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Abstract

This file will contain the minutes for the TGmd 4 (2-hour) teleconferences held between the September 2017 802 Wireless Interim Session and the November 2017 802 Plenary Session:
Friday September 29, October 6, 13 and November 3 at 10am Eastern (2 hrs) for comment collection comment resolution and presentations.

R0: September 29th Telecon

R1: October 6th Telecon

R2: October 13th Telecon

R3: November 3rd Telecon

Color Code

CIDs Ready for Motion

CIDs needing more work

CIDs previously marked ready and have been updated.

Teleconferences are subject to applicable policies and procedures:

•       IEEE Code of Ethics

–       <http://www.ieee.org/about/corporate/governance/p7-8.html>

•       IEEE Standards Association (IEEE-SA) Affiliation FAQ

–   <http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliation.html>

•       Antitrust and Competition Policy

 –       <http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf>

•       IEEE-SA Patent Policy

–       <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/bylaws/sect6-7.html>

–       [https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public//mytools/mob/loa.pdf](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt)

–       <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf>

–       <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt>

•       IEEE 802 Working Group Policies &Procedures (29 Jul 2016)

–       <http://www.ieee802.org/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_WG_PandP_v19.pdf>

•       IEEE 802 LMSC Chair's Guidelines (Approved 17 Mar 2017)

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0201-00-00EC-ieee-802-lmsc-chairs-guidelines.pdf> as updated in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/17/ec-17-0016-06-00EC-march-2017-rule-changes.pdf>

•       Participation in IEEE 802 Meetings

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>

•       IEEE 802.11 WG OM: (Approved 17 Mar 2017)

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0629-19-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx>

1. **802.11 TGmd Telecon** – September 29, 2017 10:00-12:00 ET
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 10:02am ET.
	2. **Present** during some portion of the call:
		1. Dorothy STANLEY (chair) - HPE
		2. Graham SMITH – SR Technologies
		3. Osama ABOUL-MAGD - Huawei
		4. Emily QI – Intel Corporation
		5. Mark RISON – Samsung
		6. Mike MONTEMURRO – (Blackberry)
		7. Manish KUMAR (Marvel)
		8. Sean COFFEY(Realtek)
		9. Edward AU (Huawei)
		10. Gabor BAJKO (Mediatek)
		11. Mark HAMILTON (Brocade)
		12. Menzo WENT…(Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation Policy
		1. Patent policy slide set was reviewed
		2. Call for patents issued. Nobody came forward
		3. Participation Slide was reviewed.
	4. **Approve Agenda**:

The draft agenda for the September 29th teleconference was sent by email:

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a.       Call for potentially essential patents: **If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:**

 i.      Either speak up now or
 ii.      Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or
 iii.      Cause an LOA to be submitted

b.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>b.      Comments received in the recent comment collection are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-03-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>

3.       Comment resolution. Scheduled:

a. Graham SMITH – 45 mins

i. CIDs 60 (PCO Phased co-existence operation), 66 (Strictly Ordered Service Class), 67 (L-SIG TXOP protection mechanism), <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-04-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx>

ii. CIDs 57 (BlockAckReq variant), 58 (Basic BlockAck variant) and 61 (NON\_HT Block Ack), <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1137-02-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-blockack.docx>

b. Mark RISON CIDs – 45 mins

c. Gabor BAJKO – 15 mins

i. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1524-01-000m-comment-50-and-51-proposed-resolutions.docx>

4.       AOB, next call on Friday October 6th

5.       Adjourn

==================================================

* + 1. No objection to the Agenda as planned.
	1. **Editor report** – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document: [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-03-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt)b.      Comments received in the recent comment collection are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-03-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>

