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Abstract

# 2019 May and June Teleconference Minutes

This document contains the Minutes for the May and June 2019 TGmd teleconferences (May 24, May 31, June 21 and June 28.

R0: Telecon - 24 May 2019 -- Thanks to Mark HAMILTON for help with taking notes for the minutes.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TGmd will hold 4 teleconferences before the July 2019 session: May 24, 31 and June 21, 28 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.

Teleconferences are subject to applicable policies and procedures, see below.

==================================================

Teleconferences are subject to applicable policies and procedures, see below.

  •       IEEE Code of Ethics

–       <https://www.ieee.org/about/corporate/governance/p7-8.html>

•       IEEE Standards Association (IEEE-SA) Affiliation FAQ

–       <https://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliation.html>

•       Antitrust and Competition Policy

–       <https://standards.ieee.org/content/dam/ieee-standards/standards/web/documents/other/antitrust.pdf>

•       IEEE-SA Patent Policy

–       <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/bylaws/sect6-7.html>

–       <https://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/patcom/>

 •       IEEE 802 Working Group Policies &Procedures (29 Jul 2016)

–       <http://www.ieee802.org/PNP/approved/IEEE_802_WG_PandP_v19.pdf>

•       IEEE 802 LMSC Chair's Guidelines (Approved 13 Jul 2018)

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/17/ec-17-0120-27-0PNP-ieee-802-lmsc-chairs-guidelines.pdf>

•       Participation in IEEE 802 Meetings

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

•       IEEE 802.11 WG OM: (Approved 10 Nov 2017)

–       <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-0629-22-0000-802-11-operations-manual.docx>

**1.0 802.11md - REVmd – Telecon, Friday 24 May 2019, 10:00- 12:00 ET**

* 1. **Call to Order** at 10:03 ET by the TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Attendance:**
		1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		2. George CALCEV (Futurewei)
		3. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/ARRIS)
		4. Mark RISON (Samsung)
		5. Sean COFFEY (Realtek)
		6. Mike MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
		7. Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		8. Thomas DERHAM (Broadcom)
		9. Liwen CHU (Marvell)
		10. Joe LEVY (Interdigital)
		11. Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		12. Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel)
		13. Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
	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** – 11-19/958r1
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0958-01-000m-2019-may-june-tgmd-teleconference-agendas.docx>
		2. Review draft agenda:

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/Edward AU (to be given by Ganesh VENKATESAN)

3.       Comment resolution

1. **2019-05-24**
	1. CIDs 2309, 2310 - 11-19-656 – George CALCEV
	2. CIDs 2596, CID 2366 – direction of resolution? – Mark RISON
	3. GEN CIDs – Jon ROSDAHL, 11-19-838 CID 2446
	4. CIDS 2081, 2082, 2083, 2088 (MAC), 2601(PHY) - pulled from Motion in Atlanta
	5. PHY CIDs – Mike MONTEMURRO

4. AOB:

1. Review of remaining CIDs – insufficient detail
	1. July meeting planning - 5 timeslots planned
		1. Monday PM1
		2. Tuesday PM1, PM2
		3. Thursday PM1, PM2

