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Abstract

Minutes from the 2013 July Plenary Meeting in Geneva, Switzerland for TG REVmc.

1.0 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 3:00pm Monday July 15, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY

* 1. Review Patent Policy
		1. No issues noted.
	2. Review Agenda for week – see doc 11-13/658r1
		1. **Monday PM2**

Chair’s Welcome, Status, Review of Objectives, Approve agenda, minutes

Editor’s Report

Timeline and Schedule

Comment resolution – 11-13-513r1-Dan, 11-13-652r5 - Adrian

* + 1. **Tuesday** **PM1**

Comment resolution

* + 1. **Tuesday** **PM2**

11-13-692 - Yanming

11-13-691 – Daniel

11-13-703 – Adrian

11-13-730 – Dan

Comment Resolution

* + 1. **Wednesday** **PM1**

Motions

Comment resolution

* + 1. **Wednesday** **PM2**

Comment resolution

* + 1. **Thursday** **PM1**

Comment resolution

* + 1. **Thursday** **PM2**

Motion

Comment Resolution Plans for Sept, AOB

Adjourn

* 1. **Approve prior meeting minutes**
		1. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0653-02-000m-tgmc-may-june-2013-telecon-minutes.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0653-02-000m-tgmc-may-june-2013-telecon-minutes.docx)
		2. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0550-00-000m-revmc-minutes-for-may-2013-hawaii.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0550-00-000m-revmc-minutes-for-may-2013-hawaii.docx)
		3. **Minutes were approved without objection**
	2. **Editor Report**
		1. Review Doc 11-13/0095r4 – Adrian STEPHENS
		2. New pie chart explained.
		3. Status of editorial Comments reviewed.
	3. **Review Plan of Record**
		1. We have had a call for comment, and received a lot of comments.
			1. We have resolved most of them
		2. We have rolled into Draft aa, ae, ad.
		3. Will update the Plan of record to indicate that we will start D2.0 out of the Sept Interim.
		4. Draft 2 would be the primary draft with AD.
		5. Then we would start the rollup of AC
	4. Review 11-13/652r6 – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. Will create r7 with any modifications.
		2. CID 1089
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Indoor/Outdoor information is present in the Country String field.
			3. No objection after some discussion of the value of the effort to review.
			4. Mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 1633
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed 2 changes
			3. Review proposed change at 1171.38 and Change at 1507.13 –
			4. The language at 1167.01 is problematic as there is a shall without conditionals.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes indicated under CID 1633 in “Kaz’Response” in 11-13-652r7.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		4. CID 1193
			1. Review comment
			2. 226 instances of the word Packet.
			3. Reviewed the list of packet usages and can we make some changes.
			4. Should we try to fix this?
			5. Currently this is deferred. –
			6. David Hunter has volunteered to do the work to show if the word could be changed/modified to MMPDU or some other appropriate replacement.
			7. Straw Poll: Should we fix use of “packet” in some way?
				1. Yes: 3 No: 0 Won’t say/Don’t Care: 6
			8. So David will prepare a submission. (Assign by GEN)
		5. CID 1412
			1. Review comment
			2. Straw Poll:
				1. Prefer Leave: 1
				2. Prefer: Remove Timeouts - 3
				3. Prefer: Fix Addt.request – 0
				4. Won’t say/don’tcare: 5
			3. Propose Resolution: Revised: Remove ADDTS.request and ADDBA.request timeouts. This includes all references to them and associated MIB variables (dot11ADDba\*, dot11ADDTS\*)
			4. Question on the extent that the proposal may extend. There may be an ok use of timeout, but we may need to be more careful in just removing them. The MLME ones seem ok, but the other ones may not be so good to take away.
			5. The normative reference is to the wrong thing anyway so at best it needs to be addressed.
			6. A follow-up review could be done to ensure that the MIB variable are or are not really used.
			7. SME requirements that we are causing a change to the MLME is a strange order.
			8. A submission may be good to ensure that the typos and the changes make sense when changing outside the MLME MIB variables.
			9. What if we removed just the ADDTS.request?
			10. The parameter of ADDTSFailure-timeout is there and so the MIB variable is not necessary.
			11. There is a requirement to operate a timer, and seems wrong to requie an external timer.
			12. We may not have a good consensus on this issue.
			13. Also discovered issue: ADDTS.request has a parameter that should be taken from the dot11ADDTS...variable, following the Model of ADDBA . And the MLME timer behaviour is related to the MIB variable, not the parameter.
			14. We have found another issue where a variable being passed into the primitive is not being used.
			15. Straw Poll:
				1. Keep timeout behaviour, but fix the obvious errors. (i.e. redundant parameters) - 2
				2. Delete timeout behaviour, but keep mib vairalbes
				3. Delete timeourt behaviouir and keep MIB variables. - 3
			16. Proposed steps: defer to the telecom for review for more stronger preference after more review.
			17. Assign to Mark Hamilton – Needs submission
		6. CID 1018
			1. Review comment
			2. From the discussion notes:
				1. Another “permission to do more work”. However we have done this work in the past, so might as well do it again.
				2. Note that MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT.confirm wrongly has a VendorSpecific parameter. This is covered by a separate comment (CID 1015).
				3. For discussion: are the MLME-RESOURCE-REQUEST primitives already covered. i.e., does the “Content of FT Authentication elements” include vendor specific elements. If so, nothing to do, but after discussion, agree to add MLME-RESOURCE-REQUEST.\* to the list.
				4. I’m making this assumption – i.e., least changes.
				5. Same discussion for MLME-TDLSDISCOVERY “TDLSDiscoveryRequest: Specifies the proposed service parameters for the TDLS Discovery Request frame.”, TDLSSETUPREQUEST.\*, TLDSSETUPRESPONSE.\*, TDLSSETUPCONFIRM.\*, TDLSTEARDOWN.\*, TDLSPTI.\*, TDLSCHANNELSWITCH.\*, TDLSPEERPSM.\*
				6. For discussion. Where does the vendor specific content in MLME-DLSPOTENTIALPEERSTA.confirm come from? I’m assuming it is an error, because there is no matching .response that can provide it.
			3. Add 3 more things to consider to delete…
			4. Proposed resolution: Make changes under CID 1018 in 11-13-652r7.
			5. No objection mark ready for motion.
	5. Take a ten minute break and start up again at 4:30pm
	6. We will start on 11-13-513r1 (AP peer Key).
	7. Recess for 10 minutes at 4:24pm
1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 4:380pm Monday July 15, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY.
	1. Review document 11-13-513r2 – Dan Harkins – CIDs 1709, 1710, 1711.
		1. Presentation of the proposed changes
		2. Discussion on the addition of “NAK” as a Request Type
		3. The use of “Conditional” for a field use seemed wrong – change to “optional”
		4. APs are not Mesh STAs so why are they creating Mesh Keys?
			1. Too lazy to make all the correct changes?
		5. Proposed Resolution for 1709, 1710, 1711 as : Revised make changes as noted in 11-13-513r2.
		6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	2. Return to Review Document 11-13/652r7 – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 1009
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The 802.11 MAC Data SAP supports transport of MSDUs of arbitrary length up to the stated maximum. Adapting this to the limitations of some other 802 technology is outside the scope of 802.11.
			3. The issue of making things work in practice is better than to be strictly correct.
			4. We discussed why this would be a good change to make.
			5. If padding is bad or not was discussed.
			6. Straw Poll:
				1. Reject comment: 6
				2. Provide a note to implementers: 2
				3. Provide an Information element to use for padding TDLS frames: 1
			7. Based on the strawpoll – proceed with the proposal of the submission.
			8. This was not a clear unanimous proposed resolution, and it will be motioned separately.
		2. CID 1047
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 897.10, 898.43, 899.59 delete “The Mesh ID element is present when dot11MeshActivated is true.” At 897.12, 898.45, 899.60 delete “The Mesh Configuration element is present when dot11MeshActivated is true..”
			3. No objection to resolution – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 1652
			1. Review comment. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The commenter has not indicated a problem to resolve or a specific change to make. In reply to the commenter, there are no constraints on the use of the Address 4 field in A-MPDUs in the standard.
			2. No objection to resolution – mark ready for motion.
		4. CID 1396
			1. Review the comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The changes described might provide a benefit, but that benefit can only be determined after careful study of the impact of specific changes. The commenter does not provide specific changes that would address the comment.
			3. No Objection to resolution – mark ready for motion.
		5. CID 1617 and 1664
			1. Review the comments
			2. Note contradictory descriptions
			3. Proposed Resolution for both CIDs:
				1. Revised. At 931.57, replace the first two sentences with: “A STA that is addressed by an RTS frame shall transmit a CTS frame after a SIFS if either of the following conditions apply:
* the NAV at the STA indicates that the medium is idle
* the STA is a QoS STA and the MAC address in the TA field of the RTS frame matches the saved TXOP holder address

