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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons:

2013-10-11

2013-11-01 – to be added

2013-11-08 – to be added

1. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for October 11 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda – October 11, 2013:
2. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Comment Resolution - review available presentations:
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0875-02-000m-cid-1050-duplicate-cache.doc>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1199-06-000m-txop-limit-rules-text.docx>
5. Schedule
6. AOB
7. Adjourn
	1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:04 am; no agenda changes.
	2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
		1. None identified
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Jean-Pierre LEROUZIC, Orange, Mark RISON, Samsung-Cambridge, Graham SMITH, DSP Group, Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink.
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. The working group recieculation ballot on D2.0 is open and closes 2013-10-23.
		2. D1.7 includes editor notes; Adrian will write comments for the issues reflected in the notes.
		3. As part of the editorial roll-in of 11ad, the reviewers identified comments that were technical rather than editorial; Adrian will also write comments on D2.0 for these items.
	5. Discussion of presentations
	6. Two presentations are available, both were discussed in the recent September Nanjing meeting, and required additional edits, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0875-02-000m-cid-1050-duplicate-cache.doc> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1199-06-000m-txop-limit-rules-text.docx> .
		1. Agree to begin with 11-13-0875 and then 11-13-1199.
	7. Review of 11-13-0875r2, since updated to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0875-03-000m-cid-1050-duplicate-cache.doc>
		1. Adrian reviewed the history of the document: Discussion in Nanjing resulted in the R1 version. Additional comments from Matthew Fischer resulted in the R2.
		2. The motivation for the proposed edits is to make requirements in the complex, nearly incomprehensible duplicate detection text understandable. The original goal was simple transliteration of the text; errors were identified as a result of the transliteration exercise, so now the changes include both requirements statements and corrections.
		3. The TR1 requirement is a “should” since it was added after existing deployments; provides a mechanism to avoid false duplicate detection occurrances at a receiver.
		4. Still an open issue regarding Time Priority Management frame transmission in response to poll events: should TPM frames be excluded from QMF? Need input from folks not on the call; Adrian will follow-up.
		5. Plan to review proposed resolution of the TPM/QMF issue on the 2013-11-01 telecon.
	8. Review of 11-13-1199r6, since updated to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1199-08-000m-txop-limit-rules-text.docx>
		1. Graham reviewed the changes resulting from discussion on the prior version of the document in Nanjing.
		2. Change final text to a “NOTE” since not creating a new rule, text emphasizes a current rule.
		3. Re-word second bullet to clarify operation under block ACK agreement.
	9. Schedule
		1. The 11mc schedule depends on the schedules for 11ac and 11af. At the end of the September Nanjing meeting, 11ac was targeting approval in the January continuous process, and 11af was targeting approval in March 2014.
		2. Since the January REVCom session is cancelled, both 11ac and 11af are now targeting approval at the Devember 2013 REVCom meeting.
		3. The IEEE editor is working on 11ac, and plans to publish the 11ac amendment at the end of December 2013. 11af publication would follow, likely in February 2014.
		4. Discussion on 11mc amendment integration options.
		5. Agree that integrating both 11ac and 11af prior to Sponsor Ballot is preferred, as both amendments will be available soon.
