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Abstract

Minutes for the REVmc - BRC Face to face mtg 7-10 December 2015 – Hosted by IEEE-SA – IEEE-SA Headquarters, Piscataway, NJ

1. REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 7 Dec 2015 – AM1
	1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba) at 9:00am
	2. Review Paten Policy
		1. No issues noted.
	3. Attendance:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Edward AU (Huawei)
		2. On WebEx at least part of the time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Mark RISON (Samsung); Osama Aboul-Magd (Huawei Technologies)
	4. Review Agenda
		1. See doc 11-15/1500r0

**7 Dec Monday**

* 1. **AM1 9-noon** -
	Mark HAMILTON CIDs (90 mins),
	Graham SMITH (90 mins)
	2. **PM1 1-3pm** -
	Jouni MALINEN 11-15-1490, (45 mins)
	Adrian STEPHENSCIDs, including 6260 and similar (75 mins)
	3. **PM2 3:30-5:30pm** -
	Graham SMITH (60 mins)
	CIDs 6203, 6427 - Emily Qi (15 mins)
	11-15-1400 CID 6304 - Vinko, Matt Fischer CIDs (45 mins)

**8 Dec Tuesday**

* + - * 1. **AM1 9-noon -**
				Stephen MCCANN 11-15-1488 (30 mins)
				Edward Au CIDs (30 mins)
				Mark RISON CIDs (60 mins)

Adrian STEPHENS(60 mins)

* + - * 1. **PM1 1-3pm -**
				Donald Eastlake MAC Service CIDs (90 mins)
				Ganesh CID 6072 (5 mins)
				2. **PM2 3:30-5:30pm -**Mark HAMILTON CIDs

**9 Dec Wednesday**

1. **AM1 9-noon** -
Adrian STEPHENS(2 hrs)
D. STANLEY CIDs
2. **PM1 1-3pm**TBD
3. **PM2 3:30-5:30pm**Youhan Kim CIDs

**10 Dec Thursday**

1. **AM1 9-noon**Menzo Wentink CIDs
2. **PM1 1-3pm**TBD
3. **PM2 3:30-5:30pm**

TBD CIDs
Motions

* + 1. Monday AM1 –Add Editor Report –
		2. Move Adrian to AM1
		3. Move Graham to PM2
		4. Move Edward to PM1
		5. See doc 11-15/1500r1
		6. No Objection to Agenda changes
	1. Editor Report (Adrian STEPHENS)
		1. Review Statics
		2. Editor Group General (10) need to have more review – 8 have drafted resolutions
		3. GEN – 65 remain
		4. MAC – 213 remain
		5. Assignee Review
			1. Mark RISON with majority at 97
				1. 53 are from the Editor group assignment
		6. Editing process
			1. All approved comments are included in the draft, but not reviewed.
			2. After this week we hope to post 4.4-revision pre-release for review
	2. Comment Resolution:
	3. Review Doc 11-15/1207r10 Adrian STEPHENS
		1. Note R10: additional resolutions provided for “purple” marked comments. Moved incomplete commets from doc 11-15/1010.
		2. Review how the “OFDM” PHY Comments relate
		3. CID 6258 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6259 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6260 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 2367.41 change “OFDM PHY” to “HT PHY”.

At 2367.25 change “the interfering signal” to “an interfering signal of 20 MHz bandwidth”.

At 2367.35 change “the interfering signal” to “an interfering signal of 40 MHz bandwidth”.

These changes address both the format and width of the interfering signal.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6261 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change "For a conforming OFDM PHY, the" to "The" at the cited location. (Note to editor: this is a subset of the changes in CID 6257)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6262 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 2368.05 change “OFDM PHY” to “HT PHY”.

At 2367.55 change “the interfering signal” to “an interfering signal of 20 MHz bandwidth”.

At 2367.64 change “the interfering signal” to “an interfering signal of 40 MHz bandwidth”. These changes address both the format and width of the interfering signal

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6263 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change "For a conforming OFDM PHY, the" to "The" at the cited location. (Note to editor: this is a subset of the changes in CID 6257)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6264 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6266 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6536 (MAC) and CID 6795 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. Adrian reviewed Mark R’s changes, and merged his changes.
				1. Reviewed each merge.
			3. Proposed Resolution for both CID 6536 (MAC) and CID 6795 (EDITOR): (MAC: 2015-12-07 14:39:20Z) Revised. Make changes in 11-15/1207r11 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-11-000m-sb0-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-3.doc> under CID 6536. These changes remove the use of “network” in place of BSS or as an adjunct to BSS.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 5031 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 1030.36 change:

"It is set to 1 if the STA supports both Link cooperating type and Link switching type. It is set to 0 if a STA supports only
Link switching or if the Duplex subfield is set to 1."

To:

"It is set to 1 if the STA supports both link cooperation and link switching. It is set to 0 otherwise."

At 1217.38 change “Link Cooperating” to “Link Cooperation”

At 1030.36 replace “It is set to 0 if a STA supports only Link switching or if the Duplex subfield is set to 1.” with “It is set to 0 otherwise.”

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperating” to “link cooperation”

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperation type” to “link cooperation”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperation mode” to “link cooperation”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperating subfield” to “Link Cooperation subfield”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link switching type” to “link switching”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link switching mode” to “link switching”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link switching” to “link switching”.

Globally change (case insensitive) “link cooperation subfield” to “Link Cooperation subfield”.

 (Note to editor, comment 5030 also globally changes “link cooperating” to “link cooperation”. The changes from this comment do not conflict.)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6589 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note IEEE 802-20014 conventions say that the colon do indicate bit order.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change MAC addresses represented using “colon” notation to use “hyphens” by substituting colons for hyphens (i.e., no change to the digits) using the following search terms:

00:01:02:03:04:05 (pages 1781 onward only)

00:01:02:03:04:06

7b:88:56:20:2d:8d

e2:47:1c:0a:5a:cb

00:ff:fd:00:00:01

00:ff:fe:00:00:10

00:0a:0b:0c:0d:0e

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6483 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed change on the Note at 648.11 caused a discussion, then the decision was to just delete the note at 648.11
			3. Discussion on the changes resulted in changes to the proposed change at 892.53.
				1. Discussion on the Rate detection and encoding of the BSS membership selectors.
			4. More discussion will be needed at 892.53 – so if we agree with the rest of the proposed changes, we will drop this one set.
			5. Skip to the next CID and come back to this one later.
		2. CID 6488 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resoution: Revised.

At 600.28 insert a new para: “The use of the basic BlockAckReq variant is obsolete. Consequently, this subclause might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

At 603.22 unsert a new para: “The value 1 in a Compressed Block Ack frame indicates HT-delayed block ack. HT-delayed block ack is obsolete and this value might be reserved in a later revision of the standard.”

At 604.11 insert a new para: “The use of the basic BlockAck variant is obsolete. This subclause might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

In Table 10-5, at 1626.13, first column, at the end of the para, add “See NOTE 1.”

In Table 10-5, at 1626.18, third column, add in a new line, add “See NOTE 2.”

At the foot of the table at 1626.31 add a new merged row with contents:

“NOTE 1—Non-HT block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard.

NOTE 2—HT-delayed block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

At 2732.36 and 2733.07 in the second column add a new para: “Non-HT block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard”

At 2753.07 in the second column add a new para: “HT-delayed block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

* + - 1. Discussion on CM30 which is TVWS, so more discussion on the last proposed change
				1. Non-HT immediate block ack appears to be mandatory for TVWS – Research in the text.
			2. More work to be done.
		1. CID 5054 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Previously approved by Straw Poll – but pulled to discuss RSN Capabilities.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1998.42 change “The Capabilities field shall set the ‘No Pairwise’ subfield to 0 and ‘Peer Key Enabled’ subfield to 1.” To “In the RSN Capabilities field, the No Pairwise subfield shall be set to 0 and the Peerkey Enabled subfield shall be set to 1.”

Globally change “the Capabilities field” (case insensitive) to “the Extended Capabilities field”.

At 826.56, 827.01, 827.02 (2x), 827.07 change “Capabilities” to “Extended Capabilities”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6226 and CID 5070
			1. These CIDs have a fixe that is included in Matthew Fischer’s proposal, but these CIDs were not referenced, and some word smithing and some added text that needs to be created to allow for the Element to be included.
			2. ACTION ITEM #1: - All BRC members need to review proposal prior to discussion.
		2. CID 6415
			1. Should be easy to resolve as it relates to CID 6413 which marked complete, but there are some minor edits that need to be reviewed.
		3. CID 5141 (MAC)
			1. Final review
			2. ACTION ITEM #2 – Mark RISON and Mark HAMILTON to review, if there is any controversy, we can reject and move one, but if the resolution is reasonable we can complete it.
		4. CID 5038 (Editor)
			1. Review Comment
			2. There is a lot of effort for this
			3. Proposed Resolution: 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.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6791 (MAC)
			1. Action still not complete, should be able later – should be able to resolve tomorrow (Tuesday).
		6. CID 6460 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The comment does not indicate a problem to solve. The proposed interpretation might create possible interoperability issues with STAs that understood and depended on the current rule.
		7. Return to complete this document on Tuesday.
	1. Review MAC Comments
		1. CID 5590 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - "DFS Owner" in this case is the name of a field of the IBSS DFS element, similar to the DFS Recovery Interval. There are many occurances of "adopt" in the Standard, where the recipient of a management frame is intended to use a received value from a field going forward in time, like this, so "adopt" is the vernacular. However, since these are field names, it would be more clear if they were capitalized and spelled correctly.

Change "DFS owner" to "DFS Owner field" and "DFS owner recovery interval" to "DFS Recovery Interval field".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5596 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5620 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The proposed change carves out the mesh peers to only those that make the move to “may” keep the pairings. But it was felt it was ok.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5622 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change "operating in multiple operating classes" to "operation in more than one operating class".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 5625 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 5628 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 5631 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6062 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. 1775.56 has another result code that may need to be looked at.(6063 and 6064 have similar issues on page 1775)
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept, Editor to correct typo.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 5100 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 6063 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 6064 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 5700 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 6710 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion on comment on if the NOTE is correct.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-07 16:29:30Z): A mesh A-MSDU can contain multiple MSDUs, and even though each MSDU may be limited in size, the resulting A-MSDU (for pre-HT and HT) could end up exceeding the A-MSDU size limit. To determine if it would/does, the Mesh Control fields should be included in the size computation, and thus the NOTE is correct as is.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		13. That ends the pre-prepared CIDs from Mark H. for today.
		14. CID 6374 (MAC)
			1. Assign to Carlos Cordiero
			2. If a resolution is not coming this week we may reject
			3. Mark RISON has a proposed change to make the rules for non-DMG and DMG the same.
			4. ACTION ITEM #3: Mark RISON to check with Carlos and see if the proposed change would be acceptable.
		15. CID 6342 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. More work is needed. Similar to 6340.
		16. CID 5035 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Propose to assign to Carlos.
			3. ACTION ITEM #4: – Adrian STEPHENSto check with Carlos for a proposed
		17. CID 5039 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar to CID 6583 – which was on a proposed Motion, but was pulled from the motion, Aug 28th it was pulled.
			3. Review 762r7 to see why we may have pulled the CID.
		18. CID 6583 (MAC)
			1. Review the changes in 762r7
			2. Proposed Resolution : REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 16:43:18Z) - Make the changes shown under "Proposed changes" for CID 6583 in 11-15/762r7, which address the comment and also add some other cases in the MAC clauses.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		19. CID 5039 (MAC)
			1. Return to review if the changes in CID 6583 made enough changes to address CID 5039.
			2. Concern on what the value “0” means – is it valid? Is it a zero offset?
			3. If zero is valid, how to phrase it? – just delete the cited sentence.
			4. Proposed Draft Resolution: Revised – Delete the cited sentence
			5. ACTION ITEM #5: Mark HAMILTON to see if Carlos is agreeable, if so, then we will use the draft resolution.
		20. CID 6331 (MAC)
			1. Stephen MCCANN is working on this one and will present later this week.
	1. GEN Comments
		1. CID 5237 (GEN)
			1. Will be ready for later this week
		2. CID 6623 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Definition proposed
			3. About 57 hits in the draft
			4. REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-07 16:57:45Z) - Add to 1.5 "exp (x) is e to the power x, where e is the base of natural logarithms.", where x and e are italicised.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6416 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-07 17:01:42Z) at 41.19 add ‘authenticated mesh peering exchange, Mesh Group Key Handshake,’ between ‘Group Key Handshake,’ and ‘and the Peer Key Handshake’
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. Recess at 12:02pm
1. REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 7 Dec 2015 PM1
	1. Called to order at 1:03pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. Review Patent Policy
		1. No isses identified
	3. Attendance
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Edward AU (Huawei)
		2. On WebEx at least part of the time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Mark RISON (Samsung);
	4. Review doc 11-15/1490r1 Jouni MALINEN
		1. Abstract: This document discusses couple of REVmc D4.0 SB comments and issues that came up from earlier discussions in this area. This includes proposed resolutions to comments CID 6332 and CID 6403 and proposed changes to address issues that do not have an explicit comment, but that are related to a discussion or research started by one of the comments.
		2. CID 6332 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Changes
			3. Proposed Resolution REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 18:11:06Z): Make changes for CID 6332 in 11-15/1490r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1490-02-000m-some-revmc-d4-0-sb-rsn-comments.docx> ).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6403 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 18:31:17Z): Make changes for CID 6403 in 11-15/1490r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1490-02-000m-some-revmc-d4-0-sb-rsn-comments.docx>).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. **CCMP/GCMP transmitter rules for PN during fragmentation**
			1. Discussion from Doc: During the discussion on CID 6024 and CID 6239 regarding GCMP receiver rules on replay protection of fragmentated frames (“The receiver shall discard MSDUs and MMPDUs whose constituent MPDU PN values are not sequential”; see 15/1132r2 for more detailed history and description of this functionality) it was identified that the current standard does not have clear rules for the transmitter side to match this receiver rule. The resolutions approved for CID 6024 and CID 6239 (the changes in 15/1132r2) addressed the receiver side. The transmitter side was strictly speaking out-of-scope for the comments and addressing it was left as a separate item. While there is no clear comment for fixing this, the issue is valid and should be addressed as part of REVmc process.
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. A Separate Motion will be prepared by the Chair to incorporate the changes in 11-15/1490r2 under the heading of CCMP/GCMP Transmitter rules for PN during Fragmentation.
		5. **Missed PMK length Changes**
			1. Discussion from Doc: The 802.11ac changes to introduce a variable length PMK missed some changes. PMK is 256 bits in most cases, but with AKM 00-0F-AC:12 and 00-0F-AC:13 a longer 384-bit PMK is used. 11.7.1.3 notes the 00-0F-AC:12 (non-FT) exception and 00-0F-AC:13. 11.7.1.7.3 mentions the 00-0F-AC:13 (FT) exception. The Supplicant and Authenticator state machines were not updated to use PMK\_bits as the length of the PMK instead of the fixed 256.
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Include in the CCMP/GCMP Motion
		6. **Missed Suite B related definition for FT AKM length changes**
			1. Discussion from the Document: The 802.11ac changes for the new AKMs related to Suite B added requirements for specific cipher suites to be used when AKM is 00-0F-AC:11 or 00-0F-AC:12. However, the rule for AKM 00-0F-AC:13 was forgotten. This should be identical to the rule specified for AKM 00-0F-AC:12 based on the key length and algorithm strength. 00-0F-AC:12 is the Suite B 192-bit level case without FT while 00-0F-AC:13 is the Suite B 192-bit level case with FT.
			2. Review proposed Changes
			3. Include in the CCMP/GCMP Motion as well.
	5. **Status Check**
		1. Plan for Motions on Wed AM1, to get Telecon/Plenary left overs/Monday/Tues(?)
		2. Ask Comment database to be update each day.
		3. Checked on CIDs assigned to Menzo, and whether Jouni could pick up some of them. He’ll check.
	6. Review document 11-15/1249r1: Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5148:
			1. This was proposed for motion in November, but was pulled at the last minute (along with 8 other CIDs).
			2. Need to determine what was the conern – delay for now.
		2. CID 5147 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Introduction on the Block Ack and the Basic BlockAckReq frames.
			3. Try to split the data across multiple TXOPs and the BlockAck could be done in different TXOPs as well.
			4. The idea is to delete the second bullet and change the first bullet to be “Separate the block of QoS data frames and the Basic BlockAckReq frame into separate TXOPs or SPs”.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 19:01:44Z): Make changes as shown in 11-15/1249r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1249-01-000m-resolutions-for-adrian-mac-comments.docx) for CID 5147. This accomplishes the changes requested.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 5145 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion from the Doc: “MCCA enabled mesh STAs use Management frames to make reservations for transmissions. …. The MCCAOP owner and the MCCAOP responders advertise this MCCAOP reservation to their neighbors via an MCCAOP advertisement. The MCCA enabled neighbor mesh STAs that could cause interference to transmissions during these reserved time periods, or that would experience interference from them, shall not transmit during these reserved time periods.”

The intent of the text is clear, it referes to mesh STAs that would interfere if they transmitted, i.e. they are close enough that tif they transmitted at the same time as their neighbour, they would mutiually block each other. The underlying “shall” is that neighbour STAs shall not transmit during MCCAOPs between neighbors.

As the commenter found this confusing I suppose we should make it clearer.

* + - 1. Discussion on what a neighbour vs peer
			2. “That could cause interference” is part of the condition rather than a constraint.
			3. Question on how do you know if you are interfering…the proposed change basically says you are always interfering, so don’t transmit, but that is not quite what is thought correct.
			4. ACTION ITEM #6: Graham to contact Guido to see about this MESH issue.
		1. CID 5135 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 5135: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-07 19:17:50Z): In 9.7.6.7, 9.7.6.5.5 and 9.26.5.2 there are direct references to TXVECTOR FORMAT and FEC\_CODING settings.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5134 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5129 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. From the document Discussion: “The use of an A-MSDU carried in a QoS Data frame under a block ack agreement is determined per block ack agreement.”

In this case it seems obvious that if ‘under a block ack agreement’, the process uses the ‘block ack agreement’. So how to say this better? I am tempted to say “as per” which is unambiguous and can not mean “each”. Then do we need “as per the process of”.

Or should it be:

“The use of an A-MSDU carried in a QoS Data frame under a block ack agreement is determined as per the corresponding block ack agreement.”

* + - 1. We could reject the comment as it was giving permission to do work, but as Graham has done a lot of analysis, we reviewed his proposed changes.
			2. Changing to another form with “per” in the sentence seems to still be ambiguous.
			3. The discussion was to make one change and ignore the other “per” instances at 1309.19
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 19:35:32Z): At 1310.19, change "The use of an A-MSDU carried in a QoS Data frame under a block ack agreement is determined per block ack agreement." to

"The use of an A-MSDU carried in a QoS Data frame under a block ack agreement is determined for each block ack agreement."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5128 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on what order the paragraphs should be.
			3. Move the first two paragraph to the end of the subclause
			4. Move 3rd Paragraph to after 4th (line 44)
			5. Start a new Paragraph with “For the Short A-Msdu Case, …”
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISEDMove Text at 1309.18 to 1309.35 to the end of the sub clause 1310.53.Move text at 1309.35 to follow para beginning at 1309.40 and start new paragraph at “For the Short A-MSDU…”The updated text should Now read:“9.12 A-MSDU operationAn A-MSDU contains only MSDUs whose DA parameter values map to a single RA value (see 8.3.2.2 (Aggregate MSDU (A-MSDU) format)). An A-MSDU contains only MSDUs whose SA parameter values map to a single TA value (see 8.3.2.2 (Aggregate MSDU (A-MSDU) format)). For the Short A-MSDU case, an A-MSDU contains only MSDUs whose SA and DA parameter values are the same. The Short A-MSDU subframe structure is used only between a pair of STAs that communicate directly (see 8.3.2.1 (Format of Data frames)). The Short A-MSDU subframe structure cannot be used for frame forwarding.The constituent MSDUs of an A-MSDU shall all have the same priority parameter value from the corresponding MA-UNITDATA.request primitive.An A-MSDU shall be carried, without fragmentation,
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5127 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECT; A compliant STA should know what to do and will strip the LLC header off and add it back in after and before the MAC-SAP
			3. The reject reason was not agreed to.
			4. Ran out of time –
	1. Recess 3:03pm
1. REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 7 Dec 2015 PM2
	1. Called to order at 3:30pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. Review Patent Policy
		1. No issues identified
	3. Attendance:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Edward AU (Huawei); Paul NIKOLICH(IEEE 802)
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Mark RISON (Samsung); Emily QI (Intel);
	4. Agenda for this slot
		1. Graham for 60 Minutes
		2. Edward for 15-20 minutes
		3. Emily – 15 minutes (2 CIDs)
		4. Vinko/Matthew FISCHER – remaining time – pending their arrival
	5. Review 11-15/1249r2 Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5148 (MAC)
			1. A Resolution had been prepared but was pulled from the motion in August.
			2. The reason for pulling was explained by Mark RISON
				1. “A DMG STA shall support the HT-immediate block ack extension.” – wants “the”, and “extension” removed and then put it at 1374.3
			3. New Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-11-07 17:51:39Z): 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 HT-immediate block ack."

At 1374.04 insert:"A DMG STA shall not use HT-delayed block ack."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5127 (MAC)
			1. Review Rejection Reason from prior to the break
			2. Review discussion on the rejection in 11-15/1249r2.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The octets that are stripped and re-inserted are described in 6.3.26.2
			4. ACTION ITEM #7: Graham and Mark H to craft the wording that is responsive and bring back later.
		2. CID 5126 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Straw Poll:
				1. A = Accept
				2. B = Change
				3. Results: A = 5 B = 3 Abstain = 1
				4. Go with Option A
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. No Objection after the Straw Poll – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5125 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 5124 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed change: REVISED At 1308.12 replace:

“An A-MSDU shall contain only MSDUs of a single service class and inherits that service class for the purpose of the following rules. For MSDUs or A-MSDUs belonging to the service class of QoSAck when the receiver is a QoS STA, the QoS Data frames that are used to send these MSDUs or A-MSDUs shall have the Ack Policy subfield in the QoS Control field set to Normal Ack, Block Ack, Implicit Block Ack Request, or PSMP Ack. For MSDUs or A-MSDUs belonging to the service class of QoSNoAck when the receiver is a QoS STA, the QoS Data frames that are used to send these MSDUs or A-MSDUs shall have the Ack Policy subfield in the QoS Control field set to No Ack.”

With

“An A-MSDU shall contain only MSDUs of a single service class and inherits that service class for the purpose of the following rules. When transmitting MSDUs or A-MSDUs belonging to the service class of QoSAck to a QoS STA, the QoS Data frames that are used to send these MSDUs or A-MSDUs shall have the Ack Policy subfield in the QoS Control field set to Normal Ack, Block Ack, Implicit Block Ack Request, or PSMP Ack. When transmitting MSDUs or A-MSDUs belonging to the service class of QoSNoAck to a QoS STA, the QoS Data frames that are used to send these MSDUs or A-MSDUs shall have the Ack Policy subfield in the QoS Control field set to No Ack.”

* + - 1. Discussion on the proposed change
			2. The issue is when a non-QoS STA is the receiver, then what does it do with the Transmitted QoSAck or QoSNoAck.
			3. As the proposed wording does not make an measureable improvement we should consider not changing.
			4. Proposed note to add “NOTE -- When transmitting MSDUs or A-MSDUs to a non-QoS STA, a QoS STA ignores the service class.”
			5. See 129.4 has text that precludes the need to make a change.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-07 21:04:31Z): See page 129, line 4, which describes operation when the recipient is a non-QoS STA.;
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5082 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 21:30:41Z): Incorporate changes as shown for CID 5082 in 11-15/1249r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1249-02-000m-resolutions-for-adrian-mac-comments.docx).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Review doc 11-15/1499r1 Edward AU
		1. CID 5773 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. TGmc Editor: Replace "PHY\_" with "PHY-" throughout the draft except CPHY\_, SCPHY\_, OFDMPHY\_ and LPSCPHY\_.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6728 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar to CID 5387 – which defined the use of they hyphen in “WNM-Sleep”.
			3. To be consistent, we can use this as a precedence to resolve the CID.
			4. Proposed Resolution: TGmc Editor: Replace "Sleep Mode" with "WNM Sleep Mode" throughout the draft when it is part of the name of a frame or element. If it is not part of the name of a frame or element, replace "Sleep Mode" with "WNM sleep mode". Further, replace “WNMSleep Mode” with “WNM sleep mode” in 3022.30, 3022.43, and 3022.44.

Changes to “WNM Sleep Mode” is made by CID 5387.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Review Doc 11-15/1180r9 – Emily QI
		1. CID 6203 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. No FMSID in an FMS Request element nore an FM Subelement.
			3. Reviewed two options for possible resolution.
			4. Proposed change: At 1568.4, Change the text as follows:

To terminate the use of FMS for an FMS Stream identified by FMSID, the non-AP STA shall transmit an FMS Request frame with an FMS Request element and FMS subelement with the ~~FMSID~~ FMS subelement matching the FMS stream and the delivery interval set to 0.

* + - 1. Need to determine how to know you have a match – i.e. which fields should be tested?
			2. The FMS subelement may not be sent back a response, so we may be not able to identify the unique FMS String
			3. What is being matched?
				1. Discussion of how many fields – which had to be matched.
			4. After discussion, it is not clear the requesting STA can reasonably create a matching FMS Subelement for the termination.
				1. So, we'll go with option 1.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 22:17:32Z):

At 939.4 Figure 8-407, between the fields "Rate Identification" and "TCLAS Elements", add the field "FMSID", the length of this new field is 1 octet.

At 939.23, add a new paragraph:

"The FMSID field contains a unique identifier for this stream. If this is a new request, the FMSID field is reserved. Otherwise, the FMSID is set to the value assigned by the AP in the FMS Response element."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6427 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. As the FTM frames can be exchanged with non associated STAs, the AP may not know the power state.
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-07 22:26:06Z): Incorporate the changes under CID 6427 in 11-15/1180r10 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1180-10-000m-sb0-resolutions-for-ps-comments.docx>).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Mark RISON Review CID 5125
		1. Change +HTC to “+HTC-HT
		2. See page 3040.25
		3. The issue in the MIB, the description starts out with a short hand notation of the particular MIB variable.
		4. This should be fixable in a future comment.
	2. Review Tuesday AM1 Agenda
		1. Stephen MCCANN 11-15-1488 (30 mins)
		Mark RISON CIDs (60 mins)
		2. Adrian STEPHENS(60 mins)
	3. Recess at 5:33pm
1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 8 Dec 2015 AM1**
	1. **Called to order** at 9:02am by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus);
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Stephen MCCANN (BlackBerry) Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark RISON (Samsung);
			1. Emily QI (Intel);
	4. **Agenda for this slot**
2. Stephen MCCANN 11-15-1488 (30 mins)
3. Mark RISON CIDs (60 mins)
4. Graham SMITH (90 mins)
	1. **Editor Report:**
		1. Review Draft was sent out to have a 2 week review of the comments that have been edited in. Need to have check done to allow for Dec Draft.
	2. **Review Doc** 11-15/1488r0 – Stephen McCAAN
		1. CID 6200 and CID 6201 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Add to the proposed change as bullet #3 : “Authentication frame with Authentication Algorithm Number field equal to 1 (Shared Key) and AuthenticationTtransaction Sequence Number field equal to 3”
			3. Change bullet #1 from “this clause” to “Clause 11”
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 14:17:50Z):; incorporate the changes as shown in 11-15/1488r1 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1488-01-000m-6200-and-friends-mac-comment-resolutions.doc> for CIDs 6200 and 6201.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6500 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the order field
			3. Concern on how the name is renamed (“Frame Control the Order/+HTC”).
				1. Changing to “Order/+HTC” was thought to be better than dropping the “order” sense intirely.
				2. Swap order of the name “+HTC/Order” as the name of the bit.
			4. Check the changes listed to look for any missing locations.
			5. Review of potentially duplicated sentances 615.36 and 620.18
				1. Same field in different figures but the description is the same. – Concern while valid is a different comment.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 14:26:09Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-15/1488r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1488-01-000m-6200-and-friends-mac-comment-resolutions.doc), for CID 6500.
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. That Clears the CIDs assigned solo to Stephen
			1. 6331 is working with Mark HAMILTON, Stephen has open action item to resolve.
			2. 6094 is working with Mark HAMILTON, but Mark has open action item to resolve.
	3. **Review document 11-15/762r14** – Mark RISON
		1. CID 6684 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. 985.58 – concern on the plural usage –
				1. Change “recipients replies” with “recipient reply” etc.
				2. Drop semicolon and recipients, leaving “and does not reply otherwise”.
			3. 1869.22 change “so” to “therefore”
			4. 3583.29 The “will” issue is resovled by “does not”, the other issues can be addressed later in subsequent round.
			5. The change in 3590.24 is not overlapping so just the change regarding “will not” is addressed here, and the “nonmonotonic” is handled elsewhere.
			6. Delete proposed change to 854.22.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Make changes in 11-15/762r15 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx> under CID 6684, which reviews and replaces a number of "will not" with an alternative.
			8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6299 (GEN)
			1. Reviewed Comment
			2. Review discussion in document
			3. Remove the following for independent review and these changes can be returned for consideration later independently:

“At 992.9 change “The Key RSC denotes the last frame sequence number sent using the GTK” to “The Key RSC denotes the last TSC or PN sent using the GTK”.

At 1984.17 change “Key RSC denotes the last frame sequence number sent using the GTK” to “Key RSC denotes the last TSC or PN sent using the GTK”.

At 1985.5 change “Key RSC = last transmit sequence number for the GTK” to “Key RSC = last TSC or PN for the GTK”.

At 1986.62 change “with the last sequence number used with the GTK (RSC)” to “with the last TSC or PN used with the GTK (RSC)”.”

* + - 1. Frame Exchange vs Frame Exchange Sequence discussion
			2. “What is ‘frame exchange’?” is in the comment, this is not completely addressed with these changes, but the commentor is ok with this as a start and we can look at the remaining “frame exchange” later.
			3. Annex G reference, is not a complete set of exchanges, but it has those that are in there.
				1. So Mandatory Coordination should be updated to include an Annex G update on future Ammendments.
			4. 3361.42 change “frame sequence” to “frame-exchange-sequence”
			5. In Annex G – change “frame-sequence” to “frame-exchange-sequence”
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-08 15:23:02Z) Make the changes the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 6299 in 11-15/762r15 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx > which add a definition of the term “frame exchange sequence” and add “exchange” where missing in “frame sequence” (but do not address the meaning of the term “frame exchange”).
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6698 (MAC) and CID 6699 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. From Discussion section: The terms “awake state”/ “doze state”/ “active mode”/ “PS mode” are used throughout subclause 10.2 Power Management, but these terms are only defined in subclause 10.2.2.2 STA Power Management modes under subclause 10.2.2 Power management in a non-DMG infrastructure network, so they do not apply to non-infrastructure (or DMG) BSSes (though 13.14.2 Mesh power modes does cross-reference back to 10.2.2.2).
			3. Review changes
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 15:32:33Z): REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 15:31:18Z): Make changes as shown in 11-15/762r15 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx) for CIDs 6698 and 6699.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. That completes first pass of this document –
			1. Need to find out what is left in the document
	1. **MAC BA and BB CIDs**
		1. Several CIDs were pulled from the motion, need to review the list of CIDs that need more discussion.
		2. MAC motion BB and BA pulled CIDs: CID 6374 (BB), 5153, 5156, 6671, 6765, 5163, 6710, 6774, 5155, and 6826 (BA)
		3. Thursday PM1 is time for this set of CIDs.
	2. **Review Doc 11-15/1249r3** Graham SMITH
		1. Adrian’s computer crashed so swap to Graham
		2. CID 5081 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 15:53:56Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5078 (MAC)
			1. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 15:55:39Z)
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 5146 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Note that CID5046 was done in 11-15/1010r2
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 16:02:42Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		5. CID 5153 (MAC)
			1. Was pulled from motion
			2. Concern was due to the fact that there may not be an HT element.
			3. Concern that this subclause was restricted to just HT STAs
			4. Need to change to “HT STA”
			5. Several Proposals:
				1. “A STA shall not transmit PPDUs separated by a RIFS unless the BSS’s AP has transmitted an HT Operation element with RIFS Mode field equal to 1.”
				2. “A STA shall not transmit PPDUs separated by a RIFS unless the RIFS Mode field of the HT Operation element is equal to 1."
				3. “the beacon or probe response most recently received from the BSS's AP contains an HT Operation element with RIFS Mode field equal to 1”
				4. Reject the comment as it is deprecated in HT STAs.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-11-07 17:50:14Z): 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: "An HT STA shall not transmit PPDUs separated by a RIFS unless the beacon or probe response most recently received from the BSS's AP contains an HT Operation element with RIFS Mode field equal to 1."

* + - 1. No objection Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5156 (MAC)
			1. This comment was pulled from a previous motion
			2. Review comment
			3. The content of the cited field is well defined and should not be ignored, so the comment is incorrect.
			4. Discussion on when the RD Grant is given or not.
			5. Discussion on the HT control field contain RD
			6. Previous Proposed Resolution – Accept
			7. New Proposed change: – Delete the cited note, and in table 8-11 add a row: Value “0”, Role of Transmitting STA:“Neither RD initiator nor RD Responder”; Interpretation of value “
				1. Trying to define this we change the direction
			8. Straw Poll
				1. A: delete note ; and be done
				2. B: delete the note and edit table
				3. Result: A2; B3
			9. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 16:25:42Z) -

Delete the cited NOTE. (Note to Editor, renumber NOTEs 7 and 8.) In Table 8-11, for Value=0 row, change "RD initiator" to "Not an RD responder".

* + - 1. Repost as ready for motion
			2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion (again)
		1. CID 5163 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Was pulled from previous motion
				1. Reason: it seems that s/frame/MSDU/ change is also needed at 1448.36 and arguably 1448.1. Also, don't the "frame"s at 1448.15 and 1448.18 need to be something like "one or more frames"?
			3. Discussion of reason and possible change to the previous resolution.
			4. Review the other “frames” that are in the paragraph on page 1448
				1. Change proposed: Change "frame" to "MSDU" at following locations: 1448.13, 1448.14, 1448.36, 1448.1.At 1448.15, change "an individually addressed" to "one or more individually addressed".At 1448.18, change "The MSDU" to "These frame(s)" and delete "a frame with".
			5. More discussion
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 16:35:49Z) -

Change "frame" to "MSDU" at following locations: 1448.13, 1448.14, 1448.36, 1448.1.

At 1448.15, change "an individually addressed frame" to "one or more individually addressed frames".

At 1448.18, change "The MSDU" to "These frame(s)" and delete "a frame with".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5155 (MAC)
			1. Review reason for removing from motion previously.
				1. CID 5155: the grammar is wonky and references to extended elementsare missing at the end. Suggest: "A STA that encounters an element with an unknown or reserved element ID value, or an element with an element ID extension whose 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 (and, if present, element ID extension) values."
				2. Review rational
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 16:49:58Z): 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 element with an unknown or reserved element ID value, or an element with an element ID extension whose 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 (and, if present, element ID extension) values.";

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. Remaining CIDs
			1. CID 5145 still open – waiting on Guido to respond to follow-up
			2. CID 5127 – reject agreed, but needed rationale
		2. CID 5127 (MAC)
			- 1. Review status
				2. We had agreed to reject, but needed an appropriate reason.
				3. Proposed Resolution; REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 16:55:21Z): The U-PID parameter of the MLME-ADDTS.request (see 6.3.26.2) indicates the number of octets to be stripped off each MSDU sent using this TS by the transmitter, and indicates the number and content of octets to be pre-pended to each MSDU by the receiver. Both processes are done within the MAC, without knowledge of the LLC headers.
				4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Graham CIDs**
		1. Doc 11-15/1249r3 – 1 CID 5145
		2. Doc 11-15/1250r2 – CID 5144 - still open – need to review later
		3. Doc 11-15/1274r0 – CID 5422 and 5423 – still open
		4. Doc 11-15/
	2. **Recess at 12:00pm**
1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 8 Dec 2015 PM1**
	1. **Called to order** at 1pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance:**
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Edward AU (Huawei)
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark RISON (Samsung); Donald Eastlake III (Huawei)
	4. **Agenda for this slot**
		1. Adrian STEPHENS(120 mins)
	5. **Review document 11-15/1207r11** Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 5070 and CID 6226 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review changes
			3. Discusion on possible changes to 709.06 –
				1. What is an “extended element ID”?
			4. Discussion on 1543.43 set of changes – “or” vs “and/or”
			5. Discussion on the change at 1809.35 caused the introduction part of the clause to be rewritten without an if statement.
			6. Discussion on changing MD10 to reserved
			7. Discussion on other changes to make consistent once we agreed on an Extended Element ID definition.
			8. In the 1543.43 box, Add “in the order they appear in the (Extended) Request element(s) of the Probe Request frame”
			9. Proposed Resolution for CID 5070 and CID 6226: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 18:05:58Z): Make changes under CIDs 6226 and 5070 in 11-15/1207r12 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-12-000m-sb0-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-3.doc). These changes add a new Extended Request element,
			10. More word smithing may take place in later ballots.
			11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6415 (MAC)
			1. Reviewed Comment
			2. This was affected by CID 6413
				1. CID 6413 was approved previously
				2. Review edits
			3. Change “containing the primary 20 Mhz channel…” to remove the “20MHz channel.
			4. Need to update the resolution to CID 6413 as well.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 19:12:45Z): Make changes for CID 6415 in 11-15/1207r12 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-12-000m-sb0-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-3.doc). These clarify that the frequency segment is that containing the primary
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5141 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. We have talked about this before
			3. Graham’s proposal with CID5144
				1. This was noted this morning that this is part of CID 5144
			4. Also related to CID 5145
				1. There are 3 overlapping
				2. Changes need to be coordinated
			5. This CID was moved to doc 11-15/1207 from doc 11-15/1010
			6. Plan to revisit again
		4. CID 6791 (MAC)
			1. Take this one tomorrow when Donald Eastlake is on the line.
		5. CID 6483 (MAC)
			1. Review status of the comment
			2. Discussion how to note the selectors
				1. The 11n rates would appear as rates in the elements.
				2. 11n rates do not go in the cited element
				3. Supported Data Rates include MCSs
				4. An 11n device supports all the mandatory rates, so you need to look at the membership selectors
			3. Possible text:
				1. A Management frame (excluding a Probe Request) is received where the Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element and any Extended Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element do not include any BSS membership selector.
				2. This would not work for the HT STA case
			4. Discussion when a STA would see a frame to determin if Non-HT STA is present.
			5. Discussion on the “basic rate set” and the “mandatory rate set”.
			6. Blah de blah de blah
			7. More thought and research will need to be done
			8. Concern that we are making this too complicated
		6. CID 6488 (MAC)
			1. Still workin on it
	6. **Recess at 3pm**

1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 8 Dec 2015 PM2**
	1. **Called to order** at 3:30pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance:**
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Edward AU (Huawei)
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark RISON (Samsung); Emily QI (Intel);
	4. **Agenda**
		1. Updated posted: 11-15/1500r2
		2. For for this slot:

Donald Eastlake MAC Service CIDs (60 mins)
Ganesh CID 6072 (5 mins)

CIDs 6826, 6774, 6765, 6671 (30 mins)

CIDs 5019, 5018 – similar to resolved 5020

CIDs 6558, 6678 – FMS related, unassigned

* 1. **Review Doc 11-15/1503r0** – Donald East Lake – Presented by Dorothy STANLEY
		1. CID 6076 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The figures indicated in the Note have been updated.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 20:40:08Z):; Change "LLC entities" to "LLC sublayer entities", "LLC entity" to "LLC sublayer entity" and "LLC PDUs" to "LLC sublayer PDUs" and "LLC" (as a noun) with "LLC sublayer", throughout 5.1 (6 occurances in total).  Figures are updated by the resolution to CID6097.
			4. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 6078 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the change implication
			3. Discuss new change description
			4. Submission required – Assign to Mark HAMILTON
			5. ACTION ITEM #8: Mark HAMILTON to provide submission to show the resultant text.
		3. CID 6080 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 20:54:39Z): The comment fails to identify a specific issue with the balloted draft. 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.No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6082 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 20:56:25Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6083 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 20:58:48Z): Change

"The integer values of the priority parameter (i.e., TID) are supported only at QoS STAs that are either associated in an infrastructure QoS BSS or members of a QoS IBSS."

to

"The integer values of the priority parameter (i.e., TID) are supported only at QoS STAs that are in a QoS BSS."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6085 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 21:01:01Z
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6086 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 21:03:13Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6087 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Do we need to have the DS requirements in the .11 standard?
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 21:08:52Z): Replace this sentence with, "In order for the MAC to operate properly, this standard assumes that the DS meets the MSDU ("object") reordering requirements of IEEE Std 802.1AC-2012."
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review CIDs assigned to Ganesh**
		1. CID 6072 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution : ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 21:12:48Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review CIDs assigned to Adrian**
		1. CID 6826 (MAC)
			1. Pulled from a prior motion
			2. Review comment
			3. Change the typo “Request” to “Response”
			4. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 21:19:33Z):

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 Response frame."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6774 (MAC)
			1. Pulled from prior motion
			2. Concern
				1. - CID 6774: this has been beaten to it by the resolutions to 6375-6377 in 15/0762 (where it becomes "The SME shall issue an MLME-ASSOCIATE.responseprimitive addressed to the STA identified by the PeerSTAAddress parameter of the MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication primitive." in the first step)
			3. Check that CIDs 6375-6377 have been approved.
				1. The same change was made in all three CIDs
				2. The resultant text used there:

The MLME shall issue an MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication primitive to inform the SME of the association request. The SME shall issue an MLME-ASSOCIATE.response primitive addressed to the STA identified by the PeerSTAAddress parameter of the MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication primitive. If the association is not successful, the SME shall indicate a specific reason for the failure to associate in the ResultCode parameter. Upon receipt of the MLME-ASSOCIATE.response primitive, the MLME shall transmit an Association Response frame.

* + - 1. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-11-07 17:40:23Z): 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 STA identified by the PeerSTAAddress parameter of the MLME-ASSOCIATE.indication primitive."

(Note to editor, resolution of CID 6375 moves the cited text. Changes should be applied to the moved text in its new location.)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			2. Question on if there was a ReAssociate Case? – Unknown.
		1. CID 6765 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Was pulled from prio motion
			3. Straw Poll:
				1. A; Reject comment
				2. B: Accept Comment
				3. Result: A=1 B=2 C=4
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 21:40:34Z): At 3504.39 change "AES-GCMP to "AES-GCM".
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6671 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Concern
				1. CID 6671: as the comment says, it's dangerous (which in turn means it might be incorrect): does "A Management frame" really refer to any old Management frame?
			3. Move this comment and related CID 6483 together to see the proposed change together
			4. Updated proposed resolution: Revised Delete the last bullet point at 892.53.
			5. We can tie the resolutions closer together and then we can resovle both at the same time.
			6. We can also address the issue of repeativness in the material.
			7. ACTION ITEM #9: Adrian – while looking for helpful input suggestions, Adrian to create definition for “operational rate set”.
	1. Review CID 5019 and CID 5018 similar to CID 5020
		1. CID 5020
			1. We looked at “s” should be “S”.
			2. Other two CIDs similar
			3. At 2522.42, the change was made
		2. CID 5018 and CID 5019 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2015-12-08 21:56:32Z)
			3. Objection – want to ensure the equestion is properly vetted.
			4. ACTION ITEM #10: Dorothy to contact the assignee (Youhan) about these.
	2. **CIDs 6558, 6687 – FMS related, unassigned**
		1. CID 6558 and CID 6687 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Propose to Reject
			3. Proposed Resolution for CID 6558 and CID 6678: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-08 22:03:55Z): 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.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready For Motion
	3. **MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 6721 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Compare 4.3 and 4.0 changes to see if there was any conflict with a previous change.
				1. The related CID 5922 which may have solved the issue
			3. Mark to go do more homework
	4. **Review doc 11-15/1239r0** Graham SMITH
		1. CID 6470 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion/background
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-08 22:26:02Z):

At 839.14 insert the following para:

“N.4.2.2 provides guidance on the use of the Maximum Service Interval to determine the limit of aggregation of nominal MSDUs.”

At 840.32 add the following sentence:

“N.4.3 provides guidance on how to determine the standard deviation of the TS and how to calculate the total traffic when there are multiple TSs.”

At 841.18 add the following sentence:

“N.4.1 provides guidance on how to calculate the value for Surplus Bandwidth Allowance.”

At 841.33 add the following sentence:

“Annex N provides guidance on the use of the TSPEC and the settings of values of the various fields.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Plan** for Tomorrow:
		1. See 11-15/1500r3
1. Comment resolution
2. Jon ROSDAHL – CID 5237
3. Adrian STEPHENS(60 mins)- 1207 CIDs remaining and Editorial “General”
4. D. STANLEY CIDs 11-15-1504
	* 1. Review comment status
	1. **Recess 5:30pm**
5. **REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ –9 Dec 2015 AM1**
	1. **Called to order** at 9:02m by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance:**
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus);
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Mark RISON (Samsung); Jouni Maline (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies);
	4. **Agenda**
		1. Updated posted: 11-15/1500r3
			1. Motions
			2. Comment resolution
			3. Jon ROSDAHL – CID 5237
			4. Adrian STEPHENS(60 mins)- 1207 CIDs remaining and Editorial “General”
			5. D. STANLEY CIDs 11-15-1504
	5. **Motions:**
		1. **Motion #177** – **CCMP Processing**

Incorporate the text changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1490-02-000m-some-revmc-d4-0-sb-rsn-comments.docx> under

“Proposed changes to CCMP and GCMP PN Processing”,

“Proposed changes to PMK length” and

“Proposed changes to Suite B FT AKM” into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved Jouni; 2nd Adrian
			2. Results: 6-0-0 – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #178: Oct/Nov remaining prepared resolutions**

Approve the comment resolutions in

1. The “Editorials - ready for motion” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-25-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
2. The “Motion MAC-BC” and “Motion MAC-BD” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-27-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> except for CID 5043 and
3. The “GEN Dallas-A” and “GEN Telecon Oct-Nov” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-15-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

Instructing the editor to expand the document references to the full URL in the resolutions for CIDs 5310, 6376, 5951, 5950, 5949 and 5942, and to update file references to match the higher version in CIDs 6802 and 6803, and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Pull from Motion:
				1. 5043(MAC) (Question on Block ACK case search sensitivity)
				2. 5225 (GEN) “is set to 1” –

discussion on it being ok –

Not pulled. – ok to leave it in motoin

* + - 1. Moved:Mark RISON 2nd: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. Dicsussion: Need to update some of the CIDs – CID 6802 and 6803 (GEN) need URL/ID updated to match r14. Also the other listed CIDs also need to be updated URLs to be corrected some in Editor some in GEN
			3. **Results**: Unanimous – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #179** **Dec 7 (Monday) BRC agreed CIDs**

Approve the comment resolutions in

1. The “Motion MAC-BE tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-28-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> except for CID 5082 and
2. The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-16-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
3. The “EditorialsreadyformotionNJ” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-25-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>

Instructing the editor to expand the document references to the full URL in the resolutions for CIDs 6583 (MAC) and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Changes to the Motion:
				1. Pull 5082 (MAC) from MAC-BE – (Some email has already be exchanged on this one – should be able to resolve quickly).
			2. Moved:Edward AU 2nd: Jouni MALINEN
			3. **Results**: Unanimous – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #180: Dec 8 (Tuesday) BRC agreed CIDs (update revisions)**

Approve the comment resolutions in

1. The “Motion MAC-BF tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-28-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> and
2. The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-1” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-16-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

Instructing the editor update file references to match the higher version in CIDs 6299, and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Request to postpone Motion #180 until Thursdsay
	1. **Editor CIDs** – Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 5160 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar comment CID 6566
				1. This one was started to be implemented, but was found to be ambiguous.
				2. MAC – does this mean IEEE 802.11 MAC or MAC in the general sense.
			3. Similar to CID 6328
				1. Different issue, but agree to Accept, delete the period.
			4. Straw Poll
				1. Reject the comment 5160 or make the change?
				2. Results: Reject:0 Make the Change: 5 Abstain: 1
			5. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-05-28 13:58:33Z) - Editor to review all occurances of " 802", and ensure each uses the pattern "IEEE Std 802"
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5856 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. The commentor had issue uploading comment, but then was able to do so, and that is why we have several duplicate comments
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; These comments have been entered into the ballot as roque comments and have been treated individually.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6559 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-04-30 13:21:58Z) - The IEEE-SA editors prefer hyphens to be present in a number of contexts, such as

• non-initial

• non-monotonic

• non-negative

• non-null

• pre-robust

• fixed-length (hyphenated when before a noun)

• follow-up

• signal-to-noise

• STA-to-STA

• third-party

• variable-length (hyphenated when before a noun)

• vendor-specific

Please bear in mind that the standard will be professionally edited prior to publication.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6585 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-04-30 12:56:40Z) - 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 Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6602 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2015-05-28 14:03:14Z) - The behaviour of a PDF reader is out of scope of this ballot
			3. Formal Objection from Mark RISON about the rejection.
			4. No other objection –
			5. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6615 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-05-28 13:58:33Z) - Editor to review all occurances of " 802", and ensure each uses the pattern "IEEE Std 802"(Note to editor, this is the same as resolution of CID 5160 and 6566).
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6714 (EDITOR)
			1. Review comment
			2. The header did not repeat, and that should be fixed up.
			3. The footer repeating across the page was done intentianly.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-06-11 09:38:56Z) - Convert table footer row to the last normal row in the following tables: 8-28, 8-38, 10-82, 23-3, 23-25.

Convert first table row to table header in Table 23-25

(Note, leave Table 10-13 as is).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6767 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-05-28 10:44:42Z)

Replace "<word version> (<numeric version>)" for the values: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 with either "<word version>" or "<numeric version>" as appropriate to WG style.

(Note, WG style uses numbers for values to go in fields and words when expressing ordinality and/or cardinality, e.g., "set to 3" and "two CTS frames".)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. End of General Group in Editor
	1. **Adrian homework CID Status**
		1. CID 6791 (EDITOR)
			1. An email has been sent, but need more time to discuss
			2. Would prefer to have Donald included in the discussion
		2. CID 6671 and CID 6483 (MAC) – see 11-14/1207r13
			1. Hangs on 6483 which is the “dog dinner”
			2. We will need to go through the updated text changes.
			3. Give it 15 Minutes now to see if we can resolve it.
			4. Review CID 6483 updates
			5. Insert a definition for “operational rate set” in clause 3.2
			6. Discussion on the “operational rate set”
				1. Is it what the STA can receive, not what is used for transmission restrictions?
				2. The Basic rate is what you will TX/RX, but operational rate set is for indicating what the receiver can handle.
				3. Update the definition from transmission to receiving.
			7. We will ignore the DMG for now.
			8. Discussion on how to resolve the issue of “non” MCS rate indication.
			9. Need to fix this in Clause 6 and Clause 8
			10. Use of the new term can simplify the other proposed changes.
			11. 892.47 box now is very simple
			12. Question on if the “Basic Rate Set” should be defined?
			13. Simplifying boxes in 1383.45 and 1384.01
			14. Pending issues reviewed outside scope of this comment
				1. Mark H concerned with spec underspecifies whether rates can duplicate rate indications done through MCS sets etc….
				2. Mark R asks for a basic rate set definition.
			15. Proposed Resolution for both CID 6671 and CID 6483: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 15:35:58Z) -. Make changes under CID 6483 in 11-15/1207r13 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1207-13-000m-sb0-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-3.doc>. These changes essentially replace instances of “supported rate set” with either basic or operational rate set and merge this bullet point into the previous one.
			16. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5318 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 6607, 6707, 5310, 5311, 5319
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-12-09 15:36:52Z) - Incorporate changes in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0758-07-000m-sb0-STEPHENS-resolutions-part-1.doc under CID 6707. These changes make the change proposed by the commenter, in addition to restructuring the description of subelements.(Note, this is similar to CID 6707, 5310, 5311 and 5319).:
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 5141 (MAC) see 11-14/1207r13
			1. Need to have some time to update
			2. **Recess for 5 minutes**
			3. Review changes being proposed.
			4. When PHY is transmitting the CCA is busy would be an assumption.
			5. In 9.22.4 a) and b), need to add TXNAV is 0.
			6. Need to change d) to “Following the latter of “ and then add two conditions.
			7. Update the bullet.
			8. More time is needed, as there was not concensus on the text as it wsa in 11-14/1207r13.
	2. **Jon’s CID** –
		1. CID 5237 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Identified that the 802-2001 have been updated to 2014, so only the ARP reference is needed to be added.
			3. Proposed Resoltuion: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 16:12:01Z) At 4.43, Insert "IETF RFC 826, An Ethernet Address Resolution Protocol, David C. Plummer, November 1982

At 1753.26, Change "ARP request packet" to "ARP request packet (RFC 826)"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-15/1504r0** Dorothy STANLEY
		1. CID 5021 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The dot11SMTbase13 is generally thought to be what is from the previous revision, and we may consider a need for a “14”
			3. From Discussion:
				1. Discussion:
				2. Dot11SMT base 13 begins at 3319.48
				3. The following have been added already:

dot11MaxMSDULength,(#3211)

dot11ExtendedSpectrumManagementImplemented(#3479)}

* + - 1. Check the other proposed entries
				1. dot11DMGOptionImplemented – included in
				2. add 3314.20 for the location to insert dot11TVHTOptionImplemented
				3. the other entries were not necessary.
			2. Proposed Resolution: **REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 16:30:48Z)**At 3314.20, insert dot11TVHTOptionImplementedNote to commenter:dot11DMGOptionImplemented – Does not need to be added, as a compliance statement exists: dot11DMGComplianceGroup OBJECT-GROUP(11ad)dot11VHTOptionImplemented – not needed, as a compliance statement exists: dot11VHTCompliance MODULE-COMPLIANCE(11ac)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			4. Question on SMTBase 13 has an “<ANA> “ flag and so we will need to investigate further as this is where the changes from 2012 through REVmc
			5. ACTION ITEM #11: Adrian to update the text at 3319.39 which has an “ANA” flag.
		1. CID 5055 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resoltuion: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 16:32:18Z) 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.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6069 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. If it is a Status variable that only the local MAC can read, then why put it here?
				1. Who is this status is being provided should be indicated.
			3. Change this MIB attribute format to be more like the other Status variable format
			4. This is the non-AP STA vesion of the MIB, and represents the value that the AP told you to use (or the default if no other info was sent).
			5. Written by the MLME rather than the MAC.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 16:40:40Z) Incorporate the text change in 11-15/1504r1 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1504-01-000m-mib-and-other-comments.docx> for CID 6069 which updates the MIB variable.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6205 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The default is set to effectively disable now, but we could make the default useful.
			3. Currently you cannot actually set the PN range anywhere close to the 32 bit range.
			4. The range should have been done with 48 bit to match
			5. To effectively disable this, then you should set it to the full 48 bit value.
			6. Discussion on the size and range of the variable.
			7. The Base types defined: -- the "base types" defined here are:-- 3 built-in ASN.1 types: INTEGER, OCTET STRING, OBJECT IDENTIFIER-- 8 application-defined types: Integer32, IpAddress, Counter32,-- Gauge32, Unsigned32, TimeTicks, Opaque, and Counter64
			8. So we need to deterimine the convention on the MIB variable and the specific changes desired.
				1. The SYNTAX to be INTEGER as we don’t have unsigned 64 right now.
				2. Change the Def Value to be a 48 bit large number
				3. The Range gives values to use for the encoding
			9. We need to replace INTEGER64 with INTEGER.
			10. Originally we used INTEGER, then we had a MIB doctor use enumerations were possible, and then use the smaller sizes where possible (i.e. INTEGER32..etc).
			11. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 17:05:29Z) - Change the syntax values of the two cited variables to "SYNTAX INTEGER (1..281474976710655)" And change the DEFVAL values to 281474976710655 from 424967295 At 2842.1, Delete Integer64 And at 2916.2, 2916.4, 2916.60 and 2917.20 from "Integer64" to "INTEGER"
			12. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess at 12:05pm**

1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ –9 Dec 2015 PM1**
	1. **Called to order** at 1pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance:**
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus);
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Mark RISON (Samsung); Jouni Maline (Qualcomm); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna Communications); Edward AU (Huawei)
	4. **Agenda**
		1. Agenda: 11-15/1500r4
2. Sigurd CIDs: 5879, 5880, 5914
3. 11-15-1400 CID 6304 - Vinko, Matt Fischer CIDs (45 mins)
4. Carlos Cordeiro CIDs
	1. **Review doc 11-15/1509r0** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE
		1. CID 5879 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Introduction and Text changes
			3. This document has been reviewed by several and included the feedback received.
			4. Small nit – need to change “smaller than” to “less than”
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 18:04:35Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-15/1509r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1509-01-000m-cid-5879.docx).
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-15/1508r0** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE
		1. CID 5880 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 18:14:21Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-15/1508r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1508-00-000m-cid-5879.docx>).
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review doc 11-15/1510** Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE
		1. CID 5914 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review propsed changes
		2. This CID was discussed earlier in 802.11-15/1090r2 and it was agreed in principle to modify Table 22-1 to avoid duplicating parts of Table 20-1.
		3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 18:32:01Z) incorporate the changes in document 11-15/1510r1 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1510-01-000m-cid-5914.docx > which updates Table 22-1.
		4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Question for Sigurd** on other PHY CIDs
		1. CID 5019 and 5018
			1. Looks good, but would like to have time to verify.
		2. CID 6431. 6640, 6477, 6431, 6821, 5019, 5018, 6782
			1. Asked to check thes resolutions and get back to us at this time tomorrow.
		3. ACTION ITEM #12: Sigurd to review CID 5018, 5019, 6431, 6477, 6821, 6640, 6782 and provide feedback to the BRC on the 10th Dec during PM1.
	5. **Review doc 11-15/1504r1** – Dorothy STANLEY
		1. CID 6249 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 18:45:49Z) Rejected: The MIB variable default values are chosen from possible valid values, see 587.30. The DEFVAL values refer to the refers to the "short(3839)" and "short(3895)" enumerations
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6538, 6689, 6705, 6743, 6690 (GEN)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Proposed Resolution for 6538, 6689, 6705, 6743: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 18:48:59Z) 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.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6752 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 18:52:04Z)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.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6234 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discuss on changing “BSS basic rate set” to “BSS’s basic rate set” or just delete the “BSS” from the sentence.
			3. In Some cases just deleting is better and in some cases it is better to be possessive.
			4. Review each instance identified.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 19:20:46Z): Incorporate the changes as shown for CID 6234 in 11-15/1504r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1504-01-000m-mib-and-other-comments.docx>).
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6331 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution from Stephen MCCANN:
				1. Change fromNOTE 2—Twenty-one Exception fields are provided to give more flexibility in defining the QoS Map and it is currentlythe number of Fibs defined by the IETF.ToNOTE 2—Twenty-one DSCP Exception fields are provided to give more flexibility in defining the QoS Map.This number is equal to the number of FIBs (Forwarding Information Bases) defined by IETF RFC 3222.And add a reference to Annex A for RFC 3222.
			3. More discussion and refinement of the proposal was made, and then we noticed that “Exception Field” need to be changed to “DSCP Exception Field”
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 19:26:12Z): Change

"NOTE 2—Twenty-one Exception fields are provided to give more flexibility in defining the QoS Map and it is currently the number of Fibs defined by the IETF."

to

"NOTE 2—Twenty-one DSCP Exception fields are provided to give more flexibility in defining the QoS Map. This number is equal to the number of FIBs (Forwarding Information Bases) defined by IETF RFC 3222."

And, add a reference in Annex A for RFC 3222.

Fix all uses of "Exception field"(s) to be "DSCP Exception field"(s).

* + - 1. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Document 11-15/1249r4** Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5145 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the discussion and e-mail exchange info contained in the document.
			3. Straw Poll:
				1. A, reduce the size of the sentence with “Shall”
				2. B,change “shall” to “Should”
				3. C; reject
				4. Results: A=4; B=1; C=0
			4. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 19:58:20Z):

At 1347.56 change "The MCCA enabled neighbor mesh STAs that could cause interference to transmissions during these reserved time periods, or that would experience interference from them, shall not transmit during these reserved time periods."

to

"An MCCA enabled neighbor mesh STA shall not transmit during these reserved MCCAOP time periods."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Docs** left to review from Graham
		1. Doc 11-15/1250r2
		2. Doc 11-15/1274r0
	2. **Recess at 3:01pm**
1. **REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ –9 Dec 2015 PM2**
	1. **Called to order** at 3:30pm by Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. No issues identified
	3. **Attendance**:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus);
		2. On WebEx at least part time: Mark RISON (Samsung); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Edward AU (Huawei); Jouni Maleni (Qualcomm);
	4. **Agenda**
		1. Updated posted: 11-15/1500r4
		2. For for this slot:
			1. Youhan Kim CIDs (8)
			2. Mark HAMILTON CIDs
			3. Graham CIDs
		3. We will have Motions Thursday AM1 to allow us to update the status during lunch.
	5. **Youhan Kim CIDs**
		1. CID 5018 and CID 5019 (GEN)
			1. Review response
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 20:37:36Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6431 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Check some of the changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 20:39:42Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6674 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. From Youhan KIM:
				1. [YK]  Table 20-2 is for TX operation.  There are two options – a) delete all the “not present” in Table 20-2, or b) replace “not present” with CH\_OFFSET\_NONE (e.g. used in 7.3.4.4 D4.0 P545L34), and add CH\_OFFSET\_NONE as one of the enumerated types in the Clause 20 TXVECTOR.  I think option a) is simpler.
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 20:41:53Z) D4.0 P2297L20, L43: Delete "or CH\_OFFSET is not present"

P2297L33, P2298L7: Delete "Not present: Not defined"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motoin
		1. CID 6495 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 20:46:14Z) 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.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6821 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-09 20:47:36Z) Clause 22 and 23 does not have a dedicated section describing Spatial Mapping. Rather Clause 22 and 23 re-uses the Spatial Mapping description in Clause20, thus the references to Clause 20.

Change D4.0 P2504L46 from "Set to 1 if a Beamforming steering" to "Set to 1 if a beamforming steering".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6477 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Youhan’s Proposed resolution: reject

While the number would be implementation dependent (as well as other factors such as SNR), there could have been some point in including specific numbers in the standard, such as defining a ‘maximum’ allowed value for the aRxPHYStartDelay. Suggest to check more before converting everything to ‘implementation specific.’

* + - 1. Discussion on the definition and what it is dependant on.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-09 20:49:09Z) aRxPhyStartDelay is not implementation dependent, rather it is part of the PHY definition, used to determine when the header of a frame has been received.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6640 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Comment from Youhan: If the argument is that PHY-TXBUSY is missing from Table 7-2 while it is a subsection of 7.3.5, then for example, should PHY-DATA (also a subsection of 7.3.5) be added to Table 7-2?
			3. 558.28 has the TX\_Busy primitive defined.
			4. Adding a table entry would resolve the comment
			5. Table 7.2 is the management stuff, and table 7.3 is the parameters.
			6. Proposed change: Insert a row in Table 7-2 for PHY-TXBUSY (the primitive column) with only the Indication column marked.
			7. The changes to Table 7-3 needs some more work.
			8. ACTION ITEM #13: Adrian to craft the instructions for the table 7-3 insertion.
	1. **Review Doc 11-15/1506r0** – Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 5043 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review document discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change all occurrences of "Block Ack is" (case insensitive search) to "block ack agreement is" throughout the document, except when the occurrence is preceded by “immediate”, “delayed” or “GCR”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5039 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the document discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Delete the cited sentence.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6721 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the document discussion
			3. The changes in CID 5922 affect this same area.
			4. There was a Note added by 5922, and that should be deleted now that we have the term defined.
			5. Initial proposed changes for CID 6721 and 5922: Revised.

Add a new paragraph at the end of clause 22.3.1 (Introduction):

“Pre-VHT modulated fields refer to the L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, and VHT-SIG-A fields, while VHT modulated fields refer to the VHT-STF, VHT-LTF, VHT-SIG-B, and Data fields (see Figure 22-17 (Timing boundaries for VHT PPDU fields)).”

Delete NOTE 1 on P2489.56 and remove references to NOTE 1 within the table (and change "NOTE 2" to just "NOTE").

At P2494.49, delete the sentence, “In the remainder of this subclause, pre-VHT modulated fields refer to the L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, and VHT-SIG-A fields, while VHT modulated fields refer to the VHT-STF, VHT-LTF, VHT-SIG-B, and Data fields, as shown in Figure 22-17 (Timing boundaries for VHT PPDU fields).”

* + - 1. Proposed resolution for CID 6721 and CID 5922: Revised; Incorporate the changes in doc 11-15/1506r1 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1506-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0.docx> for CID 6721 and CID 5922
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6078 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes and discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in doc 11-15/1506r1 < https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1506-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0.docx> for CID 6078. – Subclause 5.1.1.3 and 5.1.1.4 were merged into one generic description.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **MAC CIDs** Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 6060 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Change “Status Code” to “BTM Status Code”
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 18:22:16Z):

At the cited location, change the field "Status Code" to "BTM Status Code", update the text to match, and change Table 8-341 to match.

Also change the parameter to MLME-BTM.response and MLME-BTM.confirm primitives, from "StatusCode" to "BTMStatusCode", in the parameter lists and parameter tables.

Change "Status Code" to "BTM Status Code" throughout 10.24.7 and its subclauses.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5421 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review history of the CID on how we got here
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 21:42:30Z) -

Replace

"AckTimeout interval, with a value of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime + aRXPHYStartDelay, starting at the PHY-TXEND.confirm primitive."

with

"AckTimeout interval, with a value of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime + aRxPHYStartDelay. This interval begins when the MAC receives a PHY-TXEND.confirm primitive."

At 1256.55, replace

"CTSTimeout interval, with a value of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime + aRxPHYStartDelay, starting at the PHY-TXEND.confirm primitive"

with

"CTSTimeout interval with a value of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime + aRxPHYStartDelay. This interval begins when the MAC receives a PHY-TXEND.confirm primitive."

At 1323.5, replace

"the STA shall wait for a timeout interval of duration of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime + aRxPHYStartDelay, starting at the PHY-TXEND.confirm primitive"

with

"the STA shall wait for a timeout interval of duration of aSIFSTime + aSlotTime + aRxPHYStartDelay, starting when the MAC receives a PHY-TXEND.confirm primitive"

At 1253.58, replace

"during a period with a duration of (2 ´ aSIFSTime) + (CTS\_Time) + aRxPHYStartDelay + (2 ´ aSlotTime) starting at the PHY-RXEND.indication primitive"

with

"during a period with a duration of (2 ´ aSIFSTime) + (CTS\_Time) + aRxPHYStartDelay + (2 ´ aSlotTime) starting when the MAC receives a PHY-RXEND.indication primitive"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6499 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 21:44:57Z): Add "or Management" after "Data" at 1260.38, and at 1272.8 (two locations) and 1272.11, 1383.7;

Change "data" to "data or management" at 1330.33;

Change "In the event neither an Ack frame nor a Data frame is received" to "If no Ack, Data, or Management frame is not received" at 1272.6;

Change "MSDU" to "MSDU or MMPDU" at 1272.13, 1272.14, 1272.15, 1272.16.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6429 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review table on 584 – see line 20
			3. Discussion on what change may need to be done.
			4. Discussion on 1414.7 as the targeted location for the new paragraph.
			5. Need to include a reference as well.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 22:07:51Z): Add at P1414.7 (at the end of the paragraph): "The VHT-MCS recommendation shall be a value from the peer's Tx Supported VHT-MCS and NSS Set (see 9.7.12.2)."
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6090 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The Diagram is not “complete” find another way to describe it.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 19:55:43Z): Change the title of Figure 4-14 to "IEEE Std 802.11 architecture for infrastructure BSS and PBSS". Change the same phrase at P97.2 (end of that sentence).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6448 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Long discussions, but no concensus
			3. Straw Poll:
				1. Shall we reject the comment: Y/N/A
				2. Result: Y = 4; N=1 A=1
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-09 17:49:16Z): The TG discussed the commenter’s proposed changes at length and did not come to consensus to make the proposed change. Concerns raised include views that the backoff procedure is a stateful machine and does not execute clear "steps,"
			5. With the Result of the Strawpoll – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6058 (EDITOR)
			1. Was motioned and resolved in Motion #144
			2. But there is an issue with “reassociation” and we need to add “(re)association” to make it more correct.
			3. Change to the resolution
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-12-09 22:20:56Z) - Change the paragraph to, "Only the fast BSS transition facility can move an RSNA during (re)association. Therefore, if FT is not used, the old RSNA is deleted and a new RSNA is constructed."(Note to editors, this was previously approved without the parentheses around "re".)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6218 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review in context
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-09 22:27:43Z): Add a sentence to the end of the State 3 description at P1587.32, "The IEEE 802.1X Controlled Port is blocked." Add a sentence to the end of the State 4 description at P1587.36, "The IEEE 802.1X Controlled Port is unblocked, or not present."
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Plan for Tomorrow:
		1. Motions for Thursday will be on The CIDs finished Tuesday and Wednesday CIDs
		2. Motion to accept the Editorial Assigned CID Proposed Resolutions – most of these CIDs are rejected.
		3. See 11-15/1500r4 for the prepared Motions
	2. Recess at 5:38pm
1. REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 10 Dec 2015 – AM1
	1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba) at 9:15am
	2. Review Paten Policy
		1. No issues noted.
	3. Attendance:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus)
		2. On WebEx at least part of the time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Edward AU (Huawei); Mark RISON (Samsung);
	4. Review Agenda
		1. See 11-15/1500r5

Adrian – CID 6640, 6451, 5141, 6791, 6813, 6428 (30 mins)

Mark HAMILTON – CID 5130, remaining MAC CIDs (60 mins)

Motions (see below)

Graham – 11-15-1274 (5422, 5423), 11-15-1250 (5144), CIDs 5531, 5226, 5082 (30 mins)

Mark RISON CIDs 6572, 6562, 6075, 6676, 6677, 6303 (30 mins)

* + 1. No objection to Agenda
	1. Editor Report
		1. Check CID status
			1. Editor has 49 with assigned resolutions (Rejects)
			2. Editor ready for motion NJ2 has 12 – Done Tues-Wed
			3. Editor Reapprove – has 1 – Reworded on Wednesday.
			4. Can Motion the 62 today.
			5. GEN 12 in ready for motion state, 33 need review
			6. MAC 121 CIDs left to resolve
	2. **Review Document 11-15/1207r14** Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 6640 (GEN)
			1. Revew comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 14:29:39Z) - At 543.72 add a new last table row:

“PHY-TXBUSY”, with an “X” in the Indication column only.

At 544.62 add a new last table row:

“STATE” in the Parameter column / “PHY-TXBUSY.indication” in the associated primitive column, and “IDLE, BUSY” in the Value column.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6451 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. We thought maybe there had been some other work.
			3. Hold off for now.
			4. Add to document 11-15/1207r15
		2. CID 6813 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Tied to 6770, which was approved on Nov 7, so the Resolution should be updated.
			3. Minutes state it was included, so update the resolution.
			4. Proposed Resolution: [7:35:30 AM] Mark HAMILTON: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 14:34:11Z): REVISED (MAC: 2015-11-07 17:39:35Z): Globally change "Null Data frame" (case insensitive) to "Null frame"
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5035 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 14:35:50Z): At the end of 1209.19 add: "The structure of the field is defined in 8.4.1.8."
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6488 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 600.28 insert a new para: “The use of the basic BlockAckReq variant is obsolete. Consequently, this subclause might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

At 603.22 unsert a new para: “The value 1 in a Compressed Block Ack frame indicates HT-delayed block ack. HT-delayed block ack is obsolete and this value might be reserved in a later revision of the standard.”

At 604.11 insert a new para: “The use of the basic BlockAck variant is obsolete. This subclause might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

In Table 10-5, at 1626.13, first column, at the end of the para, add “See NOTE 1.”

In Table 10-5, at 1626.18, third column, add in a new line, add “See NOTE 2.”

At the foot of the table at 1626.31 add a new merged row with contents:

“NOTE 1—Non-HT block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard.

NOTE 2—HT-delayed block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

At 2732.36 and 2733.07 in the second column add a new para: “Non-HT block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard”

At 2753.07 in the second column add a new para: “HT-delayed block ack is obsolete. Support for this mechanism might be removed in a later revision of the standard.”

At 2753.06 in the Status column change contents to:“CF16 AND QB4.2:OCF30 AND QB4.2:O”

* + - 1. Added change to 2753.06 to the proposal.
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5141 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. After discussion, we did not find consensus to a change.
			3. The Proposed Resolution needed more descriptive response for the reject, and so the BRC worked on the wording to get it right.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 14:51:33Z) - The BRC discussed the commenter’s proposed changes at length and did not come to consensus to make the proposed change. The proposed change is, of itself, not adequate. Alternatives were considered at length, but these would modify complex state machines, and the BRC required a degree of validation of proposed changes that was not feasible.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6451 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review PICS table
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 14:53:34Z) - 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. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6428 (MAC)
			1. Not in file
			2. Note that we may have discussed this, or that a previous change may affect this one.
			3. Leave this for later discussion
		2. Review the file to ensure we have caught them all
			1. One open CID 6791 – will address at 11:45am ET
	1. MAC CIDs – Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 5130 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Propose to move sentances to an existing clause that already is about the frame length
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:04:10Z): Move the sentence,

"MPDUs in an A-MPDU carried in an HT PPDU shall be limited to a maximum length of 4095 octets." to subclause 9.13.2, 4th paragraph, after the 1st sentence.

Move the sentence, "A STA shall not transmit an MPDU in a VHT PPDU to a STA that exceeds the maximum MPDU length capability indicated in the VHT Capabilities element received from the recipient STA." to subclause 9.3.2, 4th paragraph, after the 2nd sentence.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6295 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Possible that we have resovled this before, it is in doc 11-15/762r15.
			3. Need to take some time to check the resolution
			4. It was discussed on Oct 28th on a telecom.The resolution prepared and was supposed to be ready for Motion
			5. AProposed resolution Updated: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:10:52Z): Make changes as shown in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx under CID 6295](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx%20under%20CID%206295).
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6775 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. It was noted in the Aug Telecon minutes that Mark RISON was going to add to his documents, but it seems to be missed.
			3. Review CID Ad-hoc notes: Assumedly, this is referencing the occurance of "1-127" as the valid range for several rate set parameters to some MLME primitives.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:15:42Z): There is no normative text that specifies that the values 126 and 127 cannot be used as rate values in these rate sets. While it is logical that these values should be excluded, so they can be unambiguously used as BSS Membership Selectors, a larger change is needed to accomplish this without creating inconsistency within the Standard.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6077 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. ARC is working on this topic
				1. 5 of the 6 figures are finished, but one left to work on in Atlanta.
			3. Doc 11-15/540r6 has the 5 completed figures.
				1. After reviewing the figures, we noted at least one typo, so it was determined to wait on incorporating the new figures.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:21:14Z): The authors of the cited document indicate that a complete proposal is not ready for inclusion.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6220 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The editor may make the three paragraphs separate notes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:24:52Z):

Move the MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT.indication in Figure 6-17 to be below (i.e. after in time) the t3 capture instant.

In 6.3.58.1, add the following after Note 2:

"NOTE 3 - In MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT.request the t1, Max t1 Error, t4 and Max t4 Error parameters are set to the values in the prior MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT.confirm for that Peer MAC Address and with a Dialog Token parameter equal to the Followup Up Dialog Token parameter in the request, or 0 if there was none.

In MLME-FINETIMIMGMSMT.confirm the t1, Max t1 Error, t4 and Max t4 Error parameters are set to the values determined for the Fine Timing Measurement frame and its acknowledgement. This primitive is not issued if no acknowledgement is received.

In MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT.indication the t1, Max t1 Error, t4 and Max t4 Error parameters are set to the values in the Fine Timing Measurement frame and the t2, Max t2 Error, t3 and Max t3 Error parameters are set to the values determined for the Fine Timing Measurement frame and its acknowledgement."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6289 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the discussion (Ad-hoc Notes)
			3. Related CID 5024 does things in reverse of what is requested here.
			4. So we can resolve 5024 with the same resolution as 6289
			5. Propsoed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:34:20Z
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5024 (MAC)
			1. This will use the same resolution as CID 6289
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:34:40Z):At 654.63 delete "and places it in the 14 LSBs of the AID field, with the two MSBs of the AID field set to 1 (see 8.2.4.2 (Duration/ID field))". In Figure 8-22 change "AID" to "ID". At 597.42 change "The AID is the value assigned to the STA transmitting the frame by the AP in the Association Response frame that established that STA's current association.

The AID value always has its two MSBs set to 1." to "The ID field contains the AID value assigned to the STA transmitting the frame by the AP in the (Re)Association Response frame that established that STA's current association, with the two MSBs set to 1." Change "Duration/ID" to "Duration" in Figures 8-25, 8-31, 8-52 and at 613.40, 616.12, 616.13, 616.16, 616.31.

Note to the commentor, this addresses the inconsistency, but with the reverse solution.

(Note to editor, this is the same resolution as for CID 6289.)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6374 (MAC)
			1. This comment was pulled from previous motion
			2. Resolution in 11-15/938r3 does not address this comment
			3. Carlos had indicated he was going to bring something, but it has not shown up.
			4. Will come back to this one.
		2. CID 5868 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:41:07Z): The proposed change buries the requirement on other frame types, within the RTS clause. Also, bandwidth signalling TA can be used in a Block Ack frame.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5874 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 5868, but in a different section
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:41:07Z): The proposed change buries the requirement on other frame types, within the RTS clause. Also, bandwidth signalling TA can be used in a Block Ack frame.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6251 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The Proposed change has “at at” that needs to be changed.
			3. Created the revised resolution
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:47:33Z): Add "by a non-VHT and non-DMG STA" after "used"
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6388 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Originally assigned to Matthew FISCHER – no alternate proposal submitted.
			4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:54:15Z)

Note to editor, also search for "non-contiguous 80+80".

* + - 1. No Ojbection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5411 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion to create a revised resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:56:26Z):Replace: "shall update its MIB values of the EDCA parameters" with: "shall update its MIB attributes that correspond to fields in an EDCA Parameter Set element".
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5412 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 15:59:28Z): The cited text is clear and correct.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5422 (MAC) and CID 5433 (MAC)
			1. Graham SMITH is working on these
		4. CID 5426 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution; ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:01:16Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 5431 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the proposed change
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:04:01Z):
			4. Replace: "value for the CH\_BANDWIDTH parameter of the TXVECTOR that is not permitted for use in the BSS, as reported in the most recently received HT Operation element with the exception transmissions on a TDLS off-channel link, which follow"

with

"value for the CH\_BANDWIDTH parameter of the TXVECTOR that is not permitted for use in the BSS, as reported in the most recently received HT Operation element, with the exception transmissions on a TDLS off-channel link, which follow"

(Editor: this adds a comma.)

* + - 1. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5133 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. CID 5885 seems to have added the text already.
				1. CID 5885 was approved in Aug – same basic text change
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:06:27Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-15/760r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0760-02-000m-some-initial-sb-comment-resolutions.docx) as shown for "Proposed resolutions to CIDs 5885, 5887, 5888, 5889, 5890" and delete lines 1311.48 through 1311.55. This resolution (from CID 5885) has already made this same change.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5976 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:12:31Z)
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6242 (MAC) and CID 5892 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on a proposed revision
			3. Same resolution for both 6242 and 5892
			4. Proposed resolution for both CID 6242 and CID 5892: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:14:43Z):

Add a para "A VHT STA shall not transmit a frame with the TXVECTOR parameter FORMAT set to VHT and the TXVECTOR parameter FEC\_CODING set to LDPC\_CODING unless the RA of the frame corresponds to a VHT STA for which the Rx LDPC subfield of the VHT Capabilities element received from that STA contained a value of 1 and dot11VHTLDPCCodingOptionActivated is true.".

Change "a STA" to "an HT STA" at 1316.6.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6073 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion – on using negative logic or not
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:22:07Z) -

Change "may transmit no more than GCR buffer size A-MSDUs" to "shall not transmit more than the GCR buffer size number of A-MSDUs"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5896 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Was pulled from motion in June
			3. Continue for now, and come back to this one – Mark RISON to investigate
		2. CID 6471 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Change the change to singular rather than plural
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:24:35Z)

Change the referenced sentence to "A STA shall not send an MRQ to a STA that has not set the MCS Feedback subfield to Both in the HT Extended Capabilities field of the HT Capabilities element."

Add the missing "the" after "set" in the cited VHT text.

(Note to EDITOR – correct the plurals in the exiting VHT text, also).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5956 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:26:42Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 6666 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:30:24Z): The comment fails to identify a specific issue with the balloted draft.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5526 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the change of “may” to “might” or “intended to” or “designed to”
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 16:34:31Z):

On line 41 replace "that may" with "intended to" and on line 42 replace "bands and may" with "bands. These procedures might".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Motions:
		1. **Motion #180: Dec 8 (Tuesday) BRC agreed CIDs**

Approve the comment resolutions in

1. The “Motion MAC-BF tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-29-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> and
2. The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-1” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-17-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

And incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS2nd: Edward AU
			2. Discussion on the motion – none
			3. **Result: 6-0-0 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #181**: **Dec 9 (Wednesday) BRC agreed CIDs and missed Nov 20 telecon CIDs**

Approve the comment resolutions in

1. The “Motion MAC-BG” and “Motion MAC-BH” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-29-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> except for CID 6234, 5879, 6448 and
2. The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-2” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-18-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> except for CIDS 6477, 5237, 6249
3. The “EditorialsreadyformotionNJ 2” and “Editorials-reapprove” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-27-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls> execept for 6602

And incorporate the text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Pull from motion:
				1. Pull 6234, 5879, 6448 in MAC BG
				2. Pull 6602 from editorials
				3. Pull 6477, 5237, 6249 from GEN
				4. From Mark RISON’s e-mail:

 6234 in MAC-BG (I don't understand the point of the "BSS's" in the proposed resolution)

 5879 in MAC-BG (due to editorial issues [\*], sorry Sigurd for not being able to attend your presentation!)

 6448 in MAC-BG, 6602 in Editorials-NJ2 (please make these a separate motion)

 6477 in GEN-Piscat-2 (the proposed resolution makes an assertion but does not provide any justification)

 5237 in GEN-Piscat-2 (shouldn't "IETF" be added before "RFC 826"?)

 6249 in GEN-Piscat-2 (misses the point of the comment – if something is determined by device capabilities then the spec can't give a default)

 6549 in Editorials-Assigned (I don't think X\_SAP is only being used for labels in figures)

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS2nd : Mark HAMILTON
			2. Discussion on the motion – none
			3. **Results – Unanimous – Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #182**: **Editorial assigned CIDs**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in
			2. The “Editorials - assigned” tab in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-26-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls except for CID 6549](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-26-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls%20except%20for%20CID%206549)
			3. Moved: Mark HAMILTON 2nd: Edward AU
			4. **Results: 5-0-2 Motion Passes**
		2. We will review the pulled CIDs after Lunch
	1. **Review Document11-15/1207r15** Adrian STEPHENS
		1. CID 6791 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes
			3. Discussion on leaving the 802.1Q-2003 is the expediate solution, due to the change in the updated standard.
			4. How many other references need to be addressed?
				1. 10 or 11 need more discussion
				2. Update to the references determined
			5. Proposed Resolution: RevisedReplace all 802.1Q-2003 with 802.1Q, except the para at 846.11Replace all 802.1Q-2011 with 802.1QEnsure separate Normative references are present for 802.1Q-2003 and -2014.Delete from Annex A, and reference to it in annex A.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. Recess at 12:05pm
1. REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 10 Dec 2015 – PM1
	1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba) at 1:04pm
	2. Review Paten Policy
		1. No issues noted.
	3. Attendance:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus)
		2. On WebEx at least part of the time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Edward AU (Huawei); Mark RISON (Samsung); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna Communications);
	4. Review Agenda
		1. Review pulled CIDs first
		2. See 11-15/1500r5
	5. Pulled CIDs
		1. CID 6234 (MAC)
			1. Not sure the value of “BSS’s”
			2. The BRC had thought yesterday that it was a valid adjective see 11-15/1504r1.
			3. Still one objection to the change – will allow for decision on motion later.
			4. Include in MAC-BI
		2. CID 5879 (MAC)
			1. Editorial issues – were the main issue.
			2. Sigurd has thought to have addressed it in 11-15/1509r2
			3. We will have a motion later today. Included in TAB MAC-BI with “r2”
		3. CID 6448 (MAC)
			1. Request to be able to vote no separately.
			2. Prepare a separate motion
		4. CID 6477 (GEN)
			1. This included in Sigurd’s document update
			2. Concern on when the start time of the period starts from
			3. While the BRC voted to reject this comment yesterday there was an objection.
			4. Concern with the undefined precise start time.
			5. Discussion on the definition of the aRxPhyStartDelay.
			6. We will have a separate Motion on the resolution.
		5. CID 5237 (GEN)
			1. The identified issue was a missing “RFC” from the citiation.
			2. Can update and include in the next Motion Tab.
		6. CID 6249 (GEN)
			1. Issue with DefVal
			2. Updated Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 18:26:48Z) - Delete the DEFVAL statements 2921.63, 3138.60 and 3141.32
		7. CID 6602 (EDITOR) and CID 6549 (EDITOR)
			1. After discussion it was determined a separate motion for the existing resolutions for these CIDs.
	6. Review document 11-15/1517r0
		1. CID 5018, CID 5019, CID 5020 (GEN)
			1. Update the resolution for these three CIDs: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-10 13:47:03Z) Reject: Equations (2-72) and (2-73) deal with N\_CBPSS (i.e. coded number of bits per symbol and per spatial stream). The index k in (22-72) and (22-73) runs from 0 to N\_CBPSS-1. If we consider the case where M=0 (see 22-71), which is true in all but a few cases, we have:

 N\_CBPS = N\_block\*N\_ES\*S

 And thus:

 N\_CBPSS = N\_CBPS/N\_SS = N\_block\*N\_ES\*S/N\_SS = N\_block\*N\_ES\*s

So lowercase s is correct and no change is needed.

* + - 1. After discussion determined that we should Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 6821 (Now in Editor)
			1. Was processed earlier today
			2. We changed the case, but the reference was not deleted.
			3. Discussion on why the reference deletion was not done.
			4. Straw Poll to remove the reference 20.3.11.11.2
				1. No objection
			5. Need to update the resolution.
				1. “Revised – remove reference to 20.3.11.11.2 Also change “Beamforming steering matrix” to “beamforming steering matrix”At P2595L38, P2504L46, P2464L11:
			6. Updated Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2015-12-10 18:42:24Z) - At P2595L38, P2504L46, P2464L11: remove reference to 20.3.11.11.2. At P2504L46: change “Beamforming steering matrix” to “beamforming steering matrix”
			7. Mark ready for Motion in an Editor TAB
		2. CID 6640 (GEN)
			1. We discussed this earlier today.
			2. After review determined to leave as is.
			3. Included as part of tab “GEN Dec F2F BRC – Piscataway – 3”
		3. CID 6782 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposal is to accept, but need to find the location
			3. Page 2616 line 12 and page 2597 line 62, were the locations found.
			4. There was a discussion on what the correct Editorial change is correct, but the bigger issue is what the real issue is trying to convey.
			5. CID 6222 deleted the subclause for the first one, so not an issue.
			6. For the second location (2597.62) it is ok to make it pluaral.
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 18:51:06Z) at 2597.62 change "PPDU" to "PPDUs".
			8. (Note to commentor: the other implied location has been deleted by CID 6222)
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **MAC CIDs** Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 5524 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 18:56:04Z) Replace:

"The direct link becomes inactive when no frames have been exchanged as part of the direct link for the duration of DLS timeout value, if the DLS Timeout Value field is a nonzero value during the DLS."

with:

"The DLS timeout value is set according to the value of the DLS Timeout Value field in the DLS Request frame that initiated the direct link. If, for the period of time specified by the DLS timeout value, no frames are exchanged as part of the direct link, then the direct link becomes inactive."

(Note to commenter, this is removing a space from "time out")

* + - 1. No objection Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 5531 (MAC)
			1. It is in document 11-15/1274
		2. CID 5051 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 18:59:58Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motoin
		3. CID 6381 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. The description of what change is to be made is ambiguous, so need to figure what text to move.
			3. Proposed resolution: - The boiler plate resolution will be added here later.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6463 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:05:57Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6464 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:08:45Z) - Change the cited text to "If the above three conditions are met, the AP should not transmit a 40 MHz PPDU containing one or more frames with a group address in the Address 1 field unless either the AP has not received a Notify Channel Width frame from any STA in the BSS or the Channel Width field of the most recently received Notify Channel Width frame from each STA that transmitted a Notify Channel Width frame is nonzero."
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 6191 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:11:15Z): Change cited sentence to "A DMG STA shall not use the TDLS protocol."
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6777 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Not enough detail to determine where the concern was
			3. Proposed Resolution: - Boiler plate for insufficient detail will be used.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 5958 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. More work would be needed for resolution.
			3. A Proposal to change from delete to modify the text indicating that the event may have occurred.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:18:10Z): Change the cited text to, "To detect when this might have happened, the STA can request a notification frame be sent when requesting the establishment of the traffic filter. If negotiated with the AP, a frame match is indicated to the non-AP STA via a notification frame."
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 6065 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on possible changes to the text, but the text is correct without change.
			3. Proposed Resolution: EJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:21:21Z): The text is accurate as it is.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 5028 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the form of the term, and if it is a field name or if it can be changed globally. – globally was the concensus
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:23:51Z): Globally replace "Relay Supportability" with "Relay Supporter".
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 6066 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:28:07Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 5985 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Straw Poll: Accept or reject the comment:
				1. Results: 0-2-5 -
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:32:05Z): The name is short and accurate, and there is re-use value to not naming things with PHY-specific names.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		13. CID 6230 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:34:23Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		14. CID 5896 (MAC)
			1. Review the comment
			2. Mark RISON had requested to revisit this CID.
			3. Alternate changes to the Proposed Change was discussed.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:37:48Z): Replace with "This subclause applies to frame exchange sequences that include PPDUs containing an HT variant HT Control field."
			5. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
	1. **Review Doc 11-15/1249r3** Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5082 (MAC)
			1. Was pulled from Motion MAC-BE
			2. There is an 11-15/1249r5 on Mentor, so we have an issue what we are looking at.
			3. There was a discussion on some text, but the screen moved so fast, no one was able to tell what was what.
			4. Discussion on the parenthiss. Corrections
			5. Question on the Multiply symbol.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 19:48:27Z): Incorporate changes as shown for CID 5082 in 11-15/1249r6 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-1249-06-000m-resolutions-for-adrian-mac-comments.docx>).
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion (once doc is posted)
	2. **Review 11-15/1004r4** Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5226 (GEN)
			1. Reivew comment
			2. The document 11-15/1004r5 is on Mentor
			3. During the lunch hour, proposed text was added to the R4 as a new proposal but it was not posted,
			4. An R6 should be created to consider
	3. Recess at 3:01PM
1. REVmc BRC F2F in Piscataway, NJ – 10 Dec 2015 – PM2
	1. Called to order by Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba) at 3:35pm
	2. Review Paten Policy
		1. No issues noted.
	3. Attendance:
		1. In Person: Jon ROSDAHL (CSR-Qualcomm); Dorothy STANLEY (HPE-Aruba); Adrian STEPHENS(Intel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus)
		2. On WebEx at least part of the time: Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark RISON (Samsung); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna Communications);
	4. Review Agenda
		1. See 11-15/1500r6
	5. Review doc 11-15/1004r6
		1. CID 5226 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discusson of the discussion text
			3. Look at 11-15/1004r6
			4. 1.2. Text talks about dot11RSNAStatsCMACICVErrors. CMACBIP variant was just a confusion.
			5. 1.3. Settled on agreement to have only one counter, and call it dot11RSNABIPMICErrors.
			6. Concern that there may be more than 8 locations
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 20:58:10Z) Replace dot11RSNAStatsCMACICVErrors with dot11RSNABIPMICErrors AND delete 2909.51 to .61
			8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. Review doc 11-15/1201r1 Graham SMITH
		1. CID 5531 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. EIRP is only option in the cited sub-field.
			3. Review Proposed changes
			4. No Agreement on resolution, so we need to look for a rejection reason.
			5. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 21:12:54Z): The text is accurate as it is.
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 5144 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Need to have Adrian’s proposal for TXOP resolved before this can be done,
			3. Look to reject this specific CID for now.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 21:14:00Z): 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. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 5422 and CID 5423 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. CID 5421 makes changes in this similar area.
			3. Long discussion, but the changes were not in a form that we could find concensus
			4. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 5422 (MAC) and 5423 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 21:24:37Z): The BRC discussed the commenter’s proposed changes at length and did not come to consensus on any change that would satisfy the comment.
			5. Mark Ready for Motion
	7. **Review Doc 11-15/762r15** Mark RISON
		1. Mark RISON CIDs 6572, 6562, 6075, 6676, 6677, 6303 (30 mins)
		2. CID 6572, 6562 , 6075 (MAC)
			1. Not time to review
			2. Propose to reject with Insufficient detail reason
			3. Proposed Resolutin: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 21:28:21Z): 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.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6676 and CID 6677 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution for CID 6676: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 21:41:42Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-15/762r15 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx> for CID 6676/6677 which clarifies the issue
			4. Proposed Resolution for CID 6677: REVISED (GEN: 2015-12-10 21:44:27Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-15/762r15 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0762-15-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d4-0-sbmc1.docx> for CID 6676/6677 which clarifies the issue and gets rid of the wacko HT modes
			5. Mark Both Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6304 (GEN)
			1. Agreed the submission is not ready.
			2. Reject for insufficient detail.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2015-12-10 20:17:28Z) 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.
			4. Ready for motion.
		5. CID 6303: (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resoltuion: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2015-12-10 21:52:25Z).
			3. Ready for motion.
		6. CID 6374: (MAC)
			1. Discussed proposed changes from Mark RISON.
			2. Prosal-- At 1578.3, delete “non-DMG”
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2015-12-10 21:49:24Z): At 1578.3, delete "non-DMG"
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6508 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2015-12-10 21:54:24Z)
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
	8. Motions
		1. **Motion 183: GEN Potential Reject tab**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in

The “GEN Potential Reject” tab in[**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-18-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-18-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx)except for 6677 6676, 6304 and 5761

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion - -None
			3. Results – 4-0-1 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion 184: Thurs AM pulled CIDs – separate motion CIDs**
			1. Approve
1. The resolution for CID 6549 in the “Editorials - assigned” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-27-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
2. The resolution for CID 6602 in the “EditorialsreadyformotionNJ 2” and tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-27-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
3. The resolution to CIDs 6477 in the “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-2” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-20-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
4. The resolutions to CIDs 6448 in the “Motion MAC-BJ(6448)” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-30-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>

And incorporate the text changes into the TGmc draft.

* + - 1. Moved Adrian STEPHENS2nd: Mark RISON
			2. Results: 5-1-0 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion 1**85: **Thursday BRC agreed resolutions**

(revisions to be updated)

* + - 1. Approve the comment resolutions in (a) The “Motion MAC-BI” tab and “Motion MAC-BK” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-30-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> and(b) The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-3” and GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-4” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-20-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> (c) The and “EditorialsreadyformotionNJ3” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-28-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
			2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON 2nd : Adrian STEPHENS
			3. Results: 5-0-1 Motion Passes
		1. **Motion 185**: **Thursday BRC agreed resolutions** (revisions to be updated)
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in (a) The “Motion MAC-BI” tab and “Motion MAC-BK” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-30-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> and(b) The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-3” and GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-4” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-20-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> (c) The “EditorialsreadyformotionNJ3” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-28-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
			2. Moved: Mark Hamilton 2nd:Adrian Stephens
			3. Result: 5-0-1 Motion Passes
		2. **Motion 186**: **Thursday PM2 BRC agreed resolutions**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in (a) The “Motion MAC-BL” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-31-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls> and(b) The “GEN Dec F2F BRC-Piscataway-5” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-21-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> except for CID 5226(c) Resolve CID 5226 as “revised” with a resolution of “Replace dot11RSNAStatsCMACICVErrors with dot11RSNABIPMICErrors AND delete 2909.51 to .61”
			2. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
			3. Discussion – None
			4. Results: 5-0-1 Motion Passes
	1. Stand at ease while all comment staus verified.
		1. Comment status was checked and the group took 10 minutes to ensure status
		2. Called back to order by Chair Dorothy STANLEY
	2. **Motion 187: Sponsor Ballot Recirculation**
		1. Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the initial Sponsor Ballot on P802.11REVmc D4.0 as contained in documents 11-15-0665r21, 11-15-0565r31, and 11-15-0532r28

• Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 5.0 incorporating these resolutions and• Approve a 15 day Sponsor Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11REVmc D5.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”

* + 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
		2. Result: Unamimous – Motion Passes
	1. Thanks to those that were present or that called in over the course of the week.
	2. Special thanks to Kathryn Bennett and the IEEE-SA for hosting the BRC this week.
	3. Adjourn at 5:32pm
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