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Abstract

Minutes for TGmd – REVmd project – task group meetings during the 2017 November IEEE 802 Plenary at the Caribe Hotel in Orlando, FL, November 6-9, 2017

1. **Monday PM1: TGmd meeting in Orlando, FL 13:30-15:30 ET – 2017-11-06**
	1. **Called to order** at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. Review agenda: 11-17/1556r1
	4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1556-01-000m-november-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx>
		1. Updates to the agenda were made an included in 11-17/1556r2
	5. **Motion O#1** to approve agenda
		1. Move Dan HARKINS, 2nd: Emily QI
		2. Results: Motion approved by unanimous consent
	6. Review Current TGmd Schedule
		1. Slide 16
		2. 
	7. Editor Report – Emily QI
		1. 11-17/920r5
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-05-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>
		3. Thanks to those that are helping with the review of the draft.
		4. Draft: P802.11REVmd D0.4 in members area includes TGai and TGah and changes approved through Sept.
		5. Review CID status report



* + 1. Reviewed some of the details drilling into the report.
	1. **Review doc 11-17/987r9** Graham SMITH
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0987-09-000m-resolutions-for-dcf-and-edca-comments-d0-1.docx> >
		2. CID 163 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. See P1493.23 in D0.01
			4. Review the conditions for exceeding the TXOP limit.
			5. Discussion on how to describe handling the case of DL MU-MIMO.
			6. Discussion on how to resolve the issue.
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-06 19:20:59Z): At the cited location, insert ", only if it does not transmit a DL MU-MIMO PPDU in the TXOP," after "in the TXOP"
			8. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 255 (MAC)
			1. This was done, but not marked green in the document.
			2. Now marked green in R10 of the document.
		4. CID 282 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review 3 options for changes
			3. Discussion on the use of SRC (Short Retry Counter) and LRC (Long Retry Counter).
			4. QSRC case not addressed in this proposal. 10.22.2.11
			5. Also, QSDRC that needs to be added as well.
			6. More work will need to be done.
		5. CID 294 (MAC) and CID 189 (MAC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Need to be careful of use of Counter and Count. Instead of set count to random number, it should be initializing the counter to a random count and decrement the counter until the count is zero.
			4. Discussion on when backoff counters are decremented.
			5. Review each change to identify the proper use of count and counter.
			6. “BackoffTime =Random()” seemed a bit strange. Given the other changes. Support changing the text
			7. Proposed resolution: CID 294 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-06 20:02:53Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-17/987r10, which clarifies the text identified in the comment.
			8. Proposed resolution: CID 189 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-06 20:04:50Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-17/987r10, which clarifies the text identified in the comment in the direction suggested by the commenter.
			9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Mark HAMILTON CIDs**
		1. CID 301 (MAC)
			1. Review comment and context see page 240.31
			2. Discussion on how to move the paragraph at 240.31 to replace the sentence at 240.14.
			3. Then do we want to do something similar to clause 11.33. or refer to 4.9.4.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 301 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-06 20:16:49Z): Move the paragraph at P240.30 to replace the paragraph at P240.24.

After the first occurrence of "FST session" in 11.33 (P2000.46), add "(see 4.9.4)".

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. Discussion on Annex G history
			1. It took a long time to remove SDLs
			2. We could just mark Annex G as Obsolete.
	1. **Recess at 3:20pm**
1. **Tuesday PM1:** **TGmd meeting in Orlando, FL 13:30-15:30 ET – 2017-11-07**
	1. **Called to order** at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. Reminder about the Patent Policy
	3. **Review Agenda** from 11-17/1556r3
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1556-03-000m-november-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1556-03-000m-november-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx%20)
		2. Tuesday PM1