		6. Possible scenario for 11mc
			1. D2.0 – Ballot completes 2013-10-23
			2. D2.1 – Includes November meeting comment resolutions
			3. D2.2 - +11ac roll-in
			4. D2.3 - +January meeting comment resolutions + 11ac roll-in fixes
			5. D2.4 - + March meeting comment resolutions
			6. D3.0 – ballot opens March 2014
			7. D3.1 - +11af roll-in (available April 2014)
			8. D3.2 - +May meeting comment resolutions + 11af roll-in fixes
			9. D3.3 - +July meeting comment resolutions
			10. D3.4 + September meeting comment resolutions
			11. D4.0 – ballot opens September 2014
			12. D4.0 – unchanged ballot October 2014
			13. November 2014 – EC approval for Sponsor Ballot
			14. D4.0 to Initial Sponsor Ballot Nov-Dec 2014
			15. D4.1 - +January meeting comment resolutions
			16. D4.2 + telecom meeting comment resolutions
			17. D4.3 + March 2015 meeting comment resolutions
			18. D5.0 recirculation sponsor ballot March 2015
			19. D5.1 - +telecom meeting comment resolutions
			20. D5.2 + May meeting comment resolutions
			21. D6.0 May 2015
			22. D6.0 June 2015
			23. July 2015 EC approval
			24. August 2015 Revcom approval
	10. No other business. Reminder: next call is November 1, 2013.
	11. Adjourned at 11:15 ET.
8. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for June 7, 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda – June 7, 2013:
9. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
10. Editor Report
11. Comment Resolution - review available resolutions:
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0583-02-000m-proposed-lb193mc-tfs-comment-resolutions.doc>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-01-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>
	3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0123-02-000m-iso-jtc1-sc6-8802-11-2012-comments.xls>
12. AOB
13. Adjourn
	1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:10 am; no agenda changes.
	2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
		1. None Identified
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Edward AU, Huawei, Qi WANG, Broadcom, Payam TORAB, Broadcom.
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. No change from last week (Editor plans to have a draft incorporating the comments approved at the recent May meeting posted on or before 2013-06-14. D1.5. Comments have been incorporated, and the editor review team is identifying any defects.).
	5. Comment Resolution
	6. Draft comment resolutions available in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-01-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>, and
	<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-01-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>, and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0123-02-000m-iso-jtc1-sc6-8802-11-2012-comments.xls>
		1. Agree to begin with 11-13-583-02.
	7. CIDs 50, 309, 311, 312, 313, 316, 1152, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1402 and 1448
		1. Review of proposed text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-01-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> .
		2. P9, Text states “When an AP transmits a TFS Response frame …” Should this say “Successfully transmits…” as AP will not know for sure that the non-AP STA has received the TFS Response frame?
		3. The non-AP STA will not know if the AP received the corresponding ACK, so just moving the problem. Should not matter at the management level. If the AP established the filter, and the non-AP STA didn’t receive the frame/has no knowledge of this, then frames are not getting through, and the non-AP STA is likely to be looking for another AP to connect to. No harm done.
		4. Agree to leave text as is
		5. P11, is the text “Otherwise, the AP shall not send additional TFS Notify frames upon frame matches. “clear? Yes, clear from context.
		6. Is the sentence specifying that the TFS Notify frame is an individually addressed frame needed? No prior sentence indicates individually addressed, so delete “A TFS Notify frame is delivered per the rules for the transmission for individually addressed frames. “
		7. Agree to resolve CIDs 50, 309, 311, 312, 313, 316, 1152, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1402 and 1448 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0583-03-000m-proposed-lb193mc-tfs-comment-resolutions.doc “.
	8. Review draft comment resolutions in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-01-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>.
		1. CID 1603.
			1. Agree with proposed direction, identified additional locations at which to apply the change, 1657.13 and 1708.47.
			2. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At the cited location replace “PHY-CCA.indication primitive of class BUSY” with “PHY-CCA.indication(BUSY)” and on the following line replace “PHY-CCA.indication primitive of class IDLE” with “PHY-CCA.indication(IDLE)” Make matching change at 1657.13 and 1708.47.
		2. CID 1589
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 416.18, delete the TxRampOffTime parameter and any references to it in this subclause. At 1618.08, 1644.44, 1701.27, 1714.34, 1809.53 delete the table row that includes this attribute.
		3. CID 1465
			1. Is there any change to 11n behaviour?
			2. No, 11n use is not impacted; if and when “Strictly ordered” is removed, will have to edit text to remove references to it, and only leave in 11n.
			3. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes shown for CID 1465 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-02-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> . This change marks the StrictlyOrdered service class as obsolete and the StrictlyOrdered service class might be removed in a future revision of the standard.”
		4. CIDs 1428, 1427
			1. Agree to resolve both as “Rejected” with a resolution of” The comment does not indicate a specific issue to resolve or a specific change to be made.”
		5. CID 1089
			1. Agree to defer, may be withdrawn by the commenter, pending further investigation.
		6. CID 1649
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter does not indicate a specific problem to solve or a specific change to make. In reply to the commenter, this term is well known. NIST defines it thus: “A function from a partially ordered domain to a partially ordered range such that x ≤ y implies f(x) ≤ f(y).”
		7. CID 1471
			1. Agree to “Rejected”, with a resolution of “Making this change for non-MBSS would make existing devices non-compliant. The benefit of the additional protection is minimal because channel switches are infrequent affairs. “
		8. CID 1621
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter does not indicate a specific problem to be solved or a specific change to make.”