Otherwise the STA shall not respond to the RTS frame.”

* + - 1. No objection -- mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1274 and 1275
			1. Review Comments
			2. Proposed resolution for both CIDs: Make changes in 11-13-652 under CIDs 1274 and 1275. These changes separate out the relationships between the services from support at different types of STA.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 1281
			1. Review Comment
			2. Management frames do not have an access category. The access category that is used is the same access category as the corresponding frame.
			3. The two notes were discussed as to be deleted or included. Thought was to leave them in for now, and have them reviewed in the recirculation.
			4. Would it be better to have only one note, at the end of the list? Only if we changed the list to be a lettered list and then the note could address specific parts.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes as shown in 11-13-652r7 under CID 1281. These changes restructure the entire cited paragraph in a similar way to that sketched in the comment.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 1666
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The +-10% relates to on-the-air events, not the accuracy of clocks, which are much more accurate (25ppm). The specification above correctly allows for the latest time of arrival of the start of a PPDU on-the-air.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		4. CID 1667
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The proposed change would make current devices that met a 10% of SIFS accuracy potentially non-compliant.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		5. CID 1290
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Agree
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		6. CID 1068
			1. Review comment
			2. Propose Resolution: Rejected. The commenter does not provide specific changes that would address the reported issue.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		7. CID 1503
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The requirements of 9.7.6.6 are on the basis of the RXVECTOR, not on the basis of what was transmitted. There is no need to clarify PHY behaviour at this specific location.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		8. CID 1407
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		9. CID 1100
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change cited sentence to the following two sentences: “An A-MSDU contains only MSDUs whose DA parameter values map to a single RA value (see 8.3.2.2 (A-MSDU format)). An A-MSDU contains only MSDUs whose SA parameter values map to a single TA value (see 8.3.2.2 (A-MSDU format)).”
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		10. CID 1515
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Editor: in table 18-17 change text in each of the 3 columns on the top to: "if dot11OperatingClassesRequired is false, XY us, if dot11OperatingClassesRequired is true, XY us plus any coverage-class-dependent aAirPropagationTime (see Table 8-57 (Coverage Class Field Parameters))". Also delete sentence P1684.32 Make similar changes also in tables 16-2 (p1617), 17-4, 18-17, 19-6 (two locations), 20-25 (Three locations) (Note to editor, same resolution as CID 1076). In reply to the commenter, the changes made above remove any dependency on aAirPropagationTime when dot11OperatingClassesRequired is false.
			3. No Objection – mark ready for motion.
		11. CID 1658
			1. Reviewed Comment (note it was very colorful in the reviewed document with lots of highlighted colors).
			2. Discussion on making sure which one should be changed.
			3. Proposed resolution: Revised. Change “dot11OperatingClassesRequired and dot11ExtendedChannelSwitchActivated are true” to “dot11OperatingClassesRequired is true” at cited location.
			4. Not enough time to complete this CID
			5. Start again with this CID later.
	1. Recess at 6pm

