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Abstract

This file has the Telecon Minutes for REVme during the 2021 November IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary.

R0: Nov 9 Telecon Minutes

R1: Nov 10 Telecon Minutes Added.

R2: Nov 11 Telecon Minutes Added.

R3: Nov 12 Telecon Minutes Added.

ACTION ITEMS:

1.8.11.9 ACTION ITEM #1: Stephen MCCAAN will send details of CID 359 (MAC) to the reflector for more offline discussion.

2.7.2.16 ACTION ITEM #2: Joseph Levey to update 11-21/1716r1 and post to mentor.

2.8.4.7 ACTION ITEM #3: Michael MONTEMURRO to contact Menzo WENTINK to review CID 253 resolution

* + 1. ACTION ITEM #4: Jerome HENRY to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 90. *(Note this action item has been completed).*
			1. ACTION ITEM #5: Brian HART to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 13.

3.11.3.4 ACTION ITEM #6: KAZ SAKODA to work with Mark RISON on list of editorial changes to 11-21/773r1 and produce 11-21/1773r2 for completing the resolution.

* + - 1. ACTION ITEM #7: Dave GOODALL to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 45. *(Note this action item has been completed).*

3.13.3.5 ACTION ITEM #8: Dave GOODALL to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 43. *(Note this action item has been completed).*

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 802 Electronic Plenary – Tuesday 9 Nov 4-6pm ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 16:03am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Officers.**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy, Copyright Policy and 802 Policies**
		1. No response to call for Patent.
		2. This Telecon is part of the 2021 November IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary and Registration is required.
	4. **Chair Statement** on goals and status of Task Group.
		1. Target to get the CC35 Comments resolved this session.
		2. Desire to work together to be ready for First WG LB out of this session.
	5. **Review today’s agenda – 11-21/1632r1**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-01-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
		2. Draft Agenda:

Tuesday Nov 9, 4pm ET

* + 1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
		2. Approve agenda
		3. 802.11ay Corrigendum PAR Review
		4. Editor Report
		5. Comment Resolution
1. MAC Comments – McCann (Huawei)
2. MAC Comments – Rison (Samsung)
	* 1. Recess
		2. Unanimous Approval for Proposed Agenda – No Objection.
	1. **802.11ay Corrigendum PAR Review** Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1750-01-000m-par-corrigendum-1-correct-802-11ay-assignment-of-protected-announce-support-bit.docx>
		2. Review the changes from last Monday.
		3. No objection – Will motion on Monday Nov 15th for sending to WG.
	2. **Editor Report** – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-04-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
		2. Reference Documents:
			1. **Draft: P802.11REVme D 0.4 (members’ area)**
				1. [Draft P802.11REVme\_D0.4.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/Draft%20P802.11REVme_D0.4.pdf)
				2. [Draft P802.11REVme\_D0.4 Redline Compared to D0.3.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/Draft%20P802.11REVme_D0.4%20Redline%20Compared%20to%20D0.3.pdf)
			2. **D0.4 Word docs and figures are also available (member’s area) for preparing submissions.**
				1. [REVme\_D0.4-Figure Source.zip](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/Figure%20Source-D0.4.zip)
				2. [REVme\_D0.4.rtf.zip](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/REVme_D0.4.rtf.zip)
			3. **CC35 Comments**
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0684-09-000m-revme-wg-cc35-comments.xlsx>
		3. Amendment Roll-in
3. **802.11-2020 – Done, D0.0**
4. **802.11ax-2021 – Done, D0.1**
5. **802.11ay-2021 – by September 2021**
6. **802.11ba-2021 – by November 2021**
	* 1. CC35 Comments – Resolution Status:

* + - 1. 79 CIDs currently ready for Motion
		1. Assignees:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Owning Ad-hoc** | **GEN** | **MAC** | **SEC** | **ED2** | **ED1** | **PHY** | **Grand Total** |
| Brian HART |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Dan Harkins |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Edward Au | 3 |  |  | 22 |  |  | 25 |
| Graham Smith | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Jon Rosdahl | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| Mark HAMILTON | 1 | 14 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 17 |
| Mark RISON | 22 | 73 | 18 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 136 |
| Menzo WENTINK |  | 12 |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| Michael Montemurro |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Stephen McCann |  | 16 |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Youhan KIM |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| **Grand Total** | **39** | **119** | **20** | **37** | **3** | **7** | **225** |

:

* 1. **Review doc 11-21/1637r4** - MAC CIDs – Stephen MCCAAN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-04-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>
		2. All references are against D0.0
		3. CID 524 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on how subelements and elements are ordered.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 524 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:29:33Z)
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 147 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 147 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:33:20Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 148 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 148 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:33:52Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 149 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution CID 149 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:34:59Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 150 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if we need DMG STA or not.
			3. demonstrate that a CDMG STA is a DMG STA: "4.3.26 CDMG STAAn IEEE 802.11 CDMG STA is a DMG STA that supports CDMG operation in the Chinese 60 GHz frequency band and has dot11CDMGOptionImplemented equal to true. In addition to CDMG features, a CDMG STA supports DMG features as described in 4.3.22 (DMG STA)."
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 150 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:36:53Z): Add "or CMMG STA" after "DMG STA".
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 159 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 159 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:38:51Z):

At P1802L60, change "has not failed" to "is considered to be a successful transmission".

At P1802L40 change "transmission failure" to "transmission success or failure".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 136 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 136 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:41:12Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 138 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if present vs optionally present.
			3. Suggested wording: “is present if dot11WNM is true and the BSS max idle period is nonzero, or optionally present if dot11S1G is true
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 138 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 21:48:56Z) - Change "is present if dot11WirelessManagementImplemented is true" (the first occurrence in the paragraph) to "is present if dot11WirelessManagementImplemented is true and the BSS max idle period is nonzero,"
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 359 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context on p774.33.
			3. Discussion on if “natural binary” has a meaning or not.
			4. Straw Poll:

Which do you support?

a) Delete the sentence

b) Delete the word Natural

c) Reject the comment

d) Abstain

* + - * 1. Results: 3-14-12-13 no answer = 64
			1. Suggestion to Delete the word “Natural”.
				1. There was an objection to delete the word, and to reject the CID.
			2. Discussion on if we need the “binary” assertion and if we need “Natural” or not.
			3. Discussion on possible Rejection.
			4. This sentence has existed since 802.11-1997.
			5. ACTION ITEM #1: Stephen MCCAAN will send details of CID 359 (MAC) to the reflector for more offline discussion.
			6. Will be a separate item on Monday’s Agenda.
			7. CID 359 (MAC): No consensus could be found. Will continue working and try to bring back.
		1. CID 366 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if the field holds a number or string.
			3. Review context on P1475.62
			4. Discussion on use of the values and if it is “USD” or 840.
			5. Discussion of ISO 4217 description of the 3-octect string.
			6. Discussion in chat window: options are:
1. receiver only needs to understand alphabetic,
2. receiver only needs to understand numeric,
3. receiver needs to understand both
	* + 1. Currency codes are defined by ISO 4217 and can be either numeric (3.g. “840”) or alphabetic (e.g. “USD”). Therefore, the phrase “Alphabetic or numeric” may be more appropriate.
			2. The currency code field is a 3-octet as defined in ISO 4217.
			3. "ASCII string" is a defined term:

"An ASCII or UTF-8 string is a sequence of ASCII or UTF-8 encoded code points, respectively, without a terminating null."