		9. CIDs 1647, 1626
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The STA does not perform CCA or ED at a specific time within the slot. It is performed continuously during the slot, except for the aRxTxTurnaround time when it transmits in the following slot. So it doesn’t matter whether a frame is shorter than the slot duration or not because it will still be detected by STAs in the BSS in the slot in which it was transmitted, provided that aAirPropagationTime is set to a large enough value.”
		10. CID 1633
			1. Agree to defer, need an additional volunteer
		11. CID 1637
			1. Discussed and agreed that no normative behaviour is changed
			2. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Insert a new subclause “20.3.20.5.0a CCA-Energy Detect (CCA-ED) with the following text: “For improved spectrum sharing, CCA-ED is required in some bands. The behavior class indicating CCA-ED is given in Table D-2 (Behavior limits sets). The operating classes requiring the corresponding CCA-ED behavior class are given in E.1 (Country information and operating classes). An HT STA that is operating within an operating class that requires CCA-ED shall operate with CCA-ED as defined in 18.3.10.6. “
		12. CID 1011
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 2.30 add: “—Defines medium access control mechanisms to support the prioritization of management frames.”
		13. CID 1673
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The 8th list item talks about support for QoS generally. The last list item describes specific support for streaming audio video without degrading data and voice performance.”
		14. CID 1121
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes as shown in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-02-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1121. These remove the definition of the term “ad hoc” and remove its use in the context of IBSS.
		15. CID 1122
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-02-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1122. These changes change references to an “FMS Token” that is not a field or type of subelement so that they refer to “FMS Token field”, thereby eliminating the need for an additional definition.”
		16. CIDs 1179, 1123, 1595
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-02-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1179. These introduce definitions of frame, MAC frame and PHY frame, and modify the definition of MPDU so that it is clear that the term “frame” is dependent on context.”
		17. CID 1193
			1. Agree to defer.
		18. CID 1182
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “8.5.13.1 states: “References to one of the TDLS Action field values as a frame, e.g., “TDLS Setup Request frame,” denote a Data frame carrying a TDLS Action Field and any vendor-specific elements tunneled as described in 10.23.1(General).” “TDLS Peer PSM Request” and “TDLS Peer PSM Response” appear in the list of TDLS Action field values.This suffices to explain the meaning of “TDLS Peer PSM Request frame” and “TDLS Peer PSM Response frame”.
		19. CID 1013
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “In cited definition change “of the mentioned type” to “of type EAPOL-Key”, and change “which” to “that”.”
		20. CID 1674
			1. Agree to “Accepted”
		21. CID 1675
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “This term is adequately defined in 802.1X-2010.”
		22. CID 1192
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-02-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1192. These changes clarify in the specification of the FromDS/ToDS fields which settings must be used by a mesh STA and simplify the definition of Mesh Data frame, now referencing the FromDS/ToDS section.”
		23. CID 1563
			1. Agree to “Accepted”
		24. CID 1412
			1. Agree to defer
		25. CID 1014
			1. Resolution agreed last week; no further action required.
		26. CID 1228
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Replace first sentence of description of ADDBA .request, .confirm, .indication and .response primitives DialogToken with: “Identifies the ADDBA transaction.” Replace first sentence of description of ADDTS .request, .confirm and .indication primitives DialogToken with: “Identifies the ADDTS transaction.”
		27. CID 1018
			1. Agree to defer
		28. CID 1019
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Remove the ResultCode parameter from the following primitives: MLME-SCS.confirm MLME-QLOAD.confirm MLME-GROUP-MEMBERSHIP.confirm. Remove the \*TIMEOUT enumeration value for ResultCode from: MLME-QMFPOLICYCHANGE.confirm MLME-MCCASETUP.confirm. Remove the UNSPECIFIED\_FAILURE enumeration for ResultCode from: MLME-TXOPADVERTISEMENT.confirm”
		29. CIDs 1239, 1240
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Change text as shown in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-02-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CIDs 1239 and 1240. These changes clarify the language in the cited locations.
		30. CIDs 1244, 1248
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The cited text is not incorrect. There are a substantial number of occurences of "IEEE Std 802.11" in the document and the TG has determined not to remove them.”
