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Abstract

IEEE 802.11 TG REVmc Minutes for Sept 2013 – Nanjing, China

1. 802.11 TG REVmc called to order at 1:32pm Monday Sept 16, 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	1. Review Agenda 11-13/0943r1
	2. Review Patent Policy
		1. No IP noted
	3. Proposed Agendas:
		1. Monday PM1 agenda reviewed:

Chair’s Welcome, Status, Review of Objectives,

Approve Agenda, Minutes

Editor Report

 Timeline and Schedule

Comment 11-13-1009 Mark Hamilton

* + 1. Tuesday PM1:

Comment Resolution:

* + 1. – Solomon
		2. 11-13-652r14 – Adrian

11-13/703r1 – Adrian

* + 1. Tuesday PM2:

Comment Resolution – GEN

11-13-0012, 0013 – Graham

11-13-1170 - Adrian

* + 1. Wednesday PM1

Motions

Comment Resolution:

ISO Comments 11-13-123

* + 1. Wednesday PM2

Comment Resolution:

* + 1. Thursday PM1

Comment Resolution:

* + 1. Thursday PM2

Comment resolution, Motion

Plans for Nov, 11mc in IEEE store, AOB

Adjourn

* + 1. No Objection to Agendas as stated.
	1. Objectives for This week: Comment Resolutions.
	2. Editor Report – 11-13/95r6
		1. Previously presented on Telecon
		2. Status of Draft – 1.6 is now on the server
		3. Comment composite: 11-13/0233
		4. Status of Comment Resolution:
			1. There are 194 Comments assigned but unresolved
			2. There are 17 ready for motion
		5. Review Comment Resolution histogram
		6. Status of Editorial Comments – submission ready for discussion:
			1. Assignees:

Mark Rison – 101 comments – but not present this week

Vinko and Vinko/Eldad – 4 assigned but believe the e-mail that was sent should have resolved these – Jon to go back and review and update