11-17-1602 – Dan HARKINS

11-17-1606- Nehru BHANDARU

Make features obsolete CIDs 174, 197, 198

Remove obsolete features –

* **CID 60, 66, 67 in 11-17-989**
	+ CID 60 PCO Phased co-existence operation – Motion prepared
	+ CID 66 Strictly Ordered Service Class – Motion prepared
	+ CID 67 L-SIG TXOP protection mechanism
* **CIDs 57, 58, 61, 70 in 11-17-1137 – text prepared, pending review**
	+ CID 57 BlockAckReq
	+ CID 58 Basic BlockAck variant
	+ CID 61 Non-HT block ack
	+ CID 70 HT-delayed block ack
* **CIDs 59 and 62 in 11-17-1518 – text prepared, pending review**
	+ CID 59 DLS
	+ CID 58 STSL
* **CID 63 in 11-17-1504 – text prepared; assess group direction**
	+ CID 63 Pre-RSNA methods
* **CID 65 in 11-17-1519 – text prepared, pending review**
	+ CID 65 PCF
* **CID 69 in 11-17-1520– text prepared, pending review**
	+ CID 69 RIFS
* **CID 72 in 11-17-1261 – text prepared**
	+ CID 70 Annex G
* **CID 282 in 11-17-987** – Graham SMITH
	+ 1. No changes – approve agenda without objection
	1. **Review submission 11-17/1602r2** Dan HARKINS
		1. **<** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1602-02-000m-nonce-reuse-prevention.docx>**>**
		2. Presentation of Submission
		3. Question on if this is all the different handshakes? Yes, where set keys are used.
		4. The state machines are robust, and in the presence of the attack, we see that they were able to recover from the attack.
		5. Question on if the reply counter could advance in some recovery? Setkeys counters would not advance without the use of them.
		6. The Krack researcher did indicate that the proposed changes would alleviate the problem, but a change to the state machines to avoid calling setkeys multiple times in the presence of an attack.
		7. There was an email received that lists out some possible issues with the Krack paper, and that email will be discussed on a following Telecon.
		8. Note that there is a “Transmitted”, that should be a “Transmitter” – an R3 will be generated to fix that.
		9. Discussion on the incrementing of the counters for Replay detection.
		10. An R3 will be created and a motion for consideration will be made on Wednesday.
	2. **Review submission 11-17-1606-** Nehru BHANDARU
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1606-03-000m-defense-against-multi-channel-mitm.pptx>>
		2. Presentation of Submission
		3. Discussion on how to address the Man in the Middle attack concerns noted in the submission.
			1. Several ideas discussed, but a submission for the explicit changes would be needed.
		4. Currently the 4-way handshake is not vulnerable to the Man in the Middle attack, and adding the channel information may complicate things unnecessarily.
			1. We should do something to address the concerns, but how complex the change to be would need to be resolved with a submission.
		5. Straw polls:
1. 802.11 specification should define a mechanism to protect against multi-channel MITM
	1. Y: 20 N:1 A:11
2. RSNE should advertise operating channel validation capability and policy
	1. Validation (Capability indication): 3
	2. Required or not required (Policy): 0
	3. None – (no advertisement needed): 0
	4. Abstain: 28
3. Operating channel information should be included and MIC protected in RSN key exchanges - Pairwise and Group Key handshakes
	1. Y: 5 N: 0 A:30
4. Operating channel information should consist of one of
	1. Country, Operating Class and Channel(s): 2
	2. Hash of Operating Channel Information: 2
	3. Other:1
	4. Abstain: 29
	5. **Make features obsolete CIDs 174, 197, 198**
		1. A Request was sent out on the reflector for comment on these CIDs for making these features obsolete.
		2. Response was received to request not making the coverage class obsolete.
		3. CID 174 (MAC)
			1. Doc 11-17/1745r0 – Peter ECCLSINE
			2. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1745-00-000m-cc25-cid-174-comment-resolution.docx>>
			3. Explanation of the history of the coverage class
			4. Will bring back on Wednesday pm2 for final discussion.
		4. CID 197 (MAC)
			1. Quite Channel Elements in IBSSen
			2. The problem is in the implementation of this feature. The principle sounds good.
			3. The issue is that this does not work as described, so if this is not implemented as described, then we should remove it, or fix it to match the implementation.
			4. Request to have those with implementation give notice.
			5. We can mark as submission required.
			6. This may be needed in a radar band.
			7. Prior to removal we would need to make sure that that there were no implementation.
		5. CID 198 (MAC)
			1. Quiet Channel Elements in MBSSen
			2. For this one, we have the same question.
			3. Mark this as submission required.
			4. 11.9.3 is quieting channels for testing and is for the DFS and we do quiet channels for TGk as well.
			5. Note the reference in the comment may not be correct.
			6. MAC Adhoc note: CIDs 197, 198 (MAC): Submission Required. Need a real decision by the TG.
	6. **CID 60, 66, 67 in 11-17-989**
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-06-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx>>
		2. CID 60 PCO Phased co-existence operation – Motion prepared
		3. CID 66 Strictly Ordered Service Class – Motion prepared
		4. CID 67 L-SIG TXOP protection mechanism
			1. These had an update of a couple missed instances.
		5. Question to the group on deleting the three features – no objection
		6. Motion for the three CIDs will be prepared for Wednesday PM1
	7. **CIDs 57, 58, 61, 70 in 11-17-1137 – text prepared, pending review**
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1137-03-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-blockack.docx>>
		2. CID 57 BlockAckReq
		3. CID 58 Basic BlockAck variant
		4. CID 61 Non-HT block ack
		5. CID 70 HT-delayed block ack
		6. Status of Review – not complete – estimate to be done by Thursday
		7. Reminder that all motions will take place during Plenary and interims.
		8. Request to see if there was any objection to the removal of these 4 items?
			1. No objections
		9. Question on the deletion of “Basic BlockAckReq” by just deleting “Basic”, we may have not have removed the full feature.
		10. We may have an issue with this feature and need more work on CID 58.
		11. The Document is in review and we will not take action this week.
	8. **CIDs 59 and 62 in 11-17-1518 – text prepared, pending review**
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1518-01-000m-resolution-cids-59-62-remove-dls-stsl.docx>>
		2. CID 59 DLS
		3. CID 58 STSL
		4. The direction of the group is to remove these features.
		5. Review scheduled to complete prior to the AdHoc and target the face to face adhoc in New Jersey for discussion.
	9. **CID 63 in 11-17-1504 – text prepared; assess group direction**
		1. **<**<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1504-02-000m-resolution-cid-63-remove-pre-rsna-security.docx>**>**
		2. CID 63 Pre-RSNA methods
		3. Review 11-17-1504 –
		4. This one gets complicated. Certified devices are not supposed to accept WEP connections, but we have a mixed mode WPA2/WPA mixed mode, then you have to do the group key using TKIP, but that would be hard because we still need TKIP. While this is the case, we cannot take TKIP out.
		5. So, a request has been made with certification locations to see if Mixed Mode can be removed.
		6. We need to probably wait on the market to determine the timing of removal.
		7. The need to make a decision by the close out in January, and so we could reject for now, and then bring it up at a later time if we feel it appropriate.
		8. We know that there known implementation of WEP and TKIP in the market. We should not remove at this time.
		9. Proposed Resolution: CID 63 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2017-11-07 20:09:31Z): There are known implementations of these features in the market, so we choose not to remove them at this time. The Group did not come to consensus on removal of these two features.
		10. Discussion on if there are implementations or not.
		11. Agreed to add a non-consensus sentence to the resolution.
		12. Mark Ready for Motion
	10. **CID 65 in 11-17-1519 – text prepared, pending review**
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1519-01-000m-resolution-cid-65-remove-pcf.docx>>
		2. CID 65 PCF
			1. Assign to Menzo
			2. Target January 2018
	11. **CID 69 in 11-17-1520– text prepared, pending review**
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1520-00-000m-resolution-cid-69-remove-rifs-for-non-dmg.docx>>
		2. CID 69 RIFS
			1. If there is disagreement with removal, let us know.
			2. There was a request to have it marked deprecated or obsolete.
			3. It is already marked obsolete.
			4. There are implementations with RIFS in the field, so we may want to encourage them not to use in new implementations, it is beneficial to keep in the standard for now.
			5. The discussion in Berlin was to remove RIFS, but the removal of features is a serious concern, and today there seems to be some sentiment to leave in but marked Obsolete.
			6. Straw Poll:
				1. If you believe we should remove RIFS?
				2. Yes -
				3. No – (leave in being marked obsolete)
				4. Result = 7 – 18
			7. Proposed resolution; Reject- The Group did not come to consensus to make the change.
			8. We should not have the terse proposed resolution.
			9. We should use the more verbose reason.
			10. We know that implementations are in the market place, and they are compliant with the older standards. The newer standards may not need the old material.
			11. Deprecated should be used rather than Obsolete as this indicates that it is not to be used or deleted yet.
			12. Using the previous resolution as a base, we should make this a revision, and mark this as deprecated as well.
			13. The use of RIFS in DMG would seem to be a limiting factor to deletion, and the definition
			14. StrawPoll:
				1. Keep Obsolete – no change
				2. Make Deprecated
				3. Remove RIFS for non-DMG
			15. AdHoc Notes: CID 69 (MAC): NOT AGREED...

