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Abstract

Minutes for TG REVmc for Sept 28, Oct 5

Next calls will be, Oct 12, Oct 26, and Nov 2nd.

Here are the action items from the Oct 5th call:

1. ACTION ITEM CID 305– Peter E to come back with a submission about ANQP-Element usage.

2. ACTION ITEM: CID 30-Assign to Adrian for new wording.

3. ACTION ITEM: CID 50-Assign to Qi for submission – she is already assigned CID 312.

4. ACTION ITEM: CID 58-Mark H. to get list of "Mandatory" instances and prepare resolution from set of changes identified from Mark R..

5. ACTION ITEM: CID 131-Assign Mark Rison, Mark Hamilton, Brian Hart and someone from the “it should be zero” camp) to work on final wording on Topic Probe Delay. Note: This topic may take more time than we will want to take for this round of commenting to gain consencuse. We need a strong consensus in order to make a change in this area.

6. ACTION ITEM: CID 324-Qi to include CID 324 with 263 and 314

7.ACTION ITEM: CID 336-Submission needed from Stephen – need to determine if we want to address here or in TGai later. (Suggest Stephen contact Dave Stephenson)

1. Minutes for Sept 28th, 2012 teleconference:
   1. Called to order at 10:04 ET by Dorothy Stanley
      1. Reviewed Patent policy,
      2. Email was sent with the following list:
         1. Note that teleconferences are subject to IEEE policies and procedures, see:
         2. IEEE-SA PATENT POLICY
         3. IEEE CODE OF ETHICS
         4. IEEE-STANDARDS ASSOCIATION (IEEE-SA) AFFILATION FAQ
         5. IEEE-SA ANTITRUST AND COMPETITION POLICY
         6. IEEE-SA LETTER OF ASSURANCE (LOA) FORM
         7. IEEE-SA STANDARDS BOARD PATENT COMMITTEE (PATCOM) INFORMATION
         8. IEEE-SA PATENT FAQ
         9. IEEE 802 LAN/MAN STANDARDS COMMITTEE POLICIES & PROCEDURES
         10. IEEE 802.11 Working Group Policies and procedures
      3. No IP request or notification.
      4. Attendance:
         1. Dorothy Stephen, Adrian Stephens, Jounie Malinen, Mark Hamilton, Mark Rison, Peter Ecclesine, Jon Rosdahl
   2. Review Agenda
      1. Agenda:
2. Call to order, patent policy, WG policies and attendance
3. Comment resolution: Propose focusing on comments in clauses 1,3,4, and 10, plus any text resolutions from Indian Wells action items
4. Plan for next call(s) Oct 5, 12, 26, Nov 5
5. AOB
6. Adjourn

Reference: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1082-02-0000-revmc-pre-ballot-comments.xls>

* 1. Comment Resolution:
     1. Adrian has an updated file for use to use 11-12/1082r3 as needed
        1. There is a new D0.4 that is on the server in the members area
        2. A new planning set of details available.
     2. Dorothy requested everyone to download the updated spreadsheet and noted that we should look at D0.4 and we will discuss it next week along with the timeline plan as well.
     3. Give presentation control to Mark H. and he brought up the MAC comment database for discussion:
     4. CID 39
        1. Review comment
        2. IEEE Style guideline shows only one page number on a page
        3. Editor to work to ensure that the page numbers are aligned
        4. Proposed resolution: Revisied – Editor is requested to ensure the pdf page numbers are aligned. – The IEEE Style guide prescribes only one page number per page.
     5. CID 341
        1. Review Comment -- IANA IKEv1 reference.
        2. Suggest that we decline this as our liason with IETF has added the missing info to the new RFC.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Reject: Rejected. Per liaison 11-12/0977r0, the additional parameters will be added to the IKE v1 registry. So the reference to RFC 2409 is still valid.
     6. CID 212
        1. Review comment: What is “MFP”
        2. Editorial comments should be handled initially by the Editor,
     7. CID 38
        1. Review comment:
        2. This has been there for a long time
        3. The term Area can be a general term, i.e. the area west of the Mississippi.
        4. Many examples of the use of “Area”.
        5. Regulators use “Area” - Range or Scope, not as a geometric term.
        6. Basic Service Area is defined by 802.11.
        7. Proposed Resolution: Reject: We call out networks as Local Area Networks or Metropolitan Area Networks. The dictionary says that the word “Area” can mean a range or scope. Regulators use Area, and not other terms for boundaries.
     8. CID 301
        1. Review Comment:
        2. There is only a small note on page 25, and in the SDL, but no other mention in the spec.
        3. No other objection.
        4. As an industry term, we do see it in use.
        5. There is a claim that a frame format for WDS is defined.
        6. The use of the 4-address format for WDS uses.
        7. Note that the new GLK group would have an opinion on this topic also.
        8. Straw Poll:
           1. Should we remove the term WDS?

