected for lack of final submission.
	1. Review doc 11-17/1445 Guido HEIRTZ
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1445-00-000m-up-mapping.pptx>
		2. Addressed UP Mapping – no CID related to this submission.
		3. Review current UP mapping in 802.11-2016
		4. “Precedence” from RFC 791 is deprecated
		5. Only three MSBs of DSCP are currently being used.
		6. 802.1D vs 802.1Q mapping changes noted.
		7. Proposed modifications explained
		8. Review the Conclusions
		9. Discussion:
			1. Disagreement on the lack of marking of priority
			2. No Concrete mapping between DSCP and UP
			3. Uncertain on which mapping should be used.
			4. Lack of Standards on how to mark the types.
			5. A Standard should be consistent to allow implementations to be consistent.
			6. How to articulate the requirements such that we can align in a meaningful manner. 802.1 should be a good place to start aligning.
			7. Contention is that No Priority in DSCP in the upper bits.
			8. Discussion of changes on slide 12
			9. The proposed ordering to remove the background and add voice seems like a reasonable thing to do.
			10. Complications in making changes are not just for the MAC level, we need to ensure the tag being used through the whole system.
			11. Annex R in 11ak should be reviewed in light of this proposal.
			12. If a change is to be made, then we need to determine the best place to make the change and how to communicate these changes
			13. Priority Code points from 802.1 may be another way to determine the values to use.
			14. 802.1AC is doing some of this mapping, and we should be in sync with those changes and with the IETF and Wi-Fi alliance.
			15. We should look for consistency for future direction.
			16. Unsure how to be compliant with the current mapping and how it is used in the industry, and we should make change sooner than later.
		10. More work to be done.
		11. 11ak mapping question.
			1. Can the annex be used more broadly, - yes, but it may be written with the GLK links only.
	2. Recess 3:29pm
3. **Wednesday PM1:** TGmd meeting in Waikoloa - 1:30-3:30pm HI – 2017-09-13
	1. Called to order at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. **<** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-03-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx> **>**

Wednesday PM1

1. Telecon and July CID Motions
2. Emily Qi CIDs
3. Mike MONTEMURRO CIDs
4. 11-17-1400 – Dan Harkins Security CID
	* 1. No objection to agenda
	1. **Motions**:
		1. **Motion #7** – Telecon and Berlin CIDs
			1. Approve the comment resolutions on the

“PHY Motion B” tab in11-17/093r5: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0930-05-000m-revmd-cc25-phy-plus-comments.xls> > except for CID 133 and the

“Ready for Motion” tab in 11-17/0956r5: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0956-05-000m-revmd-wg-cc25-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls> >

“Motion MAC-B and “Motion MAC-C” tabs in 11-17/0927r6: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-06-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls> >

“Motion Editor2-B” tab in 11-17/0929r3: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0929-03-000m-revmd-editor2-comments.xlsx> >

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
			2. Second: Mark HAMILTON
			3. **Results Motion #7: 12-0-0 – Motion Passes**
		1. Motion #8 – **Teleconference non-CID documents:**

Beacon report - 2017-07-28 teleconference

* + - 1. **Incorporate the text changes in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0971-03-000m-enhancement-to-beacon-report.docx>
			2. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
			3. Second:  Emily QI
			4. **Result Motion #8:** **Approved by Unanimous Consent**
		1. **Motion on Teleconference non-CID documents:**

SAE timeout - 2017-07-28 teleconference

* + - 1. Deferred until Thurs PM2
		1. **Motion #9** –**Teleconference non-CID documents:**

