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Abstract

# 2020 January -March Teleconferences

TGmd will hold teleconferences before the March 2020 session: January 31, February 7, 14 and March 13th at 10am Eastern (2 hours) for the purpose of Initial SA ballot comment resolution and presentations.

See the dial-in instructions: **Webex meeting:** [**Join**](https://www.google.com/url?q=https%3A%2F%2Fieee802.my.webex.com%2Fieee802.my%2Fj.php%3FMTID%3Dm44a65d3602426882964d2467e1a2a87d&sa=D&ust=1580250108691000&usg=AFQjCNEqlklrD7OiMl9fqBOaLIWIqDGc0Q) Meeting number: 796 002 752 Meeting password: wireless Join by phone: +1-510-338-9438 USA Toll +44-20-3198-8144 UK Toll Access code: 796 002 752

[more details»](https://www.google.com/calendar/event?eid=dXEzZDluMnFvaGh2MnNmdTk2ZHNybDFxb2MgODAyLjExY2FsZW5kYXJAbQ&ctz=America/New_York)  [copy to my calendar](https://calendar.google.com/calendar/r/eventedit/copy/dXEzZDluMnFvaGh2MnNmdTk2ZHNybDFxb2MgODAyLjExY2FsZW5kYXJAbQ)

This File has the minutes for the January 31, 2020 Telecon.

1.0 **802.11md - REVmd – CRC Telecon, January 31, 2020 10:00-12:00 ET**

* 1. **Called to Order** at 10am by the TG Vice Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO.
  2. **Excused for travel**: The Chair, Dorothy STANLEY is away on travel.
  3. **Attendance**:
     1. Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
     2. Edward AU (Huawei)
     3. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
     4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     5. Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     6. Emily QI (Intel)
     7. Mark RISON (Samsung)
     8. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
     9. Sean Coffey (Realtek)
  4. **Review Patent Policy**
     1. Reviewed Policy – Call for Patents was made
     2. No items noted.
  5. **Review Participation Slide**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>
  6. **Review Agenda: 11-20/0234r1**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-01-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
     2. 31 January 2020:

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](mailto: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

3.       Comment resolution

1. 2020-01-31
   1. Edward Au - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0235-00-000m-resolution-for-cmmg-related-comments.docx> 30 mins
   2. Graham SMITH - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0233-00-000m-cids-for-graham-from-mike.docx> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0233-02-000m-cids-for-graham-from-mike.docx> 40 mins

Menzo Wentink - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-05-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx> 40 mins

4. AOB:

5 Adjourn

* + 1. No objection to approve the agenda by unanimous consent.
  1. **Editor Report:** - Emily QI (Intel)
     1. Review in process of the updates from January.
     2. Some comment review feedback had some comments.
     3. CID 4140 (EDITOR:
        1. Reviewed Comment/Proposed Change/Resolution.
        2. Reviewed the context in D3.0 – p1709.33
        3. Proposed Resolution was implemented, but the feedback was this was not correct. The sentence should be different.
        4. Discussion:
           1. "Change the text back, and add the reference, to say, ""This field is defined in 10.25.6.5 when the NDP BlockAck is used during a BlockAck session …""
           2. Confirm this change with the TG, since it goes against the agreed Resolution and will require updating the Resolution."
        5. Updated Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change

"This field is defined in when the NDP BlockAck is used during a BlockAck session and is defined in 10.3.2.12 (Fragment BA procedure(11ah)) when it is used during a fragment BA session."

to

"This field is defined in 10.25.6.5 (Generation and transmission of BlockAck frames by an HT STA, DMG STA, or S1G STA(11ah)) when the NDP BlockAck is used during a BlockAck session and is defined in 10.3.2.12 (Fragment BA procedure(11ah)) when it is used during a fragment BA session."

* + - 1. Emily will send info to reflector for motion during AdHoc next Month.
  1. **Review Doc 11-20-2315** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0235-00-000m-resolution-for-cmmg-related-comments.docx>
     2. CID 4222 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Noted that there was a space on the “880 x 106” that should not have extra spaces.
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 4222 (PHY): Accepted. Note to editor, remove the extra spaces, also.
        4. No objection -Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 4223 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 3544.29, replace “1320” with “1320 \times 10^6 sample/s”.

At 3544.29, increase the font size of “\times 10^6” so that it is consistent with the surrounding text.

Note to the editor remove any extra space in "1320 \times 10^6"

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4225 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4235 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.
       3. At 3528.41, change “If the channel bandwidth is 1080 MHz, the modulated SIG symbols are transmitted using duplication style as described in 25.3.10.” to “If the channel bandwidth is 1080 MHz, the modulated SIG symbols are duplicated as described in 25.3.10 and then transmitted.
       4. Discussion: there was some email that was sent by Mark RISON that was sent to privately to Michael MONTEMURRO.
          1. Mike sent to Reflector.
          2. Will return after email has a chance to propagate.
    3. CID 4237 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At 3513.38, change “Transmission and reception of CMMG SC mode PPDUs transmitted by CMMG SC MIMO may be supported” to “Transmission and reception of CMMG SC mode PPDUs with MIMO in MCSs 4 to 8 may be supported”.
       3. Discussion – concern for restriction of 4-8 limitation. Again, we have an issue with delayed information getting to the task group due to email policies.
       4. This is a technical comment and may need more review.
       5. The email that was forwarded had a lot of attachments (5) and we could not readily digest on the call.
       6. Will take offline and bring back later.
       7. Adhoc Status: CID 4237 (PHY): Will take off-line, also, and bring back. More work is required to be consistent about MCS 1-3 MIMO being mandatory or not.
  1. **Review doc 11-20-233** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0233-02-000m-cids-for-graham-from-mike.docx>
     2. As some of the CIDs were covered by Edward, the duplicates have been deleted and will be removed from R3.
     3. CID 4559 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review context of where training field is defined:

20.9.2.2.3 P3132L34 says

“A value of *N* in the Training Length field indicates 4×*N* AGC subfields and that the TRN-R/T field has *N* TRN Units.”

