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Abstract

Minutes for the IEEE 802.11 REVmc March 2013 Plenary Session in Orlando Florida.

1. TG REVmc called to order at 1:32pm Monday March 18 2013

by Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba Networks.

* 1. Agenda in 11-13/283r0
		1. No changes, adopted by unanimous consent
	2. Patent Policy Reminder
		1. Reviewed the slides that were read during the WG opening Plenary
		2. No issues identified
	3. Review other guidelines
	4. Minutes
		1. **Approve prior meeting minutes – 11-13/0022r0 and 11-13/0236r1**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0022-00-000m-minutes-for-jan-2013-interim-vancouver.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0236-01-000m-minutes-for-tg-revmc-teleconferences-feb-and-march-2013.docx>

* + 1. Moved to approve by Jon Rosdahl, 2nd Michael Montemurro
	1. Editor Report
		1. Review 11-13/095r1
		2. D1.02 is now available which has 11ad rolled-in
		3. Pre-Ballot Comments – 88 comments brought forward
		4. Comment state reviewed:
		5. 19 Trivial Technical comments that we should review in session.
	2. Timeline and Schedule
		1. Review Plan of Record – 11-13/0283r0 slide 8
		2. July may be best guess for recirc ballot
		3. Comment resolutions will be based on 1.0, and 1.2 is now available with 11ad now included. – status normal.
	3. Advancing the “Needs Submission” category Comments
		1. Please Review the comments with “Needs Submission” in ad-hoc status category (Column W). in 11-13/0233
			1. Check to see if they are marked incorrectly.
		2. Proposal is to assign submission to commenter, and if no submission received, we would reject comment with “insufficient detail provided” reason.
		3. This is for those comments with little or no suggested proposals.
		4. For the PHY Comments, and we have asked Vinko to look at these, so we can assign Vinko to those comments.
		5. Additionally mark CIDs 1010, 1078, 1640 as “Needs Sumbission”, and assign them to the commenter to bring the submission.
	4. Comment Resolution
		1. Editor ”Discuss” comment
			1. CID 1211
				1. Review the comment
				2. Discussion on name usage and when proper name vs informal proper names should be capitalized.
				3. Look at 5.1.1.5 for example of “Normal ACK” is the “n” supposed be capitalized.”
				4. See table 8-7 for example of why a capital seemed to be correct.
				5. Note: After discussion, consensus supported initial caps for names reflecting the value of a field.
				6. The resolution would include a statement that in this instance the need for a capital is correct.
			2. CID 1224
				1. Review the comment
				2. Do we want to delete the “the IEEE Std 802.11” from the standard?
				3. We may have worked to ensure that we consistently used the “Std” in the names of all instances of the name of the standard, but we may not want to have it.
				4. We may need to have some use of the formal name, but when do we over use it and can drop it?
				5. Changing 510 locations may cause more confusion than it is worth.
				6. After discussion, the group determined that there are lots of these instances, and rather than fix them partially, we should reject the comments.
				7. The current text as written is accurate.
				8. A proper resolution will be created later and brought back to the group.
			3. CID 1225
				1. Review the Comment.
				2. See 6.3.24.1.2
				3. This is an enumerated parameter, and the values in the enumerated cell, we do not need double quotes.
				4. If we agree, then we have to check to ensure we have not missed any tables with similar enumeration.
				5. The value descriptions are listed in 6.3.24.1.4, and moving the description to the table seemed that it would make the table unreadable.
				6. We could move the descriptive information closer to the table to make it clearer.
				7. The consensus of the group is we don’t need quotes around the literals. We could move the text from “effect of receipt”, but there was no clear consensus for this.
				8. Do we have an exhaustive list of conventions that we can point to? No – we do not.
				9. A proper Reject will be created.
			4. CID 1227
				1. Review the comment
				2. 718 instances of “Block Ack” – do we really need to move them to lower case.
				3. No, we use this a lot, and we should leave it alone.
				4. We purposefully have de-capitalized in the past, and these seem not on the list.
				5. The attempt to be consistent is what is causing this type of comment to appear. We have tried to not uppercase nouns that are not names of Fields, frames etc.
				6. Concensus position: while acknowledging the inconsistencies caused by current usage of Block Ack, we choose to grandfather this uage in the draft.
				7. A proper resolution will be created.
			5. CID 1233
				1. Review Comment See 292.33
				2. “May” maybe being used incorrectly.
				3. Replacing “may” with “is”, may be a better choice.
			6. CID 1236
				1. Review Comment see 314.06
				2. TIM Broadcast vs TIM broadcast
				3. There seemed to be 30 lower case instances and many more that were uppercase. If we uppercase these instances and then grandfather them in.
				4. Grandfather “TIM Broadcasts” and change “TIM broadcast” to this usage.
			7. CID 1243
				1. Review the comment
				2. See 6.4.4.1.1
				3. This is similar to other comment. Leave as is.
			8. Need to let the Editor leave the room, so we stood at ease for 5 minutes.
			9. CID 1250
				1. Review comment
				2. Proposed resolution: Revised -- Deletee subclause 7.3.4.1, including its single statement.
				3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
			10. CID 1404
				1. Same issue, same resolution and status in GEN AdHoc
			11. CID 1273
				1. Review comment
				2. There are both manual and automatic “(xx)” in the text that will result in the automatic ones being removed.
				3. Discussion on why these should be included or why we should not do.
				4. This is really an editor decision to follow the style guide.
				5. Concensus: Zap the Parens, and follow the style guide.
			12. CID 1294
				1. Review the comment
				2. There are 260 “Report”
				3. 716 “report”
				4. These are not as a common usage as “Block Ack”, but here we have a large variance of the useage.
				5. We could fix this by changing the “Report” to “report” where appropriate. A submission would be harder to justify, but the editor can find and correct as he can.
				6. Concensus: the Editor should do more work and fix it.
			13. CID 1322
				1. Review the comment
				2. We have 60 “is optional” statements.
				3. We may want to search and find all “is mandatory”. (26 instances).
				4. A Generic resolution may be good to do.
				5. We found about 10 places (see CID 58) before where we fixed some already.
				6. About 76 changes in total is the estimate.
				7. There are a few comments that are similar, and would be delt with similarly.
				8. (CID 1267 – GEN and CID 1286 – Editor) are similar nature comments.
				9. By changing we match the style guide.
				10. We have a start on this type, but not a complete submission prepared.
				11. CID 1286 has been accepted by the Editor already.
				12. Assign CID 1267, CID 1322, CID 58 are to be assigned to David Hunter.
				13. There may be some more that need to be include, but Mark H. was not sure.
			14. CID 1699
				1. Review comment
				2. Consensus: leave it in.
				3. Proposed resolution: Rejected: There is no rule stating that an item in the bibliography needs to be referenced from more than one place. The change is unnecessary.
			15. CID 1700
				1. Review Comment
				2. Similar issue
				3. Proposed resolution: Rejected: There is no rule stating that an item in the bibliography needs to be referenced from more than one place. The change is unnecessary
			16. CID 1372
				1. Review Comment
				2. .informative annex use of “is recommended” -- is this a veiled should?
				3. Discussion on should we change this or not.
				4. Consensus was not to make the change. The current recommendation is useful informative information.
				5. A Proposed Resolution will be prepared.
	5. Review Agenda for week:
		1. Tues PM1: Start with 13/102; 13/131, 13/293 will be presented by Yaron Alpert.