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: CID 366 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:18:18Z): Change the cited sentence to: "The Currency Code field is a 3-octet ASCII string representing an ISO 4217 currency alphabetic or numeric code (e.g., "USD")."
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 439 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context at 2120.55
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on if the full change is needed.
			5. Suggestion to reject the CID as it is clear.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:22:37Z): Replace "STAs" with "Non-AP STAs that are not in a PBSS" in the cited sentence. Change "In a PBSS, STAs" to "Non-AP STAs in a PBSS" in the second location.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 429 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 429 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:27:00Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 434 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution CID 434 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:27:45Z): At P2294L45, change “multicast group address" to "multicast-group address".

At P3996L27 and P4010L62, change “Multicast Group address indicates the MAC address of the multicast group" to "Indicates the multicast-group address of the multicast group”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 374 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 374 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:29:11Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 572 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
				1. Proposed Resolution: CID 572 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:31:45Z)
				2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 591 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 591 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:32:28Z): 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. Move to insufficient details tab to keep rejections of this type separate from the others.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-21/0829r7** - MAC Comments – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 114 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the proposed resolution.
			3. Discussion on why “one or more” is appropriate.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 114 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:36:06Z): In the referenced subclause, replace:

“The transmission process is started by the MAC’s receipt of an MA-UNITDATA.request primitive containing an MSDU and the associated parameters. This might cause one or more Data frames containing the MSDU to be transmitted following A-MSDU aggregation, fragmentation, and security encapsulation, as appropriate.

The MAC generates the MA-UNITDATA.indication primitive in response to one or more received Data frames containing an MSDU following validation, address filtering, decryption, decapsulation, defragmentation, and A-MSDU deaggregation, as appropriate”

with:

“The transmission process is started by the MAC’s receipt of one or more MA-UNITDATA.request primitives, each containing an MSDU and its associated parameters. This might cause one or more Data frames, containing the MSDU(s), to be transmitted.

The reception process is started by the MAC’s receipt of one or more Data frames containing one or more MSDUs. This might cause one or more MA-UNITDATA.indication primitives, each containing an MSDU and its associated parameters, to be issued.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 170 and 172 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 170 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:41:36Z)
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 172 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:41:51Z): Make the change proposed by the commenter and additionally in 11.2.7.2.2 and 11.2.7.3.2 change "that contain a BU or are QoS Null frame" to "that are acknowledged by the AP".
			5. No Objection – Mark both CIDs Ready for Motion
		2. CID 231 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Review how the 11ay changes were duplicative of changes made by 11ax.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 231 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:47:32Z): In D0.4 Subclause 11.2.6 after “while the EDMG STA enables its multiple receive chains only when the frame it receives indicates that the following transmission requires the activation of multiple receive chains” append “ (see 10.39.12.4 (MIMO channel access)”, and change:

“The (11ay)HT STA may switch back to the single receive chain mode immediately after the end of the frame exchange sequence.(11ax)(11ay) The EDMG STA switches to the multiple receive chain mode when it receives a frame addressed to it and the frame indicates the following transmission requires multiple receive chains (see 10.39.12.4 (MIMO channel access)); the EDMG STA switches back immediately when the frame exchange sequence ends.”

to:

“The STA may switch back to the single receive chain mode immediately after the end of the frame exchange sequence.”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion
		1. CID 263 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 263 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:48:50Z): Change the cited NOTE to “NOTE 2—AC\_VO might be selected prior to completion of the (re)association procedure, to assist timely discovery of and joining a BSS.”
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 270 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Review proposed changes
			4. Discussion on change for 10.25.8.4.
			5. This is in the context is all A-MSDU, so we should not change to MSDU.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 270 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-09 22:58:09Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-21/829r7 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>> for CID 270, which make the proposed changes except saying "A-MSDU" in 10.25.8.4, instead of "MSDU".
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Recess at 6:01pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 802 Electronic Plenary – Wednesday 10 Nov 4-6pm ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 16:03am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Officers.**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy, Copyright Policy and 802 Policies**
		1. No response to call for Patent.
	4. **Chair Statement** on goals and status of Task Group.
		1. This Telecon is part of the 2021 November IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary and Registration is required.
		2. The Goal is to go to WG LB out of this session. Please work to close CIDs in timely manner.
	5. **Review today’s agenda – 11-21/1632r2**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-02-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
		2. Draft Agenda

Wednesday Nov 10, 4pm ET

1. Comment Resolution
	1. Document 11-21/1784 - Halasz (Morse Micro) – CID 246
	2. CID 101 – Levy (Interdigital)
	3. MAC Comments – Rison (Samsung)
	4. GEN Comments – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
2. Recess
	* + 1. Remove Editor Report from today.
			2. No other changes – Agenda approved without objection.
	1. **Review Document 11-21/1784** – CID 246 – Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1784-00-000m-cid-246.docx>
		2. CID 246 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Check for reference on the Table vs D0.0.
				1. It is Table 9-74 in REVme D0.4 for Table 9-69
				2. Table 9-32 (Beacon frame body) in D0.0 is Table 9-60 in D0.4
			3. Review Context p887 D0.00.
			4. Discussion on how restrictive the text in the table needed to be.
			5. Discussion on the text to add “Optionally present information elements(s) that are listed in Table 9-32 and not listed above.”
			6. Alternate wording: “Optionally present information element(s) that are not listed above but are allowed in Beacon frames (see Table 9-32), in the order they appear there.”
			7. Updated suggested wording: “Optionally, element(s) that are not listed above or below but are allowed in Beacon frames (see Table 9-32 Beacon Frame Body), in the order they appear there.”
			8. Need to make a distinction for S1G - "are allowed in S1G Beacon frames “
			9. Discussion on where the S1G Beacon frames elements are listed.
			10. Review table 9-46 (D0.0).
			11. Discussion on the use of MIB Variables that should preclude some elements in S1G.
			12. Suggestion to replace “above or below” with “in 9.3.4.3”
				1. Change to “in this table”
			13. Change to remove “there” with Table 9-32.
			14. Proposed Resolution: CID 246 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-10 21:29:03Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-21/1784r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1784-01-000m-cid-246.docx>).
			15. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review CID 101** Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1716-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-101-cc35-clause-11-2-1.docx>
		2. CID 101 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Minutes from Oct 22:

4.6.2.2 D0.3 used for reference in presentation.4.6.2.3 Review how the proposed change looks when implemented.4.6.2.4 Discussion on leaving the “can” statement.4.6.2.5 Assertion that Power-save is not a binary operation.4.6.2.6 Request that the STA that is ACTIVE mode, is always in AWAKE state should be stated.4.6.2.7 From standard: 11.2.3.2 Non-AP STA Power management modesA Non-AP STA can be in one of two power management modes: - Active Mode: The STA receives and transmits frames at any time. The STA remains in the awake state.4.6.2.8 Opposition to adding “scheduled” – it conflicts with some other power mode descriptions.4.6.2.9 Proposed resolution to just add “in power save (PS) mode can be in one of two states…leaving “can”4.6.2.10 Proposed Resolution: Revised; Replace “A STA can be in one of two power states:” with “A STA in power save (PS) mode can be in one of two states.”4.6.2.11 Concern that this would imply that a STA has to be in power save (PS) to be….

