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Abstract

Minutes for the 26th August 2016 REVmc BRC Telecon Minutes.

1. **BRC Telecon 26th August2016 10am-1pm ET**
	1. **Called to order** at 10:03am by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE).
	2. **Patent Policy Reviewed** and call for Patents issued
		1. No issues noted
	3. **Attendance:** Dorothy STANLEY (HPE), Adrian STEPHENS (Self); Emily QI (Intel); Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm); Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus); Mark RISON (Samsung); Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huewei) Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); George CALCEV (Huawei); Sean COFFEY (Realtek); Jinjing JIANG (Marvell);
	4. **Review Agenda**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1113-01-000m-tgmc-brc-august-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>

The draft agenda is:

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report

3. Comment resolution

4. Motions

5. AOB: Schedule

1. On or before Sept 9: Complete comment resolution (goal unchanged draft)
2. Sept 10 to Sept 20: 10 day recirculation of unchanged draft
3. September meeting (Warsaw) – approve report to EC for forwarding to RevCom
4. Sept 10: TGai and TGah can begin to make any changes required based on TGmc changes (in September meeting)
5. October 4th: EC teleconference approval – requests for unconditional approval for TGmc, TGah, TGai

6. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to agenda
	1. **Editor Report 11-13/95r34** Adrian STEPHENS (Self)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-34-000m-editor-reports.pptx>
		2. Thanks to those that helped with the review
		3. BIG THANK YOU to Edward AU and Emily QI as sub-Editors
		4. Review the current status of the comments and numbers assigned to comment groups
	2. **Comment Resolution:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-60-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
		2. CID 9004
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Change is correct and the comment is in scope.
			3. Discussion of the validity of the comment
			4. Question on if the publication editor could make the change?
				1. While obvious to those of us on the call, the Publication Editor is not likely to make the change
			5. Ramification of any change to D7.0?
				1. Stated plan of record is to try to publish D7.0
				2. We could do a D8,and then do two recirc ballots
				3. TGai and TGah are updating their drafts to D7.0, if we produce D8.0, we may cause TGai another recirc. Which could push TGai and TGah to March 2017.
				4. Discussion on the current TGai status – plan is to start next Recirc on Monday to process comments for Sept mtg.
				5. 4th Oct is Submission Deadline for Revcom
				6. There are 3 comments in the “New Comment Category” and 7 in the Valid Pile-on Comments in the published file –

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-60-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>