1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 1:38 pm Tuesday July 16, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY.
	1. Agenda for today

Comment Resolution: 11-13-652r8 –Adrian STEPHENS

* 1. Agenda for later in the week we will add 11-13-876 (Qi), 11-13-867 (Eldad) 11-13-875 (Adrian)
		1. Motions for Telcons, Mon and Tues CIDs for Wednesday PM1 slot.
			1. Review motions for CIDs approved to date, will be updated as necessary
		2. Motion for CID 1009 will be separate
	2. Comment Resolution: 11-13-652r8 – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 1658
			1. Review Comment context more thoroughly
			2. Note that dot11OperatingClasesRequired and dot11ExtendedChannelSwitchActivated may not both be needed to be true.
			3. The Country Element provides the Operating Class. The ExtendedChannelSwitch also provides a means for operating Class
			4. CoverageClass is different from Operating Class.
			5. The CoverageClass may be in the Country Element.
			6. The concern is that the Country Element has to not only be present, but the Coverage Class field in the Country Element as well.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes as indicated in 11-13/0652r8 under CID 1658
			8. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1516
			1. Review comment
			2. When the OperatingClassesRequired bit is not set, you would not be able to be part of the BSS.
			3. When a device wants to join an AP that does not support the OperatingClassesRequired, then you would not have good support.
			4. If it was in False, then the Beacon would be coming from other APs
			5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The text in D1.0 does imply that the Country IE is ignored as claimed. Note, see the resolution to CID 1658 (Make changes as indicated in 11-13/0652r8 under CID 1658), which removes one of the terms in this condition.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion
		3. CID 1150
			1. Review comment Proposed Resolution: Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The two figures represent two different states. If Figure 9-20 alone were to remain, the presence of A\_\* queues would need additional explanation or qualification.
			2. No objection – mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1616
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		5. CID 1439
			1. Review Comment
			2. See context for each point
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 979.33 replace “A frame with that AC is requested to be transmitted,” with “An MA-UNITDATA.request primitive is received that causes a frame with that AC to be queued for transmission such that one of the transmit queues associated with that AC has now become non-emtpy and any other transmit queues associated with that AC are empty,”

In reply to the commenter’s second point:, “initiated” might be redundant, but it is not incorrect; The purpose of item b) is to ensure a backoff after successful transmission. The phrase “final transmission by the TXOP holder initiated during the TXOP” is unambiguous and correct. In reply to “Is this really the final transmission in the TXOP, or the final transmission in a burst before a response” – if the transmission implies a response, “success” is not known until the response is received. There is no need to state this specifically here.

“Is a transmission that of an MPDU or a PPDU or what?” - it doesn’t matter. All we need to do is understand what “successful transmission” means. 979.01-27 does this.

In reply to “c) Why is it only that the transmission of the initial MPDU in the TXOP fails that matters? What if subsequent MPDU transmissions fail?”

The STA has a choice of continuing after a PIFS (if enough time is left) or performing a backoff. This behaviour is clarified in the NOTE at 979.44.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1292
			1. Review Comment
			2. Reviewed all uses of ACK and No ACK as documented in 11-13/652r8.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes as indicated in 11-13/0652r8 under CID 1292
			4. No objection – mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 1295
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes as indicated in 11-13/0652r8 under CID 1295
			3. No objection – mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 1296
			1. Review Comment
			2. No consensus, need more work to resolve.
			3. TX-RX Report cannot just be fixed on the fly.
		4. CID 1566
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: At 1019.24 change “robust management ADDBA” to “robust ADDBA”. At 1919.28 change “this BlockAckReq frame” to “this BlockAckReq or robust ADDBA frame”.
			3. No objection – mark ready for Motion
		5. CID 1305
			1. Review comment
			2. 11ac has a similar clause that they had and they have changed some parts into normative text. This may warrant more review
			3. Status: pending for more review. Model response after changes to TGac D6 Matching VHT subclause.
		6. CID 1656
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed resolution to add “(or continue to use)” and other alternatives.
			3. Change to add “and the AP is using Short Slot time,”
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes as indicated in 11-13/0652r8 under CID 1656
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion
		7. CID 1678
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace cited sentence with:

“A non-AP STA in which dot11MgmtOptionMultiBSSIDActivated is true shall support frame filtering for up to two BSSIDs one for the transmitted BSSID and one for the nontransmitted BSSID. The STA, when associated with a BSS corresponding to a nontransmitted BSSID, shall discard all Data and Management frames that use the transmitted BSSID as the transmit address, except for Beacon, Probe Response, and TIM broadcast frames.”

