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Abstract

Telecon Minutes for REVme - 2022 Jan Electronic Interim

R0: January 18th to January 24th telecons.

R1: corrected typo on 5.5.2.3 (1014 should have been 1016)

R2: corrected typo on 1.10.8 (2048 should have been 2084

ACTION ITEMS:

**1.8.15 ACTION ITEM #1:** Youhan KIM: Assign the unassigned CIDs for non-DMG non-S1G PHY (Clauses 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21 and 27), and also CIDs 1867/2333/2367 (HE 6G STA) and CID 2364 (related to Clause 19).

* + - 1. **ACTION ITEM #2:** Emily QI – Release the ANA assignments in 11-22/82r2 (Bit 12) and mark it Reserved.

**3.5.3.5 ACTION ITEM #3:** The Editor to check if Clause 5 is normative or not.

**4.5.2.10 ACTION ITEM #4:** Mark HAMILTON - reach out to Kaz about the Mesh profile and the Mesh STA configuration differences.

* + - 1. **ACTION ITEM #5:** Mark HAMILTON to send resolution to put a Note at P2223.40 vs P2137.55 -- “"NOTE---The timer is started at different times for DCF and EDCA."
			2. **ACTION ITEM: #6:** Joseph Levy to look at all cases of DEENABLED and UNABLED to look for consistency and report back.
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim – Tuesday, January 18, 2021 at 16:00-20:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:01 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. 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)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1965r1 slides starting at 11.
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-01-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Requirement for Registration** for the 2022 January IEEE 802 Wireless Electronic Interim.
		1. See slide 4.
	4. **Review agenda**:11-21/1965r1:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-01-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Tuesday Jan 18, 4pm ET
2. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
3. Approve agenda
4. Editor Report
5. Motions
	1. Telecon and November Plenary minutes (Slide x)
	2. CC35 – Document 11-22/0056r0
6. Comment Resolution
	1. Editor 1 Comments – 11-22/0073r1 – Emily QI
	2. MAC AdHoc – Discuss – Mark HAMILTON
7. Recess
	* 1. Wednesday Jan 19, 4pm ET
8. Editor Report
9. Comment Resolution
	1. <>
10. Recess
	* 1. Thursday Jan 20, 4pm ET
11. Comment Resolution
	1. <>
12. Recess
	* 1. Friday Jan 21, 1:30pm ET
13. Comment Resolution
	1. <>
14. Recess
	* 1. Monday Jan 24, 4pm ET
15. Comment Resolution
	1. <>
16. Motions
	1. <>
17. Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for January
18. AoB
19. Adjourn
	* 1. Add Editor1 easy and MAC to plan for Today.
		2. – No objection – Agenda R2
	1. **Review LB Comment Resolution for REVme rules for LB processing**
		1. See Slide 5 in 11-21/965r2.
	2. Administrative Motions – **REVme minutes approval**
		1. Approve the minutes in documents
* 11-22/35r0 Telecon Minutes for REVme - January 7 – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0035-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-january-7.docx>
* 11-21/1967r2 Telecon Minutes for REVme - December 6 13 and 20 – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1967-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-december-6-13-and-20.docx>
* 11-21/1901r2 Telecon Minutes for REVme - November 22 and 29 – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1901-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-november-22-and-29.docx>
* 11-21/1838r4 Telecon Minutes for REVme - November Electronic Plenary – <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1838-04-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-november-electronic-plenary.docx>
	+ - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. Seconded: Mark HAMILTON
			3. Results for Motion to approve minutes: No objection – Unanimous
	1. **Motions:** Document 11-22/0056r0
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0056-00-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
		2. **Motion 37 – ED2, GEN, MAC, PHY, SEC CIDs (2022-01-17)**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

“Motion ED2-I” tab (5 CIDs) in 11-21/0689r9: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0689-09-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>

“GEN Motion - Comment Withdrawn" (2 CIDs)“, “GEN Motion Nov – B” (3 CIDs), and “Gen Motion - Dec A" (6 CIDs) in 11-21/699r19: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>,

“Motion MAC-AH” (16 CIDs) and “Motion MAC-AI” tabs (19 CIDs) in 11-21/0793r10: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-10-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>,

“PHY Motion F” tab (1 CID) in 11-21/0727r7: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-07-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>,

“Security Motion G” tab (9 CIDs) in 11-21/0690r12: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0690-12-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>,

**and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.**

* + - 1. Moved: Edward AU
			2. Seconded: Jouni Malinen
			3. Results: No objection – Unanimous Consent. – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion 38 – CID 336 (GEN) (2022-01-17)**
			1. **Approve the comment resolution for CID 336**
			2. **on the “**GEN Motion - CID 336” tab in 11-21/699r19: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>,

**and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.**

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
			2. Seconded: Edward AU
			3. Results: 20/1/1 – Motion Passes.
			4. Note that this is a rejection- so no text needs to be incorporated into the TGme draft.
		1. **Motion 39 – CIDs 230 and 497 (GEN) (2022-01-17)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CIDs 230 and 497 on the

“GEN Motion CID 230 and CID 497” tab in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-14-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls),

