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Abstract

Minutes for TGmd (REVmd) telecon for November 1st, 2019.

1. **802.11md – REVmd – Telecon, Friday 1 November 2019, 10:00-12:00 ET**
	1. **Call to Order** at 10:04am ET by the TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Attendance:**
		1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
		2. Dan Harkins (HPE)
		3. Edward Au (Huawei)
		4. Emily Qi (Intel)
		5. Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/CommScope)
		6. Mark Rison (Samsung)Michael Montemurro (Blackberry)
		7. Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		8. George Calcev (Futurewei)
		9. Joseph Levy (Interdigital)
	3. Patent Policy reviewed.
		1. In response to the patent policy being read, a member noted that there is a potentially essential patent that is covering one of today’s agenda items.
		2. The Chair will follow up with the member to obtain details.
	4. **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. Draft Agenda:
2. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy
	1. 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.

* 1. Participation slide: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0180-05-00EC-ieee-802-participation-slide.pptx>
1. Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU
2. Comment resolution
3. AOB,
	1. Plans for the 2019 November session
4. Adjourn
	* 1. Add to agenda:
			1. Comment resolution (30 comments)
			2. Dan Harkins 11-19/1817r1
		2. **No objection to updated Adgenda.**
	1. **Editor report 11-18/611r27** Emily QI (Intel)
		1. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0611-27-000m-revmd-wg-ballot-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-0611-27-000m-revmd-wg-ballot-comments.xls)
		2. There were 30 Comments
		3. There were 20 Technical Comments – 10 Editorial comments
		4. Only 3 MBS comments and 27 non-MBS comments
		5. Ballot passed:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P802.11REVmd Ballot Series** | **LB245** | **LB236** | **LB232** |  |
| **Approve** | 213 | 199 | 166 |  |
| **Disapprove** | 8 | 16 | 29 |  |
| **Abstain - Lack of expertise** | 7 | 7 | 8 |  |
| **Invalid** | 0 | 0 | 1 | Invalid - disapprove w/o comment |
| **Abstain - Lack of time** | 4 | 3 | 3 | Invalid abstain |
| **Abstain - Other** | 0 | 0 | 0 | Invalid abstain |
| **#N/A** | 33 | 40 | 58 | No ballot returned |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sum (includes ex-officio)** | 265 | 265 | 265 |  |
| **Approval Percentage** | 96% | 93% | 85% |  |
| **Disapproval Percentage** | 3.62% | 7.44% | 14.87% |  |
| **Abstain Percentage (<30%)** | 2.76% | 2.76% | 3.15% |  |
| **Pool= Voters-exofficio** | 254 | 254 | 254 |  |
| **Return rate (>50%)** | 89.76% | 87.40% | 79.92% |  |

