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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons April 2013: April 5, April 12, April 19 and April 26th

Thanks to Dorothy and Mark for helping take minutes when I was not available.

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; Jon ROSDAHL, CSR Technology Inc.
	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))"
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion
	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.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion
		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 has 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.”
			8. No objection – mark ready for motion
		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.”
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion
		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. No objection – mark ready for motion
		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. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1410
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		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. No objection – 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
		6. Next call would be the 19th April
		7. Adrian has a conflict and will not be on the call.
		8. Jon to send the call details
		9. Dan to have security on the 26th.
	1. Adjouned 12:00 ET

1. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for April 19, 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda for April 19th call:1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance2. Comment resolution - review available resolutions, MAC+GEN comment assignments, if needed11-13-0417, last 2 comments see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0417-01-000m-additional-mac-comment-resolutions-ii.docx11-13-0422, see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0422-00-000m-additional-mac-comment-resolutions-iii.docx11-13-0416, 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.pptx3. AOB4. Adjourn
	2. Called to order at 10:05am ET by Doroty STANLEY, Aruba
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Mark HAMILTON, Spectralink; Mark RISON, Samsung; Jon ROSDAHL, CSR Technology Inc; Osama ABOUL-MAGD, Huawei; Edward AU, Huewei; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel;
	4. Continue with Document 11-13/417r1
		1. Continue on review of CID 1175
			1. There was some concern if we had actually finished this one or if we had some issues left unresolved.
			2. Dorothy to check with Adrian who was not able to be on the call to determine if there was something we forgot or outstanding issue with this on.
		2. CID 1102
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject- The referenced text is correct. Rather than risk confusing the reader with a reference to part of a section that addresses a different topic, leave the text as is.
			3. No objection CID marked ready for motion
		3. CID 1151
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Change from “An associated mesh STA that receives a Probe Request frame shall not respond…” To “A mesh STA that receives a Probe Request frame shall not respond…”
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
	5. Document: 11-13/422r0 – Dorothy STANLEY
		1. CID 1172
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Change: **Revised** Change from “QMF policies are exchanged and implemented between two QMF STAs. QMF policy is communicated through the QMF Policy element as described in 8.4.2.119 (Quality-of-Service Management Frame Policy element).” To “QMF policies are exchanged and implemented between two QMF STAs. A STA’s QMF policy is advertised and exchanged using the QMF Policy element described in 8.4.2.119 (Quality-of-Service Management Frame Policy element).”
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1006
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: **Revised -** Change from: **“**When all ACs associated with the STA are delivery-enabled, AP transmits one BU from the highest priority AC.” To: “When all ACs associated with the STA are delivery-enabled, the AP transmits one BU from the highest priority AC that has a BU. “
			3. No objection, mark ready for motion
		3. Adrian joined the call, and was asked if he could check on CID 1175 proposed resolution and ensure he had no issues. He reported he did not see a problem and was ok with the proposed resolution.
		4. CID 1062
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: **Proposed resolution: Revised --** Replace the paragraph at 1097.47 through 1098.9 with the following text:

“A scheduled SP starts at fixed intervals of time specified in the Service Interval field. The following rules describe scheduled SP operation:

1. If the scheduled Service Interval field equals 0 (for example, with the GCR-A delivery method), the scheduled SP starts from the service start time without a fixed delivery interval.
2. In order T~~t~~o use a scheduled SP for a TS when the access policy is controlled channel access, a STA shall send an ADDTS Request frame to the AP with the APSD subfield of the TS Info field in the TSPEC element set to 1.
3. To use a scheduled SP for a TS for a AC when the access policy is contention-based channel access, a STA shall send an ADDTS Request frame to the AP with the APSD and Schedule subfields of the TS Info field in the TSPEC element both set to 1. If the APSD mechanism is supported by the AP and the AP accepts the corresponding ADDTS Request frame from the STA, the AP shall respond to the ADDTS Request frame with a response containing the Schedule element indicating that the requested service can be accommodated by the AP.
4. When the access policy is contention-based channel access for a GCR group addressed stream, a scheduled SP is set up according to 10.24.16.3.3 (GCR setup procedures). The first scheduled SP starts when the lower order 4 octets of the TSF timer equals the value specified in the Service Start Time field.
5. If the SI is nonzero, ~~the~~ a STA using scheduled SP shall first wake up at the service start time to receive downlink individually addressed and/or GCR-SP group addressed BUs buffered and/or to receive polls from the AP/HC. ~~If the SI is nonzero, the~~The STA shall wake up subsequently at a fixed time interval equal to the SI.
6. The AP may modify the non-GCR service start time by indicating so in the Schedule element in a successful ADDTS Response frame (which is sent in response to an ADDTS Request frame) and in Schedule frames (which are sent at other times).
7. The AP may modify the GCR service start time by indicating so in the Schedule element in the GCR Response subelements (see 8.4.2.88 (DMS Response element) and 10.24.16.3.4 (GCR frame exchange procedures)).
8. In both non-GCR and GCR cases, the service start time shall be updated (using the previously described service start time modification procedures) whenever the upper 4 octets of the TSF timer change.
	* + 1. There was
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised make the changes as noted in 11-13/422r1
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1049
			1. Review comment
			2. Question on context of the paragraph being changed
			3. Requet to add an additional “the frame contains all or part of an” to the poposed change.
			4. There was not unanimous consent for the request.
			5. Discsusion on if “received frame contains all or part of the MSDU or A-MSDU” was correctly describing the situation.
			6. The point is that the unit of dropping is identified clearly.
			7. Proposed to change the “the” to “an” and add an “is”
			8. Proposed change “even if an MSDU or A-MSDU is carried partly or wholly within the frame and” to replace “the frame”.
			9. Proposed resolution: Revise: Replace the note as described in 11-13/422r1
			10. No objection mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1051
			1. Review Comment
			2. Changing QoS STA to QMF STA as only a QMF STA can Reject QMF frame.
			3. Note that line 5 has a QoS STA, but it is consistent with the rejected type of frame.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			5. No objection mark ready for motion
		3. CID 1054
			1. Review Comment
			2. There was two proposed alternative resolutions:

**Proposed resolution: Revised**

Either there is no requirement for 11n with Alternate EDCA transmit queues: At 967.57, delete “dot11AlternateEDCAImplemented”.

Or

There is a requirement for HT operation (CF16): At 967.57, change “dot11AlternateEDCAImplemented” to “dot11AlternateEDCAActivated” and at 1968.6 (AVT3 PICS definition) change the Status entry from “CF23:O” to “CF23:O CF16:M”