* + 1. CID 1679
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The cited sentence indicates that this is an option for a WNM STA. A WNM STA has certain mandatory features, so remoal of the sentence removes the implicit requirement that Multiple BSSID capability is also accompanied by the mandatory WNM features.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1157
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. 1086.65 states: “When a nontransmitted BSSID profile is present in the Multiple BSSID element of the Probe Response frame, the AP shall include all elements that are specific to this BSS. If any of the optional elements are not present in a nontransmitted BSSID profile, the corresponding values are the element values of the transmitted BSSID.” From this it is evident that the BSSID that responds is the transmitted BSSID.
			3. Jouni was concerned with this resolution. Jouni has volunteered to research constraint on non-AP and AP
			4. Leave the comment open and assign to Jouni – needs submission.
		3. CID 1155
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. 1086.43 states: “The non-transmitted BSSID profile shall include the SSID element (see 8.4.2.2 (SSID element)) and Multiple BSSID-Index element (see 8.4.2.73 (Multiple BSSID-Index element)) for each of the supported BSSIDs.” From this it is evident that the SSID may be different for each non-transmitted BSSID.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		4. CID 1156
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The commenter does not identity a problem to be resolved or a specific change to be made.
			3. This resolution was proposed due to the large number of questions in the comment, but as Jouni was assigned 1155, it would be better to group it with CID 1157
			4. Mark as assigned to Jouni – submission required.
		5. CID 1511
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is an issue of not using the SSID List element when in an IBSS mode.
			3. Not seen as a serious limitation or issue.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Remove: “The SSID List element shall not be included in a Probe Request frame in an IBSS.”
			5. No objection – mark ready for motion
	1. Break time
		1. Will resume at 4pm with presentations.
	2. Recess at 3:30pm
1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 4:05pm Tuesday July 16, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY.
	1. Agenda Review
		1. We will have a new presentation on Wed Afternoon (see 11-13-0658r4)
	2. Agenda for today
		1. 11-13-692 - Yanming
		2. 11-13-691 – Daniel
		3. 11-13-703 – Adrian
		4. 11-13-730 – Dan
		5. Comment Resolution
	3. Review Doc 11-13/692 - Yanming
		1. 3GPP access to MIB variables
		2. Question if the MIB is not truly implemented in a standard way why would we want to do this?
			1. If we have a set of stats, we do want to standardize some stats, how are they held internally is still implementation dependant, but we would have a set interface that is available.
		3. If we do have an SNMP MIB interface then we could introduce a new interface.
			1. If we do have usefulness in the MIB we could make use of it in a standardized way.
		4. If we can add some more notes into the MIB that there would be added value.
		5. The Standard interface to get MIB variables is already there, but it may or may not have been available in all APs. We started .11 with the Management Interface as an important thing, but over time we have not had industry provide compliance tests, only interop tests, and many of the technical points are left as implementation details that are not validated.
		6. Are there existing MIB parameters that are being extracted from certain APs …if there are then we can encourage APs to advertise that they provide information.
			1. Useful notes on the MIB parameters that are useful should be added, and notes on the ones that are in use now and the rationale for adding any new ones.
		7. Question on Slides was on parsing the bullet point that was on an unnumbered slide.
		8. Discussion did not come to definitive conclusion.
	4. 11-13-691 – Daniel
		1. Adrian will present the paper.
		2. Retry Counter Rules
		3. In 9.3.3 there is a typo and a less than and greater than that was in the wrong place and or missing.
		4. If there is no objection, we could accept a motion on 691 during the motion time.
	5. 11-13-703 – Adrian
		1. 802.11 MIB addition in support of 3GPP
		2. 3GPP SA5 liaison was investigated before, but the 3GPP was not willing to create it.
		3. Things that are useful have been identified by 3GPP and this presentation is a starting point.
		4. There may be more work to thing about how useful and how much work for the return on the benefits.
		5. The Time Scale for 3GPP has some dynamic scale and may be needed sooner than later.
		6. The cell phone offload is not currently defined well.
		7. This paper is to define two new objects in the MIB.
		8. No other comments were made.
		9. There are two similar proposals, suggest that Adrian and Yanming works together to get a joint proposal. Mike M. asked to join the group as well.
			1. Goal to bring the paper in Sept.
	6. 11-13-730 – Dan
		1. Not present. – will put back in the schedule at a later time.
	7. Comment Resolution 11-13-652r8 – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 1615
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1091.21 Delete the sentence “A STA shall include a Country element in the transmission ofBeacon frames if dot11MultiDomainCapabilityActivated, dot11SpectrumManagementRequired, or dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true.” And merge following sentence into previous paragraph. Delete Para at 1510.17.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1400
			1. Review comment
			2. Question on whether the heading is a normative statement. Does it have any effect on the normative nature of the paragraph below.
			3. There is not a consistent model to see.
			4. Sometimes we have the qualification in the header and the first sentence, and in some case not.
			5. Straw Poll: headings are significant, and can be used to create assumed conditions in child text.
				1. Yes this is obviously true, what is the debate about
				2. No – I can’t say why, but its just not that way
			6. Change the Straw Poll:
				1. Headings are not significant, and don’t care where text is under specified (no change – laziness - inconsistent)
				2. Headings are not significant, and we need to add necessary qualifications (lots of work- add globally)
				3. Headings are significant, and we don’t need to change anything (no change – laziness)
				4. Headings are significant, and we need to remove unnecessary qualification. (Lots of different work)
				5. Headings are significant, but it doesn’t hurt to add additional qualifications where so asked. (little work)
				6. We won’t say whether headings are significant, and we won’t change anything – ever!
				7. Results: 1- 1, 2 – 1, 3 – 3, 4 – 0, 5 -4, 6 – 1.
				8. Agree that headings are significant, but it doesn’t hurt for the inconsistency.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes as shown in 11-13/652r8 under CID 1400.
			8. After discussion of the Straw-Poll results and review of the proposal the final wording was determined and the group agreed.
			9. Mark ready for motion
		3. CID 1154
			1. Review Comment
			2. Status need to assign to Qi and request that she use the analysis that is in 11-13/652r8.
		4. CID 1482
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if BU can be fragmented or not. Kittens are not to be fragmented, but a BU may be fragmented.
			3. If the fragment threshold is smaller than your BU you would be required to fragment the BU.
			4. Possible sentence to add “The AP should attempt to transmit all fragments of a fragmented BU in the SP.”
			5. The actual question should be answered: “Is it OK to signal EOSP part-way through an MSDU/MMPDU in a U-ASPD SP?” it seems that this is ok and no change is required.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – In answer to the commenter, it is OK to signal EOSP part way through an MSDU, the AP is required to attempt transmission of at least one BU, but might stop at any point after that, even part way through a BU.
			7. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		5. CID 1481, 1660
			1. Review comment
			2. The wording may be unambiguous, but it also may be wrong.
			3. If a AP does not have any data, it will not send any data, and the STA has to stay awake until the next beacon to find out it is ok to go back to sleep.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revise - At 1101.31 change as follows: Add “If Available, a” to the sentence at “g)”
			5. Straw poll: Do we believe there is a problem here that needs to be fixed?
				1. Yes - 2
				2. No – 4

The group did not see a problem.