One objection to some of the classifications

* + 1. Review other New Comments CID 9017 and CID 9031
			1. Note that 9031 is a pile-on to 8325 rather than 8324.
			2. Discussion on the scope nature of CID 9031.
			3. Consistency as the heart of the CID, but 8325 was to make IGTKData consistent.
			4. Support for Validity of the scope of the comment. There were changes that were made in 8325 and 8324 and so this is valid to ask for similar change.
			5. This specific change would not impact TGai
		2. CID 9001
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is a pile-on to CID 6225
			3. This is an error in resolving the old CID
			4. This not part of the No Vote
			5. This would not impact TGai specifically
		3. CID 9014
			1. Review Comment
			2. The commenter is probably correct. But, I don't see any changes related to CCMP-128 in D7.0. Comment 6285 makes a similar change for GCMP.
			3. This is in a table that can identify the size.
			4. Not part of No vote
			5. Suggestion for Rejection as “-128” is not needed here due to this instance, there is only one choice, the ones that have the length have other options and do need the specific length
			6. This is a pile-on to 8005 which indicated that CCMP should include the length when a specific length is being noted.
			7. Technically this CID is correct as the name of the Cipher Suite, and there are 2 other locations that need to be changed at some time.
			8. Let’s mark this as easy to do, and move on to look at other comments
		4. CID 9015
			1. Review comment
			2. This is technically correct
			3. Comment 6285 makes a similar change for GCMP.
			4. Easy to do, move on.
		5. CID 9030
			1. Review comment
			2. The change is executable, as it is just adding a note.
			3. This is a pile-on for 8150, which rejected adding a note.
			4. A proposed rejection has been prepared
		6. CID 9032
			1. Review comment
			2. Marked as a Valid Pile-on to CID 8202 which rejected the comment for lack of consensus.
			3. Suggestion that we discuss the comment again, and we may come to the same conclusion of no consensus for the change.
			4. We would have to have the discussion to know for sure.
		7. CID 9033
			1. Review Comment
			2. Marked as a valid pile-on to CID 8222 (r0-222) which rejected a slightly different change.
			3. This CID is to make the EstimatedThroughputInbound ambiguous
			4. (r0-222) is the external Comment ID number in the IEEE-SA Sponsor Ballot database.
			5. Do not wish to make a change was stated.
			6. As Noted, this has a technical issue that the inbound and outbound is not the same. This needs to be corrected.
			7. This is a pile-on comment, so it is in scope in this case.
			8. More discussion will be needed on this one.
		8. CID 9038
			1. Review comment
			2. Marked as a Pile on to comment 8269 (r0-269) which rejected adding a note.
			3. This CID adds parenthetical information this time.
		9. About 5 of the 10 comments have small changes that could be made.
			1. If we are going to reject, then we should look at the possible reject reasons
		10. CID 9038
			1. Discussion on the importance of the need for the change or to reject.
			2. 3GPP happened to be discussing this today in their meeting, but we should not try to fix one little point at a time, and we need to fix the full feature in REVmd after 3GPP has a final resolution.
			3. If it is broken we should remove or deprecate it.
			4. Straw Poll
1. Accept the comment
2. Reject the comment
	* + - 1. Results 1 – 9 – No consensus for the change
			1. Proposed Resolution will be prepared.
			2. Proposed Resolution: The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A Straw poll to accept the comment failed 1-9.
			3. Mark Ready for motion – rejected
		1. CID 9033
			1. Review the notes from the previous discussion
			2. Discussion :
				1. There is an assertion that the inbound equation is incorrect.
				2. The timing of fixing somethings have very little benefit, not need to fix now.
				3. Annex R is informative, and so no need to make change now.
				4. While this is an informative subclause, there is a normative statement that cites this, but it was debated if this needed to be fixed at this time.
			3. Straw Poll
3. Accept the comment
4. Reject the comment
	* + - 1. Results 1 – 10 – No consensus for the change
			1. Proposed Resolution will be prepared.
			2. Proposed Resolution: The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A Straw poll to accept the comment failed 1-10.
			3. Mark Ready for motion – rejected
		1. CID 9032
			1. Review previous concerns (shared in chat window):
			2. Chat window text:

- WFA's WMM Spec (a parallel spec) divergence is a concern - Concern with doing a change that would result in complex implementation. - Reassociation is recognized as a good (sometimes the only) way to renegotiate some aspects of the association's U-APSD state. - The commenter's point about the combination of TS Info Ack Policy and TSs may have validity, but it is more complicated, as other ack policy TSs should not be affected by reassocation to the same AP. - The proposed solution makes a broader change than needed. - Would potentially cause more interoperability issues.

* + - 1. Discussion on the difference of opinion of the points cited.
			2. From the Adhoc notes in 11-15/532r61:

EDITOR: 2016-08-23 08:53:36Z - This is a pile-on to comment 8202 (r02-202), which stated:

" Are TSPECs preserved across reassociation to the same AP? What if e.g. the TS Info Ack Policy is Block Ack (since the BA agreements have been reset)? Although the list in 11.3.5.4 does not discuss this, my recollection is that reassociation to the same AP preserves TSes, so then you'd be left with a TS with BA policy without a BA agreement. My memory might be broken, since 1649.51 says "All TSPECs that have been set up shall be deleted upon disassociation and reassociation." (but this contradicts 1651.48's "A non-AP and non-PCP STA that associates, disassociates or reassociates (except for reassociation to the

same AP) shall locally delete all existing allocations and all TSs that have been established using a PTP

TSPEC.") "

With resolution: “Add TSPECs to the list of things that are destroyed on reassociation to the same AP”

This new comment has the same comment, but an alternative change, which preserves TSPECs on reassociation to the same AP.

The earlier comment was rejected with reason: " REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-24 20:27:01Z): The CRC could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comment.

Straw polls held:

July 21st Straw Poll:

A) Continue to work on the CID

 B) Reject the CID – and not make a change

 Results: 0-5-11 "

 July 26th Straw Poll:

a) Make the change

b) Reject the CID – could not come to consensus

c) Abstain

 Results: 1-11-10 – Direction is for reject as could not come to consensus

Concerns raised during discussion:

 - WFA's WMM Spec (a parallel spec) divergence is a concern

 - Concern with doing a change that would result in complex implementation.