* + - 1. Moved: Jouni Malinen
			2. Seconded: Emily QI
			3. Results: 21-1-9 – Motion Passes.
		1. **Motion 40 – CID 111 (GEN) (2022-01-17)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 111 on the “GEN Motion - CID 111” tab in 11-21/699r19: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>,
			2. and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.
			3. Moved: Jouni Malinen
			4. Second: Jon Rosdahl
			5. Results: No objection – Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
		2. **Motion 41 – GEN Exception A (GEN) (2022-01-17)**
			1. **Approve the comment resolution for GEN Exception A comments**

**on the** “GEN Exception - A” tab (3 CIDs) in 11-21/699r19: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>,

**and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.**

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
			2. Second: Emily QI
			3. Results: No objection – Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
		1. **Motion 42 – CID 140 (GEN) (2022-01-17)**
			1. **Approve the comment resolution for CID 140 on the** “Gen Motion - CID 140” tab in11-21/ <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>,

**and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.**

* + - 1. Moved: Jouni Malinen
			2. Seconded: Amelia Andersdotter
			3. Results: No objection – Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
	1. **Editor Report** – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. See 11-21/0687r5
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-05-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
		3. Review submission
		4. Over 6000 pages in the draft now.
		5. Move to process LB258 Comments in doc 11-22/65 file series.
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0065-01-000m-revme-wg-ballot-comments.xls>
		6. Discussion on the Amendments to roll in—still open, as only TGaz and TGbd are in SA Ballot.
		7. CC35 Comments have all been resolved –
			1. AdHoc chairs asked to update and sent update files to Editor
		8. LB258 Comments:
		9. 
		10. Comment Distribution:
* ED1 (Emily Q): Editorial comments from clause 1 to clause 10, plus non-clause specified editorial comments
* ED2 (Edward A): Editorial comments from clause 11 to the end, plus non-clause specified editorial comments
* GEN (Jon R): General Comments (G) and Technical comments from clause 1 to clause 8
* MAC (Mark H): Technical comments from clause 9 to 11, clause 14, 26, 29
* PHY (Mark R): Technical comments from clause 15 to 25, clause 27, 28, 30, plus non-clause specified tech comments
* SEC (Mike M): Technical comments from clause 12 and 13, , and Annexes.
	+ 1. Issue with some of Guido’s comments – he will provide updated text that does not have the issues for the database.
		2. Review Comments by Commentors – Top 3
			1. Mark RISON – 809 comments
			2. Mark HAMILTON – 77 Comments
			3. Stephen Sand– 45 Comments
		3. Comment resolutions are starting to be done.
		4. Comments are assigned to the Commentor if submission is required.
		5. **ACTION ITEM #1:** Youhan KIM: Assign the unassigned CIDs for non-DMG non-S1G PHY (Clauses 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21 and 27), and also CIDs 1867/2333/2367 (HE 6G STA) and CID 2364 (related to Clause 19).
	1. **Review doc 11-22/0073r1** – Emily QI
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-01-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
		2. REVme WG CC35 EDITOR1 ad-hoc Comments
		3. Motion-EDITOR1-1A tab to be reviewed offline for consideration later in the session.
	2. **Review MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 1637 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context for where the suggested change would be applied.
			3. Discussion on what it means to have a Self-protected Action Frame not being protected or not.
			4. More work is required – Assigned to Mark RISON – Submission Required.
			5. Text at 1965.7 does say this, but it could be made clearer.
		2. CID 1986 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. CID 1985 has an alternative resolution to the same comment.
			4. More work required. Submission Required. Assign to Mark RISON.
		3. CID 2089 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Schedule to review on Thursday (doc 11-21/829r10)
			3. Assign to Mark RISON and mark submission required.
		4. CID 1991 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Having different phrases may be ok, rather than a global statement trying to make terms have different meanings.
			3. More work required. Mark Submission Required and assigned to Mark HAMILTON
		5. CID 1992 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on what the “beacon interval” is and how it is used.
			3. Review of 11-21/0448r0 started.
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0448-00-000m-miscellaneous-11me-d0-0-issues.pptx>
			4. The changes will need page and line numbers
			5. Assign to Mark RISON and mark submission required.
			6. Mark RISON to send request for collaboration on the reflector.
		6. CID 2008 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the header “Procedures common to the DCF and EDCAF.
			3. Some suggestion to deprecate DCF – but lots of work would be needed.
			4. Suggest wait to change the title until the heavier work is ready to be done.
			5. Suggested resolution to reject it.
			6. Discussion on if rejection is correct possible path or not.
			7. Assign the CID to Mark Hamilton, who will craft a rejection reason.
		7. CID 2036 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context p2129.58
			3. Proposed change reviewed – not sure how to execute the proposed change.
			4. The comment is not clear enough for the editor.
			5. More Work needed to clarify the instructions.
			6. Assign to Mark RISON and mark submission Required.
		8. CID 2084 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed change – to delete “Note”
			3. Review Context p1546.33 – 9 Notes in the table.
			4. Discussion on how to properly change the Notes to Normative text.
			5. Discussion on P184 – rules for normative Nots vs Lettered Footnotes.
			6. From Guido referring to ETSI: Regarding notes in Figures and Tables, please see 5.1.5 and 5.2.2 in <https://portal.etsi.org/Portals/0/TBpages/edithelp/Docs/43_ETSI_directives_20_may_2021_part2%20%28EDR%29.pdf>
			7. Editorial Style Guide says “Normative text (information required to implement the standard) includes the following:

• The main clauses of the documents including figures, tables, and equations

• Footnotes to tables

* + - 1. If it is the direction to make these NOTES as normative, then they would need to remove from the table and put in the normal text.
			2. Editor would like a submission to better understand the proposed change.
			3. Discussion on keeping the text in the box so that it is part of the table, and just remove the “NOTE ---”.
			4. It was identified that NOTE 6 refers to NOTE 7 which has a normative reference. NOTE 9 may have a normative reference as well.
			5. This will need more work.
			6. More work required. Assign to Mark RISON and mark submission required.
			7. Discussion on if the Footnote on page 184 could be changed, but our style guide dictates the format and manner of Normative text which is from the SA style guides.
			8. From 2020 and 2021 IEEE SA Standards Style Manual: "Normative text (information required to implement the standard) includes the following:

 The main clauses of the documents including figures, tables, and equations

 Footnotes to tables

 Footnotes to figures

 Annexes marked “(normative)”

Informative text (text provided for information only) includes the following:

 Frontmatter

 Notes to text, tables, and figures

At the first instance of a note associated with text, a table, or a figure, the following footnote should appear:

Notes to text, tables, and figures are for information only and do not contain requirements needed to implement the standard.

 Annexes marked “(informative),” e.g., Bibliography

Interspersed normative and informative text is not allowed. As such, neither

* + 1. CID 1615 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Assign to David GOODALL (Morse Micro)
			3. More work needed.
		2. CID 1699 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the proposed change.
			3. Discussion on relevance of Note 2 being added.
			4. The comment seems to need more work, the proposed change was not immediately accepted.
			5. More work to resolve the CID. Mark Submission Required.
			6. Assign CID to Jouni MALINEN
	1. **Recess at 6:01 ET**.
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim – Wednesday, Jan 19, 2021, at 16:00-20:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:02 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. 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)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1965r2 slides starting at 11.
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-02-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		3. No issues were noted.
	3. **Requirement for Registration** for the 2022 January IEEE 802 Wireless Electronic Interim.
		1. See slide 4.
	4. **Review agenda**:11-21/1965r2:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-02-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Wednesday Jan 19, 4pm ET
* Editor Report
* Comment Resolution
* SEC comments – Rison (Samsung)
* Recess
	+ 1. No objection to the agenda – Unanimous Consent.
	1. **Editor Report** - Emily QI (Intel)
		1. After the motion yesterday, we need the CC35 resolutions from the AdHoc groups to be able to implement them.
	2. **Action item reviewed**. – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. Issue with the encoding of the comments being submitted.
		2. It is an issue the comments submitted in ePoll being considered Unicode, when in fact they are in latin1 and that should not be Unicode specifically.
		3. So we need to recognize the text is in latin1 and then naively converted it to Unicode.
	3. **Review 11-21/829r10** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 1412 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is related to CID 193 which was approved yesterday.
			3. Proposed resolution – Revised – tie the resolution to CID 193
			4. Action Item Michael Montemurro to craft the specific wording (SEC AdHoc Chair)
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	4. **CID 1881 (SEC)** – Separate CID – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. CID 1881 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed Changes
			3. Discussion on if the right wording is done.
			4. Request to add to the 11-21/829 document.
			5. Discussion on if the events it properly described, request for more time to review.
			6. Note that there were some italic words that need to be fixed up.
			7. Discussion on if the proposed change is going to be in a word doc prior to consideration. Not a requirement, but rather a request.
			8. More work is required.
			9. Please post a doc and post to the TGm reflector and it will be scheduled for a future meeting.
	5. **Review 11-21/829r10** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 1955 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Reviewed Proposed change (was posted to WebEx chat window).
				1. Make the changes shown under "Proposed changes" under "CIDless submission (cf. CID 199, CID 587)" in 21/0829 (latest revision). Also change "In this subclause "peer STA" refers to the AP a non-AP STA is associated with, a STA that has associated with an AP, a STA in the same IBSS or PBSS, or a TDLS peer STA." to "In this subclause "peer STA" refers to the AP a non-AP STA is associated with, a STA that has associated with an AP, a STA in the same IBSS, MBSS or PBSS, or a TDLS peer STA." in 12.6.9
			3. Review context of where the change will be applied.
			4. Question on what the pages cited were for which version.
				1. No pages were used, but just clause numbering.
			5. Editor was not able to clearly decern all the changes requested.
			6. Need to indicate which revision of the document is being cited.
			7. Discussion on not having it as Accept as we cannot take verbatim, but as a Revised, with modification to indicate the proper revision of the document.
			8. Proposed resolution: CID 1955 (SEC): Revised. Ad hoc chair will craft the details to remove the confusion about what has already been done. Ready for motion.
			9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. **Review doc 11-21/1128r1** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1128-01-000m-on-frattacks-and-related-matters.docx>
			1. CID 1956 and 1957 (SEC)
			2. Review comments
			3. Note: The document may also include changes beyond those two CIDs.
			4. CID 2128 (PHY) also refers to this document.
			5. The three CIDs are covered by the doc 11-21/1128r1.
			6. The presented material is not the correct version of the file.
			7. Request to have R2 posted before continuing was made.
			8. doc 11-21/1128r2 – Mark RISON (Samsung) was posted.
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1128-02-000m-on-frattacks-and-related-matters.docx>
				2. Abstract: This submission discusses various considerations regarding vulnerabilities related to fragmentation, prompted by https://papers.mathyvanhoef.com/usenix2021.pdf, and related matters.
			9. Discussion on changes in 10.5 and 10.4 have difference references due to TX/RX.
			10. Review proposed changes
			11. FYI, "Change 26.3.3.1..." says that change applies to D0.1 and all other changes are to D0.0. Probably need to clean that up and confirm that things are still correct.
			12. There is a “Discussion” in the middle of the changes, so need to make changes after the “Discussion section” as well.
			13. Discussion on what CID tag should be used for these changes. Suggestion to use CID 2128 for all the changes.
			14. Add a note to editor for where the specific Tags need to identify the CID 1956 and 1957 as well.
			15. Discussion on how the CIDs relate to changes, and how to separate the issues so that they can be addressed independently.
			16. Possible option is to withdraw CID 1956 and 1957 and mark them all as CID 2128.
			17. Continue with review of submission without consensus on path forward.
			18. Request to upload the changes that were made during the call to R3.
			19. Discussion on the Note changes. Why do we want them or why not?
			20. Added “Consecutive” to the packet ordering.
			21. Proposed Resolution: CID 2128/CID 1956/CID 1957 as revised incorporate the changes in 11-21/1128r3.
			22. Schedule for more review on January 31st telecon
	7. **Review 11-21/829r10** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 1980 (ED2)
			1. This was CID 453 (ED2) that was rejected for insufficient detail on Nov 15th.
			2. CID 1980 requests to make the changes shown under CID 453 in 11-21/829
			3. Review Proposed Resolution in the submission.
			4. Discussion on how the proposed resolution is being presented.
			5. Discussion on when the Page and line numbers, or if Comments should be left in.
			6. The Editor noted that in 14.7 changes seem to be already made in D1.0, so this change is not needed. Without the clear change bars, it is hard to determine where the changes are and if they have been made previously or not.
			7. Ran out of time.
	8. **Recess at 6:00 ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim – Thursday, Jan 20, 2021, at 16:00-20:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:01 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. 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)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1965r3 slides starting at 12.
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-03-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
			1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Requirement for Registration** for the 2022 January IEEE 802 Wireless Electronic Interim.
		1. See slide 4.
	4. **Review agenda**:11-21/1965r3:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-03-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Specific agenda for today:
* Comment Resolution
	1. Document 11-22/0082 – Patil (Qualcomm)
	2. Document 11-22/0115 – Patil (Qualcomm)
	3. CID 2089 – Rison (Samsung)
		1. No objection to agenda:
	4. **Review doc 11-22/0082r2** - Abhi PATIL (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0082-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-protected-ba.docx>
		2. CIDs 1002, 1821 (MAC):
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review submission discussion
			3. Discussion on the potential Resolution. Make wording clear that it is not promising anything in the future.
			4. Review proposed changes.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1002 and 1821 (both MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-01-20 21:06:39Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0082r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0082-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-protected-ba.docx>) for CIDs 1002 and 1821.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			7. **ACTION ITEM #2**: Emily QI – Release the ANA assignments in 11-22/82r2 (Bit 12) and mark it Reserved.
			8. Expect to motion on Monday all CIDs ready for motion through Friday.
		3. CID 1001 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Agree with the comment. Changing the order of decryption/integrity check and reorder buffering will enable an attack scenario where the reorder buffer is filled with (fake) Data frames and the attacker is able to update the WinStartB value.

