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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons:

2013-10-11 – thanks to Dorothy for taking notes.

2013-11-01

2013-11-08 – This call was cancelled.

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 Nov 1, 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda:

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance

2. Editor report. See <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0233-19-000m-revmc-wg-ballot-comments.xls> for the comments received in the recent WG recirculation ballot (passed 90%).

3. Presentations and comment resolution:

3.1 11ad bug fixes - Gaius Yao Huang Wee, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1298-00-000m-dmg-allocation-deletion-fixes.docx>

3.2 LB199 comment resolutions – Adrian

3.3 MAC Comments

4. AOB
5. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to the Agenda
	1. Review PatCom policy
		1. No issues noted
	2. Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Ed RUESS (Self), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel), Jon ROSDAHL (CSR), Mark RISON (Samsung), Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink)
	3. Editors Report – Doc 11-13/95r6 – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. Reviewed Report
		2. Questions on Report
			1. How many people spend time on PICS? No idea.
			2. Lets focus on the comments and things we can address productively.
	4. Presentation of 11-13/1298r1 by Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel)
		1. Gaius was going to present, but he is in Singapore so the time may not be easy for him.
		2. Presentation includes 2 proposed corrections
		3. Questions:
			1. Changing the structure – may make legacy devices interoperable – what are the expectations?
				1. The implementations in the field have noted that the folks involved in the interop testing were aware of the change, and hope that this will not be a big issue.
				2. Bottom line there is not a big deployment that has the original structure.
				3. The changes here are expected in the 2nd roll-out of products
		4. Thanks for the submission was given.
		5. A motion will be made to make the change in the F2F.
			1. There were 2 comments that were discussed last time, and those also will have a motion ready for the F2F.
		6. This change was identified in the Interop testing, and no CID is directly associated with this change.
	5. Editor Comments needing Discussion
		1. CID 2069
			1. Review Comment
			2. By going through D2.1 and search for #2069 to check the over 800 changes to give more confidence.
				1. Several Days were spent in GREP for the changes…
				2. Frame type were checked to ensure consistency/correctness
				3. Question on ACK vs Ack – this was changed