Results: Yes – 3 No – 3 abstain - 1

* + - 1. There is only a definition of “Wireless Distribution” in one place in the spec.
      2. If we remove all the obsolete and the SDL, then it would go away anyway.
      3. We should leave the definition for now, and allow the new TGak to look into it.
      4. **ACTION ITEM**: CID 301- Jon to talk to Donald Eastlake about his interest on this topic.
      5. Look at page 122 – another Definition example of term defined but not used “Unreachable star”.
    1. CID 74
       1. Review comment.
       2. Do we agree in general to add a table somewhere?
          1. No objection
       3. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 74- Jouni to look at creating a table in a submission.
       4. Assign Comment to Jouni for submission.
    2. CID 323
       1. Review Comment
       2. Relates to CID 218
       3. The use of Sleep is in TDLS. – how STAs use AP to get info when asleep.
       4. The use of Sleeping may not be incorrect.
       5. We use doze and sleep with lots of ease.
       6. 10.2.1.18.1 – sleep is part of the WNM
       7. 4.3.13.1 lists the features that were added by WNM, and so it is here.
       8. What is being managed? Is the real questions.
       9. Many of the WMN management functions only manage point to point communication.
          1. They only manage STA to AP or some other Point to Point functionality
       10. The AP is managing and doing work for the STA which allows the STA to Sleep.
       11. The number of actual things that WNM-Sleep does is numerous, and so after we resolve some of those issues, then maybe a new name may be an outcome.
           1. Filtering, and buffering etc is still only point to point management.
       12. Radio Management implemented is required to get many of the WNM features.
       13. Changing the name was thought to loosing meaning.
       14. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. WNM-sleep mode is dependent on a device's support of the mandatory WNM features. And it enables a STA to sleep for extended periods of time, and this is clearly related to "sleep".
       15. There was an objection to the rejection.
       16. There are many features in the WNM-Sleep that don’t seem to address sleeping.
       17. Request for CID 96 to be included – no this will be part of the request to PHY panel of experts (open invitation to be sent to the reflector) to discuss before we discus it on a conference call.
    3. CID 213
       1. Review comment
       2. (see note from Mark Hamilton)
       3. Should we allow this.
       4. More time may be needed to look at this.
       5. How this is used in practice and in other definitions needs to be reviewed.
       6. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 213-Mark Rison assigned to research this issue further.
          1. Other Comments that are related: CID 263, 314, 324,
    4. CID 79
       1. Review Comment :
       2. There was an offline discussion that worked to improve the proposed resolution.
       3. Initial Proposed Resolution: Add a new paragraph after the third paragraph of 10.2.1.2:”An AP shall always assume a non-AP STA's Power Management mode is Active upon Association, or Reassociation from another AP, and the non-AP STA shall operate per the Active mode until it can inform the AP of a mode change. The STA's mode shall also be Active in relation to any AP with which it is not associated. Reassociation to the same AP shall not change the Power Management mode of the non-AP STA.”
       4. 10.2.1.1 – the change of the mode needs to be communicated.
       5. If the STA is not associated then it cannot use PS mode.
       6. A STA that has transmitted a management frame to an AP that it is not associated from which it expects a response shall remain in the Awake state until such a response is received, or until the procedure has timed out.
       7. All of the main frames being sent are part of a management frame exchange.
       8. The new Beacon variant and beam forming that are extended control frames.
       9. If we drop the “management” from the suggested sentence, then it would still be correct and may be clearer in the end.
       10. Trying to get rid of the word “Assume” should be done.
       11. Change where the SHALL is in the new paragraph.
       12. There is also a similar comment in CID 257.
       13. Reassociation to the same AP you do not want to have to go in and out of ACTIVE mode?
       14. Working on what the proper action took some time.
       15. Deleting the text about the Reassociation was thought to be the simplier definition.
       16. Can we add a note for the FP case?
           1. No consensus to add any note.
       17. Proposed Resolution: Add a two new paragraphs after the third paragraph of 10.2.1.2:”A non-AP STA shall be in Active mode upon Association, or Reassociation

A STA that has transmitted a frame to an AP with which it is not associated and from which it expects a response shall remain in the Awake state until such a response is received or until the procedure has timed out.”