The proposed change updates the side note in Figure 5-1 requiring that the order of the processes is maintained in protected BA agreement.

TGm editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-22/0082r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0082-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-protected-ba.docx>> tagged as CID #1001

* + - 1. Discussion on if the resolution that says require, matches the proposed changes which has a may statement.
			2. **ACTION ITEM #3:** The Editor to check if Clause 5 is normative or not.
			3. Clause 9 is Normative, and you don’t need normative statements because of one of the initial statements stating it is normative descriptions.
			4. A Visio file is also needed in order for the motion to be in order.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1017, 1014, 1745 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review the proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the old "to" versus "through" debate.
			4. Keep it “to”.
			5. Proposed resolution CID 1017: (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-01-20 21:52:17Z); Agree with the comment. The proposed text change states that the recipient STA does not use the value carried in Block Ack Starting Sequence Control subfield of the BAR frame to WinStartB. As a result, this statement will also cover the error condition stated in subsequent sentences.

TGm editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-22/82r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0082-03-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-protected-ba.docx>> tagged as 1017

* + - 1. Proposed resolution: CID 1014: REVISED (MAC: 2022-01-20 21:55:46Z); Agree with the comment. Since BAR is not a protected frame, the proposed change states that the recipient STA must not use the value carried in Block Ack Starting Sequence Control subfield to update the value of WinStartR. Instead, the WinStartR gets updated based on the SN carried in a genuine MPDU.

Since clause 10.25.6.5 specifies the rules for sending a BA. Therefore, the first sentence of the first bullet is not required.

