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Abstract

802.11md REVmd CRC teleconferences for March 11 and 13, 2020.

R0: contains the minutes for March 11

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon March 11, 2020 16:33 – 18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** at 4:33pm ET by the TG Vice Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry).
   2. **Attendance**:
      1. Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      2. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      3. Emily QI (Intel)
      4. Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
      5. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
      6. Mark RISON (SAMSUNG)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No issues reported.
   4. Review Agenda: 11-20/234r15
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-15-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
      2. Review Agenda:

**The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a. **Patent Policy: Ways to inform IEEE:**

1. Cause an LOA to be submitted to the IEEE-SA ([patcom@ieee.org](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this 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, please respond at this time by providing relevant information to the WG Chair

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

c. Adhoc meeting reminders:

April 21-23 Cambridge UK (Mark Rison [m.rison@samsung.com](mailto:m.rison@samsung.com) )

Webex to be provided.

Please unicast email the respective host if you are attending in person so that local arrangements (e.g. lunch) can be made.

2.   Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU

3.   Comment resolution:

e.2020-03-11 Wednesday – 4:30-6pm Eastern \*\*\*\*\*Teleconference announced with 10-day notice\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*(London is +4)

i. Mark RISON CIDs

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

* 1. **Editor Review** – Emily QI
     1. Working on speculative draft
     2. Review in process
     3. Expect to have 3.2 on Monday.
  2. **Review Mark RISON CIDs**
     1. Doc 11-20/0435r0
     2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
     3. CID 4393 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review minutes from AdHoc – Sunrise:

7.7.1 CID 4393 (MAC)

7.7.1.1 Review comment

7.7.1.2 Discussion on why “(no data)” should be deleted.

7.7.1.3 P790.79 is example of when we have it and when we don’t.

7.7.1.4 There are 24 locations of (no data)

7.7.1.5 The “(no data)” is unnecessary. The text does not add to the description of the frames that carry no data. QoS NULL is the name of the QoS NULL frame.

7.7.1.6 QoS CF-Poll has no data

7.7.1.7 A submission is required to prepare the changes and the cited locations.

7.7.1.8 There was no specific objection to making this change.

7.7.1.9 Request to have a submission prepared to see the actual changes.

7.7.1.10 Will come back with submission

* + - 1. Review submission discussion
      2. Proposed Resolution: CID 4393 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-03-11 20:42:34Z): In D3.1:

At 782.10 change:

QoS (+)Null frame refers to all three QoS data subtypes with “no data”: the QoS Null (no data) frame, subtype 1100; the QoS CF-Poll (no data) frame, subtype 1110; and the QoS CF-Ack +CF-Poll frame, subtype 1111.

to:

QoS (+)Null frame refers to all three QoS data subtypes with an empty frame body: the QoS Null frame, subtype 1100; the QoS CF-Poll frame, subtype 1110; and the QoS CF-Ack +CF-Poll frame, subtype 1111.

Delete “ (no data)” at 785.60, 786.15/18/20, 790.48 (2x), 790.49, 799.43, 850.32 (3x), 850.33 (2x), 1860.24, 3605.32/35/39/47, 3613.23/27/30/41.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4432 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion in submission.
       3. Note that in the submission it says TA instead of RA, so a check will need to be done.
       4. Proposed Resolution was in the submission, but there needs to be a check before we resolve this CID.
       5. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to check the “Announce” frames and the TA vs RA description.
    2. CID 4451 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Submission Discussion
       3. Review the rules
       4. Review the proposed changes
       5. Request for more time to review.
       6. Schedule for March 20th Telecon
    3. CID 4433 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review submission discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2020-03-11 21:06:18Z): At the end of the sentence in 10.27.5 Protection rules for VHT STAs (D3.1 P1907.14) add " and that the applicable HT protection mechanisms are extended to include 80, 160 and 80+80 MHz transmissions using non-HT duplicate frames defined in Clause 21".
       4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 4582 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Submission Discussion.
       3. Review proposed changes.
       4. Discussion on if DEFVAL should be 512 or 500 for EDCA.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-03-11 21:06:00Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 4582 in 11-20/0435r0 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>, which address the issue raised by the commenter (except for the one at 1763.63 -- see CID 4168).
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 4284 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review proposed changes.
       3. Proposed resolution: CID 4284 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-03-11 21:24:51Z): Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 4284 in 11-20/0435r0 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>, which allow for optional subelements in the requests identified by the commenter.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    6. CID 4499 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review submission Discussion
       3. Review proposed changes
       4. Discussion on the proposed changes:
          1. From the REVmd CRC AdHoc Minutes – Sunrise:

2.6.6 CID 4499 (EDITOR):

2.6.6.1 Review Comment.

2.6.6.2 Proposed Resolution: Rejected. IEEE Editor completed MEC with TGmd draft 2.1. There is no issue with the term “Master”.

2.6.6.3 No objection - Mark Ready for motion

* + - 1. The proposed changes are either field names or regulatory identified names.
      2. Discussion on if the term Slave or Master are offensive. Are the changes warranted or not?
         1. Timing master maybe we want to change, but after more thought, it may be better to not change rather than change to controller.
      3. Master has other connotations than the objectionable Master-Slave, i.e. Master Clock, Master Craftsman, Master Plumber etc.
      4. From CID 2020: REVISED (EDITOR: 2019-03-11 16:20:39Z)- change the cited sentence to "The BeamLink isMaster subfield is set to 1 to indicate that the STA is the master of the data transfer and set to 0 otherwise. The STAs use the BeamLink isMaster subfield to negotiate the dot11BeamLinkMaintenanceTime as specified in Table 9-343 (The Beamformed Link Maintenance negotiation)."
      5. The old text (before CID 2020), was: "The BeamLink isMaster subfield is set to 1 to indicate that the STA is the master of the data transfer and set to 0 if the STA is a slave of the data transfer."
      6. There was discussion on the relationship of Radio vernacular, Master and Client are often used.
      7. Look to bring back to the group- Not enough consensus.
      8. This was already rejected: Current Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2020-02-20 10:25:02Z). Reject Reason: IEEE Editor completed MEC with TGmd draft 2.1. There is no issue with the term “Master”.
      9. See Motion #162. (REVmd CRC AdHoc – Sunrise meeting)
      10. Mark RISON was told he could bring his updated proposed resolution back during the motion time on the 20th.
          1. Proposed replacement resolution: REVISED

In 9.5.6 Beamformed Link Maintenance field inc. Figure 9-852—Beamformed Link Maintenance field format and Table 9-344—The Beamformed Link Maintenance negotiation, change “isMaster” to “isController” (5x). In 9.5.6 Beamformed Link Maintenance field change “master of the data transfer” to “controller of the data transfer”.

In 11.1.2.1 TSF for an infrastructure BSS or a PBSS change “timing master” to “timing source”.

* + - 1. There was not consensus to make the updated change.
    1. CID 4715 and 4716 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-03-11 21:45:38Z) Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CIDs 4715 and 4716 in 11-20/0435r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>>, which clarify the use of MLME-FINETIMINGMSMTRQ primitives and also MLME-TIMINGMSMTRQ primitives.
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4591 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review the usage of UTF-8 String vs UFT-8 encoded code points.
       3. Discussion on if the SSID is a String vs Encoding points.
       4. Discussion on the proposed changes
       5. Discussion on the use of the word “string” vs “encoded code points”.
       6. Note: 6.4.7.1.2 (which defines an ESSIdentifier parameter): "An identifier composed of the string value of the SSID element concatenated with ..."
       7. A Proposed resolution was prepared at the REVmd CRC AdHoc – Sunrise. Today’s discussion is to replace that resolution with the proposed resolution here.
       8. Discussion on which resolution should be used.
       9. We are at time, will bring back later on Friday (March 13, 2020).
  1. Adjourned 6:01pm ET.
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