Tentative MAC Minutes
Monday, March 6, 1995

The meeting was called to order by chairman Dave Bagby at 8:30 AM. Carolyn Heide secretary.

Break Small Groups

> The group broke into small groups to discuss sections, as divided up in the interim meeting of the day before (document P802.11 95/43).

Brief all together discussion:

> How to resolve cross-group issues on Wednesday afternoon? Vic had in mind bringing motions on issues easy to resolve, then discussing overlap issues.

> How to make changes official? Can't vote individually as there is a huge volume, need to group things ("blocks"). If things could be printed, people could look at the subject of their "block" voting.

> Some people are against "block" voting: don't want to vote yes on things they haven't seen. Circulate the comment/response documents, then discuss, then vote. This takes longer, but let's be realistic about how long this will take.

> Straw poll - proceeding with the goal of "block" voting: many in favor; one against; many undecided.

> Group will now go and produce: (1) responses to comments individually; and, (2) modified draft standard text that reflects the comment responses. As much as can be done by the end of the day so they can be copied and circulated.

Break Small Groups Again

Wednesday PM, March 8, 1995

Meeting called to order at about 2:15 PM, by chairman Dave Babgy. Carolyn Heide secretary.

Break Small Groups Again

Thursday AM, March 9, 1995

Meeting called to order at 8:40 AM, by chairman Dave Babgy. Carolyn Heide secretary.

1. Administration

> - Comments on minutes from last two meetings (Lake Tahoe & San Jose): none

> - approved by consensus

2 Overview of section changes

> 1. Mostly wording and clarity no major changes

> 2. Unresolved issue revolve around security issues. Default authentication method desired. Missing state transition put back in which causes some changes to section 4.

> 3. Quite a few time bounded comments. Made section consistent with section 5. Fixed some service class parameters to match the new 802.2. Connection service definitions and security issues to be discussed.

4. A lot of 'write it better' comments. Got into management frames then decided they should be driven by other sections. Deferred: even octet size of elements; setting beacon interval for FH considerations. Improved descriptions and consistency. Elements remain used for frame optional information, fixed fields for mandatory. Requests for complete reorganization of types and subtypes not done yet.

5. Improved the overview sections. Specifications for the IFSs are needed. Fixed MPDU ID references. Removed the DTBS section. Medium free versus slot boundary unresolved discussion. RTS/CTS patent issue unresolved. Removal of multirate issue unresolved. Need a list of management services. update MAC state machine. UPCS etiquette support issue unresolved. Changes made up to the middle of 5.2

5.4 January meeting security decisions incorporated. Unresolved - whether security is optional or mandatory and what the algorithm is.

5.5 & 5.6 Changes: 1. to reflect fragmentation is intended to handle MSDU > MPDU; 2. Fixed MPDU ID references. Deferred: 1. removal of use of fragmentation at dwell boundary; 2. Barry's comments about a MAC not implementing fragmentation if its MPDU > MSDU.

7 Updated 7.1. Defined: time synchronization; beacon generation; passive and active scanning; probe response procedure; mechanism to initialize and synchronize with a BSS; algorithm to coalesce ad hoc networks; mechanism for timing synchronization between MAC and FH PHY. Specific value definition deferred.

3. How to proceed

Some people would like to see modified text supplied by this week's groups and address each of their comments individually based on what they see there. Others prefer "block" voting on all the changes in a section, evaluating what's there as a whole. Everyone agrees the result has got to be better than D1.

Some propose reading the modified sections yet this week and voting now. Others would like to have more time.

Motion #1:	**802.11 send out a letter ballot for (closure before the May meeting)**
	1. Recognizing that D1 L.B. comment process is incomplete.
	2. In order to capture the progress made in March mtg. The question is 'are the changes a net improvement over D1', not 'is everything perfect'.
	3. Do you approve adopting the changes from March mtg into D1.1 on a ~~section~~ document by ~~section~~ document.
Moved by:	Tom Baumgartner
Seconded by:	Tom Siep

Motion 1 Discussion:
In favor: If you believe there is something fundamentally wrong with a block of text, you can't communicate with the group about it before the letter ballot goes through.
Against: If a group intended to continue working to get stuff decided into the document and had hoped to keep working between the meetings, that might be obstructed by this. impact on editors, what do we do after the vote results are in.

Motion #2:	**In the 3rd item use 'document' instead of 'section'**
Moved by:	Rick White
Seconded by:	Pablo Brenner

Motion 2 Discussion:
Call the question, Tom Baumgartner, second Greg Ennis (all ayes, no nays).

Approved: many ayes   Opposed: 1 nay   *Motion #2 passes*

Motion 1 Discussion (con't):
Clarification of how stuff gets into the draft - if a section passes the letter ballot vote the editors put right into draft as is. New draft (D1.1) will come out shortly before the May meeting. The letter ballot votes will be technical, require 75% to pass.

Motion #3:   **To amend 'document' to 'subsection'.**

Moved by: Tom Tsoulogiannis
Chairman hears no second, Chris Zegelin appeals. Vote to overrule (16, 7).
Seconded by: Chris Zegelin

Motion 3 Discussion:
Call the question, Tom Baumgartner, second Tom Siep (15,10).
Against: introduces complication to process, and will introduce inconsistencies to the draft. Those documents were made as a whole and should stand or fall that way.
In favor: documents usually will be 80% is right, 10% is bogus. This allows highlighting the bad while getting the good stuff.
Call the question, Dave Bagby, second Barry Dobyns (no nays)

Approved: 10   Opposed: 14   Abstain: 3   *Motion #3 fails*

Motion 1 Discussion (con't):
Time scale? Section 4 changes are not all made yet, can be done by end of next week. Whatever text is available by the first mailing is suggested, but the first mailing is tomorrow, so that's no good. Issue not resolved, the parties involved will work it out.

Approved: 20   Opposed: 2   Abstain: 7   *Motion #1 passes*

4. Reviews of report to the plenary

Motion #4:   **15 minute break.**

Moved by: Jon Rosdahl
Seconded by: Don Johnson

Opposed: none   *Motion #4 passes*

Report approved by consensus.

Motion #5:   **To adjourn the MAC meeting for the purpose of allowing people to read the stuff in their pigeon holes in order to be prepared for plenary votes this afternoon**

Moved by: Barry Dobyns
Seconded by: Chandos Rypinski

Approved: 18   Opposed: 3   Abstain: 0   *Motion #5 passes*

Meeting adjourned: 10:50 AM