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Abstract

Minutes for the TGm REVmc telecons:
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4. 2014-01-10
5. 2014-01-17
6. Minutes for the TG REVmc Telecon for December 6, 2013
	1. Proposed Agenda – December 6, 2013:
7. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
8. Editor Report
9. Comment Resolution and available presentations
10. AOB
11. 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; Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink, Menzo WENTINK, Qualcomm. Jon ROSDAHL, CSR.
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. D2.2 is posted on the IEEE 802.11 website and includes resolution of editorial comments approved at the November meeting.
		2. D2.3 is under review by reviewer volunteers and includes the remaining (largely technical) changes approved in November. D2.3 will be posted before the January meeting.
		3. Chair noted that there is interest in draft D2.3; she has received an inquiry about availability of D2.3.
	5. Discussion of presentations: Available draft comment resolutions for review are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1314-09-000m-some-lb199-proposed-resoluitons.doc> .
	6. Review of 11-13-1314r9, since updated to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1314-10-000m-some-lb199-proposed-resoluitons.doc>.
		1. CID 2189 – Review of proposed changes to 3.1 and 3.2, moving 802.11 specific items from clause 3.1.
			1. What is the impact on the IEEE document that collects and publishes 3.1 terms?
			2. IEEE has an online database now, not a document. Adrian is working with IEEE staff to make sure that changes we make are reflected in their database.
			3. Observation that many of the defintions are 802.11 specific, and will be moved – resulting clause much shorter.
			4. Consider status of BSS definition and related definitions, portal.
			5. Adrian to revise.
		2. CID 2099 – Adrian and Guido Hiertz are discussing the resolution, no proposal at this time.
		3. CID 2258 – Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		4. CID 2436 – Assigned to Dan Harkins.
		5. CID 2468 – Assigned to Brian Hart.
		6. CID 2473 – Assigned to Matt Fischer.
		7. CID 2329, 2330, 2334, 2335 – Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		8. CID 2197 – Agree to rejected resolution as in 1314r10.
		9. CID 2015 – Review of changes to tables of “order” values. Agree to make changes to Table 8-35 P574L30 to include added mesh-related frames. Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		10. CID 2045 – Review and editing of “order” values. – Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		11. CID 2028, 2448 – Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		12. CID 2447 – Change to clarify “following”, Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		13. CID2030 – Agree to accepted resolution
		14. CID 2031 – Assigned to Qi Wang.
		15. CID 2446 – Agree to accepted resolution
		16. CID 2469 – Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		17. CID 2032 – Agree to accepted resolution
		18. CID 2033, 2034 – Agree to revised resolution as in 1314r10.
		19. CID 2338 – Discussion regarding just deleting “contiguous”. Out of time. Consider on next call.
	7. AOB
		1. Reminder: next call is December 13, 2013 same time: 10am Eastern.
		2. Dec 13 call will use the new IEEE webex meeting.
		3. Schedule plan is to discuss 11b related comments at the upcoming Los Angeles January meeting, Weds PM1 (not on telecons).
	8. Adjourned at 1159 ET.
12. Minutes for December 13, 2013, 10am **Eastern** (7am Pacific) Telecon
	1. Proposed Agenda:

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
2. Editor report

3. Presentations and comment resolution, including
- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1314-10-000m-some-lb199-proposed-resoluitons.doc>
4. AOB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to agenda
	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; Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink, Jon ROSDAHL, CSR.
	4. Editor Report:
		1. Received some of the Edit Reviewers comment. Some still outstanding.
		2. Michelle Turner has given 11ac publication timeline – will be published before the end of the year.
		3. Comment resolution writing by Editor will go to zero in January, as he will be busy with the roll-in during January.
		4. Both 11ac and 11af were approved by the Standards Board. Official word from Bruce is pending.
	5. Presentation of 11-13/1314r10 – Adrian Stephens
		1. CID 2338
			1. Was where we left off last time.
			2. Review Comment
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change “contiguous time block” with “period of time”at cited location.
			4. No objection – ready for motion
		2. CID 2339
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – ready for motion
		3. CID 2035
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – ready for motion
		4. CID 2036
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – ready for motion
		5. CID 2037
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes see 11-13-1314r11 – CID 2037
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes in 11-13-1314r11 under CID 2037.
			4. No objection – ready for motion
		6. CID 2041
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised. Change all “Directional Channel Quality Reporting Information” to “Directional Channel Quality Reporting”. And Change all “Information subelement” to “subelement”, with capitalization as required by syntax.
			3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
		7. CID 2445
			1. Change assignment to Dan Harkins
			2. Adrian will delete from 11-13/1314
			3. MAC comment
		8. CID 2042
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Review all figure captions in the range 8-554 to 8-642 and replace "frame format" with "Action field format". And Review all table captions in the range 8-232 to 8-366 and replace "frame format" with "Action field format".
			3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
		9. CID 2043
			1. We discussed this previously
			2. Change assignment to Qi Wang
			3. MAC Comment
		10. CID 2044
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 2046
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised . At cited location Delete: “Any number of elements can be included within an Announce frame.”
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 2095
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make changes in 11-13-1314r11 under CID 2095.
			3. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
		13. CID 2066
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The proposed change does not provide specific changes to make. In reply to the commenter, CID 2115 replaces all “PCP/” terminology with a textual conjunction “and” or “or”, resulting in “AP or PCP” and “non-AP and non-PCP”.
			3. No objection – Mark ready for motion
		14. CID 2050
			1. Review Comment
			2. Instead of the proposed “sender” change to “Provider”
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At 1556.46 add:

“In this subclause, the following terms are used:

--Directed Multicast Service (DMS) provider: An AP, PCP, or DMG STA associated with a PCP that provides the DMS service.

--DMS recipient: A non-AP STA that uses the DMS service.”

Throughout 10.24.16.2 replace “AP or DMG STA” with “DMS provider”.

Throughout 10.24.16.2 replace “non-AP or DMG STA” with “DMS recipient”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2116
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised Delete Cited Sentence
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2117
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussed the context of why this is a variable vs attribute
			3. In the PHY it is PHY Characteristics.
			4. Editor to comment on this in the next ballot the changing of DMG MAC parameters to Attributes – noted that it was already noted in the editor notes for future comment.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace cited sentence with:

“A DMG AP shall set dot11MaxLostBeacons to the value of the aMinBTIPeriod parameter.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for motion
		1. CID 2125
			1. Review Comment
			2. From the presentation: That aside, although the term “network” does exist outside .11ad text, the term “network initialization” is unique to .11ad text. So the question is:
1. No position
2. No objection.
3. Do we object to “network”
4. Do we object to the term “network initialization” on principal
5. Do we object to the term “network initialization” only because it hasn’t been adequately defined related to the MLME primitives and state machine?
	* + 1. Give we have only 4 on the call a straw poll is not really useful
			2. We have concern that we would want more time to look at this question.
			3. In 11ad there is Beam forming training that uses beacons so this is an “initialization process”
			4. Any station joining would need to transmit beacons
			5. Is the Network being referred to the “BSS”?
				1. It may be,
				2. Looking at the context at page 1357, we see this is during active scanning. We could change the title from “before network initialization” to “during active scanning”.
			6. Does this occur for every station? Then if it does, then this may be a joining rather than an establishment of a “network”.
			7. This may be better described as “while joining” or “while scanning” which is different primitives may cause more confusion.
			8. This occurs during discovery of devices, so different.
			9. More discussion is needed. Adrian to check with Carlos if other uses of this “subroutine” elsewhere.
		1. CID 2126
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is going to be affected by CID 2098
			3. More discussion in January
		2. CID 2098
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is an ongoing debate among the original .11ad experts.
			3. More discussion in January
		3. CID 2029
			1. Review Comment
			2. From the presentation: Status:

This is a SWAG for discussion. I have no doubt it is choc-full of errors. These are unknown. The question is whether the original text is better on the basis of:

1. It is demonstrably full of issues. But we have managed to live with this, and the universe has not yet imploded.
2. The new text may contain new issues to which current implementations are not inured. Making this change will definitely cause the universe to implode, which will possibly get 802.11 a bad rep.
	* + 1. We may want to take this up at the F2F to get better uptake on discussion. Suggest we pull this out and post a separate document and then post for request for more review on the reflector.
		1. CID 2130
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2132
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Delete cited sentence. At 1367.22 insert “(see 11.6.1 for MAC comparison)” after “greater than”.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 2356
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 2134
			1. Review Comment
			2. Why is there an “In order” ?
				1. “A Non-AP STA may transmit a … “by rewording get rid of the “In Order”
			3. The concept of the non-AP STA “may” is the tripping issue.
			4. Original Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace cited text with: “In order to terminate use of all QoS services provided by an ADDTS Request frame including U-APSD Coexistence, a non-AP STA may transmit a DELTS Request frame to the AP”
			5. Suggested improvement: “a non-AP STA may terminate use of all QoS services resulting from an ADDTS Request frame including U-APSD Coexistence by transmitting a DELTS Request Frame to the AP”
			6. More discussion and the final Proposed Resolution was prepared.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace cited text with: “A non-AP STA may terminate use of all QoS services (including U-APSD Coexistence) resulting from an ADDTS Request frame by transmitting a DELTS Request frame to the AP”
			8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 2359
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Delete “contiguous”
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for motion
		6. Thanks to Adrian for the Yeomen effort on completing so many resolutions...
	1. We need to get a larger group of folks to volunteer for comment resolution
		1. We need to assign more comments to folks for possible solutions.
		2. Need to get databases to be updated.
		3. There are some folks working on topics but need the CIDs assigned to make clear what they are working on.
	2. Adjourned 11:45am ET
3. Minutes for December 20, 2013, 10am **Eastern** (7am Pacific) Telecon
	1. Proposed Agenda:
4. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
5. Editor report
6. Comment resolution
7. AOB
8. Adjourn
	* 1. No objection to agenda
	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; Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink, Jon ROSDAHL, CSR; Carlos ALDANA, Qualcomm (no audio); Menzo WENTINK, Qualcomm,
	4. Editor Report:
		1. No change from last week.
		2. One question – updated list of status was sent out...but not including any update from GEN.
		3. Update sent on Thursday (yesterday) resovelved 149 of 400 comments. 120 or so were Editorial, so we have about a third of the way done. We have 130 that are not assigned still.
	5. Note Graham has posted a document on deprecation, doc 11-13/1533r0, it is scheduled for the Face-to-Face meeting in January.
		1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1533-00-000m-clause-16-and-17-deprecation.docx
	6. Comment Resolution Plan:
		1. 11-13-1399r2 Dorothy STANLEY
		2. Adrian has CID 2172
		3. Mark has a review comment – CID 2494
			1. Menzo is assigned to help with this one and work on wording.
			2. Menzo said an update will come next year.
	7. Comment Resolution
		1. CID 2172
			1. Discussion from 11-13/1314r12 page 59 - Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Review Comment
			3. Discuss proposed solution
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised Change 1397.51 as shown in 11-13/1314r12 under CID 2172. These changes avoid multiple queed ATIMs to the same address.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	8. Presentation 11-13/1399r2 Dorothy STANLEY
		1. Document Abstract:

Proposed resolutions to the following CIDs are included in this document:

2433, 2483 – resolution approved

2414 and 2005, 2405, 2406, 2427, 2002, 2226, 2246, 2392– ready for review

2199 – Assigned to Carlos Cordiero

2410 - Assigned to Mark Hamilton

2065, –to be done

2407 assigned to Brian Hart

2426 – Assign to Dan Harkins

* + 1. CID 2199
			1. Assigned to Carlos Cordiero
		2. CID 2410
			1. Assigned to Mark HAMILTON
		3. CID 2414
			1. CID 1674 was not implemented.
				1. CID 1674 Reviewed
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised Change the definition to: “EAPOL-Start frame: A Data MPDU that carries an 802.1X EAPOL-Start PDU”.
		4. CID 2405
			1. Review comment
			2. Looked at where “supports” and “activated was defined and how they coordinate.
			3. The capability is related to Activated.
			4. The D2 redline has a change here already.in these clauses
				1. The MIB variable and supports was connected in the last changes
			5. Proposed resolution: Revised; delete the text “The STA does not support the [fine] timing measurement procedure” at 1542L1-2 and at 1543L30-32/
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 2406
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note that at page 1543 is the function, but in clause 4 there is text explaining the differences.
			3. Clock drift vs location is the key difference
			4. Proposed Resolution: Reject; There is already text in 4.3.14.18 and 4.3.14.19 that describes each feature.
			5. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 2407
			1. Still in progress for review
			2. Assign to Brian Hart
		7. CID 2427
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. Discussion on why this is not correct
			4. The “shall” defined the required elapse time if the “may” condition is present.
			5. This is really a constraint, so as a proposed alternative.
			6. The “Shall only” is often confusing
			7. Change “the originator HWMP SN shall not be incremented until at…”
			8. Proposed Resolution: Revised: The “shall” defined the required elapsed time if the “may” condition is present.Reword to clarify the constraint on the time interval. Change the cited text as indicated: “In this case, the originator HWMP SN shall not be incremented ~~only after~~ until at least dot11MeshHWMPnetDiameterTraversalTime has elapsed since the previous increment. “
			9. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 2359, 2246, 2392
			1. All are about “contiguous”
			2. Review comments
			3. Initial Proposed Resolution: Revised: Delete “contiguous” at 28.18, 55.55 and 1944.08
			4. We did delete when in conjunction with a period of time, but this time there is a service overlap, so we should evaluate with continuous may be appropriate or not.
			5. One alternative is “uninterrupted”, but some concern for still seemingly a time based issue.
			6. The use of contiguous is likely better for countries as they don’t overlap.
			7. Reevaluate each instance for right word...complete, just deleted, non-disjoint, uninterrupted
			8. Final Proposed Resolution: Revised: Delete “contiguous” at 28.18 and 1944.08, Change to “This is commonly used to provide complete coverage within a physical volume.” At 55.55
			9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. This document will be posted as an R3.
	1. Status review
		1. Looking at the comment resolution spreadsheet, and find all comments with Blank resolutions and unassigned and look at the remaining commenters
			1. I have suggested that we assign comments from several and assigned them out
			2. CID 2411 and 2412 assign to Dorothy
			3. CID 2413 assign to Graham (see doc 11-13/1012)
				1. This has been presented several times. We still need to determine which group will act on it on or not.
				2. The initial thought is that this is too big a change for this Revision.
				3. The change as described in 11-13/1012 is not sufficient so a new submission would be needed.
				4. So assign to Graham and mark “submission required” for now.
			4. Concern that Adrian is not going to find enough takers for his CIDs
				1. Comments from Adrian/Mark/David have more comments, and they generally find resolutions
				2. If Adrian spends time on comment resolutions prior to roll-in of 11ac, that may be better use of his time to avoid the rush to conclusion if takers are not found soon enough.
				3. The chair indicates that on the first pass, she did not try to look at this set of comments. But would look later.
			5. We should be able to have most if not all resolutions for the comments in March.
				1. We may have some comments that will need further review time, but we need to be careful as we are not following the Sponsor Ballot Process as “parking” a comment for later cycle is not allowed.
				2. Rejecting vs reviewing/resolved in a subsequent round is a balance that we need to be careful with. For now we may need to be prudent
				3. When we are looking for going to Sponsor Ballot, any unresolved comments have to be done before going on.
				4. More discussion on possible paths
		2. Resource management concerns reviewed
			1. We should not put more load on Adrian, as he has done the heavy lifting for this round (again as he has in the past)... More people need to be motivated to help out.
		3. Reviewing the list again
			1. CID 2423 and 2424 assign to Dorothy
			2. Comments from Matthew Ficher need to be assigned still
			3. Comments from Mitsuru need to be evaluated and assigned
			4. Comment from Peter needs to be reviewed
		4. Dorothy will look through the last few and get assignees for our next call.
	2. Next Call is January 10th and another call on January 17th
	3. Thanks to everyone for the hard work and support was expressed by the Chair.
	4. Adjourn 11:28am ET
1. Minutes for January 10, 2014, 10am **Eastern** (7am Pacific) Telecon
	1. Proposed Agenda – January 10, 2014:
2. Call to order, Patent Policy, Attendance
3. Editor Report
4. Comment Resolution and available presentations
5. AOB
6. 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; Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink, Carlos CORDIERO, Intel; Mark RISON, Samsung.
	4. Editor Report – Adrian Stephens
		1. D2.3 is posted on the IEEE 802.11 website and includes resolution of all comments approved at the November meeting.
		2. The roll-in of 11ac is underway and about 35-40% complete. Anticipate completion 1-2 weeks after the January meeting.
		3. Discussion on the need for reviewers with 11ac knowledge to review the roll-in, prior to posting the document. Chair will send out an e-mail request to the 802.11 reflector; goal to have reviewers identified by the end of the January meeting.
	5. Discussion of presentations: Available draft comment resolutions and presentations for review are here:
	<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0005-01-000m-proposed-resolution-to-cid2098.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0006-00-000m-fixes-to-dmg-operation.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-04-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>