* + - 1. Other assignees should have brought a submission for resolution.
		1. Process for completion:
			1. Once we believe it is complete, we will have a check to ensure it is in fact not missing any comment resolutions.
		2. Chair gave a formal “Thanks” to Adrian and the Editorial review team as the doc is very large > 3000 pages
		3.
	1. Approve Prior Minutes
		1. Move to adopt the minutes in11-13/0697r0 and 11-13/098r2 by unanimous consent.
		2. No Objection – Minutes are approved.
	2. Review Plan of Record:
		1. Integration of 11ac from Dec 13 to March 14
		2. Letter ballot on D3.0 including 11ac March 2013
		3. Feb 2014 Mandatory Draft Review
		4. Integration of additional amendments (11af)
			1. We may delay roll-in of 11af for D4.0
			2. Another option we could use the first recirc of the Sponsor ballot
			3. So we have alternatives for D3.0 or 4.5/5.0 after SB
			4. Things to think about and prepare for a discussion and make a better plan in November Plenary session.
			5. Some believe that we may have better luck rolling in one amendment at a time.
	3. Advancing the “Needs Submission” category Comments:
		1. Please Review the comments with “needs submission” in AdHoc Status Category. In 11-13-0233(latest Version) column W
		2. Are there other CIDs that should not be categorized?
			1. If so notify the chair
		3. Process:
			1. Assign Submission to commenter
			2. If No Submission received, reject comment with “insufficient detail provided” reason
	4. Draft Motion slides are provided for preparing for later in the week in 11-13-0943r0
	5. Comment Resolution - Presentation of 11-13/1009r2 – Mark HAMLITON (Spectralink)
		1. Resume where we left off from the Teleconference – start on page 9
		2. CID 1411
			1. Review comment
			2. Nowhere is there a definition of “prepared to deliver”, so there seems to be a problem of “prepared to deliver or STA within the BSS”.
			3. Some may buffer frames that are not “ready to be delivered”
			4. That did not seem to be clear as to what “ready to be delivered meant.
			5. Maybe the sentence is just long and needs rewriting
			6. There was an understanding that for buffered BUs that you could set the TIM bits, and note that an AP may set the bit when it is ready to deliver the Buffered BUs.
			7. Discussion on large buffered groups, but how to identify the BUs that are ready to go this TIM period that may be being done for some AP optimization.
			8. We could add a sentence that states that how the AP selects is implementation dependant.
			9. The first sentence in the Clause does not allow for selection/decision.
			10. The clause would have to be revisited to clarify what is being implied if we make changes even adding the new sentence.
			11. Many of the steps to “prepare a frame” is defined, and so we do have a “prepare a frame” set of steps.
			12. Discussion on whether the first sentence does or does not force a particular function.
			13. The SHALL in the first sentence does mean that the two sentences are not completely in alignment.
			14. Managing TIM bits may have some work being done by TGah.
			15. The fact that this comment requests “Please Clarify” so a simple reject may be inline.
			16. The proposed resolution was not accepted by the group, so an alternate would be to simply reject the comment.
			17. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			18. No Objection - Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 1412
			1. Review comment
			2. Assigned to GEN – Straw poll was not conclusive
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Remove ADDTS.request and ADDBA.request timeouts. This includes all references to them (including service primtives (6.3.26.2.2's parameters and 6.3.26.3.2's ResultCode and associated text, etc. as well as the timeout from the figures and text in 10.4 and 10.5) and associated MIB variables (dot11ADDba\*, dot11ADDTS\*). Note to Editor that for ADDBA, this is the ADDBAFailureTimeout, not the BlockAckTimeout which is needed.
			4. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		4. CID 1510
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject The Extended Capabilities element is in several frame types, not just Beacons (or Probe Responses). The Otherwise case covers the other Frame Types.
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		5. CID 1525
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change the cited sentence into a “NOTE-“
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion.
		6. CID 1548
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change to “in units of 1Mb/s in the range 1 to 1023” in both of the cited locations.
			3. One objection –
			4. Question of what is wrong with the Monty Python wording? The terse sentence seems less clear to some.
			5. Discussion on which version is less clear.
			6. The debate of “1-3” meant “1-3” includes both 1 and 3.
			7. Describing the specifics of a range and the issue of how to describe the steps or boundaries.
			8. Mark ready for Motion – Re-ask if there is any objection, then bring up when the motion is made, and we can pull to address CID separately.
		7. CID 1602
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID1602: Revised. At 985L41, change “the PHY-CCA.indication primitive is clear” to “the PHY-CCA state indicates IDLE”. At 985L48, change “if PHY-CCA.indication primitive is clear” to “if the PHY-CCA state indicates IDLE during the CCAdel period preceeding the TxPifs slot boundary”. Also change “PHY-CCA.indication(idle)” to “PHY-CCA.indication(IDLE)” and “PHY-CCA.indication(busy)” to “PHY-CCA.indication(BUSY)” throughout the Draft, for example at 986L7, 1089L28, 1790L36 and 1790L39.
			3. In General the group was in agreement, but Menzo wanted to review the proposal between now and Wednesday.
			4. There was concern of the term “Clear” vs ”Idle”. The PHY service primitive has only two states, and while the physical radio may have used clear as apposed to idle, the terms were synonymous.
			5. There is a formal interface between the MAC/PHY and there are two states IDLE and BUSY, but we have to use the terms of the interface, and CLEAR is not a state.
			6. To change IDLE to CLEAR would be outside this comment.
			7. General Agreement - Mark ready for Motion
		8. CID 1635
			1. Review the comment
			2. Clause 10.2.2.12 is a general discussion on the AP aging scheme.
			3. Don’t use “per” prior to a normative statement. Do you as “Described by” or as “Defined by”?
			4. Use of “as described by” in place of per.
			5. Should this aging function be limited to never delete prior to ListenInterval.
			6. There are other reasons for dropping MSDUs, so we should include some of that in this definition.
			7. Discussion on the impact of the “unless” statement being added.
			8. If we fix10.2.2.12 to be more generic, then we can point other clauses here for definition, and then we do not have to rewrite the alternate cases in the other locations.
			9. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Make resolutions as stated for CID 1635 in 11-13/1009r2.
			10. There was some dissent from full acceptance.
			11. The commenter asked for some restriction on when to drop BUs. An other alternative would be to decline the comment.
			12. There was sentiment that this comment should be declined and the changes were more or less non-responsive to the request.
			13. There was objection to the changes, and a discussion ensured.
			14. StrawPoll:
				1. Decline the Comment vs accept the Proposal
				2. 9 for proposal: 3 decline proposal
			15. New Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			16. Mark ready for Motion
		9. CID 1660
			1. Review Comment
			2. The straw poll indicated we should not change, but a proposed change was suggested.
			3. If we make a change when we suggest no change is needed, then we may set a poor precedence.
			4. Changing one case does not necessarily mean that you have to change the other cases.
			5. Disagreement on if the statement is wrong or if a change is needed.
			6. If it ain’t broke don’t fix.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Reject. The current text is clear. A single buffered BU is delivered.
			8. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion.
		10. CID 1668
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection : Mark ready for Motion
		11. End of list of CIDs in this submission.
	6. Review upcoming documents to review later in the week.
	7. Recess at 3:25pm
1. TG REVmc called to order at 1:32pm Tuesday 17 Sept 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	1. Review the Agenda
		1. Doc:11-13/1017r1 was used for resolution of CID 1154, but an R2 has been posted with a default value of 0 replacing what was 255 that was in R1.
			1. People are asked to review as R2 would be used for resolution.
		2. Doc: 11-13-0875r1 was for CID 1050
			1. Has not been presented yet.
			2. Present on Wednesday PM2
		3. Doc: 11-13-703r1 for today.
	2. Presentation: doc:11-13-0954r1 Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
		1. Simple Fix to the 11ad text that was rolled in.
		2. There is a discrepancy in 9.38.3 and 8.6.7.4 & 8.6.7.5
		3. This single page submission corrects this.
		4. No questions after presentation
		5. A Motion will be prepared by Dorothy to incorporate the changes in the draft.
	3. Presentation; doc:11-13-1009r3 Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink)
		1. CID 1216
			1. One last comment that was not discussed during last time slot.
			2. Review comment and the history of discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change:

“The LLC definitions of the primitives and specific parameter value restrictions imposed by IEEE Std 802.11 are given in 5.2.2 (MA-UNITDATA.request) to 5.2.4 (MA-UNITDATA-STATUS.indication).

to:

“IEEE Std 802.11 places restrictions and semantics on the parameter values for these primitives, as described in 5.2.2 (MA-UNITDATA.request) to 5.2.4 (MA-UNITDATA-STATUS.indication).”

