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Abstract

R0 of this document contains the minutes for the 802.11REVmc BRC Telecon on November 6, 2015 (10-noon ET).

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TGmc** for Friday November 6, 2015 – called to order by Dorothy STANLEY (HP/Aruba) 10:05 am
	1. Review Patent Policies, call for essential patent reports
		1. No Issues identified
	2. Attendance
		1. Dorothy Stanley (Aruba/HP)
		2. Adrian Stephens (Intel)
		3. Emily Qi (Intel)
		4. Mark Hamilton (Ruckus)
		5. Jinjing Jiang (Marvell)
		6. Graham Smith (SR Technologies)
	3. **Review agenda (11-15/1260r2)**
		1. Motion: Approve the comment resolutions in
			1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-23-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls , “Motion MAC-AZ” tab and
			2. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-13-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx “GEN Cambridge F2F-2” tab.
			3. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-20-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls “Editorials-Ready for Motion” tab.
		2. 11-15-1207 – Adrian – New material starts with CID 6572, also CIDs 5054, 5212, 6227, 6460, 6483, 6488, 6536&6795 (75 mins)
		3. 11-15-1239 – Graham Smith – CID 6470
		4. 11-15-1249 – Graham Smith – many CIDs
		5. 11-15-1274 – Graham Smith – CIDs 5422 and 5423
		6. 11-15-1250 – Graham Smith – CID 514411-15-1207
		7. No changes suggested.
	4. **Editor’s report**
		1. Starting a draft review cycle on D4.3 now. Call for volunteers is out.
		2. Considering when D4.4 makes sense. Can review after Dallas if it makes sense then.
	5. **Comment resolution Motion**
		1. Motion #167: Approve the comment resolutions in
			1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-23-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls , “Motion MAC-AZ” tab and
			2. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-13-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx “GEN Cambridge F2F-2” tab.
			3. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-20-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls “Editorials-Ready for Motion” tab.
		2. **Moved: Adrian Stephens Second: Mark Hamilton**
		3. **Result: Y: 3 N: 0 A: 0; PASSES**
	6. **Comment resolution: 11-15/1207r3**
		1. **CID 6227 (MAC):**
			1. Will hold until face-to-face next week, as Adrian believes some not on the call today have an opinion
		2. **CID 6460 (MAC):**
			1. Will also hold this until the SMEs have a chance to confer and agree
		3. **CID 6483 (MAC):**
			1. Will also hold on this one until next week.
			2. Agreed to have a discussion on basic rates and supported rates as a topic in Dallas next week. Dorothy will arrange, and check with Mark Rison for any other CIDs on this topic.
		4. **CID 6488 (MAC):**
			1. Also hold this one, for discussion next week.
		5. **CID 6536 (MAC):**
			1. Skip over this one, until Adrian and Mark R can coordinate.
			2. Target December BRC F2F for this one.
		6. **CID 6572 (MAC):**
			1. Propose to assign to commenter (Mark Rison), submission required.
			2. No objection.
		7. **CID 6589 (MAC):**
			1. Like to hold a straw poll in a larger group. So, hold until Dallas meeting.
		8. **CID 6617 (MAC):**
			1. Propose Rejection.
			2. Should we have a common constraint on all subelements? Right now, they are all explicitly numbered and listed, so they could be different each time (even though are not currently).
			3. Needs more discussion. Will pick up in Dallas.
		9. **CID 6624 (MAC):**
			1. Propose assign to commenter (Mark Rison), submission required.
			2. No objection.
		10. **CID 6671 (MAC):**
			1. References must be to D3.0, this isn’t the same table in D4.0.
			2. Found in Table 8-163. Applies to OBSS Non-HT STAs Present bit.
			3. Rejected: The cited text (see 892.53) is not incorrect.
			4. No objections. Ready for motion.
		11. **CID 6706 (MAC):**
			1. This is somewhat already corrected by CID 6483.
			2. Rejected. All instances of this term have been reviewed. There are no instances of “Supported Rates element” that need an additional “Extended Supported Rates element”.
			3. No objection. Ready for motion.
		12. **CID 6708 (MAC):**
			1. Agreed DMG is mixed up. Huge amount of work to fix this.
			2. Resolution: Rejected. The comment fails to identify a specific issue to be addressed. It fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No objections. Ready for motion.
		13. **CID 6710 (MAC):**
			1. Reviewed context.
			2. Proposed resolution: Accepted.
			3. No objections. Ready for motion.
		14. **CID 6765 (MAC):**
			1. Can’t find this phrase in the draft.
			2. Found as an underscore in Annex M.11.1. But, that’s an input to the test vector, and probably shouldn’t be changed.
			3. Proposed resolution: Rejected. The term referenced is, we assume, “AES\_GCMP” at 3504.39. It is used as part of a test vector, and as such should not be changed.
			4. No objections. Ready for motion.
		15. **CID 6768 (MAC):**
			1. Discussion of whether AP’s STA’s MAC Address is more correct. Decided that’s not needed.
			2. Proposed resolution: Accepted. (Note to editor, there are 9 instances.)
			3. No objections. Ready for motion.
		16. **CIDs 6770 (MAC), 6813 (MAC):**
			1. Agreed with discussion in document.
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised. Globally change “Null Data frame” (case insensitive) to “Null frame”
			3. No objections. Ready for motion.
		17. **CID 6774 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: Revised.

At cited location change “The SME shall generate an MLME-ASSOCIATE.response primitive addressed to the non-AP and non-PCP STA.”

to “The SME shall generate an MLME-ASSOCIATE.response primitive with the PeerSTAAddress parameter set to the MAC address of the non-AP and non-PCP STA.”

* + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
		1. **CID 6786 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: Accepted.
			2. No objections. Ready for motion.
		2. **CID 6791 (MAC):**
			1. We’ve looked at this before, and some of the dates are needed, due to changes in 802.1Q between the versions.
			2. Need to check with Donald as he researched this for TGak.
			3. Suggest holding on this one until Dallas, so we can discuss. Adrian will contact Donald with a heads up.
		3. **CID 6332 (MAC):**
			1. After research, Adrian asks to give to an expert to dive in deeper. Suggest Jouni.
			2. Change to submission required, and assign to Jouni.
			3. Also, note that CIDs 6333 and 6334 are similar, and those are resolved.
		4. **CID 6799 (MAC):**
			1. Can’t find any reference that this was ever allocated. So, just remove it.
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Remove cited table row (1971.21).
			3. No objections. Ready for motion.
		5. **CID 6811 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: Rejected. There is no dot11DMGOptionActivated MIB variable. Changing at this specific location would create a reference to a variable that does not exist.
			2. No objections. Ready for motion.
		6. **CID 6826 (MAC):**
			1. Revised.

Delete paragraph at 1206.46.

Change the para at 1206.48 “The provided elements are elements, as described in 8.4.2 (Elements), that the transmitter of this frame is providing to the destination of the frame.”

to read

“The requested elements are those returned in response to an Information Request frame, as described in 10.30.1. The provided elements are elements, as described in 8.4.2 (Elements), that the transmitter of this frame provides to the destination of the frame, either in addition to the requested elements, or in an unsolicited Information Request frame.”

* + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
	1. **Comment Resolution: 11-15-1249 – Graham Smith**
		1. **CID 5050 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: Rejected. The mesh cache operates on MSDUs/MMPDUs and is logically at a layer above the cache in 9.3.2.12, which also applies to the fragments of those MSDUs/MMPUDs.
			2. No objection. Ready for motion.
		2. **CID 5163 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: Accepted.
			2. No objections. Ready for motion.
		3. **CID 5162 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: Rejected. The mesh cache operates on MSDUs/MMPDUs and is logically at a layer above the cache in 9.3.2.12, which also applies to the fragments of those MSDUs/MMPUDs
			2. No objections. Ready for motion.
		4. **CID 5157 (MAC):**
			1. Noted email discussion with Carlos.
			2. Proposed resolution: Include changes as shown for CID 5157 in 11-15/1249r0, which adds the Extended variants to the list.
			3. No objections. Ready for motion.
		5. **CID 5156 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: accepted.
			2. No objections. Ready for motion.
		6. **CID 5155 (MAC):**
			1. General agreement. Minor wordsmithing.
			2. Proposed resolution: Replace

“A STA that encounters an unknown or reserved element ID value in a Management frame received without error shall ignore that element and shall parse any remaining management frame body for additional elements with recognizable element ID values.”

with

“A STA that encounters an unknown or reserved element ID value, or if the value of the Element ID field is 255 and the element ID extension value is unknown or reserved, in a Management frame received without error, shall ignore that element and shall parse any remaining management frame body for additional elements with recognizable element ID values.”

* + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
		1. **CID 5153 (MAC):**
			1. Proposed resolution: At 1388.24 delete

“A STA shall not transmit PPDUs separated by a RIFS unless the RIFS Mode field of the HT Operation element is equal to 1."

Insert new paragraph at 1249.59

“A STA shall not transmit PPDUs separated by a RIFS unless the RIFS Mode field of the HT Operation element is equal to 1."

* + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
		1. **CID 5150 (MAC):**
			1. There is no analysis that Dual CTS protection actually works with GCR, which was the intended point of the comment, and the resolution does not really address this.
			2. Note that while the commenter asserts that these mechanisms don’t work together, there is no evidence or analysis that this is true, either.
			3. So, for now, reject, and the commenter can decide how to proceed.
			4. Proposed resolution: The commenter asserts that these mechanisms will not work, but has not shown any specific issue.
			5. No objections. Ready for motion.
		2. **CID 5148 (MAC):**
			1. Reviewed the destination where the sentences should be relocated.
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised.

At 1359.42 delete

“A DMG STA shall support the HT-immediate block ack extension. A DMG STA shall not use the HT-delayed block ack extension.”

At 1366.31 insert

“A DMG STA shall support the HT-immediate block ack extension.”

At 1373.63 insert

“A DMG STA shall not use the HT-delayed block ack extension.”

* + - 1. No objection. Ready for motion.
	1. End of time.
	2. **AOB:**
		1. Noted additional teleconference on Friday Nov 20, announced via email.
	3. **Adjourned at 12:00**
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