* + - 1. Proposed resolution CID 1660: Rejected. The wording is unambiguous. In reply to the commenter, a single buffered unit is exactly one buffered unit.
			2. No objection – mark ready for motion.
			3. Proposed resolution CID 1481: Rejected. The corner cases described is considered rare enough that a specific description of it is not justified. Specifying a QoS Null AP shall be sent by the AP might render existing implementations non-compliant..
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
	1. End of time
		1. Will resume tomorrow afternoon pm1
	2. Recessed at 6pm

1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 1:40pm Wednesday July 17, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY.
	1. Review Agenda
		1. Motions
		2. Comment Resolution
		3. 14:45: ISO Comments
	2. **Motion** **#27**
		1. Approve comment resolutions to comments in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-09-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> “Motion MAC-I” (telecon) tab and “Motion MAC-J” (Monday) tab

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-05-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx> “Gen Motion Telecon A” tab

* + 1. Moved: Stephen McCann 2nd: Jon Rosdahl
		2. Discussion:
			1. None
		3. Result 9-0-5 motion passes
	1. **Motion** **#28**
		1. Approve comment resolutions to comments in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-07-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> “Motion MAC-K” (telecon) tab
		2. Moved: Michael Montemurro 2nd : Adrian Stephens
		3. Discussion: 6-2-1 straw poll earlier, but we had wanted to revisit this CID prior to motion.
		4. Results: 12-1-4 motion passes
	2. **Motion #29**
		1. Approve comment resolutions to comments in doc: 11-13/0691r0 into IEEE P802.11-REVmc D1.5
		2. Moved: Adrian Stephens 2nd Stephen McCann
		3. Discussion: - none
		4. Results: 10-0-5 motion passes
	3. Comment Resolutions – Continue with 11-13-652 now r9
		1. CID 1167
			1. Review Comment
			2. The distinction is made if the rx address to determine duplication detection.
			3. Discussion on if we need “address discovery “ and “duplicate address detection” in the sentence?
				1. Can we have a note that explains the extra info?
				2. Yes. “Note – The Neighbor Solicitation message is used for both address discovery and duplicate address detection (IETF RFC 4862)
			4. Need to add an informative reference to IETF RFC 4862
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes as shown in 11-13/652r9 under CID 1167
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 1170
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion—the order does not have to match, but is there a corresponding relationship with the descriptor and the Status.
			3. The response should have a matching status for each descriptor
			4. We may want to add a “Shall” for making sure that this is the case.
			5. Looking in 10.24.16.2 – page 1259 lower part
			6. There seems to be that currently the AP either Accepts or Denies, but there may be an option of ignores that would need a separate sentence.
			7. The DMSID allows us to be flexible to not match order.
				1. If we do not take into count any possible legacy devices we could state that the order is required to be the same.
				2. Forcing order may be an issue
				3. Add “DMSDescriptor Field preserving the order present in the request.”
				4. If we make rules about the contents of the elements, then the issue is that the response may be larger than a given frame.
			8. Proposed resolution: Revised.

At 145.49, 151.58, 326.10, 327.33 change “As defined in DMS Request Element” with “Sequence of DMS Request Elements”.

At 149.10, 155.24, 326.52, 328.19, 329.12, 329.54 change “As defined in DMS Response Element” with “Sequence of DMS Response Elements”.

At 890.02, change the name of the last field to “DMS Request Elements”.

At 890.14, change “The DMS .. Element field contains a …” to “The DMS … Elements field contains one or more …”

At 890.26, change the name of the last field to “DMS Response Elements”.

At 890.47, change “The DMS .. Element field contains a …” to “The DMS … Elements field contains one or more …”

At 746.26 and 749.23, add the following sentence to the end of the para: “The maximum value of the DMS Length field is 253.”

At 1259.65 add: “The response frame shall contain a matching (i.e. as the same DMSID) DMS Status field for each received DMS Descriptor field preserving the order present in the request frame.”

NOTE—There is no requirement that the number of DMS Request elements and the number of DMS Response elements match. There is no requirement that the number of DMS Descriptor fields within any DMS Request element matches the number of DMS Status fields within any DMS Response element.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		1. CID 1498
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1499
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The commenter does not give specific changes that would fully address the comment. In reply to the commenter, the resolution of comments 1429 and 1430 should have addressed this issue
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 1568
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution. Revised. Change “sequence” to “Sequence” at 446.37, At 203.38 and 670.58 change “Block Ack starting sequence control” to “Block Ack Starting Sequence Control field”.

At 471.61 and 63 replace “(Block Ack Starting Sequence Control + n)” with “(value of the Block Ack Starting Sequence Control field + n)”.

At 1009.60 change “sequence control” to “sequence control value”.

* + - 1. No objection – mark ready for motion
		1. CID 1294
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make changes as shown in 11-13/652r9 under CID 1294
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1475
			1. Review the Comment this the last comment in the submission
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace “only if:” with “only if the Address 1 field in the probe request is the broadcast address or the specific MAC address of the STA, and either of the following applies:”. Delete item a) and re-letter b) and c) accordingly.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		3. Done with this submission….and there great Rejoicing and people said AMEN.
	1. ISO Comments 11-13/123r4
		1. Comments from the Swiss National Body(NB) have been received and are to be addressed.
		2. CID CH1
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; We thank the commenter for the submitted comments and propose resolutions to comments, in-line with IEEE SA rules, where specific recommended changes are provided by the commenter.
		3. CID CH2
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; We agree with the sentiments expressed by the commenter, and attempt to create a structure, internal to the 802.11 specification, where possible, to segment the component functions. New Physical layers are typically separable and are defined in new clauses. New major MAC features are kept in separate sections where possible, for example Fast Transition and Mesh. However, where new MAC functionality extends current functionality, the changes are necessarily made in the existing MAC clauses. Thus the clause sub-structure in the existing single document provides a partitioning of the total complexity.
		4. CID CH3
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected - RFC925 was published in 1984, prior to the Status assignments/allocations in IETF. The reference to RFC925 is included and retained as it defines Proxy ARP, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard.
		5. CID CH4
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - The reference to RFC 1321 is included and retained as RFC1321 is the IETF RFC that defines the MD5 algorithm; while use of MD5 is described in other standards track RFCs (for example in RFC 3748), the algorithm itself is not defined there. RFC 1321 has not been superseded and is the defining reference for the algorithm.