Comment Resoluion: Alex Ashley and Editor “Review” and “Trivial Technical”Category and 118, 284, 1555, 1556, 1585, 1622.

* + 1. Also change Security topic to Wed PM2.
		2. Add 13/12 and 13/13 to Wednesday PM2
		3. Vinko needs 10 minutes in Wed PM1 for a submission for CID 1394?
		4. “Scope of Editorial Changes” topic add to Tuesday PM2
	1. Recess 3:31pm
1. TG REVmc Tuesday PM1 – 1:30-3:30pm – March 19th 2013
	1. Called to order at 1:32pm by Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba Networks.
	2. Presentation: 11-13/0293r1 – presented by Yaron Alpert, Lantiq
		1. Beacon transmission time
		2. The use of ensure is problematic
			1. Change slide 4 to say “and shall not initiate any other frame exchange prior to the transmission of the Beacon….”
		3. PIFs is SIFs plus one slot …What we are doing it getting rid of one window. VO\_AC seems to be sufficient. And that choosing a different value for time is not reasonable.
		4. You could make a counter with a different value just as you have a random value.
		5. The last sentence should be “AC\_VO” rather than “AP-selected Random number”
		6. There is some comments that could be taken offline and allow a more structured sentence.
		7. Discussion on the beacon jitter and timing of transmission of the beacon.
		8. A useful clarification as proposed, we should be careful to the change.
		9. Beacons tend to be big and slow, so if we delay some amount, the question is how much of a difference is a small delay? Is this small improvement worth the effort.
		10. From a product point of view, we use 4 priories, and in the case where you have multiple APs in a product it gets really problem.
		11. It may not make any difference in reality. The hold up on Beacon is not the priority, but rather by the medium being busy. CWmin of 3 or 7 is not going to make much different in practice. Beacon Jitter is due for the most part from the medium access. Do not think that this change is needed.
		12. Testing on this may need to be shown to justify the change.
		13. The actually scheduling by the AP may show more Jitter, but we would want to model and test for this information.
		14. By having a quicker attempt, we actually may cause things to be worse.
		15. Shall schedule for transmit? What does that mean? This does not mean it is being sent immediately….if we are moving to a point where APs TBTT align and we have saturations
		16. The proposal is on10.1.3.3 and 10.1.3.2, the former is for IBSS, and we need to make sure we align the issues in both places.
		17. Discussion on the benefits of the proposal, and the author suggest some changes to improve the presentation can be done.
		18. Chair suggests that he make correction and come back later in the week.
	3. Comment Resolution:
		1. Editor Review CIDs – 11-13/233r4 see Editor Tab
		2. CID 1568
			1. Review comment
			2. Commenter gave 6 places to make a change.
			3. Editor to review and make a resolution later.
		3. CID 1289
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - Change all "APs shall" to "An AP shall" Change all "STAs shall" to "<article> STA shall" with rewording as necessary to adjust the preceding article and tense of verbs in the sentence, excluding when the STAs are not the subject of the normative statement, or are intentionally plural. Also change "ERP APs and ERP STAs" to "ERP STA" when used in a normative statement.
			3. There are 102 instances where these changes would need to be made. – We reviewed many examples of the changes in context to check the changes. We randomly selected a dozen changes to discuss.
			4. This type of consistent edit is a candidate for documenting in the Style Guide.
			5. 1376.37 in D1.2 has an place where the “Non” should be “non” when the article was added. – NOTE for EDITOR.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1326
			1. Review Comment
			2. Ensure comment
			3. See 1312.46 in D1.0
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised -- Replace cited sentence with: "An initiator STA or peer STA shall not initiate an STSL master key (SMK) Handshake and STSL transient key (STK) Handshake if dot11RSNAActivated is false. An initiator STA or peer STA shall not establish a security association if dot11RSNAActivated is false.(#1326)"
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		5. CID 1352
			1. Review Comment
			2. Another “Ensure” comment.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-14 00:01:25Z) - Replace cited sentence with "The CCA of the DSSS PHY shall indicate(#1352) ..."Make matching change at 1615.03.
			4. These are speculatively edited into D1.2.
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		6. CID 1354
			1. Review Comment
			2. Same issues as last two.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-14 00:03:43Z) - Reword sentence: "Also, in both cases, the CCA of the DSSS PHY shall indicate(#1354) ..."Make matching change at line 47.
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		7. CID 1356
			1. Review comment
			2. Same issue
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-14 00:15:43Z) - Reword cited sentence: "Also, in this case, the CCA of the OFDM PHY shall indicate ..."Make matching change at 1697.32
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	4. Comment Resolution: Trivial Technical
		1. CID 1090
			1. Review Comment – roll in 802.11ad
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
			3. No objection, mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 1142
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
		3. CID 1395
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept
			3. No objection, mark ready for motion.
		4. CID 1393
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept
			3. No objection, mark ready for motion.
		5. CID 1389
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept (even though there is no proposal).
		6. CID 1213
			1. Review Comment
			2. We decided elsewhere that we were not going to do this, so a reject resolution will need to be written.
			3. Need new proposed resolution to be written.
		7. CID 1220
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Replace "frame for those frames that IEEE Std 802.11 reports via a" with "frame that is reported by a".
			3. Question on the next sentence starting with “This MAC” … is that correct? More research could be done, but it is not related to this comment. 107.5 NOT to EDITOR to fix it up.
			4. Question on if a statement of leaving a differentiation of 802.11 vs some other type frame. – Products can indicate different frames, but the standard only defines one set of frames.
			5. No objection, mark ready for motion.
	5. CID 1221
		1. Review the comment
		2. Proposed resolution. Reject – need a proper rejection resolution to be written.
	6. CID 1500
		1. Review comment
		2. See page 173
		3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
		4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	7. CID 1223
		1. Review Comment
		2. See page 181 line 57
		3. Proposed resolution – reject – need reject proposed resolution.
	8. CID 1644
		1. Review Comment
		2. See page 416 line54
		3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		4. No objection – mark ready for motion
	9. CID 1569
		1. Review comment
		2. See page 457 line 22
		3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-08 01:07:01Z) - Reword: "The Mesh Control field is present in a Mesh Data frame containing an unfragmented MSDU or the first fragment of a fragmented MSDU, and is present in a Multihop Action frame transmitted by a mesh STA."
		4. No objection – mark ready for motion
	10. CID 1447
		1. Review Comment
		2. Look at the instances of “TFS subelement”.
		3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-16 14:29:33Z) - Change as specified at lines 24 and 28.Note that other references to TFS subelement are correct, and are references to the specific subelement of that name.
		4. No objection – mark ready for motion
	11. CID 1041
		1. Review Comment
		2. See page 791 line 4
		3. Proposed resolution: Accepted
		4. No Objection – mark ready for motion
	12. CID 1287
		1. Review comment
		2. See page 984 line 33.
		3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-12 00:34:41Z) - Reword the cited sentence thus: "However, because the HC can also grant polled TXOPs, by sending QoS (+)CF-Poll frames, during the CP, the HC might not use the CFP for QoS data transfers."
		4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	13. CID 1133
		1. Review Comment
		2. Page 1022 line 56
		3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
		4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	14. CID 1119
		1. Review Comment
		2. See page 1089.39
		3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
	15. Secretary had to leave the room at this point. – Mark Hamilton takes notes
		1. CID1475:
			1. Agree on the intent to merge a) into the previous sentence and remove the “b) and c)” references, and add an OR between b) and c). But, the resolution needs rewording.
			2. Alex Ashley’s e-mail:
		2. CID1020:
			1. Alex: “The name "group membership" is (IMHO) overly general. There are lots of different types of groups. e.g. .11ac Has MU-MIMO group membership."
			2. "Replace all unadorned use of this term by .11aa with "GCR Group Membership".
			3. The proposed change does not work because the group membership management feature is used to learn the contents of the dot11GroupAddressesTable of associated STAs. This table existed prior to 11aa and its use is independent from the use of GCR. I agree that the term "group membership" is overly general and we need a new term, but "GCR group membership" ain't it.
			4. Looking at the description of dot11GroupAddressesTable it says "A conceptual table containing a set of MAC addresses identifying the multicast-group addresses for which this STA receives frames.". Would something like "Group addressed reception management" work as a replacement for "Group membership management" ?
			5. Response: Investigated how Group Membership Request/Response/Report works. Ah hah – there is no “Group Membership Report” frame. Considered changing this entire facility, including frame names, from “group membership” to “group addressed reception”. Then, reconsidered, that perhaps there is nothing wrong with “GCR group membership [membership]” after all. We need to investigate the concern Alex raised.
	16. Recessed: 3:30pm
2. TG REVmc Called to order at 4:06pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	1. Comment Resolution: Alex Ashley comments continued
		1. CID 1020 (continued)
			1. We are in danger of making things even more confusing with any changes; “group membership” is not overly general, yet. This might be an issue when we roll in 11ac, but we can wait until than and see. Suggestion of using “group address membership” instead. Note that clause 10 already calls this “GCR group membership procedures”, so we are really talking about what to say in clause 6, only. Could just change the heading 6.3.89. Maybe want to change the phrase “group membership” in two places in the first sentence, too. Consensus: just add “GCR” to the beginning of the subclause title.
			2. Proposal to reject Alex proposal and take the commenter proposed change
			3. Some discussion on not making a change.
			4. Proposed Resolution; REVISED (GEN: 2013-03-19 20:19:30Z) insert the term "GCR" at the beginning of title at 6.3.89 (p390.51 - D1.0).
			5. No objection –mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1025
			1. Review comment
			2. Confusion on what the comment is noting as an error
			3. Discussion on different ways to make the sentence say the same thing, but clearer. Mark to revise the proposed resolution.
		3. CID 1042
			1. Review comment
			2. Page 822 line 20
			3. Convert the DELBA GCR Group Address should be the GCR Group Address Element.
			4. Note 822 line 30 should really say “DELBA Parameter Set Field” NOTE TO EDITOR
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised – Change 822.34 to “The DELBA GCR Group Address field is defined in 8.4.2.125 (GCR Group Address element)”
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1044
			1. Review comment
			2. Suggestion from Alex Ashley’s E-mail: ""The Public Key field contains the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame and is defined in 8.4.1.39 (Scalar field)". I beg to differ. The cited location does not contain the definition of a Public Key field."