* 1. Review of 11-14-0005r1, since updated to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0005-02-000m-proposed-resolution-to-cid2098.docx> to reflect resolution of “Revised”.
		1. CID 2098 – Carlos Cordiero reviewed the comment and proposed resolution
		2. Question on text at 10.1.4.3.2a list item “b” and 10.1.4.3.2 list item “g”: is the timer that is referred to the NAV?
		3. No, see text in item h “When the timer reaches MaxChannelTime, process all received probe responses”.
		4. Resolution is “revised” as the commenter did not provide the detail described here.
		5. Agree to a resolution of “Revised; Incorporate the text changes in 11-14-0005r2”.
	2. Review of <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0006-00-000m-fixes-to-dmg-operation.docx> .
		1. Carlos Cordiero reviewed the proposed text changes. Bug fix to 11ad text.
		2. No objection to the change.
		3. Chair will draft a motion for the January meeting to adopt the text changes in 11-14-0006r0.
	3. Review of comment resolutions in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-04-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx> since updated to <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-05-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx> .
		1. CID 2485 – Editorial change to make inserted “Not” lower case. Also insert an “N/A” entry in the last column. Agree to the “Revised” resolution.
		2. CID 2484 – Agree that there are issues with the current text.
			1. Current text is interpreted as “When all conditions are met, then WNM is optional; otherwise WNM is not applicable.” Draft proposed resolution does not interpret this correctly.
			2. Review of WNM text: ExtendedChannel Switch and RRM are required.
			3. Also include CF11 (Operating classes capability implemented) per requirement in 10.10.1 P1465L32 “When dot11ExtendedChannelSwitchActivated is true, dot11MultiDomainCapabilityActivated and dot11OperatingClassesRequired shall be true,”
			4. Currently Extended Channel Switch (DS9) is tied to 11y; would need to add another CF entry for it.
			5. Agree that the change suggested by the commenter is an improvement.
			6. Agree to “Accepted” resolution.
		3. CID 2478
			1. Object to the commenter’s proposed change, seems to introduce a circular description of SSID element.
			2. Additional locations for the change are included.
			3. Agree to the edited “Revised” resolution.
		4. CID 2477 – Agree to the proposed “Revised” resolution.
		5. CID 2476 – Agree to the proposed “Rejected” resolution.
		6. CID 2475 – There is value in stating that a DMG STA is a QoS STA, so that behaviour of the DMG STA prior to association is defined.
			1. Agree to “Revised” resolution.
		7. CID 2474 – Review of comment and proposed resolution. Ran out of time for discussion/agreement. Pick up with this comment next time.
	4. Adjourned at 1200 ET.
1. Minutes for January 17, 2014, 10am **Eastern** (7am Pacific) Telecon
	1. Proposed Agenda:

1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance
2. Status of call for volunteers -11ac roll-in review
3. Presentations and comment resolution
<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-05-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx>
Additional available resolutions
4. AOB
5. Adjourn