 - Reassociation is recognized as a good (sometimes the only) way to renegotiate some aspects of the association's U-APSD state.

 - The commenter's point about the combination of TS Info Ack Policy and TSs may have validity, but it is more complicated, as other ack policy TSs should not be affected by reassocation to the same AP.

 - The proposed solution makes a broader change than needed.

 - Would potentially cause more interoperability issues.

* + - 1. That is the approved resolution for CID 8202, not a proposed...
			2. Discussion on the need to make the change or not.
			3. If we do make any changes to this draft, then the scope of the changes would be small and we could start a ballot early next week, but the impact is on TGai and on TGah which could cause a 3 month slip.
			4. Review potential schedule issues.
				1. MC goes out on Aug 30 and Interim we finish is we have No comments, or if we do use the interim to reject and send out final recirc.
				2. TGai would have a trivial change to the text, but we could not guarantee the changes can be made to avoid a delay.
				3. Concern with TGai timelines is the main issue. TGah is waiting on availability of TGai and REVmc and has same timing issue as TGai
				4. We need to be more careful on any changes.
			5. This CID has the most risk to the change.
			6. Review the proposed changes in 11.3.5.4.
			7. The changes were marked up to see what the change would look like.
				1. Question on “TSes” correct?
				2. It should be “TSs”
				3. Periods are not a concern – neither insertion should have one.
				4. Discussion on the use of reassocitaion vs association.
				5. Discussion on if this was a correct change.
			8. Concern that the existing text is not clear when reassociation to a different AP, so this subbullet c does not clearly identify what happens if the case of the different AP.
			9. The AdHoc Notes do not completely capture all the
			10. Straw Poll:
1. Make the revised Changes as shown above
2. Reject the change
3. Abstain
	* + - 1. Results: 1-7-3 – proceed with reject
				2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-26 15:44:21Z) - The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A straw poll to accept the comment failed 1,7,3
				3. Mark ready for motion as reject
		1. CID 9030
			1. Discussion on the importance of making the change
			2. Adding a Note to reassure the text is not necessarily needed.
			3. Discussion on the value of a note vs having a change to the normative text.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 09:22:36Z) - The cited text is correct, and the proposed added NOTE is unnecessary.
			5. Straw Poll: Make the revised Changes as shown above
4. Reject the comment as shown
5. Do not reject the comment as shown
	* + 1. Results: 8-1 – preference is to reject
			2. Mark ready for motion – proceed with Reject.
		1. CID 9014 and CID 9015
			1. Both CIDs are similar in nature
			2. Concern that we missed one location that is similar to CID 9014
				1. Location p2035.49 – needs CCMP-128 also
			3. CID 9014: Proposed Resolution: Make change as specified and at 2035.49 change "CCMP" to "CCMP-128"
			4. CID 9015: Proposed Resolution: Accept
			5. Straw Poll:
6. Revise 9014 (as shown above) and Accept 9015
7. Reject both 9014 and 9015
8. abstain
	* + 1. Results: 4-3-2 – proceed with Revise and Accept
			2. Mark as Revised and Accept
		1. CID 9001
			1. Review comment
			2. Review 11-16/1068r0
			3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1068-00-000m-fix-to-cid-6225-resolution.docx>
			4. Two numbers need to change – 1208 to 128 and 120 to 128.
			5. Straw poll:
9. Accept the change
10. Reject the comment
11. abstain
	* + 1. Results: 6-2-1 – proceed to Accept
			2. Mark ready for motion - Accepted
		1. CID 9031
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on possible scope issue – note it is not part of a No Vote.
			3. Straw Poll:
12. Accept the comment
13. Reject the comment
14. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 3-3-3 - no consensus
			2. Chair indicates we will reject without consensus
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-26 16:05:19Z) - The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A straw poll to accept the comment failed 3,3,3.
			4. Mark ready for motion
		1. CID 9017
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the importance of making the change.
			3. The parenthetical change would be made in several locations in the subclause.
			4. Question of if this was used in other locations?
				1. No this is the only location with this type language.
			5. Discussion on the possible rejection reasons.
			6. Straw Poll:
15. Accept the comment
16. Reject the comment
17. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 1-6-2 – proceed with preparing reject
			2. Discussion the proposed rejection resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 09:16:50Z) - The interpretation of the cited text is unambiguous. ATIM window applies only to IBSS STAs, and Awake Window applies only to non-IBSS DMG STAs. It is not necessary to state this here.
			4. Discussion on when the “ATIM window” or “Awake Window” applies.
				1. Discussion on if the text is ambiguous or not.
			5. There was debate on the technical rationale for the reject, so the Chair asked that we move to the Procedural reject reason.
			6. Updated Proposed Resolution: REJECTED - The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A straw poll to accept the comment failed 1-6-2.
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 9004
			1. Review comment
			2. Simple change –
			3. Straw Poll:
18. Accept
19. Reject
20. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 6-2-1 – proceed with Accept
			2. Mark Ready for motion – Accepted
	1. **Review Comments to pass to Publication Editor**
		1. CID 9006, 9007, 9008, 9009, 9012, 9013, 9018, 9022
		2. Question on if these could just be marked Accept.
		3. Straw Poll:
21. Accept resolution of “Pass to Publication Editor” tab as shown
22. Do not accept the proposed resolution as shown
23. Abstain
	* 1. Results: 5-0-4 – proceed with proposed resolutions as noted in 11-15/532r61 “Pass to publication Editor”
		2. Mark ready for Motion
	1. **Review Comments on “Reiteration” Tab – 11-15/532r61**
		1. CID 9035
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 08:37:32Z) - The definition of PPDU\_Dur and its application in this subclause is not incorrect.
			3. Discussion on the specific changes being proposed in the comment.
			4. This is a small change, and we should not change in this subclause that may have need of more changes
			5. Motion to extend the call for 30 Minutes:
				1. Moved Adrian STPEHENS; 2nd Jouni MALININ
				2. Results: 6-0-3 – Motion Passes – the call time will be extended to 1:30pm
			6. While this is a small change, there are other CIDs that address the other issues in the subclause.
			7. Straw Poll:
24. Accept the Comment
25. Reject the Comment
26. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 1-7-1 – Proceed with rejection
			2. Discussion of the Rational for Rejection
			3. We will have a motion on this CID’s proposed resolution later.
			4. Mark ready for motion
		1. CID 9039
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution:

REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 08:28:55Z) - This is a reiteration of comment 8317 (r02-317), which stated: “We don't define <PHY> STA for any other PHY. This was raised as CID 7522 and rejected on the basis that "DMG as a qualifier applies to more than just the PHY. It is defined by reference to the frequencies it operates in, but that does not limit the qualifier only to the PHY layer." But this rejection makes no sense: VHT as a qualifier applies to more than just the PHY too. Still, we don't have a definition for "VHT STA" "with proposed change: " Delete the definition of DMG STA (and also DMG AP and maybe DMG BSS) "

The resolution approved to comment 8317 was:

" REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-28 00:09:30Z) - The cited definition is correct. The CRC had no consensus to make any change to address the questions raised by the comment. A straw poll to make the proposed change failed 1/14/4. "

The CRC reaffirms its rejection of this comment with rationale: "The cited definition is correct".

* + - 1. Discussion on use of “dot11SupportedMCS” in the draft.
			2. Request to get a count for the “CRC reaffirms” claim.
			3. Assertion that the resolution is not accurate.
			4. Straw Poll: Reject comment with the reason shown:
1. Yes
2. No
3. Abstain
	* + 1. Result: 1-5-3 – will not reject with the reason proposed.
			2. Straw Poll:
4. Accept the comment
5. Reject the comment
6. Abstain
	* + 1. Result: 1-6-2 need to proceed with reject
			2. Updated Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-26 16:45:11Z) - The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A straw poll to accept the comment failed 1,6,2.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 9040
			1. Review Comment and proposed Resolution
			2. Discussion on if this is clear or ambiguous?
			3. Proposed Resolution:

REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 09:07:37Z) - This is a reiteration of comment CID 8131 (r02-131), which states:

" There are 3 instances of " transmission of an A-MPDU or frame in" on this page, but this is the usual layering confusion: an A-MPDU contains frames (a.k.a. MPDUs); it is not at the same level "

with proposed change:

" Change the instance at line 33 to "transmission of a PSDU of length less than or equal to dot11RTSThreshold fails, regardless of the presence or value of the DEI field in the frame(s) in that PSDU".

Change the instance at line 50 to "transmission of a PSDU of length greater than or equal to dot11RTSThreshold fails, regardless of the presence or value of the DEI field in the frame(s) in that PSDU".