* + - 1. Review submission discussion in R1
			2. Suggest adding introductory sentence to 11.2.1
				1. “A STA in Active mode is always fully powered and in Awake State.”
			3. Should we include how many modes there are and what they are called.
				1. A STA can be in one of two modes:

Active Mode

PS Mode

* + - 1. Do the heading or clause title need to be adjusted?
			2. Discussion on how to address power management.
			3. Concern with the use of “can”
			4. From the CHAT

A non-AP STA can be in one of two power management modes:— Active mode: The STA receives and transmits frames at any time. The STA remains in the awakestate.— Power save (PS) mode: The STA enters the awake state to receive or transmit frames. The STAremains in the doze state otherwise.

* + - 1. Discussion on if modes are capablilities.
			2. Suggestion of changing the “can” to “shall” (or “may”).
			3. Discussion on how to make a minimal consensus on proposed changes.
			4. Suggestion to move the first paragraph in 11.2.3.2 to 11.2.1.
			5. Review the effect of moving the paragraph.
			6. Make sure that the editing instructions are made.
			7. ACTION ITEM #2: Joseph Levey to update 11-21/1716r1 and post to mentor.
			8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-10 21:54:10Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/1716r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1716-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-101-cc35-clause-11-2-1.docx>).
			9. Straw Poll”:
				1. Do you support the proposed resolution?
				2. YES/No/Abstain
				3. Results: 10/1/18 – No answer 78.
			10. Mark Ready for Motion
			11. Move CID to separate Comment Group – separate Motion.
	1. **Review doc 11-21/0829r7** – MAC CIDs – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. Display the Database for MAC CIDs
		3. CID 245 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. This seemed to have been included elsewhere.
			3. This should be Clause 9.3.3.2.
			4. Review proposed changes and the context.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 245 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-10 22:07:12Z)
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 253 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes and context.
			3. Discussion on what can be included in TXOP during EDCAF.
			4. Discussion on the proposed sentence to be deleted is redundant.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 253 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-10 22:10:15Z)
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			7. ACTION ITEM #3: Michael MONTEMURRO to contact Menzo WENTINK to review CID 253 resolution.
		5. CID 273 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes and context.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 273 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-10 22:12:58Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			5. Question on if the deleted sentence could be a note.
			6. Given this is clause 9, the sentence does not belong.
		6. CID 288 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Look for context.
			3. Discussion on if “Conditionally” vs “optionally” should be used.
			4. Proposed resolution changes:
				1. P876.44 Change to “is present if the Status Code Field is 126, under the conditions described in 12.4.7.4”
				2. P1351.62 Change “conditionally” to “optionally”
				3. P1366.48 delete the sentence.
			5. Discussion on why the prior statement being a different form is correct.
			6. Change the changes to p876.44.
				1. Change “
			7. Discussion on third possible change.
			8. In Clause 9, is “conditionally” meaningful, or “may be present, see figure” would be an option.
				1. But it would need to be a reference to some other clause, not figure.
				2. ".. subfields are present if indicated so in Figure 9-670"
			9. Fields are either Conditional/optional/required and the bit are set to tell us when they are present.
			10. The presence bit tells us if the field is present.
			11. The design of devices needs to know if the field is present or not, and the bits tell us if the fields are there.
			12. We could use “"as indicated in the RAW Control subfield bits B4...B7"”
			13. We could use the bits to indicate if present and not sate optional or conditional.
			14. We could also delete the sentence.
			15. Final Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-10 22:39:30Z): At P876.44 Change to "If the Status Code field is 126, the Rejected Groups element is conditionally present as described in 12.4.7.4; otherwise, the Rejected Groups element is not present."

At P1351.62: Change "conditionally" to "optionally"

At P1366.47: Delete the sentence at P1366.47.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Document 11-21/1821r0** - 13 CIDS - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1821-00-000m-cc35-13-gen-cids.docx>
		2. CID 181 (GEN):
			1. Reviewed the proposed change.
			2. Editorial fixes to also delete the parallel "to" that occurs later in sentences at P773.7 and P773.12.
			3. P1825.12: change the new text to “A QoS STA shall support receiving…”
			4. P1840.39: Discussion about what the MIB attribute indicates. Description says it is the maximum number of MCCAOP reservations that the MAC entity is able to track. So, we’re saying the STA shall [be able to] track the number that it is able to track – which seems self-referential.
			5. Ran out of time. Will have to pick this back up.
	2. **Recess at 6:01pm ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 802 Electronic Plenary – Thursday, 11 Nov 4-6pm ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 16:03am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Officers.**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy, Copyright Policy and 802 Policies**
		1. No response to call for Patent.
	4. **Chair Statement** on goals and status of Task Group.
		1. This Telecon is part of the 2021 November IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary and Registration is required.
		2. The Goal is to go to WG LB out of this session. Please work to close CIDs in timely manner.
	5. **Review today’s agenda – 11-21/1632r4**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-04-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
	6. **Draft Agenda:**