* 1. Presentation: doc: 11-13-652r14 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel).
		1. R14 addresses the final set of Editorials
		2. CID 180
			1. Review comment
			2. The proposed change was made due another CID already, but need to have some bookkeeping done as the edits are done in the draft already.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2012-10-03 11:31:51Z) - Change O.3 at item CF8 to "O". At B.2.1 after " is required" add ". The scope of the group of options is limited to a single table (i.e., subclause) within the PICS)." change "O. optional, support" to "O. optional <em-dash> Support"
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1517
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: In 9.18.5 replace any normal spaces between a value and its units with a non-breaking space.
			3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 1491
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised Change Cited instances to use degree symbol and review all use of “degree(s)” and “deg” and replace with the degree symbol where it represents a unit following a value in degrees.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1540
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At Cited location change “-1-RSS Max” to “-1 to RSSI Max”.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1570
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The current usage does not cause an ambiguity.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1574
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Apply courier font to code in O.3
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1580
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Add missing quotes at 57.47.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 1583
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Both the e and exp are acceptable forms. The exp form has the advantage of not reducing font size for its parameter, which is important when the parameter itself has nested superscripts and subscripts.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 1612
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject, Clause 3.1 has defined “group address” as synonymous with “multicast address”. No change is required.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1624
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Comments on the pdf metadata are out of Scope.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		12. CID 97
			1. Review Comment
			2. This was listed as a reject, but needs good reject text
			3. Proposed Resolution; Rejected. Generally protocol data units (PDUs) contain data defined in a protocol. Therefore the MAC management protocol data unites need to be some kind of PDU, not MMDU.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		13. CIDs with Insufficient Detail
			1. Standards Board Ops Man review of how to handle a negative vote.
			2. The following CIDs are proposed to have a resolution: “Rejected. The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”
			3. CIDs: 98, 135, 141, 170, 171. 179. 194, 1508, 1518, 1519, 232, 254, 259, 1435, 1436, 1438, 1440, 1441, 1446, 1450, 1452, 1453, 1457, 1461, 1462, 1463, 1466, 1470, 1479, 1501, 1505, 1538, 1543, 1544, 1551, 1557, 1560, 1562, 1571, 1572, 1575, 1577, 1584, 1588, 1592, 1594, 1598, 1611, 1614, 1629, 1639, 1663, 1669, 1670.
		14. Review the document to ensure we have covered all the CIDs
			1. CID 1335 has been done, but had not been marked. Need to be marked in the document
		15. CID 1078
			1. Reviewed comment
			2. A review with the PHY experts was done after the Telecon, and a proposed resolution was determined.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. While these characteristics are implementation dependent, there is normative behaviour defined in the MAC based on these values, so their presence in this interface is necessary.
			4. No Objection s ready for motion.
	2. Presentation: doc:11-13-703r1 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. Review Submission – This was presented before, and further review and research was requested.
		2. 3GPP is not providing a liaison, so having individuals from the different groups are looking at the issue and trying to address them in the respective groups unofficially.
		3. Proposed changes: Add a statistics table, Insert the 2 new Octect counters, define a new table, Add counters from China Mobile proposal. Add definitions for the counters and variables. Deprecate dot11Counters Group3 and add a new dot11Counters Group 4. Add a new group for statistics group, update the compliance statement.
		4. The minor changes noted during presentation will be saved and an R2 to be posted.
		5. There is a protocol above layer 2 that needs some of this info to tell devices which APs to consider in the handover and connections.
		6. A motion will be created to incorporate these changes into the draft for consideration on Wednesday.
	3. Presentation: doc:11-13-0013r3 – Graham SMITH (DSP Group)
		1. Review document – Changes to Annex N.
		2. CIDS 1112, 1113, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1458 (MAC), 0166 (mostly GEN)
		3. Red Text is the mark-up for the editor
		4. Submission 11-13/12r0 has more details on the why of each change.
		5. Remove the “should”s and make an R4 of the document.
		6. Review determining how to define “Medium Time”. This text has been reviewed several times.
		7. Reviewing the equations for SBA, a power was missing. This was corrected and will be in R4.
		8. SBA discussion –
		9. Trying to save the file, there was a problem; Graham will have to address offline.
		10. Proposed Resolution: Revised, Make the changes as documented in 11-13-0013r4.
		11. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
	4. Recess at 3:26pm
1. TG REVmc Called to order 4:02pm, 17 Sept 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	1. Call to order at 4:02
	2. Agenda discussion –
		1. Proposed Agenda:

11-13-1170 - Adrian

11-13-1178r0 - Naveen

11-13-0012, 0013 – Graham

11-13-0448r1 - Matthew

Comment Resolution – GEN

* + 1. Agenda approved without objection
	1. Presentation: doc:11-13/1170r1 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. Classification of traffic into AC's is a mandatory component of EDCA. This proposal does not change other QoS behaviour.
		2. -The timing on this proposal is urgent.
		3. - This only refers to QoS STA's, not WMM.
		4. - The QoS Simplification extended capabilities field indicates that the device implement QoS simplification.
		5. - A device is still free to use EDCA. It provides an alternative mode.
		6. - This proposal will be presented in 11ac. If it fails to be accepted, it will be proposed in 11mc.
	2. Presentation: doc 11-13/1178r0 – Naveen KAKANI (CSR)
		1. - The position of AP1 and AP2 is determined prior to the Time of Flight Measurement.
		2. - The AP's Geospatial location configuration would be determined from the Time of Flight measurement. The Geospatial location could be determined via ANQP. However the Geospatial location may not be configured properly on an AP.
		3. - There is a number of steps to determine location that is out of scope of IEEE 802.11.
		4. - There are likely more changes to this text. However that can be done through future letter ballot comments.
		5. - How precise is the SIFS time for these time-of-flight measurements.
		6. - Three of four APs would be need to be used to accurately determine the location of the device.
		7. - No Objection to resolving CIDs 1424, 1671, 1418 with proposed Resolution.
		8. Proposed Resolution CIDs 1424, 1671, 1418: Revised. Accept the changes indicated in document 1178r0.
		9. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion.
	3. Presentation: Doc 11-13/448r1 – Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
		1. Review submission
		2. CID 280
			1. Review Comment
			2. This comment had been presented last May, further time to review had been requested.
			3. Changes were reviewed again
			4. TKIP is deprecated and we should not make changes to it.
			5. Has any feedback from security experts been sought?
			6. QoS Control Field is not the same as QC, so in 11.4.3.3.1, it needs to be QoS Control Field first, and the other QC instances are ok.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes in 11-13-448r2 for CID 280 section. Note no changes to the TKIP clauses were made because TKIP is now deprecated.
			8. No Objection – ready for motion
		3. CID 285
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion text
			3. Change of “successful” to “completed” is requested.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
			5. No Objection – ready for Motion
		4. CID 208
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – ready for Motion
		5. CID 1646
			1. Review Comment
			2. The changes while correct are put into a sentence that is really not correct. The sentence construct is not right, but not the subject of the comment, so the proposed change is in the normal form of the clause it is being inserted.
			3. A recirc ballot comment may be used to clean it up further.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised – Incorporate the changes in 11-13-448r2 for section CID 1646.
			5. No Objection – ready for Motion
		6. CID 278
			1. The discussion is in document 11-13-449r0
			2. Review the minutes from May (4.3.3.9)
			3. We did review 449r0 in May.
			4. Review the comment
			5. Text is not detailed ready for comment resolution.
			6. Question of if the presenter wanted to conduct the straw poll on slide 21, and the presenter said no. He wanted to continue to show slide 24-26 and the details of the proposal.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			8. The presenter claims that there is detail in 11-13-449r0, while it was not prepared in a form that the editor could make the changes required for this change.
	4. Recessed at 6pm
1. TG REVmc called to order at 1:30pm 18 Sept 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	1. Review Agenda for today

