IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Telecon Minutes for REVme –  2022 March 802 Electronic Plenary | | | | |
| Date: 2022-03-11 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. | 10871 N 5750 W  Highland, UT 84003 | +1-801=492-4023 | jrosdahl @ ieee . org |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

Minutes for REVme (TGme) telecons held during the 2022 March IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary

R0: March 8 Minutes added.

R1: March 9 Minutes Added

R2: March 10 Minutes Added

R3: March 11 Minutes Added – Minor updates to numbering and editorial corrections for previous.

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, March 8, 2022 at 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** 4:03pm 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 slides 11-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
      2. No issues were noted.
   3. **Review agenda**:11-22/270r1:

Tuesday Mar 8, 4pm ET

1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
2. Approve agenda
3. Editor Report
4. Motions
   1. Telecon and January plenary minutes (Slide 6
5. Comment Resolution
   1. CID 1276 – 11-22/253 – Halasz (Morse Micro)
   2. CID 1428 – 11-22/359 – Halasz (Morse Micro)
   3. CID 1678 – Rison (Samsung)
   4. CID 1090 – 11-22/0404 – Qi (Intel)
   5. ED1 CIDs – 11-22/0073 – Qi (Intel)
6. Recess

Wednesday Mar 9, 4pm ET

1. Comment Resolution
2. CID 1088 – 11-22/0386 – Qi (Intel)
3. CID 1084 – Document 11-22/305r0 – Harkins (HPE) - Mar 9
4. PMK for SAE – 11-22/399 – Huang (Intel) – Mar 9
5. SEC CIDs – Montemurro (Huawei)
6. Recess

Thursday Mar 10, 4pm ET

1. Comment Resolution
2. 11-22/329 – Kneckt (Apple)
3. CID 1218 – Coffey (Realtek)
4. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
5. CID 2323 – 11-22/0350 – Myles (Cisco)
6. ED1 CIDs – 11-22/0073 – Qi (Intel)
7. Recess

Friday, Mar 11, 1:30pm ET

1. Comment Resolution

a. CIDs 1497, 1498, 1499. and 1557 – 11-22/365 – McCann (Huawei)

b. CID 2273 – Chen (Intel)

c. ED2 CIDs – 11-22/0218 – Au (Huawei)

1. Recess


Monday Mar 14, 4pm ET

1. Motions
2. 11-22/0059r6 – slides x-y
3. Comment Resolution
4. 11-22/398 – Qi (Intel)
5. PHY CIDs – Rison (Samsung)
6. Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for May
7. AoB
8. Adjourn
   * 1. Add 11-22/436 - Youhan KIM to Thursday
     2. Emily needs to present tomorrow during the first hour. Swap order for Wednesday.
     3. No objection on the agenda.
   1. **Procedural Motions:**
      1. **Approve the TGme telecon minutes in documents**

**January interim:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0108-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-jan-electronic-interim.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0108-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-jan-electronic-interim.docx)

**January 31 teleconference:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0247-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-january-31.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0247-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-january-31.docx)

**February teleconferences:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0266-03-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-february.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0266-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-february.docx)

