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Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11REVmc Telecon on May 1, 2015 (10-noon ET).

Thanks to Mark Hamilton for capturing the minutes for the conference call.

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TG REVmc on Friday May 1, 2015 –** 
   1. **Called To Order** by Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba), Chair, at 10:03ET
   2. **Review Patent Policy** – Noted updated patent policy slides. No issues noted.
      1. In response to call for potentially essential patents: Rainer HACH (Nanotron) noted that he has submitted a comment to the Sponsor Ballot with a concern.
      2. Dorothy interpreted this as a request for an LOA to be submitted, from Intel, regarding Fine Timing Measurements. (See CID 5223 for details.)
      3. No further response.
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. The agenda as previously announced:

1. Call to order, patent policy, and attendance

2. Editor report, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-20-000m-editor-reports.ppt> (Adrian STEPHENS)

3. Comment assignment and begin generation of proposed resolutions

1. 11ad comments – Tuesday PM1

Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel): <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0534-00-000m-resolution-to-11ad-related-cids.docx>

Solomon TRAININ (Intel):

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0253-01-000m-802-11ad-grant-frame-related-clarifications.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0254-01-000m-802-11ad-non-pcp-sta-power-management-clarifications.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0255-01-000m-802-11ad-pcp-power-management-clarifications.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0256-00-000m-802-11ad-atim-frame-usage-clarifications.docx>

Payam TORAB (Broadcom):

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0410-01-000m-dmg-control-response-frame-rate-selection.docx>

Also Alecsander Eitan: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0533-00-0000-removal-of-dmg-ofdm-from-802-11-revmc-ballot.pptx>

1. Dan HARKINS (Aruba): has agreed to develop resolutions to the security comments – teleconference
2. Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom): CIDs – Weds PM1

5959: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1246-10-000m-cid3309-est-throughput-enhancements.docx>

5960: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0793-09-000m-lb202-cid3296-cid3297-bw-nss-support-partitioning.docx>

4. AOB

Teleconference times: May 22, 29, June 5, June 19, June 26

Discuss Face-to-face meeting: June 22-24

Also: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0533-00-0000-removal-of-dmg-ofdm-from-802-11-revmc-ballot.pptx>

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Comments on the agenda:
       1. Dorothy added a section to discuss BRC process at the start of the call
       2. Adrian requested time to discuss resolutions he has that need discussion, if we have time. Edward has some also.
       3. Carlos asked to have Location CIDs added to his list for discussion in Vancouver
       4. No additional comments/changes to agenda
  1. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (Aruba); Edward AU (Marvell); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Mark RISON (Samsung); Emily QI (Intel); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Joseph LEVY (InterDigital); Marc EMMELMANN (Self); Rainer HACH (Nanotron); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel); Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom); Carlos ALDANA (Qualcomm).
  2. **Review procedure for Ballot Resolution Committee**:
     1. Dorothy reviewed her proposed procedures, based on the outline in 11-14/629r10
     2. Checked on 10 day announcement rule – Dorothy can announce a call with 10 days’ notice.
     3. No other comments
  3. **Editor Report (11-13/0095r20)**:
     1. Composite comments are being tracked in a new document, 11-15/0532. This document still has all the old comments, as well.
     2. Reviewed comments by commenter. Mark RISON has the most – thanks for the hard work Mark!
     3. Looked at projection of how long it takes to review comments
        1. Prediction based on WG ballots would indicate 445 days to resolve the number of comments we have. That would be an 8 month delay. 11ah and 11ai would be delayed (at least at final Sponsor recirc) waiting for REVmc to stabilize. As the BRC, we can agree to change our approach to comment resolution from the WG ballot culture, and perhaps speed this up.
        2. Could/should we consider rolling 11ah/11ai into REVmc, then? If we consider the likely additional impact on our schedule, it probably just makes things worse.
        3. We got 1889 comments, including a few rogue comments that came in late. A lot are Editorial (more than half). Very few PHY comments this time, so mostly only General comments went to GEN ad-hoc, which made the split between MAC and GEN ad-hocs not well balanced this time.
        4. There are some Editorial comments that are really a style question (like inserting the phrase “value of” in 100+ locations). We can discuss those.
        5. No questions.
  4. **Comment assignment:**
     1. Carlos ALDANA will produce a document covering the Location CIDs. Tentatively assigned to Wednesday PM1 in Vancouver.
     2. Carlos CORDIERO will cover 11ad related comments in Tuesday PM1.
        1. Note especially the comment (CID 5857) from Alecsander EITAN (and document 11-15/533r0) requesting to have DMG OFDM removed from the Standard. This will be discussed in TGmc.
     3. Dan HARKINS will work on security related comments. He won’t be in Vancouver. We’ll handle on a future teleconference.
     4. Matthew FISCHER will address CIDs 5959 and 5960, and any additional items he has prepared. This is scheduled for Wednesday PM1.
  5. **Comment discussion/resolution:**
     1. CID 6634 (EDITOR):
        1. Should we replace these (“of type data” or “of type Data”) (31 of them) with more precise language, perhaps something like “with the Type field equal to Data”? Or document the vernacular in 1.4?
        2. Straw Poll:
           1. A: Should all such (“of type data” or “of type Data”) be replaced with “with the Type field equal to Data”?
           2. B: Keep the vernacular (“of type data” or “of type Data”) as is?
           3. C: Keep the vernacular and document it in 1.4?
           4. D: Don’t care/No opinion
           5. A: 4.5 B: 1 C: 2.5 D: 3
           6. Adrian will consider proceeding with “A”
     2. CID 6635 (EDITOR):
        1. Is similar to 6634, won’t discuss further here.
     3. CID 6566 (EDITOR):
        1. “IEEE 802\*” or “IEEE Std 802\*”, etc
        2. 567 instances of this, just for “std 802.11”
        3. Thought about this before. Nobody had the time to sort this out, previously. Does the group care (enough) this time?
        4. We really need the “Std” (et al) when we reference a Standard. There are places where we reference our own MAC, so we say “802.11 MAC”, and then we end up adding the “IEEE Std” even though we probably don’t need it. But, we’re not sure.
        5. Straw Poll:
           1. The current level of use of the term “IEEE Std 802.11” is excessive and should be fixed? A: Yes B: No C: Don’t care/no opinion
           2. A: 5 B: 2 C: 5
           3. Adrian will consider proceeding with “A”
     4. CID 6487 (EDITOR):
        1. Adrian agrees it should be fixed. Which way?
        2. Some felt that “status” was the response/report of an action. “State” is a condition being reported.
        3. Straw Poll:
           1. A: State
           2. B: Status
           3. C: Don’t care
           4. No objection to choosing “State”. Adrian will proceed.
     5. CID 6420 (EDITOR):
        1. Adrian agrees it should be fixed (small enough number of occurrences). Which way?
        2. Straw Poll:
           1. A: High rate PHY
           2. B: HR/DSSS PHY
           3. C: Don’t care
           4. A: 1 B: 6 C: 3
           5. Adrian will proceed.
     6. CID 6700 (EDITOR):
        1. Check with the group if anyone cares if this were changed.
        2. Straw Poll: Agree this should be changed? A: Yes B: No C: Don’t care/no opinion
        3. No objection to making the change, so Yes.
        4. Adrian will proceed.
     7. CID 5308 (EDITOR) – and about 150 similar comments (cf. CID 5312, 5420):
        1. In 1.4 we have a convention to not use “value of” in the context of “set to” or “equal to” (setting or checking) a field. It doesn’t explicitly cover a case like this (using “indicates”).
        2. Straw Poll: We should avoid “decoration” of field/subfield/element/subelement references with “value of”? A: Yes (decline the comment, possibly extend the language in 1.4 to cover this case) B: No C: Don’t know.
        3. Any objection to not adding “value of”, and extending 1.4 to cover this? No objection.
        4. Will apply to “parameter” “subfield” also. Will consider how/if can apply to “element” and “subelement”.
        5. Adrian will proceed.
     8. CID 5310 (EDITOR):
        1. Any objection to this change – it seems trivial – in all 37 places. No objection. Adrian will proceed.
     9. CID 5311 (EDITOR):
        1. How to refer to the extensibility of subelements (versus elements) within elements that are extensible (indicated by “Yes” in the “Extensible” column)?
        2. Adrian suggests maybe a new subclause to discuss this concept in one place, rather than repeating some long winded phrase in ~37 places.
        3. Text like what need is already in 9.27.9. Maybe we just need to reference that more clearly here? Adrian will work up a resolution to do that. No objection.
     10. CID 5402 (EDITOR):
         1. “expiry” versus “expiration”
         2. U.S. speakers prefer “expiration”
         3. No objection to “expiration”. Adrian will proceed.
     11. CID 5434 (EDITOR):
         1. “value for” versus “value in”. Related to CID 5308, above, but a little different.
         2. What about “value of” – this seems to be the most common, currently.
         3. Sometimes “value of” doesn’t work in context, though, and “value in” is probably needed there.
         4. No objection. Adrian will proceed.
     12. CID 5690 (EDITOR), see also CID 6432 (EDITOR):
         1. Will address CID 6432, and indicate in CID 5690 that it is already covered.
         2. Mark RISON is working on CID 6432. He’ll bring back a check with the group on direction, before doing all the work.
     13. CID 5730 (EDITOR), CID 5736:
         1. Primitive or element “indicates”. They don’t indicate, they do/are something else, which includes an indication.
         2. Adrian will work up a change to 1.4 to allow this phrasing to remain as is, and clarify what it means.
     14. Out of time for any more of Adrian’s discussion comments.
  6. **AOB:** 
     1. Teleconference times: May 22, 29, June 5, June 19, June 26
        1. May 22: no Adrian, no Mark H. Probably can’t do. Will consider another time of day on May 21? Everyone please send Dorothy times that would work.
        2. May 29: Adrian is traveling. Could perhaps attend, but limited.
     2. Discuss Face-to-face meeting: June 22-24. Could be prior week, maybe latter part of the week? Need a sponsor.
  7. **Adjourned** 12:03pm

**References:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-20-000m-editor-reports.ppt>