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Abstract

IEEE 802.11 REVmc Task Group Teleconference minutes for February 20th and 27th, 2015

R0: February 20th, 2015

R1: February 27th, 2015

Note that teleconferences are subject to IEEE policies and procedures see:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [IEEE Patent Policy](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt) | [Anti-Trust FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf) | [802 WG P&P](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_WG_PandP_v15.pdf) |
| [Patent FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf) | [Ethics](http://www.ieee.org/portal/cms_docs/about/CoE_poster.pdf) | [IEEE 802.11 WG OM](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0001-03-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx) |
| [Letter of Assurance Form](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf) | [802 LMSC P&P](http://standards.ieee.org/board/aud/LMSC.pdf) |  |
| [Affiliation FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html) | [802 LMSC OM](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_OM_v13.pdf) |  |

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday February20, 2015 –** 
   1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 1005 EST
   2. **Review Patent Policy** – no issues noted
   3. **Review Agenda**
      * 1. The agenda as previously announced:  
           1. Call to order, patent policy, attendance  
           2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution:

11-13-0233r52

4. SB Planning

5. AOB

6. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to the agenda
  1. **Attendance**: Edward AU (Marvell); Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei); Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink); Mark RISON (Samsung); Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel);
  2. **Editor Report**:
     1. LB 206 has closed and 46 comments were received. The ballot passed with a number of voters changing their vote to “Yes”.
     2. Reviewed the editor’s report in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-17-000m-editor-reports.ppt> .
     3. We must prepare resolutions to all of the comments, independent of whether they are marked “must be satisfied”.
     4. Have received new “must be satisfied” comments associated with No votes. The disposition of these comments is reported to the EC, and their presence requires that we recirculate the comments and their resolutions (and any changes made to the draft).
     5. Discussion of schedule impact of rejecting all of the comments now, versus recirculating a changed draft. Schedule difference is 3 months minimum.
        1. Scenario 1: Resolve comments with no change to the draft, then recirculate the unchanged draft during or after the March meeting (and the comments). Ask for conditional approval from the EC in March. Could start the ballot in April.
        2. Scenario 2: Resolve the comments with changes to the draft, then recirculate D5.0 with changes, then resolve any subsequent comments without changes to the draft: Recirculate D.5.0 without changes out of May meeting. Resolve any comments received in July. EC approval in July. July SB. 3 month slip.
        3. Scenario 3: Resolve the comments with changes to the draft, then recirculate D5.0 with changes, then resolve any subsequent comments with changes to the draft. Recirculate D.6.0 with changes out of May meeting. Resolve any comments received in July. Recirculate a changed D7.0 out of July. Resolve comments in Sept. EC ballot in Oct. Likely Nov SB.
     6. Comment: 11ac experience was to reject comments and go to SB; believe TG and WG expect and desire to go to SB now. Suggest chair contact voters and ask if they would consider withdrawing any comments now. Chair agrees to do this.
     7. Need to review the comments. Comment rejection reasons can include: rejected for reason of “Out of scope” – not the subject of changed text or text affected by changed text, “Insufficient detail” – Resolution does not have sufficient detail so that the text changes that would satisfy the commenter can be determined. If a comment is not out of scope, it might be rejected on the merits of the comment, or the TG could consider the proposed resolution, or other resolutions, and not come to consensus to make a change; in the latter case, the “Considered, no consensus to make the change” would be the resolution.
  3. **Review 11-15/0233r52** – All – Reviewed all 46 received comments to determine if comments are valid or not and determine potential rejection reasons. Action Item: Adrian to prepare an updated comment spreadsheet reflecting the discussion below and including proposed resolution language for the cited reasons from 11-13/0230r1.
     1. CID 4001
        1. Reviewed comment, which is “No comments”. This is an invalid comment as it does not identify a defect in the draft.
     2. CID 4002
        1. Reviewed the comment. It is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     3. CID 4003
        1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
     4. CID 4004
        1. Reviewed comment. Proposed resolution does not contain sufficient detail to determine a resolution that would satisfy the commenter.
     5. CID 4005
        1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
     6. CID 4006
        1. Reviewed the comment. The Style Guide does not require an enumerated list. Reject on that basis.
     7. CIDs 4007, 408, 409, 4010
        1. Reviewed the comments. The comments are on unchanged text and are out of scope.
     8. CIDs 4011, 4012
        1. Reviewed the comments. The cited text is unrelated to changes made in the surrounding text – out of scope.
     9. CIDs 4013, 4014, 4015
        1. Reviewed the comments. The comments are on the front matter text, which is out of scope for review.
     10. CID 4016, 4017
         1. Reviewed the comments. Comments are out of scope – on unchanged text.
     11. CID 4018
         1. Reviewed the comment. Insufficient detail in the proposed resolution to identify the changes that would satisfy the commenter.
     12. CIDs 4019, 4020, 4021, 4022, 4023, 4024
         1. Reviewed the comments. All are valid. Refer to editing error – extra “)” TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     13. CID 4025
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is out of scope, it is not on draft text.
     14. CID 4026
         1. Reviewed the comment. Insufficient detail in the proposed resolution to identify the changes that would satisfy the commenter. Commenter present and indicated that he could provide specific changes. Propose “insufficient” detail resolution as that is the current state. Revisit if needed.
     15. CID 4027
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     16. CID 4028
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     17. CID 4029
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     18. CID 4030
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     19. CID 4031
         1. Reviewed the comment. Insufficient detail in the proposed resolution to identify the changes that would satisfy the commenter.
     20. CID 4032
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     21. CID 4033
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     22. CID 4034
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     23. CID 4035
         1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
     24. CID 4036
         1. Reviewed the comment. Comment is valid – related to an existing unsatisfied comment. TG to consider whether or not to make the change.
     25. CIDs 4037, 4038, 4039, 4040, 4041, 4042, 4043, 4044
         1. Reviewed the comments. Comments are valid. TG to consider whether or not to make the changes.
     26. CID 4045
         1. Reviewed the comment. The cited occurrence does comply with the style guide. Reject on that basis.
     27. CID 4046
         1. Reviewed the comment. The comment is on unchanged text and is out of scope.
  4. **AOB:** 
     1. Next call is in 1 week, February 27th
        1. Continue discussion of proposed resolutions.
        2. Review draft ExCom report
        3. AOB
  5. **Adjourned** 1158 EST