 **Thursday Nov 11, 4pm ET**

1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
2. Approve agenda
3. Goals for the week
4. Comment Resolution
	1. Document 11-21/836 – Jerome HENRY (Cisco) – CID 90
	2. CID 511 – Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
	3. CID 13 – Brain HART (Cisco)
	4. CID 359 – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
	5. Document 11-21/1775 – SAKODA (Sony) – CID 391/CID 397
	6. Document 11-21/1724 – Dave GOODALL (Morse Micro) – CID 603, 604, 42, 339, 334
5. Recess
	* 1. Question on changes that Joseph Levy is working on is not ready for today, and has more detail than expected yesterday (CID 101).
		2. Review Agenda, no objection to proposed agenda for today.
	1. **Review Document 11-21/836r1** – CID 90 – Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0836-01-000m-1as-ranging-ie-proposal.docx>
		2. CID 90 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on proposed changes.
				1. Need to put in “<ANA>” for the requested bit until it is assigned. Replace the “90”.
				2. Same with the “Reserved” field.
			5. Potential editorial changes need to be made.
			6. Review of 802.1AS-2020 for context check – we were not able to find the cited field. “FollupInformation” content can be variable on what can be in this variable, the format depends on the context of the STA. The format of the time is defined at the Network level.
			7. Discussion on what is the format of the Follow-up Information field.
			8. Discussion on page 7; Question on what values are not described. These values are defined in 802.11az.
			9. Discussion on information that is carried in the 1AS Follow-up Information Element.
			10. Discussion on if this submission should be in 802.11az rather than here, or something that should be brought after 802.11az is rolled in.
			11. Suggestion to have this be withdrawn and let the commenter bring back to LB1.
			12. Proposed Resolution: CID 90 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-11 21:30:33Z): The commenter has withdrawn the comment.
			13. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. ACTION ITEM #4: Jerome HENRY to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 90. *(Note this action item has been completed).*
	2. **Review doc 11-21/1824r1** – Channel Switch - Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1824-01-000m-channel-switch.docx>
		2. CID 511 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on the value of having a switch.
			5. Discussion on the when the Channel Switch is sent, and when it is required vs when it is just allowed to.
			6. More discussion on alternate paths on making connections to other variables.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 511 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 21:41:23Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/1824r1: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1824-01-000m-channel-switch.docx>.>
			8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review doc 11-21/1570r5** - CID 13 – Brain HART (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1570-05-000m-cid13.docx>
		2. CID 13 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the history of the submission and changes made.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on the importance of adding a NOT in 17.3.9.8.
			5. Discussion on what is distinct to Option 5 that has been added. It deprecates and adds notes on how it is used in the past.
			6. Discussion on what buffer requirements need to be met, and if it is scalable.
			7. Discussion on possible withdrawal.
			8. A list of queued Commenters was sent to Brian to work on a future revision to be brought back after Letter Ballot.
			9. Proposed Resolution: CID 13 (PHY): The commenter has withdrawn the comment.
			10. ACTION ITEM #5: Brian HART to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 13.
	4. **Review doc 11-21/1637r5** – MAC CIDs - Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-05-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>
		2. CID 359 (MAC)
			1. Discussion on the history of the CID and the straw poll that was taken.
			2. Proposal for rejecting the comment.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 359 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:02:19Z): The group could not come to a consensus as to how to resolve this comment.

The following straw poll "Which do you support?

a) Delete the sentence

b) Delete the word Natural

c) Reject the comment

d) Abstain

produced the result a) 3, b) 14, c) 12, d) 13.

A subsequent debate on the TGme email reflector did not produce any consensual resolution."

* + - 1. This will be a separate motion.
			2. Mark ready for motion
	1. **Review Document 11-21/1773r1** – CID 391-397 and 454 – Kaz SAKODA (Sony)
		1. Document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1773-01-000m-revme-cid-391-397-and-454-comment-resolution.docx>
		2. CID 454 (MAC)
			1. CID 454 (EDITOR): It is motioned. This is a re-visit (Motion 23)
			2. Review the minor changes
			3. New changes are in 2416.50 are being asked today.
			4. It was changed before, so we do not need to add it today.
			5. Also, we are changing the case of “mesh beacon” to “Beacon frame”.
			6. So only the upper case “Beacon Frame” may be needed to change.
				1. No is beacon and “frame” is not necessary.
			7. No change to be made to the previously approved resolution.
		3. CID 391 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes for the resolution.
			3. Discussion on if there are a long list of editorials that need to be considered offline.
			4. ACTION ITEM #6: KAZ SAKODA to work with Mark RISON on list of editorial changes to 11-21/773r1 and produce 11-21/1773r2 for completing the resolution.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 391 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:16:06Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-21/1773r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1773-02-000m-revme-cid-391-397-and-454-comment-resolution.docx) for CID 391.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 397 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 397 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:21:35Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-21/1773r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1773-02-000m-revme-cid-391-397-and-454-comment-resolution.docx) for CID 397.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	2. **Review document 11-21/1831r1** – Dave GOODALL (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1831-01-000m-cc35-for-cids-45-528-603-604-for-11ah.docx>
		2. CID 528 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 528 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-09 16:24:07Z): Insufficient details are provided to incorporate this change correctly, as the global change is not always correct. Consider, for example, 9.4.2.127 where "relay STA" (without DMG) is referring to a DMG relay STA and adding "S1G" would be incorrect.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 45 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Discussion on if two different CIDs are making a change in the same clause/paragraph.
				1. Need to only accept one of the two CIDs.
			4. Discussion to withdraw the comment and address in later time.
			5. Proposed resolution: CID 45 (SEC): Rejected. Withdrawn by commenter.
			6. ACTION ITEM #7: Dave GOODALL to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 45.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 603 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. There is not a change being agreed to now but can bring it up in WG Letter ballot time.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 603 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:29:09Z): Insufficient details are provided to incorporate this change correctly, as defining an additional PTID/Subtype has the effect of adding an extra PV1 management frame type but does not differentiate between QMF and non-QMF in general for PV1 management frames.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 604 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Discussion that the CID cannot be a simple Accept as the there is not sufficient detail.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 604 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:39:17Z): The comment fails to provide sufficient detail to implement the changes, as the changes rely on the requirements for QMF usage in PV1 frames.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	3. **Review document 11-21/1805r1** CIDs 39-43-44-334-468 - Dave GOODALL (Morse Micro).
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1805-01-000m-cc35-cids-39-43-44-334-468-for-11ah.docx>
		2. CID 39 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 43 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 43 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:49:25Z): The commenter has withdrawn the comment.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			5. ACTION ITEM #8: Dave GOODALL to send email to the reflector to note withdrawal of CID 43.
		4. CID 44 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 44 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:47:06Z): 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. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 334 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 334 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:53:39Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-21/1805r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1805-01-000m-cc35-cids-39-43-44-334-468-for-11ah.docx>) for CID 334.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion
		6. CID 468 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 468 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:55:56Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/1805r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1805-01-000m-cc35-cids-39-43-44-334-468-for-11ah.docx>) for CID 468.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Review document 11-21/1805r1** CIDs - Dave GOODALL (Morse Micro).
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1795-01-000m-cc35-phy-cid-371-for-802-11ah.docx>
		2. CID 371 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 371 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-11 23:00:55Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/1795r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1795-01-000m-cc35-phy-cid-371-for-802-11ah.docx>) for CID 371.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **Recess at 6:01pm ET**.
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 802 Electronic Plenary – Friday, 12 Nov 4-6pm ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 16:03am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Officers.**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		4. Officers that will be tardy today:
			1. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			2. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
	3. **Review Patent Policy, Copyright Policy and 802 Policies**
		1. No response to call for Patent.
	4. **Chair Statement** on goals and status of Task Group.
		1. This Telecon is part of the 2021 November IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary and Registration is required.
		2. The Goal is to go to WG LB out of this session. Please work to close CIDs in timely manner.
	5. **Review today’s agenda – 11-21/1632r5**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-05-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
		2. Draft Agenda:
2. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
3. Approve agenda
4. Goals for the week
5. Comment Resolution
6. CIDs withdrawn: 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 90, 91, 112, 113 and 422
7. CID 458
8. CID 175, 23 – HAMILTON
9. Document 11-21/1753 – WENTINK (Qualcomm) – TDLS
10. GEN CIDs – ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
11. MAC CIDs – HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
12. CID 224 – MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
13. Recess
	* 1. No objection on the proposed displayed agenda.
	1. CIDs withdrawn: 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 90, 91, 112, 113 and 422
		1. CIDs withdrawn were reviewed.
		2. The Proposed Resolution for each will be “Reject – Commenter has withdrawn comment”.
		3. Each will be added to the Comment Group ”Comment Withdrawn”
		4. Each will be marked ready for Motion.
	2. CID 458 (MAC)
		1. It is a duplicate of 359 (MAC)
		2. So, the resolution of CID359 will be copied to CID 458
			1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-11 22:02:19Z): The group could not come to a consensus as to how to resolve this comment.

The following straw poll "Which do you support?

a) Delete the sentence

b) Delete the word Natural

c) Reject the comment

d) Abstain

produced the result a) 3, b) 14, c) 12, d) 13.

A subsequent debate on the TGme email reflector did not produce any consensual resolution."

* + 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Review doc 11-21/1803r0** CID 175 and 23 – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope).
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1803-00-000m-revme-cids-175-23.docx>
		2. CID 175 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At P2532.64 and P2533.2, replace “has a non-NULL dot11RSNAConfigPasswordIdentifier” with “has a dot11RSNAConfigPasswordIdentifier that does not have a zero length”.

At P4067.29, insert

“DEFVAL { ‘’H }”

as a new line, before

“::= {dot11RSNAConfigPasswordValueEntry 3 }”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 23 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Insert the following rows, in the correct numeric sequence, in the comments following the definition of dot11phy, on P3779.27:

“-- dot11PhyFHSSTable ::= { dot11phy 4 } – No longer used”

“-- dot11PhyIRTable ::= { dot11phy 6 } – No longer used”

“-- dot11PhyVHTTable ::= { dot11phy 23 }

“-- dot11VHTTransmitBeamformingConfigTable ::= { dot11phy 24 }

“-- dot11PhyTVHTTable ::= { dot11phy 25 }

“-- dot11TVHTTransmittedBeamformingConfigTable ::= { dot11phy 26 }”

“-- dot11PhyS1GTable ::= { dot11phy 27 }

“-- dot11S1GTransmitBeamformingConfigTable ::= { dot11phy 28 }”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-21/1753r2** – TDLS Comments – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1753-02-000m-tdls-related-comment-resolutions-on-revme-draft-0-0.docx>
		2. CID 250 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 250 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-12 18:49:03Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 195 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 195 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-12 18:49:45Z): After "Transmitting a TDLS frame through the AP means that the frame's RA is set to the BSSID. Transmitting a TDLS or other frame over the direct path means that the frame's RA is set to the MAC address of the TDLS peer STA."

add

"NOTE--This implies that the RA of frames transmitted over the direct path cannot be a group address."

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 237 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if it was an MSDU or MPDU.
			3. Change to match other examples to keep “frame usage” very strict.
			4. Example definition - EAPOL-Key frame: A Data frame that carries all or part of an IEEE 802.1X EAPOL PDU of type EAPOLKey.
			5. Discussion on updating the proposed resolution.
			6. Discussion on the purpose of the TDLS frame is to be used and the specific use is limited to this case.
			7. The p2318.24 changes were discussed.
				1. Suggestion "TDLS frames shall use the formatting as specified in 11.20.2" (i.e., that Data frame encapsulation of Action frames)
				2. Discussion on if “should simply say "a frame"
				3. Other opinion - not talk about TDLS frames and say TDLS MSDUs
				4. New proposed text: "Transmitting a frame through the AP means that the frame's RA is set to the BSSID. Transmitting a frame over the direct path means that the frame's RA is set to the MAC address of the TDLS peer STA."
			8. Concern that removing TDLS before frame may lose context in subsequent paragraphs.
			9. Discussion on a possible new way to reference the TDLS Frame as may be “Encapsulated TDLS action frames”
			10. See context for TDLS payload 11.20.2 p2319.50
				1. It is not a frame, -- The TDLS payload contains a TDLS Action field.
			11. Annex H (normative) Usage of Ethertype reviewed.
			12. Other suggested definitions:
				1. "TDLS frame: A Data frame encapsulating the TDLS Action field of a TDLS Action frame"
				2. "tunneled direct-link setup (TDLS) frame (TDLS frame): A Data frame that carries all or part of a specific Ethertype encapsulation of a TDLS Action field, used for establishing and managing a TDLS direct link."
			13. Assertion that there is no such thing as a "TDLS Action frame"
			14. We do have “TDLS Action frame" per 9.4.1.11
			15. Update to the proposal was made.
			16. Proposed resolution: CID 237 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-12 18:51:46Z): Add a definition:

"tunneled direct-link setup (TDLS) frame (TDLS frame): A Data frame carrying all or part of the encapsulation of a TDLS Action field, using Ethertype 89-0d."

At 2318.24 change

"Transmitting a TDLS frame through the AP means that the frame's RA is set to the BSSID. Transmitting a frame over the direct path means that the frame's RA is set to the MAC address of the TDLS peer STA."

to

"Transmitting a TDLS frame through the AP means that the frame's RA is set to the BSSID. Transmitting a frame (whether a TDLS frame or another frame) over the direct path means that the frame's RA is set to the MAC address of the TDLS peer STA."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 201 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 201 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:25:29Z): change the cited sentence to

"Subsequent to the successful completion of the TPK handshake, all Data frames transmitted on the TDLS direct link, and all Management frames if management frame protection is in use, shall be protected using the TPKSA"

Note to commenter: Relative to the proposed change, 'TDLS link' is changed to 'TDLS direct link' and 'and received' is removed because the transmission is where the protection takes place.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 196 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 196 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:28:14Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 574 and 1 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed change to proposal: "This is the only valid combination for Data frames transmitted: a) by an IBSS or PBSS STA, b) on the direct path of a TDLS direct link, or c) outside the context of a BSS."
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CIDs 574 (MAC) and CID 1 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:29:20Z):

At 780.19, after

"A Data frame from one STA to another STA within the same IBSS or the same PBSS, a Data frame direct from one non-AP STA to another non-AP STA within the same infrastructure BSS, or a Data frame outside the context of a BSS."

replace

"This is the only valid combination for Data frames transmitted by an IBSS or PBSS STA, or outside the context of a BSS."

with

"This is the only valid combination for Data frames transmitted: a) by an IBSS or PBSS STA, b) on the direct path of a TDLS direct link, or c) outside the context of a BSS."

(Note to Editor, this is the same resolution as for CID 1.) <for cid 574>

(Note to Editor, this is the same resolution as for CID 574.)<for CID 1>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2 and 118 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Discussion on the difference on proposed change is an accept or revised.
			3. Updated the proposal to remove unneeded lists
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 2 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:36:30Z): At 1150.23, replace

"When the Element Count subfield has a value greater than 0, the MIC field contains a MIC that is calculated using the algorithm specified in 13.8.4 (FT authentication sequence: contents of third message) and 13.8.5 (FT authentication sequence: contents of fourth message). Otherwise, the MIC field is set to 0."

with

"When the Element Count subfield has a value greater than 0, the MIC field contains a MIC. Otherwise, the MIC field is set to 0."

(Note to Editor, this is the same resolution as for CID 118.)

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: CID 118 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:38:14Z): At 1150.23, replace

"When the Element Count subfield has a value greater than 0, the MIC field contains a MIC that is calculated using the algorithm specified in 13.8.4 (FT authentication sequence: contents of third message) and 13.8.5 (FT authentication sequence: contents of fourth message). Otherwise, the MIC field is set to 0."

with

"When the Element Count subfield has a value greater than 0, the MIC field contains a MIC. Otherwise, the MIC field is set to 0."

(Note to Editor, this is the same resolution as for CID 2.)

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 9 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context p1176
			3. Discuss possible missing items/definitions:

1) what about the initiator

2) what about the dialog token

3) "The TDLS initiator STA Address field is set to the TDLS initiator STA’s MAC address. The TDLS responder STA Address field is set to the TDLS responder STA’s MAC address."

* + - 1. Discussion on what matters to be fixed.
				1. Both response frames are unsolicited by a request.
			2. There is more work that can be done, but reject this CID and let come back in LB 1.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 9 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:53:03Z) - 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. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 8 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on possible implication from the comment, but not clear there is any difference.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 8 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-12 19:55:40Z): The TDLS Responder STA address should not be different from the MAC address of the STA. This might be different in 11be, but it should be handled there.

This change may cause issues with legacy TDLS devices in the field when they do not check this field.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 182 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the consistent use of “TDLS direct link”, but counter examples without “direct” was given in the discussion.
			3. There are many examples of “TDLS direct link” – 135 instances.
			4. The Editor did a search and found 98, but each would have to be checked.
			5. Request to place on separate Comment group and have a separate motion.
			6. Proposed Resolution:
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **GEN CIDs – database** - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. CID 183 (GEN), CID 184 (GEN), CID 563 (GEN).
			1. Review comments for the 3 CIDs.
			2. TG had discussed this before, back in May 2021.
			3. CID 184 (GEN) is very similar to CID 183 (GEN).
				1. Need to agree on both of them and align the resolutions.
			4. Also, CID 563 (GEN) is on this material.
			5. Discussions:
				1. Support for “Option 1”. Also support for not using “link” (versus “communication”)
				2. Support for rejecting the comment, no clear meaning that the sentence is “broken”.
				3. Option 1 includes DMG, which we need to include.
				4. The current definition doesn’t have DMG.

Not convinced we need to add it.

* + - * 1. Neither of these options is correct.
				2. We are actually modifying two different parts of the sentence.
				3. Alternates given:
			1. Alternates:
				1. D0.0 has no DMG: "peer-to-peer link: A direct link within a quality-of-service (QoS) basic service set (BSS), a tunnelled direct-link setup (TDLS) link, or a station-to-station (STA-to-STA) communication in an independent basicservice set (IBSS)."and 9.4.2.66.4
				2. Assertion that we would also need to update 9.4.2.67.4 to match whatever we change here, or delete the "a peer-to-peer link defined to..." there
				3. “A link between TDLS peer STAs in an infrastructure BSS or between STAs in an IBSS, PBSS or DMG BSS”
				4. “A link between TDLS peer STAs in an infrastructure BSS or between STAs in an IBSS or PBSS”
			2. Discussion on one option: “A link between TDLS peer STAs in an infrastructure BSS or between STAs in an IBSS, PBSS or DMG BSS”
				1. We need to see all these edits, and also fixes in 9.4.2.66.4, 9.4.2.67.4.
				2. This set of CIDs would need a submission.
			3. Straw Poll: Option1 (per ad hoc notes), Option2 (per ad hoc notes) or Option3 (Reject).
				1. Results of Straw Poll: 1-0-6-9(abstain), no answer 33.
				2. There was objection to the straw poll as the options did not include the alternatives after the start of the Straw Poll.
			4. Discussion on getting consensus on “A link between TDLS peer STAs in an infrastructure BSS or between STAs in an IBSS, PBSS or DMG BSS”.
				1. Objections to taking the alternate as is.
				2. At least one comment that we need the fix the other locations, also.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2021-11-12 20:25:05Z) After discussion in the TG, consensus for a resolution was not found.
			6. Mark Ready for motion.
	1. CID 423 (GEN):
		1. Review comment
		2. The GEN ad hoc chair was asked to find page and line numbers for SM20”s and “DSE9”s.
			1. That has been done.
		3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2021-11-12 20:35:00Z)

Make the changes as noted:

P3642.49 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.1 Status cell

P3642.53 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.2 Status cell

P3642.57 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.3 Status cell

P3643.6 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.4 Status cell

P3643.20 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.5 Status cell

P3643.31 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.6 Status cell

P3643.40 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.7 Status cell

P3643.50 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.8 Status cell

P3644.08 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.9 Status cell

P3644.16 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.10 Status cell

P3644.21 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to SM20.11 Status cell

And at

P3662.12 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.1 Status cell

P3662.21 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.2 Status cell

P3662.28 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.3 Status cell

P3662.37 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.4 Status cell

P3662.46 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.5 Status cell

P3662.55 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.6 Status cell

P3663.08 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.7 Status cell

P3663.18 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.8 Status cell

P3663.26 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.9 Status cell

P3663.37 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.10 Status cell

P3663.46 – add “AND NOT CFDMG:M” to DSE9.11 Status cell

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion.
	1. CID 393 (GEN):
		1. Review comment
		2. This was discussed back in May, and GEN AdHoc chair asked to identify edition locations and instructions.
		3. GEN AdHoc chair Added explicit editing locations and instructions.
			1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2021-11-12 20:33:40Z) on p300.4 Change “frame and is acknowledged by the STA” to "frame (and so is acknowledged by the STA)."

and on p300.5 Change “frame and is not acknowledged by the STA." to “frame (and so is not acknowledged by the STA)."