* + - 1. Discussion on what other correlation to other PICS that may give a hint.
			2. GSR probably does require AVT2, which does require CF16:M
				1. This does not require the change, but it does point out one more possible link.
			3. Action item: Dorothy to Follow-up with Alex to get more insight before proceeding to motion.
		1. CID 1055
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revise – **Move the paragraph at 979.56 to 980.39; results in the 9.19.2.6 (Retransmit procedure)** (see 11-13/422r1).
			3. No objection: mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1056
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept
			3. No objection: mark ready for motion
		3. CID 1057
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 982.13, change from “9.22” to “9.23”
			3. No objection: mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1058
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accept
			3. No objection: mark ready for motion
	1. Discussion of Graham’s CIDs
		1. Should these on 11b be presented in WNG or WG meeting time is being discussed.
	2. Review of Document 11-13/415r0
		1. CID 1136:
		2. Review comment
		3. Discussion on the size of the buffer that may be used. The size used is modulo 4096.
		4. Proposed Resolution by author: “Reject” The size of the field is in increments of 4096. Fragmented frames would never be larger than this.
		5. Discussion – change to Accept, but there was a concern that we may be granting an eception, and if so we need to cite the proper location of where it is described.
		6. Look at AP Buffered Load field is only in this clause.
		7. Implication of setting the value in all subsequent fragments is something to discuss may be later.
		8. As this is in clause 8, we should not have normative behaviour documented.
		9. Concept that the buffer size is only monitored at the abstract interface, it is an untestable requirement.
		10. Proposed Resolution: Reject: in reply to the commenter yes, the definition of the buffer size is implementation dependent, and the implementation could keep the buffers constant, and at line 57 there is a strong indication that it may be the case.
		11. Mark to adjust some of the spelling or capitalization, otherwise there was no objection and ready for motion.
	3. CID 1118
		1. Review comment
		2. In the presentation, 8.4.2.41 should really be 8.2.4.2.39
		3. This is all repeated in 8.2.4.43 so we need to be careful to make similar change there if needed.
		4. What is being measured vs what is being delayed does not seem matched.
		5. The average access delay is something that can be observed, but the queing delay in the AP is an unknown.
		6. The addition of “additional” would need a reference to what it was in addition to, so this not really a good suggested change.
		7. The check of what was in 11k and what is here now looks like it matches. So no changes are noted in 11mb or 11mc from what was there in 11k.
		8. The suggested idea of “ready for transmission” may be the point of misunderstanding.
		9. Suggestion is to reject and leave as is.
		10. This is a piece-wise linear curve
		11. While the numeric values may not be best, we cannot change them at this point without invalidating the existing devices.
		12. We could deprecate the table and remove it in time.
		13. There did not seem to be any extensibility to the table or BSS AC Access Delay Element
		14. We would need to show a market demad for this as well.
		15. Leaning toward a decline, but not completely there – nearly out of time.
		16. Need to have a volunteer for crafting the reject reason – Mark H to work on it, but not for next week.
	4. Next Week
		1. Dan Harkins will be presenting (he will have to be up early for the call).
		2. Dorothy to prepare another 10 that we can work on until he gets on the call.
		3. Then we will work on the rest at the Face-to Face in Waikoloa
		4. Jon to post minutes on Monday or Tuesday and then the person taking notes can start with that and pass it to Jon if he is able to make the call.
		5. Jon to start the call early to pass the presenter to Dorothy ahead of his leaving to run the NesCom call. He will return after the NesCom call.
	5. Telecon was adjourned at noon ET.
1. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for April 26, 2013

Proposed Agenda for April 26th call:1. Call to order, patent policy, and attendance2. Editor report3. Comment resolution - security comments, editorial comments, MAC+GEN comment assignments, if needed, seehttps://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0432-00-000m-security-cid-lb193-submission.docxhttps://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0431-00-000m-security-cids-lb193.xlshttps://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0439-00-000m-some-lb193-comment-resolutions.doc4. AOB5. Adjourn

* 1. Called to order at 10:01 EDT by Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba Networks
	2. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Mark HAMILTON, Spectralink; Mark RISON, Samsung; Jon ROSDAHL, CSR Technology Inc; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Alex ASHLEY, Self; Dan HARKINS, Aruba Networks.
	3. Approval of Proposed agenda:
		1. No agenda changes
	4. Call for Patents referenced. No comments given.
	5. Editor’s report (Adrian Stephens);
		1. Draft 1.4 is in the member’s area. Thanks to all those who helped review.
		2. Up-to-date on all agreed comment resolutions.
	6. Comment Resolution (11-13/0431r0)
		1. CID 1499: Reject: the section is behavioral. The AP does thus and so; the non-AP STA does thus and so. If there is a case where the behavior is not specified please rephrase the comment.
		2. CID 1029: Accept.
		3. CID 1422: Revised. Changes per CID 1029, to replace “—“ with “no” at the cited location.
		4. CID 1419: Reject: this text does not exist in 1.0 of the draft and 1.3 already says “CCMP or GCMP”
		5. CID 1578: Revised: Strike the sentence at P760.1.
		6. CID 1109: Accept.
		7. CID 1550: Revised: Delete the “256 +” at the cited location. Figures 11-24 and 11-26 use the additional 256 bits in the other cases.
		8. CID 1340: Reject: It’s a variable in this pseudo-code. It is used on P1433.25 and P1433.30.
		9. CID 1338: Revised: change “Rx\_Tx\_MMPDU” to “Rx\_Tx”.
		10. CID 1339: Revised: change “TxRx” to “Rx\_Tx”.
		11. CID 1709:
			1. Alex noted that there are places of confusion or missing details in this description.
			2. Noted that this is used within an AMPE exchange for HCCA TXOP Advertisements.
			3. Alex and Dan will work off-line to draft a response.
		12. CID 1710: Same as CID 1709.
		13. CID 1075:
			1. Use text similar to other places in the Standard, like 11.6.1.3 (P1386.33).
			2. Dan proposes text in 11-13/432r0.
			3. Revised: Make changes as shown in 11-13/432r0 as changes to subclause 11.10.2.
		14. CID 1712: Accept.
		15. CID 1552:
			1. Revised: Make changes as shown in 11-13/432r0 as changes to figures in clauses 11 and 12.
			2. Mark will submit a new comment next time about his parameter list concern.
		16. CID 1091:
			1. Discussion noted the various cases, and following paragraphs covering all except the case of an unprotected frame from a peer that has a security association.
			2. Accept.
	7. Comment Resolution (11-13/0422r1)
		1. CID 1054:
			1. Alex agrees that the MIB variable is not defined. He notes that it has no effect on over-the-air behavior, so simply use the dot11AlternateEDCAActivated variable.
			2. Alex response on whether 11n is mandatory for 11aa: while 11n is not required for alternate EDCA queues, it is required for other 11aa features (GCR), and the alternate EDCA queues features requires 11aa support, so effectively there is this requirement.
			3. Discussion about the syntax of the PICS entry to say this correctly. Two ways to say this: “If you support 11n, it is optional to support 11aa” OR “If you support 11aa, support for 11n is mandatory”. The latter is rarely used.
			4. Agreed on syntax: “CF23 and CF16:O”, for AVT3.
			5. Resolution: Revised. See 11-13/422r2.
	8. Comment Resolution (11-13/439r0)
		1. CID 1033:
			1. Reviewed each change, all agreed, except:
				1. At P919.07, use “To transmit …” instead of “In order to transmit …”
				2. At P921.53, are we okay with the usage “in which”? There are 260 of these in the draft currently; agreed we’re not going to fix them now, so this appears to be okay.
				3. P1101.31: the change loses the idea that this is a special case of the previous sentence. Change to “If the STA is using U-APSD …” instead.
			2. Revised: make changes as shown in 11-13/439r1 for CID 1033.
		2. Discussion on resolution of CID 58.
			1. Adrian notes that we did not fix statements of the form “It is optional for a … STA to …”
			2. Straw poll: Shall we make the changes as shown to the “optional for a” occurrences? 6,0,1
			3. Add these proposed changes to the resolution for CID 58. Note that CID 58 is not resolved yet, so these changes will be considered as part of that formal resolution , later.
		3. CID 1030:
			1. Make the ‘x’ in the proposed resolution a real multiplication sign.
			2. Revised: replace table 8-57 as shown in 11-13/439r1 for CID 1030.
		4. CID 1032: Revised: Replace cited sentence with: “The Length field is defined in 8.4.3 (Information Subelements).” (Note to editor, this resolution is a subset of the resolution to CID 1429).
		5. CID 1034: Revised: remove the length column in Table 8-116. (Note to editor, this resolution is a subset of the resolution to CID 1429).
		6. CID 1035: : Revised: Replace cited sentence with: “The Length field is defined in 8.4.3 (Information Subelements).” (Note to editor, this resolution is a subset of the resolution to CID 1429).
		7. CID 1454: Revised. Remove the Length column in Table 8-159. ).” (Note to editor, this resolution is a subset of the resolution to CID 1429).
		8. CID 1455: Revised. Remove the Length column in Table 8-159. ).” (Note to editor, this resolution is a subset of the resolution to CID 1429).
	9. Out of time.
		1. Next meeting the Face-to-Face during the 802Wireless Plenary in Waikoloa, Hawaii.
		2. Jon to combine and post the minutes.
	10. Adjourned 12:00 ET
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