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday 27 February, 2015** 
   1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 10:05 EST
   2. **Review Patent Policy** – no issues noted
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. The agenda as previously announced:  
         1 Call to order, patent policy, attendance  
         2. Editor report  
         3. Comment resolution

4. SB planning

5. AOB  
6. Adjourn

* + 1. No changes
    2. Approved without objection
  1. **Attendance**: Edward AU (Marvell); Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei); Mark HAMILTON (Spectralink); Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (CSR); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
  2. **Editor Report** 
     1. Review document 11-13/95r18
     2. Comments by Commenters reviewed – slide 6
     3. 46 total comments – 21 are part of a No vote
     4. Reviewed Comment Status
     5. Doc: 11-13/244r53 spreadsheet has all comments
     6. Reviewed some comment details
        1. CID 4002
           1. This is in scope, but we may or may not change
           2. Need to review this comment and determine if a change will be made.
        2. Similar process for other comments needed.
  3. **Comment Resolution:**
     1. CID 4019, 4020, 4021, 4022, 4023, 4024
        1. Extra “(“ comments –
        2. Review comment
        3. Potential Editorial change, but not changing any technical understanding
        4. Straw Poll: two options –Accept change (A) or Reject Comment (B)
           1. Question of need for Straw Poll – this shows that the group did give consideration to each comment and not just reject out of hand.
           2. Results A: – (0) B: 111111 (6)
           3. Proposed to Reject all comments – does not change technical understanding.
           4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:25:36Z) - The cited text is not ambiguous.
        5. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     2. CID 4002
        1. Review Comment
        2. Comment is on a changed figure
        3. Not part of a No Vote.
        4. The figure is an example and is thus informative,
        5. Straw Poll: A- Make Change, B- No Change
           1. Results: A: - B: 11111 (5) Abstain: 1 (1)
        6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected, A straw poll to make this change failed 0,5,1. The cited text is in figures that are examples. The normative text is clear and unambiguous.
        7. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     3. CID 4033
        1. Review Comment
        2. the Italics are just a range of values in this case
        3. The Editor says that there is no style rule to preclude this, and this normally would be an editorial change if one were to be made.
        4. The Text is unambiguous, so no
        5. Proposed Resolution: Reject, There is no meaning indicated by the italic digits. The text is unambiguous.
        6. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     4. CID 4027
        1. Review Comment
        2. Consider the change
        3. Straw Poll: A Consider change B; Reject – Meaning of text is Clear
           1. Results: A: - (0) B: 111111 (6)
        4. Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:38:33Z) - The task group considered the comment and did not reach consensus on any change to the current text that would satisfy this comment. No change is needed as the meaning of the text is clear.
        5. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     5. CID 4028 and 4029
        1. Review Comments – text in Annex M
        2. Cited text is in pseudo code and the technical implication is clear
        3. There is no rule that requires pseudo code confirm, but could be a good thing.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:42:08Z) - The cited text is in pseudo-code and does not affect an implementation. The meaning of the cited text is clear.
        5. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     6. CID 4032
        1. Review comment
        2. Looked at the use of brackets
        3. This text has a different usage than was used previously
        4. The description explains how to use HASH functions in this document.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:46:57Z) - The interpretation of this construction to hash function definition in the document is unambiguous.
        6. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     7. CID 4044
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:49:22Z) - The cited text is not incorrect.
        3. No objection – Mark ready for motion
     8. CID 4034
        1. Review Comment
        2. A Note is informative and not necessary
        3. The cited Text seems clear
        4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:52:50Z) - The cited text is clear at it stands.
        5. No Objection – Mark ready for motion
     9. CID 4036
        1. Review comment
        2. Not sure where this was
        3. Defer discussion for now and return to other SHA related CIDs
     10. CID 4037
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review KDF-Length use
         3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 15:59:37Z) - The cited text is clear. In this context, the "z" refers to any value following KDF.
         4. No Objection – Mark ready for motion
     11. CID 4038 & CID 4039
         1. Review Comment
         2. Same rationale and issue as CID 4037
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 4038: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 16:00:28Z) - The cited text is clear. In this context, the "z" refers to any value following KDF.
         4. Proposed Resolution: CID 4039: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 16:00:50Z) - The cited text is clear. In this context, the "X" refers to any value following KDF.
         5. No Objection – Mark both CIDs ready for motion
     12. CID 4040 (added CID 4041 during discussion)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on the Truncate operation
         3. Review Cited Note – not sure it is incorrect
         4. Check the redline draft for how the changes in this area were applied in this area.
         5. Changes to SHA1 to SHA-1 at the cited line
         6. Check CID 3439 which instigated the change here.
         7. Review 11-14/1104r11 to look at the specific requested changes.
            1. No specific change to this was there.
         8. Also check CID 3429 which was in 11-14/1357r2
         9. It was determined that this CID is not really related to this CID
         10. The CID is really Two parts: 1. introduce Truncate and 2. Delete “-128” from the note.
             1. Discussion on value and correctness of the request
             2. CID 4041 is also very similar situation

