IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Minutes for REVmd April 2018 telecons | | | | |
| Date: 2018-04-27 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies Inc. | 10871 N 5750 W  Highland, UT 84003 | +1-801-492-4023 | jrosdahl@ieee.org |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

Minutes for REVmd 6th and 27th April 2018 telecons

R0 = REVmd April 6th Telecon

R1 = REVmd April 27th Telecon

Teleconferences are subject to applicable policies and procedures, see below.

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

•       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 09 Mar 2018)

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/17/ec-17-0120-26-0PNP-ieee-802-lmsc-chairs-guidelines.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 10 Nov 2017)

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0629-21-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx>

1. April 6, 2018 REVmd Telecon – 802.11md
   1. **Called to order at 10:05 ET** by the TG Chair Dorothy Stanley (HPE)
   2. Attendance:
      1. Dorothy Stanley (HPE)
      2. Abhishek Patil (Qualcomm)
      3. Emily Qi (Intel)
      4. Edward Au (Huawei)
      5. Sean Coffey (Realtek)
      6. Menzo Wentink (Qualcomm)
      7. Mark Hamilton (ARRIS/Ruckus)
      8. Graham Smith (SR Technologies)
      9. Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
      10. Manish Kumar (Marvell)
      11. Joseph Levy (Interdigital)
   3. Reviewed Patent Policy and Participation Policy
   4. **Review Agenda:**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0626-01-000m-2018-april-agendas-for-teleconferences-and-ad-hoc-meeting.docx>

Draft agenda for the April 6th teleconference:

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/17/11-17-0920-08-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

b.      Comments received LB 232 are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0611-00-000m-revmd-wg-ballot-comments.xls> :

3.       Comment resolution.

**2018-04-06**

1. Edward AU - Editor 2 CIDs: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0619-00-000m-revmd-editor2-lb232-comments.xlsx> ; Any comments on proposed resolutions, reminder to review, plan to motion in May
2. Edward AU - Editor 2 CIDs – Direction of resolution for 24 similar comments:
   1. 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, and 1219
3. Additional CIDs
   1. CID 1329, 1236
4. Emily QI – Editor CIDs, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0657-00-000m-revmd-wg-lb232-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls> and 11-18-0658
5. Graham SMITH – CIDs 1000, 1147 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0654-01-000m-resolution-for-cids-1000-1147.docx>
6. Graham SMITH – CID 1347 – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0655-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-1347.docx>
7. Graham SMITH – CIDs 1356, 1358- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0656-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-1356-1358-rts-cts.docx>
8. Available CIDs/presentations
9. CID assignment

4. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to the proposed agenda that was in the 11-18/626r1
  1. **Editor Report – 11-17/920r8** - Emily Qi
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-08-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>
     2. Reviewed report
  2. **Review Sumission 11-18/619r0** - Editor 2 CIDs- Comment Resolution: - Edward AU -:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0619-00-000m-revmd-editor2-lb232-comments.xlsx>
     2. Thanks to Mark RISON for reviewing the full list of Comments listed by Edward to the reflector to review.
     3. There are a couple CIDs that Mark found similar issues elsewhere and Edward wanted to know if he should fix up the typos there also?
        1. Making the Changes for typos is ok, but the comment resolution should be marked revised and show the changes are noted.
        2. For those changes that are possibly technical in nature a separate submission should be prepared and the CID moved to MAC or PHY Adhoc.
        3. We want to keep all the Editorial (simple changes etc) be kept in the Editorial AdHoc comment group.
     4. Review of the comments is requested from the Task Group for the proposed resolutions.
        1. There are 24 comments that are the same, but on different sections.
        2. See CID 1196 (Editor)
           1. Proposed Change “Change “ppm” with “10^6””
           2. The “ppm” occurs 24 times.
           3. Neither the Editorial and Style Guidelines address the issue, and if we make this change we would need to update the guidelines.
           4. Another check also found possibly 34 instances…need to verify.
           5. There is use on page 1009 Which has a file type (mapping file type) reference, and is not really an issue.
           6. Discussion on the possible substation and whether it was worth the making the change.
           7. For the instance on p1009, it should be all caps…editorial issue if it is to be changed. – PPM would be Portable Pixal Map, and the table has mixed capitalization states. Leave it to Editor to check
           8. Not a lot of support for changes.
  3. **Review Submission, 11-18/657r0** - Editor CIDs- Emily QI –
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0657-00-000m-revmd-wg-lb232-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>
     2. Review of comment resolution is encouraged on 657r0
     3. Question on format displaying –
     4. More complex comments will be reviewed at the AdHoc and the next telecon.
     5. Question on CID 1350 – Emily will check the email request and respond accordingly. It is a similar related error for the Editor to consider.
  4. **Review Submission 11-18/654r1** - CID 1000 and CID 1147 - - Graham SMITH –
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0654-01-000m-resolution-for-cids-1000-1147.docx>
     2. Review submission
     3. CID 1000 GEN
        1. Review Comment
        2. Reviewed proposed changes
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED, At 162.31 delete “point-cordinated” **contention period (CP):** The time period outside of the contention free period (CFP) in a basic service set (BSS).
        4. As the strike through cannot be in the excel file, change proposed resolution to “REVISED, At 162.31 delete “point-cordinated””
        5. Discussion of if CFP was removed, or is there a needed use of CFP still in HCCA or not.
        6. We took the use of CFP out of HCCA, so it may be that this should have been removed, and there may be a lot of occurrences that may need to be reviewed for removal.
        7. See p1690, -- 45 instances in CFP still in the document,
           1. ACTION ITEM #1- Menzo to review and come back with proposal for complete removal as appropriate. And PC (25 instances). Will bring a separate submission to address.
           2. Also CAP has several instances to be addressed as well.
        8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2018-04-06 15:01:10Z) At 162.31 delete “point-coordinated”
        9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 1147 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review Discussion and proposed changes.
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1147 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2018-04-06 14:58:02Z) Make changes as shown in 11-18/0654r1 for CID 1147. These changes implement the commenter's proposed change.
        4. Discussion on the proposed changes.
        5. Discussion on the referencing of Annex G but the annex would ned to be fixed to make the referenc make sense.
        6. The “shall” is the main point of the discussion.
        7. The discussion about PSDU vs MSDU in this clause would make sense.
        8. Discussion on if the last sentence referenced should be deleted or not.
        9. The clause 10.3.5 only applies to DCF.
        10. Proposal to not make a change at all, as this only applies to DCF and it may not be an issue that needs to be fixed at this time.
        11. Proposal to review next week after more thought. Some discussion on making the changes to make it clearer that it does not violate the rules in annex G and other places.
        12. The use of CIFS and PS-Poll precludes the use of RTS/CTS prior to PS-Poll.
        13. The proposal was to make it clear and consistent.
        14. Alternative changes were discussed to remove “data or management” from the “may” statement.
        15. Sounding exchanges are described in Annex G, but it should not necessarily be for DCF anyway.
        16. Trying to make the standard consistent is the over riding goal, and the comment is specific to 10.3.5 is the focus of the changes that we are looking to make.
        17. Reviewing under DCF exclusively, do we think the statement is really a problem.
        18. Just explicitly precluding PS-Poll would be better than all management frames.
        19. More discussion and thought should be done.
  5. **Review Submission: 11-18/655r0** - CID 1347– Graham SMITH –
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0655-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-1347.docx>
     2. CID 1347 (MAC)
     3. Review Submission
     4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2018-04-06 15:41:42Z): EDCA and DCF backoff procedures should be basically the same. Removing EIFS condition only from DCF would be a major difference to EDCA. EIFS is required to account for packets detected where the NAV information is not reliable.
     5. Discussion:
        1. Suggestion to add to resolution more detail. Reference to 10.3.2.3.7 should be added.
        2. Discussion on reasons for rejecting the comment and more details to clarify the resolution.
     6. Updated Resolution: Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2018-04-06 15:41:42Z): EDCA and DCF backoff procedures should be basically the same. Removing EIFS condition only from DCF would be a major difference to EDCA. EIFS is required to account for packets with frame errors, as specified in 10.3.2.3.7.
     7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  6. **Review Submission 11-18/656r0** - CIDs 1356, 1358 - Graham SMITH
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0656-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-1356-1358-rts-cts.docx>
     2. CID 1356 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. This is related to CID 1147.
        4. Discussion to make the change at 1612.43 to make the replacement as well as the deletion.
        5. This new alternative would leave a “what other purposes” which is a concern.
        6. Concern about leaving the use of RTS/CTS being used for alternate purposes.
        7. We should allow a very general capability that is not precluded in general, and let it be used as needed.
     3. The discussion was split, so we will need more discussion and make the related CIDs are aligned.
  7. Next week is the Face to Face AdHoc in Ft. Lauderdale – a call in on Join.me will be available.
  8. Adjouned 12:00pm ET.

1. **REVmd Telecon April 27, 2018 10am -12pm ET**
   1. **Called to order** at 10-:03am by the Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Attendance:**
      1. Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      2. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
      3. Mark HAMILTON (ARRIS/Ruckus)
      4. Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
      5. Jinjing JIANG (Marvell)
      6. Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
      7. Sean COFFEY (Realtek)
      8. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      9. Emily QI (Intel)
      10. Mark RISON (Samsung)
      11. Osama ABUUL-MAGD (Huawei)
   3. **Review Patent Policy and Participation Policy**
      1. No items noted.
   4. **Review Agenda** – 11-18/626r9
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0626-09-000m-2018-april-agendas-for-teleconferences-and-ad-hoc-meeting.docx>
      2. Draft Agenda
2. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy
   1. 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:**

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

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

1. Editor report – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-08-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

b.      Comments received LB 232 are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0611-01-000m-revmd-wg-ballot-comments.xls> .

1. Comment resolution.
2. **2018-04-27**
   1. Jerome HENRY - 11-18-354 – QOS Mapping CID 1014
   2. Emily QI – 11-18-658 – non-trivial editorial CIDs
   3. ~~Edward AU – Editor2 CIDs~~
   4. PHY CIDs – 1552, 1324, 1264, 1188, 1004, 1552
   5. MAC CIDs: CID 1391, 1347, 1356, 1358, 1398, (1469, 1477), 1382
   6. Mark RISON CIDs
   7. Additional CIDs/Presentations
3. AOB
4. Adjourn
   * 1. Add Mark Rison CIDs – if there is time
     2. Edward is not able to join today.
     3. No other additions/changes made – see R10
        1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0626-10-000m-2018-april-agendas-for-teleconferences-and-ad-hoc-meeting.docx>
     4. No objections to the modified agenda
   1. **Editor Report – Emily Qi**
      1. Editor Report in 11-17/920r8
      2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-08-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>
      3. Comments received LB 232 and current reported resolutions are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0611-01-000m-revmd-wg-ballot-comments.xls> .
   2. **Review Doc – 11-18/354r1** – QoS Mapping CID 1014 - Jerome Henry
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0354-01-000m-qos-mapping-comment.pptx>
      2. CID 1014 (PHY):
      3. Review submission
      4. Proposed Mapping changes proposed reviewed.
      5. Discussion**:**
         1. Why not just reference RFC 4694? And then when it updates, then it would be updated already.
            1. It is useful as we have our own elements and maps to the UP table, so we may find useful directions on where to find the normative info, but table R2 could be used as informative material.
         2. Maybe just referencing the RFCs would be better as it seems that 802.1Q seems to change often. To try to get a more stable view at the 802.11 level.
         3. Being able to track when things change has been a difficulty of having our tables look out of date.
         4. What is an implementation to do with UP2? We should not leave it blank, but if we have a place to point that we could avoid the issue.
            1. The table provides L2 to L3 mapping and not the L3 to L2.
            2. Support removing table and point to the external reference, and we should also remove the other table R1 as well.
         5. Table R3 does do the upward mapping and 11ak has expanded the upward mapping.
            1. So we may want to remove those tables as well.
            2. We need some minimum tables for UP to AC as it is in our realm, but above that we may want to remove that.
         6. Removing the 3GPP table may be ok, but we need to make sure that the 3GPP spec does not point to our spec for the definition. As a consistency check. And we would want to do ths same with 802.1 to make sure we are consistent there as well.
         7. For GSMA, we may want to do the check.
         8. Let people think about this and look at the proposed changes to the text later. The submission today has minor changes, but to facilitate the extensive changes of removing the different tables, the specific replacement text would need to be available.
         9. The Minimal change would be to take the changes suggested in slides 9-11, but to do the broader set of changes we would need a more detailed submission.
         10. Concern on the text that references external documents already and to R2, so we need to address that if we want to make any of the “simple” changes. Making changes in R2 will cause changes in the surrounding text as well.
         11. 802.11ak is coming soon – expected end of June, and will have some of these type changes already in the mix. We need to account for that as well.
         12. Need to ensure 802.11ak changes are not conflicting with the proposed changes.
         13. Supportive of possibly removing tables that are not needed, and make things more generic and have only one mapping that points out of our layer. The new text from 802.11ak is separate.
         14. The proposed changes should be applied with the 11ak roll-in. The editors will roll in by end of June. The next draft will potential have 11ak …(D2.0).
         15. Summary: Jerome and Mark are to create a submission with proposed changes assuming 11ak in the direction Jerome suggests, but with the more detail changes outlined.
   3. **Review Doc 11-18-658r3** – non-trivial editorial CIDs -- Emily QI
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0658-03-000m-lb232-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-ad-hoc.doc>
      2. CID 1487 (Editor)
         1. Review comment
         2. Question on if the added definitions were limited?
         3. This is not really an editorial CID, and should be moved to MAC AdHoc.
         4. There is a VHT BSS, but it references a VHT STA that we don’t have it defined, so we may want to define it.
         5. We have a lot of definitions that do not provide any new information, so should we remove more than we add?
            1. There was a CID that was rejected in the past that would have removed some of these extraneous definitions, but given that, then we need to add all the missing ones.
         6. In CID 204, we had a specific issue that PBSS that was unique to the issue, and so it is not a clear mandate to do something in the future.
            1. There is a concern that the rejection of CID 204 rational was not clear.
         7. We have some new terms that are really necessary, and we should look to remove the definitions that are just adjectives being added.
         8. Previous discussion of CID 204 had concerns from the TGad and TGay folks not wanting the DMG definitions removed.
         9. We need to just look at the proposed addition request and see the definitions are warranted.
         10. Review context of the varied definition.
         11. If we can find a rationale for why the definition are not needed, or is the argument that the commenter did not give rationale for the addition.
         12. By Convention can we add an adjective before “AP, STA, BSS” unless there is some ambiguity that needs definition, such as DMG.
         13. Proposed Resolution: Reject. By convention, an adjective for a capability, when used with “AP”, “STA” or “BSS” is assumed to be understood by the reader without an explicit definition, unless there is some noted ambiguity. Therefore, the definition of the “HT AP” is not needed.
         14. ACTION ITEM #2: Emily will revisit CID 204 and expand the rational for the rejection.
      3. CID 1508 (EDITOR)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on if “can be included” is needed and if it is redundant or not. Is table in Clause 9 sufficient?
         3. Discussion on if there is something that is out of date.
         4. When we find text that is not accurate, then we should update it.
         5. It is not a definitive list at (9.4.2.18) and there may be more places that it can be used, and it is not a complete list.
         6. We have some that believe it is a complete list.
         7. Use of Such as language should be kept in Clause 4 and in the other clauses like in 9 it is normative.
         8. Discussion on how it is constructed in clause 4 and in clause 9.
         9. Instance at Clause 4.9.3 seems ok
         10. This is really not an Editorial comment and treat it as a Technical comment and a submission will need to be prepared.
         11. Or do we put in a statement somewhere that says the lists are not always exhaustive.
         12. Straw Poll:

A – Keep text and fix omissions/errors

B – Delete the text

C – Keep text and add text in 1.4 that indicates non-exhaustive list.

* + - * 1. Results for Just for Clause 4: 5A 1B 4C
        2. Results for Just Clause 9: 3A 3B 4C
        3. The preference is to add text in 1.4 for the clause 9 cases and for Clause 4 we should fix errors or omissions.
      1. ACTION ITEM #3.: Emily to work with Mark RISON to craft text and bring back based on the straw-poll
    1. CID 1518 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion on if we have errors in the deprecated text, then we need to either remove or fix it.
       3. We have been on the path of rejecting CIDs that affect a change to the deprecated features, but if we change now, we would need to go back and adjust other CIDs.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Reason, WEP has been deprecated and the task group has determined that they are not making any changes to clauses associated with the obsolete/deprecated features.
       5. Mark ready for motion
       6. Dorothy to group all the similar type CIDS for further discussion and consideration.
       7. CID 1188 is a TKIP that needs to be rejected as it is similar to CID 1518.
    2. CID 1545 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Need a rational as to why the 802.1Q-2003 is being kept.
       3. Need to search to determine the references and if it is really necessary.
       4. There is a reference to 802.1Q-2003 at P1051.30 and the version is specifically necessary.
       5. The reference at 802.1Q-2011 are explicit, and so those will need to be checked to determine if they are necessary.
       6. This is getting to be more technical in nature, so we need to move to either GEN or MAC.
       7. There are 4 places that will need to be added to this resolution.
       8. Need more work to clean the references in the draft.
       9. CID 1609 indicates that 802.3 references need to be updated, and the proposed change is to update all the references.
          1. Need to address these two comments together
       10. Review instances:
           1. P1568.14 – there is a specific clause in a specific version, so we need to do more review.
       11. Running out of time –
       12. Move CID to MAC and assign to Mark HAMILTON.
    3. CID 1609 (EDITOR) –
       1. The 802.3 reference that uses a year P271.52 can be fixed to remove the year. And then in clause 2 update the reference.
       2. Review the references in Clause 2 that may need updated. Only 802.3 seemed to need updating.
       3. Resolution of 1609 and CID 1545 should be resolved together to ensure a complete resolution is created.
  1. Next meeting is in Warsaw.
  2. An update to the Warsaw agenda will be made based on today’s progress.
  3. Adjourned 12:01pm ET.
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