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# Tuesday, 18 May 2010, 8:00 (AM2)

**10:53** Pat Kinney, TG4h chair, called the meeting to order.

Chair presented the opening report (15-10-0296-01).

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.

Chair announced the LB52 (TG4h letter ballot) results:

Responses: 185 (82.6% of 224)

Approve: 160 (95.8%)

Disapprove: 7

Abstain: 18

Comments: 111

Editorial 46

Technical 65

The ballot is valid (> 50% return and <30% abstains) and the draft is approved (> 75% approve).

**Comment Resolution Process**

1. Define comment categories
2. Assign comment resolution team lead for each category
3. Categorize comments as per teams
4. Review comments and sort into categories
	1. More information from commenter needed
	2. Out of scope
	3. Resolution is straightforward without contention
	4. Comment is conflicting or resolution could be considered contentious
5. Send out emails to commenters requesting additional information
	1. 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

Four categories were defined: UWB (4a), MAC, Security (Sec), General Technical (Gen-T), General Editorial (Gen-E).

The rest of the time was spent categorizing the comments and resolving the less contentious comments with the results being recorded in doc 15-10-0280-02.

**12:04** Meeting adjourned