Potential: resolution REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-07 20:23:39Z) - Change "obsolete, and support for such use might be subject to removal in a future revision of the standard." to "deprecated."

Note to commenter: There are known implementations of these features in the market, so we choose not to remove them at this time. The Group did not come to consensus on removal of these two features.

* + 1. Ran out of time
	1. **Recess at 3:30pm**
1. **Wednesday PM1: TGmd meeting in Orlando, FL 13:30-15:30 ET – 2017-11-08**
	1. **Called to order** at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
	3. Review agenda: 11-17/1556r4
		1. Approved without objection
	4. Motion O#2 – approve Prior TGmd Minutes

**Approve the minutes of**

TGmd September 2017 meeting, Waikoloa in 11-17/1505r1: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1505-01-000m-minutes-revmd-sept-2017-waikoloa.docx>>

* + 1. Moved: Edward AU, 2nd: Mike MONTEMURRO
		2. **Result O#2:** Unanimous – Motion Passes
	1. **Motion #14** - **Telecon and Waikoloa CIDs**
		1. Approve the comment resolutions on the

“Motion EDITOR-D” tab in 11-17/0956r7: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0956-07-000m-revmd-wg-cc25-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>>

"Motion EDITOR2 - C" in ​11-17/0929r5: <​<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0929-05-000m-revmd-editor2-comments.xlsx>>

“PHY Motion D” tab in 11-17/930r8: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0930-08-000m-revmd-cc25-phy-plus-comments.xls> >

“Motion MAC-F and Motion MAC-G” tabs in 11-18/0927r10: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-10-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>> except for CIDs 60 and 66, and changing the resolution to CID 37 as “Rejected”.