Yes, it really does contain the definition of the \_format\_ of the key. The public key is made up of the group ID and the scalar value.

Suggest changing "The Public Key field contains the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame and is defined in 8.4.1.39" to "The Public Key field contains the scalar value of the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame and is defined in 8.4.1.39"

* + - 1. As this may be related to some of the Security discussion, let’s put aside until we are working on Security.

Change the final sentence to” "The Public Key field contains the scalar value of the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame as defined in 8.4.1.39"

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-19 20:46:02Z) Change "The Public Key field contains the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame and is defined in 8.4.1.39 (Scalar field)"

to

"The Public Key field contains the scalar value of the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame as defined in 8.4.1.39 (Scalar field)"

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		1. CID 1052
			1. Review comment
			2. Suggestion from Alex Ashley:

<bad grammar around 11aa addition>

Suggest changing "In the absence of a PCF or use of the group addressed transmission service (GATS), when group addressed MPDUs in which the To DS field is 0 are transferred from a STA, only the basic access procedure shall be used." to "When group addressed MPDUs in which the To DS field is 0 are transferred from a STA only the basic access procedure shall be used, unless these MPDUs are delivered using PCF or the group addressed transmission service (GATS)."

* + - 1. “Transmitted by” is better than “transferred”
			2. More word-smithing was done to make the sentence better.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-19 20:53:39Z) Change

"In the absence of a PCF or use of the group addressed transmission service (GATS), when group addressed MPDUs in which the To DS field is 0 are transferred from a STA, only the basic access procedure shall be used."

to

"When a STA transmits group addressed MPDUs in which the To DS field is 0, the STA shall use the basic access procedure, unless these MPDUs are delivered using PCF or using the group addressed transmission service (GATS)."

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID1053:
			1. Review Comment
			2. Suggested Change from Alex Ashley:

<GCR-SP delivery>

I think the 11aa additions can be removed. For legacy reasons, the group addressed frames are still buffered when PS mode is active. A STA using GCR-SP will get concealed versions of the group addressed MSDUs on a different schedule to DTIM. Therefore there is no need to put in the wriggle text "except when using GCR-SP" because the PS schedule still applies.

* + - 1. Discussion on the proposed text
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-19 20:59:40Z) Change "If there are buffered group addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs that are not being delivered using the GCR-SP delivery method" to "If there are non-GCR-SP buffered group addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs"
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1060
			1. Review comment.
			2. Suggestion from Alex Ashley:

CID1060: "is responsible for" in a note sounds like a requirement.

It is not a requirement, it is a warning to AP implementers to watch out for an ambiguity in the block ack bitmap. It's not perfect, but how about changing "The originator is responsible for recognizing that these bit positions apply to MPDUs irrelevant to the STA and for not spuriously retrying MPDUs." to "These bit positions apply to MPDUs irrelevant to the originating STA and it is recommended that the STA avoid spuriously these retrying MPDUs."

* + - 1. Discussion on possible changes
			2. The purpose of this note is a warning. So we need to clarify the note.
			3. Propose to take the full “Note 2” and promote it into the mainline text.
			4. Remove the spuriously from the sentence.
			5. More Word-Smithing on the proposed resulting paragraph.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-19 21:18:37Z)
			7. Promote Note 2 to normal text, and reword to: ”If an originator accepts two or more GCR agreements with multiple STAs where the GCR agreements have the same Ethernet classifiers, but different additional classifiers, then each STA receives multiple GCR flows from the originator and sends them to upper layers where the MSDUs irrelevant to the STA are discarded, in the same manner that non-GCR MSDUs irrelevant to the STA are discarded. In the Block Ack bitmap sent to the originator, each STA sets bits corresponding to MPDUs received from any of the multiple GCR streams. The originator should not retry MPDUs to the STA for the bit positions that are irrelevant to that STA.
		1. CID 1065:
			1. Review comment
			2. From Alex Ashley’s E-mail: CID1065: "There is no such beast as an "ADDTS Reserve Request action frames""

Yes there is. It is defined in 8.5.3.7

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2013-03-19 21:21:46Z). Yes, there is. See 8.5.3.7.
			2. No objection – Move to Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1074
			1. Review Comment
			2. From Alex Ashley’s E-Mail: CID1074:

"Need to define the notation <0>32 here, or reference where it is defined"

Agree with proposed resolution. It is supposed to indicate 32 octets, where each octet contains the value zero.