Change the instance at line 36 to "transmission of a frame in which the HT variant HT Control field is present, the DEI field is equal to 1 and the length of the PSDU that contains the frame is less than or equal to dot11RTSThreshold fails". "

This was resolved with: " REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-26 23:37:22Z): Depending on PHY capabilities, a PSDU can hold either a frame or an A-MPDU, the text at the cited location " … of an A-MPDU or frame in a PSDU of length …" is correct. There is no layering violation in this case, because the PSDU can transport objects from different layers. "

The CRC reaffirms this rejection with the same rationale. 7-0-2

* + - 1. Straw Poll: Reject the comment as proposed
1. Yes
2. No
3. Abstain
	* + 1. Results 7-0-2 – keep proposed resolution as proposed adding the results.
			2. Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 9047
			1. Review comment and Proposed Resolution:
			2. Proposed Resolution:

REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 08:28:26Z) - This is a reiteration of comment 8317 (r02-317), which stated: " We don't define <PHY> STA for any other PHY. This was raised as CID 7522 and rejected on the basis that "DMG as a qualifier applies to more than just the PHY. It is defined by reference to the frequencies it operates in, but that does not limit the qualifier only to the PHY layer." But this rejection makes no sense: VHT as a qualifier applies to more than just the PHY too. Still, we don't have a definition for "VHT STA" "with proposed change: " Delete the definition of DMG STA (and also DMG AP and maybe DMG BSS) "

The resolution approved to comment 8317 was:" REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-28 00:09:30Z) - The cited definition is correct. The CRC had no consensus to make any change to address the questions raised by the comment. A straw poll to make the proposed change failed 1/14/4. "

The CRC reaffirms its rejection of this comment with rationale: "The cited definition is correct". 6-1-2

* + - 1. The comment was brought back because it is more specific this time.
			2. Straw Poll: Reject the comment as proposed
1. Yes
2. No
3. Abstain
	* + 1. Results 6-1-2 – keep proposed resolution as proposed adding the results.
			2. Mark Ready for Motion with Reject resolution with vote added.
		1. CID 9048
			1. Review Comment and Proposed resolution.
			2. Straw Poll: Reject Comment as shown
4. Yes
5. No
6. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 7-1-1 proceed with proposed Resolution.
			2. Proposed Resolution:

REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-23 08:28:55Z) - This is a reiteration of comment 8317 (r02-317), which stated: “We don't define <PHY> STA for any other PHY. This was raised as CID 7522 and rejected on the basis that "DMG as a qualifier applies to more than just the PHY. It is defined by reference to the frequencies it operates in, but that does not limit the qualifier only to the PHY layer." But this rejection makes no sense: VHT as a qualifier applies to more than just the PHY too. Still, we don't have a definition for "VHT STA" " with proposed change: “Delete the definition of DMG STA (and also DMG AP and maybe DMG BSS) "

The resolution approved to comment 8317 was:" REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-07-28 00:09:30Z) - The cited definition is correct. The CRC had no consensus to make any change to address the questions raised by the comment. A straw poll to make the proposed change failed 1/14/4. "

The CRC reaffirms its rejection of this comment with rationale: "The cited definition is correct". 7-1-1