* + 1. Moved: Michael MONTUMURRO, 2nd: Emily QI
		2. Discussion:
			1. Question on PHY Comment timestamp – they were updated after the telecon last week.
			2. CID 37 the resolution should be rejected. – change the motion to note it.
		3. **Result Motion #14:** 14-0-5 Motion Passes
	1. **Motion #15** - **Remove Phased Coexistence Operation**
		1. Approve the comment resolution for

CID 60 in the “Motion MAC-G tab in11-17/0927r10: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-10-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>>

* + 1. Moved Chris Hansen, 2nd: Mark RISON
		2. No discussion
		3. **Result Motion #15:** 15-0-5 Motion Passes
	1. **Motion #16 – Remove Strictly Ordered service class**
		1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 66 in the “Motion MAC-G tab in 11-17/0927r10; <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-10-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>>
		2. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS, 2nd: Graham SMITH
		3. No Discussion:
		4. **Results of Motion #16:** 15-0-5 Motion Passes
	2. **Motion #17 - Remove L-SIG TXOP protection mechanism**
		1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 67 as

“Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-17/0989r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0989-06-000m-resolutions-for-obsolete-and-repace-comments-d0-1.docx> > under CID 67. These changes remove the L-SIG TXOP protection mechanism from the standard.”

* + 1. Moved: Graham SMITH 2nd: Mike MONTEMURRO
		2. No Discussion:
		3. **Results of Motion #17:** 14-0-6 Motion Passes
	1. **Motion #18 Motion – Approve “Editor Note” Comments as discussed on 2017-11-03 teleconference**
		1. Incorporate the text changes indicated in 11-17/1610r1; <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1610-01-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-s-notes-in-revmd-d0-4.doc>>
		2. Moved: Emily QI, 2nd: Edward AU
		3. No discussion
		4. **Result of Motion #18:** No objection to unanimous consent.
	2. **Motion #19 -Nonce reuse prevention**
		1. Incorporate the text changes indicated in 11-17/1602r3: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1602-03-000m-nonce-reuse-prevention.doc> >
		2. Moved: Menzo WENTINK, 2nd: Emily QI
		3. Discussion: none
		4. **Result of Motion #19**: 20-0-1 Motion passes
	3. **Review presentation 11-17/1724r0** – Chris HANSEN
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1724-00-000m-unsolicited-block-ack-extension.pptx>
		2. Abstract: This presentation describes a proposal for simplifying the establishment of Block ACK agreements. It has already been incorporated into 802.11ay Draft 0.8, but is applicable to other 802.11 devices as well**.**
		3. Presentation of submission
		4. Related to CID 3 (MAC)
		5. Questions:
			1. Has this been presented to TGax? – no may be good idea
			2. The clause numbers were based on the 802.11-2016, so if it is based on TGay, the section that is being suggested is not just TGay, it is a general section, so it should be ok. Other elements defined may be EDMG only STAs so we need to go back and check to see if it is already ok.
			3. This is probably not the right task group to do this as the other Task groups have their own Block ack process. Encourage to take to TGax
			4. Usefulness was questioned for other PHY types.
			5. It was noted that this could be applied to other STAs, but this would be defined if it was incorporated into the standard.
			6. There may be other features that could be indicated.
			7. Why another BlockAck method? – this one would be a good candidate for a default that did not require ADBBA.
			8. How can we be assured on the benefit of this new BlockAck Method?
				1. Would like to see simulation.
			9. There would be a capability bit and then have to request this to be used.
	4. **Review submission 11-17/1529r1**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1529-01-000m-forwarding-information.docx>
		2. CID 112 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion and proposed changes
			3. Updated document questions
				1. 14.15.10 There is not PREP element in Received PERR, -- it is a typo should be PERR.
			4. Also a typo on the word Information --
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-17/1529r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1529-02-000m-forwarding-information.docx>> which resolves the comment in the direction suggested by the commenter.
			6. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
	5. **Review document 11-17-1738r0** – Huizhao WANG
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1738-00-000m-setting-ccf0-for-20-40mhz-bss-bw.docx>>
		2. Abstract: This submission is to address the inconsistence of assigning CCF0 value when the BSS bandwidth is less than 80MHz in the Table 11-25.
		3. Review the inconsistency and the proposed change to make it clear.
		4. A motion to adopt will be prepared for Thursday.
	6. **Review document 11-17/1745r1** Peter ECCLSINE
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1745-01-000m-cc25-cid-174-comment-resolution.docx>
		2. CID 174
			1. Review Discussion
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED.We do not burden the standard with additional information in associate request that is unused outside of bands where Coverage Classes increase CSMA diameters. We are aware of products using Coverage Classes deployed in TV White Space bands, and do not agree to mark Coverage Classes as obsolete.
			3. Request to add a note to the Standard at P1482 L29 Incorporated into the resolution.
			4. Discussion to change direction of resolution. Determine a revised response.
			5. Motion #20 CID 174 Coverage Classes
				1. Resolve CID 174 as “REVISED, At 1482.54 insert “NOTE 3 – An AP using coverage classes that determines that an associating or associated STA does not support coverage classes might deny association to or disassociate that STA.  The mechanism by which the AP makes that determination is outside the scope of this standard.”

