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Abstract

REVmc BRC Telecon Minutes for May 27th 2016.

1. REVmc BRC Telecom 27 May 2016, 10:00am ET to 1:00pm ET
	1. **Called to order** by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY at 8:03am
	2. **Patent Policy reviewd**
		1. No issues noted
	3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HPE); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Emily QI (Intel), Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Mark RISON (Samsung); Jouni Malinen (Qualcomm); Mark HAMILTON (Brocade); Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm); Sean Coffey (Realtek); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Jinjing Jiang (Marvell);
	4. **Review Agenda:** doc 11-16/757r1 Dorothy STANELY (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0757-01-000m-tgmc-june-2016-teleconference-agenda-planning-document.docx>
		2. Updated Agenda:

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report – any issues with editing of approved CIDs, MIB compilation update

3. Comment resolution –

GEN CIDs 7486, 7133, 7604CID 7377 (secure PSK)CID 7177 (Support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC)Additional available CIDs

4. Motions

5. AOB

6. Adjourn

* + 1. Mark Rison asked to add CIDs: 7572, 7604 (Key ID)7529 (Action No Acks and MMEs)7593 (USP does not end until BU succeeds/fails)
		2. No objection to the updated Agenda – see 11-16/757r2
	1. **Editor Report**
		1. By the end of next week we should be ready for reviewing
		2. Edward and Emily noted that no issues in completing the editirg have been noted:
	2. **Review doc 11-16/741r2** Emily QI (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0741-02-000m-draft-5-4-mib-revision.doc>
		2. Review the errors noted with compiling the MIB
		3. Concern on expressing two integers as a fraction vs single number
		4. Discussion on the dot11LCIDSELatitudeInteger Integer32, and dot11LCIDSELatitudeFraction Integer32,
			1. We edited these to match the new RFC definitions.
			2. INTEGER is an abstract that expands to ANS.1 types
			3. We do not have a way to get an Integer larger than 32 bits in the MIB
		5. Question on change to dot11VHTExtendedNSSBWSignaling:
			1. Why was the range changed from “Integer (0..3)” to “Unsigned32”?
			2. There are other places like this, but not sure why this one was changed.
			3. This is most likely a “DEFVAL {false}” that caused the error.
			4. This should be changed to “DEFVAL {0}” only, revert back to INTEGER and keep the range for the SYNTAX.
		6. Where we split the variables into two parts, we are missing articles in the description.
			1. Several other case edits were also needed.
			2. “Latitude is represented as a 2s compliment….”
			3. Need to make change for each changed location.
		7. The UNITS “packet number” has issue
			1. This is really 64K packet numbers
			2. Just delete the “Units” line in the “high” variables
		8. Dot11PNExhaustionThresholdHigh
			1. The high part (0…65535)
			2. Also for the low (0…4294967295)
		9. We checked the description in the clause where the MIB variables were used in the main draft text.
		10. ACITION ITEM #1: Need to post an R3 of the document and then we will move to adopt R3 with a note to the editor to make the same similar changes as described above throughout.
	3. **GEN CIDS:**
		1. CID 7486 (GEN)
			1. Review the comment and the reject reason
			2. Discussion on the rational for the rejection
				1. ARC group has not discussed this specifically
				2. SME is part of the STA
				3. ARC is trying to be very specific in identifying where actions take place.
			3. Analysis would be needed to be done on each of the 12 statements to determine if a change is really needed.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-05-27 14:46:20Z) Page 144 line 12 states: “In order to provide correct MAC operation, an SME is present within each STA.” – i.e., the SME is a component of a STA.
			5. Therefore a statement that a dot11\*Activated variable is set by the STA does not exclude the variable being set by the SME.
			6. The commenter’s rationale for this change “set by the SME, not the STA”, is therefore incorrect.
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 7133 (GEN)
			1. ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-05-27 14:48:25Z)
		3. CID 7604 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Propsoed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-05-27 14:51:23Z)
		4. CID 7377 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review History of the proposals:
			3. Possible options
				1. Failed motion: delete “or PSK”
				2. Jon: Delete Sentence
				3. Option: No consenus reject
				4. Mark R: At 1966.22 change “A STA performing secure password-based, or PSK, authentication uses SAE authentication.” to “SAE authentication is a secure password-based authentication mechanism.”
			4. Discussion on the rational of the reasons
			5. No objection to prepare a no concensus reject
		5. CID 7106 (GEN)
			1. A motion was prepared to resolve this
			2. Proposed resolution: “REVISED (GEN: 2016-05-20 03:11:14Z) incorporate the changes in 11-16/709r2 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0709-02-000m-cids-7106.docx >, which removes the MAC mandatory requirements from the PHY section."
			3. This was the intent of the motion in Waikoloa, but due to the typo the wrong CID was marked.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 7107 (EDITOR)
			1. Will be added to the motion for the insufficient detail motion
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Review Doc 11-16/276r11** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx>
		2. CID 7177 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-27 15:08:29Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r11 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx), under "Proposed changes if new extended NSS proposal accepted", for CID 7177. These changes implement the new feature to support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 7572 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
			3. Discussion on how changes effect the draft.
				1. Changes seem to be innocuous,
				2. Changes may introduce errors at this late time concerned.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-27 15:32:42Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r12 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx), for CID 7572. These changes clarify the text as requested.
			5. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark RISON to Post R12 immediately prior to motion.
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 7529 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
			3. Discussion on how changes effect the draft.
				1. These changes are being made late in the process
				2. The changes are addressing for the most part clarity issues, but there are a few minor bugs that are being fixed.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-05-27 15:38:01Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r12 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx), for CID 7529, which affect the requested changes.
			5. Mark Ready for Motion
		5. 7593 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar CID 7592 (EDITOR\_A) was already resolved, and passed Motion 227.
			3. Discussion as to why the two CIDs were not resolved at the same time.
			4. 11.2.2.10 p1585 (D5.0) line 57 – point of when to remain awake.
			5. What happens to a BU does not completely get transmitted?
			6. How to determine what happesn as the end of an unscheduled SP?
			7. Discussion on when a fragment should be held over?
				1. Maybe if a failure? Not clear? SP should end if BU fails?
				2. So we decided to add a note.
			8. A Proposed way to resolve:

FIRSTInsert at 1580.58 the following:NOTE 1: The SP ends if a BU is presumed to have failed i.e. when maximum retries are exceeded.NOTE 2: If a BU is transmitted as fragmented packets, then all fragmented packets are sent in the same SP. THENAt P1580.49 insert new bullet e) that Starts with “If the STA has set up to use unscheduled SPs,…” and renumber the following bullets.

* + - 1. Page 1582.26 indicates that we don’t assume the SP ends, and a ESP bit is always sent.
			2. Notes are not normative –
			3. We will come back to this when we consider a motion on this CID
	1. **Motions:**
		1. **Motion 238 (Waikoloa GEN and MAC CIDs):**

Approve the comment resolutions in the following document and tabs indicated and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “GEN-Waikoloa-C” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-34-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
* “Motion MAC-BX” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-46-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>
	+ - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
			2. Discussion: none
			3. **Results #238: 9-0-0 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion 239** **CID 7106 (GEN)**

Approve the comment resolutions in the following document and tabs indicated and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “GEN-Waikoloa-A-pulled” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-34-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
	+ - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion:
			3. **Results #239: no objection – Unanious Consent – Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion 240 (GEN Insufficient detail)**

Approve a comment resolution of “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.” For the CIDs in the following tab and document:“GEN-Insufficient detail” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-34-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx> and CID 7107

* + - 1. Review doc 11-15/665r34 tab GEN-Insufficient Detail tab
				1. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-34-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-34-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx)
			2. Moved Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Jon ROSDAHL
			3. Discussion: None
			4. **Results #240: no objection – Unanious Consent – Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #241 (GEN "MIB" tab: CID 7486 )**

Move to resolve CID 7486 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “ Page 144 line 12 states: “In order to provide correct MAC operation, an SME is present within each STA.” – i.e., the SME is a component of a STA. Therefore a statement that a dot11\*Activated variable is set by the STA does not exclude the variable being set by the SME .The commenter’s rationale for this change “set by the SME, not the STA”,  is therefore incorrect.”

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
			2. Discussion: none
			3. **Results #241: no objection – Unanious Consent – Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #242: CID 7133 (GEN "Other PHY" tab)**

**Move to Resolve CID 7133 as “Accepted”**

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Graham SMITH
			2. Discussion: none
			3. **Results #242: no objection – Unanious Consent – Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #243:** **Motion GEN "Security" tab: CID 7604**

**Move to resolve CID 7604:  as “Accepted”**:

* + - 1. Moved: Jouni MALINEN 2nd: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. **Results #243: no objection – Unanious Consent – Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #244: CID 7177 (MAC)** (Support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC):

Move to resolve CID 7177 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Make changes as shown in 11-16/0276r11 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx), under "Proposed changes if new extended NSS proposal accepted", for CID 7177. These changes implement the new feature to support indicating preference for not receiving LDPC.

* + - 1. Moved: Menzo WENTINK 2nd: Mark RISON
			2. Discuss: speaking against the motion – concern with the powersave indication not being clear
			3. **Results #244: 6-1-3 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #245** CID 7377 (Secure PSK):Move to approve the comment resolution to CID 7377 as “Rejected” The BRC could not come to consenses to make the change. Multiple options were considered, including deleting “or PSK" (Motion failed), Delete the sentence, and 1966.22 change “A STA performing secure password-based, or PSK, authentication uses SAE authentication.” to “SAE authentication is a secure password-based authentication mechanism.”
			1. Discussion on the proposed motion text, but there was a different set of motions that were watned by some.
			2. The Commenter’s proposed change has been discussed then.
			3. A Motion to simply accept was asked if it could be made.
			4. **Motion #245: on CID 7377 (GEN) (Secure PSK):**

Move to approve the comment resolution to CDI 7377 as “Accepted”

* + - * 1. Moved Jounie MALINEN 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
				2. **Results #245: 7-2-1 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #246: CID 7106 (GEN)**

 Move to approve the resolution to CID 7106 as “as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the text changes in 11-16-709r2”

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian 2nd: Jon
			2. **Results #246: no objection – Unanious Consent – Motion Passes**
			3. **SECRETARY NOTE:** CID 7106 was missed in the Waikoloa Motion #234, but was motioned twice today. Motion #239 and 246 provide the same resolution to CID 7106. Motion #239 was put in the database.
		1. **Motion #247: CID 7572 (Security Pseudocode)**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7572 (security pseudocode) as “Revised” with a resolution of “incorporate the changes under CID 7572 in 11-16/276r12 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx), These changes clarify the text as requested..

* + - 1. Moved; Mark RISON 2nd: Jouni MALINEN
			2. Discussion:
				1. Speaking against the motion – late changes in the process on Security concerning.
			3. **Results #247: 6-3-1 Motion Fails**
			4. Discussion on a way forward.
			5. Would a subset of the changes be agreeable to the no voters?
				1. Considered the sub set of the changes
				2. Make only the changes at 223.44 and 224.34
			6. **Motion #248:** **CID 7572 (Security Pseudocode)**

Move to approve CID 7572 as as “Revised” with a resolution of “incorporate the changes under CID 7572 at 223.44 and 224.34 in 11-16/276r12 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> ).

* + - * 1. Moved: Jouni MALINEN 2nd: Adrian STEPHENS
				2. Discussion: it is important to pick the TID, and it is not clear that the MAC is being identified.

This motion is a compromise and the other clarifications should be taken up in REVmd

* + - * 1. **Results #248: 4-0-6 Motion Passes**
		1. **Motion #249 CID 7529 (Action/no ack Cleanup)**

Move to approve the resolution to CID 7529 (action/no ack cleanup) as “as “Revised” with a resolution of “incorporate the changes under CID 7529 in 11-16/276r12 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0276-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11mc-d5-0-sbmc1.docx> ), which effect the requested change.

* + - 1. Moved: Mark Rison 2nd: Graham SMITH
			2. Discussion:
				1. Speaking against the motion – this does not fix an actual issue and we can wait until later to fix this.
				2. Speaking for the motion - desire to fix now to avoid issue like DMG caused.
			3. **Results #249: 2-1-7 Motion Fails**
			4. Discussion on path forward
				1. Discussion on possible rejection
			5. **Motion #250** **CID 7529 (Action/no ack Cleanup)**

Move to resolve CID 7529 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “There is no frame in the current draft that requires this feature”

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Emily QI
			2. Discussion: There is at least one fram that could make use of this, but we can fix this later.
			3. **Results #250: 6-2-2 Motion Passes**
	1. The Chair declared we are at time
	2. Next Telecon June 3rd – hope to resolve any outstanding CIDs by then in order to go to recirculation
		1. CID 7593 (MAC) still open please discuss on reflector
		2. Emily document
		3. CID 7532 (MAC)
		4. Need Adhoc group reports to be updated
		5. MAC needs to check on sufficient detail for the proposed resolution
	3. Adjourned 11:02am ET
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