5.       Adjourn

* + 1. Modifications to agenda were made to accommodate those on the call:
		2. Final Comment Resolution plan:
* **2019-05-24**
	+ CIDs 2309, 2310 - 11-19-656 – George CALCEV
	+ CIDs 2596, CID 2366 – direction of resolution? – Mark RISON
	+ GEN CIDs 2648, 2632, 2606– 11-19-449r2 -Jon ROSDAHL, 11-19-838 CID 2446
		1. No objection to the Agenda plan.
			1. (Highlights indications were added after the meeting for those CIDs marked ready for motion).
	1. American entity list participants?
		1. Dorothy: I’m not a lawyer. Referenced [link to email to reflector archive May 20, from Dorothy](http://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11/msg03708.html) >. My understanding is that this is a public meeting, and for public meetings where information is available to everyone, such as this, free participation is allowed. See < <http://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11/msg03708.html> > for detailed information.
	2. **Editor’s report**, provided by Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel)
		1. Draft 2.3 is in process, with all approved changes from Atlanta meeting.
		2. Target release is end of June.
	3. **Review Document 11-19-0656r3,** George CALCEV (Futurewei Technologies)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0656-03-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-2309-2310.doc>
		2. CIDs 2309 2310 (both GEN):
			1. CIDs are on primitives that have no clear “effect of receipt”
			2. Proposal is for Revised, with new text for the “effect of receipt” subclauses
			3. Don’t need the IPI-STATE description, since that parameter is deleted from the .confirm parameters.
			4. Does the IPI-REPORT contain the IPI-STATE? No, that’s not what the IPI-STATE is – it is only whether IPI reporting is on or not, which is not useful to REPORT. But, the current text talks about the reporting being on \_prior\_ to the latest .request primitive.
			5. This seems to need more off-line discussion.
	4. **Review Document 11-19-0856r2**, Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0856-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d2-0-lb236.docx>
		2. CID 2596 (MAC):
			1. Has been worked off-line since Atlanta. Intent is no technical change, just removal of the redundancy and reorder for better flow.
			2. The sentence with “If it does not support…” then bullets, and then a “then …” is confusing. No suggestion for a better way to say it, though.
				1. Discussion over which form is preferred. Two weak preferences, one for each format. Third preference for the second form, or to fix the wording in the first form to be less ambiguous.
				2. No objection to proceeding with Alternative 2.
				3. Mark will post an r3 with Alternative 2 clearly stated.
				4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes for CID 2596 in doc 11-19/856r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0856-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d2-0-lb236.docx>> which updates the text in the direction suggested by the commentor.
				5. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 2366 (GEN):
			1. Attempts to clean up “MAC variables” that are “local” or that are PHY characteristics.
			2. There is history to this, that we categorized “variables” as MIB, or characteristics, or “local” (in the programming language sense). But, generally agree with making this clearer. Could perhaps define the phrase, or a similar phrase to “local variable”.
			3. What does it mean to “force a PHY characteristic” like aSlotTime? A better verb would be preferred.
			4. Some preference for having some phrase for these “variables”, and add a definition of it. Others think the implicit definition is sufficient. The PHY characteristic ones could have wording that they are a shared interest (shared between the MAC and PHY) in this variable.
			5. Change “force” to “override”. Otherwise agree with these changes.
			6. Maybe we want to reword the whole concept around changing the aSlotTime, to be clearer about the MAC’s usage of the PHY characteristic, not changing the PHY characteristic.
			7. Will work off-line and bring back.
	5. **GEN AdHoc CIDS** Jon ROSDAHL
		1. Process comments from database – GEN Discuss comments
		2. GEN AdHoc files are also noted in doc 11-19/449r2:
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0449-02-000m-revmd-lb236-gen-comments.xls>
		3. CID 2565 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Do I need to identify each usage, or is the global change sufficient to do “ACCEPT”?
			3. Believe “packet number” is a field in some security contexts, so we need to look at the individual changes; there are ~24 instances.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON for a detailed review.
		4. CID 2348 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 2349 (GEN) which is assigned to Menzo.
			3. Assign this to Menzo and mark it Submission Required, to be done along with CID 2349 (GEN), which is Submission Required.
		5. CID 2316 (GEN):
			1. There are about 8 real uses of “within a beacon interval”.
			2. Mark RISON to prepare a review of these.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
		6. CID 2648 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. “regulatory-only CCA-ED” is not a defined term. CCA-ED is used quite a lot in the Standard. At least in Annex D, the change seems unnecessary and confusing. Consult with Brian HART (Cisco) about this, to clarify the intended usage. “CCA-ED” might be intended to refer to the -62 dBm ED, which is common and normal, and shouldn’t be changed.
			3. Looking a just the first half of the changes proposed in CID 2648, the term “virtual CS mechanism” is described in 10.3.1 and 10.3.2.1, and with an alternative mechanism applied for S1G MACs in 10.3.2.1. Also, there are multiple NAVs in DMG (7th paragraph of 10.3.2.1 – D2.0 P1695.43)
			4. This needs more work, also, to be clear what we are changing.
			5. Discussion of possible rejection.
				1. There are multiple mechanisms that make up the “virtual CS”. See D2.0 P1695.20 and P1695.43. Also, the suggested change to insert “regulatory-only” was considered, but the term introduces confusion in the draft as no definition is provided.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2019-05-24 15:29:21Z) There are multiple mechanisms that make up the “virtual CS”. See D2.0 P1695.20 and P1695.43. The suggested change to insert "regulatory-only" was considered and the term was not defined to justify its addition.
		7. CID 2645 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Agree with the intent, but we need to check locations.
			3. Jon will review off-line and bring back – Submission Required.
		8. CID 2632 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. This seems related to CID 2633, which was done in March.
			3. Proposed Resoution: REVISED (GEN: 2019-05-24 15:38:06Z) in D2.2 p649.26 and p648.38 change "OCT MMPDU structure" to "OCT MMPDU Descriptor field" which are the only two instances in D2.2.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 2560 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Not sure RSNI works anymore, or is used, maybe just remove it.
			3. Assign to Youhan to look at it.
			4. Removing it would be a lot of work to check and clean up all the places it is mentioned (in BSSDescription, for example).
			5. Maybe we just add a NOTE here.
		10. CID 2606 (GEN):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Looked at referenced locations.
			3. Issue here is that “present” with a list of frames leads to Spec Rot, when the list of frames changes. But, we defined “included” to clearly mean that the list is not all inclusive, so changing to the word “included” avoids the Spec Rot. But, we noted that “present” has the same clarification in 1.4.
			4. Separately, the second half is trying to fix that there is no normative statement that these can be plural, outside clause 9, so the use of “can” (which means it is stated elsewhere) is wrong. But, putting a normative “may” in clause 9 leads to other problems.
			5. Even if we agree that the second is a real issue, the conversation was to reject the comment’s proposed resolution.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2019-05-24 15:57:05Z) in 1.4 it states "A construction of the form “the x element can be included in a, b and c frames” or “the x element can be present in a, b and c frames” is not to be understood as being a complete list of frames in which the element might be present." which indicates that either verb is ok. The suggested change introduces normative verbs in clause 9 which we have tried to avoid.
			7. This CID will be in a separate motion and will be put on a separate tab in 11-19/449r3 (“GEN Motion Present”).
		11. ACTION ITEM: Jon will send email to the reflector with a list of the remainder of the comments he has ready for discussion, to be reviewed off-line by the group.
	6. **Adjourned at 12:02pm ET.**
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