In response to the commenter: The request by the commenter to mark as obsolete is not adopted. We do not burden the standard with additional information in associate request that is unused outside of bands where Coverage Classes increase CSMA diameters. We are aware of products using Coverage Classes deployed in TV White Space bands, and do not agree to mark Coverage Classes as obsolete.”

* + - * 1. Moved: Peter ECCLESINE Seconded: Mark RISON
				2. No discussion
				3. **Result Motion #20:** 13-0-7. Motion Passes.
			1. Updated Resolution: ID 174 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-08 19:56:23Z) - add NOTE 3 in 10.21.5 (at 1482.54): An AP using coverage classes that determines that an associating or associated STA does not support Coverage Classes may deny association to or disassociate that STA. The mechanism by which the AP makes that determination is outside the scope of the standard.

In response to the commenter: The request by the commenter to mark as obsolete is not adopted. We do not burden the standard with additional information in associate requests that are outside bands where Coverage Classes increase CSMA diameters. We are aware of products using Coverage Classes deployed in TV White Space bands, and do not agree to mark Coverage Classes as obsolete.

* 1. **Discussion on CID 69 - RIFS**
		1. Way Forward for RIFS Straw Poll:
1. Keep Obsolete – no change to current standard
2. Make Deprecated – text remains, Obsolete changed to deprecate, mention of removal is deleted
3. Remove RIFS for non-DMG as proposed by CID 69
4. abstain
	* + 1. Discussion on difference with Obsolete and Deprecate
			2. Discussion on the option to vote – Chicago voting
			3. Results: a-16 b-8 c-5 d-4
			4. Based on this result consider a motion
		1. **Motion #21 RIFS rejection**
			1. Resolve CID 69 as “Rejected”; The TG considered 3 options: retain the current text. marking as deprecated and removing the feature, see straw poll results below. There was no consensus to remove RIFS from the standard. Concerns raised in the discussion include existence of implementations in the field.

Way forward for RIFS straw poll:

1. Keep obsolete – no change to current standard 16
2. Make deprecated – text remains, Obsolete changed to deprecate, mention of removal is deleted - 8
3. Remove RIFS for non-DMG as proposed by CID 69 - 5
4. Abstain 4
	* + 1. Moved: Menzo WENTINK, 2nd: Stephen PALM
			2. **Results Motion #21**: 20-1-3 motion passes
	1. **Discussion on CID 63**
		1. **Motion #22 WEP & TKIP**
		2. Resolve CID 63 as “Rejected, There are known implementations of these features in the market, so we choose not to remove them at this time. The Group did not come to consensus on removal of these two features.”
			1. Moved: Menzo WENTINK; 2nd Peter ECCLESINE
			2. Discussion: None
			3. **Results Motion #22**: 19-3-3 motion Passes.
	2. **Review schedule** for the afternoon
	3. **Recess at 3:22pm**
5. **Wed PM2: TGmd meeting in Orlando, Fl 16:00-18:00 ET – 2017-11-08**
	1. **Called to order** at 4:00pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. Review Patent Policy
	3. Review Agenda – 11-17/1556r6
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1556-06-000m-november-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx>>
		2. Wednesday PM2
* 11-17-1728 – Evgeny KHOROV
* 11-17-1745 - CID 174 -– Peter ECCLESINE
* 11-17-1089 – Mike MONTEMURRO
	+ 1. No change for today – Agenda approved without objection.
	1. **Review Submission 11-17-1728r1** – Evgeny KHOROV
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1728-01-000m-enabling-frame-body-capture-effect.pptx>>
		2. Review Submission
		3. Problem statement: In dense deployment, it may happen that a stronger frame from own BSS arrives when a STA is already synched to a weaker frame (e.g. from an alien BSS)
		4. Discussion on the state-machine and the meaning of what is or is not allowed.
		5. Discussion on the word “Typical”
		6. Concern that the figure does not actually preclude what is being asserted.
		7. Discussion on past history of something similar.
		8. The tests were done with 802.11a
		9. Discussion on the possible issue being described and if it is an implementation or standard issue.
		10. Discussion on the state of the medium and if the condition is accounted for in the calculation
		11. More discussion is welcomed.
	2. **Review Submission 11-17/1089r9** Michael MONTEMURRO
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1089-09-000m-revmd-cc25-comment-resolutions.doc>>
		2. CID 133 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Have had many discussions on this topic
			3. The discussion was on the reflector and the resolution was thought ok
			4. Discussion on if each was to be for Tx/Rx or just one of the other “or” or “and”
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Relative to D0.1,

At 1005.57 change “does not allow use of DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “does not allow transmission of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

At 1005.58 change “does allow use of DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “allows transmission of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

At 1005.61 change “does not use DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “supports neither transmission nor reception of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

At 1005.62 change “STA uses DSSS/CCK in 40 MHz” to “STA supports transmission and reception of DSSS/CCK PPDUs when the operating channel width is 40 MHz”

* + 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 71 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the proposed change
			3. Proposed Change “Data type Null Data subtype bit (Frame Control field B6) equal to 1.”