* 1. Called to order by Dorothy Stanley, Chair of TG REVmc at 10:04 am;
		1. Review Agenda - no agenda changes.
	2. Call for Patents - Review Patent Policy and Meeting Policy
		1. None identified
	3. Attendance: Attendance: Dorothy STANLEY, Aruba; Jon ROSDAHL, CSR; Mark HAMILTON, SpectraLink, Osama ABOUL-MAGD, Huawei
	4. Status of call for volunteers -11ac roll-in review
		1. Volunteers were sought for 11ac roll-in
		2. Have received several volunteers to help with review of roll-in
		3. It is expected to be done mid to late February
	5. Comment Resolution:
		1. There are 6 MAC comments to look at after the review of the scheduled Document
		2. Review [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-06-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1399-06-000m-some-lb199-proposed-comment-resolutions.docx%20)  creating revision 7 with the changes identified during the discussion.
		3. CID 2449 - GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – ready for motion
		4. CID 2442 –Gen
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – ready for motion
		5. CID 2440, 2441 and 2439 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution for all three cids: Revised Incorporate changes as shown in doc 11-13-1399r7 for CID 2440, 2439, 2441
			3. No objection – ready for motion
		6. CID 2438 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Trying to remove the “Note that” and change to regular Notes.
			3. Discussion of AP vs AP’s ATA address
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change from:

"Note that all APs are also STAs; thus they are addressable entities."

 to

"An AP contains a STA and via its STA address is addressable on the WM."

* + - 1. No objection – ready for motion
		1. CID 2435 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review 9.22.4
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion
		2. CID 2488 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Are tables under ANA control?
				1. Need to ensure we are processing/requesting properly
				2. It was confirmed it was under ANA control
				3. Need to Proposed change of 19 to next ANA value for Table E2
				4. Need to change proposed change in E4 from 85 to next available ANA value in E4
				5. Need to change proposed change in Table D-2 from 19 to ANA assigned also.
			3. If changes are made, how will this get rolled into products in the field?
				1. Will this be backward compatible?
			4. Would need to update the tables to match the ANA in general
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised: incorporate the changes as shown in doc 11-13-1399r7 for CID 2488.
			6. Concern for how this would be incorporated.
				1. Similar to other table changes i.e. in TGaf etc.
				2. Does the BSS advertise multiple of these?
				3. Do changes to this table get used by new technologies, but how does this work with legacy device?

If this is a new functionality, then it is not able to confer the information of the operating class to the legacy device to use the new power rate

* + - 1. Need to discuss during the Face-to-Face and ensure we have thought this out completely.
			2. Do we want to have a pointer to the ANA table or have the tables updated in the document ?
				1. Do we want to update the table, or remove the table?
				2. Having tables in the document may be out of date, so the ANA is the authoritative location for the information
			3. Include in 11-13-1399 to discuss this when we talk about this CID
			4. Another possibility is to include a note that the tables are current as of publication, but that the ANA table is more current
		1. CID 2487 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised – Incorporate Changes as noted in doc 11-13-1399r7 for CID 2487
			3. Need to check with Carlos to ensure that the PICs are correct as well as the list of items that DMG STAs do not use
		2. CID 2486 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. Need to check with Carlos CORDIERA/commenter to see why unprotected DMG is defaulting to AC\_VO? What is time critical with unprotected DMG
			4. We have scheduled CID 2466 and 2199 for Tues pm1 to discuss with doc 11-14-49 and doc 11-14-30 for those CIDs. We will add 2486 and 2487 for that time as well.
		3. CID 2474 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We had started to discuss last week
			3. We may want to put into the Carlos set of CIDs and discuss next week
		4. CID 2472 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. What is behaviour of Legacy Items?
			3. Discuss: Ensure the proposed additional text does not conflict with the Country element requirements
			4. The IBSS table has a column that indicates which attributes get adopted from which elements
			5. How does a mixed set of STAs with mix of capabilities to know what the proper adoption is supposed to be? STAs that do not know about newer elements cannot adopt newer element information.
			6. The IBSS would need to be going with the least common denominator case to ensure all are using the same protection mechanism
			7. Adopting the behavioural parameters rather than the capabilities is a good starting point.
			8. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Revised: incorporate the changes as shown in doc 11-13-1399r7 for CID 2472
			9. No objection – mark ready for motion
		5. CID 2467 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – mark ready for motion
		6. CID 2470 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 2472
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Revised: incorporate the changes as shown in doc 11-13-1399r7 for CID 2470
			4. No objection – mark ready for motion
	1. Adjourned 11:30ET
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