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Abstract

Minutes of the 802.11 TGad meetings during the May 2012 session.

# Minutes of TGad session – Monday May 14th, 13:30 – 15:30

Eldad (Intel) called the TGad meeting to order at 13:30.

Eldad presents 802.11-12/0631r0, including IEEE patent policy.

* There was no one who spoke up when the Call for potentially essential patents was made.
* Reviewed agenda.
  + Removed PAR Extension since it was decided to defer to July meeting.
  + Added Relay discussion to Monday PM1 agenda.
  + Added QAB to Tuesday PM1
  + Added Recirc motion to Thursday PM1.
  + No objections to approving the agenda.
* Task Group Leadership
  + Chris Hansen is not nominated for vice-chair election.
  + There were no objections to reaffirming the candidates as nominated.
* Review of comment resolution results on D6.0
* Review of 2nd recirc sponsor ballot on D7.0
* Motion to approve March 2012 TGad minutes as contained in **11-12-0358r0**
  + Moved/Second: James Yee (MediaTek) /Carlos Cordiero (Intel)
  + Passed unanimously.
* Motion to approve **TGad conference call minutes as contained in 11-12-0007r11**
  + Moved/Second: James Yee/Carlos Cordiero
  + Passed unanimously.
* Editor Report on 2nd Recirc SB
  + 18 editorial, 47 technical, 1 general.
  + 12/0638r1 contains the latest proposed comment resolution
    - Sunggeun Jin assigned Relaty CID 8064

CID8064 Discussion

* David Hunter (WireFi Networks) questions why the proposed Relay is limited to DMG.
* Sunggeon (ETRI) responds. Carlos explains that the Relay mechanism is based on the scheduled SP.
  + Reject because DMG Relay is defined specifically on the basis of SPCA. (See the 2nd bullet in the 4th paragraph of 10.35.1)

Carlos continues with Comment Resolution

* Comments from Mark Hamilton (Polycom)
  + CID8003: no objections to the proposed REVISE resolution.
  + CID8004: no objections to the proposed ACCEPTED resolution.
  + CID8005: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8002: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
* Comments from David Hunter
  + CID8008: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8010: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8009: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8011: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8014: no objections to the proposed REJECTED resolution.
  + CID8013: discussion about the statement “A DMG STA uses EDCA only within a contention-based access period (CBAP).”
    - Strawpoll: Do you support that it is required in a DMG BSS that EDCA only operates in a CBAP.
      * Result: 10-1-1
    - Commenter is ok with the proposed REJECTED resolution.

TGad is in recess at 15:30.

# Minutes of TGad session – Tuesday May 15th, 13:30 – 15:30

Eldad calls TGad into session at 13:30.

QAB discussion

* Eldad points out that there is actually no comment on QAB in this round of comments.
* David explains this is related to a comment from a previous round.
  + Section 10.36.
  + David Hunter says this is a “partially-done concept” which does not explain how the quiet intervals are allocated. David proposes to remove the feature.
  + Zhou Lan (NICT) responds the tools are already available. Carlos: in P480L38 in 10.36.2 it is explained that the Quiet Element is used.
  + Mark Hamilton: should replace reference to 8.4.2.25 with reference to 10.9.3. Suggests to replace the current text “The AP shall use the Quiet element (8.4.2.25) to schedule quiet periods according to the request.” with “The AP shall use the procedure in 10.9.3 to schedule quiet periods according to the request.”
  + Discuss whether the feature is DMG only and if QAB is a AP or STA capability. Should a QAB capable AP only allow STA’s that support QAB to associate?
  + James Gilb (Tensorcom): suggests a new replacement text “The AP shall use SPs to schedule the quiet period(s) according to the request.” The group agrees that this is a better text than the previously suggested replacement text.
    - In addition, the group agrees to append the following text to the replacement text: “The SP shall have the AP as both source and destination and the AP shall not transmit during the SP.”
  + James Gilb suggests to create a new “10.36.1 General” section which states “If an AP supports QAB the AP shall set the QAB Capability field within the Extended Capabilities element to 1 and set the QAB Capability field to 0 otherwise. In addition, if an AP supports QAB, the AP shall also support scheduling SPs as defined in 9.33.6”
  + Carlos states that the original motivation of the feature is coexistence, to allow the detection of 15.3c traffic by quieting 11ad traffic.
  + Security: two cases
    - 1. Someone owns all APs
    - 2. APs have different owners.
  + Eldad asks for a CID associated with this so that the proposed resolution can be applied to a CID.
    - Zhou Lan and David suggest CID7102
    - Eldad will propose to revise the resolution CID7102 (from D6.0) as discussed above.
    - A motion will be added to address this on Thursday.
* Continue with Comment Resolution
  + CID8060: no objections to the proposed REVISE resolution.
  + CID8061: discussion and changed the REJECTED to REVISED. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8015: discussion and no objections to the proposed REJECTED resolution.
  + CID8062: no objections to the proposed ACCEPTED resolution.
  + CID8065: no objections to the proposed REJECTED resolution.
  + CID8017: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8066: discussion and changed the REJECTED to REVISED. Added change to Table 8-54, making the Multi-band element extensible. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8018: similar to CID8017. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8022: no objections to the proposed REJECTED resolution.
  + CID8023: Replace AT with ATI. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8027: discussion and no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8029: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8030: Replace AT with ATI. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8031: discussion and no objections to the proposed REJECTED resolution.
  + CID8033: Replace DTT with DTI. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8032: discussion and no objections to the proposed REJECTED resolution.
  + CID8034: no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8035: discussion and no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
  + CID8040: and no objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.
* Eldad asked how many comments remain. Carlos: 17.
* Jon Rosdahl (CSR) asks Eldad about recirc sponsor ballot plans.
* TGad is in recess at 15:36.