Agenda:

Motions

Comment Resolution – David Hunter

ISO CID 11-13-123, 11-13-1173 Dan Harkins

11-13-562 GEN/Jon Rosdahl

* + 1. Question on Skipping MAC Comment CID 283?
			1. Add the comment CID 283 to Wednesday PM2
		2. For today, there was No Objection to the proposed Agenda
	1. Motions:
		1. Motion Geneva Minutes, Telecons
		2. **Motion #34:** Approve comment resolutions to comments in 11-13/361r2 “Motion MAC-M” tab changing “11-13/1017r1” to “11-13/1017r2” in the resolutions to CIDs 1154, 263, 214, 324 (MAC). Also comments in 11-13/562r10 “Gen Motion Geneva B” and Gen Motion Telecon Aug-Sept Tabs (GEN) and to incorporate the text changes indicated in 11-13/0937r2 (11ad text corrections)
			1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS, 2nd Mike MONTEMURRO
			2. Results: 9-0-0 motion passes
		3. **Motion #35:** Approve comment resolutions in 11-13/361r12 “Motion MAC-N” tab, and 11-13-0562r10 “Gen Motion Nanjing A” except for CID 166 and incorporate the text changes indicated in 11-13-0954r1 (11ad text corrections) and 11-13/073r2 (MIB additions for 3GPP).
			1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON 2nd: Carlos CORDIERO
			2. Results: 11-0-0 Motion Passes.
		4. **Motion #36**: Editorial: Approve comment resolution to comments in 11-13/0233r16 “Editor Motion A” and “Editor Motion B” tabs.
		5. Moved Adrian STEPHENS, 2nd Mike MONTEMURRO
		6. Results: 11-0-0
	2. Comments assigned to David HUNTER
		1. CID 1322
			1. There are many more than 60 “is optional”.
			2. A spreadsheet was prepared that shows lots of “optionally”
			3. There is a style guide statement that explicitly uses “optionally” to be used in clause 6.
			4. See page 129 of D1.6 for a random example.
			5. The request was to change “optionally present” to “might be present”, and we have debated this before, and we made this choice.
			6. Debate on what the description is actually doing? Is it defining the parameter, or when the parameter is present.
			7. Straw poll: Should there be more work to identify all the uses of “optionally” and find replacement?
				1. Question in Clause 6 there may be a reason to have it one particular way, so other clauses may have different rules.
				2. The point is to find if there is enough support to do the work to look for replacement words.
				3. The editor noted that we have already chosen this style in the style guide in clause 6 and clause 8. It is written that a STA may be able to have optionally do this or that.
				4. New Straw poll : Should there be more work to identify the uses of “optionally” and find replacement in clauses other than 6 or 8?

Results: 5-2-2

* + - 1. Question on what format is to be discussed offline with the Editor?
		1. CID 58
			1. Decline the comment – lack of detail.
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 1193
			1. Decline the comment – lack of detail
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 1203
			1. Decline the comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		4. CID 1291
			1. Decline the comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
	1. Presentation :doc 11-13/123r0 – ISO - Dan HARKINS (Aruba)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Swiss Body representative has commented that GCM not in the pseudo code
		3. There is different ways to deal with this. GCM can be added, but we have this issue that there is an CCMP MIB variable that is not properly defined.
		4. Debate over whether if this is normative or informative.
		5. Thresh holds that trigger reports, and we need to be careful to not make a change that cascades the changes in the standard.
		6. Three seems to be that we found a possible error that is not directly related to the comment, but do we fix it now or do we accumulate and fix later.
		7. Error are like radioactive material, if we get enough in one area then that is when we have to fix it.
		8. We do not seem to have a lot of MIB implementations, so this is a don’t care area.
		9. The CCM problem is not being requested to be resolved, and in the future we should be happy to have comments that provide fixes.
			1. There is no normative text that says increment the counter for a particular error, there maybe other variables that need to be fixed, but we should just do the work that is identified.
		10. A Motion will be prepared to adopt the changes made in 11-13/1170r0
	2. Gen Comment Resolution:
		1. CID 257
			1. Review comment
			2. There was previously a prepared resolution in 11-12/1229r4
			3. There is an objection to that resolution then and now.
			4. There is objection to loosing state when doing a reassociation.
			5. When you loose state, you have to redo the 4way Handshake.
			6. The different in Associate vs ReAssociate and what should be the behaviour.
			7. The comment has identified a problem, but what does the ReAssociate change or not change.
			8. There is some work that needs to be done, and the proposed resolution is not sufficient, but future comments can be brought back later.
			9. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			10. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 229
			1. Review comment
			2. We had decided to reject this before, and then a proposal was made for an alternative resolution.
			3. We decided to defer for more thought and research in Jan 16th 2013.
			4. There is a paper 11-13/144r0 that was also submitted to resolve this CID.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Reject - The rationale of the proposed resolution in 11-13/144r0 and in the comment is insufficiently clear to come to consensus that there is an issue to resolve
			6. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 228
			1. Review comment and history
			2. Proposed resolution: Reject The comment does not indicate an issue to be resolved or specific changes that would satisfy the commenter.