* + 1. Mark Ready for motion.
		2. Place on a separate Comment Group and run a separate motion.
		3. Out of time.
	1. **Recess at 3:32pm ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 802 Electronic Plenary – Monday, 15 Nov 4-6pm ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 16:02pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Officers.**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		5. Officers that will be tardy today:
			1. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
	3. **Review Patent Policy, Copyright Policy and 802 Policies**
		1. No response to call for Patent.
	4. **Chair Statement** on goals and status of Task Group.
		1. This Telecon is part of the 2021 November IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary and Registration is required.
		2. The Goal is to go to WG LB out of this session. Please work to close CIDs in timely manner.
	5. **Review today’s agenda – 11-21/1632r5**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-06-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda for Monday Nov 15, 4pm ET
2. Goals for the week
3. Comment Resolution
	1. MAC CIDs – HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
	2. MAC CIDs – RISON (Samsung)
	3. Annex G – SMITH (SRT)
4. Motions (at 5pm ET)
	1. Telecon and September Plenary minutes – Slide 6
	2. Document 11-21/758r14 – Slides 28-37
5. Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for January
6. AoB
	* + 1. There are 15 GEN CIDs that need to be reviewed as well as 1 SEC CID.
			2. There is one Mark RISON CID that had an email sent, but not had resolution completed.
			3. Joseph LEVY noted in CHAT: He uploaded contribution for CID 170 and 101, which have been previously discuss and waiting contributions - in 11-21/1716r1 and 11-21/1878r0 - they should be quick, but understand time is a premium.
			4. No objection to proposed agenda
	1. **MAC CIDs –** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 299 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Question on where the location is in the draft?
				1. Need to add page and line number for the changes.
				2. Location is at P2639.62 in Emily’s private draft.
				3. 2156.53 in D0.0
			3. Security concerns were expressed to not make this change.
			4. The Proposed change with “Maybe” should not be made as it is a security issue.
			5. There are 4 changes that can be made.
				1. Verified that the sentences could be found.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 299 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:15:24Z): Delete:
* "The AP shall decline any ADDTS Request frame that indicates the use of both scheduled and unscheduled APSD to be used on non-GCR-SP frames of the same AC at the same time."
* "An AP shall decline any SCS Request frame where a TCLAS Processing element is present and the Processing subfield does not have a value of 0 or 1."
* "The AP shall decline an MSCS request with the Request Type field set to "Add" or "Change" if a TCLAS Mask element is not present."
* "An AP shall decline an MSCS request with the Request Type field set to "Add" if MSCS is currently active for the requesting non-AP STA."
	+ - 1. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 301 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the context.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 301 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:20:27Z) -
			4. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 303 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. RC9 and BA and S1G usage needed to be checked
			3. Discussion on PV1 Data Frame uses.
			4. See 1726.62 (D0.0)
			5. Need to revise. – address the “or” statement.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:24:45Z): Add ", if any," after "cache" in the cited sentence.
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 304 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Context: 10.3.2.14.3:When a PV1 Data frame or PV1 Management frame is received, the appropriate cache is searched for a matching frame, regardless of the presence of the Retry subfield of the Frame Control field. If the search is successful, the frame is considered to be a duplicate. Duplicate frames are discarded.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 304 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:28:46Z) - Add RR6 in "Receiver Requirements" column, for rows RC11 and RC12.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 358 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed rejection rationale.
			3. At least one person wanted to note that this may come up in a future LB for hopefully more discussion.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 358 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-06 16:44:50Z) There are numerous issues with this area of the specification (possibly due to cutting and pasting from DMG material), including:

- Something like “All rules from 11.1.4.3.2 apply, with the following exceptions ...” is missing

- The weird ref to setting NAV to 0 is also in "Active scanning procedure for a DMG STA". The condition is when nothing has been received and switching channels

- This subclause indicates that an S1G STA can proceed directly to association from receipt of a (PV1) Probe Response frame, which only applies to a DMG STA (and only when open authentication is in use)

- Waiting for a beacon doesn't help in S1G because an S1G Beacon does not contain an RSN element etc.

However, the specific set of changes that would satisfy the commenter has not been provided.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 365 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Context p1188, p1190, p841 –
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 365 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:33:51Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		2. CID 370 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. While we reviewed this on 9-17, there did not seem to be consensus, so propose rejection for no consensus.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 370 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:34:59Z) - No consensus. This was discussed on 9/17. The group was not satisfied with just “Accept”. There were alternate proposals for “ignore” versus “drop” or maybe “discard”. We ended up with “discard” for frames, and “ignore” for everything else, but need the details to be written down and reviewed.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 380 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 380 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:36:19Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 389 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 389 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:37:31Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 390 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 390 (MAC): CCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:38:52Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 399 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review the Context of the changes.
			3. Change paragraph to Note and change “may” to “might”.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 399 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:41:49Z)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 416 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context of comment.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 416 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:43:57Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 448 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context of comment.
			3. Change “can determine” to “determines”
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 448 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:45:09Z)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 457 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on when a number in a table is a Binary or not.
			3. Proposed change originally: Change to "Values in other tables are shown in decimal notation, unless the values only contain the digits 0 and 1, in which case they are shown in binary notation." – P774.35 – Clause 9.2.2
			4. Clarify for change for Proposed Resolution:
			5. Alternate was to update all the tables that are in Binary to say so.
			6. The new sentence is less wrong that the text in the draft, but still some concern with this update.
			7. Would request a separate motion to consider later.
			8. Proposed Resolution: CID 457 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:48:21Z): Change to "Values in other tables are shown in decimal notation, unless all the values in the table only contain the digits 0 and 1, in which case they are shown in binary notation."
			9. Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 473 (MAC)
			1. Skip for later.
		11. CID 496 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Context – not given in comment.
			3. Proposed location: CID 496 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:55:20Z): The cited text location cannot be found in the D0.0 text.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 498 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Take same Resolution from CID 97
			3. Include in Motion 27 when motions are to be made.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 498 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-15 21:58:33Z):

Add the following 4 definitions in 3.2:

basic modulation and coding scheme (MCS): An MCS that belongs to the basic MCS set.

basic modulation and coding scheme (MCS) set: A set of MCSs designated by the station (STA) that started the basic service set (BSS) and fixed for the lifetime of the BSS. The basic MCS set is typically advertised in the physical layer (PHY) operation element(s), e.g. HT and VHT Operation elements. All STAs in a BSS are capable of, or have signaled that they are capable of, receiving and transmitting at all MCSs in the basic MCS set.

basic rate: A data rate that belongs to the basic rate set.

basic rate set: A set of data rates designated by the station (STA) that started the basic service set (BSS) and fixed for the lifetime of the BSS. The basic rate set is advertised in the Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element and, if present, the Extended Supported Rates and BSS Membership Selectors element. All STAs in a BSS are capable of, or have signaled that they are capable of, receiving and transmitting at all rates in the basic rate set.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Motions:**
		1. **Motion 26 – ED2, GEN, MAC, PHY, SEC CIDs (2021-11-15)**

Approve the comment resolutions in the

“Motion ED2-F” tab (28 CIDs) in 11-21/0689r7 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0689-07-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>>,

“GEN Motion OCT- B“, “GEN Motion Nov –A”, except CID 183, 184 and 563 and “Comment Withdrawn” tabs (11 CIDs) in 11-21/0699r14: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-14-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>>,

“Motion MAC-AG” and “Comment Withdrawn” tabs (66 CIDs) in 11-21/0793r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-09-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>>,

“PHY Motion E” tab (26 CIDs) in 11-21/727r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-06-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>>,

“Security Motion F” tab (1 CIDs) in 11-21/0690r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0690-11-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>> ,

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Question on version document listed in CID 285 (PHY)?
				1. When Motions were done on Oct 25th, this was missing, but was added back to this tab, and the resolution is the same for the cited revision and the updated one.
			2. Moved: Jouni MALINEN
			3. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
			4. **Results for Motion #26:** Unanimous consent – Motion Passes – 39 on the WebEx call.
			5. It was noted that about 129 Comments were just resolved.
		1. **Motion 27 – CID 97 (GEN) (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 97 on the

“GEN Motion CID 97” tab in 11-21/0699r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-14-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>>, and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. Seconded: Sean COFFEY
			3. Result: Unanimous – Motion Passes – 40 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 28 – CID 393 (GEN) (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 393 on the

“GEN Motion CID 393” tab in 11-21/699r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-14-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>>, and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. Seconded: Jouni MALINEN
			3. Result: Unanimous – Motion Passes – 40 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 29 – CIDs 93, 94, 95 (MAC) (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CIDs 93, 94, 95 on the

“Motion MAC 93,94,95” tab in 11-21/0793r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-09-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>>, and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jouni MALINEN
			2. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
			3. Results: Unanimous with one exception: one abstention – Motion Passes. – 40 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 30 – CID 101 (MAC) (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 101 on the

“Motion MAC 101” tab in 11-21/793r9 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-09-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>>, and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
			2. Seconded: Joseph LEVY
			3. Result: Unanimous – Motion Passes – 40 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 31 – CID 359 (MAC) (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CIDs 359 and 458 on the

“Motion MAC 359” tab in 11-21/793r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-09-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>>, and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
			2. Seconded: Mark HAMILTON
			3. Results: Unanimous with two exceptions: one objection and one abstention – Motion Passes. – 40 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 32 – CID 207 (ED2) (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 207 on the

“Motion ED2-G” tab in 11-21/689r7 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0689-07-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>> , and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Discussion on rationale for why pulled out of the other CIDs.
			2. Moved: Edward AU
			3. Seconded: Emily QI
			4. Request for abstain on the motion.
			5. Results: Unanimous with one exception: One abstention – Motion Passes. – 40 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 33 – Insufficient Details (2021-11-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

“Insufficient Details” tab (3 CIDs) in 11-21/0738r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0738-08-000m-revme-wg-cc35-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>> ,

“Motion ED2-H” tab (31 CIDs) in 11-21/0689r7 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0689-07-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx> >

“Motion MAC Insufficient details” tabs (58 CIDs) in 11-21/0793r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-09-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>> ,

“Submission Required” tab (18 CIDs) in 11-21/0690r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0690-11-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>> with the exception of CIDs 179, 180, 186, 188, 193, 507, 462, and 432 which are in doc 11-21/829.

“Insufficient Details” tab (16 CIDs) in 11-21/0727r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-06-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>> ,

* + - 1. GEN AdHoc Insufficient Details CID resolutions are still in the AdHoc Notes for 11-21/699r14. An 11-21/699r15 will have to be posted and a motion will be made at a later time. – GEN removed from motion.
			2. Moved: Dan Harkins
			3. Seconded: Edward AU
			4. Results: Results: Unanimous – Motion Passes. – 39 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Motion 34 – 11ay Fix (2021-11-15)**
			1. Instruct the editor to incorporate the following changes (Based on

P802.11REVme D0.4):

At page 1673 line 17, replace value “6” with “11”,

At page 1673 line 26, change “8– (8xn – 1)” to “8, 9, 10, 12– (8xn – 1)”

Add a new row with value “6/ Reserved (used by the Wi-Fi Alliance® <footnote>)”

Swap the row of “Protected Announce Support” with the row of “Protected WUR Frame Support”.

into the REVme draft.

* + - 1. Discussion on why we don’t make row 6 explicitly state it is reserved for WFA. The other bits are being used for other assignments.
			2. Discussion on if the “®” is needed. Editor to work it out.
			3. Moved: Emily QI
			4. Seconded: Edward AU
			5. Results: Results: Unanimous – Motion Passes. – 38 on the WebEx call.
		1. **Initial LB Motion Discussion**
			1. Discussion:
* There are three objectives of a revision PAR:
	+ To roll-in published amendments into the baseline
	+ To address any errors/omissions in the standard
	+ To improve the specification
* Since March we have rolled in 3 amendments (11ax, 11ay, 11az) which adds ~1400 pages of specification text.
* For the comment collection:
	+ Received 604 comments; resolved approximately 550; approximately 54 comments remaining
* Rather than take the 2-month schedule hit for the project, the proposal is to approve and run the initial LB while continuing to resolve comment collection comments.
* Comment collection comment resolution will complete at the beginning of the January electronic interim
	+ - 1. How to determine which CIDs should be addressed in the Telecons between now and January?
			2. How many Telecons do we have between now and January to be determined.
			3. We need to identify what CIDs are in scope for the Telecons.
			4. Concern on duplicative effort on comments that may be posted to LB that are still open for the Telecon.
			5. For Comments that are open now but are not able to be resolved by Jan interim would need to be addressed in some manner, but concern on how that would be done.
			6. All Comments will be addressed about – 9 Discuss, 11 Review, 21 Submission required are left (41 CIDs). These would be the only ones in scope of the Telecons. The Remaining Ready for Motion (i.e the ones prepared by Mark HAMILTON today – MAC 16 CIDS) still need to have the motions applied. The Chair said he would assist with location translations from D0.0 to the draft version in question.
		1. **Motion 35 – Initial LB (2021-11-15)**
			1. Move to:

Instruct the TGme editors to prepare P802.11REVme D1.0 by incorporating P802.11REVme D0.4 and all accepted changes per motions contained in 11-21/0758r15 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0758-15-000m-revme-motions.pptx>>,

and

Approve a 40-day Working Group Technical Letter Ballot asking the question “Should REVme D1.0 be forwarded to SA Ballot?”

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
			2. Seconded: Stephen MCCAAN
			3. Result: 18-Yes 0-No 1-Abstain - Motion Passes
	1. **Move the in-person Adhoc discussion to the November 22nd Telecon.**
	2. **Telecon Schedule**
		1. Next call: Monday 22 November 2021 at 10am ET, 2hrs (previously scheduled.
		2. New Calls– 10am ET, 2hrs
			1. 29 Nov.
			2. 6, 13, 20 Dec.
			3. 7, 10, 31 Jan
		3. For the January Plenary: 6 sessions
	3. **Adjourned 6:02pm ET**
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7. **November 10:**
8. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-02-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
9. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1784-00-000m-cid-246.docx>
10. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1784-01-000m-cid-246.docx>
11. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1716-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-101-cc35-clause-11-2-1.docx>
12. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1716-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-101-cc35-clause-11-2-1.docx>
13. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
14. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1821-00-000m-cc35-13-gen-cids.docx>
15. **November 11:**
16. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-04-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
17. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0836-01-000m-1as-ranging-ie-proposal.docx>
18. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1824-01-000m-channel-switch.docx>
19. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1570-05-000m-cid13.docx>
20. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-05-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>
21. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1773-01-000m-revme-cid-391-397-and-454-comment-resolution.docx>
22. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1831-01-000m-cc35-for-cids-45-528-603-604-for-11ah.docx>
23. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1805-01-000m-cc35-cids-39-43-44-334-468-for-11ah.docx>
24. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1795-01-000m-cc35-phy-cid-371-for-802-11ah.docx>
25. **November 12:**
26. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-05-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
27. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1803-00-000m-revme-cids-175-23.docx>
28. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1753-02-000m-tdls-related-comment-resolutions-on-revme-draft-0-0.docx>
29. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1821-02-000m-cc35-13-gen-cids.docx>
30. November 15

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-06-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0689-07-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-14-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-09-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-06-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0690-11-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0738-08-000m-revme-wg-cc35-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0758-15-000m-revme-motions.pptx>