Missed ISO comment - 2017-08-25 teleconference

* + - 1. **Incorporate the text changes in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1172-01-000m-missed-tgmc-jtc1-sc6-comment.docx>
			2. Moved: Emily QI
			3. Second: Stephen MCCANN
			4. **Result Motion #9:** **Approved by Unanimous Consent**
	1. **Review Doc11-17/1191r4 -** Editor CIDs - Emily QI
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1191-04-000m-cc25-proposed-resolutions-for-editorial-comments.doc>
		2. CID 210 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in document 11-17/1191r4 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1191-04-000m-cc25-proposed-resolutions-for-editorial-comments.doc> > which clarifies the middle instance identified by the commenter. Editor to confirm article agreement.
			4. Need to have editor check the article agreement, but mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 257 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. This was rejected in REVmc
			3. Proposed resolution: Reject; There is no confusion. It helps the reader who hasn’t read 9.2.2. The text is correct as written.
			4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 260 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. This was rejected in REVmc
			3. The absolute nature of the request was to make use of the Abbreviations in all cases, makes the titles to be changed also.
			4. There may be a use of a title without the acronym, but the commenter should identify the changes desired, as the global search and replace is not a good option.
			5. The current use is that in some places we have expanded the abbreviations in the first use of a section/clause, but no always.
			6. The broad global changes in the past have caused issues, so cited locations should be identified before we make a change.
			7. We should find a way to consistently call out the items.
			8. Roughly 5 times more locations (for example “FTE” is in 105 locations but the full expansion is 16 and about 10 are attached to the expanded name.)
			9. Proposed Resolution: Rejected, the proposed resolution does not provide changes to the draft that can be immediately adapted to satisfy the comment. Applying the proposed will cause the loss of the clause titles.
			10. **Straw Poll**:
				1. Support proposed Resolution:
				2. Oppose proposed Resolution.
				3. Results: 6 Support – 2 Oppose
			11. After discussion and Straw Poll – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 270 Editor
			1. Review Comment
			2. The cited table is not correct – believe the correct table is 9-328 not 9-318.
			3. The cited text 1282.39
			4. The proposal is to move the element to the subelement table. This would not be correct.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; Table 9-328 is for allowed subelements for the Location Parameters Element field. The cited text is for the Measurement Report Element field, - different context.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 275 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar to CID 224 and 225.
			3. Assign CID 275 to Dan HARKINS and move to PHY comment group.
		7. CID 277 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. Many ResultCode have underscores and some do not.
			3. Enumeration names have underscore in many cases, but it seems that some Task Groups may have their own style and cause a maintenance headache.
			4. Proposed Resolution: There is no rule on whether ResultCode should include underscores or not. Underscores are used for ResultCode everywhere. No need to remove them. The current usage creates no ambigity or confusion.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 278 Editor
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on what the proper grammar should be applied.
			3. When plural or singular should be used.
			4. After discussion, change where needed to plural.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; change to use “plural”.
			6. After discussion - Mark ready for Motion
		9. CID 301 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: At 240.14, change

“An FST session is the state resulting from the operation of the FST session setup protocol.”

To

“An FST session is the association resulting from the operation of the FST session setup protocol.”

* + - 1. After more discussion on if the “association” should be “agreement”, the discussion included an option to not change from “state”.
			2. Move to MAC comment group as this is not an editorial issue.
	1. **PHY CIDs** – Mike MONTEMURRO
		1. CID 75 PHY
			1. Review the comment
			2. The proposal is just to change the “shall” to “should”
			3. The proposed change is to just remove the paragraph.
			4. We would need a rational to understand why deleting would be a good option.
			5. More work to be done.
		2. CID 26 PHY
			1. Review comment
			2. There is more wordsmithing to be done.
			3. MEAN value definition would be the main focus
			4. Need to change “mu” to “Mu sub I”
			5. We may just delete “the mean value mu, i” may be enough.
			6. This would be an accept.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			8. Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
		3. CID 358 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
		4. CID 287 PHY
			1. Review comment
			2. p2777.39 was the location of the “L-LENGTH”
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revise, on P2777.39 change “L-LENGTH” to L\_LENGTH”
			4. Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
	2. Review doc 11-17/1400r1 – Dan HARKINS
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1400-01-000m-some-security-comments.docx> >
		2. CID 92 PHY
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
		3. CID 139 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: incorporate the changes for CID 139 in 11-17/1400r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1400-01-000m-some-security-comments.docx> > which makes the changes described in an unambiguous way for the editor.
			3. No objection Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
		4. CID 224 PHY
			1. Review comment
			2. Call the TPKSA a “nascent TPKSA”.
			3. Discussion on the state of the TDLS and TPKSA.
			4. The discussion on the addition of “nascent” may cause more comments.
			5. Discussion on the proposed wording changes starting with what was in the comment.
			6. Proposed Resolution: incorporate the changes to 11-17/1400r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1400-02-000m-some-security-comments.docx> > for CID 224 which resolves the comment in the direction of the commenter with addition clarification.
			7. No objection Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
		5. CID 225 PHY and 275 Editor
			1. Review Comments
			2. Initial proposal was like CID 224 which adds a “nascent”
			3. Discussion on the changes to be made in doc 11-17/1400r2.
			4. Proposed Resolution: incorporate the changes to 11-17/1400r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1400-02-000m-some-security-comments.docx> > for CID 225 and 275 which resolves the comment in the direction of the commenter with addition clarification.
			5. No objection Mark ready for Motion
			6. Move 275 to PHY and update in database.
		6. CID 245 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if the example is needed in both places or not.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The procedure given in 12.7.1.5 is an example of one way to generate a GTK using a random GMK and a Gnonce contribution. It is not necessary to replicate this example in 12.7.1.5. Appendix J.5 also suggest how random values can be arrived at.
			4. No objection Mark ready for Motion – “PHY motion – C” comment group.
	3. Out of time
	4. Next meeting in Kona 1 for Wednesday PM2
	5. Recess at 3:30PM
1. **Wednesday PM2 :** TGmd meeting in Waikoloa - 4-6pm HI – 2017-09-13
	1. Called to order at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. Review Patent Policy and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-03-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx> >