To “Data frame where Subtype subfield bit 6 (B6 in the Subtype subfield of the Frame Control field) is equal to 1.”

* + - 1. Proposed resolution: Rejected; The +null attribute is only used with Data frames in Annex G.
			2. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed change in context see page 1694.1.
			3. Also, we note one other place where “present” needs to be “not transmitted”. 763.63.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised; At 1695.1 at the end of the first sentence, insert the following sentence: "A PCP or DMG AP shall set the Next Beacon subfield of the Beacon Interval Control field in the DMG Beacon to a value that indicates the number of beacon intervals following the current beacon interval during which the DMG Beacon frame will not be transmitted."

At 763.63, change “present” to “transmitted”

Note to commenter, the proposed text is added changing “present” to “transmitted”, but is inserted at a later location.

* + - 1. No Objection, Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 82 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept - Note the correct location is 1472.33 in D0.1.
			4. No Objection, Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 84 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept - Note the correct location is 1472.60 in D0.1.
			4. No Objection, Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 85 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: In table 12-2, change the four occurrences of “The AP may associate with the STA” to “The AP may accept associations from the STA.”
			3. No Objection, Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 91 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 93 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. The proposed change looks OK but the dependencies need to be worked out. These protocols are based on association procedures. Therefore, they should be dependent on DMG-M15.2 or DMG-M15.3.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Add following entries to the end of the DMG-M15 (Authentication and association) section in PICS:
			"DMG-M15.5, SAE authentication, 12.4, (DMG-M15.2 OR DMG-M15.3) AND PC39:O, Yes No N/A",
			"DMG-M15.6, FT authentication, 13, (DMG-M15.2 OR DMG-M15.3) AND PC35:O, Yes No N/A",
			"DMG-M15.7, FILS authentication, 12.12, (DMG-M15.2 OR DMG-M15.3) AND FILS4:O, Yes No N/A".
			5. No objection Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 94 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes and the context.
			3. Proposed resolution; Revised. In the notes column of Table 9-31, change the following: At 742.62, replace

“and dot11RSNAAuthenticationSuiteSelected is 00-0F-AC:3, 00-0FAC:4, or 00-0F-AC:9 (i.e., part of a fast BSS transition in an RSN).”

With

“and dot11RSNAAuthenticationSuiteSelected is 00-0F-AC:3, 00-0F-AC:4, 00-0F-AC:9, 00-0F-AC:13, 00-0F-AC:16, or 00-0F-AC:17 (i.e., part of a fast BSS transition in an RSN).”

At 743.15, replace

“Either dot11RSNAAuthenticationSuiteSelected is 00-0F-AC:3, 00-0F-AC:4, or 00-0F-AC:9 (i.e., part of a fast BSS transition in an RSN) or dot11RSNAActivated is false (i.e., not in an RSN).”

With

“Either dot11RSNAAuthenticationSuiteSelected is 00-0F-AC:3, 00-0F-AC:4, 00-0F-AC:9, 00-0F-AC:13, 00-0F-AC:16, or 00-0F-AC:17 (i.e., part of a fast BSS transition in an RSN) or dot11RSNAActivated is false (i.e., not in an RSN).”

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 98 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Delete duplicate sentence and make it a separate paragraph.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change

“Management frame protection protocols in an infrastructure BSS or IBSS apply to robust Management frames after RSNA PTK establishment for protection of individually addressed frames is completed and after delivery of the IGTK to protect group addressed frames. Robust management frame protection is

implemented by CCMP, GCMP, BIP, and the SA Query procedure.

Management frame protection protocols in an MBSS apply to individually addressed frames after establishment of the RSNA MTK, and to group addressed frames indicated as “Group Addressed Privacy” in Table 9-47 (Category values). Robust management frame protection is implemented with CCMP and GCMP.

To

“Management frame protection protocols in an infrastructure BSS or IBSS apply to robust Management frames after RSNA PTK establishment for protection of individually addressed frames is completed and after delivery of the IGTK to protect group addressed frames.

Management frame protection protocols in an MBSS apply to individually addressed frames after establishment of the RSNA MTK, and to group addressed frames indicated as “Group Addressed Privacy” in Table 9-47 (Category values).