* + - 1. Searching with regular expression finds that there are few “<0>”
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-19 21:27:16Z) Add a 'where,' saying, "where <0>32 denotes thirty-two (32) octets of the value zero (0)"
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		1. CID 1075
			1. Review Comment
			2. From Alex Ashley E-mail: CID1075:

"Need to define Max and Min for addresses, perhaps by reference to where this function is defined."

Min and max are already used in the spec for addresses. For example in 11.3.4.2.2. We need to make sure they use the same rules.

* + - 1. This may be a comment for further discussion with Security group.
			2. How to convert an address to an integer and then do the comparison is a possible source of error.
			3. See page 1486 line 32 has the definition for MIN and MAX operations that could be used for a starting point.
			4. We need to make sure that those that have implemented this have chosen the same way that we would be documented.
			5. Action item: Mark to contact Dan and bring back a proposal for the resolution (along with 1044).
	1. Editorial Scope
		1. During the checking of the 11ad roll-in, there were identified what one of the reviewers viewed as defects, and the Editor felt was a rational adjustment in the roll-in process.
		2. The discussion was should the roll-in be put in without any editorial adjustments, or should editorial changes be ok to apply during the roll-in process.
		3. Review Table 12-31 for an example of changes that were made to keep the changes to match the changes that were made before the roll-in was made. The Characteristics were in 802.11-2012, but in 802.11REVmc 1.0, they were not, now that we are adding in 11ad, we find that a change was required to make it roll-in.
		4. Editor Notes are applied when the roll-in is not precisely what was in the amendment being rolled-in in accommodating the editorial change.
		5. In this example “aRxRFDelay” was removed from the table, but now it is undefined in many equations now that need to be updated.
		6. If the Editor Note had highlighted the deleted parameter it may have helped in the review process.
		7. NOTE TO EDITOR aRxRFDelay is a dangling parameter that is missing definition elsewhere in the document.
	2. Recess at 5:52pm

1. TG REVmc Wednesday PM1 called to order at 1:34pm by Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba Networks – March 20, 2013.
	1. Review Agenda:
		1. We do not have the motions ready for today, put off for tomorrow.
		2. Vinko is not here, so move to MAC comments.
	2. Comment Resolution:
		1. CID 118
			1. Review Comment
			2. CID 79 is the same issue.
				1. This has been implemented
			3. So this is a really duplicate comment.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Duplicate of CID 79
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 1044
			1. We discussed this a bit earlier this week.
			2. Public Key Field issue – definition citation is not correct.
			3. Alternative suggestion: “The Public Key field contains the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame encoded as an octet string according to 11.3.7.2.5 (Octet string to element conversion).
			4. No objection with the new text.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-20 17:46:06Z) -
			6. Change "The Public Key field contains the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame and is defined in 8.4.1.39 (Scalar field)" to "The Public Key field contains the public key of the AP that is sending this Public Key frame encoded as an octet string according to 11.3.7.2.5 (Octet string to element conversion)."
			7. No objection – mark ready for motion
		3. CID 1555
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject – There is no prohibition against this behaviour, no change is required.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1556
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the way to implement
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2013-03-20 17:50:58Z)

Per 9.12.1: "When an A-MPDU contains multiple QoS Control fields, bits 4 and 8–15 of these QoS Control fields shall be identical." EOSP is bit 4. So, all MPDUs of an A-MPDU have the same EOSP setting.

Per a note in 10.2.2.6.j: "NOTE—An AP that transmits an A-MPDU containing Data MPDUs in which the EOSP field is set to 1 and that receives a BlockAck frame that does not acknowledge all of those MPDUs cannot transmit any missed Data MPDUs within the current service period because the destination STA might now be asleep." This acknowledges that the result of the rule in 9.12.1 is that a non-AP STA may get only some of the MPDUs within an A-MPDU, but it will (might?) go to sleep, nonetheless.

This is clear, and nothing further is needed.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1585
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1622
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject - REJECTED (MAC: 2013-03-20 17:58:43Z) The Standard does not reserve the Retry field for 11e Block Ack.

9.19.2.6.1 does say, "All retransmission attempts for an MPDU that is not sent under a Block Ack agreement and that has failed the acknowledgment procedure one or more times shall be made with the Retry field set to 1 in the data or Management frame." But, this doesn't preclude setting the field to 1 under a Block Ack agreement.

Further, 9.21.3 says, "The originator need not set the retry bit to 1 for any possible retransmissions of the MPDUs." This implies it can be set either way.

There seems to be no further direct discussion of the Retry field in any other optimized Block Ack or TXOP operations. In fact, 11n Block Ack, as well as other scenarios, all discuss indirectly that retried frames can be sent, without any mention of special behavior with the Retry field. Thus, it seems retry behavior (including setting of this field) is orthogonal to these modes of operation.

No change is needed.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1429
			1. Review Comment
			2. Looking at a sample it seemed reasonable
			3. “The Length field is 6” is an example of what is being suggested to delete.
			4. The definition of the Length is consistent and only needed to be in one place, but is left in several different subfield descriptions.
			5. Delete the Length column in table 8-55. – agreed to delete
			6. Look at 8.4.2.12 – did not see any problem.
			7. The list will need to be checked to ensure it is correct.
			8. Length Fields in Tables can be deleted
			9. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-20 18:10:32Z) Make changes as specified, excluding any locations where statements are required to cover any additional semantics.
			10. No objection – mark ready for motion
			11. This is also something that is included in the Editor’s guidelines.
		2. CID 1456
			1. Review comment
			2. Not able to find a claim of 252 near 8-310
			3. Remove the length column in Table 8-144 should fix the perceived problem.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-20 18:19:21Z)

