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Abstract

Minutes for 802.11md (REVmd) Telecon for March 29, 2019

# 2019 March, April, May Teleconference Agendas

TGmd will hold 4 teleconferences before the March 2019 session: March 29, April 12, 26 and May 3 at 10am Eastern (2 hours) for the purpose of Letter Ballot 236 comment resolution and presentations.

We’ll use the [join.me](http://join.me) bridge:  <https://join.me/ieee802.11>, see <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/11/joinme.html> for more detailed instructions.

1. **802.11md - REVmd – Telecon, Friday 29 March 2019, 10:00- 12:00 ET**
	1. **Call to Order** at 10:02 ET by the TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Attendance:**
		1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		2. Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		3. Edward AU (Huawei)
		4. Emily QI (Intel)
		5. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		6. Carol ANSLEY (ARRIS)
		7. Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		8. Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
		9. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/ARRIS)
		10. Mark RISON (Samsung)
		11. Sean COFFEY (Realtek)
		12. Srinivas KANDALA (Samsung)
		13. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
	3. **Review Patent Policy**
		1. Call for essential patents
		2. No issues noted
	4. **Review Participation slide**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>
	5. **Review Agenda** -
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0533-00-000m-2019-apr-may-tgmd-teleconference-and-ad-hoc-agendas.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0533-00-000m-2019-apr-may-tgmd-teleconference-and-ad-hoc-agendas.docx%20)
		2. **The draft agenda for the teleconferences/ad-hoc is below:**

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

a.       **Patent Policy: Ways to inform IEEE:**

1. Cause an LOA to be submitted to the IEEE-SA (patcom@ieee.org); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this 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, please respond at this time by providing relevant information to the WG Chair

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

2.       Editor report – Emily QI

3.       Comment resolution

1. **2019-03-29**
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0336-01-000m-cids-2709-2710-2711.docx> - Sigurd
	2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0335-00-000m-cid-2708.docx> - Sigurd
	3. 11-19-338 – Stephen McCann – ANQP
	4. 11-19-179 – MAC randomization – Carol Ansley
2. **2019-04-12**
	1. 11-19-286 – Roger Marks
3. **2019-04-26**
	1. Available CIDs
4. **2019-05-03**
	1. Available CIDs

4.       AOB:

* 1. May meeting planning

5.       Adjourn

* + 1. Review of the Draft Agenda. We identified that Carol and Graham were available to present today.
		2. Modify agenda -- see R1
			1. Moves Carol and Graham as first presenters.
		3. No objection to approving the modified agenda
	1. **Editor Report** – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. All comments from March put in database.
		2. 197 Comments resolved during the March Session
		3. MDR implementation is to be incorporated in D2.1 and middle of April target to incorporate the comments from March.
		4. Thanks to the Editors and reviewers on their hard work.
	2. **Review doc 11-19/0179r1** - *IDQuery Query Message Proposal* - Carol ANSLEY (ARRIS)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0179-01-0arc-idquery-query-message-proposal.pptx>
		2. Abstract: Proposal to add a new action frame that an AP can use to query an associated STA for a unique identifier.
		3. Submission presented
		4. Discussion:
			1. Discussion on the problem of PMK caching with this proposal.
			2. Discussion on the ID Length and the size of maximum length
			3. Discussion on the need for a response, even if it is not providing an identifier.
				1. 10.29.4 Response to an invalid Action frame

If a STA receives an individually addressed Action frame with an unrecognized Category field or some other syntactic error and the MSB of the Category field equal to 0, then the STA shall return the Action frame to the source without change except that the MSB of the Category field is set to 1.

* + - 1. Discussion on the post/pre-authentication mode for exchange. Concern that the information would be in the clear, so may not want to share the identifier then.
			2. Discussion on the information element being included in the frame.
			3. Discussion on the Globally Unique identifier, or if it was just a good value for the duration of the implementation. Concern that the value is unique for some control period and network coverage.
			4. Expectation is that the Vendor Specific would include length info like a Vendor Specific Element field.
			5. Discussion on the use case for login and how is the identifier provided to the upper layers. Concern with an open choice for the ID, maybe a bit more standardization should be considered. The restricted set of ID may preclude the need for the ID length field in that case.
		1. Next steps
			1. There is a document that has started to be prepared but the author would like to include the feedback from the discussion.
			2. See doc 11-19/496r0 Carol ANSLEY (ARRIS)
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0496-00-000m-id-query-proposal.docx>
			3. Will come back to the group with an updated proposal.
	1. **Review doc 11-19/574r0**, *Resolutions for backoff and obsolete comments D2*, Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0574-00-000m-resolutions-for-backoff-and-obsolete-comments-d2.docx>
		2. CID 2300 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review 4 locations that missed changing “time” to “count”.
			3. Typo in the Proposed change.
			4. On p1696, there is two instances that need to be addressed.
			5. Need to craft a new Proposed Resolution.
			6. Discussion on what the “Backoff Time” in the figure should be changed to, and why the need to change from “time” to “counter”.
			7. The lower right instance has no objection to change “time” to “counter”.
			8. Discussion on what the figure is trying to depict.
			9. Discussion on if this figure 10-16 could be confused to indicate a different scenario than intended.
			10. One option would be to change the “Backoff Time” to “Backoff Duration”, or just delete the arrow and “Backoff Time”.
			11. Suggestion to change title of figure 10-16 to include “example”.
			12. Strawpoll:

Change “Backoff Time”

1. No Change
2. Change to “Backoff Durration”
3. Change to “Backoff”
4. Delete the term and arrow
	* + - 1. **Results Strawpoll**: a – 1, b- 4, c-1, d-9
				2. Propose that we go with delete, but the vertical lines stay.
			1. Discussion on the right vertical line be deleted and the “Next frame” should also be deleted.
			2. Discussion on what changes should be made to minimalize the changes.
			3. If we only make the strawpoll changes for now.
			4. For Figure 10-17, suggested to make similar changes.
			5. Discussion on how to clarify the figure that this is not a fixed time.
			6. Discussion on possible use of “Elapsed Time”, but concern for new term. Concept of time being removed could be just deleting “time”.
			7. Discussion on the use of “backoff” by itself.
				1. Review p226 as an example where we used “backoff” by itself.
			8. Need to let more offline discussion to occur.
			9. A Revised proposal will be prepared.
			10. Discussion on 10.3.3 title and the clause that discusses time and counters. How to describe this section accurately as the clause is talking about the time that the backoff will be?
				1. Change “Time” to “Procedure” as a proposal.
				2. Suggest changing to “DCF Random backoff procedure”
				3. There is 10.3.4.3 that has DCF Backoff procedure.
				4. The two paragraphs are similar, but not redundant.
				5. Suggest making just the minimum changes.
				6. Discussion on what the clause is actually saying.
				7. Strawpoll:

Change title to:

1. Random Backoff Time (no change)
2. Random Backoff Procedure
3. Random Backoff
4. Contention Window Description

After discussion we did not hold the Strawpoll as we could not agree on the choices.

* + - 1. Review the current thought of proposed changes and will be in R1 of the document.
				1. Figure 10-17 do not change “Backoff Time”
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2019-03-29 15:43:18Z):

In Figure 10-6

1696.38 delete "Backoff Time" and the arrows

1696.45 change "Select backoff time" to "Select backoff count"

In Figure 10-17

1729.35 change "Select backoff time" to "Select backoff count"

At P1730.43, change "backoff time" to "backoff count"

At P2247.38 change "backoff time" to "backoff count"

* + - 1. Discussion on the instances of “backoff time” still in the draft.
				1. Three separate locations:
				2. 10.3.1 The basic medium access protocol is a DCF that allows for automatic medium sharing between compatible PHYs through the use of CSMA/CA and a random backoff time following a busy medium condition.
				3. 10.3.4.3 The effect of this procedure is that when multiple STAs are deferring and go into random backoff, then the STA selecting the smallest backoff time using the random function wins the contention
				4. 11.8.3 Before starting transmission of an MPDU, a STA shall check if there is enough time for the exchange to complete within the time allowed by the quieting rules. If there is not enough time, the STA shall defer the transmission by selecting a random backoff time, using the present CW
			2. We will not try to resolve this now but will include in the updated proposal that will come back later.
		1. CID 2642 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment – looking for a volunteer for a submission.
			2. May want to check with Menzo as he had provided material in the previous comment resolution.
			3. This will need a submission to make the change, but we should document the rational on why we chose to reject. Previously we held a strawpoll and we should include from the minutes the rational for the rejection.
	1. **Review plan for Adhoc** meeting next week:
		1. Starting Time for Tuesday AdHoc will be 9am, for those attending in person, try to arrive in lobby by 8 or 8:30am. There will be a bridge (WebEx) and the details are in doc 11-19/533.
	2. **Adjourned at 11:55 pm**

**References:**

Friday 29 March 2019:

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0533-00-000m-2019-apr-may-tgmd-teleconference-and-ad-hoc-agendas.docx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0179-01-0arc-idquery-query-message-proposal.pptx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0496-00-000m-id-query-proposal.docx>