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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons April 2013: April 5 and April 12

1. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for April 5, 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda – Apr 5, 2013:
2. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Comment Resolution - review available resolutions, MAC+GEN comment assignments, if needed
5. AOB
6. Adjourn
	1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:02 am; no agenda changes.
	2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
		1. None Identified
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark HAMILTON; Carlos ALDANA, Qualcomm.
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. TGad defect resolution underway, mainly editorial; reviewers have identified additional technical changes; consider those changes either before or as submitted comments on the next ballot.
		2. Editor plans to have a draft incorporating the editorial defects and approved editorial comments soon – D1.3.
		3. D1.4 will incorporate approved technical comments, available before the May meeting.
		4. Speculative edits re: MPPDU are still in the draft.
	5. Comment Resolution
		1. Draft comment resolutions available in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0391-00-000m-additional-mac-comment-resolutions-orlando-assignment.docx> . Includes CIDs 1263, 1269, 1392, 1480, 1694, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706, and in
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-03-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> . Includes CIDs 89, 1008, 1134, 1135, 1424.
		3. Agree to begin with 11-13-391-00 comments, then 11-13-0361-03 comments.
	6. CID 1263: Agree with proposed Accept.
	7. CID 1269: Agree with proposed Revised.
	8. CID 1392: Agree with proposed Revised.
	9. CID 1480: Agree with Reject.
		1. Discussion – does 11ac change the restriction?
		2. Add reference to 11ac text.
		3. Modify reject reason, adding “Note that in 11ac D5.0 P77L8, the restriction to non-overlap is within a Sub-band triplet sequence” are not used within the same Subband Triplet Sequence field”. Can have overlapping between two sub-band triplet sequences.”
	10. CID 1694: Agree with proposed Reject.
		1. Difficult to distribute regulatory responsibility.
		2. Radar bit use is referenced in clause 10.
		3. Do we make existing equipment non-compliant?
		4. Potentially can distribute the responsibility; prefer to not prohibit.
		5. OFDM bit and Unidentified Signal bits are not referenced in Clause 10.
		6. Could add text – general use; provide hint.
		7. Only have channel selection described for 11n.
		8. Bits likely added by those wanting to avoid non-802.11 systems. Avoid channels with values set. Don’t believe we need to specify use – for example AP channel selection algorithms not specified – protect from non-802.11 systems.
		9. Add to reject reason “The OFDM Preamble, Unidentified Signal bits can be used by implementations as an input to channel selection algorithms; channel selection algorithms are not specified.”
	11. CIDs 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706: Agree with proposed Accept.
	12. CID 89: Discussion on improved text alternatives; no agreed resolution.
		1. Why does the ACK frame need to be different from the Block ACK?
		2. Modify text changes to reduce ambiguity:
		3. Many complicating cases, unsure that either piece of text is correct; have counterexamples to each piece.
		4. Propsed text: “"…a non-AP STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange described in Annex G, initiated by the non-AP STA, including a management, extension or data frame, and that includes receiving an acknowledgment (ACK frame or BlockAck frame) from the AP."
	13. CID 1008: Agree to resolution of “Revised”
		1. Text describes the TIM element in the Beacon frames.
		2. This is a UAPSD issue, not a mesh issue.
		3. Agree with the logic of the proposed text change.
		4. Might be better to organize as a list of essential differences. Not at this time.
		5. Agree to resolution as follows:
		6. REVISED (MAC: 2013-04-05 15:27:45Z):
		Replace, "Bit number N is 0 if there are no individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs buffered for the STA whose AID is N. If any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered and the AP or the mesh STA is prepared to deliver them, bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 1."
		with
		"Bit number N indicates the status of buffered, individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for the STA whose AID is N. If the STA is not using APSD, and any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered and the AP or the mesh STA is prepared to deliver them, then bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 1. If the STA is using APSD, and any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered in at least one nondelivery-enabled AC (if there exists at least one nondelivery-enabled AC), then bit number N in the traffic-indication vitual bitmap is 1. If the STA is using APSD, all ACs are delivery-enabled, and any individually addressed MSDUs/MMPDUs for that STA are buffered in any AC, then bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 1. Bit number N in the traffic-indication virtual bitmap is 0, otherwise."
	14. CID 1134: Agree to resolution of “Revised”
		1. Can you have an HC in any other kind of BSS?
		2. Not in 11ad.
		3. “In a BSS” not necessary. Will be in a BSS by definition.
		4. HC only exists in an infrastructure BSS.
		5. Not incorrect to add, but tautological, since an HC only exists in an infrastructure BSS.
		6. Cannot use in the “Outside a BSS” case, not in an IBSS.
		7. HC is collocated with an AP – stated in the definitions.
		8. Agree to resolution as follows:
		9. CID 1134: REVISED (MAC: 2013-04-05 15:37:25Z):
		Replace
		"The TXOP Limit subfield is an 8-bit field that is present in QoS Data frames of subtypes that include CF-Poll and specifies the time limit on a TXOP granted by a QoS (+)CF-Poll frame from an HC in a BSS."
		with
		"The TXOP Limit subfield is an 8-bit field that is present in QoS Data frames of subtypes that include CF-Poll and specifies the time limit on a TXOP granted by a QoS (+)CF-Poll frame from an HC in an infrastructure BSS."
	15. CID 1135: Discussion on improved text alternatives; no agreed resolution.
		1. Need to clarify effect on DMG STAs.
		2. See 4.3.3 PBSS – only established by DMG STAs, but Infrastructure and non-DMG are not mutually exclusive tersm.
		3. 11ad introduces a new scheduling mechanism; in a 60GHz infrastructure BSS, have an AP, use 11ad channel access mechanisms (not 11e). QOS Data frames can be sent by a QOS STA and by a DMG STA.
		4. Means no HCCA in DMG STA; 11ad by definition non-QOS.
		5. Mark Hamilton to further investigate, proposed updated text.
	16. CID 1424: Location comment; indicated presentation was heard in the January meeting. Likely to discuss location comments in May. Telecon time available upon request.
	17. Adrian, Mark and Jon to remind the “Needs Submission” comment owners of their comment assignments.
	18. No other business. Reminder: next call is April 12th.
	19. Adjourned at 12:00 ET.
7. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for April 12, 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda – Apr 12, 2013:
8. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
9. Editor Report, including reviewers for technical comment incorporation
10. Comment resolution - review available resolutions, MAC+GEN comment assignments, if needed
11. Two CIDs for Alex Ashley CID1026 and 1027
12. 11-13-0417, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0417-00-000m-additional-mac-comment-resolutions-ii.docx>
11-13-0416, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0416-00-000m-cid-32-11b-is-poison.pptx>
11-13-0415, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0415-00-000m-cids-1136-1118-and-1458.pptx>
13. AOB
	1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:02 am; no agenda changes.
	2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
		1. None Identified
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark HAMILTON, Spectralink; Chris HANSEN, Broadcom; Mark RISON, Samsung; Alex ASHLEY, self;
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. Need Volunteers for editorial reviw has 7 to help
		2. Working on d1.04
	5. CIDs from Alex Ashley
		1. CID 1027
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-04-12 14:10:26Z): Change "When the GCR field is equal to 1, the BlockAck frame is sent in response to a BlockAckReq that had the GCR field with a value of 1 in the BAR Control field." to "The GCR field indicates whether the BlockAck frame was sent in response to a GCR BlockAckReq. The GCR field is set to 1 when the BlockAck frame is sent in response to a GCR BlockAckReq and set to zero otherwise."
			3. No objections after final crafting of the resolution.
			4. Mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1026
			1. Review comment
			2. Comment from Alex: When using GCR-A, there is no end to the service period as the AP can transmit the GCR frames whenever it wants to. Setting the EOSP bit to zero indicates that a receiving STA must stay awake because there are more frames to come.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-04-12 14:21:16Z): Change the cited location to a note: "Note -- As GCR-A frames are sent outside of any SP, the EOSP field is set to 0 in a group addressed frame delivered using the GCR-A procedures described in 10.24.16.3.8 (GCR-SP(11aa))"
	6. Review document - Doc 11-13/417r0 – Dorothy Stanley, Aruba
		1. CID 1229
			1. Review comment
			2. Presented two choices – discussion on the value of each
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change the text at 215.50 From “On receipt of this primitive, neighbor report data may be available to the SME.”To“The SME is notified of the receipt of the neighbor report data.”
			4. No objection
			5. In the cited text, there was another use of “may be” but it was not subject of this CID.
		2. CID 1222
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on whether (or not) the MLME-RESET is required prior to MLME-Start.
			3. The 2nd paragraph was found to be confusing at best but not necessary, so we will propose to delete it.
			4. Mesh STA have default Synchronization Method as well as other methods (vendor specific and future methods).
			5. Add a sentence: The MLME-START.request primitive shall be generated before any synchronization or mesh peering have been attempted.
			6. Discussion on what happens if we have two MLME-START followed by another MLME-START.
			7. Poposed resolution: RevisedDelete the following text “An MLME-START.request primitive may be generated in an infrastructure BSS or IBSS only after an MLME-RESET.request primitive has been used to reset the MAC entity and before an MLME-JOIN.request primitive has been used to successfully join an existing infrastructure BSS or IBSS.“ It isn’t needed, since at 158.23, the text states “The MLME-RESET.request primitive shall be used prior to use of the MLME-START.request primitive.” And change from “An MLME-START.request primitive may be generated in an MBSS only after an MLME-RESET.request primitive has been used to reset the MAC entity and before any synchronization and mesh peering have been established. When the mesh STA uses the default synchronization method and the default mesh peering protocol, the MLME-START.request primitive shall be generated before an MLMEMESHNEIGHBOROFFSETSYNCSTART.request primitive and MLMEMESHPEERINGMANAGEMENT.request primitive have been used.”
		3. CID 1638
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the GAS initial Frame Format and the Query request.
			3. Proposal to change from “specified” to “ identified”
			4. The protocol is identified in the element, rather than specified.
			5. Proposed resolution: Proposed resolution: Revised Change from“with the protocol specified in the Advertisement Protocol element.”To“with the protocol identified in the Advertisement Protocol element.”
		4. CID 1469
			1. Review the comment
			2. Discussion on Extended Channel Switch Announcement element.
			3. Two places that need change.
			4. Change element to ChannelSwitchCountfield – there are four similar issues that would need to be fixed to a more specific field name added.
			5. Proposed resolution: RevisedWhile the initial design could have incorporated the ECSA directly, the design instead incorporated the fields directly, perhaps to eliminate inclusion of the element ID and length fields. No change is proposed by the commenter; and no change is made to the frame format definition, to preserve backwards compatability. To clarify that the Channel Switch Count field is used in the frame as per the element definition

Also make the changes as marked in 11-13/417r1 for CID 1469.

* + 1. CID 1549
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted -- Change from “16 or 43” to “16 to 43”
			3. Not wanted as we have been not having the length field redefined in multiple places, and so we would want to delete the offending text instead of changing it.
			4. This was covered in another CID – See CID 1429 where we stripped out a lot of the duplicate lengths, and put in references.
			5. Proposed resolution: RevisedSince CID 1429 deletes length fields in subelement definitions;Change“The value of the Length field is 16 or 43”To“The Length field is defined in 8.4.3.”
			6. Mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 1410
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept
		3. CID 1430
			1. Review Comment
			2. There are about 17 elements to consider that has a length description.
			3. Some are clearer than others.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised Delete the individual Info ID and length field statements from the element definitions in sections 8.4.4.2 through 8.4.4.19, replacing with a statement: “The Info ID and Length fields are defined in 8.4.4.1 (General).” except merge in any non-trivial semantics attached the length field.
			5. Mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1175
			1. Review comment
			2. This frame is not a response – but rather used for requests for a change
			3. The Policy change is done by sending this change frame
			4. Concern on the ambiguous nature of the element. Is this changing the whole policy or just some changes to be indicated? The believe is that we discussed this in the past, and the whole policy had to be sent inorder to allow “deletion” and to make it consistent.
			5. The only place that it is not ambiguous is in the MLME section and it may not have been intentional there, so the many other ambiguous cases are the concern.
			6. The only way to delete some part would be to send the whole Policy.
			7. There are two STA and they have exchanged a QMF Frame Policy, and one sends the QMF Policy Change Frame to change the policy.
			8. These are uni-directional and link by link.
			9. STA-b will use the policy as set, and STA-a can send a change to STA-b asking for a change for STA-b to use when sending frames to STA-a… but maybe we have this backwards as well.
			10. The Receipiant of the QMF Frame Policy Change Frame will send a response of sending a new Policy to the requester. STA-a is telling STA-b that it is using a particular policy when STA-a is telling STA-b what Policy it is using.
			11. The question is still is this a change set or the full policy – we believe it is always the Full Policy.
			12. So a STA-a gets a policy from STA-b and then it has to reflect the full Policy with any changes back to STA-b and then if STA-b likes or makes the changes, it sends the Policy back to STA-a
			13. Proposed resolution: Revised Change from:"It indicates the new access categories requested for Management frame(s)"to"It indicates the access categories requested for Management frame(s), including any changes to the QMF policy it most recently received from the destination STA."
		5. Out of time
	1. Next call would be the 19th
		1. Adrian has a conflict and will not be on the call.
		2. Jon to send the call details
		3. Dan to have security on the 26th.
	2. Adjouned 12:00 ET
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