In reply to the commenter, EIFS is used instead of DIFS when using either the DCF or the EDCAF to access the medium. When PIFS is being used to access the medium, it is done so without regard to whether a previous frame would have caused EIFS to be used, if DCF/EDCAF were to be used for channel access

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 218
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The commenter doesn’t indicate a specific issue to resolve or specific changes that would satisfy their comment.

In reply, generally we have three things:

1. Mandatory rates

2. Basic rates

3. Operational rates

Operational rates necessarily include all the Mandatory rates.

Operational rates necessarily include all the Basic rates.

The STA starting a BSS has complete freedom in selection of the basic rates from the set of rates it supports.

The mandatory rates are the mandatory rates defined “for the attached PHY”, and are fixed by specification.

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 183
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The commenter has not indicated a specific issue to be resolved or specific changes that would satisfy the commenter.
			3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 134
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Commenter does not indicate a problem to be resolved.
			3. Commenter does not indicate specific changes that will resolve the comment.
			4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 116
			1. Review the comment
			2. This is tied to CID 22
				1. Review CID 22
			3. Proposed Resolution CID 22: Revise: At 854.50 change “No HT Operation element is present in the most recently received Association Response frame that was addressed to this STA.” to “No HT Operation element is present in the Association Response frame received from the current AP.”

At 867.60 Change “most recently received HT Capabilities element from” to “HT Capabilities element received from”

At 868.03, 868.15, 868.30, 868.40, 1106.65 delete “most recently received”

At 943.40 delete “most recently transmitted”

At 1097.15 delete “most recently transmitted”

At 1098.32 delete “most recently”

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 106
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 06:57:08Z) - The limit on MPDU length in 802.11n is determined by the MAC, not the PHY. It is related to MAC concepts such as A-MPDU aggregation structure and the maximum MSDU/MMPDU size. Note that 802.11ac will introduce a framework for describing such constraints that will clarify this and will be rolled into the base document.
			3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 234
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.
			3. - In 8.4.2.7, after the para which starts "When dot11MgmtOptionMultiBSSIDActivated is false" add a "NOTE---The bit numbered 0 in the traffic indication virtual bitmap need not be included in the Partial Virtual Bitmap field even if that bit is set."

- In the same para, and in the "Method A" and "Method B" paras below, change "in the bitmap" to "in the traffic indication virtual bitmap"

- In the next para, and in the para which ends "Otherwise, an AP uses Method A." below, change "in the virtual bitmap" to "in the traffic indication virtual bitmap"

- In Figures O-2 and O-3 show the AID 0 bit in the PVB as 1 and split the arrow from AID 0 to point at both the Bitmap Control b0 and the PVB b0. Similarly, on O-5, show the AID 0 bit in the PVB as 1.

- In Figures O-1 to O-7 change the captions to:

 - say "Partial" first

 - have "Bitmap" in caps

 - not have "Example" in caps

 - say "Bitmap" (for O-7)

- Ditto for the title of Annex O

- Change "bit map" (case-insensitively) to "Bitmap"

- Change "bitmap control" (case-insensitively) to "Bitmap Control"

- "Traffic Indicator bit" is used exactly once in the spec, despite the grandiose uppercase letters -- change to "traffic indication virtual bitmap bit"