# Minutes of TGad session – Wednesday May 16th, 13:30 – 15:30

Eldad calls TGad into session at 13:30.

Continue with previously agreed upon agenda.

Brian presents 12/0668r1 on 9 CIDs related to Clustering

* CID8007: Simplified proposed text after discussion. No objections to proposed resolution Definition text.
* CID8006: Simplified proposed text after discussion. No objections to proposed resolution Definition text.
* CID8012: Agreed to removed the phrase “from other potential users on the same channel that are outside the area” in 4.3.4.4 after discussion. No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8058: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8057: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8036: No objections to proposed Decline resolution. Refers to proposed new QAB related resolution for CID7102.
* CID8037: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8039: Revised reasons after discussions to state that “Clustering and FST are orthogonal mechanisms in the sense that the rules for FST do not require changes to the rules of clustering and vice versa”. No objections to proposed Decline resolution.
* CID8056: Reworded 10.33.1 after discussions. No objections to proposed Revised resolution.

Carlos continues with Comment Resolution

* CID8001: REJECTED because it was withdrawn.
* CID8044: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8043: No objections to proposed ACCEPTED resolution.
* CID8046: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8047: No objections to proposed ACCEPTED resolution.
* CID8048: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.
* CID8049: Changed the resolution from Rejected to Revised after discussion. Include new entries to Status Code, which is carried in the Association Response. No objections to proposed REVISED resolution.
* CID8051: No objections to proposed Revised resolution.

CID8054 is the last remaining unresolved comment.

TGad is in recess at 15:32.

# Minutes of TGad session – Thursday May 17th, 13:30 – 15:30

Eldad calls TGad into session at 13:30.

David asks to add one more agenda item: CCSR

Continue with comment resolution

* CID8054: Lengthy discussion results in changing proposed resolution from Rejected to Revised. No objections to the proposed REVISED resolution.

David brings up the CCSR topic related to CID7054

* CID7054 was rejected in a previous round of comment resolution.
* David comments on the 1st paragraph of 9.34.2.2 on P317, objecting to the ‘shall’ behavior involving ‘Enroll’ and “configure”, which are not Layer 2 operations.
* Brian proposed rewording to address the concerns.
* Eldad proposes to discuss the proposed changes from Brian during the next conference call. David is ok with this approach.

Motion#94:

* *Move to approve resolution to* *comments in 12/0638r4 and resolution to comment 7102 (from first recirculation sponsor ballot) in 12/0481r5.*
* Move/Second: James/Mark
* Approved by unanimous consent.

Motion for recirculation sponsor ballot

* *Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the second recirculation Sponsor Ballot on P802.11ad D7.0 as contained in 12/0638r4 and resolution to comment 7102 (from first recirculation sponsor ballot) in 12/0481r5.*
* *Instruct the Editor to prepare Draft 8.0 incorporating these resolutions.*
* *Approve a 15 day Sponsor Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11ad D8.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”*
* Move/Second: David Hunter/Graham Smith
* Result: 11-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain)

Planning for the End

* Recircs
* EC Conditional approval is July 20th, 2012
  + Only one recirc expected
* Deadline for submission to RevCom is approximately August 31st, 2012.
  + For Continuous process Revcom call in October.

Goals for July

* Comment resolution on recirc sponsor ballot
* Prepare for EC conditional approval

Discussion of Conference call times

Continued discussion on CCSR based on proposed resolution to CID7054 from Brian

* Proposed resolution is contained in 12/0668r2.

TGad is adjourned at 15:26.