* + - 1. Comment marked ready for motion.
    1. CID 145
       1. Review comment:
       2. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 145-Mark RISON to submit a proposal
    2. CID 49
       1. Review Comment:
       2. See CID 308
       3. We could also set DTIM Period to be reserved.
       4. The new sentence sets the DTIM Count field as reserved.
       5. We will allow other groups to test to ensure that we don’t have any issues.
       6. The DTIM Period value is still useful and we should keep it in there.
       7. A draft of the Proposal was started.
       8. Draft Proposed resolution: Revised: See CID 308. The DTIM Period value is still useful, and we can keep it here. Add a note that the DTIM Period is independent from any TIM Broadcast Interval(s).

Note – The DTIM Period carried in a TIM element in a TIM frame could be unrelated to any TIM Broadcast Intervals.

* 1. Proposal for next week:
     1. Look at the schedule
     2. For comments resolution, Mark and Jon are to solicit more input from others as possible.
     3. Note that Mark R. is changing affiliations, and may not be available on the call next week.
     4. Need to preannounce the comments that are targeted for the call identified a couple days ahead.
     5. Need to have people look at the PHY comments and a call to focus on that topic will be determined.
     6. **ACTION ITEM:** Dorothy/Mark H. – To Send A list of about 8 comments that need the PHY group to review and provide input for resolutions.
  2. Adjourned 12:00 ET.

1. Minutes for Oct 5th teleconference:
   1. Meeting called to order 10am ET by Dorothy Stanley, Aruba Networks.
      1. Review Patent Policy
         1. No items noted
      2. Attendance: Dorothy Stanely, Aruba Networks; Jon Rosdahl, CSR; Mark Hamilton, Polycom; Edward Au, Huawei; Peter Ecclesine, Cisco; Mark RISON, Samsung; Adrian Stephens, Intel.
   2. Review agenda

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance

2. Editor Report

3. Comment resolution - CIDs listed

- Discuss and resolve (needs discussion):

213, 305, 329, 331.

- Identify resolution direction and volunteer who will develop proposed resolution:

30, 50, 58, 80, 131, 324, 336, 343, 365.

- Discuss and resolve (hopefully straightforward):

49 (finish, from last time), 6, 14, 354, 48, 83, 214, 286, 330, 337, 344, 348, 351.

If you are not able to make the call, but want to work on one of these comments, or have an opinion on direction, please respond to this mail, or let me know your input.

4. Schedule, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1203-01-000m-revmc-shedule.docx>

5. Plan for next call(s) Oct 12, 26, Nov 2, AOB

6. Adjourn

7. Reference: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1082-04-0000-revmc-pre-ballot-comments.xls>

* 1. Editor Report –
     1. There are 28 comments that need feedback on the reflector or directly.
     2. Next week on the 12th the Editor will review these comments
  2. Review Discuss and resolve MAC Comments:

CIDs: 213, 305, 329, 331.

* + 1. CID 213 –
       1. Mark Rison has action to come back with feedback. – Mark was not on the call at the time.
    2. CID 305
       1. Review comment
       2. Search on ANQP-Element to find issue.
       3. Where do we describe the query?
          1. See 10.24.3.2.1
       4. Reverences to the where this is defined.
       5. There may not be so many vague ones that we may be able to fix this with a submission. Make the references consistent as well.
       6. AdHoc notes: MAC: 2012-10-05 14:15:05Z - Consider clarifying all "ANQP Query" (without further adjective) to be explicit. Need help from Dave Stephenson. Peter E will follow up.
       7. **ACTION ITEM** CID 305– Peter E to come back with a submission.
    3. CID 213
       1. Mark R. joined the call
       2. Mark R. indicated that he would withdraw the comment.
       3. Commenter said it refers to a different spec.
       4. Proposed resolution: Reject – withdrawn on TGmc Oct 5th Telecon.
    4. CID 329
       1. Review comment
       2. Need to check with some security experts and how the use of a key that was supposed to be expired seems like a security risk.
       3. This could be 18 hours.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Reject – MAC: 2012-10-05 14:21:37Z - Propose decline. The non-AP STA deletes the GTK to remove any possibility of using the expired key. Dorothy to confirm with Jouni.
    5. CID 331
       1. Review Comment
          1. 10.23.6.3 first paragraph seems to apply.
          2. No changes seemed warrented.
          3. Request for more clarification does not seem needed.
       2. Proposed Resolution: MAC: 2012-10-05 14:21:37Z - Propose decline. The non-AP STA deletes the GTK to remove any possibility of using the expired key. Dorothy to confirm with Jouni.
       3. from Mark Hamilton to Everyone:
       4. REJECTED (MAC: 2012-10-05 14:27:23Z):10.23.6.3 first paragraph says, "The AP may transmit a group addressed BSS Transition Management Request frame to associated non-AP STAs if …" so clearly this text is written as if such a group addressed frame should be considered as sent "to (a) non-AP STA(s)". Thus, the text at the top of P1134 does apply.That paragaph goes on to say, "When the BSS Transition Management Request frame is transmitted as a group addressed frame, a receiving non-AP STA shall not respond with a BSS Transition Management Response frame." so the individual STAs can not reply with a request for delay.The net result of this particular scenario is that all STAs are notified of the termination, and none are given an opportunity to reject it outright or request a delay.No change was specifically requested, and the existing text is sufficiently clear.
  1. Identify resolution direction and volunteer who will develop proposed resolution:

30, 50, 58, 80, 131, 324, 336, 343, 365.

* + 1. CID 365
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposal - Revised – Change “Element” to “field” at the cited location.
       3. Check page 1117 see 10.22.6.2.1
          1. Seems that element to field may be correct change
       4. Check clause 8.5.13.7 on page 773.
          1. The operating class is a field.
          2. Same thing with secondary channel offset it is a field.
          3. The action is to change element to field in both dashed lists.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2012-10-05 14:35:49Z): Change "element" to "field" at the cited location. Also change "Secondary Channel Offset element" to Secondary Channel Offset field" in the same list.
    2. CID 30
       1. Suggestion to get Adrian to help with wording.
       2. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 30-Assign to Adrian for new wording.
    3. CID 50
       1. Similar to CID 312
       2. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 50-Assign to Qi for submission – she is already assigned CID 312.
    4. CID 58
       1. Review Comment
       2. There are many places that need to be checked to make sure we are consistent that need to be fixed.
       3. Mark Rison sent an e-mail to Mark Hamilton with many of the most needed corrections..
       4. There are some more that need to be checked.
       5. The use of Mandatory is sometimes an noun and those may be ok.
       6. Let’s star with the ones that Mark R has identified
       7. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 58-Mark H. to get list of “Mandatory” instances and prepare resolution from set of changes identified from Mark R.
    5. CID 80
       1. Review Comment
          1. Update the Figure is necessary.
          2. The text and figure should match
          3. Discussion of the diagram
          4. Do both the AP and the Non-AP STA switch back to state 2 for an unsuccessful Re/Association attempt from State 3?
          5. Review of page 1017 and 1018.
          6. Maybe the title of the figure could be adjusted to make what the diagram is depicting. By adding:”between a given pair of non-mesh STAs”
          7. The deleted arrows are for successful completion of authentication should not change the state if you are in a higher state.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2012-10-05 15:05:02Z): Update Figure 10-6 by deleting the arrow and label from State 3 to State 2 upon successful 802.11 Authentication, and the arrow and label from State 4 to State 2 upon successful 802.11 Authentication.Also change the title of Figure 10-6 to add "between a given pair of non-mesh STAs"
    6. CID 131
       1. Review comment
          1. Need for change was not strong.
          2. There are 3 MIB variables for ProbeDelay.
          3. dot11RMMeasurementProbeDelay, dot11TDLSProbeDelay, and ProbeDelay. With three points the standard is not consistent.
          4. Setting the Probe Delay in one place may be better.
          5. Group with 132 and CID 36.
          6. These Three CIDs should be worked in harmony.
       2. **ACTION ITEM::** CID 131- Assign Mark Rison, Mark Hamilton, Brian Hart and someone from the “it should be zero” camp) to work on final wording. Note: This topic may take more time than we will want to take for this round of commenting to gain consencuse. We need a strong consensus in order to make a change in this area.
       3. Move CID 132 and 36 to MAC Comment Group for ease of processing.
    7. CID 324
       1. Qi is working on this along with CID 263 and 314.
       2. **ACTION ITEM**: CID 324-Qi to include CID 324 with 263 and 314
    8. CID 336
       1. Review Comment
       2. Need Submission for sure
       3. There was some objection to having multicast response to GAS.
       4. There is another CID that is similar in nature.
       5. From Peter E: We definitely do NOT want GAS response to be multicast/broadcast. There is no L2 ack and support for GAS fragmentation would be a nightmare. Its sort of ridiculous anyway, because what are the odds that another STA would be awake at the random time the AP sends the response? If we want a way to multicast a GAS response, then IMO we should bring the GASTIM beacon approach that was originally in the draft,
       6. This may be better addressed in TGai. – Suggestion to have commentor take the issue up with TGai.
       7. So we can make a request for submission, but where it is presented and addressed is the debate.
       8. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 336- Submission needed from Stephen – need to determine if we want to address here or in TGai later. (Suggest Stephen contact Dave Stephenson)
       9. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2012-10-05 15:29:44Z): Concerns raised with the proposal include: There is no L2 ack and support for GAS fragmentation would be complex. Concern that another STA would be awake at the random time the AP sends the response. The GASTIM approach proposed in TGu could be applicable. Note, TGai is looking at technical solutions for high-density, rapid discovery, this proposal may be applicable there..
    9. CID 343
       1. Review comment
          1. It is vaque, but more help in clarifying the text would be needed.
       2. Would like to find a volunteer to help with wordings.
       3. A more specific declaration could be made to make it easier to understand which channels are “affected”
       4. The intent of the original wording was questiond.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2012-10-05 15:42:34Z) Add to the end of the first sentence of 10.15.5, "i.e., the 20 MHz channels that wholy or partly overlap the 40 MHz signal."
  1. Discuss and resolve (hopefully straightforward):