Wednesday PM2

 11-17/0940r2 - Stephen MCCANN

11-17/1447r0, 11-17/1448r0 and 11-17/1450r0 - Kazuyuki SAKODA

Mark HAMILTON CIDs

Jon ROSDAHL CIDs

* + 1. No objection to the agenda
	1. **Review doc 11-17/0940r2** Stephen MCCAAN
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0940-02-000m-3gpp-ts-reference-per-liaison-11-17-0854-00.doc> >
		2. Review document
		3. Proposed change in 9.4.5.5 – Emergency Call Number ANQP-element.
		4. Concern with the use of “preferred” and change to “recommended”
		5. A revision will be created (11-17/0940r3).
		6. A motion on Thursday to approve will be made.
	2. **Review doc 11-17/1447r0** - Kazuyuki SAKODA
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1447-00-000m-mesh-mcca-mob-correction.docx> >
		2. CID 110 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the effect of the changes and if there would be any interoperability or backward compatible issues.
			4. Question on if the dot11MCCATrackStatesActive should be a control variable and should be read-write.
			5. Discussion on if an external management entity can write to the MIB variable.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-14 02:27:57Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-17/1447r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1447-00-000m-mesh-mcca-mob-correction.docx> >. This makes changes consistent with the comment.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review Doc 11-17/1448r0** - Kazuyuki SAKODA
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1448-00-000m-mesh-high-phy-rate-airtime-link-metric.docx> >
		2. CID 109 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes
			3. Question on if this is a new mechanism, but the response was that this was just a new unit metric instead of a new mechanism.
			4. Discussion on the merits of the proposed metric.
			5. The change in 4.3.20.5.10 needs to be a normative verb. Changes were discussed and a new r1 was created.
			6. How different do the different Link Metrics work?
			7. Discussion on the path selection and the link metric usage.
			8. Add a “when it starts a new MBSS” to the end of the 4.3.20.5.10 clause.
			9. Proposed resolution: incorporate the changes in 11-17/1448r1 [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1448-00-000m-mesh-high-phy-rate-airtime-link-metric.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1448-00-000m-mesh-high-phy-rate-airtime-link-metric.docx%20) > comment is resolved in the direction of the comment requested.
			10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. Review doc 11-17/1450r0 Kazuyuki SAKODA
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1450-00-000m-suggested-resolutions-to-cid219-and-cid357.docx> >
		2. CID 219 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed change
			3. Minor change – “concatenated by the” change added to R1
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-14 03:01:43Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-17/1450r1 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1450-01-000m-mesh-high-phy-rate-airtime-link-metric.docx> > for CID 219. The comment is resolved in the direction of the comment requested.
			5. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 357 will be reviewed tomorrow (or later).
	5. Review Doc 11-17/1191r5 Emily QI
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1191-05-000m-cc25-proposed-resolutions-for-editorial-comments.doc> >
		2. CID 327 Editor
			1. Review Comment
			2. From Discussion:

When awake windows appear in the TDLS section, they are awake window used for TDLS.

When awake windows appear in the DMG section, they are awake window used for DMG.

Please note 194 instances of awake windows. Some of them are Awake Window element.

There is also an Awake Window for IBSS.