* + 1. Editors are preparing updated Draft with 82 approved comments from Waikoloa session.
		2. 4 comments need clarification on the version of the referenced document, for document 11-17/1400. Dorothy and Emily will contact Dan Harkins off-line.
		3. CID 243 is in the database referring to 11-17/1243r2, which was not posted. Mark RISON has now posted it. Reviewed minutes from Aug for this CID. Agreed that text is needed to describe the meaning of “shown” in the interpretation of wording subclause. Mark Rison’s 11-17/1243r2 has proposed text that needs to be reviewed by the group.
	1. **Comment resolution.**
	2. **Review Submissions from Graham SMITH, 11-17/989r4 (**<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-04-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx>**)**
		1. CIDs 60, 66, 67 and 68 (MAC):
		2. These are all comments about removing obsolete text.
		3. Several CIDs that were in this document have been moved into separate documents, to make the process more manageable.
		4. Reviewed CIDs still left in this document
		5. CIDs 60, 66, and 67 (MAC):
			1. These were previously agreed to remove the text, in general, but specific editing instructions were needed. Graham has provided those details in this revision of the document.
			2. Menzo agreed to help review these details, for next week.
			3. Noted that CID 68 has already been done and motioned. Ignore that one in this document.
	3. **Review Submissions from Graham SMITH, 11-17/1137r3 (**<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1137-03-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-blockack.docx>**)**
		1. CIDs 57, 58, 61 and 70 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed details on Table 9-22. Noted that
			2. Also noted that there is a NOTE at 712.5, that “BlockAckReq”, unless otherwise qualified, means all the of variants. Graham tried to keep that in mind when making changes.
			3. It gets complicated for PSMP, which uses the basic variant. But, that appears to be restricted to non-HT block ack, which is obsolete, so delete that text.
			4. No immediate comments.
			5. Menzo volunteered to review this document off-line. We’ll target the Oct 6 call to revisit, if Menzo can get it done by then.
		2. Graham is also working on a comment to remove PCF. Looking for thoughts about how to rename “PIFS”, since it currently means PCF IFS. He’s suggesting Priority InterFrame Space, but open to other suggestions.
	4. **Mark RISON, 11-17/1243r2 (**<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>**)**
		1. CID 243 (EDITOR):
			1. Per above agenda introduction, the subclause 1.4 changes need to be reviewed.
			2. Mark also found a couple more places where the change to “shown” was needed, and those have been added.
			3. Subclause 1.4 text looks okay.
			4. Reviewed added places for “shown” replacement.
			5. If we need Table I-2 to be normative (at 2455.12), because that is the only definition of this behaviour (and we want to change the word to “shown”), then we need to move the table into a normative clause. Decided this table is informative, so leave the word “illustrated”, and leave the table as is in Annex I.
			6. On P2466, first paragraph, there are several references to the Tables that show the constellation mapping rules, but Figure 17-10 also shows these mappings. Which is normative and which is informative? We’ve agreed to change 2463.61 to shown, so leave 2466 items as “shown” for now.
			7. With this discussion, we didn’t make any changes to 11-17/1243r2 (other than clarification in the comments). So, for CID 243, we’ll motion it again in November, just to be clear. Emily will “unmark” the current status, to show that it is not motioned yet.
			8. REVISED. Incorporate changes in 11-17/1243r2.
			9. Ready for motion
		2. CID 264 (MAC):
			1. Mark has moved the proposed new text as requested last time.
			2. Discussion about the new NOTE 2: This is odd and broad language. Also, this is a normative instruction (taking precedence), can it be in a NOTE? Wouldn’t it better to fix the places in the text that are in conflict, and fix them in place? But, we believe that is an error-prone approach. We think there is some existing text that similarly broad – couldn’t find it quickly.
			3. Mark will take the comments today under advisement, and bring this back.
		3. CID 191 (PHY):
			1. Reviewed options presented by Mark. Prefer to explicitly state “each intended receiver” when more than one receiver.
			2. With this direction, Mark will finish the detailed resolution.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		4. CID 207 (PHY):
			1. Reviewed comments and proposed resolution.
			2. No objection. Ready for Motion.
			3. REVISED. At 648.5½ add “. If the actual value of the length of the HT-STF is not an integer number of microseconds, the value is rounded up to the next higher value.” to the end of the rightmost cell
			At 648.15½ add “. If the actual value of the length of the Additional HT-LTFs is not an integer number of microseconds, the value is rounded up to the next higher value.” to the end of the rightmost cell.
			4. Menzo will get off-line review by PHY experts.
			5. Mark will post the comment and resolution to the 802.11 reflector, also.
		5. CID 205 (PHY):
			1. Assign this CID to Mark RISON
			2. Reviewed comments and proposed resolution.
			3. Would like to get some feedback, to check if there are any issues with existing implementations. Looks like it is only important in HT PPDUs in the computation of L\_LENGTH.
			4. Will mark ready for motion now, and check off-line.
			5. Mark Rison will send this to the 802.11 reflector, also.
			6. REVISED. At 648.17, after “excluding aPHYSigTwoLength if present” add “and the SERVICE field if it is in the Data field of the PPDU”.
			7. Ready for motion.
	5. **Gabor BAJKO, 11-17/1524r1 (**<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1524-01-000m-comment-50-and-51-proposed-resolutions.docx>)
		1. CID 50 (MAC):
			1. Reviewed comments and proposed resolution.
			2. Felt this paragraph would be confusing without the parenthetical clause.
			3. Clarify the editor instructions, we have covered both locations in the first paragraph of the resolution, and don’t need the additional note to the editor.
			4. Gabor will post that in an R2.
			5. REVISED. Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-17/1524r2 for CID 50. These changes clarify the usage. Ready for motion.
		2. CID 51 (MAC):
			1. Reviewed comments and proposed resolution.
			2. No objections.
			3. REVISED. Remove the cited sentence. Note to commenter: upper layers mechanisms exist and are well defined to deal with IP conflict situations.
			4. Ready for Motion.
	6. **Next call is Oct 6th**
		1. Proposed presenters: Graham SMITH, Mark HAMILTON, Ganesh VENKATESAN, Kaz SAKODA
	7. **Adjourned at 11:52am ET**
1. **802.11 TGmd Telecon** – October 6, 2017 10:00-12:00 ET
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 10:02am ET.
	2. **Present** during some portion of the call:
		1. Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		2. Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		3. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		4. Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei)
		5. Emily QI (Intel Corporation)
		6. Mark RISON (Samsung)
		7. Mike MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
		8. Manish KUMAR (Marvel)
		9. Sean COFFEY(Realtek)
		10. Edward AU (Huawei)
		11. Mark HAMILTON (Brocade)
		12. Menzo WENTINK(Qualcomm)
		13. Amelia ANDERSDOTTER (Article 19)
		14. George CALCEV (Huawei)
		15. Kazuyuki SAKODA (Sony)
		16. Sungeun LEE (Cypress)
	3. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation Policy
		1. Patent policy slide set was reviewed
		2. Call for patents issued. Nobody came forward
		3. Participation Slide was reviewed.
	4. **Approve Agenda**:

The draft agenda for the October 6th teleconference is:

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a.       Call for potentially essential patents: **If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:**

i.      Either speak up now or

 ii.      Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or

                     iii.      Cause an LOA to be submitted

b.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

b.      Comments received in the recent comment collection are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-04-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>

3.       Comment resolution.

**2017-10-06**

a.       Graham SMITH – 40 mins

      i.      CIDs 60,66,67 – 11-17-989, 11-17-1137 Results of Menzo WENTINK review

 ii.      CIDs 59 and 62 (DLS and STSL),

 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1518-00-000m-resolution-cids-59-62-remove-dls-stsl.docx>

       iii.      CID 63 Pre-RSNA methods,

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx>

b.      Mark HAMILTON CIDs – 50 mins

c.       Ganesh VENKATESAN (CID 148) – 10 minutes

  i.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1078-00-000m-resolutions-to-cids-148-and-339.doc>

d.      Kaz SAKODA (CID 112) – 15 minutes - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1529-00-000m-forwarding-information.docx> . 

4.       AOB, next call on Friday October 6th

5.       Adjourn

==================================================

* + 1. No objection to the planned Agenda.
	1. **Editor Report:** Emily QI
		1. Verbal report
		2. The spreadsheet 11-17/0914r4 has been updated.
		3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-04-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>
		4. Updated the approved tabs – 81 comments that were approved in Hawaii and completed the implementation at this time in D0.4 candidate and is being reviewed by the editing volunteers.
	2. **Review document: 11-17/989r5** -Menzo WENTINK
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-05-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx>
		2. CID 60 MAC
			1. Reviewed the PCO items that had minor changes
			2. There was a +3 page to the annex portions so the pdf page is correct, but the page on the page is 3 pages different
			3. Start of Clause 20 the page number jumps by 2 pages in D0.1 (page 2004)
		3. CID 66 MAC
			1. Reviewed the changes suggested
			2. Noted that “/Order” was overloaded and several instances needed to be deleted.
		4. CID 67 MAC
			1. Reviewed suggested changes
		5. CID 60 and 66
			1. Proposed resolution: CID 60 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-10-06 14:24:27Z): Incorporate changes as shown in 11-17/0989r5 for CID 60. These changes delete the Phased Coexistence Operation.
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 66 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-10-06 14:25:35Z): Incorporate changes as shown in 11-17/0989r5 for CID 66. These changes delete the StricklyOrdered service class.
			3. No Objection - Mark ready for Motion
		6. More updates will be prepared and reviewed with Graham prior to next week’s call.
	3. **Review document 11-17/1518r1** Graham SMITH
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1518-01-000m-resolution-cids-59-62-remove-dls-stsl.docx>
		2. CID 59, 62 (MAC)
			1. Review 11-17/1518r1
			2. Changes to remove DLS were reviewed.
			3. ACTION ITEM #1: Request review by Menzo.
			4. Note that we need to inform the ANA of released encoding and capability bits
			5. We need to add to this document a list of fields to notify ANA.
			6. ACTION ITEM #2: Graham to make a list of proposed values being released to the reflector and then after the motion to approve removal we can inform ANA.
			7. It was noted that DLS and TDLS are mutually exclusive.
			8. Do we need to mark these bits as reserved or previously used.
			9. The ANA will try to avoid reusing until the space if fully used, but in bit fields, the ANA will look for coexistent issues.
			10. We may want to make it clear in the field itself in the draft.
				1. We have not done that in the past
				2. Value of doing that is not clear
				3. Not necessary – ANA database handles reuse issues.
			11. The reuse of the freed bits would be managed by the ANA administrator, and he would avoid reusing until other options are explored.
	4. **Review 11-17/1504r2** Graham SMITH
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx>
		2. CID 63 (MAC)
			1. Review comment and the previous discussion
			2. Not a trivial task to remove WEP and TKIP.
			3. Review the proposed changes to remove WEP and TKIP
			4. Need a volunteer to review changes.
			5. Expectation is that we get an accurate plan for removal, but would not expect to see a motion to remove prior to January. Have discussion on another call, and in the November Plenary. Then a final decision would be made in January.
			6. ACTION ITEM #3: Michael MONTEMURRO will review the proposal and give feedback.