The reference to RFC 2104 is included and retained as it defines HMAC-MD5, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard. RFC 2104 has been updated by RFC 6151 - to update the security considerations section. Add RFC 6151 as a new informative reference.

The reference to RFC 2460 is included and retained as it defines IPv6, which is used and referenced in the standard. RFC2460 has Draft Standard status, see https://www.ietf.org/download/rfc-index.txt .

The reference to RFC 3164 is included and retained as it defines the syslog protocol, which is normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 3394 is included and retained as it defines the NIST AES Key wrap algorithm, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 3616 is deleted as it is no longer used and normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 4017 is moved to an informative reference, as it is not normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 5297 is included and retained as it defines AES-SIV which is normatively referenced in the standard.

* + 1. CID CH5
			1. Proposed Resolution: Revised, The reference to RFC 2104 is included and retained as it defines HMAC-MD5, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard. RFC 2104 has been updated by RFC 6151 - to update the security considerations section. Add RFC 6151 as a new informative reference.

The reference to RFC 4821 is not present in the standard.

* + 1. CID CH6
			1. Proposed Resolution: Revised The reference to RFC 3748 is included and retained as it defines EAP, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 4282 is included and retained as it defines the NAI, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 4776 is included and retained as it defines DHCP, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard.

The reference to RFC 5216 is included and retained as it defines EAP-TLS, which is used and normatively referenced in the standard.

These references meet IEEE-SA guidelines.

* + 1. CID CH7
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The reference to RFC2409 is retained as the normative reference is to an IKEv1 IANA registry.
			3. Need to rewrite the comment resolution.
		2. CID CH8
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; These references meet IEEE-SA guidelines. .
		3. CID CH9
			1. Review the Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; These references meet IEEE-SA guidelines.
		4. CID CH10
			1. Review the comment
			2. Review 5869 as an extractor function
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The RFC 5869 is informatively referenced; move RFC 5869 to list of informative references.
		5. CID CH11
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the text changes in 11-13-tbd.
			3. This will need to have a new submission to complete this CID as the submission is not ready today.
		6. So outstanding we have CH7 and CH11
			1. Dorothy will get better for Text CH7
			2. Dan H. Will prepare a submission for CH11.
			3. All of the comment response are contained in 11-13/123r4 or later.
	1. Recess at 3:30pm
1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 4:00pm Wednesday July 17, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY.
	1. Agenda for this time slot:
		1. Doc 11-13/876 Qi
		2. Doc 11-13/880 Wei Hong
		3. Comment Resolutions: GEN Adhoc
	2. Presentation/discussion of Doc 11-13/876r0 – Qi WANG
		1. Covers CID 78, CID 309, CID 310 from LB193mc
		2. Reviewed proposal and noted several typos that need to be corrected – will repost with r1 after other proposal points are considered.
		3. The desire of the submission is to make the use of traffic classification (TCLAS) be generic. Concern that the detail did not do that.
		4. The MSDU is defined at the top of the MAC, and an MPDU is at the bottom of the MAC.
		5. Start with the original text and try to come up with a more generic definition for traffic classification
		6. Classification parameters are listed in table 8-111
		7. Change proposal for TCLAS to “identify a Protocol Data Unit (PSDU) or MSDU.
		8. The TCLAS element is not included in uplink or direct-link transmissions, so that sentence can be removed in 8.4.2.33.
		9. When defining the value of the bit fields this proposal was quite different from other clauses in the draft.
		10. Discussion on how to describe the new assigned bits.
		11. Plan for Qi to post the modified submission, and Adrian will provide some input for suggested changes, and then a new version to be submitted for later discussion.
	3. Presentation of Doc 11-13/880r1 Wei Hong
		1. Interference description and coordination with 3GPP
		2. Suggestion of other venues that may be more appropriate
		3. WNG probably better to go to first rather than HEW.
		4. Discussion on merits of concept
		5. No conclusion or consensus.
	4. Comment Resolution Gen AdHoc - Jon ROSDAHL
		1. Thanks to Dorothy for taking Notes
		2. CID 1696
			1. -Discussion: No objection to the proposed reject.
			2. Delete the last sentence of the proposed rejection text; not needed.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-17 15:43:13Z) There are many combinations of MSDU size and rate/MCS selection and channel/medium condition for all PHYs which are unlikely to be successful. But there are some scenarios and conditions when those same parameters produce a likely outcome of success. There is no reason why the specification should introduce a limit that applies to only some situations.
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 1651
			1. Discussion: No objection to the proposed reject.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-17 15:46:16Z) The PHY header portion of every transmission provides a commonly decodable set of information including length information that has always been the fallback for cooperation in 802.11 networks when MAC information is not properly decoded. The probable failure of 3rd party nodes to properly decode the PSDU and then not possess DUR field information has always existed in the standard, before the introduction of LDPC, for example, when a STA close to the AP uses a relatively high rate of encoding (e.g. 64-QAM 3/4) – and a STA located farther from the AP is unable to decode the PSDU for that transmission – a commonly encountered scenario – the only information available at the second STA is the PPDU header – no requirement exists in the standard that in such a scenario, the transmitting STA is not allowed to initiate the transmission without a preceding RTS/CTS or some other more reliable means of communicating MAC DUR information. There is no reason to single out LDPC as a special, new or unique situation.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		4. CID 1620
			1. Discussion: No objection to the proposed reject.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-17 15:49:26Z) No specific problem identified, and no specific resolution suggested.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		5. CID 1591
			1. Discussion: No objection to the proposed reject.
			2. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-17 15:50:29Z) No specific problem identified, and no specific resolution suggested.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		6. CID 1546
			1. Discussion: No objection to the proposed reject.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-17 15:51:25Z) At this point operations are not ambiguous. If some new operations became ambiguous in the future we can worry about it then
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		7. CID 1085
			1. Discussion: Agree to reject the comment, “the problem statement is overly broad and no specific solution s proposed.”.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-17 15:53:29Z) The problem statement is overly broad, and no specific proposal is being suggested.
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		8. CID 1512
			1. Review Comment
			2. GEN: 2013-07-18 13:12:59Z - after discussion, we determined this should be deferred and referred back to Vinko -- may need to get Matthew F. and Vinko to check with Adrian about table 18-17 and that it does or does not apply.
			3. GEN: 2013-07-18 -Proposed resolution 1: Reject – many numbers are not explained in the spec. Probably old submissions would need to be references which is not common practice.