TGm editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-22/82r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0082-03-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-protected-ba.docx>> tagged as 1014

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: CID 1745: REVISED (MAC: 2022-01-20 21:56:45Z); The cited sentence was updated as a resolution to CID 1014. Since BAR is not a protected frame, the proposed change states that the recipient STA must not use the value carried in Block Ack Starting Sequence Control subfield to update the value of WinStartR.

TGm editor, please implement changes as shown in 11-22/82r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0082-03-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-protected-ba.docx>> tagged as 1014

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1808, and 1013 (MAC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Provide context for the two CIDs.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on the history of the changes being proposed.
			5. Why the changes between r1 and r2? So can more time be given to the discussion on those changes.
			6. Discussion on the change continued.
			7. Discussion on if we could use a completely different frame format for WinStartb rather than trying to use the ADDBA request format.
			8. More work may be needed on these CIDs.
			9. Bring back later for discussion.
		2. CID 1015 and 1016 (MAC)
			1. Review context of the two CIDs
			2. Review the Comments
			3. Review the discussion in the submission.
			4. Discussion on the changes.
			5. Discussion on flushing the scoreboard.
			6. A Request for more time to consider the changes.
			7. Discussion on when the Scoreboard can be flushed
			8. More work will need to be done to review the issues.
	1. **Review Doc 11-22/0115r1** Abhi PATIL (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0115-01-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-fd-frame.docx>
		2. CIDs 1011 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on "primary channel", vs "primary 20 MHz channel".
			5. Discussion on context of changes.
			6. Discussion on frequency operating classes.
			7. Discussion on properties of the BSS and MBSS.
			8. Discussion on FILS discovery.
			9. More work to be done. Will bring back later.
		3. CID 1012 and 1010 (MAC)
			1. Review comments:
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 1012 (MAC) - Accepted
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 1010 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-01-20 22:57:14Z): Insert

"The Roaming Consortium element is defined in 9.4.2.95 (Roaming Consortium element)."

as a new paragraph after

"The FILS Indication element is defined in 9.4.2.182 (FILS Indication element)." in 9.6.7.36.

* + - 1. CID 1012 and 1010 - No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Plan for tomorrow**
		1. CID 2089 – Rison (Samsung) move to time when Youhan is present.
	2. **Recess 5:58pm ET**.
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim – Friday, Jan 21, 2021, at 13:30-15:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 1:32 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. 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)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1965r4 slides starting at 12.
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-04-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
			1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Requirement for Registration** for the 2022 January IEEE 802 Wireless Electronic Interim.
		1. See slide 4.
	4. **Review agenda**:11-21/1965r4:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-04-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Friday Jan 21, 1:30pm ET
* Comment Resolution
* CID 2089 – Rison (Samsung)
* MAC adhoc comments – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
* Recess
	+ 1. No objection – Agenda Approved by Unanimous Consent.
		2. Need to wait on 2089 (MAC) until after Youhan joins the call.
	1. **MAC AdHoc CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 1727 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context
			3. No objection to proposed change
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			5. Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1771 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Context
			3. Discussion on the consequence of deleting the heading.
			4. Just deleting the header may not be sufficient.
			5. Discussion on why there needs to be both.
			6. There may be places where the configuration and the profile are not identical in all places.
			7. The Mesh profile and the Mesh STA configuration are distinctly defined.
			8. Proposed Resolution to reject.
			9. More work needed –
			10. **ACTION ITEM #4:** Mark HAMILTON - reach out to Kaz about the Mesh profile and the Mesh STA configuration differences.
			11. Mark submission required.
		3. CID 1957 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1807 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on possible change of “Another ADDBA...” to just “an ADDBA…”.
			3. Discussion on when request frames are in order.
			4. No objection to using an.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1807 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-01-21 18:51:56Z): At the end of 10.25.2 add

"A block ack agreement may be modified by the originator by sending an ADDBA Request frame. All parameters of the agreement may be changed except for the TID. If the request is not successful, the existing agreement is not modified."

Delete at 2260.31:

"The originator STA may send an ADDBA Request frame in order to update block ack timeout value. If the

updated ADDBA Request frame is accepted, both STAs initialize the timer to detect block ack timeout. Even if

the updated ADDBA Request frame is not accepted, the original block ack setup remains active

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1808 (MAC)
			1. This should be part of the CIDs that Abhi is working on.
			2. Assign this CID to Abhi Patil
		2. CID 1813 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context.
			3. Discussion on the reason for the need for the change.
			4. Discussion on if “robust” should be added or not.
			5. This is in Clause 4, so the existing text may have an error in it that needs to be reviewed outside the context of this CID, but if we are making changes in the clause, then maybe we should fix the “after deliver of the IGTK” phrase. To “after deliver of the BIGTK”
			6. Assign the comment to Jouni to complete the clean-up of the clause.
	1. **Review doc 11-21/829r10** - CID 2089 – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 2089 and 1988 (MAC)
			1. CID 22 (MAC) from CC35
			2. In text under Alternative in the doc under CID 22, there is extra text for discussion.
			3. Not sure what text will be actioned as some is redundantly listed (changes accepted in CID 22 before) in the new Alternative set of changes.
			4. Discuss the direction with the mixed set of changes as point of display.
			5. The proposed change text is not the same as in D1.0, so we will need more work to identify the specific changes in D1.0.
			6. The spirit seems to be the same as 11ax.
			7. Concern with the divergence in D1.0 from 11ax and what products may have implemented.
			8. Discussion on the first channel number above 200 in the 6 GHz
			9. Review D1.0 for context. P1190.28.
			10. Discussion on comparing the changes and the impacts to the changes.
			11. Technically we need to have a redline compared to D1.0 and evaluate the consequences of the changes.
			12. Assign both CIDs to Youhan KIM – Mark Submission Required.
	2. **MAC AdHoc CIDs part 2** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 1891 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the Context of where the 3 instances are located.
			3. Locations were noted to the AdHoc Notes.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1691: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-01-21 19:24:44Z) Note to Editors, locations are: 2817.33, 2817.44, 2818.6
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1859 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review if the condition is even possible.
			3. Discussion on if there is an implementation path that has been done already. Leave as is until we are sure we are not changing compliant behaviour.
			4. Question on if this is only on Type 1? Not sure.
			5. Discussion on if this was to be done, then just putting at the end of the full clause does not seem correct place to put it.
			6. The proposed change given does not seem to be correct for all cases.
			7. Discussion if we should reject the comment or if we need a different change be created.
			8. AdHoc Notes added: “Better direction might be to say such a Mask should not be transmitted.”
			9. Need to check other fields that are not covered by the mask that may be a valid qualifier in other cases.
			10. The Classifier Mask field has the following classifier masks:

0, 1, 2, 4, 5: bitmap indicating parameters that need to match

6, 7, 8, 9: bitmap with 2-bit subbitmaps

3: reserved

10: not present (despite what Figure 9-364—Frame Classifier field format says -- see CID 1856)

* + - 1. The direction of the group was to specify that classifiers that don't classify anything shall not be transmitted, rather than trying to specify that they never or always match.
			2. Mark CID Submission required – Assign to Mark RISON.
		1. CID 2003 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if “Ack or BlockAck frame” is the way we are doing this or is it just “Ack frame” in a general case.
			3. Mark CID Submission required – Assign to Mark RISON.
			4. Add to AdHoc Notes: Also look at P953.18 “ii)”
		2. CID 2077 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on what APs may send to other Aps, we cannot use Data frames, but Management frames. Public Action frames are one answer.
			3. AdHoc notes included: 802.11aa added AP-AP individually addressed Mgmt frames.
			4. Examples found D1.0:
				1. (#396) This field, in an infrastructure BSS, is the MAC address currently in use by the STA in the AP of the BSS."
				2. "2) In Public Action frames, the Address 3 field is the BSSID. The BSSID value is set according to 11.17 (Public Action frame addressing)."
			5. The direction is that the proposed change is not acceptable, but the request is to understand what is put in “A3”.
			6. Review clause 11.17 in D1.0 for context p2863.1
			7. Possible conclusion that Public Action frames are used for AP-AP communication.
			8. Request to provide answer for all 3 questions in the comment be included in the resolution.
			9. Proposed Resolution: CID 2077 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-01-21 19:51:36Z): The only Standardized frames that can be sent individually from AP to AP are Public Action frames. Subclause 11.17 (P2863,7) has the rules for the BSSID. Broadcast frames are not sent "to" another AP, and they have well-defined format.
			10. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1615 (MAC)
			1. Assign to Dave HALASZ
		4. CID 1985 (MAC)
			1. Maybe related to CID 1986
			2. CID 1535 also related.
			3. CID 1419
			4. Assign all to Mark RISON and Submission Required.
			5. Suggest compiling to a single submission with redline to show the changes.
		5. CID 2054 (MAC)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Review proposed change, but not sure where the NOTE would be added.
			3. Location would need to be identified to make this actionable by the Editors.
			4. Suggestion on location p2223.40 for the “NOTE”.
			5. Discussion on if it is needed in other locations as well.
			6. Discussion on if the NOTE is even needed or correct.
			7. Possible locations for note: P2223.40 vs P2137.55
			8. **ACTION ITEM #5:** Mark HAMILTON to send resolution to put a Note at P2223.40 vs P2137.55 -- “"NOTE---The timer is started at different times for DCF and EDCA."
			9. More work will be done.
		6. CID 2067 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the scope of the rules being questioned.
			3. Discussion on the value of the change.
			4. Discussion on if the DMG Beacon and S1G Beacon differences need different solutions to address the concern.
			5. There is no reason to include S1G Beacon in locations where S1G is not supported.
			6. Better approach would be to address the specific locations where it is thought to be inadequate.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Reject – Rationale to be created.
			8. Adhoc Notes: In effect, this creates new issues, not clear it fixed more than it creates.
			9. Mark Ready for Motion after rejection rational created.
		7. CID 2109 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Context is on page 865.63 (Clause 6 even though the Comment indicates Clause 10). Definition for “aRxPHYStartDelay”
			3. Discussion on if the variable is needed, and how it is used.
			4. Discussion on if the variable should be an integer (as it is defined now) or change it as proposed (an group of values per PHY type).
			5. Mark Submission Required – Assign to Mark RISON
			6. More work will need to be done.
			7. Out of Time
	1. **Next Meeting** Monday January 24 – Motions on CIDs Mark Ready for Motion.
	2. **Recessed at 3:31pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim – Monday, Jan 24, 2021, at 14:00-16:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:02 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
			2. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			3. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
			4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		2. Absent today:
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1965r5 slides starting at 12.
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-05-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
			1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Requirement for Registration** for the 2022 January IEEE 802 Wireless Electronic Interim.
		1. See slide 4.
	4. **Review agenda**:11-21/1965r5:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1965-05-000m-revme-agenda-january-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Monday Jan 24, 4pm ET
* Motions
	+ Document 11-22/0056r2
* Comments
	+ Straw poll request on CID 1084 - Harkins
	+ ED2 adhoc comments – Au (Huawei)
	+ Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for March
* AoB
* Adjourn
	+ 1. No objection to the agenda plan.
	1. **Motions -** Document 11-22/0056r2
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0056-02-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
		2. **Motion 43 – ED1, GEN, MAC, SEC CIDs (2022-01-24)**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in the
* “Motion-EDITOR1-1A” tab (93 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-02-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>,
* “GEN Motion January" (1 CID)“, in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-00-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xls>,
* “Motion MAC-AJ” (12 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-12-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>,
* “SEC Motion A” tab (2 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0105-01-000m-revme-lb258-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>,

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Review the tabs under consideration.
			2. Some of the 1808, 1013, 1015, and 1016 were deferred, and not part of today’s motion. The other CIDs that Abhi presented last week are on the list for approval today.
			3. Moved: Jouni MALINEN
			4. Seconded: Dan HARKINS
			5. **Result for Motion 43**: Approved with only one voter abstaining – Motion Passes. (25 participants on the call).
	1. **Straw poll request on CID 1084** – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
		1. Review Comment – Use of OWE is being referred to, but in the standard, it is not really defined. It is referred to as reserved in the current standard.
		2. Similar to RSN but is not authenticated.
		3. Request to consider having OWE as a type of RSN?
		4. What should we call this going forward?
		5. Discussion on adding to the RSN section.
		6. Standardizing OWE in the 802.11 standard is a good path.
		7. RFC and in Wi-Fi Alliance is defining the OWE.
		8. The place and naming of the feature are not as important as being able to use the current definitions.
		9. Is OWE an RSN protocol?
			1. Results: 8y-1n-9a-10na
		10. More work will be done and a submission to be brought later.
	2. **ED2 AdHoc comments** – Edward AU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0175-01-000m-proposed-resolution-to-miscellaneous-editorial-comments.xlsx>
		2. See doc 11-22/0176r0:
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0176-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-comments.docx>
		3. CID 1194 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on denenabled vs Unenabled – will they appear with a modifier, or will it be stand alone.
			3. Discussion of is denenabled vs Unenabled the same as Disabled?
			4. Unenabled may mean that something that was enabled, is now not enabled, and Disabled would be not able to reenable something.
			5. Discussion on enable and disabled not being permanent in either case.
			6. Concern with the ramifications of changing the definition.
			7. More Work to be done.
			8. Discussion notes for CID 1194
				1. Direction from the discussion on January 24:

• Both “DEENABLED” and “UNENABLED” are not real words. DISENABLED is a more appropriate choice.

• Difference between “UNENABLED” and “DISENABLED”?

• Follow-up with Joe L. on “DEENABLED”, “UNENABLED”, and “DISENABLED”.

• If change is needed, don’t limit to the term “Authorization deenabled”.

• See if Peter E and Rich K. have any comment.

* + - 1. **ACTION ITEM: #6:** Joseph Levy to look at all cases of DEENABLED and UNABLED to look for consistency and report back.
		1. CID 1186 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is not really an Editorial Comment.
			3. The Proposed change indicates that it only 5 and 6Ghz, but it also for 2.4 GHz. Need to review the syntax of the PIC section.
			4. O.<n> optional – Support of at least one of the group of options labeled by the same numeral <n> is required. The scope of the group of options is limited to a single table (i.e. subclause) within the PICs.
			5. Move CID to PHY and assign to Jouhan KIM.
			6. More work needed.
		2. CID 1487 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on Beacon frame protection procedures.
			3. Options for consideration:
				1. Option 1: Accepted.

(That is, to delete “on the transmission of Beacon frames”)

* + - * 1. Option 2: Revised.

Delete “to indicate that beacon protection is enabled on the transmission of Beacon frames”

* + - * 1. Option 3: Rejected.
			1. Straw Poll: Which Option do you prefer:
		1. Accepted
		2. Revised – “Delete
		3. Rejected
		4. Abstain.
			1. Result: 2y-2n-2a-5na
			2. More work and bring back.
			3. Discussion notes for CID 1487:
				1. Need to check the definitions of S1G and DMG beacons, before considering either Option 1 or Option 2.
				2. Reassign comment to "Beacon Interval" assignee. Check with Mark H for the assignee.
			4. Move to MAC AdHoc and allow more work.
			5. Need to check the definitions of S1G and DMG Beacons too.
		5. CID 1810 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the redline of the proposed changes for context.
			3. Table cited is 9-41 should be 9-69.
			4. Subclauses cited are not correct for D1.0.
			5. The intent was to make changes to 11-21/1130…
			6. This comment should be assigned to Mark RISON and moved to SEC AdHoc.
		6. CID 2385 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. See 4143.35 in D1.0 for context.
			3. Will mark ready for motion, and if there is any objection to come later.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised:

At 4143.35 in D1.0, replace “, and is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.” with “.”.

At 4143.42 in D1.0, replace “, and is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.” with “.”.

At 4143.49 in D1.0, replace “, and is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.” with “.”.

At 4143.52, add a new paragraph “The BA Information field is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.”.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
				1. (*NoteCID 2385 was revisited later and so this entry is highlighted yellow*).
		1. CIDs 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2276, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283 (ED2) and 2272 and 2277 (ED2)
			1. Review comments.
			2. Proposed resolution for CIDs 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2274, 2276, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283*:*Rejected. When a draft standard is sent to IEEE SA Publication Editor for publication, the Publication Editor may adjust any figure, table, or equation for readability purpose. It is the reason why the equation is extended over the paragraph margin.
			3. Proposed resolution for CIDs 2272 and 2277:Rejected. When a draft standard is sent to IEEE SA Publication Editor for publication, the Publication Editor may adjust any figure, table, or equation for readability purpose. It is the reason why the figure is extended over the paragraph margin.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2352 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The two paragraphs are identical but the first one refers to the PPDU transmission for EDMG control mode PPDU, while the second one refers to the PPDU transmission for EDMG SC mode and EDMG OFDM mode PPDUs that are different. One alternative is to move the description to the General subclause.
			3. Two alternatives:

Option 1: Rejected.

The paragraph at 4574.15 in D1.0 cannot be removed. Otherwise, there is no definition of PPDU transmission for EDMG SC mode and EDMG Control mode PPDUs.

Option 2: Revised.

Move the paragraph at 4573.42 to the end of the subclause 28.3.3.3.2.1 (General) at 4573.54 in D1.0.

Remove the paragraph 4574.15 in D1.0.

* + - 1. Discussion on two options.
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected.

The paragraph at 4574.15 in D1.0 cannot be removed. Otherwise, there is no definition of PPDU transmission for EDMG SC mode and EDMG Control mode PPDUs.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2385 (ED2)
			1. Fix the Proposed Resolution:
			2. (Highlight previous point Yellow)
			3. Updated Resolution:

Revised.

At 4143.35 in D1.0, replace “, and is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.” with “.”.

At 4143.42 in D1.0, replace “, and is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.” with “.”.

At 4143.49 in D1.0, replace “, and is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame.” with “.”.

At 4143.52, add a new paragraph “If the BA Information field is addressed to the STA, it is processed according to the procedure defined in 26.4.2 (Acknowledgment content in a Multi-STA BlockAck frame).”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1345 (ED2), CID 1346 (ED2), CID 2266 (ED2)
			1. Review Comments:
			2. Proposed resolution for CID 1345: Revised. At 4290.39 in D1.0, replace “a mixture of HE:” with “a mixture of Clause 27 (High-efficiency (HE) PHY specification),”
			3. Proposed resolution for CIDs 1346 and 2266: Revised. At 4290.46 in D1.0, replace “a mixture of HE, TAs support a mixture of HE:” with “a mixture of Clause 27 (High-efficiency (HE) PHY specification),”
			4. No objection – Mark 3 CIDs Ready for Motion.
	1. **Timeline,**
		1. Review Timeline.
* **Feb 2021 – PAR Approval**
* **March 2021– Initial meeting, issue comment collection on IEEE Std 802.11-2020 (if published)**
* **March 2021 – Draft 0.00 available**
* **May 2021 – Process CC input, 11ax, 11ay, 11ba integration begins**
* **Nov 2021 – Initial D1.0 WG Letter ballot**
* **Jul/Sep 2022 – D2.0 Recirculation LB**
* **Mar 2023 – D3.0 Recirculation LB (11az + other amendments <11bc, 11bd, 11bb> )**
* **Jul/Sep 2023 – D4.0 Recirculation (<other amendments – if Jul>)**
* **Nov 2023 – D5.0 Initial SA Ballot**
* **Mar 2024 – D6.0 Recirculation SA Ballot**
* **May 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot**
* **Jun 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot (clean recirculation)**
* **Sep 2024 – RevCom/SASB Approval**
	+ 1. Consider completing D2.0 by May if possible. – Use a Mixed Mode in April for help in meeting the goal.
		2. Status 400 Editorial, 600 need submission – Total 1392
		3. 109 resolved today.
		4. Straw poll:
			1. When should REVme should go to Recirc?
1. May
2. July
3. September
	* + 1. Results: 2-6-4
		1. Change timeline for end of this comment period to July
		2. Then Recirc should be quicker to resolve.
		3. Looking for a way to improve the efficiency of the TG.
		4. Discussion on potential timeline improvements.
		5. Look to use a different color for milestones not yet solid (confirmed).
		6. No objection to the proposed timeline adjusted for D2.0 Recirc in July.
	1. **Teleconference schedule**
		1. Next call: Monday 31 January 2022 at 10am ET, 2hrs
		2. 10am ET, 2hrs
			1. Feb: 7, 14, 25, 28
			2. March 21
	2. **Plan For the March Plenary:**
		1. 5 sessions
	3. **AOB:**
		1. Request to move Edward’s ED2 CIDs to Feb 14th Agenda.
4. **Adjourned 5:59pm ET**
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