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Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11REVmc BRC Telecon on November 20, 2015 (10-noon ET).

1. **Minutes for 802.11 TGmc** for Friday November 20, 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. No response to call.
	2. **Attendees:**
		1. Dorothy Stanley (HPE-Aruba)
		2. Adrian Stephens (Intel)
		3. Mark Hamilton (Ruckus)
		4. Edward Au (Huawei)
		5. George Calcev (Huawei)
		6. Jinjing Jiang (Marvell)
		7. Mark Rison (Samsung)
		8. Matthew Fischer (Broadcom)
		9. Mike Montemurro (BlackBerry)
		10. Sean Coffey (Realtek)
	3. **Review agenda (11-15/1260r4)**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3.1 11-15-1392 – Edward Au, CIDs 5249,5693, 5695, 5694

3.2 CID 6427 – Carlos Aldana, if resolution available

3.3 11-14-1424 – Matthew Fischer

3.4 11-15-1399 – CIDs 5045, 5267

3.5 CIDs 6286, 6260, 6262, 6261, 6263, 6264, 6266, 6258, 6259 – Adrian, if resolutions available

3.6 11-15-1249 – Graham Smith, continue starting with CID 5147

3.7 11-15-0762 – Mark Rison

3.8 11-15-1400 – Vinko

3.9 Additional available CIDs

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. 11-14-1424 is not ready yet, will defer.
		2. Some presenters not present, will defer those.
		3. Agreed running order: Edward, Matthew, Adrian, Mark R
	1. **Editor’s report**
		1. Will start review process editing in about a week
		2. Draft 4.4 will have the renumbering, pulling in Annex R. Lots of work for Editors.
		3. Expect Draft 4.4 before January meeting
	2. **Comment resolution – Edward Au: (11-15/1392r1)**
		1. **CIDs 5249, 5693, 5695 (EDITOR):**
			1. Comments could almost be considered editorial, but worth reviewing.
			2. Replace WNM-Notification with WNM notification except when part of the name of a frame, field, or bit in which case replace with WNM Notification.
			3. CID 5695: Accept.
			4. CIDs 5249, 5693: Revised. The commenter’s proposed resolution is made. In addition, corresponding changes are made throughout the draft using the following instruction: Replace "WNM-Notification" with "WNM notification" throughout the draft except when it is part of the name of a frame, field, or bit in which case replace "WNM-Notification" with "WNM Notification".
		2. **CID 5964 (EDITOR):**
			1. Discussion about how ARC is currently thinking about MIB attribute naming. Decided to leave this as is, and let ARC make changes globally, later, if any.
			2. Noted CID 5493 (referenced in this comment).
			3. Discussion about wording of “A STA that has a value of true” versus “A STA whose … is true”, or maybe “A STA in which … is true”.
			4. Revised. Replace "A STA that has a value of true for dot11WNMNotificationActivated is defined as a STA that supports WNM-Notification. A STA for which dot11WNMNotificationActivated is true shall set the WNM-Notification Enabled field of the Extended Capabilities element to 1" with “A STA in which dot11WNMNotificationActivated is true is defined as a STA that supports WNM notification. The STA shall set to 1 the WNM Notification field of the Extended Capabilities elements that it transmits.”.
			5. Ready for motion.
	3. **Comment resolution - Matthew Fischer (11-15/1400r3)**
		1. **CID 6304 (GEN):**
			1. Pick back up after Dallas discussion, about the timer that needs to be reset.
			2. There was an off-line email exchange. There was a difference of opinions about what timer the text was supposed to be discussing. One thought was to just remove the reference of the timer, and just say “reset the CCA process”.
			3. After further consideration, now thinking to just remove the PHY-CCARESET primitives altogether.
			4. Since we removed the concept that the PHY’s CCA mechanism is connected to the MAC’s slot concept, we no longer have any such timing behaviors described inside the PHY. Seems we don’t need the RESET, then.
			5. Need to correct the change to the change to the text in clause 22, to still mention CCA. Wordsmithed, into 11-15/1400r4.
			6. An implication of this is that IPI-STATE cannot be changed, so just assume it is always IPI-ON.
			7. Revised. Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-15/1400r4 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1400-04-000m-lb1000-misc-phy-cids.docx), for CID 6304.
			8. Ready for motion.
	4. **Comment resolution – Adrian Stephens (11-15/1207r8)**
		1. **CID 5212 (MAC):**
			1. Updated proposal is to just delete the sentence as it says you can do <x> regardless of <y>.
			2. Comments that we need to make this clear, because it is not obvious that you can send an ADDTS even if ACM is set to 0, to fiddle with the settings. Suggest keeping this as a NOTE, at least.
			3. Revised.At 1552.34, Replace "The request may be sent for ACs for which the ACM subfield is 0." with“NOTE—Such an ADDTS Request frame can be sent regardless of the ACM setting of the AC.”
			4. Ready for motion.
		2. **CID 6451 (GEN):**
			1. Revised. At 2753.44 change “Duration/ID rules for A-MPDU and TXOP” to “Duration/ID field in A-MPDU” and change reference from 8.2.4.2 to 8.7.3 (A-MPDU contents).

After QD8 at 2735.14 add a new row:

“QD9” / “Duration/ID rules for QoS STA” / “8.2.5 (Duration/ID field (QoS STA))” / CF12:M / “Yes No N/A ”

* 1. **Comment resolution – Adrian Stephens (11-15/1010r16)**
		1. **CID 5054 (MAC):**
			1. Can we try this one again. Objections from Mark R, he wants to remind himself why this was pulled.
			2. Assign to Mark Rison. Submission required.
			3. Dorothy will bring this back on Nov 30, to resolve it one way or the other.
	2. **Comment resolution – Mike Montemurro (11-15/1399r4)**
		1. **CID 5045 (MAC):**
			1. No nice way to fix this, without making changes throughout the standard. Agreed that DMG advertised rates is rather a mess.
			2. Suggest reject. Do we try to explain in detail why, or just say it is for the standard “insufficient detail” reason?
			3. Similar to CID 6708.
			4. Rejected. 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. Ready for motion.
		2. **CID 5627 (MAC):**
			1. Another CID like CID 5045, about DMG rate advertisement.
			2. Rejected. There is no specification of BSSBasicRateSet for a DMG STA, also the parameter is a list of integers, so specifying “Empty” for DMG STAs is correct.
			3. Ready for motion.
	3. **Comment resolution – Mark Rison (11-15/762r14)**
		1. **CID 6684 (EDITOR):**
			1. Reviewed text not in yellow. No comments.
			2. Reviewed first text in yellow, about the AP Reachability field in the Neighbor Report element. Agreed that when this field is set to 1, the AP is indicating that it knows, for sure, that the candidate AP will not be reached with a preassociation request, so believe the “will” here is a statement of fact, and correct.
			3. Ran out of time. Will pick this back up later.
	4. **Next teleconference plan:**
		1. November 30 is next call.
		2. Might only go 1 hour.
		3. Mark Hamilton CIDs will be scheduled for the first hour.
	5. **Adjourned at 11:58am.**
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