 Or

Proposed Resolution 2: Reject – the numbers reflect a generally conservative estimate of an upper bound on the time needed for this operation for a typical implementation of the standard as typical was imagined at the time that the value was placed into the standard. An upper bound value is needed in order to allow the slowest-operating implementation to complete specific tasks involving this parameter (namely, the possible resetting of the NAV as specified in 9.3.2.4 Setting and resetting the NAV and backoff as described in 9.20.2.5 EDCA backoff procedure) and for other implementations operating in the same network to delay their own decision regarding these tasks until the slowest implementations have been allowed enough time to complete theirs, so that all STAs that reset their NAV or begin competing for backoff slots do so at the same time and therefore remain in synch.

Note also, the editor’s note in Table 18-17 within 18.4.4 OFDM PHY characteristics:

Editor’s Note: I challenge the utility of having implementation dependent values in what is intended to be an abstract (i.e., implementation independent) interface.

* + - 1. The note should be removed because the values are not only part of an abstract interface but have direct impact on observable MAC behaviour as described in the proposed resolution above.
			2. – Assign to Vinko ERCEG
		1. CID 1513
			1. Review comment with 1512
			2. Proposed resolution: GEN: 2013-07-18 - Reject – this parameter is defined on page 417.16, for example: “The delay, in microseconds, from a point in time specified by the PHY to the issuance of the PHY-RXSTART.indication primitive.” where PHY-RXSTART.indication is further defined in the spec (see PHY PLCP receive procedures, receives state machine figures, etc. in different clauses)
			3. GEN: 2013-07-18 13:26:06Z - the actual point in time is not defined in any of the PHYs and we do not know when that time is…so this may be an implementation detail, but the standard is a bit ambiguous. This may have been made ambiguous with the removal of the PMD. Eldad to help research this issue.
			4. Assign to Vinko/Eldad
		2. CIDs 1691
			1. Assign to Dorothy to look into it.
		3. CID 1692
			1. Assign to Dorothy to look into it.
		4. CID 1529
			1. Needs submission to identify “where appropriate”.
		5. Assign to Mark Rison (commenter)
		6. CID 1478
			1. This comment requests work to be done.
			2. Submission required
			3. Assign to Mark Rison (commenter)
		7. CID 1701
			1. – Discussion:  Believe no change needed
			2. GEN: 2013-17-23 - Proposed Resolution: Reject (Same as CID 293).
			3. Discussion: The PICS seem to reflect what is in the Standard. It is not defining the shall, but rather referring to a Shall that is in the standard. It does clarify what is there for implementers.
			4. Question: How certain are we that we have a Shall in the PICs for each Shall in the Standard?
			5. Assign CID 1701 and 293 to Jon ROSDAHL to craft response.
	1. Recess 6pm
1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 1:38pm Thursday July 18, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY
	1. Review Agenda:

 Comment Resolution: -

11-13-730 – Dan,

11-13-867 -- Eldad,

11-13-875 – Adrian,

11-13-876r2 -- Qi

* 1. Presentation of Doc 11-13-073r0 – Dan HAWKINS
		1. Neighbour Report Info
		2. Discussion on why having a reject with reason – to give more hints as to why reject
		3. An R1 is to be posted to correct some minor spelling and a missing instruction correction.
		4. Question on preallocations cases
			1. What cases are being addressed
			2. This proposal seems to cover the useful cases that were targeted.
	2. Presentation of Doc 11-13-687r0 - Eldad
		1. Removal of PMD from 11ad
		2. Based on REVmc D1.4
		3. No objections – A Motion will be prepared to accept changes in the draft.
	3. Presentation of Doc 11-13-875 – Adrian STEPHENS
	4. CID 1050
		1. Review Comment
		2. Looking at very long paragraphs
		3. Provide complete replacements
		4. While presenting identified at least one change r1 will be posted
		5. Still one more TBD in Table 9-x.
		6. Individually addressed QoS STA needed more definition in table 9-x
		7. Replaces all the long paragraphs. Note that eelier we had added text to indicate an additional counter was involved, and it was added in the wrong place. This does not matter though as both locations will be replaced with the proposed text.
		8. Foot notes to a table are normative, but notes are informative.
		9. A new revision will be posted to capture the changes discussed.
		10. A motion to include this presentation would be made in Sept to allow more review for the group.
	5. Presentation of Doc 11-13/876r2 – Qi WANG
		1. R1 was presented yesterday, and this version includes the suggested changes.
		2. Thanks to those that provide feedback and help in making it more compact and clear.
		3. This version converts the long paragraphs to table format to help explain the detail.
		4. Identified a change to undo an add of three new values in table
		5. Couple other typos noted
		6. Make R3 will be created and a motion to adopt this document in the PM2 session today.
	6. Comment Resolution: Gen AdHoc
		1. CID 1561
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-18 13:01:40Z) The commenter does not indicate a specific problem to resolve or a specific change to make. Note to commenter: A transmitter is required to stop using a PTKSA/GTKSA/STKSA prior to counter wrapping."
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 1692
			1. Review Comment
			2. GEN: 2013-07-18 - while the RFC may need to be updated we need to ensure the correct section is being referenced as well.
			3. Assign to Dorothy Stanley
		3. CID 1691
			1. Review Comment:
			2. GEN: 2013-07-18 13:52:27Z - The specific section that is being referenced needs to be checked before we can make the proposed change to ensure the complete reference is correct.
			3. Assign to Dorothy Stanley
		4. CID 301
			1. Discussion on the term WDS
			2. Some would like it gone, others not gone.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2013-07-18 14:29:22Z) TThe WDS term is listed in 3.1 Definitions that gets integrated into a generic dictionary of terms. This term is still in active use in devices implementing the IEEE 802.11 standard and such use is likely to continue to be the case in the future. As such, it is useful to maintain this definition.