Delete the length column from Table 8-144. Note, also covered in resolution to CID 1429.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1628
			1. Review comment
			2. This is another example of bad stuff –
			3. Submission required --making a rewrite of 9.7. This would be best done after 11ac is rolled-in and so it would make sense to wait to tackle this after the roll-in.
			4. Add to Adhoc notes: This should be done after the 11ac roll-in.
			5. Assign to Jon – who will not be able to see what the text will be after the roll-in before the next letter ballot.
			6. Comment tutorial is doc 13/230r0
			7. Proposed resolution: The comment does not indentify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			8. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID1602
			1. Review comment
			2. See page 985 line 43
			3. Change “clear” to “IDLE
			4. See page 1611 line 63 – Clear channel when idle is described.
			5. AI – Mark to go craft a proposed resolution.
	1. Submission from Vinko – 11-13/348r0
		1. CID 1394
			1. Review submission.
			2. EVM calculation is in two places, and we only fixed one place before.
			3. Page 1655 was not corrected before
			4. The plan is to make both equations the same, and then address any possible error in both of the equations at one time (CID 1082 and 1083 has the possible issue that will be discussed during the May Interim.)
			5. Proposed resolution: Revise – accept the text in doc 11-13/348r0.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 224:
			1. Review the comment.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2013-03-20 18:44:47Z) The commenter does not adequately indicate the issue, or propose specific changes that can be considered.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 284
			1. Review comment
			2. This was assigned to Matthew Fischer last January, he will follow-up.
		4. CID 1075
			1. We have come to nearly a complete answer. – need more discussion.
			2. The intention is to compare the Address by octet by octet, and compare as unsigned integer as you process. But we have not specified the bit order within the octet.
			3. While it works now, it has not always necessarily worked in the past or the future.
			4. Currently : MAC addresses are assigned as ordered sequences of bits. The Individual/Group bit is always transferred first and is bit 0 of the first octet. For transmission purposes, this is fine (and what we all do, of course). But note that the I/G bi is what is generally considered the least significant bit in normal use….
			5. So the proposal is to convert the address to a 48 bit integer and then do the compare.
			6. So the conversion is the issue that we need to understand.
			7. Big-indian vs little-indian are common terminology for describing integers.
			8. There are interoperable devices that use SAE and there are RSN implementations that use this, so we need to check that the description does not break the implantations.
			9. AI: Mark H. to check with Jouni about the proposed resolution.
			10. The proposal will be to put something in 8.2.2 conventions to put in one place what we do.
			11. The Partial AID in 11ac is another place that has functions operating on the MAC address, so we should be using the same algorithm/description.
		5. CID 284
			1. All the cited references are talking about the starting sequence in BA or BAR, but the comment is talking about the ADDBA
			2. See 9.21.4 – Receive buffer operation.
				1. The next expected sequence number being set to 0 is not correct. So there should be a statement to fix both the Rx left edge and Tx right edge
			3. Need a statement somewhere for the TX side, 9.21.2?
			4. AI: Matthew Fischer is reassigned again to provide resolution.
		6. CID 1194
			1. Review comment
			2. PSMP mechanism is specific to a service period.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-03-20 19:06:51Z) Replace the current defintion: "power save multi-poll (PSMP) session: The periodic generation of a PSMP burst aligned to its service period (SP)." with: "power save multi-poll (PSMP) session: The relationship between an AP and one or more STAs that exists while any TS exists that uses the PSMP mechanism with the same service period."
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		7. CID 1477
			1. Review comment
			2. Check the PICS for TDLS.
			3. CF18 is TDLS
			4. So the PICS does not connect QoS and TDLS.
			5. CF12 is QoS – we did not find it tied to TDLS.
			6. W could make it mandatory in the future (match testing and compatibility testing)
			7. We do not have a statement that makes QoS mandatory, we may want to put that in.
			8. Go to page 1225 last paragraph – The MAC service lets you specify U
			9. Go to page 1227.16 EDCA is not essential but you can use QoS.
			10. We could have another statement that says if you have two stations that support this, then they would need to use it. – Strong indicator but not definitive.
			11. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2013-03-20 19:14:55Z) There is no requirement in the Standard for QoS support in order to use TDLS (cf P1227.16).

However, TDLS Peer U-APSD mode requires dot11TDLSPeerUAPSDBufferSTAActivated to be true, which is signaled and 'negotiated.'

In discussing this MIB attribute, 10.2.2.15.1 says, "Support for the TDLS Peer U-APSD Buffer STA function means that the STA has the capability to buffer Bus destined to the TPU sleep STA, and to deliver them during unscheduled service periods." While this doesn't directly say QoS must be supported, it is clear from the context.

Nothing needs to be done.

* + 1. CID 1526
			1. Review comment
			2. While we could fix this issue up now, it would not cause harm to the work that will be done in 9.7 in the future.
			3. From the Adhoc notes: In contexts like the frame formats, it is correct, and references two different information element types (Supported Rates and Extended Supported Rates).The MLME interface talks about basic rate set and operational rate set. 8.4.3.3 and 8.4.3.12 discuss the mapping between the two concepts (with some additional information in 10.1.4.6 and 10.1.7).9.7 uses the term "supported rate set" rather loosely, and should probably be clarified to be something like "the rates supported by a/the STA" which is a reasonable English phrasology equivalent for all this, and is used in clauses 6 and 8. (See 1136.54 for a good example, and 1135.47 for a bad example.)Nothing to do, except the clean up in 9.7. Do as part of the 9.7 update?
			4. There are only 5 instances that will need to be address.
			5. Comment assigned to Mark RISON
		2. CID 1552
			1. Review comment.
			2. EAPOL-Key frame is probably meant to be identified.
			3. From the Adhoc Notes: MAC: 2013-03-17 18:51:01Z - Yes, this appears to mean EAPOL-Key frame. While changing it, it would be good to add something describing the parameter list shown for the operation, also. Presumably that maps to the fields shown in 11.6.2, although the mapping to those fields is enigmatic. That should be clarified. And, the uses in the 11.6 Figures are not consisent in their parameter sets, adding to the confusion.EDITOR: 2013-03-07 15:56:05Z - Asking for a technical interpretation. Transferring to MAC.
			4. Submission needed. – Assigned to Dan Harkins/Jouni
	1. Recess at 3:30pm
1. TG REVmc Wednesday PM2 called to order by Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba Networks at 4pm March 20, 2013
	1. Agenda: Security Comments
	2. Submission from Dan HARKINS – 11-13/342r0
		1. Review the comments in the spreadsheet, there is a submission with the proposed changes to the draft.
			1. Submission 11-13/0332r0
				1. There are some minor spelling errors noted
				2. An r1 will be submitted.
		2. CID 1095
			1. Review the comment
			2. Look at the proposed text change in 11-13/0332/r1 with the spelling errors corrected.
		3. CID 1328
			1. Review the comment
			2. Look the proposed text change in 11-13/0032r1
		4. CID 1109
			1. Review the comment
			2. There is a thought that a new PN when concealment is needed when retransmitted using GCR. Why?
			3. Discussion lead to the idea that a more wider audience was needed – Discuss on the reflector this topic.
			4. Discuss on the reflector: Why is there a different MPDU? Concealment should be done pretty far up the stack, before CCMP processing….
			5. The AMSDU has the concealed MPDU.
			6. Why is this any different from any other retransmission?
			7. If you transmit it, you should preserve the PN and the structure, so you don’t have to rebuild it.
			8. When you retransmit it, you have to rebuild it.
			9. GCR has its own retransmission rules.
			10. Need more discussion.
		5. CID 1108
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on how to have multiple queues that feed one AC.
			3. Look at Table 9-1 UP to AC mappings
			4. The different Queues do not have different TIDs, or at least that was the thought.
			5. See page 974 – figure 9-20. – where do retries sit in the queue?
			6. Brian was happy to have them sit in the bottom four boxes.
			7. We need text to direct the retry to be in those four boxes.
			8. Discussion on when the PN is preserved while retransmitting.
			9. Suggestion: Proposal to go with the suggested decline
			10. Proposed Resolution: decline 9.2.4.2 d) says that the STA sends multiple frames within the same AC. Not sure….
			11. Change resolution.
			12. New Proposed Resolution: decline – Agreed that there are only 4 EDCAF and reordering of CCMP – protected frames is not possible.
			13. There are 3 bits used for the priority queues.
			14. More discussion that was fast and furious about the possibility of how to interpret figure 9-20 and the history of how it was created.
			15. Lot of discussion with one proposal for a rejection, and then we had more discussion on the fact that there are only 4 queues.
		6. CID 1071
			1. Review Comment
			2. Change “do not use” to “are not afforded”
			3. This came in with 11ae.
			4. Suggest swap with “that are outside the…”{
			5. Change the second “use” to “were sent using”
			6. How do you determine when a packet was sent with the QMF?
			7. See 8.4.2.119
			8. Sequence numbering QMF is
			9. See table 8-3 – Management frame description
			10. Replace “use the QMF service” with “are received with the To DS field equal to 1”
			11. Replace “do not use the QMF service” with are received with the To DS field equal to 0.”
			12. Proposed resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1/
		7. CID 1331
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1
		8. CID 1097/1098
			1. Review comment
			2. Make a change to the 11.5.1.1.12 – missing an article “An” in the last sentence. Need or
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1.
		9. CID 1073
			1. Review comment
			2. Remove the Note was determined good.
			3. Proposed resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1
		10. CID 1332
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed to decline.
			3. Proposed Resolution:
		11. CID 1333
			1. Review Comment
			2. MUI tells you what the handshake is.(Message Unique Identifier)
			3. We know the values, but how and where is it used?
			4. It is defined and described in this location.
			5. We do not have a description of the field itself. We should add the description.
			6. We do not say when we fill it in, or when to use it or why.
			7. Need a more detail resolution and it would be something similar to the 4-way PTK Handshake…that would be complicated.
			8. But it is only used SMK, so maybe we only need to explain it from that perspective.
			9. Why did we define the values in Big-Endian order?
			10. See 11.6.2
			11. The type field is being defined here, and in a network order for a network function.
			12. This appears in 11.6.8.5.1 it is an SMK error type?
				1. If this is only for SMK handshake, why define it for all the other types?
			13. Suggestion of to just delete the MUI?
			14. This is a handshake type.
			15. More discussion on what the MUI is or is not.
			16. Go to page 1404 line 36. – The Error is used, but not the MUI?
			17. We could remove Table 11-7, and mark reserved the uses of MUI.
			18. From page 1404, Key Data is Error KDE….which is a different table.
			19. Table 11-7 is never used.
			20. Could the resolution be to delete Table 11-7, and to make the MUI field in Figure 11-37? Yes.
			21. Make change to 11-13-342r1 to do remove the table and to mark MUI as reserved in Figure 11-37. Include instruction to delete all reference to MUI.
			22. Proposed Resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1.
		12. CID 1168
			1. Review comment
			2. Propose Resolution; decline 11.6.7 discusses the group key handshake and is not a generic section on updating the GTK/IGTK.
		13. CID 1337
			1. Review comment
			2. See page 1443 line 31 – Is this related to the MLME and if the RX/TX is proper called out for this section.
			3. Propose Resolution: Decline it is correct in 6.3.24.1.2 and is correct here
		14. CID 1074
			1. Review comment – Again We
			2. This is not really an accept as we are not making a change in 1.5
			3. Proposed Resolution – this was prepared before.
			4. We need to identify which changes go with which CID…Dan to include that in the r1 as well, but we will remove the text for this CID.
		15. CID 1075
			1. Review Comment.
			2. We have a problem with whether it is Little-Endian or Big-Indian.
			3. The convention used must not break implementations.
			4. This comment will be removed from 11-13/0342r1
		16. CID 1092
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1.
		17. CID 1093
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1.
		18. CID 1094
			1. Proposed Resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1.
		19. CID 1096
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revise – make changes as noted in 11-13/0342r1.
		20. These were all the ones that were marked as Security and Mesh
			1. The remaining open ones is 1075 MAC address compare and 1109 which is a PN question.
	3. Final time better to use either on Graham’s submission or more MAC Comment resolution.
		1. Graham would like to present on PM1 tomorrow.
	4. MAC Comment Resolution
		1. CID 128
			1. Submission 11-13/293r3 by Yaron Alpert
			2. A new proposed solution was put in this new revision.
			3. Proposed Solution: Modify the text in 10.1.3.2 as follows:

At each TBTT, the AP shall schedule a Beacon frame as the next transmission. At each TBTT the AP should suspend the decrementing of the backoff timer for any pending non-beacon transmission and transmit the Beacon according to the medium access rules specified in Clause 9.

Modify the text in “10.1.3.3 Beacon generation in an IBSS” as follows:

c) Wait for the period of the random delay, decrementing the random delay timer using the same algorithm as for backoff, except that PIFS should be used as the medium idle period before the backoff procedure is invoked

* + - 1. Revision 4 will be uploaded with the minor text changes.
			2. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changed as noted in 11-13/293r4.
			3. Question should we update the list of what the PIFS is used for?
				1. See page 928 9.3.2.3.4
				2. This section says you may be used, but shall not be used otherwise.
				3. Should the “may be” be changed to “is”?
				4. The use of PIFs shall not be used when not listed.
			4. The concept of this resolution is that you wait a PIFS and then you do your back-off so it would be at least a PIFS
			5. So is the idea hear to give the Beacon a bit of priority over other packets
				1. The formal definition is that he Beacon has to have some priority, and so the original text, but when we put in some improvements in AE, we put in some AC\_VO and we have some correction that we have to add.
			6. Discussion on how to address the way that the Beacon is getting priority access.

Implementations tend to give priorities to the Beacon, but there is nothing in the standard to say it should be done.

* + - 1. The Medium IDLE period is thought to be part of the backoff procedure.
				1. Suggested change “before” with “within” and delete “is invoked”.
			2. The discussion is that this is what is really being done now, but not put in the standard to allow devices to be more correctly compliant.
			3. The Beacon is not critical, so why is this so time critical.
			4. The proposed solution will need to put in the PIFS list another entry that allows it to be used. But really what may be better to list is the use of AIFSN.
			5. So Yaron will work on updated resolution text/proposal.
	1. Recessed at 6pm.
1. TG REVmc called to order at 1:30 by Mark HAMILTON, Spectralink, TGmc Vice Chair March 21, 2013 PM1.
	1. Reminder for attendance and Patent Policy
	2. Agenda: Motions and then back to Comment Review Graham to be at 2:30
	3. Motion 23
		1. Approve Comment resolutions to comments in 11-13/0233r6 in the “Ready for Motion-Review” and “Ready for Motion – Editorials Tab”.
		2. Moved Adrian STEPHENS, 2nd Stephen McCann
		3. Results: -- 6-0-1 motion passed
	4. Motion 24
		1. Approve comment resolutions to comments in 11-13/0361r1 in Motion MAC-F and Motion MAC-G Tabs
		2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON 2nd Stephen McCANN
		3. Results: -- 9-0-0 – Motion Passes
	5. Comment Resolution: Editor-Review comments.
		1. We have approved 276 Editorial, 33 Editor Tech and 33 MAC comments.
		2. CID 1119
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised make change as indicated and rename arrows as follows: min+probe\_respnse\_time -> MinChannelTime and max-probe\_response\_time -> MaxChannelTime.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 1595
			1. Review comment
			2. Concern that we should not change PHY frame to PPDU, or where the generic use of Frame should not be used.
			3. Discussion on the use of frame vs symbol and an example shown proved the need to change to use symbol consistently.
			4. Look at d1.2 and look for CID tag 1595, and you see the size of the change is 168 instances.
			5. In table 16-1, it shows “first frame energy” vs “first PPDU energy” is the substitution, but it could be that this could be symbol, but that is a discussion for later.
			6. Reviewed several random changes.
			7. Where is PPDU defined as a frame?
			8. Look for MAC Protocol Data Unit.
		4. Is the use of Symbol an 11n only thing?
			1. No it is a general PHY item.
		5. PPDU is used in PHY clauses extensively.
		6. The global change of frame to symbol may not be completely doable.
			1. The Comment said PHY Frame, but we have not listed all the generic “PHY Frame” instances. It is not ambiguous to use the generic term frame.
		7. Concern on the iterations of change in a global application of the change.
			1. In some cases the word symbol as shown would be better than frame.
		8. Consensus was that in 18.3.2.5 we were happy with the change of “frame” to “symbol”
		9. There was a lot of discussion on how extensive frame vs PPDU is used.
		10. Making the change, we can get a discussion on when it is possibly not correct.
		11. There are cases where it is proper, but what of the cases where it might not be?
			1. What about PHY Frame?
			2. All instances were changed.
		12. These changes were incorporated in D1.2 as a speculative edit. The Chair suggested that if you are concerned with how this would be implemented, please search for “#1595” and report concerns for discussion on a conference call and if no issues are noted, we will motion it during the Interim.
		13. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2013-03-11 14:52:24Z) - Replace all "frame" in the PHY clause with "PPDU" where it relates to the on-the-air PHY packet/frame/structure. Also check affected definitions (RCPI ...).

