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Abstract

Minutes for REVmc BRC Telecon April 1, 2016

Email announcement sent March 18, 2016:

Below are the draft agenda and teleconference bridge details for upcoming TGmc BRC teleconferences on April 1 and 15. Details for the April 21 and May 6 and 13 teleconferences, and the April 25-28 meeting in Cambridge, UK will follow.
Thanks,
Dorothy
==================
Draft agenda:

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution

 Available CIDs, 11-16-384 (Dan H), 11-16-273 (Adrian), 11-16-303 (Graham), 11-16-276 (Mark R), 11-290 (Mark H)

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)

We'll select from these for today's call, in the agenda discussion, based on attendees present:

* 11-16-384 (Dan H)
* 11-16-273 (Adrian)
* 11-16-303 (Graham), also 11-16-228, 11-16-385, 11-16-304, 11-16-237, 11-16-221, 11-16-278
* 11-16-276 (Mark R)
* 11-16-290 (Mark H)
* 11-16-501 (Edward) PICS and MIB comments
* Editorial rework required CIDs – 30 mins
* 11-16-499 (Edward) CID 7452
1. Minutes for 802.11 TGmc BRC for Friday, April 1, 2015 –
	1. **Called to order** by Dorothy STANLEY (HP/Aruba) 10:00 am ET
	2. **Review Patent Policies**, call for essential patent reports
		1. No Issues identified
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy Stanley (HPE); Mark Hamilton (Ruckus); Adrian Stephens (Intel); Edward (Huawei); Emily Qi (Intel); Graham Smith (SRT Wireless); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell); Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm); Jouni Malinen (Qualcomm)
	4. **Discus Agenda plan**
		1. Determine who is in attendance and the available documents for review today.
		2. Available submissions for resolving CIDs
* 11-16-501 (Edward) PICS and MIB comments - 30
* 11-16-290 (Mark H) - 30 mins
* 11-16-273 (Adrian) – 60 mins
* 11-16-303 (Graham) – 30 mins
* Editorial rework required CIDs-30 mins
* 11-16-499 (Edward) – Defer
	1. **Review Approved Agenda:**
1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy
2. Editor report
3. Comment resolution:
4. 11-16-501 (Edward) PICS and MIB comments - 30 min
5. 11-16-290 (Mark H) - 30 mins
6. 11-16-273 (Adrian) – 60 mins
7. 11-16-303 (Graham) – 30 mins
8. Editorial rework required CIDs (Adrian) – 30 mins
9. 11-16-273 (Adrian) – until 12:55pm ET
10. AOB
11. Adjourn
	* 1. No Objection to the approved agenda
	1. **Editor Report** Adrian Stephens (Intel)
		1. Edited everything except some changes, like additional MCS changes, are out for external review.
			1. Changes due to motions not tied to comments have been done.
		2. Editing is progressing, there are some issues that need more review
			1. Initial reviews of the edited changes are being done and should be ready by April face to face.
		3. Expecting some updates resulting from issues found in editing, likely at May F2F
	2. Review doc 11-16/501r0
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0501-00-000m-resolution-for-some-pics-and-mib-comments.docx>
		2. Review presentation
		3. CID 7556 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on proposed changes
			3. More work is needed to describe why both terms are needed.
		4. CID 7767 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on proposed change:
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised (page and line numbers from D5.2)[1] At line 3437.28: change “when object dot11PHYType has the value of ht” to “when object dot11PHYType is ht”.[2] At line 3437.41: change “when object dot11PHYType has the value of vht” to “when object dot11PHYType is vht”.[3] At line 3437.56: change “when object dot11PHYType has the value of tvht” to “when object dot11PHYType is tvht”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7355 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. WEP has been marked deprecated
			3. Discussion on the change proposal and the proposed disposition.
				1. Discuss with changing “may accept” with “receives”
				2. Discuss with what it means to “receives”
				3. The comment is on unchanged text, so could be simply rejected as out of scope.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-04-01 14:35:58Z); The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
			5. Discussion on the proposed text
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7437 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-04-01 14:40:23Z) (page and line numbers from D5.2) At lines 3128.50, 3256.29, and 3370.61, delete "This field contains the fixed-point part of Altitude.".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 7438 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Same cited sentence as in CID 7437– use same resolution
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-04-01 14:40:23Z) (page and line numbers from D5.2) At lines 3128.50, 3256.29, and 3370.61, delete "This field contains the fixed-point part of Altitude.".
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review doc: 11-16/290r1**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx>
		2. CID 7807 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We need to avoid use of Must – change to “are”
			3. Fix misspelled organized
			4. An R2 will need to be posted
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Make changes as shown in 11-16/290r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx>>, for CID 7807. These changes effect the commenter’s intent, with additional editorial clean up.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7317 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Question on if this had been covered by a previous presentation.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Make changes as shown in 11-16/290r2 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx> >, for CID 7317. These changes effect the commenter’s intent.
			4. Discussion on if this was covered by Graham’s previous
				1. ACTION ITEM #1: Graham to check and get back if it needs review
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7324 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the context of the proposal.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Make changes as shown in 11-16/290r2 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0290-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0.docx> >, for CID 7324. These changes effect the commenter’s intent.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7378 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Check to see if this CID was included in another proposal.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Change both occurrences of “PMK or PSK key identifiers” to “PMK identifiers” and “PMK or PSK key identifier” to “PMK identifier” (P126.47 and P126.49).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7792 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion – the change could be just “buffered BU”
			3. Not able to remember why this was not included in the BU language change.
			4. More work required to review.
		7. CID 7658 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED. The commenter did not provide sufficient evidence that this particular MIB attribute needs to be included in the list in 4.3.13. That is, just because the attribute in not in this list, a missing behavioral requirement has not be identified.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. Return to 7317 (MAC)
			1. This CID 7317 is identical to 5195 which we rejected a change in D4.0 ballot.
			2. Discussion this may be a bit different, and the proposed change may be appropriate.
			3. Change to the proposed change was made to make it “independently” correct.
			4. Remove the “for example…”
			5. The updated text will be in R2 and the resolution proposed before is still valid, but the document in R2 captures the updated final proposed changes.
	4. **Review doc 11-16/273r5** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-05-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc>
		2. CID 7103 (EDITOR)
			1. Still waiting on response from Peter ECCLESINE
		3. CID 7543 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 15:26:47Z): Replace: “Unlike an AP providing RM capability, an AP Advertisement location capability does not return an “incapable” response if the non-APSTA requests the “remote” location.” with: “An AP that advertises its ability to provide its location in Civic or geospatial format does not return an “incapable” response if a requesting STA requests the “remote” location.”
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7770 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. ACTION ITEM #2: Adrian to follow-up with Assaf/Youhan
		5. CID 7511 (MAC)
			1. This has been assigned to Dorothy – remove from this doc.
		6. CID 7648 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 15:31:44Z): Replace the “Notes” cell at 838.31 with:

“This field indicates support for PSMP operation. See 10.29 (PSMP Operation).

Set to 0 if the STA does not support PSMP operation

Set to 1 if the STA supports PSMP operation”

* + - 1. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7533 (MAC) and CID 7687 (MAC) have been assigned elsewhere remove from doc.
			1. CID 7533 assigned to Dan HARKINS.
			2. CID 7687 assigned to Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE
		2. CID 7119 (MAC)
			1. Review the comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 15:36:26Z)

At 1071.13, delete "The value of N in the diagram corresponds to the number of Access Categories for which Estimated Service Parameters information is provided and has a value from 1 to 4."

At 1071.17, change "ESP Information" to "ESP Information List"

At 1071.19, change "N x 3" to "variable"

At 1071.26, insert a new paragraph: "The ESP Information List field contains from 1 to 4 ESP Information fields, each corresponding to an access category for which estimated service parameters information is provided."

* + - 1. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion:
		1. CID 7494 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 15:38:46Z):

At 1076.07 replace:

"Single value TLV comprising fields in related table in …"

with:

"One or more TLV fields identified as a Device Identification Information Value field, as defined in …"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 7481 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context see Table 9-19
			3. Discussion of conflicts noted – we can make the change just as suggested, reject the comment as it is technically out of scope, or make a revision and fix up any conflicts.
			4. Straw Poll:
			5. Reject the comment – it is out of scope.
			6. Make the change indicated
			7. Make the change and also fix up the issues in table 9-19
			8. abstain
			9. Results: A:2 B:1 C:4
			10. More work will need to be done to prepare the final resolution.
		2. CID 7560 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-04-01 15:50:31Z): The setting of the Retry subfield to 1 is described normatively at 1361.06. Internal collisions do not result in failure of the acknowledgement procedure for the "losing" ACs. So there is no need to specify this normatively.
			3. Discussion on the use of the Retry bit and if internal collisions are to be treated differently from external collisions.
				1. Prefer to make a change to promote the note with clarification
			4. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 15:56:09Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0273r6 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0273-06-000m-sb1-stephens-resolutions-part-3.doc), for CID 7560. These changes clarify the normative text.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7539 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. RC2, for example, cites RR1 and RR5. Because RR1 excludes DMG STAs, in a DMG STA RC2 is subject onto to receiver requirement RR5. This is different from excluding RC2 itself from DMG STAs, which would leave them with no cache for QoS Data frames.
			3. After explanation, there is a possible change to the RR10 and RR2 that may need to be considered.
			4. Proposal to change the resolution:
			5. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 16:03:50Z): At 1287.34 replace "The STA shall discard the frame" with "The STA shall discard the frame it matches an entry in the cache".