Replace

"This standard specifies such a frame format and its use only for a mesh basic service set (MBSS)."

with

"This standard specifies such a frame format. This standard defines use of this frame format for a mesh basic service set (MBSS)."

Delete "Because of this, the term WDS is obsolete and subject to removal in a subsequent revision of this standard." (page 26 line 25 in REVmc/D1.5)."

* + - 1. Not without some dissention, but most felt this was ready for Motion and we should move on.
		1. CID 1521
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2013-07-18 14:41:23Z) At 34.42 Delete the following text, retaining the definition and the first sentence of the definition: “Such a device might use pre-RSNAs because of configuration. Note that RSNA-capable does not imply full compliance with the RSNA Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS). A legacy device that has been upgraded to support Temporal Key Integrity Protocol (TKIP) might be RSNA-capable, but is not compliant with the PICS if it does not also support Counter mode with Cipher-block chaining Message authentication code Protocol (CCMP).”
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		2. CID 154
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission 11-12/1345
			3. Disagreement with changing name spaces.
			4. Issue with submission addressing more than comments and changes not indicated by comments.
			5. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-07-18 14:51:21Z) - The benefit of changing the name space from numeric to descriptive is not clear to the TG. Unique name space is more specific than a descriptive name.
			6. No objection – mark ready for motion.
		3. CID 29
			1. Part of discussion on PICs
			2. Reassign to Adrian for addressing on Telecon
		4. CID 127
			1. Part of discussion on PICs
			2. GEN: 2013-07-18 15:26:13Z - There was a long discussion on the usefulness of having consistency in the tables and the usefulness of just parking the synonyms in the introductory text. Some like the "AND" others thought "&" is better or at least should be used consistently. The use of "and" was thought to be sloppy, but not worth the effort to correct.
			3. Being late in the day, it was getting a bit sappy, so we agreed to disagree.
			4. Reassign to Jon for addressing on Telecon
		5. CID 269
			1. Part of the PICS discussion.
			2. GEN: 2013-18-23: - This was assigned to Mark RISON -- who created 11-12/1345r0, the submission was overreaching, and corrected more than was requested/thought by the comments.
			3. Reassign to Jon for addressing on Telecon
	1. Recess at 3:30pm
1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 4:05pm Thursday July 18, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY
	1. Review Agenda:
		1. Motion
		2. Comment Resolution
		3. Plans for Sept,
		4. AOB
		5. Adjourn
	2. **Motion #30**
		1. Approve comment resolutions to comments in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-10-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> “Motion MAC-L” tab , except for CID 1155 and

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-06-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx> “Gen Motion Geneva - A” tab, and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-12-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls> “Editor Motion 1” tab.

* + 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl 2nd:Stephen McCaan
		2. Discussion:
			1. Question on CID 1155. Discussion on the resolution.
			2. Wish to have 1155 removed from the set.
			3. After ensuring the correct tab indications no further discussion
		3. Results 8-0-0 motion Passes
	1. **Motion #31**
		1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-13/0730r1 into IEEE P802.11-REVmc D1.5.
		2. Moved Adrian Stephens, 2nd Stephen McCann
		3. Discussion: - None
		4. Results: 7-0-1 Motion passes
	2. **Motion #32**
		1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-13/867r0 into IEEE P802.11-REVmc D1.5.
		2. Moved Adrian Stephens, 2nd Stephen McCann
		3. Discussion: - none
		4. Results: 6-0-0
	3. **Motion #33**
		1. Move to incorporate the text changes in 11-13/876r3 and resolve CIDS 78, 309, 310 as “Revised” with the resolution of “Incorporate the changes in 11-13/876r3”
		2. Moved Qi Wang; 2nd Stephen McCann
		3. Discussion: none
		4. Results: 7-0-0
	4. Now that the motions are done, the agenda file will be uploaded as R7.
	5. Meeting Planning:
		1. Propose 3 telecons
			1. Aug 16, 30; and Sept 6
			2. At 10am ET.
			3. No objection
	6. Schedule review
		1. Change the date of the Recirc from July to Sept 2013.
	7. Draft Status
		1. A 1.6 will be prepared out of this meeting when the editor has incorporated the Approved CIDs.
	8. Assign all outstanding comments without Assignees.
		1. CID         Assignee Ad-hoc              Note

278         Fischer MAC

1021       Stephens MAC             Location

1028       Stephens MAC             Present during Telecon

1424       Rosdahl MAC             Location

1050       Stephens MAC             Present during September Interim

1654       Stephens MAC             Present during Telecon

1291       Hunter MAC             Present during Telecon

1296       Stephens MAC             Present during Telecon

1305       Stephens MAC

1311       Hamilton MAC

1483       Rison               MAC       Submission required

1660       N/A MAC Resolved in 652r1

1671       Rosdahl MAC                Location

1418       Rosdahl MAC                Location

1084       Hart                  MAC Submission required

1335       Stephens MAC             Present during Telecon

1373       Hamilton MAC              Present during Telecon

* + 1. Adrian to post an updated document that gives assignees.
		2. Dorothy will assign a presentation time to each assignee.
		3. Advertised that CIDs requiring submission that are not done by Sept.
		4. Adrian to provide a tab per assignee
		5. Use of comment group is less useful at this time.
	1. No other business
	2. Adjourned at 5:50pm
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