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Abstract

This document provides proposed resolutions to CID 6901 and CID 7690, Both CIDs are related to the dominance issue in 11ax discussed at the 802.11 WG and the 802 EC and the the related remedy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Claue.**  **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** | **Owning Ad-hoc** |
| 6901 | 1.01 | The IEEE 802 Executive Committee has determined that the proceedings of Task Group ax were impacted by dominance by the 'DensiFi' group of companies. Since Draft 1.0 was largely developed and was completed and approved, while DensiFi was still in existence, the integrity of the draft as a whole must be considered severely compromised by the adjudged dominant behavior. While changes may now be made, the burden is on those who want to propose changes to get a 75% majority to do so. It would be better to require 75% to approve the various constituent elements of draft 1.0 affirmatively. This can be accomplished relatively easily by deleting the entire draft, and by considering motions to reapprove it feature by or section by section This might not take long if organized efficiently, and it would greatly add to the prospects for successful deployment of the technology by demonstrating broad industry consensus around the features that receive reapproval. Note: it isn't at all the same thing to rely on the various votes that will be necessary later to approve the draft \*as a whole\*: in practice virtually nobody considers these as up-or-down votes on individual features. | Delete the entire draft. (Reconsider the constituent elements feature by feature or section by section.) | Rejected.  The commentor is true in referring to the result of the dominance investigation in IEEE 802.11 (11-16/1519r0). At the same time the commentor fails to mention the penalty and the remedy proposed by the IEEE 802 EC which resulted in the disbanding of Densifi group. The remedy was outlined in doc (ec-16/0186r2)  Additionally the remedy was further approved by the IEEE- SASB and it will continue to monitor the progress of 11ax to ensure the IEEE-SA values and recommendations are adhered to.  The IEEE-SASB statement at the end of its March meeting; “*In regards to P802.11ax, the SASB concluded that the measures are effective, SASB oversight will continue, and notes that a ProCom Ad Hoc was formed to determine whether changes are needed in IEEE-SA policies and procedures regarding dominance”* | EDITOR |
| 7690 |  | The current amendment to the standard has been produced by a process which was subject to dominance.  Technical content contained in the draft has been produced by an interest group external to IEEE 802.11. Produced technical content has been voted into the draft under a process which was subject to "dominance" as concluded by the IEEE 802.11 / EC investigation.  Technical content requires a 75% approval to be included in the draft. Several votes conducted to include technical submissions in the draft were conducted while the process was dominated by members of the external interest group. Even though companies having had participated in the interest group have declared that they would no longer participate in the interest group, the established state is that the technical content of the draft was (partially) created while companies dominated the process agreed moving technical content into the draft.  As all companies that participated in the dominated process have by now declared that they will no longer participate in the special interest group, and as such are no longer subject to special measures, i.e. counting the vote of all members affiliated by one company as a single vote, it is impossible for member of 802.11 that were not part of the special interest group, to exclude / take out any technical contents that was approved under the process subject to dominance as it would require 75% approval vote which is unlikely to occur as all members affiliated by companies that dominated the process have again their individual voting rights.  Abondoning the special interest group that dominated the process in order to avoid that all votes of members of the same company are counted as one vote solved the problem of having an external group considered as dominating the process. Still, the result of this work -- as conducted under dominance -- is still in place and given the time the special measures taken agains the companies dominating the process, did not prevent that a draft was created which has technical contents subject to votes being taking under dominance.  Up to today, not a single vote that confirmed the technical contest of the existing draft, and that is subject to the special measures, has been taken in order to verify that the technical contents of the draft is agreed on by the task group while dominance was ruled out by applying special measures.  Even though the interest group has been dissolved and all members affiliated with a company participating in the interest group for which companies declared to stop participation | Apply the special measures to all subsequent votes on the TGax amendment; especially the working group voter pool and any subsequent voter pools should be subject to special measures. | Rejected.  The commentor is true in referring to the result of the dominance investigation in IEEE 802.11 (11-16/1519r0). At the same time the commentor fails to mention the penalty and the remedy proposed by the IEEE 802 EC which resulted in the disbanding of Densifi group. The remedy was outlined in doc (ec-16/0186r2)  Additionally the remedy was further approved by the IEEE- SASB and it will continue to monitor the progress of 11ax to ensure the IEEE-SA values and recommendations are adhered to.  The IEEE-SASB statement at the end of its March meeting; “*In regards to P802.11ax, the SASB concluded that the measures are effective, SASB oversight will continue, and notes that a ProCom Ad Hoc was formed to determine whether changes are needed in IEEE-SA policies and procedures regarding dominance”*  The SASB didn’t require to apply any special measure other than the one taken by the 802 EC. | EDITOR |
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