Also change "PHY frame" to "PPDU"

Also change "PPDU frame" to "PPDU"

At 1668.09, change "frame" to "symbol"

* + 1. While there was some objection, the idea is that this will be marked ready for motion, but will not be motioned until the interim. So we have until then to determine there are any issues that need to be revisited.
	1. Presentation of Submission for 11-13/360r0
		1. Review the proposal
		2. Approximately half of 9.7 is put into the tables
		3. The logic of what we have is reflected, and in many cases it is very bizarre, and that is only going to be worse.
		4. The way forward would be to wait for 11ac to roll in and then complete the tables and the edits to the clause.
		5. What about waiting for af or ah? There would be an need to control the data tables.
			1. This is very good to show the silliness and show the gaps that we have.
			2. This information is good for information, but maybe not be the right thing for the standard.
		6. Lots of kudos for showing what is in the standard. How can you embed this in the spec? Once we use this to measure the gap, then we need to find ways to fix-up the errors found. If it is an annex then it may be out of sync with the normative text, and if it is then how to resolve the inconsistencies.
		7. Also Volunteer to assist was given by Yaron.
		8. Use of the tables is good for identifying the Gap, and we need to get it sooner than later.
		9. We would not put this table in as an informative annex, but its value is only if it was the spec, but the nomenclature or format is a debatable thing to take up later.
		10. Concern that we be careful of how to handle the exceptions and how to add new things to the table – the pseudo code may be a good thing.
		11. This shows how amazingly convoluted it has become, as it should be simpler than this. But as we go forward we would like to see it be a simpler view.
		12. There is a concern that this new way of describing this clause as a normative way.
	2. Presentation of Submission for 11-13/12r0
		1. Look at Annex N – Admission Control
		2. This submission is in response to 6 CIDs.
		3. “do not care” = DC – only used in Annex N – look to replace this with optional.
		4. Some of the headings to the table may need some minor editoring
		5. Summary from Slide 14:

If encouraging aggregation then the TSPEC for EDCA Admission Control should include value for Max Service Interval

Nom MSDUs per max SI
 = Mean Data Rate/(Nom MSDU x 8) x max SI

Invalid TSPEC if Nom MSDUs per Max SI <1

Amount of A-MPDU = INT (Nom MSDUs per Max SI)

All this, of course, similarly applies to HCCA TSPEC.

* + 1. Question on where did Bandwidth and SNR come into play?
			1. This is a medium access time that is based on the PHY rate, MSDU processing time and aggregation effected, and that gives the time that you are needing to transmit on the medium.
		2. Packet Error rate is a collision component that is not included here.
		3. The overhead factor (EDCA Overhead factor) that takes into account the competing overhead that is added to by using multiple video channels for example.
		4. Discussion on other parameters that may or may not be included in the calculations of SBA.
		5. The calculation is based on a set of assumptions and parameters and we do not need to try to include other things.
		6. Switch to the text – 11-13/13r0
			1. Removed the DC – do not care from the text.
			2. Text for “Deriving Medium time” was provided by Mark RISON, and there was a lot of review on that text.
			3. Discussion on way to get the standard deviation.
			4. Computation adjustments may cause an incompatibility.
			5. The corrections should take care of the 11n for TXTime or what ever it is called, but we will need to be careful to watch how this is adopted and changed. The items in the tables are not used, because non of the tables information is used in testing, but the new text reflects how interop events have tested things.
			6. The real changes are to clear up the table values and clear up the SBA definitions and make them closer match the real world uses. Then the text from Mark RISON on how to calculate the Medium Time and then the maximum Service Interval that can be used.
		7. We have comments related to this submission, but no motion this week, but we can revise this submission and consider it as the resolution to a number of comments in May.
		8. CIDs related to this submission 1112/1113/1114/1115/1116/1117
		9. Not sure what optional means as apposed to DC…These values must be set, but what it needs to be set to something, so unspecified or a zero, but it is not sufficient to say optional.
		10. Nominal SI to control EDCA – the non-AP STA controls
			1. Is the AP expected to aggregate more often?
			2. The station knows the Video, and he tells the AP what aggregation level is really necessary for the specific video. The non-AP STA tells the AP the aggregation level.
		11. Question on SBA being per service interface?
			1. Discussion on the allocation of the SBA and how to get a number value.
		12. SBA Work is a bit of math detail that may or may not be worth fixing.
			1. Other than the fact that the math is in some cases just wrong, or does the results come out to be fairly steady and nominally.
			2. The limit is 1.111, but it could be smaller.
			3. If you have a low bit rate, then you need a higher SBA, and the formula was trying to show that in the graph and therefore the formula would still be of value.
		13. TSPEC has some zeros that are not undefined and some are more important, and in one case it should be a 1, or stated as a “non-zero” where a zero would be meaningful.
	1. Look at what to do next time
		1. CID 32 revisit the resolution from a conference call.
		2. Then continue with MAC discussion
		3. And then do a single motion on GEN motion.
	2. Recess 3:30pm
1. TG REVmc called to order by Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba at 4:04pm PM2 March 21
	1. Reminder of Attendance recording
	2. Review Agenda:
		1. Comment CID 32 revisited
		2. MAC comment
		3. GEN comment Motion may or may not have
		4. Plans for May Interim, AOB
	3. CID 32 Revisited
		1. Review the comment and the approved resolution (Jan 2013- Motion 5)
		2. Discussion on the pros and cons for how rates are selected.
		3. If we allow 11b devices to be protected are we enabling the lifetime of things.
		4. Generally the TGm deprecates the obsolete features.
			1. The request is to deprecate clause 16 and 17.
			2. There was not consensus during this discussion.
		5. If we deprecate protection for 11b, then they may behave badly.
		6. There may be reasons for keeping protection.
		7. How should we deprecate if we do decide we would need a plan
			1. We would need to require 6-12-24 rates.
			2. We cannot remove the clauses as some devices do use the protection, and if we had a device that did not have this protection described in the spec, then the new device would not be able to decode the packet stream.
			3. We want to put in some constraint, but the idea of 6-12-24 seems right.
			4. Support of the proposal that 5.5/11 be deprecated supported rates.
			5. There is minimal benefit to 1-2 for rates for both LOS and non-LOS.
				1. Lower power settings problems seem to be mitigated and even solved by eliminating 1-2
			6. We don’t want to get into talking about implementation details, but we can talk about deprecating something, and then a future revision remove it.
			7. Slow to deprecate is a good thing.
			8. An analogy to TKIP would be to do the same for 11b rates and then we can convert the deprecated to a shall
			9. There is a legitimate question that we migrate beacons and probe response etc could move from 1Mbps to 6Mbps.
			10. We have lots of folks that say we need 11b because”..” but we should look at the analysis of what the performance effects of 11b is doing to us.
				1. We would want to have the larger forum to look at the proposal.
		8. There is at least one organization that purchases 11b chips and then disables the 5.5 and 11 operation to reduce the battery requirements.
			1. This is one example that we are possibly causing an issue with a part of an industry vertical.
		9. We are not going to make a decision today, but we will want to raise this on an ongoing discussion.
		10. We have had discussion on changes of this magnitude before, and the consensus was that we would not make that level of a change in a maintenance project.(self policing).
		11. The CID was closed in January by motion #5,and so this topic could be addressed with agenda time for topics not covered by a CID.
	4. MAC Comment Resolution
		1. CID 128
			1. Review Comment again – See 11-13/293r4
			2. Question for DCF rather than ECF
			3. The only thing you could say is SIFS+1 back-off
			4. Discussion on the terms used and why PIFS are not.
			5. The idea is that this is not really a PIFS + Back-off.
			6. The section on what is allowed for PIFS deals with use of PIFS only, and in this case we have PIFS plus another terms
			7. In some cases of the list of allowed uses of PIFS, does it not also list cases that are a PIFS minimum and then some, then this would be similar to this case.
			8. There was still some discussion on the use of PIFS.
			9. The discussion seems that r4 plus edit would be acceptable.
			10. The addition is changing to use SIFS + aSlotTime from AIFSN=1.
			11. No objection to the proposed to incorporate the r5 version and we can have additional discussion on the use of PIFS or not separately.
			12. Proposed Resolution: Revised make the changes as described in 11-13/293r5.
			13. No objection mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 86
			1. Review comment
			2. The problem would be the legacy/compatibility issue and if we change the wording but does not make a change, do we need to do this?
			3. The change would make the standard clear, and sane, but if they were doing some of these it would be more of an “odd” implementation and outside the nominative way of implementation.
			4. A submission would probably need to be done to resolve this comment. It was thought that the submission should address the issue of compatibility as well.
		3. CID 284
			1. Review comment
			2. Presentation from Matthew Fischer – 11-13/381r1
			3. Discussion of the changes
			4. Is there a backward compatibility issue on this?
				1. If there is, those are not changing, but if they are probably not sending anything other than zero.
				2. This sentence was added in 2011.
			5. Proposed resolution: Revise – Incorporate the changes as described in 11-13/381r1.
			6. No objection – Mark ready for motion.
		4. CID 1668
			1. Review the comment
			2. Moving some definition to 8.2.2 and fixing “QoS Data frame” to be QoS Data Frame”
			3. Ok for direction will need resolution to be provided.
		5. CID 1635
			1. Review the comment
			2. No objection to moving toward a “should”
	5. Motion #25
		1. Motion to resolve CID 1020 with the following resolution:

REVISED (GEN: 2013-03-19 20:19:30Z) insert the term "GCR" at the beginning of title at 6.3.89 (p390.51 - D1.0).

and resolve CID 1394 with the following resolution:

REVISED (GEN: 2013-03-20 18:41:51Z) Implement the changes as documented in 11-13/384r0.

* + 1. Moved Jon Rosdahl, 2nd Vinko Erceg
		2. Results: 12-0-0 motion passes.
	1. Planning for future sessions
		1. **Objectives**
			1. Comment resolution
		2. **Conference Calls 10am Eastern 2 hours**
			1. April 5, 12, 19, 26
			2. Discussion on availability was agreed to the list.
		3. **Ad-Hoc meeting – none**
		4. **Schedule review**
	2. Comment resolution MAC adhoc
		1. There are some Security comments that need to be assigned to Dan HARKINS. – Assign 13 CIDs.
		2. 164 Comments unassigned in MAC AdHoc.
		3. CID 1434 assign to Adrian
		4. CID 1480 assign to Dorothy
		5. CID 1148 assign to Mark Hamilton
			1. Chris Hansen is also working on this CID as well.
			2. The assignment of MAC address by the IEEE is specific to a device.
			3. The current text says you cannot do this is the inference.
		6. CI D 1707
			1. Review comment
			2. In a definition, the “is” is as strong as a “shall’.
			3. Generally, we have not any “shall” in clause 8.
			4. Check the standard for dot11OCBActivated and BSSID in near proximity.
				1. Found 3 hits.
			5. No harm to do the change.
			6. Proposed resolution: Accept.
			7. No objection – mark ready for motion
		7. CID 1026 assign to Alex Ashley
		8. CID 1132 assign to Mark Hamilton
		9. CID 1134 assign to Kaz
			1. This should be simple.
		10. CID 1135 assign to Kaz
			1. Similar to 1134
		11. CID 1136 assign to Graham
			1. Reviewed the comment
			2. This is in QoS Buffered Load.
			3. This is an 11e type
		12. CID 1027assign to Alex Ashley
		13. CID 1003 assign to Mathew Fischer
		14. CID 1028 assign to Mike Montemurro
		15. CID 1499 assign to Dan Harkins
			1. Recatogorize to Security
		16. CID 1525 assign Mark Hamilton
		17. CID 1257 assign to David Hunter
			1. Needs submission
		18. CID 1259 assign to Mark Hamilton
		19. CID 1260 assign to Mark Hamilton
		20. CID 1258 assign to Mark Hamilton
		21. CID 1261 assign to Mark Hamilton
		22. CID 1263 assign to Dorothy Stanley
		23. CID 1029 assign to Dan Hawkins
			1. Recategorize to Security
		24. CID 1706 assign to Mark Hamilton
		25. CID 1008 assign to Kaz
		26. CID 1411 assign to Mark Hamilton
		27. CID 1030 assign to Adrian
		28. CID 1031
			1. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			2. No objection – mark ready motion
		29. CID 1392 assign to Dorothy
		30. CID 1694 assign to Dorothy
		31. CID 1705 assign to Dorothy
		32. CID 1424
			1. Assign to Location Comment Group and for review
		33. CID 1032 assign to Adrian
		34. CID 1269 assign to Dorothy
		35. CID 1632 assign to Mark Rison
			1. Submission required
		36. CID 1510 assign to Mark Hamilton
		37. CID 1458 assign to Graham
			1. This is another one to add to Graham’s presentation.
		38. CID 1152 and 1153 assign to Qi Wang
			1. Submission required.
		39. CID 1034 assign to Adrian
		40. CID 1035 assigned to Adrian
		41. CID 1118 assigned to Graham
		42. CID 1548 assigned to Mark Hamilton
		43. CID 1704 assigned to Dorothy
		44. CID 1703 assigned to Dorothy
		45. CID 1454 assigned to Adrian
		46. CID 1433 assigned to Qi Wang
		47. CID 1455 assigned to Adrian
		48. CID 1402 assigned to Qi Wang
		49. CID 1158 and 1159 and 1160 assigned to Qi Wang
		50. CID 1148 and 1161 and 1162 assigned to Qi Wang
		51. CID 1146 assigned to Jon Rosdahl
		52. CID 1037 assigned to Adrian
		53. CID 1038
			1. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			2. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		54. CID 1039
			1. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			2. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	3. Time to stop
		1. Next meeting will be Telecon on 5th April
		2. Get info to the assignees and get started.
	4. Adjourned at 6:01pm
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