	5. **Review doc: 11-17/1412r1** – Mark HAMILTON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1412-01-000m-mac-comments-for-discussion.docx>
		2. CID 15 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes, but there was a question on the direction.
			3. Usually the use of “optional” in the text is normal, but in Waikoloa, we agreed to a “0 or <n>” in the octet count/length.
			4. Question on how consistent the use of “(Optional)” was included in the figures/tables?
				1. Would need more research.
			5. The “j” for the length of OUI, it is in a vendor specific element, then j was defined in another section. There may be additional places with “j” being used and how to describe it. Note that if “j” is not removed, then future proofing would be removed. As there is a single section that defines the field size in one place and it is possible to be variable.
			6. The “2 x n” case. We could use “0 or 2 x n” for example. See figure 9-255 for use example.
			7. Moving forward, we can make minimal change or we can make the more extensive changes as shown here.
			8. The Chair suggested that we make the minimalistic change to address the comment, and do the extensive work in the background and bring these proposed changes at a later time.
			9. Proposed Resolution CID 15 (MAC): Revised. Replace “(conditional)” with “(optional)” in the cited locations (2 places).
			10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 40 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Graham Smith is the commenter.
			4. It would be better to add a Note in the text.
			5. Propose that we reject this comment and add a comment in the next letter ballot.
			6. ACTION ITEM #4: Mark HAMILTON to update the resolution with a Revised and a note added to the text.
		4. CID 134 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on “shall be ignored” as opposed to “can be ignored”
			3. Proposed suggestion to reject the comment. - Rejected – the AP can do nothing useful with the information conveyed in this field, and it is unnecessary to state this.
			4. Discussion on if the BSS sets to 0 to disallow in the BSS, then it may be that it should be RESERVED in the other cases.
			5. The use of “use’ vs “capable” may be the underlying issue.
			6. Discussion on if the “intended to use” was there previously, so when we dropped the “intends” we may have lost intent.
			7. CID 133 (PHY) was discussed and has proposed resolution that changes this table.
			8. While the changes in CID 133 do not resolve this CID, it should align properly.
			9. Need to resolve this CID and CID 133 together.
			10. Transfer to PHY – assign to Mike MONTEMURRO
		5. CID 266 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 326 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. RTT definition is provided in equation 11-5
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The 802.11 definition of RTT is provided in equation 11-5, consistent with the usage in the Standard. There is no technical error.
			4. There was an objection that the RTT including the turnaround time. Will bring more detail later.
			5. Mark ready for Motion for now.
	6. **Review doc 11-17/1529r0** - Kaz SAKODA
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1529-00-000m-forwarding-information.docx>
		2. CID 112 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on “Shall Validate” – then if it is not valid then what?
				1. Will need to add the negative case.
			3. Another way to look at it would be to not identify it as forwarding info until it has been validated.
				1. The MLME uses the forwarding info even if it is not validated for forwarding.
				2. Suggestion to add to Table 14-9 – a field for validation
				3. This table is a summary of MLME is trying to reflect out, but will need more thought before just adding it.
				4. There may be a table that the MAC uses.
			4. More work will need to be done.
	7. Next call will be on 13th of Oct
		1. Will get update on Menzo’s review
		2. Will review two new documents from Graham
		3. Mark RISON and Jon ROSDHAL will have time allocated.
	8. Adjourned at 9:58am ET.
1. **802.11 TGmd Telecon** – October 13, 2017 10:00-12:00 ET
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 10:02am ET.
	2. **Present** during some portion of the call:
		1. Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		2. Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		3. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		4. Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei)
		5. Emily QI (Intel Corporation)
		6. Mark RISON (Samsung)
		7. Manish KUMAR (Marvel)
		8. Sean COFFEY(Realtek)
		9. Edward AU (Huawei)
		10. Mark HAMILTON (Brocade)
		11. Adrian Stephens (Intel)
	3. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation Policy
		1. Patent policy slide set was reviewed
		2. Call for patents issued. Nobody came forward
		3. Participation Slide was reviewed.
	4. **Approve Agenda**:

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a.       Call for potentially essential patents: **If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:**

                                       i.      Either speak up now or

ii.      Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or

iii.      Cause an LOA to be submitted

b.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

b.      Comments received in the recent comment collection are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-04-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>

3.       Comment resolution.

**2017-10-13**

 a.       Graham SMITH  – 40 mins

1. CID 67 in 11-17-989, CIDs 59, 62 in 11-17-1137,  CIDs 59 and 62 in 11-17-1518 (DLS and STSL), - Results of Menzo WENTINK review
2. CID 63 Pre-RSNA methods, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx> - any review feedback
3. CID 65 PCF, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1519-00-000m-resolution-cid-65-remove-pcf.docx>
4. CID 69 (RIFS), <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1520-00-000m-resolution-cid-69-remove-rifs-for-non-dmg.docx>

b.      Mark RISON CIDs – 40 mins

c.       Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDS  – 30 minutes

 i.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0928-01-000m-revmd-cc25-gen-comments.xlsx>

* + 1. Graham and Menzo were not on the call initially, so we will start with Mark RISON if they are not on when time comes.
		2. No objection to agenda
	1. Editor Report – Emily QI
		1. Deadline for the editor review is today. Editor will send to the chair the final doc for review prior to posting next week.
		2. Chair gave thanks for all the work that the Editors have been doing.
	2. Review CIDs assigned to Mark RISON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>
		2. R2 is on Mentor, and R3 was presented to capture discussion today along with some other updates made by Mark.
		3. CID 191 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the proposed changes
			3. Discussion on dualCTS mechanism – it is marked or may be marked deprecated.
			4. Discussion on if TXVECTOR description was covered.
			5. The number of uses of TXVECTOR and RXVECTOR were too numerous to check all the instances, but in a quick check, there are some in Clause 9 that need the same consideration to be applied.
			6. Discussion on the inconsistencies that are trying to be addressed.
			7. The start of clause 9 seems to have a few that were not included, but will need to be addressed
			8. More work will need to be done on the proposed resolution.
		4. CID 206 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 206 in 11-17/1243r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>>, which clarify the structure of the criteria.
			4. Mark ready for motion – document to be posted after the telecon
		5. CID 264 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion of if a packet is acknowledged if the policy is No Ack.
			3. More work needed
		6. CID 322 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion of the primitives that may need to be used.
			3. Need more input from the PHY experts.
			4. TXBUSY was added by TGad, so need to see if that is the only PHY using it.
			5. The state of the TXBUSY changes when some event, but not clearly identified.
			6. Suggestions welcome to help with this CID
		7. CID 146 (Editor)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the name of the acknowledgement – “Indicator”?
			3. We need to refer to a lower case ack policy in general
		8. CID 261 (Editor)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Changing “intended for” to “addressed to” globally is not the right thing.
			3. Review specific instances where the change should be made.
			4. There was confusion on if the change was made or not. The change was made in 0.3, but in 0.4 the change was removed.
			5. The changes for CID 261 will not be included.
			6. D0.4 needs to be sure the reversal was done completely.
			7. Then in November when we look at this CID again, the proposed changes will be against the D0.4.
			8. The New Resolution for CID 261 will need to be reviewed and voted on in November and the changes will be based on D0.4 and give exact locations of the changes.
		9. Expectation that R3 will be posted Monday
	3. **Review doc 11-17/1519r1** Graham SMITH
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1519-01-000m-resolution-cid-65-remove-pcf.docx>
		2. CID 65 (MAC) PCF
			1. Review Comment
			2. Point Coordination Function (PCF) – Removal changes reviewed.
			3. Proposed to redefine PIFS to “Priority Interframe Space”.
			4. Review proposed changes.
			5. Calling for a volunteer to review proposed changes.
			6. We will review again in November
			7. Discussion on the new name proposed.
			8. No objection to the new name.
			9. Notes to the CID Database: MAC: 2017-10-13 15:09:19Z - Changes drafted. Needs a reviewer. Agreed to rename PIFS to Priority Interfame Space"
	4. **Review doc 11-17/1520r0** Graham SMITH
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1520-00-000m-resolution-cid-69-remove-rifs-for-non-dmg.docx>
		2. CID 69 (MAC) RIFS
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. For 1588.22 change, a review of this change explicitly was requested.
				1. There was a question on if this was for DMG and may need to be left in.
				2. It is in clause 19, so it should be deleted as it is not DMG related.
				3. However, would like a review of this change.
			4. Note put in the CID database: MAC: 2017-10-13 15:11:57Z - Need to confirm the text at P2588.22 only applies for RIFS transmissions; the existing text is ambiguous. Otherwise, changes are shown in 11-17/1520. Plan to motion in November.
			5. A request for review will be sent to the Reflector.
		3. A motion specific for this document, and a separate motion per document will be made in November.
		4. A Review of doc 11-17/1261r1 will be scheduled for Tuesday Nov 7th. For discussion
			1. We did talk about this a long time ago, and the discussion on frame exchange sequence which refers to Annex G, but we need to see if the uses were all identified. 21 references to Annex G specifically, but there may be more indirect references to Annex G.
			2. More review will need to be done there.
	5. CIDs from GEN database
		1. Check for unassigned CIDs.
		2. CID 286 (GEN):
			1. Reviewed comment as a group.
			2. If we say VHT does not operate in 2.4 GHz, does that sufficiently limit it to not operate in, for example, sub 1 GHz? Look at the definition of HT, in 4.3.13, which says HT operation is only defined for operation in 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz. Discussion about whether 4.3.13 is sufficiently clear.
			3. Agreed the current text is correct. But, making the change would make it easier to understand.
			4. Noted that REVmc CID 3476 is perhaps related to this, and raises the question of whether VHT STAs can operate in anything other than 5 GHz. We can review this off-line, but it might be orthogonal.
			5. No objection to change drafted (which corrects 5 GHz exclusion to be 2.4 GHz exclusion). Ready for motion.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2017-10-13 15:29:08Z) Delete the cited text at 200.37 and add at 200.43 ", but does not operate in the 2.4 GHz band" to the end of the next para, just before the full stop
			7. Mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 140 (GEN):
			1. We need a submission on this one, and to go through each use carefully.
			2. Assign to commenter, Submission Required.
		4. CID 195 (GEN):
			1. Need to review. Reference to Table 16-1 doesn’t seem right. Maybe these are old references?
			2. Will check off-line and bring back.
		5. CID 196 (GEN):
			1. May have same issue with references.
			2. Will check off-line and bring back.
		6. CID 244 (GEN):
			1. Reviewed comment.
			2. Location appears to be 1558.18 in D0.1.
			3. MME is the MIC element for a protected frame. In 9.3.3.5 there is a NOTE that the MME always appears as the last thing in the frame.
			4. Since this is a clause about how to parse a frame with Vendor-specific items, it seems useful to keep the clarification in this clause that the receiver can always find the MME.
			5. The issue of whether this is all correct or not appears complicated. Need to consider off-line.
			6. Suggest rejecting. No objections. But need to investigate the AMPE question.
			7. Assign to Mike (PHY), for now.
			8. Draft resolution: GEN: 2017-10-13 16:00:45Z - Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2017-10-13 15:57:53Z) The Statement is correct, the note is in the context of parsing Vendor specific frames, and that the MME can be located.
	6. Adjourned 12:00pm
1. **802.11 TGmd Telecon** – November 3, 2017 10:00-12:00 ET
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 10:03am ET.
	2. **Present** during some portion of the call:
		1. Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		2. Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		3. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		4. Emily QI (Intel Corporation)
		5. Mark RISON (Samsung)
		6. Manish KUMAR (Marvel)
		7. Edward AU (Huawei)
		8. Mark HAMILTON (Brocade)
		9. Adrian Stephens (Intel)
		10. Joseph Levy (InterDigital)
		11. Michael Montemurro (BlackBerry)
		12. Menzo Wentink (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation Policy
		1. Patent policy slide set was reviewed
		2. Call for patents issued. Nobody came forward
		3. Participation Slide was reviewed.
	4. **Approve Agenda**:

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a.       Call for potentially essential patents: **If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:**

                                       i.      Either speak up now or

ii.      Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or

iii.      Cause an LOA to be submitted

b.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

b.      Comments received in the recent comment collection are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-04-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>

3.       Comment resolution.

**2017-11-03**

a. Edward AU –CID 238 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1274-01-000m-resolution-for-cid-238.docx>

b. Edward AU - CID 203 - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1650-00-000m-cid-203-revisited.docx>

c. Mark HAMILTON CIDs - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1412-02-000m-mac-comments-for-discussion.docx>

d. Emily QI - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1610-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-s-notes-in-revmd-d0-4.doc>

e. Mike MONTEMURRO – CIDs 133, 134 – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1089-07-000m-revmd-cc25-comment-resolutions.doc>

f. Graham SMITH – any comments on feature removal documents:

1. CID 67 in 11-17-989,
2. CIDs 59, 62 in 11-17-1137, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1137-03-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-blockack.docx>>
3. CIDs 59 and 62 in 11-17-1518 (DLS and STSL), - Results of Menzo WENTINK review <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1518-01-000m-resolution-cids-59-62-remove-dls-stsl.docx>>
4. CID 63 Pre-RSNA methods, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx> - any review feedback
5. CID 65 PCF, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1519-00-000m-resolution-cid-65-remove-pcf.docx>
6. CID 69 (RIFS), <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1520-00-000m-resolution-cid-69-remove-rifs-for-non-dmg.docx>

g. Graham SMITH – CID 163 - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0987-09-000m-resolutions-for-dcf-and-edca-comments-d0-1.docx>

h. Matthew FISCHER CIDs – 11-17-1192 - ?

