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# Wednesday, 19 May 2010, 8:00 (AM1)

**8:20** Pat Kinney, TG4e chair, called the meeting to order.

Chair presented opening report 15-10-0294-00-004e:

Chair displayed the IEEE-SA slides #1 through #4 of the IEEE patent policy.

Chair asked if anyone in the meeting was 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? There were no responses.

**Agenda for Beijing**

Chair presented the agenda 15-10-0254-0. Chair noted that the three meetings on Tuesday had been canceled due to LB53 not being completed at that time, the following changes were agreed upon:

* Delete meetings on Tuesday

Revision resulted in updating the agenda to rev 1. Motion to approve agenda as modified was moved by Myung Lee and seconded by Ludwig Winkel. Upon neither discussion nor objection the motion carries by unanimous consent.

**Minutes from Orlando**

Motion to approve the minutes from Orlando 15-10-0232-00 was made by Ludwig Winkel and seconded by Ghulam Bhatti. Upon neither discussion nor objection the motion carries by unanimous consent.

**8:35 LB53**

Results:

* Voters     224
  + Voted      178 (79.5%)
  + Yes         120 (73.6%)
  + No            43
  + Abstain    15 (8.4%)
* Comments         1643
  + Editorial      491
  + Technical 1152

The Letter Ballot was valid with more than 50% of voter return and less than 30% of voters abstaining but it failed due to less than 75% approval.

**Comment Resolution Process**

The chair advised the group on the IEEE requirements of letter ballot comment resolution. The chair further advised the group to treat all comments as per their merits and not by the commenter’s vote; the rationale being that the primary purpose of the comments is to improve the quality of the draft and not to turn “no” voters to “yes” voters.

The group agreed to the following comment resolution process:

1. Define comment resolution categories and name team leads
2. Assign categories to each comment
3. Categorize comments as per team
4. First review of comments into resolution classes
   * More information from commenter needed
   * Out of scope
   * Straightforward resolution (i.e. just do it)
   * Contradictory/contentious
5. Send out emails to commenters requesting additional information
   * If no response within ~1-2 week(s), comment will be rejected
6. Comment resolution team to work on non-contentious comments
7. Those comments with high potential for conflict should be scheduled for a face-face meeting

**Resolutions**

The group agreed to the following resolutions:

* Accept (A) – comment and proposed change are agreed upon
* Accept in Principle (AiP) – comment is agreed upon but with a different propose change
* Reject (R) – comment and proposed change are not agree upon, reason for rejection will be stated in the comment database
* Withdrawn (W) – comment and proposed change were withdrawn by commenter

**Categorization**

The group agreed to categorize the comments as per the following categories and leads:

* DSME Myung Lee
* TSCH Jonathan Simon
* LE Wei Hong
* LL Michael Bahr
* EBR Pat Kinney
* ESOR Will San Filippo/Robert Cragie
* General Pat Kinney
* 4F Tim Harrington
* 4G Wun-Cheol Jeuog/Greg Gillooly
* Metrics Tim Godfrey
* FastA Betty Zhao

The group then started the effort of categorizing the comments with the results capture in the consolidate comment document 15-10-0321-02.

**10:00** meeting recessed

# Wednesday, 19 May 2010, 13:30 (PM1)

**13:35** Chair called the meeting to order

Comment categorization continued with results captured in document 15-10-0321-02

**15:20** Meeting recessed by chair

# Thursday, 20 May 2010, 8:00 (AM1)

**8:24** Meeting called to order

Comment categorization continued until completion with results captured in document 15-10-0321-02

**10:00** Chair recessed the meeting

# Thursday, 20 May 2010, 10:30 (AM2)

**10:40** Chair called meeting to order

Chair advised the group that the comments were more appropriate for TG4g needed to be sent to TG4g before noon to allow TG4g to review them. Accordingly two comments: “it is not clear what the term ‘symbol’ means for the OFDM PHY” (195-210, 213-226, 228-236, 1094-1109, 1112-1125, 1127-1135) and “the OFDM PHY has many modulation and coding schemes….” (168, 193, 227, 237, 963, 1014, 1015, 1126, and 1137) were identified as being not MAC issues. Document 350r0 was created to list these comments.

Motion: *TG4e rejects the comments as listed in document 15-10-350-00 as out of scope and recommends that TG4g consider them as related to the implementation of OFDM.*

Moved by Will San Filippo and seconded by Tim Godfrey. Upon no further discussion nor objection the motion carries.

Discussion ensued as to how to start comment resolution.

The breakdown of technical comments per category was:

* DSME 331
* TSCH 226
* ESOR 186
* General 144
* 4G 124
* LL 99
* LE 26
* 4F 10
* Metrics 5

It was agreed to split into two teams to address the largest number of comments; DSME and ESOR went off to start comment resolution.

**12:30** meeting recessed until Thursday PM1

# Thursday, 20 May 2010, 13:30 (PM1)

**13:43** Chair called meeting to order

The DSME team defined the process that they would follow to resolve comments; i.e. by working on them individually and then discussing them on conference calls.

The ESOR team reviewed the history of the scheme present on the draft and then worked on resolving their comments on a comment by comment basis. Of the comments designated as ESOR, the team identified 57 as being related to frame control, 10 to split frames, 20 to enhanced security, 20 miscellaneous, 25 comments that should be reassigned to DSME, 7 that should be reassigned to LL, and 1 that should be reassigned to TSCH.

Discussion ensued as to the best way to resolve the frame control and split frame comments. The ESOR team believed that the commenters did not understand the draft’s frame control concept. Discussion ensued as to how to remedy the situation; either draft text to better explain the system or to change frame control to make it simpler. Michael Bahr presented 15-09-825-03 as a simpler frame control mechanism that accomplished the needs of TG4f, LL, and the other groups. After discussion of the effect of changing frame control fields, there were no objections to changing the frame control scheme to that proposed by Michael Bahr. Michael Bahr agreed to draft the changes to 802.15.4-2006 to achieve the frame control field scheme as described in doc 825r3 and to identify all current frame control field text that should be removed from the draft. Furthermore Michael Bahr agreed to supply a schedule for the above efforts.

**15:47** Chair recessed until PM2

# Thursday, 20 May 2010, 16:00 (PM2)

**16:07** Chair called meeting to order

Discussion ensued as to major TG4g concerns. It was generally agreed that the TG4g comments would be the basis for any MAC changes.

Discussion ensued as to the need for a face to face ad hoc. An ad hoc would allow discussion and resolution of contentious comments. It was agreed that collocating with TG4g’s ad hoc would be best. There were no objections to the ad hoc being held on 7,8,9 July in the San Diego area. The group reviewed the TG4e closing report 15-10-0359-00 and approved it.

**17:24** Meeting adjourned