25.7.2.3. P3545L44 says

“A value of *N* in the Training Length field indicates that the AGC has 4*N* subfields and that the TRN- R/Tfield has 5*N* subfields

So there is duplication and a problem in that one says N and the other says 5N.

Table 25-7 P3505L26 is the training Length field

“The use of this field is defined in 20.9.2.2.3 (BRP PPDU(#1379) header fields)”

I don’t see a problem with the cross reference as 20.9.2.2.3. does refer to the Training Field, but commenter wants to delete it and it is not strictly correct.

* + - 1. So, the question is “Is it N or 5N? 20.9.2.2.6 P3133 should tell us and Fig 2020 indicates 5, so probably 5N is correct.
      2. Discussion: concern with proposed deletion of text in Clause 25. Figure 25-28 has another potential error that needs a “5N” as well. P3545.
      3. Also, there is a TRN that should be TRNT or visa-versa and should be reconciled.
      4. Concern with how the cross reference was being done, and we should define this differently.
      5. Request to have CMMG experts to look at this. Edward AU to contact them and bring back proposal.
      6. Defer for later call.
      7. “TRN unit” is only defined in Clause 20. (clause 9 does use it).
    1. CID 4693(PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review submitted discussion
       3. Request to reassign comment to an expert.
       4. Assign to Assaf. (It is already assigned; this was coordination confusion.)
  1. Review doc 11-20/0150r5 Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)

* + 1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-05-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>
    2. Not able to display.
    3. CID 4001 (GEN)
  1. Change to doc 11-20/227r1 from Andrew MYLES (CISCO) by Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0227-01-000m-pifs-for-beacons.pptx>
     2. Review the submission
     3. From Slide 14: The proposed change to allow PFS for Beacons is limited to the PIFS clause

*10.3.2.3.4 PIFS*

*The PIFS is used to gain priority access to the medium.*

*The PIFS may be used as described in the following list and shall not be used otherwise:*

* + - * …
      * *A STA transmitting a Beacon frame, as described in 11.1.3.2 (Beacon generation in non-DMG infrastructure networks). The use of PIFS for Beacons should be used with caution, in particular by avoiding undue interference to other systems*
    1. Discussion:
       1. There was not consensus on the intermittent slides. The final proposal seems to need more work. If it is Note, there would need to be more detail. The first sentence may be ok to add as a note, but not sure how it would be properly added.
       2. May be ok to add first of red sentences.
       3. Concern with the clock drift being suggested as a potential solution. Missing Beacons or having Beacons that are not correct seems dangerous to allow.
       4. After longer discussion, we decided that we should take the discussion to the reflector.
    2. CID 4002 (MAC)
       1. Has been motioned before
    3. CID 4004 (MAC)
       1. Was motioned before
    4. CID 4153 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; This proposal was discussed extensively in a prior phase of REVmd, and ultimately rejected.

Amongst the arguments for rejecting the comment was the proposed alternative of using an Action frame for the purpose of signalling a temporary limited connection (TLC), because

- an Action frame can convey additional information about the nature of the interference

- an Action frame can convey additional information about possible measures to take, like enable RTS/CTS, lower the MCS, shorten the transmissions, leave room in between, etc.

- an Action frame can inform whether a CTS will not be sent in case of interference

- there will be no BA when no data has been received, but a BA would have to be sent to provide any signalling

- A BA provides no specific feedback about whether any measures taken by the transmitter are successful, or too much, etc

Therefore, an action frame was considered to be a more versatile way of conveying interference mitigation.

* + 1. There may be a proposal from the commenter coming, but for now this will be the TG position for a possible resolution.
    2. Menzo will post the resolution to the reflector for potential further discussion or any updated proposal.
    3. Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. CID 4168 (MAC)
     1. Review comment
     2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-01-31 16:33:06Z)
     3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. CID 4264 (MAC)
     1. Review Comment
     2. Significant effort may be required to potential make any of the proposed changes.
     3. A submission will need to be made.
     4. Direction of the proposed resolution; Reject – Insufficient details.
     5. Assign to Commenter for submission.
     6. AdHoc Status: Mark as "insufficient detail". Assign to Mark RISON. Mark ready for motion, until/unless a submission is provided.
     7. Prepared Resolution: CID 4264 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2020-01-31 16:36:04Z): The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
  3. CID 4270 (PHY)
     1. Review Comment
     2. Need for more work.
     3. Submission would be required. – Menzo to prepare.
  4. CID 4271 (PHY)
     1. Review comment
     2. Need for more work.
     3. Submission would be required.
     4. Discussion on the EDCA table requirements – 1 for itself and 1 for what it signals to the AP.
     5. Assign to Mark RISON for a submission.
  5. CID 4289 (MAC)
     1. Review Comment
     2. Proposed Resolution: Revised - agree with the comment.

1834.11 change to "Frames from a higher priority AC may be included when at least one frame from the primary AC will be transmitted and all frames from the primary AC will have been transmitted."

1834.18 delete “Frames from the primary AC shall be transmitted first."

* + 1. Discussion on how the traffic is being determined for content and order.
    2. Discussion on Fairness of queuing. Is it permissible to add extra packets if you have open slots?
    3. Menzo will take to reflector for more discussion.
  1. Next telecon next week Feb 4
  2. Please send Email if attending the Face to face in Florida Feb 18-20, 2020
  3. Also need to resolve if Mark RISON is able to host AdHoc in April – Add to agenda for next Friday.
  4. **Adjourned** 12:02pm
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