4.       AOB, next meeting: Orlando face to face

5.       Adjourn

* 1. **Editor report**
		1. We have D 0.4 available on website
	2. **Review submission 11-17/1274r1** - Edward Au: CID 238
		1. Edward AU –CID 238 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1274-01-000m-resolution-for-cid-238.docx>
			1. CID 238
			2. Review comment
			3. Previously we had a straw poll on this one and had a direction for a rejection.
			4. Objection to rejection was voiced
			5. The proposed resolution has editor discretion that would need to be applied. (search clause and replace with one of three options…not a list of locations and the proposed change).
			6. There are over 700 instances of “packet”
			7. Proposed Resolution: Rejected, The proposed resolution does not provide changes to the draft that can be immediately adapted to satisfy the comment.
			8. **Straw poll**: I support the rejection resolution:
				1. Yes/No/abstain
				2. Results: 4/1/3
			9. Proceed with rejection reason and look to include in motion in Plenary.
	3. **Review submission 11-17/1650r0** Edward AU – CID 203
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1650-00-000m-cid-203-revisited.docx>
		2. CID 203 (Editor2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion from submission.
			3. Discussion on the use of qualify in front of STA for the PHY type is a bad path.
			4. TGay is currently going down that path, Request to return to TGay and ask them not to have a separate term
			5. The TGay definition does not add any material information and the DMG one and the TGay should have both the definition cleaned up.
			6. More discussion will be needed in TGay and REVmd to resolve this one.
			7. TGay to consider removing the definition of EDMG STA.
	4. **Mark Hamilton withdrew** his need for time today.
	5. **Review submission 11-17/1610r0** - Emily QI
		1. - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1610-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-s-notes-in-revmd-d0-4.doc>
		2. Editor Notes were inserted while rolling in TGai and TGah. The plan is to resolve these as we progress with the letter ballot process.
		3. Review each of the Editor Notes
		4. EN#4 -P1677.33 – delete line 36-39 which is a duplicate of lines 21-25
		5. EN#5 – the TGah draft had a number that seems to be moved to different location.
		6. EN#11 – the sentence seemed strange – the “as described in” or “in if 1 MHz Duplicate PPDU as described” should be deleted, but we will not remove the editor note and let the TGah experts see it in the next round of ballot to comment.
		7. EN#16 – similar to CID 115. It is part of the submission from Mike Later today in his submission. Will remove from Emily’s document.
		8. The other Editor Notes will be actioned as noted in the submission.
	6. **Review doc 11-17/1089r7** - Mike MONTEMURRO – CIDs 133, 134
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1089-07-000m-revmd-cc25-comment-resolutions.doc>
		2. CID 133 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Posted proposed resolution to reflector 2 weeks ago, but no response.
			3. Review the proposed change.
			4. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to get with Youhan to resolve this consideration. Note CID 134 is related and will need to be resolved accordingly.
		3. CID 188 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Comment resolution was posted to the reflector with proposed text for 10.2.3.9.
			3. Minor change to the resolution needed a plural form of “frames”
			4. Discussion on other minor changes to the proposed resolution were incorporated.
			5. Discussion on if we want to reference the Annex G here now that we have the explicit list put in. so we can remove the Annex G reference here.
			6. Article matching needs to be done still.
			7. Need to include a page and line number to help with the instructions.
			8. This resolution is based on D0.1.
			9. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Relative to Draft 0.1, in Clause 10.3.2.9 (P1419L62), replace: “The cases when an Ack or BlockAck frame can be generated are shown in the frame exchange sequences listed in Annex G.”

with

“The following frames require acknowledgment:

 - Individually addressed Management frames other than an Action No Ack frames

- Individually addressed non-QoS frames of Type Data

- Individually addressed QoS frames of Type Data where the Ack Policy is 00

- BlockAck frames not sent in immediate response to A-MPDU

- BlockAckReq frames

- PS-Poll frames, which can be acknowledged by generating a Data frame.”

At 3585.29 after "Frame RA has i/g bit equal to 0" add "or is sent to an AP/PCP"

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion - PHY Motion D
		1. **CID 226 (PHY)**
			1. Reviewed Comment
			2. Proposed resolution was posted to reflector.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace

“The TDLS responder STA shall process message 3 as follows:

If the Source and Destination Addresses of the Link Identifier element do not match those for an outstanding TDLS Setup Request, the TDLS responder STA shall discard the message.