At 1286.13 replace ", and RC9" with ", RC9, and RC10".

There is no need to add non-DMG to rows that cite RR1 and RR3. RC2, for example, cites RR1 and RR5. Because RR1 excludes DMG STAs, in a DMG STA RC2 is subject only to receiver requirement RR5. This is different from excluding RC2 itself from DMG STAs, which would leave them with no cache for QoS Data frames.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-16/303r1** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0303-01-000m-resolution-of-several-cids-for-d5.docx>
		2. Review current place to start
		3. CID 7038 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the use of optional elements
			3. How the Vendor Specific Elements are described may have had an outstanding item to review.
			4. Table 9-304 was reviewed for context.
			5. Discussion on how this element is different,
				1. See table 9-82 for contrast
				2. The element structure is known – the length is known to be a certain number of octets.
				3. Concern if the subelement is Vendor Specific followed by a Vendor Specific Element, the ability to tell the difference is the issue. When does it end?
			6. Discussed Field vs element
			7. The comment proposed change is not complete, and a paragraph would need to be included.
			8. In Table 9-304 we could remove Vendor Specific entry
			9. The 9.6.8.3 Measurement Pilot Frame format is the 3rd to last element that is possible.
			10. We could remove the subelement entirely and then allow other elements to follow.
			11. See ANQP that was just updated is an example of the way to possibly do this.
			12. Optional Subelements has optional Subelements which is interesting.
			13. We have numbers from two different name spaces – the Elements and subelements and the name spaces overlap and we cannot tell when we have an element or a sub-element.
			14. Straw Poll:
				1. Reject the comment
				2. There is an issue - make a change
				3. Abstain
				4. Results: A:3 B:4 C: 0
				5. Preference is to make a change
			15. ACTION ITEM #3: Adrian and Jouni to prepare a proposal
			16. Assign CID to Adrian STEPHENS
		4. CID 7039 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The proposed change included too much of the sentence to be replaced.
			3. Update the document to R1
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 16:37:11Z): Replace the cited sentence with,". The Vendor Specific Content is outside the scope of this Standard."
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 7773 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. 2.4Ghz uses DIFS and 5Ghz uses PIFS – done deliberate.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-04-01 16:43:47Z): In the 2.4 GHz band there is less room for 40 MHz channels and hence a slightly longer sensing time is valid.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7580 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Modification is on 872.40 and adds “all”
			3. Proposal: At P872.40 replace “for DCF or EDCAF” with “for all DCF and EDCAF” and At P873.22 replace “or EDCAF” with “or the EDCAFs”
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-04-01 16:50:08Z)

At P872.40 replace "for DCF or EDCAF" with "for all DCF and EDCAF" At P873.22 replace "or EDCAF" with "or the EDCAFs"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Editor Question CIDs**
		1. CID 7702 and CID 7701 (EDITOR)
			1. Issue is similar comments, but different text used.
			2. The issue is where the energy is to be measured. It is supposed to be at the Antenna. So “at the Antenna” has to be clearly related to the energy measurement.
			3. For CID 7702 we should have it more consistent with CID 7701.
				1. Propose to move the “at the antenna” to the end of the sentence.
				2. Old Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-02-24 17:06:20Z) Keeping "at the antenna" is consistent with other places in the document, however the sentence can be clarified as follows:

Change:

"CCA shall report busy at least while a PPDU with energy above the ED threshold is being received at the antenna."

To:

"CCA shall report busy at least while a PPDU is being received at the antenna with energy above the ED threshold."

* + - 1. New Proposed Resolution for CID 7702: REVISED (EDITOR: 2016-04-01 17:02:47Z) - Keeping "at the antenna" is consistent with other places in the document, however the sentence can be clarified as follows: Change:

"CCA shall report busy at least while a PPDU with energy above the ED threshold is being received at the antenna."

To:

"CCA shall report busy at least while a PPDU is being received with energy above the ED threshold at the antenna."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark to have ready for motion and clear the previous motion number.
	1. Next Call is on April 15th
		1. Updated agenda will be sent
		2. Remember it is 3 hours
		3. We will have motions related to the outstanding comments from Macau
		4. We will also look at a motion for the March Macau minutes for approval.
	2. **Adjourned 1:01pm ET**
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