Draft 2 uses the mixed case form

* + 1. Need volunteer to have a second (or more) pair of eyes look it over
			1. Approx 818 marked locations
			2. No takers for review before the F2F time frame
			3. Due before we start rolling in AC
			4. Ed said he may, but not able to respond until F2F for sure.
			5. An E-mail calling for review volunteers will be sent out.
		2. CID 2131
			1. Review Comment
			2. Does this change suggest an ambiguity to make this change?
			3. The change many not introduce an ambiguity, but rather it may be there already.
			4. How many occurrences? Not known.
				1. There are 8 instances of “th” in D2.0
			5. There are on the order of 20 or so instances as a guess.
			6. How does this make things clearer?
				1. This allows for complex number and for better grammatically consistent uses especially for non-native speakers to understand
			7. Note that there are also some instances of “i-th” that need to be searched for as well.
			8. Noted that the change should look at the grammar correction.
			9. No objection to making the change was made on the call.
			10. This does make it more uniform
		3. CID 2145
			1. Review comment
			2. This has been speculatively edited already in 2.1
			3. Not very many instances
			4. No objection to the proposed change
			5. In this case, the “\” does mean “or” as the choice is one or the other.
			6. Question of the use of “frame” or “MPDU”? Seems half one way, half the other.
				1. Is this to be one way or the other?
				2. Need to look and update the style guide.
	1. Gaius joined us and had the wrong time.
		1. Reviewed results and plan with Gaius
	2. Editor Comments continued:
		1. CID 2039
			1. Review comment
			2. Consistency issues.
			3. Using a consistent set of syntax may be good
			4. Concern that having a formal language that will parse in a “c” compiler may be hard.
			5. What is the ROI on this?
			6. Leave it for someone to pick up
			7. This specific cited place is no more or less consistent with other parts of Clause 11.
			8. Is this normative text? Yes as figures in Normative text are Normative
			9. Is there any ambiguity that is being created?
				1. Not specifically
				2. It is believed that this may be sufficient as is.
				3. Ambiguities may be fixed as they are identified
				4. We will reject the comment unless we find a volunteer to do some work on this
		2. No other CIDs were seemingly controversial, but will put out 2.1 so that we can review what we can on the editorial proposed changes prior to the F2F.
	3. Other CIDS to discuss on LB199
		1. There are a couple, but let’s look at assignee process first.
	4. How to get Assignees for CIDs
		1. We need volunteers for about 400 CIDs.
		2. Jon and Mark could make initial assignments and see how that goes.
		3. We may want to get some volunteers from this call.
		4. We will have another call next week, but we may not have enough proposals for the call.
	5. MAC AdHoc Comments: -- Mark Hamilton –
		1. CID 2114
			1. Review comment
			2. Rationale to Deprecate PCO
			3. This is an example of a feature that was added during compromising days
			4. PCO is not compatible with AC devices
			5. VHT explicitly does not use PCO
			6. What happens if we have a PCO network overlapping an AC network?
			7. We could find a list of new Deprecated features that we want to include in REVmc.
			8. Discussion on how to proceed and the proper wording to use.
			9. Concern that we have a ballot already “PASSED”, where we did not have this issue identified. So asking for a proposal for other things to be deleted may not be in the appropriate order of things. We are looking to converge and we do not want to open this up unnecessarily.
			10. A review of 11n MAC features had only 2 that were identified for potentially marked as Depreciated. These two features (CID 2190-Dual CTS, 2114-PCO) has not been implemented and so would not be as risky as a problem.
			11. We do have two comments before us to discuss, but if we bring this up in the Mid-week plenary, we may cause a lot of new comments – We may give the impression that we have opened the door. If we don’t do that, but rather just address these two comments then we would not open ourselves to this criticism
		2. CID 2112 –
			+ 1. Review comment
				2. This comment would cause the concerned criticism
			1. CID 2423 and 2424
				1. Review comment
		3. What is the concern with the closing at this state as we are still at Draft 2?
			1. Not suggesting that scope argument, but rather the concern of the inference of CID 2112
			2. CID 2112 was submitted as a non-MBS status, so would not be subject to later commenting.
			3. An appropriate Reject will be prepared for CID 2112
		4. We need to be careful for using the Scope argument at this point, but as we are early in the process. If we find that there is controversy on these two items, then we may want to defer to a later process time (Revision time). We are identifying features that need to look for “end of life” basis as it is not removed this cycle but in a future cycle.
		5. How to move forward?
			1. Need volunteer –
			2. We could put in a revised resolution to provide the text.
			3. We are looking for some volunteer for these two, but we need to ensure we have a broad enough review to get a good discussion on these deprecation suggestions.
			4. Providing agenda time to 11mc and then advertise to get interested parties to come to discuss.
			5. We will need to give a list to Dorothy to provide in her report.
		6. List of CID topics that we want to consider for Dorothy to put in Chair report:
			1. Dual CTS – 2190; PCO – 2114; 11b – 2411; 11b – 2412; are quick finds
			2. Sean Coffey’s CIDs 2423 and 2424 also should be on this agenda item for discussion.
		7. Look to Adrian as assignee for CID 2190 and 2114 for the text, but we need to have the discussion independently of getting the text, but it was felt that we should have the text to facilitate the conversation.
		8. Review CID 2411
			1. We would look to change the text to be more consistent with Deprecation wording
			2. There is concern on how to allow the deprecation and the ramifications that may not be completely simple.
		9. Review CID 2423
			1. This is an alternative the deprecation of 11b
			2. This is a different issue of SNR between 5 and 6 MB rates
			3. Discussion a bit on the value of 1 and 2 MB and whether or not this is a stepwise improvement
			4. CID 32 was rejected in the pre-ballot processing – this was looking to drop MAC protections for 11b-only devices.
		10. We will be looking to resolve all the comments and go to a next recirculation out of January 2014 (stretch target) and March 2014 at the latest.
		11. We need to have work to prepare for Assignees as we can for the F2F.
		12. Dorothy will look to identify the PHY comments and contact Vinko et al. to work on resolutions.
		13. Assign - PHY, Security, and Mesh – Vinko, Dan, Guido respectively
		14. Adrian is expecting to grab 30 comments between now and F2F and would look at the frame format area for initial target.
	6. Plans for next Telecon
		1. Let Dorothy know by Wednesday for Agenda items for Nov 8th. If no items call will be canceled.
	7. Meeting adjourned 11:50am ET.
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