* + - 1. There was an Objection to the proposed resolution:
				1. GEN: 2013-09-18 07:04:45Z - Need to revisit the proposal from January. This needs one more review. Deferred until Thurs PM1 (19Sept2013).
		1. “GEN REVIEW” CIDS
			1. Proposed to Reject the set of 11 CIDs
			2. CID 1529, 1478
				1. Review Comments
				2. Proposed Resolution: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
				3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
			3. CID 271
				1. Review comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 07:09:25Z) - Reject: The comment fails to identify a problem that needs to be solved.
				3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
			4. CID 165
				1. Review comment
				2. There was a discussion that did not produce a consensus.
				3. REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 07:12:34Z) The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
				4. There was concern that there was a lot of work that had been done this CID and this wanted to be captured in the resolution. The issue began to unravel as discussions were held.
				5. New proposed resolution: The comment fails to identify a problem that needs to be solved.
				6. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
			5. CID 267
				1. Review comment – tied to CID 165
				2. Proposed resolution: Reject: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
				3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
			6. CID 151
				1. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 07:25:43Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
				2. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
			7. CID 129
				1. Review comment
				2. This is included in11-13/1009
				3. Proposed resolution : REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 07:28:26Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined
				4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
			8. CID 125
				1. Review comment
				2. Ran out of time
	1. Recess at 3:30pm
1. Called to order at 4pm 18 Sept 2013 by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	1. Agenda Review
		1. Continue with GEN comments
		2. 11-13-875r1 Adrian
		3. CID 166 – 11-13-1199r2
		4. Accept Agenda
	2. Resume Comment Resolution:
		1. CID 125
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:03:45Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 1144
			1. Review the comment
			2. Duplicate of CID 59
			3. Mark as a duplicate and move to Editor from GEN AdHoc
			4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 116
			1. Review the comment
			2. The proposed change in the AdHoc notes were more specifically for CID 22.
			3. Proposed change: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:14:12Z) The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined. Note that CID 22 is specific to capabilities and addresses some instances of "recently" mentioned in the proposed change.
			4. No Objection mark ready for comment
		4. CID178
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:21:50Z) - Many of the features in DCF are also used by a QoS STA (see 9.3.2) therefore it is appropriate that DCF support is mandatory for QoS STAs.
			3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		5. CID 123
			1. Review comment
			2. Review page 1010 line 57 where it says that “need not set”
			3. In 8.2.4.1.6 has a Retry “bit is set”
			4. So this is not clearly consistent.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:34:51Z) - At the end of the first sentence of 8.2.4.1.6, L61, insert "except as specified in 9.21.3"
			6. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		6. CID 1145
			1. Review comment
			2. This figure has had a lot of work done on it.
			3. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:38:02Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion.
		7. CID 269
			1. Review comment
			2. Mark did provide a submission, but it was too far reaching.
			3. Proposed resolution REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:48:12Z) - The commenter does not indicate a specific issue to resolve or a specific change to be made.
			4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		8. CID 127
			1. Review comment
			2. There was a lot of work done on the PICs in 11-12-1345r0
			3. There were 3 alternative proposals for resolution presented. There was not agreement to make a subset of the changes to the PICs that were proposed.
			4. The discussion was that the PICS should be fixed at one time.
			5. Long discussion on value of submission and now to extract the meaningful bits.
			6. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 09:09:30Z) - The comment does not make specific changes to be made. The commenter did bring a submission as a proposed resolution of this and other comments. There was no agreement on the proposed changes due to their broad scope.
			7. No Objection mark rady for motion
		9. CID 293 & 1701
			1. Review the comment
			2. We found the resolution for TG REVmb comment resolution for this nearly same comment: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 09:18:17Z) - The TG debated the comment, and the concensus was that a Normative PICS provides value and should be included in the standard.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 09:18:17Z) - The TG debated the comment, and the concensus was that a Normative PICS provides value and should be included in the standard.
		10. CID 234
			1. Return to the CID – Mark did a check and make sure the proposed resolution from January was still good.
			2. There was a concern on “need not be include” in the statement.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2013-09-18 09:24:31Z) - - In 8.4.2.7, after the para which starts "When dot11MgmtOptionMultiBSSIDActivated is false" add a "NOTE---The bit numbered 0 in the traffic indication virtual bitmap need not be included in the Partial Virtual Bitmap field even if that bit is set."

- In the same para, and in the "Method A" and "Method B" paras below, change "in the bitmap" to "in the traffic indication virtual bitmap"

- In the next para, and in the para which ends "Otherwise, an AP uses Method A." below, change "in the virtual bitmap" to "in the traffic indication virtual bitmap"

- In Figures O-2 and O-3 show the AID 0 bit in the PVB as 1 and split the arrow from AID 0 to point at both the Bitmap Control b0 and the PVB b0. Similarly, on O-5, show the AID 0 bit in the PVB as 1.

- In Figures O-1 to O-7 change the captions to:

 - say "Partial" first

- have "Bitmap" in caps

- not have "Example" in caps

- say "Bitmap" (for O-7)

- Ditto for the title of Annex O

- Change "bit map" (case-insensitively) to "Bitmap"

- Change "bitmap control" (case-insensitively) to "Bitmap Control"

- "Traffic Indicator bit" is used exactly once in the spec, despite the grandiose uppercase letters -- change to "traffic indication virtual bitmap bit"

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion.
		1. That is all the GEN AdHoc comments. – Thanks to all the helpers.
	1. Presentation: doc 11-13/875r1 – CID 1050 – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. Review the submission.
		2. The paragraphs are long without breaks and are hard to read.
		3. Review of the text was done, but uncertain if the proposal was sufficiently reviewed to be able to include in the draft today.
		4. For CID 215 the editor was told to make a change a the start of the sentence that starts “A transmitting STA” however, there was 2 sentences that started the same way, and the Editor changed the wrong one.
			1. While these changes were included in the 201301 group of changes.
			2. This should have been applied page 1120L18 of the D1.6 rather than 1120L2 in D1.6.
			3. Mark/Adrian/Menzo to get together to review the text changes and bring to a later LB.
		5. For CID 1050
			1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2013-09-18 08:38:02Z) - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			2. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
	2. Presentation: doc: 11-13/1199r2 – CID 166 – Graham SMITH (DSP Group)
		1. This CID should not have been included with the CIDs being resolved with 11-13-0013r4. Remove that Resolution and consider this presentation for a proposed Resolution.
		2. Review presentation
		3. There was a concern with the sentence starting “note” that also had a “shall” that caused a problem with distinction.
		4. Ran out of time – Graham to look at submission issues and update for tomorrow.
	3. Recess 6pm
1. TG REVmc called to order at 1:30pm 19 Sept 2013 (Thurs PM1) by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba).
	1. Review Agenda
		1. Proposed Agenda

Motion, Comment Resolution

11-13-1199 – CID 166 – Graham

MAC comments – Mark H.

* + 1. No Objection to Agenda
	1. Motions:
		1. **Motion #37**: Wednesday approved Resolutions.