HMAC-SHA-1 issue

* + - 1. Straw Poll on CID 4040 and CID 4041: A – Make a change; B – No Change;
         1. Results: A: - (0) B: 11111 (5) abstain-0
      2. Straw Poll: use the following for the resolution: Rejected. The task group considered the comment and did not reach consensus on any change to the current text that would satisfy this comment.
         1. Results: yes -1111(4) no-1 (1) abstain (0)
      3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The task group considered the comment and did not reach consensus on any change to the current text that would satisfy this comment.
      4. Not unanimous 4-1-0 to mark both CIDs ready for motion
    1. CID 4042
       1. Review Comment
       2. Specific page/line not cited
       3. Resolution is not really specific “Also fix”
       4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 16:36:58Z) - 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.
       5. No Objection – Mark ready for motion
    2. CID 4043
       1. Review Comment
       2. Use similar resolution as we did previously
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 16:37:59Z) - The cited text is not incorrect
       4. No Objection – Mark ready for motion
    3. CID 4030
       1. Review Comment
       2. A previous CID had the agreed instruction that it should be changed. It was missed in editing
       3. The choice is if this change needs to be made now or not.
       4. Straw Poll: Make change – No Change
          1. Results: A 0 B 3 Abstain 2
          2. Propose moving forward with resolution
       5. Straw Poll: Resolution Text: The task group considered the comment and did not reach consensus on any change to the current text that would satisfy this comment.
          1. Results: Yes -3 No-2
       6. Not unanimous 3-2-0 to mark ready for motion
    4. Discussion on if non-unanimous CID resolutions should be marked them ready for motion
       1. CID 4030 should be in a separate Comment Group (leave in the Discussion Tab).
          1. CID 4040 and 4041 should be marked ready for motion
    5. CID 4036
       1. Review Comment
       2. This is effectively a pile on for CID 3386
          1. The motion on 3386 to accept failed -
          2. The motion to reject passed in Atlanta -
       3. The new CID requests only changes that deal with “Operating Channel width”, but that seems that we would domino and need all the changes in 11-14/1104r11 again, which was voted down in Atlanta.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-02-27 16:56:42Z) - The changes in 1104 under CID 3386 were considered in Atlanta.

Motion 108 – Thursday PM2 CIDs -5: Resolve CID 3386 as “revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate text changes in 11-14/1104r14 for CID 3386

Moved: Mark Rison

Seconded: Edward Au

Result: 6-6-9 Fails

Motion 109 – Thursday PM2 CIDs -6: Resolve CID 3386 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “There was concern that the proposed changes include behavioral changes”

Moved: Eldad Perahia

Seconded: Youhan Kim

Result: 14-2-6 Passes

The comment is effectively requiring all the changes under 3386 to be made as it is not possible to pull out just a subset of the changes without introducing inconsistency.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark ready for motion
    1. Report on Flipped Votes:
       1. David Hunter and Alex Ashley have sent e-mails to change from a Disapprove to Approve.
       2. Other Disapprove Voters are being checked for status of their supplied comments
  1. **Adjourned** 12:01pm ET.
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