		31. CID 1605
			1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter does not specify an issue to be resolved or a specific change to be made.”
		32. CIDs 1513, 1512
			1. Agree to defer, obtaining input from PHY experts.
		33. CID 1404
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 425.55, delete subclause 7.3.4.1.”
		34. CID 1024
			1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 429.51, delete the sentence “This vector contains … parameters.” At 430.23, delete the sentence “This vector contains both PHY and PHY operational parameters.”
	9. Continue on the next call at CID 1267.
	10. No other business. Reminder: next call is June 21st.
	11. Adjourned at 12:00 ET.
14. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for June 21 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda – June 21, 2013:
15. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
16. Editor Report
17. Comment Resolution - review available resolutions:
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-03-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc>
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0123-02-000m-iso-jtc1-sc6-8802-11-2012-comments.xls>
18. AOB
19. Adjourn
	1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:02 am; no agenda changes.
	2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
		1. None Identified
	3. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Adrian STEPHENS, Intel; Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink, Edward AU, Huawei.
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. Editor reported the draft version 1.5 is available in the members area of the 802.11 website.
	5. Comment Resolution
	6. Draft comment resolutions available in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-03-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> .
		1. Agree to begin with 11-13-0652 comments.
	7. CID 1267:
		1. Agree to “Accepted
	8. CID 1642
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 1344.55, change “It uses <<< to denote…” to “It uses <circleplus> to denote XOR, <<< to denote…” where <circleplus> is the circle-plus symbol appearing in Figure 11-11.”
	9. CID 1659
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Delete the cited sentence. Delete 19.4.5. The behaviour cited in 19.1.3 and 19.4.5 is already described normatively in the MAC (in 9.3.2.12, 10.1.3.2 and 8.4.1.4). “
	10. CID 1643
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 1749.46, add to the end of the “variable list”: “<circle-plus> denotes XOR” where <circle-plus> is the circle-plus symbol used in equation 20-18.”
	11. CID 1702
		1. Agree to “Accepted”
	12. CID 1445
		1. Refernce in GCR Concealment address.
		2. Value specified in the MIB, see 2257.26.
		3. Is either adequately defined elsewhere, or it isn’t. Applies to the entire industry, not just 802.11.
		4. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “MacAddress is defined by SNMPv2-TC. See IETF RFC 2579.”
	13. CID 1539
		1. Agree to “Revised, with a resolution of “Globally change 2E32 to 2\*\*32.”
	14. CID 1599
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter does not indicate a problem to resolve or a specific change to make.”
	15. CID 1004
		1. Agre to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 463.39, remove “(0)” from the “More Data” field. The relationship between the cited MIB variable and the “More Data Ack subfield” of the “QoS Capability element” is clear, and needs no further clarification. The operation of the More Data field is specified in 8.2.4.1.8, and this specification includes Ack and other individually addressed frames. However Figure 8-32 conflicts with the description in 8.2.4.1.8. This conflict is resolved by the edit above.”
	16. CID 1648
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter does not indicate an issue to resolve or a specific change to make. The interpretation of “line break” is determined by looking at the octet listing of the message. In this case, it is represented by the value 0x0A.”
	17. CID 1110
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “An AP supports a single BSS. The multiple BSS mechanism allows a device that contains multiple APs to optimize its beaconing overhead. Architecturally each of those APs otherwise operates independently.”
	18. CID 1558 (From list of GEN comments)
		1. Agree to “Rejected. The commenter has not identified a specific issue to address or a specific change to make.”
	19. CID 1444 (From list of GEN comments)
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The style using colons has been used by 802.11 for a long while. Its use is unambiguous.”
	20. CID 1524 (From list of GEN comments)
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The definitions are correct as stated.”
	21. CID 1460
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 1102.31 after “Data frame” insert “that is a non-A-MPDU frame”. This change resolves the inconsistency between the cited text and the note. At 1102.40 delete “NOTE—“ and replace “set” with “equal”, At 1102.41 replace “cannot” with “should not”.”
	22. CID 1399
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The clause title and conditions within it use the phrase “STA in PS mode”. As an AP cannot be in PS mode, there is no ambiguity.”
	23. CID 1398
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Change 1094.32 and 1104.13 as shown in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-03-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1398. These changes remove ambiguity in the required timing of the wake up interval, and remove duplicate normative specification from 10.2.2.1.”