Approve comment resolution to comments in

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-13-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> “Motion MAC-O” tab, (MAC)

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-11-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx> “Gen Motion Nanjing B”, and

Resolve comment CH11 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0123-04-000m-iso-jtc1-sc6-8802-11-2012-comments.xls> as “Revised” with a reason of “Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1173-00-000m-gcm-is-missing-from-the-pseudocode.docx> “ and incorporate the indicated changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd Mike MONTEMURRO
			2. Results: 7-0-0 Motion passes
	1. Presentation (cont): 11-13-1199r4 – CID 166 – Graham SMITH (DSP Group)
		1. Review Presentation
		2. There is an “STA or AP” that should be “STA”.
		3. An R5 will be posted
		4. In R4 there was some bullets that were added that discuss the use of the word of “fragmentable”.
		5. The statement “A STA shall fragment an individually addressed MSDU so that the transmission of the first MPDU of the TXOP does not cause the TXOP limit to be exceeded at the PY rate selected for the initial Transmission attempt of that MPDU”
			1. Change it by adding “Except as described above, “
		6. The “note” sentence needed to be made into a NOTE- .
			1. Change “Note the” to “NOTE— The”
			2. Because it is now a real NOTE, we do not have a problem with “fragmentable” not being defined.
		7. Split the two paragraphs after the new NOTE as they are separate concepts.
		8. The Passive voice paragraph needed to be changed
		9. The TXOP holder shall not transmit a transmitted a QoS Data, QoS Null or Management MPDU that causes the TXOP limit to be exceeded if it has already transmitted a QoS Data, QoS Null or Management MPDU in the TXOP.
		10. There is confusion of “Initial Transmission” is it the first time you transmit a control frame in the TXOP or the MPDU.
			1. For those frames that are not retransmitted, then having an “initial” is not appropriate.
			2. The 3rd bullet – delete “initial”, and add at the end of the sentence “, when the transmission is the first in the TXOP”.
		11. Adding “, when the transmission is the first in the TXOP” for all but the last bullet, this addresses the issue of when the frame is sent in relation of the TXOP.
		12. Change the second bullet to “Transmission of a fragment of an MSDU/MMPDU fragmented into 16 fragments, when the transmission is the first in the TXOP.”
		13. Remove the redundant paragraph after the Bulleted Note.
		14. The last paragraph seemed awkward.
			1. Simply delete.
		15. There is a concern that the more we work on this the more little nits that seem to be found. The review of the proposal is great, but we do not have enough confidence to apply it to this draft.
			1. There are 3 volunteers to help complete the review, and we can have a conference call to work on the final details.
		16. Proposed resolution for CID 166: Reject, The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
		17. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
	2. MAC Comment Processing
		1. CID 1025
			1. Review the comment and discussion history.
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised; REVISED (MAC: 2013-09-19 06:35:53Z): Change the cited paragraphs to:

"The More Data field is set to 1 in non-GCR-SP group addressed frames transmitted by the AP when additional group addressed bufferable units (BUs) that are not part of an active GCR-SP remain to be transmitted by the AP during this beacon interval. The More Data field is set to 0 in non-GCR-SP group addressed frames transmitted by the AP when no more group addressed BUs that are not part of an active GCR-SP remain to be transmitted by the AP during this beacon interval and in all group addressed frames transmitted by non-AP STAs.

The More Data field is set to 1 in GCR-SP group addressed frames transmitted by the AP when additional group addressed BUs that are part of an active GCR-SP remain to be transmitted by the AP during this GCR-SP. The More Data field is set to 0 in GCR-SP group addressed frames transmitted by the AP when no more group addressed BUs that are part of an active GCR-SP remain to be transmitted by the AP during this GCR-SP."

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 89
			1. Review Comment and discussion history
			2. The STA that is cited is a Non-AP STA....agreed.
			3. The “including” needed to be changed to “that includes”
			4. Long discussion on word-smithing.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-09-19 06:38:26Z):

Change 10.2.2.2 6th paragraph, first sentence, from

"To change Power Management modes, a STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange as described in Annex G initiated by the STA and that includes an Ack frame or a BlockAck frame from the AP."

to

"To change Power Management modes, a STA shall inform the AP through a successful frame exchange as described in Annex G, that is initiated by the STA, and that includes a management, extension or data frame, and that includes an ACK or a BlockAck frame from the AP."

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 86
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-09-19 07:02:54Z):

Change 8.2.4.1.7's lists by retaining the existing first paragraph and changing the rest to:

In an infrastructure BSS, the following applies:

- The Power Management field is valid only in frame exchanges as described in 10.2.1.2. In such exchanges, a value of 1 indicates that the STA will be in PS mode. A value of 0 indicates that the STA will be in active mode.

- The Power Management field is reserved in all management frames transmitted by a STA to an AP with which it is not associated.

- The Power Management field is reserved in all frames transmitted by the AP.

In an IBSS, the Power Management field is valid only in frame exchanges as described in 10.2.2.4. In such exchanges, a value of 1 indicates that the STA will be in PS mode. A value of 0 indicates that the STA will be in active mode.

In an MBSS, the Power Management field is valid only in frame exchanges as described per the mesh power mode transitions rules in 13.14.

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 1261
			1. Review comment.
			2. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2013-09-19 07:06:06Z):

- In the table at 505.57, replace

"SME cancels the mesh peering instance with the reason other than reaching the maximum number of peer mesh STAs" with

 "Mesh peering cancelled for unknown reasons".

 - Remove "the mesh STA has reached its capacity to set up more mesh peering," from the NOTE in 1516.31, as it conflicts with MESH-MAX-PEERS.

- Relocate NOTE in 1516.31 to 1516.26, because this note gives hint to the 'internal reason' that is described in 1516.24-25.

 - In 1516.53, insert the following paragraph

"If the Mesh Peering Confirm frame is rejected, the REQ\_RJCT event shall be passed with the specified reason code to the protocol finite state machine to actively reject the mesh peering confirm."