49 (finish, from last time), 6, 14, 354, 48, 83, 214, 286, 330, 337, 344, 348, 351

* + 1. CID 6:
       1. Review Comment:
          1. Not seeing any problem with how it is.
       2. Proposed Resoluion: REJECTED (MAC: 2012-10-05 15:45:21Z) While it is implied that an individually addressed BU results in an individually addressed ATIM with the same address, it is not explicitly said anywhere except this sentence.
    2. CID 14:
       1. Review Comment.
       2. The sentence may have been missing due to an editing error.
       3. Suggestion that the sentence be modified to be consistent with RDE as well.
       4. Proposed Resoluion: REVISED (MAC: 2012-10-05 15:48:17Z) Add the sentence at the cited location (add "In an AP whendot11SSPNInterfaceActivated is true, the HC shall set the dot11NonAPStationAddtsResultCode in the non-AP STA’s dot11InterworkingEntry equal to the ResultCode." to the end of the 7th paragraph of 10.4.4). Also, add the sentence, "In an AP whendot11SSPNInterfaceActivated is true, the HC shall set the dot11NonAPStationAddtsResultCode in the non-AP STA’s dot11InterworkingEntry equal to the Status Code in the corresponding RDE." to the end of the 4th paragraph of 10.4.5.
    3. CID 354
       1. Review comment
       2. Propose we reject the comment.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2012-10-05 15:50:02Z) While it is true that the Timing Measurement procedure could be used while not associated, no use case is provided to compel doing this. Further, since only the non-AP STA could know that both peer STAs (AP and non-AP) are dot11MgmtOptionTimingMsmtActivated=true (by monitoring Beacons), it would have to be the non-AP STA that initiates the procedure. This means the AP would need to generate periodic Timing Measurement frames, thus consuming long-term resources on the AP to remember the procedure is active. Typically, APs should not be required to dedicate any resources to non-associated STAs, unless there is a strong need for it.
  1. We were at 10 minutes, move to Adrian’s doc 11-12/1203r2
     1. Review the document:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1203-02-000m-revmc-shedule.docx>

* + 1. Review the 3 options
    2. No decision today, but wanted to get people to look this over and in November we may or may not go to ballot, but we will make decision then.
    3. Question/Discussion on the point that TGac is being added late in the process.
       1. If we add it late, it does not get the same review cycles that other parts are done.
       2. If we added it during the WG LB phase, we would definitiely have to delay our timeline.
       3. Getting changes for TGac in TGac seems to be the right point.
       4. And getting 3 chances to make comments vs 4 may not be that much of an issue.
       5. Major fixes shoulreally be done in the amendment processing time.
  1. Next call
     1. Continue where we left off and then start Editor,
     2. On the 26th we will start on the GEN comments.
     3. Thanks for those that are working on resolutions.
     4. **REMEMBER** that there are more comments that are not listed, and we need review of them as well.
  2. Adjourn at 12:03 pm ET.

**References:**

**Oct 5th:**

Full Comment Database file:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1082-04-0000-revmc-pre-ballot-comments.xls>

Proposed Scheduleing:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1203-01-000m-revmc-shedule.docx>

**Sept 28th:**

Full Comment database file:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1082-02-0000-revmc-pre-ballot-comments.xls>

Liaison Letter referencing IANA IKEv1 .

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-0977-00-0000-liaison-to-ietf-group-repository.doc>