	24. CID 1397
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment does not identify an issue with the existing behaviour. Removing the cited text would make existing QoS STA non-compliant.”
	25. CID 1401
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment is a series of questions. It does not identify any issue to be resolved in the draft.”
	26. CID 1474
		1. Agree to “Rejected. There is little value from optimizing a rare occurrence”
	27. CID 1472
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “Rejected. The existing mechanism in 10.2.1.2 is essentially useless, because no minimum value is specified for Probe Delay. A value of zero is commonly used in existing equipment in order to maximise battery life. There is no value propagating an essentially useless mechanism to an IBSS.”
	28. CID 1473
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The existing mechanism in 10.2.1.2 is essentially useless, because no minimum value is specified for Probe Delay. A value of zero is commonly used in existing equipment in order to maximise battery life. There is no value propagating an essentially useless mechanism to a mesh BSS.”
	29. CID 1661
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Revised. At 675.40, change the first sentence of the definition of SM Power Save to read: “Indicates the spatial multiplexing power save mode that is in operation during and immediately after (re)association.”
	30. CID 1007
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment does not indicate an issue to resolve, but summarises that different features treat reassociation differently. The proposed resolution does not provide specific changes that would address the comment.”
	31. CID 1315
		1. The change was also identified in the editorial review – CID 1205- has already been accepted.
		2. Agree to “Accepted”
	32. CID 1468 – Submission Required
	33. CID 1534
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The current behaviour allows the transmission of control frames, which might be used to improve protection in the secondary channel. The proposed change would prevent this.”
	34. CID 1406
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Change 1245.59 and 2056.09 as shown in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-03-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1406. These changes remove the conflicting references to MIB variables and modify the definition of the “…Activated” MIB variable to indicate that its value are static for the duration of an association.”
	35. CID 1066
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “Revised. Make changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0652-03-000m-some-more-lb193-resolutions.doc> under CID 1066. These replace references to the “…Implemented” MIB variable with “…Activated” and remove redundant text in 10.24.6.
		2. Assumes an interpretation and use of implemented and activated MIB variables. ARC can update 11-05-933, but the updating is not required.
		3. Mark Hamilton agrees that ARC will review the MIB variabl guidelines proposed.
	36. CID 1067
		1. Agree with “Accepted”
	37. CIDs 1164, 1163, 1165, 1166
		1. Agree with “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in document 11-13/0583r3. These changes substantially clarify the TFS operation.”
	38. CID 1170
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 890.02, change the name of the last field to “DMS Request Element”. 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 Element”. 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.”
		2. Adrian will forward agreed resolution to Qi to confirm.
	39. CID 1111
		1. Agree to “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment confuses the box sold as an AP with the 802.11 architectural entity known as an AP. The Allocated Traffic self metric is a property of the AP that is a logical entity. It does not, and should not, matter whether that AP is physically collocated with any other AP.”
	40. CID 1107
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At 1308.07 replace dot11RobustAVStreamingImplemented is true and dot11PublicHCCATXOPNegotiationActivated” with

“dot11PublicHCCATXOPNegotiationActivated is true or dot11ProtectedHCCATXOPNegotiationActivated”At 1304.45, 1304.46, 1308.24 and 1308.25 replace “…TXOPNegotiationImplemented” with “…TXOPNegotiationActivated”. This makes the conditions on the two cited locations identical and resolves incorrect usage of “…TXOPNegotiationImplemented” MIB variables.”

* 1. CID 1106
		1. Agree to “Revised” with a resolution of “At the end of 10.1.2 (1083.40) add: NOTE—The beacon interval, and hence the valid values of dot11BeaconPeriod, is constrained for APs in which dot11PublicHCCATXOPNegotiationActivated is true or dot11ProtectedHCCATXOPNegotiationActivated is true as specified in 10.28.4.1.”
	2. Additional CID assignments – chair to contact assignees and request proposed resolutions
		1. CIDs 1696, 1651, 1546 – Assign to Vinko/Eldad.
		2. CIDs 1620, 1591, 1478, 1085 – Mark in spreadsheet/database as submission required
		3. CID 1646 – Assign to Matthew Fischer.
		4. CID 1561 – Assign to Dan Harkins
	3. No other business. Reminder: next meeting is at the July session in Geneva.
	4. Adjourned at 12:00 ET.
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