* + - 1. There is an Awake Window Element that is used also.
			2. Proposed resolution: Reject.Proposed changes are nonspecific and do not handle the IBSS Awake Window case.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 119 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. From discussion: Not Specified", "implementation dependent" and "outside of the scope" are different. Using these different ways to say it is appropriate .
			3. Proposed resolution: Rejected The proposed resolution does not provide changes to the draft that can be immediately adapted to satisfy the comment.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 28 Editor
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on how to change the sentence, or change handle to handles or change to “must handle” or some other option.
			3. Grammatically, we did not find consensus on the usage.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Reject; IEEE publication editor has approved this text multiple times. No change is needed.
			5. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 100 Editor
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Do not see any benefit to change base-10 integers in Table 9-1. Table 9-1 with this format has been there since IEEE 802.11-2007 (at least), these is no need to change a different format.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 147 Editor
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review options for comment resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Subelement is “local” parameter (subelement). The Subelement usage is in the scope of a particular field or element.
			4. Mark ready for Motion
		5. All the Editor comments in the document have now been reviewed.
	1. MAC CIDs – Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 83 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept (Editor, note that this is just one sentence.)
			3. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 155 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. As the commenter points out, there are numerous places where a "complete MSDU" MPDU is a fragment. For example, consider dot11TransmittedFragmentCount and associated statistics, the description of Fragment Number field in 9.2.4.4.3, and the setting of the Duration field in 9.2.5.2(a)(5)(i). The Standard would need to be cleaned of all such references that would be in error, before this NOTE can be added.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 194 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Found location at page 1492 Line 22-24.
			3. Discussion on what the sentence means, and if it is an “exchange” or just a frame set.
			4. The discussion on if the exchange vs just a duplicate frame
			5. Assign to Menzo WENTINK
		4. CID 149 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context page 1506
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 178 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
	2. Resume tomorrow PM1 and PM2
	3. Recess 6:00PM
1. **Thursday PM1:** TGmd meeting in Waikoloa – 1:30-3:30pm HI - 2017-09-14
	1. Called to order at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. Review Patent Policy and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. Review Agenda
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-04-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx> >
* Thursday PM1
1. 11-17-1260 - Gabor BAJKO
2. Ganesh VENKATESAN CIDs
3. Mark HAMILTON CIDs
	* 1. No objection to agenda
	1. **Review doc 11-17-1260** - Gabor BAJKO
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1260-02-000m-beacon-report-fragmentation.docx> >
		2. Review document
		3. Question on beacon reports and if they are fragmented or not.
		4. Discussion on how to fragment the Beacon Report.
		5. Discussion on changing “should” to “does” and “Shall” to “is” or to “may”
		6. Discussion on how to identify which fragments go with which report and how to reassemble on the receiving side.
		7. More work is needed on this to resolve the discussion items.
		8. Report ID field in the subelement field will need to be the field to identify the fragments from a given report.
		9. R3 was created during discussion, Dorothy will post and Gabor will revise further and bring back.
	2. **Review doc 11-17/1078r1** - Ganesh VENKATESAN
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1078-01-000m-resolutions-to-cids-148-and-339.doc> >
		2. CID 339 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the new equation description.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised modify equation 11-6 to “Clock\_offset = [(t2\_n – t1`\_n) – (t4`\_n – t3\_n)]/2”
			4. Leave this for more discussion on a teleconference.
	3. **MAC CIDs** - Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 330 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context – DCF is described in 10.3 to allow all description in one place for the DCF behaviour.
			3. Proposed Resolution: : REJECTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:08:08Z): The rules for DMG CBAP are in 10.36.5, which explicitly states that the basics of the channel access are specified in 10.3. So, the 10.3 rules need to be qualified for the DMG situation, for those rules that are in 10.3 (like backoff window contention). 10.36.5 does have some additional rules for DMG, but these rules are not particularly related to the basic rules in 10.3, and so are kept in a separate subclause.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 142 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Fix typo in proposed change.
			3. Review Context on page 1703 line 44. There is a note that is a couple pages later (1705.33) describes “suitable” definition is out of scope.
			4. There are several instances of “Suitable”, and so changing to remove it will change the meaning that originally was deemed out of scope.
			5. Page 1705 – “Note applies to 11.1.4.3.2” and we need to determine if it applies to only FILS or is it a more generic application.
			6. We are not planning on changing all the instances of “suitable” in the document.
			7. Need more review
		3. CID 39 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Dynamic information element and non-dynamic element only occurs once in the draft.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:26:34Z): This list is also used in 9.4.2.182. It seems to be the only definition of “dynamic information element”. Yes, Maintenance is an issue, but we need the list to have a normative definition of AP-CSN behaviour.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 42 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:30:46Z):Replace the paragraph with:

"A FILS non-AP STA may send, to an AP, an individually addressed Probe Request frame that includes an AP-CSN element (as defined in 9.4.2.182 (AP Configuration Sequence Number (AP-CSN) element(11ai))), if the STA has the BSS Configuration Parameter Set associated with the AP-CSN of the AP. When sending such a Probe Request frame, the FILS non-AP STA shall set the Address 3 field in the Probe Request frame to the BSSID of the AP."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 41 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:33:00Z): Change "zero or more" to "an implementation-dependent number of zero of more".

Note to commenter: The use of "zero or more" provides at least some indication of the intended requirements, whereas "any" is a loss of some specificity. Better yet, would be to be clear that this number is an implementation choice.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 132 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context on page 1878 line 26.
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:37:11Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 160 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Context – page 1925 line 52
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:40:12Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 181 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 181 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:43:50Z): To better align with other bullets and 11.3.5.1, change the sentence to:

"If an Association Response frame is received with a status code of SUCCESS at an MM-SME coordinated STA and the value of the Single AID field within the MMS element is equal to 1, then

— For each of its MAC entities advertised within the MMS element and for which dot11RSNAActivated is true, the state is set to State 3. Progress from State 3 to State 4 occurs independently in each such MAC entity.

— For each of its MAC entities advertised within the MMS element and for which dot11RSNAActivated is false, the state is set to State 4.

— For each of its MAC entities advertised within the MMS element the state for any other AP or PCP which is State 3 or State 4 prior to the association request shall be set to State 2."

Make the same change in 11.3.5.4(e).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 180 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 179 – review minutes from Monday.
			3. Need more time to prepare
		2. CID 185 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Page 712 L12 – review context.
			3. Add “with gaps allowed”
			4. The entire line 12 will be deleted.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:50:00Z): Merge the "gaps" comment with the ordering sentence in prior paragraph:

"… and appear in the specified, relative order, +with gaps allowed+." Then, delete the cited paragraph.

* + - 1. The proposed Resolution is a bit ambiguous. 2nd try on resolution.
			2. Updated Proposed Resolution: ID 185 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:50:00Z): At P733L5, Change:

"All fields and elements are mandatory unless stated otherwise and appear in the specified, relative order."

To:

"All fields and elements are mandatory unless stated otherwise and appear in the specified, relative order, with gaps allowed."

Delete the cited paragraph.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 363 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Context: P746 Line 36 reviewed.
			3. 2 additional places not include in the comment were added to resolution.
			4. The “Reason Code” should be lower case in P746L36 as it is not a field.
			5. At page 741L36 make same change
			6. At page 1780.21 – needs to change to “Status” code.
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 00:54:42Z): At 746L14, replace "Reason Code" with "Status Code field". Also make the same change at P741.36. At P1780.21, replace "Reason Code" with "Status Code".
			8. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 281 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Check location where INVALID\_RSNE was used.
			3. Change definition to include TDLS status code error.
			4. Concern of usage by legacy STAs.
			5. P2195 L 20 – use of Error code similar
			6. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 01:02:25Z)
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 230 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 01:11:20Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 23 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context 1389L36
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 01:14:26Z): Align the left end of the arrow, and extend the arrow to the end of the "A-MPDU subframe n" field.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. Review MAC CIDs not assigned
			1. CID 174, 197, 198 which are to mark something obsolete.
			2. CID 301 – From Editor group – FST Session – Assign to Mark HAMILTON
			3. Mark the other 3 as Assigned to Mark HAMILTON
	1. **Review CIDs unassigned**
		1. Skip the “discuss ones” in GEN
		2. CID 92 (PHY) – moved to PHY – Assign to Mike MONTEMURRO
		3. CID 98 (GEN)– Move to Security – PHY – Mike to assign later.
		4. CID 99 (PHY) – Move to PHY - Mike to assign to Mike
		5. CID 139 (PHY) – done
		6. CID 179 (MAC)– Assign to Mark RISON
		7. CID 177 (PHY) – Assign to Sigurd
		8. CID 184 (GEN) – Assign to Mark RISON
		9. CID 199 (PHY) – Assign to Mark RISON
		10. CID 212 (GEN)– Move to MAC - Assign to Matthew FISCHER – (see document)
		11. CID 222 (GEN)– Assign to Menzo
		12. CID 223 (GEN)– Assign to Menzo
		13. CID 247 (GEN)- Assign to Mark RISON
		14. CID 250 (GEN) – Assign to Menzo
		15. CID 273 (PHY) – Assign to Mark RISON
	2. Recess at 3:31PM
1. **Thursday PM2 :** TGmd meeting in Waikoloa - 4-6pm HI – 2017-09-14
	1. Called to order at 4:01pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. Review Patent Policy and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. Review Agenda
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1199-04-000m-september-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx> >
* Thursday PM2
1. Motions
2. Mark EMMELMAN CIDs 11-17-1100r1
3. Mike MONTEMURRO CID 75, 133
4. AOB
5. Plans for Sept - Nov
6. Adjourn
	* 1. When we get to Gabor’s document, we will discuss R4 prior to the motion.
		2. No objection to modified agenda as noted above
	1. **Motions**
		1. **Motion #10**: Waikoloa CIDs
			1. **Motion:** Approve the comment resolutions on the

“Motion-C” tab in 11-17/956r6

 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0956-06-000m-revmd-wg-cc25-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>

“Motion GEN-Aug” tab in 11-17/928r2

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0928-02-000m-revmd-cc25-gen-comments.xlsx>

“PHY Motion C” tab in 11-17/930r6

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0930-06-000m-revmd-cc25-phy-plus-comments.xls>

“Motion MAC-D” and “Motion MAC-E” tab in 11-17/927r8 [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-08-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-07-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls)

* + - 1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
			2. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
			3. Discussion: none
			4. **Result Motion #10**: 10-0-0 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #11** – **non CID document:** 3GPP reference change
			1. **Motion:** Incorporate the text changes in 11-17/0940r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0940-03-000m-3gpp-ts-reference-per-liaison-11-17-0854-00.doc>
			2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
			3. Seconded: Peter YEE
			4. **Result Motion #11**: no objection Motion passes by Unanimous Consent.
		2. **Motion #12** - **non- CID document**: Beacon report fragmentation
			1. A review of the changes made in R4 that included changes during the presentation earlier today.
			2. Question on the Fragment ID and when it was present. Concern that the Fragment ID should be mandatory to be in each frame, and we may even want to have that field be first.
			3. Discussion on where the Reported Frame Body Fragment ID Subelement appears and if it is described as mandatory or not.
			4. Make another change to the paragraph to include text for ensuring that the subelement is required in each fragment and first.
			5. Discussion on if the fragment id counted down then you don’t need the “More Frame Body Fragments” – concern on the requirement to form the full frame ahead of time, to know the final fragment id number.
			6. Dorothy made the changes on the screen and posted an 11-17/1260r5.
			7. **Motion:** Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1260-05-000m-beacon-report-fragmentation.docx>
			8. Moved: Ganesh VENKATESAN
			9. Seconded: Edward AU
			10. Discussion:
				1. One speaker against the motion as concern expressed for being too soon.
			11. **Result Motion #12**: 10-1-2 Motion Passes
		3. **Motion #13** - **Teleconference non-CID documents**:

SAE timeout – 2017-07-28 telecon

* + - 1. **Motion:** Incorporate the text changes in 11-17/q030r1 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1030-01-000m-sae-retry-timeout-clarification.docx> >
			2. Moved: Edward AU
			3. Seconded: Peter YEE
			4. Discussion: none
			5. **Result Motion #13**: 8-0-2 Motion Passes
	1. **Review Doc 11-17/1089r6** – Michael MONTEMURRO – presented by Dorothy STANLEY
		1. < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1089-06-000m-revmd-cc25-comment-resolutions.doc>>
		2. CID 75 PHY
			1. Review the comment
			2. Review the need to change the “Shall be set” to 0.
			3. The softer text would seem to allow an improper setting.
			4. The Should followed by a shall is not usual, but if it is not a strong should to set to 1, but if you are not going to set to 1 then you may want to ensure it is 0.
			5. We will have more discussion on this CID.
			6. We may want to keep the simplification, but keep the last sentence with a “shall”.
			7. **Action Item #3**: Mark HAMLITON to discuss with Sigurd.
		3. CID 133 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review feedback from Youhan KIM
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Revised. Relative to D0.1,

At 1005.57 change “does not allow use of DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “does not allow transmission of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

At 1005.58 change “does allow use of DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “allows transmission of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

At 1005.61 change “does not use DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “does not support transmission or reception of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

At 1005.62 change “STA uses DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “STA supports transmission and reception of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark ready for Motion
	1. **Review Document 11-17/1100r1** Mark EMMELMANN – presented by Dorothy STANLEY
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1100-01-000m-fils-comment-resolutions.docx>
		2. Start with CID 36 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. This was discussed for a bit on a telecon.
			3. Concern with the changing of the beacon period.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Reject. The suggested rewording would impact the periodicity of the beacon, which is not intended. For a detailed discussion of the comment, please refer to 11-17/1100r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1100-01-000m-fils-comment-resolutions.docx> >
			5. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 37 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject. The suggested rewording would impact the periodicity of the beacon, which is not intended. For a detailed discussion of the comment, please refer to 11-17/1100r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1100-01-000m-fils-comment-resolutions.docx> >
			3. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
		4. CID 43 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 02:58:38Z)
			3. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
		5. CID 46 & 87 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. The proposed resolution had a typo – fixed below.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED.

AT P2053 L22-25:

Replace:

"If before it transmits a (Re)Association Response frame, the AP does not receive any HLP packets that have the non-AP STA's MAC address or a group address as the destination address, from the upstream network or BSS."

With:

"If before it transmits a (Re)Association Response frame, the AP does not receive any HLP packets from the upstream network or BSS that have the non-AP STA's MAC address or a group address as the destination address, the AP shall not transmit any FILS HLP Container elements in the (Re)Association Response frame.”

AT P2053 L17-19

Replace:

“If before it transmits a (Re)Association Response frame, the AP receives one or more HLP packets that have the non-AP STA’s MAC address or a group address as the destination address, from the upstream network or BSS.”

With:

“If before it transmits a (Re)Association Response frame, the AP receives one or more HLP packets from the upstream network or BSS that have the non-AP STA’s MAC address or a group address as the destination address, the AP transmits each HLP packet in a different FILS HLP Container element in the (Re)Association Response frame.”

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 50 and 51 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review IP address assignment description
			3. The proposed deletion may actually be wrong, and just remove the parenthesis.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At 2054.53 delete the Parenthesis
			5. There is a bit more here that needs researched. The original TGai draft has different text that may make more sense. Need to check.
			6. Assign to Gabor – Both CID 50 and 51
		2. CID 113 MAC
			1. Review comment
			2. Essentially this fixes a reference number.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-09-15 03:24:49Z): replace the reference to “11.6.1 (Introduction)” with a reference to “1.5 (Terminology for mathematical, logical, and bit operations)”
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 338 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. FILSSC type is being checked, but then what?
			3. Proposed change Text left it unresolved. Original Text said to check and update FILSC.
			4. We may just delete the last sentence all together, but need to clarify this on a telecon later.
			5. **Action Item #4:** Mark HAMILTON to contact Marc EMMELMANN.
		4. CID 44 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2017-09-15 03:36:48Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Plans for Sept – Nov
		1. **Conference calls**
			1. Fridays Sept 29, Oct 6, 13 Nov 3 10am Eastern 2 hours
		2. **Potential October AdHoc?**
			1. Not for October
			2. AdHoc Dec 7-8 in Piscataway NJ
			3. **Action Item #5**: Jon to Talk with Kathrine BENNETT about possible rooms at the IEEE headquarters for the REVmd AdHoc Dec 7-8, 2017.
			4. **Motion W2: December 7-8 AdHoc**
				1. **Motion:** Authorize a TGmd AdHoc December 7-8, 2017 in Piscataway NJ for the purposes of comment resolution.
				2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
				3. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
				4. Discussion:

Straw Poll: how many would attend? 6 said yes

Will a bridge available? Yes

The meeting will be organized in 2 hour blocks and scheduled by CID.

* + - * 1. **Result Motion W2: 9-0-2 Motion Passes**
	1. **Adjourned 5:50pm**
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