* 1. **Comment Resolution:**
		1. Review Comments
			1. The TG needs to determine if we will make any changes to the draft based on the comments received or not.
		2. Reviewed 11-11-1625 r2 – Comment Resolution Guide
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/11/11-11-1625-02-0000-comment-resolution-guide.doc>
			2. Review section 2.6 “Must be satisfied” (MBS) comments.
		3. Review Technical comments
			1. CID 3005 Technical
				1. Review comment
				2. Proposed change is insufficient detail.
				3. Proposed resolution: Reject; 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.
				4. Mark Comment ready for Motion
			2. CID 3008 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; 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. Mark comment Ready for Motion
			3. CID 3009 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; 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. Mark comment Ready for Motion
			4. CID 3010 Technical
				1. Review comment
				2. Review 10.6.13.3 in draft.
				3. The formula was not changed in this draft.
				4. If we are not making any changes, then rejecting is fine, but if we are making any changes, then we should reconsider this.
				5. This should be revisited. Can be rejected
				6. Propose to assign this to Matthew Fischer/Youhan Kim/Brian Hart to review technical merit.
				7. Proposed resolution: Reject – unchanged text
				8. Mark ready for motion
			5. CID 3011 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; 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. Mark comment Ready for Motion
			6. CID 3012 Technical
				1. Review comment
				2. Review p1827
				3. No change from the prior ballot.
				4. Can be rejected – unchanged text.
				5. Proposed resolution:
			7. CID 3013 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Review 11-19/1564r0
				3. Not explicit changes as there are only examples given.
				4. Review state of document from September 802W Interim – document was presented, no action was taken as it did not reference any CID up to that time.
				5. The clause cited is changed text.
				6. The changes in the document are not clearly called out to know which of the changes are to address this CID.
				7. Proposed resolution: Reject - insufficient detail; the cited document also includes changes to 10.25.6.6.3. It is unclear if these changes are also to be included.
				8. Mark Ready for Motion
			8. CID 3014 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Review doc 11-19-1562
				3. Review Minutes from September 802W Interim
				4. Rejected. Document 11-19-1562 was discussed in the 2019-September meeting (see 11-19-1407 section 6.5) where additional required changes were identified.
				5. Mark Ready for Motion
			9. CID 3015 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Change requested on specific lines not changed
				3. Can mark Reject unchanged text
				4. Proposed resolution: Reject – Unchanged Text
				5. Mark Ready for motion
			10. CID 3016 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Discussion of the Proposed Change.
				3. P1018.51 changes checked.
				4. Proposed resolution: Reject – unchanged text.
				5. Mark ready for Motion
			11. CID 3017 Technical
				1. Review comment
				2. The sentence cited is unchanged, but the previous sentence is changed.
				3. P3851.
				4. CID 2570 changed the hyphen in the prior sentence.
				5. Proposed Resolution: Reject – unchanged Text.
			12. CID 3020 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Insufficient Detail.
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			13. CID 3021 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – Unchanged Text
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			14. CID 3022 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Insufficient Detail.
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			15. CID 3023 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Insufficient Detail.
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			16. CID 3024 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Insufficient Detail.
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			17. CID 3025 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Insufficient Detail.
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			18. CID 3026 Technical
				1. Review Comment
				2. Can be marked rejected on unchanged text.
				3. Proposed resolution: Reject unchanged text
				4. Mark Ready for Motion
			19. CID 3027 Technical
				1. Review comment
				2. Proposed resolution: Rejected; The cited text applies to frames that do not use QMF, per the previous sentence. The previous paragraph applies to GQMFs. Thus, they are not redundant.
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			20. CID 3029 Technical
				1. Review comment
				2. Proposed resolution: Rejected – insufficient detail
				3. Mark ready for Motion
		4. Review all the technical CIDs for potential rejections.
			1. Action item for Emily – need formal language for rejected for unchanged text.
			2. Action item to check CID 3010 for unchanged text.
		5. Editorial Comments
			1. CID 3018 and 3019
				1. Comments from Roger Marks may be withdrawn.
			2. Discussion on if we should continue looking for reject reasons for the editorial comments if we have a presentation that may cause a change anyway.
				1. Continue with the Comment resolutions for 15 minutes then look at Mr. Harkins Submission.
			3. CID 3000 Editorial
				1. Review comment
				2. Proposed resolution: Rejected – the editorial style is to minimize the use of hyphens.
				3. Mark Ready for motion
			4. CID 3001, CID 3002, 3003 Editorial
				1. Review Comment
				2. Motion 117 was used to incorporate changes in doc 11-19/119r0. Two of the 3 cited locations were not changed. And the third instance was added to be consistent.
				3. Proposed resolution CID 3001 and 3002: Rejected- unchanged Text
				4. Proposed resolution CID 3003: Reject - the term "doing xxx" is used elsewhere in the draft; no change for consistency. See 2719.59 for an example.
				5. Mark Ready for Motion
			5. CID 3004 Editorial
				1. Review comment
				2. Review change in area from earlier draft - CID 1363: In O.3 change "PPDU addressed" to "Frames addressed" (3x)
				3. Proposed Resolution: Reject – Unchanged draft.
				4. Mark ready for Motion
			6. CID 3006 Editorial
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed resolution: rejected – unchanged text
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			7. CID 3007 Editorial
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed resolution: rejected – unchanged text
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
			8. CID 3018 and CID 3019 Editorial
				1. Review comment
				2. This is on changed text: commenter might withdraw comments.
				3. Still open for now.
			9. CID 3028 Editorial
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed resolution: rejected – unchanged text
				3. Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-19/1817r1** Dan Harkins (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1817-01-000m-hash-to-curve-changes.docx>
		2. Abstract: REVmd uses an algorithm from an Internet-Draft to convert an arbitrary string into a point on an elliptic cufve. One of the parameters in this algorithm has changed and criteria for selecting it has also changed. This submission updates REVmd to use the new selection criteria and to indicate the parameter values for popular elliptic curves.
		3. Review submission
		4. There were noted some spelling errors and minor errors that will need to be made into R2.
		5. New test vectors will need to be created and tested.
		6. Discussion:
			1. Concern with the equations and the table providing redundant information.
				1. The Internet draft has both the equations and the z value for each curve.
			2. Suggestion to take into consideration the changes during the Sponsor Ballot phase.
				1. The request was to add this change to avoid a potential SEP issue with this text.
			3. Internet draft could be referenced instead of copying text.
				1. We cannot reference an Internet Draft
				2. We can reference the RFC.
				3. The next IETF call is coming very soon, a few months delay for RFC.
			4. Can the section be removed and just reference the RFC in the future?
				1. This could be one possible path.
			5. Whether we make changes or not will be determined during the November Plenary.
			6. Discussion on if we make one change if we can recirculate once or does it require twice.
				1. Review process of the Letter Ballot process.
				2. Dorothy to present the process for review in November
	3. **Review the text for reject reason “unchanged text”**
		1. Reject reason for unchanged text: The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
		2. This will be applied to each of the CIDs we discussed today and noted as “unchanged text”
		3. Action Item: Mark HAMILTON – to try to verify all the points of the rejection are correctly applied.
	4. **Action Item: Emily to post updated comment file with 28 comments resolved ready for motion and the outstanding 2 will be discussed further.**
	5. **Discussion on the potential timelines.**
		1. Will discuss more detail at the face to face Plenary session in Waikoloa.
	6. **Adjourned 12:00 ET**
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