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review of “Reiteration of Invalid Comment” tab**
		1. There are 9 of them CID 9034, 9036, 9037, 9041, 9042, 9043, 9044, 9045, 9046
		2. Discussion on the classification of the 9 CIDs.
		3. These Pile-on comments were all rejected previously as “having been determined to be invalid, the cited comment cannot act as a valid target of a pile-on /reiteration.
		4. Discuss CID 9034 as an example
			1. Disagreement with how the CID 8261 was handled.
		5. We will proceed with the rejections.
	2. **Review Scope Tab**
		1. Comments deemed out of Scope:
		2. CID 9002
			1. Review comment
			2. No objection
		3. CID 9005
			1. Review Comment
			2. Change Resolution to match the “Pass to Publication Editor” tab comments.
			3. Change comment group to “Pass to Publication Editor”
			4. Remove from Scope tab.
			5. Mark Ready for motion
		4. CID 9010
			1. Review comment
			2. Review if change is in scope.
			3. Not deemed in scope.
		5. CID 9011
			1. Review comment
			2. No Objection
		6. CID 9016
			1. Review Comment
			2. Related to Cipher Suite selection
			3. Straw Poll:
1. Accept the Change
2. Reject the Change
3. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 1-2-4 – Proceed with the Rejection reason of no consensus
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-26 17:12:19Z) - The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A straw poll to accept the comment failed 1,2,4.
			3. Mark ready for Motion and move to “Valid Pile-on” tab.
		1. CID 9024
			1. Review comment
			2. This is a pile-on to CID 8176
			3. Straw Poll:
4. Accept the comment
5. Reject the comment
6. Abstain
	* + 1. Result: 0-3-3 – Proceed with Reject – Non-Consensus
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (EDITOR: 2016-08-26 17:17:00Z) - The CRC discussed the comment and could not come to consensus on changes that would address the comment. A straw poll to accept the comment failed 0,3,3.
			3. One objection to the processing of this comment – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. **Motion to extend the time by 30 Minutes**
			1. Moved Adrian STEPHENS 2nd: Jon Rosdahl
			2. **Results:** 5-1-0 motion passes
		2. CID 9025
			1. Review comment
			2. This is a pile-on to CID 8175 and 8176
			3. The Previously proposed resolution is not valid (it is in scope).
			4. Review proposed change:
			5. Discussion on the proposed change and if it was needed.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The cited text is not incorrect.
			7. Straw Poll:
7. Accept the Comment
8. Reject the Comment with the reason “ the cited text is not incorrect”
9. Abstain
	* + 1. Results: 1-6-0 – Reject as shown
			2. Mark ready for Motion and move to “Valid Pile-on” tab
		1. CID 9029
			1. Review comment
			2. Different table being cited from previous comments
			3. Time was allowed for the commenter to search for what was thought to be the relevant citation or relevant CID.
			4. No connection was found.
			5. Proceed with the unchanged Rejection for CID 9029
	1. **Check that all CIDs have a resolution**
		1. Upload of 11-15/532r62
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-62-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
			2. Note one error: CID 9017 should be marked as a reject.
			3. Question on 9046? – it is an “Reiteration of Invalid Comment”
		2. Upload of the Agenda Doc 11-16/1131r1
		3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-1113-01-000m-tgmc-brc-august-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>
	2. **Motions:**
		1. The chair had prepared Motions for each of the separate Tabs.
		2. Request to have a single motion on the “SB3” tab.
		3. **Motion #279** Motion to accept SB3 Resolutions:

Approve the comment resolutions on the following Tab: “SB3” in 11-15/532r62 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-62-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>> and mark CID 9017 as Rejected and leaving the resolution reason unchanged.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL 2nd: Jouni MALINEN
			2. Discussion: None
			3. Results: 6-1-0 **Motion #279 Passes**
		1. **Motion #280 (Recirculation)**
* **Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the recirculation Sponsor Ballot on P802.11REVmc D7.0 as contained in document 11-15-0532r62 <**<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-62-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>
* **Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 8.0 incorporating these resolutions and**
* **Approve a 10 day Sponsor Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11REVmc D8.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”**
	+ - 1. Moved: Jouni MALINEN 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
			2. Discussion: None
			3. Results: 6-0-1 **Motion #280 Passes**
	1. **AOB: Schedule**
1. On or before Sept 9: Complete comment resolution (goal unchanged draft)
2. Sept 10 to Sept 20: 10 day recirculation of unchanged draft
3. September meeting (Warsaw) – approve report to EC for forwarding to RevCom
4. Sept 10: TGai and TGah can begin to make any changes required based on TGmc changes (in September meeting)
5. October 4th: EC teleconference approval – requests for unconditional approval for TGmc, TGah, TGai
	1. Editor recap
		1. Making the updates are very trivial, but the updated draft should be ready on Monday Morning, then we need to have some fast review of the changes on Monday to ensure we have it right, and then start the Recirculation ballot on Monday.
		2. Jouni will review 9014 and 9015 – Dorothy will review 9001 and 9004 -
		3. Recirc should be able to start on Monday
		4. Dorothy to alert Kathrine Bennet (IEEE-SA) to be prepared.
		5. TGai should delay their ballot to include the D8.0 draft.
	2. We will cancel the Telecon for Sept 2nd.
	3. Plan to be complete by Sept 14 Wednesday of the Face to Face week.
	4. Adjourned 1:58pm
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