If the ANonce and SNonce fields of the FTE do not match that of an outstanding request to the

TDLS initiator STA, then the TDLS responder STA shall discard the message.

Otherwise, the TDLS responder STA shall validate the MIC in the FTE as specified in the MIC

calculation procedure for TPK handshake message 3. If invalid, the TDLS responder STA shall

discard the message.

The TDLS responder STA shall discard the message, the TDLS responder STA shall abandon the

TPK handshake identified by the <ANonce, SNonce> combination, and delete existing TPK

handshake key state for this sequence if any of the following checks fail:

The contents of the RSNE are not the same as that sent by the TDLS responder STA in

message 2

The Timeout Interval element is not the same as that sent in message 2

The BSSID from the Link Identifier element is not the same as that sent in message 2”

With:

“The TDLS responder STA shall process message 3 as follows:

- Confirm that the Source and Destination Addresses of the Link Identifier element match those for an

outstanding TDLS Setup Request;

- Confirm that the ANonce and SNonce fields of the FTE match that of an outstanding request to the

TDLS initiator STA;

- Validate the MIC in the FTE as specified in the MIC calculation procedure for TPK handshake message 3;

 If any of the above conditions are not met, the TDLS responder STA shall discard the message. If the above conditions are met, the TDLS responder STA shall:

- Validate that the contents of the RSNE received in message 3 are the same as the RSNE sent by the TDLS responder STA in message 2;

- Confirm that the Timeout Interval element is the same as that sent in message 2;

- Confirm that the BSSID from the Link Identifier element is the same as that sent in message 2.

If any one of the above conditions are not met, the TDLS responder STA shall discard the message and abandon the TPK handshake identified by the <ANonce, SNonce> combination, and delete existing TPK handshake key state for this sequence.”

* + - 1. **Mark this as ready for motion - PHY Motion D**
		1. **CID 234 (PHY)**
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 1759.17, change “has not performed unscheduled power save to enter doze state” to “is in the awake state”

At 1759.35, change “that has performed unscheduled power save to enter doze state” to “is in the doze state”

At 1759.36, change “use the unscheduled power save mechanism to leave doze state” to “leave the doze state”

At 1753.41, change “has used unscheduled power save to enter doze state” to “is in the doze state”

At 1756.1, change “When attempting to enter doze state, the PCP shall not enter doze state unless it has received an Ack or BlockAck from each associated STA. When attempting to leave doze state, the PCP shall enter awake state as soon as it receives an Ack or BlockAck from one associated STA.”

to

“The PCP shall not enter doze state unless it has received an Ack or BlockAck from each associated STA. The PCP shall enter awake state

as soon as it receives an Ack or BlockAck from one associated STA.”

At 1760.2, change “has performed unscheduled power save to leave doze state” to “is in the awake state”

* + - 1. Mark Ready for motion – PHY-Motion D
		1. **CID 115 (PHY)**
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar to the Editor note issue
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. Mark Ready for Motion - PHY Motion D
		2. CID 24 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
	1. **Review list of docs from Graham, and if enough review has occurred.**
		1. Request for status on review from Menzo
		2. He will have some updates next week.
		3. Discuss the deletion of features that may still be included in devices may not be the right thing to do at this time.
		4. More discussion will be needed to be done next week.
		5. Action Item: PCF or RIFS review will be done by Menzo
	2. AOB:
		1. KRACK question
			1. There is one document 11-17/1602 and 11-17/1606 which is a discussion document and there will be agenda time for both to be discussed next week.
		2. Scheduled AdHoc
			1. Dec 7-8 in Piscataway
	3. Next meeting in Orlando – Face to Face.
	4. Adjourned at 12:00pm
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**September 29th telecon:**

 **Editor Report:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-04-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-03-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>

**Submissions:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-04-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1137-03-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-blockack.docx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1524-01-000m-comment-50-and-51-proposed-resolutions.docx>

**October 6, 2017 telecon:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0914-04-000m-revmd-wg-cc-comments.xls>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-05-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1518-01-000m-resolution-cids-59-62-remove-dls-stsl.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1412-01-000m-mac-comments-for-discussion.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1529-00-000m-forwarding-information.docx>

October 13, 2017 telecon:

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1519-01-000m-resolution-cid-65-remove-pcf.docx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1520-00-000m-resolution-cid-69-remove-rifs-for-non-dmg.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0928-01-000m-revmd-cc25-gen-comments.xlsx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>

November 3, 2017 Telecon:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1274-01-000m-resolution-for-cid-238.docx>

* 1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1650-00-000m-cid-203-revisited.docx>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1610-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-s-notes-in-revmd-d0-4.doc>
	3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1089-07-000m-revmd-cc25-comment-resolutions.doc>