Robust management frame protection is implemented by CCMP, GCMP, and BIP confidentiality protocols and the SA Query procedure.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 99 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the choices for Pair-wise cypher suite
			3. There is only one place that CCMP is used without defining CCMP-128 or CCMP-256 as the cipher suite, otherwise it is referring to the protocol.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised: Revised. At 2128.52, 2130.27, 2131.60 change “CCMP” to “CCMP-128 or CCMP-256”
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 101 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 2211.25, replace the sentence with “See 12.7.1.5 (Integrity group key hierarchy) for the definition of the IGTK. A STA shall use bits 0–127 of the IGTK as the AES-128-CMAC key, bits 0–127 of the IGTK as the AES-128-GMAC key, bits 0–255 of the IGTK as the AES-256-GMAC key, and bits 0-255 of the IGTK as the AES-256-CMAC key.”
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 122 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 289 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion
			3. Guido to investigate further. Might delete Mintrack states.
			4. Mark submission required, assign to Guido.
		5. CID 318 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion
			3. Location of change. 9.4.2.3 or 11.1.4.6
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised. At 1718.20, insert the suggested note at the end of Clause 11.1.7. Renumbering the notes as appropriate.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 170 (PHY) and CID 171 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context
			3. The proposed resolution is not very clear. Need to add a one row table and indicate at 946.49, insert the following row, updating the reserved row and requesting a new suite type selector from ANA.
			4. Rev 10 of the doc will be produced and we will resolve them then.
	1. **Recess at 5:55pm**
1. **Thursday PM1: TGmd meeting in Orlando, FL 13:30-15:30 ET – 2017-11-09**
	1. **Called to order** at 1:30pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. Review Agenda: - 11-17/1556r6
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1556-06-000m-november-2017-tgmd-agenda.pptx>>

Thursday PM1

* 11-17-1192 – Matthew FISCHER
* 11-17-1078 – Ganesh VENKATESAN
* 11-17-1243 - Mark RISON CIDs - 197, 323 and updates to 191, 261, 264, 322
	+ 1. After updating from r6, R7 was approved.
	1. **Review Submission 11-17/1192** – Matthew FISCHER
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1192-07-000m-cr-esp.docx>>
		2. Review revision history
		3. CID 259 (MAC) CID 54, 55, 56 (MAC), CID 30, 31 (MAC), CID 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217 (MAC)
		4. Discussion on how to determine the uplink and downlink times for transmissions.
		5. CID 215 was revised, now reject in this revision
		6. Review the proposed changes in the submission.
		7. CID 214 – proposed reject – check definition of A\_MSDU\_B
			1. Need to Modify to allow MSDU not defined.
		8. CID 215
			1. Add cross references to the two elements in CID 215
		9. CID 213
			1. Add padding accounting in equation
		10. CID 216
			1. No dependency on the AC? Then delete the note.
			2. Describe which parameters are AC dependent
			3. Or delete the note
		11. Target Value DPDUR
			1. Put with previous comment
		12. Main Changes is outbound Air compression
			1. Question on how many assumptions are being made are limiting the value of having the estimates in the first place.
		13. CID 54
			1. The plus/minus 5db is not worth keeping, can we get rid of?
			2. Discussion on the Voice estimates usage
		14. Some comments have been received, and will need a revision before we can complete processing.
		15. Plan to have a motion on a single database tab on the 12 CIDs, and we will move all to MAC to allow for a single point of processing.
			1. CIDs 213, 214, 216 and 217 are (PHY) to move to MAC.
			2. Request to Matthew to add CID 251 to his document (it is on the same equations). It is also effectively a duplicate of CID 213, which is handled in this doc.
		16. We will plan to review at the F2F in Piscataway.
	2. **Review Submission 11-17/1078r3** - Ganesh VENKATESAN
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1078-03-000m-resolutions-to-cids-148-and-339.doc> >
		2. CID 339 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment and concern
			2. Need cross reference to Tn\_1 for n
			3. Discussion on how the variables were derived.
			4. We need to describe the n and the prime variable to understand the variables.
			5. Taken the comments, will go back and try to get another try.
			6. Waiting on 802.1ASrev to complete to have the fine timing definitions.
			7. We may just keep the equations in our document
		3. CID 148 (MAC)
			1. Fix the feature to call out the “Initial” FTM.
			2. Change all three figures is the current plan.
			3. There was confusion on how the comment was interpreted.
			4. Discussion on how to make the improvement.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 148 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2017-11-09 19:41:40Z): Change "initial" to "first" at P937.48. Also add a sentence at the end of the same paragraph, "For example, this is FTM\_2 in Figure 11-36, and FTM\_1 in Figure 11-37."
			6. This one will be marked Ready for Motion, but will not be motioned this week.
	3. **Review Submission 11-17/1243r4** - Mark RISON
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx> >
		2. CID 323 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Context
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 323: REVISED: Delete “PHY-TXSTART shall be disabled by the issuance of the PHY-TXEND.request primitive.” in 15.3.6, 16.2.5, 17.3.11.

Delete “PHY-TXSTART shall be disabled by receiving a PHY-TXEND.request primitive.” in 19.3.20, 20.8.

Delete “(i.e., PHY-TXSTART shall be disabled)” in 15.3.6, 16.2.5, 17.3.11, 19.3.20, 20.8.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 191 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discuss where the correction could be put in.
			3. Measurement Report usage reviewed.
			4. See page 981 for reference to what the Measurement Report was using
			5. Looking to agree on the wording of the type: “A CTS frame, even though it does not have a TA field, can also be transmitted in a PPDU with ~~the~~ TXVECTOR parameter “
			6. Need to see if definition is closer to the usage.
			7. Prefer to add to clause 1.4 rather than in clause 9
			8. Update the resolution in next revision.
		2. CID 261 (EDITOR): ... Previously motioned, was EDITOR originally, too.
			1. Review Comment
			2. Accepted in previous Draft, but we have undone this and now we are trying to get the specific locations.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

Change “intended for” to “addressed to” in Subclauses 4.5.2.1 and 11.2.3.19.

In 10.60 in D0.4 change “The S1G STA shall not schedule a transmission of a PPDU carrying an individually addressed MPDU intended for the EL STA, or cause the EL STA to transmit an individually addressed PPDU until the ELRecoveryTimer has reached 0.” to “The S1G STA shall not schedule a transmission of an MPDU individually addressed to the EL STA, or cause the EL STA to transmit an individually addressed MPDU, until the ELRecoveryTimer has reached 0.” (note also added comma and change from PPDU to MPDU).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 264 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review history of discussion
			3. Discussion on the context of implicit Block Ack.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 264 in 11-17/1243r4<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx> >, which make it clear that No Ack QoS Data frames and Action No Ack frames are never acked
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 322 (PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. Discussion of PHY-TXSTART
			4. After discussion, we should not reject, and will need to find some more text to consider. Will work some more offline, to understand if we even need TXBUSY
	1. **Ideas for CID 213 and 214**
		1. With last 10 minutes, Matthew FISCHER presented some more ideas on CID 213 and 214, but without consensus on how to resolve the CIDs.
		2. On CID 213, we questioned if the right solution was to add small details for A\_MPDU delimiters, or remove the details on the symbol rounding. This was left for us to think about, but we'll go with Matthew's suggestion to add the details, unless someone comes back with an objection.
		3. On CID 214, there were objections to the proposal to add "if the MPDUs are expected to contain A-MSDUs". How do you know if this is "expected" or not? Some research into how this is derived turned up that the transmitter and receiver have to both have the capability, have the capability enabled, and have an expectation that the capability would be negotiated after association. This is even more complicated - we need something simpler. Ran out of time, trying to think of something.
	2. **Recess 3:30pm**
1. **Thursday PM2: TGmd meeting in Orlando, FL 13:30-15:30 ET – 2017-11-09**
	1. **Called to order** at 4:01pm by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent Policy** and Participation information
		1. No items noted
	3. Return to agenda as approved in PM1: 11-17/1556r6
* Motions,
* Comment resolution
	+ 11-17-1243 - Mark RISON CIDs - 198,
* AOB
* Plans for Nov 2017 – Jan 2018
* Adjourn
	1. **Motion #23 – Setting-CCF0-for-20-40MHz-BSS-BW**

Incorporate the text changes in 11-17/1738r0: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1738-00-000m-setting-ccf0-for-20-40mhz-bss-bw.docx>>

* + 1. Moved: Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE, 2nd: Edward AU
		2. Discussion:
			1. This presentation had been requested to be delayed to a later
			2. Discussion on when to take it up.
		3. **Motion to table:**
			1. the Motion to table was made by Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE, 2nd Edward AU
			2. **No objection to Table the Motion**
		4. **Motion #23 - Tabled**
	1. **Motion #24 Orlando CIDs through Wednesday**

Approve the comment resolutions on the

“PHY Motion E” tab in 11-17/093r9: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0930-09-000m-revmd-cc25-phy-plus-comments.xls>>

“Motion MAC-H” tab in 11-17/0927r11: < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-11-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>>

* + 1. Moved: Edward AU, 2nd: Chris HANSEN
		2. Discussion: none
		3. **Result Motion #24**: 14-0-2 Motion Passes
	1. **Review Submission 11-17/1243r4** - Mark RISON
		1. <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx>>
		2. CIDs 197, 198 (MAC):
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Discussion on changing the process on Quiet Channel Element.
			4. In 2nd Par of 11.9.3 proposed change, remove the highlighted sentence.
			5. Discussion on adding phrase in 3rd paragraph in 11.9.3.
			6. Proposed resolution: REVISED Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CIDs 197 and 198 in 11-17/1243r5: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-1243-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d0-1-cc25.docx> >, which disallow use of Quiet Channel elements for IBSS STAs, indicate quietening is basically broken for IBSS STAs, and clarify the quietening behaviour for MBSS STAs.
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Plan for future**
		1. **Objectives:**
			1. Comment collection resolution
		2. **Conference calls**
			1. Fridays December 1, 15, Jan 5 10am Eastern 2 hours
		3. **December 7-8, Piscataway NJ ad-hoc**
			1. A meeting reminder and invite will be sent out.
		4. **Schedule review**
			1. 
	3. **Adjourned at 4:30pm**
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