* + - 1. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 58
			1. Review comment database shows it is already rejected yesterday.
			2. While we may want to have some of the draft resolution in the future it is not today.
		2. CID 1146
			1. Review comment
			2. Is the name of the report sufficient?
				1. A Submission would be necessary to find and correctly apply the names.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The term “multicast” is deprecated.
			4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		3. CID 31
			1. Review comment
			2. Questions – does an FMS contain Management frames?
				1. No
				2. That is the point of the comment
			3. The change is what is contentious.
			4. The problem is that we have not found a solution for the full problem, and we will need to have a proposal for how to fix the problem with a new comment in the LB.
			5. After discussion, we found that we could use an Accept for this CID.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
			7. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		4. CID 131
			1. Review comment
			2. Use the proposed reject
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2013-09-19 07:28:09Z): While the same purpose is being served, there could be different assumptions about the usage of the channel, which could affect the delay that should be used. The commenter has not provided evidence that the channel conditions and usage should be assumed to be the same as those assumed at SCAN time.
			4. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		5. CID 211
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection Mark ready for Motion
		6. CID 1322
			1. We reviewed this yesterday, but failed to agree on a proposed resolution.
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The group prefers to make a unified change for all the instances of this type of problem. Consensus was not met for resolving this comment without further detail.
		7. That is all the harder CIDs.
		8. The remaining CIDs may be resolved with the nominal resolution: Reject, The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			1. The following is a list of CIDs that this will apply: CIDs 120, 361, 1086, 121, 119, 1442, 1526, 59, 36, 132, 147, 148, 363, 91, 11, 1632, 1433, 1087, 200, 198, 1046, 153, 283, 157, 117, 88, 177, 145, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1483, 1425, 222, 201, 1468, 124, 1084
		9. The database will be checked over the break to ensure status of CIDs..
	1. Recess at 3:30pm
1. TG REVmc called to order at 4pm (Thurs PM2) 19 Sept 2013, by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba)
	1. Review Agenda
		1. Proposed Agenda:

Comment Resolution Status

Motions

Plans for Nov, 11mc in IEEE store, AOB

* + 1. No Objection to the Agenda
	1. Comment Resolution status:
		1. As of the end of PM1 we have confirmed that we have resolutions for all the comments.
		2. Final documents for GEN and MAC are 11-13-0361r14 and 11-13/562
	2. Motions:
		1. **Motion #38**: Thursday approved Resolutions.

Approve comment resolution to comments in

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-14-0361-13-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls> “Motion MAC-P” tab, (MAC)

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-12-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx> “Gen Motion Nanjing C”.

* + - 1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON 2nd Jon ROSDAHL
			2. Results:9-0-2
		1. **Motion #39**: Prepare Draft:
			1. Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from LB193 on P802.11mc D1.0,

Instruct the editor to prepare P802.11mc D2.0 incorporating these resolutions and

 Approve a 20 day Working Group Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11mc D2.0 be forwarded to Sponsor Ballot?”

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd Jon ROSDAHL
				1. Discussion – was a check made to ensure we have all CIDs completed.

yes

* + - 1. Results: 11-0-1 motion Passes
	1. Plans for Nov:
		1. **Objectives**
			1. Comment resolution
		2. **Conference Calls 10am Eastern 2 hours**
			1. Oct 11, Nov 1, 8
		3. **Ad-Hoc meeting – none**
	2. Schedule review:
		1. On track for Sept LB 2.0
		2. The roll-in of 11ac slipped.
		3. We will review the schedule for the plan on the telecons when we have more detail.
			1. The 11ac will be presubmitted to the Publication editor early, and we may be able to gain access to it sooner.
		4. Most likely we have to move out to July 2014 at the earliest.
		5. We could roll-in TGaf with the Sponsor Ballot rather than WBG ballot.
	3. Request for Draft of 11mc in IEEE store:
		1. Availability of 11mc in the IEEE store
			1. D1.0 – we can request this now.
			2. D2.0 after ballot completes
			3. Later drafts as they become available.
		2. Discussion on the value of having the REVmc draft in the store for sale.
		3. Is there value in D1.0 vs D2.0? What is rolled in is the value of the document.
		4. Some would rather wait for D2.0 rather than put up D1.0.
		5. There is a short shelf life for D1.0 as D2.0 is coming within about 30-45 days.
		6. The question will be asked tomorrow.
		7. Concern for the confusion that may occur if D1.0 is posted during our D2.0 ballot.
		8. Consensus would be to use D2.0
	4. AOB:
		1. Editor review period of Sept 27-Oct 1st
			1. Then we can have a Ballot could close on about the 24th
			2. Volunteers: Edward, Mark, Dorothy, Jon, and flaky 5th- David Hunter.
	5. Adjourned at 5:45pm
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<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0982-02-000m-revmc-telecon-minutes-for-aug-sept-2013.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0697-00-000m-revmc-minutes-for-july-2013-geneva.docx>

Submissions discussed this week:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1199-01-000m-txop-limit-rules-text.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0013-06-000m-annex-n-proposed-text.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0013-05-000m-annex-n-proposed-text.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1199-00-000m-txop-limit-rules-text.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0448-02-000m-lb193-cid-1003-208-277-280-285.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0448-01-000m-lb193-cid-1003-208-277-280-285.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-15-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-14-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0703-02-000m-mib-addition-in-support-of-3gpp-manageability.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0703-01-000m-mib-addition-in-support-of-3gpp-manageability.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1178-00-000m-resolution-for-draft-1-0-lb-cid-s-cids-1424-1671-1418.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1009-03-000m-resolutions-to-some-assigned-comments.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1009-02-000m-resolutions-to-some-assigned-comments.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1173-00-000m-gcm-is-missing-from-the-pseudocode.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1017-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-lb193-cid-1154.doc>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0937-02-000m-proposed-pre-ballot-changes-related-to-11ad-text.docx>

GEN AdHoc Comment Files:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-12-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-11-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-10-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-09-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0562-08-000m-gen-adhoc-lb193-comment-resolutions.xlsx>

MAC AdHoc Comment Files:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-14-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-13-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-12-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0361-11-000m-revmc-mac-comments.xls>

Consolidated Comment Files:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-17-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-16-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-15-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-14-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls>