IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| REVmc BRC Telecon Minutes – Feb 2016 |
| Date: 2016--02-19 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. | 10871 N 5750 WHighland, UT 84003 | +1-801-492-4023 | jrosdahl @ ieee. org |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11 REVmc BRC Telcons for February 5th and 19th, 2016

Draft agenda:

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution

4. AOB

5. Adjourn

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

–        [IEEE Patent Policy](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.ppt)
–        [Patent FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/faq.pdf)
–        [Letter of Assurance Form](http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/loa.pdf)
–        [Affiliation FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html)
–        [Anti-Trust FAQ](http://standards.ieee.org/resources/antitrust-guidelines.pdf)
–        [Ethics](http://www.ieee.org/portal/cms_docs/about/CoE_poster.pdf)
–        [802 LMSC P&P](http://standards.ieee.org/board/aud/LMSC.pdf)
–        [802LMSC OM](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_OM_v16.pdf)

On Friday, Feb 5, 2016 and Friday, Feb 19, 2016, 7:00 am | 2 hr San Francisco (Pacific Standard Time, GMT-08:00)

Host: Dorothy Stanley

 When it’s time, join the meeting from here:

<https://meetings.webex.com/collabs/meetings/join?uuid=M2HOO8S0N7IAGCYZMVVGJFD8IA-4O2>

Meeting number: 194 302 142

Audio Connection :+1-415-655-0001 US TOLL

Access code: 194 302 142

1. 802.11 REVmc BRC Telecon: 05 February 2016
	1. **Call to order** by Dorothy STANLEY, Chair, at 10:04am
	2. **Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Alecsander EITAN (Qualcomm); Assaf KASHER (Intel), Chris HANSEN (Peraso Technologies); Edward AU (Huawei), Emily QI (Intel), Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Jinjing JIANG (Marvel); Lisa WARD (Rohde & Schwarz); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus Wireless); Mark RISON (Samsung); Osama ABOULMAGD (Huawei); Payam TORAB (Broadcom); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Carlos CORDEIRO (Intel);
	3. **Patent Policy Review**
		1. No items reported
	4. **Review Agenda**
2. Call to order,
3. Attendance
4. Patent Policy Review
5. Agenda Review
6. Editor report
7. Comment resolution:
8. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0220-01-000m-clause-20-extended-mcs-set.docx - Assaf KASHER
9. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0221-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-7086-dcf.docx - Graham SMITH
10. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-00-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx - Graham SMITH
11. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx - Graham SMITH
12. AOB
13. Adjourn
	* 1. No objection to the proposed agenda
	1. **Editor report** 11-13/95r27 – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. Slide 5 needs to be updated – stale data - ignore
		2. Slide 6: 828 new comments
		3. First pass has been done and assigned some comments
		4. Slide 7: Review Editorial assigned status
			1. Note that comments will be assigned to commenter by default that need submission, if a submission is not done in a timely manner, the comment will be rejected for lack of information.
		5. **Action item #1:** Adrian to send list of Submission required that is currently noted out to the reflector.
		6. Request to be noted: Adrian had to leave the call at this point. (10:20am ET)
	2. **Comment resolution**
		1. Review Document 11-16/220r1 -- Assaf KASHER (Intel),
			1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0220-01-000m-clause-20-extended-mcs-set.docx
			2. Review the document
			3. Questions and discussion
			4. Concern on the scope of the changes presented today.
			5. Suggest TGay may be better place to review and consider
			6. Question on if this submission addresses a specific comment.
				1. There is a comment 7142 (GEN)– about missing MCS
				2. The comment is valid, technical discussion is being allowed
			7. The determination of where this technical change should be discussed is debatable, the timeline of TGay is too late in usefulness in 2020 products.
			8. The constellations proposed are
			9. Assertion that the TGay should be the location for this discussion and review, the level and scope of this change being brought to a conference call between face-to-face sessions seems to be inappropriate.
				1. Is there a way to send to TGay for a broader technical discussion?
				2. If we discuss it here, a more widely announced topic should be made.
			10. Note that Comments that come in on the ballot are processed as submissions are brought forward.
				1. Comments are process and the topics are announced in the telecom announcements for the agendas in a timely manner.
			11. There are several editorial comments that need to be addressed, but they can be addressed offline.
			12. Is the proposal deprecating OFDM?
				1. Current products are not seen as using the OFDM in the 60Ghz band.
				2. Should we just mark it deprecated?

Maybe, but that would be a separate discussion

* + - 1. Support for presentation
				1. We have a need for legacy support
				2. This submission prevents changing the header to allow legacy support
				3. Yes this will cause a minor PHY change on a reserved bit use.
			2. Support for presentation
				1. This is a small change, and many simulations have been done to vet the change.
				2. Limited change – extension of the signal carrier only. Not a major change in 11ad.
			3. Another comment7138 (GEN) was also added in the recirc, and these also are pile-on comments from the original comments that were not addressed in the first ballot. (CID 7136 is related, but it says to deprecate OFDM mode, which this submission does not address, other than in the introductory narrative.)
		1. Review Document 11-16/221r1 – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
			1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0221-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-7086-dcf.docx
			2. CID 7086 (MAC)
				1. Review comment
				2. Review document
				3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-05 16:07:57Z): Incorporate the text changes in 11-16/221r0 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0221-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-7086-dcf.docx). This deletes the cited sentence, and clarifies DIFS and EIFS behavior.
				4. Question on “if the immediately preceding..” event change

If idle for DIFS it does not matter, if you are doing EIFS, then this captures that case

* + - * 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. Review Document 11-16/228r0 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
			1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-00-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx
			2. CIDs 7087(MAC) and 7088(MAC): 11-16/0228r0
			3. Review document
			4. Review comment and proposed change
			5. Questions and Discussion:
				1. Trying to fix this section is laudable, but concern on making sure to get any change correct.
				2. Where are we doing the decrement for each free medium for each slot time?

The implication is that it just decrements unless busy….no need to explicitly say decrement on the slot time boundaries.

If the time is counting down, and the slot goes busy, do you go back to 0 or continue where you were?

It is not time, but rather slot counts.

Backoff timer may be a poor choice of name, as it is really slots, and you cannot have a portion of a slot.

The idea is to get a converged consensus on where the slot boundaries are defined.

May need more thought offline to define this.

* + - * 1. The Rx/TXTurnaround is used once per sequence, but the concern was if it was being done for each condition.

The argument is that this is added at the end just prior to the transmission.

As the timers are really counting slots, and the aRXTXTurnaroundTime is a bit of time, and so you are not getting a full slot, but rather to help get into the right slot time.

* + - * 1. The events a-e describe interesting events, and then event f is the last event.

The draft describes how the aRxTxTurnaroundtime is used, and this change will need more work.

* + - 1. Suggestion to look at the comments and update for later discussion
		1. Review Document 11-16/237r1 -- Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
			1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx
			2. CID 7275(MAC): 11-16/237r1
				1. Review document
				2. Comments – discussion

Is the Non-HT STAs rules also applies to DMG STAs?

DMG can only talk to DMG as it is a different frequency.

As the DMG is non-HT STA, then it follows the Block Ack Policy?

No it is more complex, we need to check this case for the DMG

DMG STAs need to be included in the case of the rules it is following

* + - * 1. ACTION ITEM #2: Graham to check with DMG folks to see if change/clarification is needed.
				2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7275: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-05 16:48:09Z): Incorporate the changes under CID 7275 in 11-16/237r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-01-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx). This rewords the cited text to clarify the advisory behavior.
				3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			1. CID 7272 (GEN) 11-16/237r1
				1. Review comment
				2. Review proposed resolution
				3. Proposed Resolution: CID 7272 REVISE At P40.40, insert “power save (PS) station (STA): A station that is in power save mode.”:
				4. No objection Mark Ready for Motion
			2. CID 7293 (MAC): 11-16/237r2
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-05 16:57:48Z)
				3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			3. CID 7360 (GEN): 11-16/237r2
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes under CID 7360 in 11-16/237r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx). This adds an exception for DMG use of RIFS.
				3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			4. CID 7361 (MAC): 11-16/237r2
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7361 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-05 17:02:17Z): Incorporate the text changes as shown in 11-16/0237r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx). This adds an exception for DMG use of RIFS.
				3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **AOB** – out of time
	2. **Adjourn** at 12:02pm
1. 802.11 REVmc BRC Telecon: 19 February 2016
	1. **Call to order** by Dorothy STANLEY, Chair, at 10:03am
	2. **Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Adrian STEHPENS (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Edward AU (Huawei); Emily QI (Intel); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Jinjing JIANG (Marvel); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus Wireless); Mark RISON (Samsung); Scott Marin (Self); Sean Coffee (Realtek); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna);
	3. **Patent Policy Review**
		1. No items reported
	4. **Review Agenda**

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution:

Adrian (40 minutes)

e)     & Emily& Edward: Editorial Discuss CIDs 7116, 7238, 7384, 7605, 7686

f)     Editor owned discuss/review: 7144, 7230, 7265, 7266, 7268, 7392, 7685, 7744, 7804

g)    <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0230-01-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-1.doc> includes discuss needed on 7162, 7804, 7630, 7605

h)     <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0260-00-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-2.doc>

i)      11-16-273 to be posted

Graham (40 minutes)

a)     <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0228-00-000m-resolution-for-cids-7087-7088-edca.docx>

b)    <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>

c)     <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0269-00-000m-resolution-cid-7089-d5.docx>

d)    <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0268-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-7090-d5.docx>

Edward Au (30 minutes)

j)      CIDs 7660, 7661, 7689 and 7707 –<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0263-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-cids-7660-7661-and-7664.docx>

k)     <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0264-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-cid-7707.docx>

l)      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0265-00-000m-resolution-for-some-mac-comments-in-sb1.docx>

Additional items for next week:

Peter E

m)   <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0828-08-000m-sb0-ecclesine-resolutions.docx>

TGmc: Mark Rison CIDs that are indicated as submission required:

n)     7192, 7255, 7277, 7292, 7320, 7334, 7347, 7352, 7377,
7399, 7400, 7421, 7427, 7483, 7486, 7499, 7529, 7532,
7596, 7597, 7626, 7665, 7675, 7678, 7746, 7780, 7795

4. AOB – reminder of BRC meeting next week, teleconference available; agenda to be posted shortly, let me know of any additional presentations

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Add time to
		2. No objection to draft agenda with modifications to accommodate for missing presenters
	1. **Editor Report**:
		1. Verbal Report on New Editor Groups due to feedback on posted proposed resolutions
		2. Motion to approve Editorial comments that are noncontroversial will be brought later
		3. Allow more review for proposed rejected comments
		4. See 532 for the detail
		5. March to get new draft D5.2
	2. **Editorial Discuss**: CIDs 7116, 7238, 7384, 7605, 7686
		1. CID 7116
			1. Review comment
			2. Reference to 9.3.5 is incorrect.
			3. Look for what is correct
			4. Suggest to change to 10.35.2
			5. Proposed resolution: Revised; Make changes as indicated, except at 2179.27 changes reference to 10.35.2.
			6. No Objection - Mark Ready for motion
		2. CID 7238
			1. Review comment
			2. Review diagram 6-17
			3. Note error on two horizontal arrows for MLME-FINETIMINGMSMT
			4. The slope between MLME and Antenna is the debate. Is there instant time or some time between those 2 points?
				1. Protocol does not acknowledge any time between those points…from a standards point of view, there is no time.
			5. The time wanted is between T1 and T2 so the MLME to Antenna time is an implementation issue that has to be accounted for in the implementations.
			6. Proposed resolution does not change
			7. Suggested change in new arrowheads to be separate issue.
			8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-01-29 15:28:53Z) - Make Fine Timing Measurement frame arrow slope down to match slope of Ack frame. Change arrowhead style of the timing markers to distinguish from messages.
			9. No objection – marked as resolution:
		3. CID 7384
			1. Mark submission required – assign Mark RISON
		4. CID 7605
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed possible rejection resolutions.
			3. Field names for FTM Parameters “Value” and “Indication”.
			4. In CID 6243, the comment was to remove FTM from some parameters as it was determined that it was needed to ensure clarity.
			5. This CID is asking for the same prefix be added for the same issue but in reverse.
			6. Concern on the precedence in creating a large scale renaming effort.
			7. Straw Poll:

1. Change the names of the fields as specified in this comment 111.5 Change the name of the field as indicated in CID 6243 111112. Leave them as is 11113. Abstain 111

* + - * 1. Results: 1: 2; 1.5: 5; 2: 4; 3:3
			1. Adrian to bring back later
		1. CID 7686
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion that the 2nd paragraph is a further constraint that causes an extra constrant on the first paragraph and so need to rework a bit.
			3. First Paragraph it says that either the map is the max or not, and the second says that this max can be adjusted in certain methods. The second paragraph may be better placed as a note or in the text.
			4. Putting a qualifier for both paragraphs would be better.
			5. ACTION ITEM #2.1: Adrian to propose text and send to reflector for review.
			6. Note that in the Rx direction on page 1055 is a similar issue.
	1. **Review doc 11-16/237r2** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0237-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-assigned-to-graham-d5.docx>
		2. Resume review of document
		3. CID 7278 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Major question is if the dot11SupportedDataRatesTxTable and the OperationalRateSet linked?
			4. We did a clean-up of the rate sets, did we cause this? – no
			5. We should make the external interfaces tied and matched properly.
			6. No objection to the Revised option idea discussion on changes proposed.
			7. Proposed resolution: Revised:

At P159.33 and P202.5

Add the following to the “Valid Range” entry of “OperationalRateSet”:

“Only data rates in dot11SupportedDataRatesRxTable may be present”

At P202.44 and P153.17

Add the following to the “Valid Range” entry of “HT Operation”

“Only MCSs present in dot11SupportedMCSTxTable and dot11SupportedMCSRxTable may be present”

At P156.52

Add the following to the “Valid Range” entry of “VHT Capabilities”

“Only MCSs present in dot11VHTTxVHTMCSMap and dot11VHTRxVHTMCSMap may be present in the RX VHT-MCS Map subfield of the Supported VHT-MCS and NSS Set”

* + - 1. A Revised resolution was supported, but we need to review the changes and update as needed.
			2. ACTION ITEM #2.2: Mark RISON and Graham SMITH to work on this one and on CID 7280 and bring back.
			3. Note Emily QI noted 3 CIDs that are related (7281, 7282, 7287), and would like to reference these two CIDs.
			4. CID 7281 – 7280 are all similar, but due to the specific parameter got assigned to different individuals
			5. Move Assignment to Mark Graham for 7281, 7281, 7287 – MAC Adhoc
		1. CID 7293 MAC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			4. Was already handled on the Feb 5th telecon
		2. CID 7360 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Started discussion then remember that we processed this on the last call.
			3. Resolved in R2.
		3. CID 7361
			1. Was completed last time also (Feb 5th)
		4. CID 7373 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review a possible sentence swap instead of deletion:
				1. “No BUs addressed directly to STAs operating in the active mode shall be buffered for power management reasons.”
			3. No objection to just deleting.
			4. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:27:01Z)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/264r0** Edward AU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0264-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-cid-7707.docx>
		2. CID 7707 (GEN) – 11-16/0264r1
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review cited tables
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Delete “dot11RSNABIPMICErrors” in line 2943.1 and 3354.45.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. Review doc 11-16/265r0 Edward AU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0265-00-000m-resolution-for-some-mac-comments-in-sb1.docx>
		2. CID 7689 (MAC) – 11-16/0265r1
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. 4 changes to be made -Replace “the STA on receive” with “the first STA on receive” in clause 10.7.12.1 as follows.
			4. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:39:58Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/265r1, for CID 7689. This adds "first" to 4 references to "STA".
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7692 (MAC): 11-16/0265r1
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:42:18Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/265r1, for CID 7692. This adds "first" to 4 references to "STA".
			4. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7645 (MAC) & 7646 (EDITOR) 11-16/0265r1
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. CID 7645: Change the Applies to to "A STA operating as a QoS STA transmitting an individually addressed QoS Data frame, excluding SNS5
			4. CID 7646: Simplify to "A STA transmitting a QoS Data frame"
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 7645: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:44:52Z).
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 7646: ACCEPTED
				1. (Adrian will do the same/similar for 7646 (EDITOR).)
			7. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7647 (MAC) 11-16/0265r1
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. The changes proposed are not quite exact to the proposed change, so this will be a “REVISED”
			4. Proposed change: TGmc Editor:

In line 1285.8, replace “A QoS STA receiving an (individually or group addressed) QoS Data frame” with “A STA receiving an (individually or group addressed) QoS Data frame”.

In line 1285.40, replace “A QMF STA receiving an individually addressed QMF” with “A STA receiving an individually addressed QMF”.

In line 1285.49, replace “A nonmesh STA with dot11RobustAVStreamingImplemented true receiving a group addressed frame subject to a GCR agreement” with “A nonmesh STA receiving a group addressed frame subject to a GCR agreement”.

In line 1285.57, replace “A mesh STA with dot11RobustAVStreamingImplemented true receiving a group addressed frame subject to a GCR agreement” with “A mesh STA receiving a group addressed frame subject to a GCR agreement”.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:50:14Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0265r0 for CID 7647. This simplifies the text, as per the commenter’s intent.
			2. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7820 (MAC) 11-16/0265r1
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Proposed change: TGmc Editor: In line 1266.48, replace “If the Address 1 field of an MPDU carrying an A-MSDU does not match any individual address at a receiving STA, then the entire A-MSDU is discarded.” with “If the Address 1 field of an MPDU carrying an A-MSDU does not match any address at a receiving STA, then the entire A-MSDU is discarded.”
			4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:52:35Z)
			5. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/263** – Edward AU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0263-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-cids-7660-7661-and-7664.docx>
		2. CID 7660 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion
			3. Proposed change: Delete “(SEE NOTE 1) and “— SEE NOTE 2” in all entries under the column “Meaning”.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-02-19 16:55:18Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0263r0, for CID 7660. This accomplishes the commenter's intent, deleting the cited text.
			5. No objection Mark ready for Motion.
	2. **Review Agenda for next week.**
		1. Documents not seen will be on the initial list
		2. Emily will need a 2 hour slot
		3. Edward will need more time
	3. **Review Face to Face meeting logistic:**
		1. Attendees in person 6 people (Graham, Dorothy, Adrian, Jon, Edward, Mark H.)
		2. We will allow for dial-in
		3. Presentations from Mark RISON will be early to accommodate the time change
	4. Question on the 60Ghz extension
		1. It is covered in the presentation from Assaf 11-16/220r1 will be revisited in Macau.
	5. Telecon has been scheduled for March 4 just in case.
		1. (Jon will need replacement for minutes as he will be traveling on that day.)
		2. Mark H will also not be able to make that call.
	6. **Adjourn** 12:03pm
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