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Abstract

Minutes for REVmd 6th and 27th April 2018 telecons

1. **Called to order at 10:05 ET** by the TG Chair Dorothy Stanley (HPE)
	1. Attendance:
		1. Dorothy Stanley (HPE)
		2. Abhishek Patil (Qualcomm)
		3. Emily Qi (Intel)
		4. Edward Au (Huawei)
		5. Sean Coffey (Realtek)
		6. Menzo Wentink (Qualcomm)
		7. Mark Hamilton (ARRIS/Ruckus)
		8. Graham Smith (SR Technologies)
		9. Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		10. Manish Kumar (Marvell)
		11. Joseph Levy (Interdigital)
	2. Reviewed Patent Policy and Participation Policy
	3. **Review Agenda:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0626-01-000m-2018-april-agendas-for-teleconferences-and-ad-hoc-meeting.docx>

Draft agenda for the April 6th teleconference:

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a.       Call for potentially essential patents: **If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance:**

                                                               i.      Either speak up now or

                                                             ii.      Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible or

                                                           iii.      Cause an LOA to be submitted

b.      <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI

a.       Editor report document, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-08-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>

b.      Comments received LB 232 are here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0611-00-000m-revmd-wg-ballot-comments.xls> :

3.       Comment resolution.

**2018-04-06**

1. Edward AU - Editor 2 CIDs: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0619-00-000m-revmd-editor2-lb232-comments.xlsx> ; Any comments on proposed resolutions, reminder to review, plan to motion in May
2. Edward AU - Editor 2 CIDs – Direction of resolution for 24 similar comments:
	1. 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, and 1219
3. Additional CIDs
	1. CID 1329, 1236
4. Emily QI – Editor CIDs, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0657-00-000m-revmd-wg-lb232-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls> and 11-18-0658
5. Graham SMITH – CIDs 1000, 1147 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0654-01-000m-resolution-for-cids-1000-1147.docx>
6. Graham SMITH – CID 1347 – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0655-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-1347.docx>
7. Graham SMITH – CIDs 1356, 1358- <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0656-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-1356-1358-rts-cts.docx>
8. Available CIDs/presentations
9. CID assignment

4. Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to the proposed agenda that was in the 11-18/626r1
	1. **Editor Report – 11-17/920r8** - Emily Qi
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-08-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt>
		2. Reviewed report
	2. **Review Sumission 11-18/619r0** - Editor 2 CIDs- Comment Resolution: - Edward AU -:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0619-00-000m-revmd-editor2-lb232-comments.xlsx>
		2. Thanks to Mark RISON for reviewing the full list of Comments listed by Edward to the reflector to review.
		3. There are a couple CIDs that Mark found similar issues elsewhere and Edward wanted to know if he should fix up the typos there also?
			1. Making the Changes for typos is ok, but the comment resolution should be marked revised and show the changes are noted.
			2. For those changes that are possibly technical in nature a separate submission should be prepared and the CID moved to MAC or PHY Adhoc.
			3. We want to keep all the Editorial (simple changes etc) be kept in the Editorial AdHoc comment group.
		4. Review of the comments is requested from the Task Group for the proposed resolutions.
			1. There are 24 comments that are the same, but on different sections.
			2. See CID 1196 (Editor)
				1. Proposed Change “Change “ppm” with “10^6””
				2. The “ppm” occurs 24 times.
				3. Neither the Editorial and Style Guidelines address the issue, and if we make this change we would need to update the guidelines.
				4. Another check also found possibly 34 instances…need to verify.
				5. There is use on page 1009 Which has a file type (mapping file type) reference, and is not really an issue.
				6. Discussion on the possible substation and whether it was worth the making the change.
				7. For the instance on p1009, it should be all caps…editorial issue if it is to be changed. – PPM would be Portable Pixal Map, and the table has mixed capitalization states. Leave it to Editor to check
				8. Not a lot of support for changes.
	3. **Review Submission, 11-18/657r0** - Editor CIDs- Emily QI –
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0657-00-000m-revmd-wg-lb232-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>
		2. Review of comment resolution is encouraged on 657r0
		3. Question on format displaying –
		4. More complex comments will be reviewed at the AdHoc and the next telecon.
		5. Question on CID 1350 – Emily will check the email request and respond accordingly. It is a similar related error for the Editor to consider.
	4. **Review Submission 11-18/654r1** - CID 1000 and CID 1147 - - Graham SMITH –
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0654-01-000m-resolution-for-cids-1000-1147.docx>
		2. Review submission
		3. CID 1000 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Reviewed proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED, At 162.31 delete “point-cordinated” **contention period (CP):** The time period outside of the contention free period (CFP) in a basic service set (BSS).
			4. As the strike through cannot be in the excel file, change proposed resolution to “REVISED, At 162.31 delete “point-cordinated””
			5. Discussion of if CFP was removed, or is there a needed use of CFP still in HCCA or not.
			6. We took the use of CFP out of HCCA, so it may be that this should have been removed, and there may be a lot of occurrences that may need to be reviewed for removal.
			7. See p1690, -- 45 instances in CFP still in the document,
				1. ACTION ITEM #1- Menzo to review and come back with proposal for complete removal as appropriate. And PC (25 instances). Will bring a separate submission to address.
				2. Also CAP has several instances to be addressed as well.
			8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2018-04-06 15:01:10Z) At 162.31 delete “point-coordinated”
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1147 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion and proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1147 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2018-04-06 14:58:02Z) Make changes as shown in 11-18/0654r1 for CID 1147. These changes implement the commenter's proposed change.
			4. Discussion on the proposed changes.
			5. Discussion on the referencing of Annex G but the annex would ned to be fixed to make the referenc make sense.
			6. The “shall” is the main point of the discussion.
			7. The discussion about PSDU vs MSDU in this clause would make sense.
			8. Discussion on if the last sentence referenced should be deleted or not.
			9. The clause 10.3.5 only applies to DCF.
			10. Proposal to not make a change at all, as this only applies to DCF and it may not be an issue that needs to be fixed at this time.
			11. Proposal to review next week after more thought. Some discussion on making the changes to make it clearer that it does not violate the rules in annex G and other places.
			12. The use of CIFS and PS-Poll precludes the use of RTS/CTS prior to PS-Poll.
			13. The proposal was to make it clear and consistent.
			14. Alternative changes were discussed to remove “data or management” from the “may” statement.
			15. Sounding exchanges are described in Annex G, but it should not necessarily be for DCF anyway.
			16. Trying to make the standard consistent is the over riding goal, and the comment is specific to 10.3.5 is the focus of the changes that we are looking to make.
			17. Reviewing under DCF exclusively, do we think the statement is really a problem.
			18. Just explicitly precluding PS-Poll would be better than all management frames.
			19. More discussion and thought should be done.
	5. **Review Submission: 11-18/655r0** - CID 1347– Graham SMITH –
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0655-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-1347.docx>
		2. CID 1347 (MAC)
		3. Review Submission
		4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2018-04-06 15:41:42Z): EDCA and DCF backoff procedures should be basically the same. Removing EIFS condition only from DCF would be a major difference to EDCA. EIFS is required to account for packets detected where the NAV information is not reliable.
		5. Discussion:
			1. Suggestion to add to resolution more detail. Reference to 10.3.2.3.7 should be added.
			2. Discussion on reasons for rejecting the comment and more details to clarify the resolution.
		6. Updated Resolution: Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2018-04-06 15:41:42Z): EDCA and DCF backoff procedures should be basically the same. Removing EIFS condition only from DCF would be a major difference to EDCA. EIFS is required to account for packets with frame errors, as specified in 10.3.2.3.7.
		7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. **Review Submission 11-18/656r0** - CIDs 1356, 1358 - Graham SMITH
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0656-00-000m-resolutions-for-cids-1356-1358-rts-cts.docx>
		2. CID 1356 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion
			3. This is related to CID 1147.
			4. Discussion to make the change at 1612.43 to make the replacement as well as the deletion.
			5. This new alternative would leave a “what other purposes” which is a concern.
			6. Concern about leaving the use of RTS/CTS being used for alternate purposes.
			7. We should allow a very general capability that is not precluded in general, and let it be used as needed.
		3. The discussion was split, so we will need more discussion and make the related CIDs are aligned.
	7. Next week is the Face to Face AdHoc in Ft. Lauderdale – a call in on Join.me will be available.
	8. Adjouned 12:00pm ET.
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