* + 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
    2. 2nd: Mark HAMILTON
    3. Results: No objection – Unanimous approval – Motion passes.
  1. **Editor Report: 11-21/0687r6** - Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-06-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
     2. Review submission
     3. Slide: 5 – Resolution Status:
     4. 
     5. Review Comment Assignment.
  2. **Review doc 11-22/253r1 - CID 1276** – Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0253-01-000m-cid-1276-protectedaidswitch.docx>
     2. Abstract: This document proposes comment resolutions for LB258 CID 1276.
     3. CID 1276 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review resolution changes.
        3. Identify that the protected version should be used.
        4. Review the PICs changes
        5. Discussion – The bit 13 should say ANA and let ANA assign Bit 13? or some other bit? But don’t list it until it is assigned.
        6. Discussion on the “this is to provide protected versions…” may not be correct if we add other entries in the table. Suggest removing.
        7. Discussion on how the MIB has to be updated.
        8. Changes made to submission to correct grammar and removal of unneeded sentences.
        9. Concern on the compliance groups at the beginning of the MIB that may need to have this new entry included there also.
        10. More work will be needed for the Editors to review, and then we will look to motion on Monday if there are no issues.
        11. Discussion on RSNXE issue – note that this will be taken offline.
        12. Will have more work to check offline and come back with R2.
  3. **Review Doc 11-22/359 – CID 1428 (GEN)** – Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0359-01-000m-cid-1428.docx>
     2. CID 1428 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-08 21:44:25Z) Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0359r1, <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0359-01-000m-cid-1428.docx>>.
        3. No Objection Mark Ready for Motion
        4. Question on related CIDs, those will stand on their own.
  4. **CID 1678 (MAC)** – Rison (Samsung)
     1. CID 1678 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Assign to Mark RISON – Mark “Submission Required”.
        3. MAC AdHoc Notes: MAC: 2022-03-08 21:47:40Z - Subclause 10.3.6 is suggested. Mark RISON will work up resolution offline.
  5. **Review Doc 11-22/0404r0 – CID 1090** – Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0404-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1090.docx>
     2. CID 1090 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review submission changes.
        3. Discussion – See Table 9-X0 and figure 9-1056.
           1. Remove the InfoID column in the new table.
        4. Discussion on name of the field in figure 9-1056. (change from “optional” to “SLA” in the naming scheme.
        5. Discussion on how to avoid embedding ANQP elements in other ANQP elements.
        6. More work offline to be done.
  6. **Review doc 11-22/0073** – **ED1 CIDs –**Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-05-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
     2. Comments have been reviewed and have had offline review requests removed from r5 (which were in r3).
     3. "TG-Review-0222" tab.
     4. CID 1092 (ED1)
        1. Review comment
        2. Suggestion posted to chat window: "If segmentation and reassembly (see 10.69) is not established between the transmitting and receiving STA, the Sequence Control field has the format illustrated in Figure 9-7”
        3. Suggest that while not part of the figure title, change the text in the referring text.
           1. At 912.9, replace "The Sequence Control field consists of two subfields, the Sequence Number and the Fragment Number. The format of the Sequence Control field is shown in Figure 9-7 (Sequence Control field format)." with "If segmentation and reassembly (see 10.69) is not established between the transmitting and receiving STA, the Sequence Control field has the format illustrated in Figure 9-7"
        4. These changes are to be done in addition to the ones suggested by Emily.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Accepted the proposed changes, Also at 912.9, replace "The Sequence Control field consists of two subfields, the Sequence Number and the Fragment Number. The format of the Sequence Control field is shown in Figure 9-7 (Sequence Control field format)." with "If segmentation and reassembly (see 10.69) is not established between the transmitting and receiving STA, the Sequence Control field has the format illustrated in Figure 9-7"
        6. No Objection – Mark Rady for Motion
     5. CID 1099 (ED1)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review context on p1194.7 (note CID indicated p1094.7).
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accept; Note to Editors; location is 1194.7.
        4. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     6. CID 1100 (ED)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     7. CID 1101 (ED1)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     8. CID 1102 (ED1)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     9. CID 1103 (ED1)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     10. CID 1104 (ED1)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     11. CID 1105 (ED1)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         3. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     12. CID 2253 (ED1)
         1. Review comment
         2. Discussion on the way the word “use” is in the context of the sentence.
         3. Change to “An instance of the wireless medium (WM) use for the purpose
         4. Proposed Resolution: CID 2253 (ED1): Change cited text to "An instance of use of the wireless medium (WM) for the purpose..."
         5. No Objection – Ready for Motion
     13. CID 2258 (ED1)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on the compound qualifiers.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; there is no need to add commas since non-DMG non-CMMG non-S1G are qualifiers for STA.
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     14. CID 2259 (ED1)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion, the proposed change included a location where the suggested change could not be made.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2259 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-08 22:39:13Z) - Revised. Please replace all six occurrences in Figure 10-104 of "N" subindex "Tx" with "N" subindex "TX" and instances on P4050L16 and P3709L51.
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     15. CID 1005 (ED1)
         1. Review Comment
         2. From the Ad-Hoc Notes: ED1: 2022-01-15 19:01:03Z -

There is no guidance on how the "Reserved" values appear in a Table. IMHO, the readability is important.

The readability of Table 9-220 seems okay although they are shown in a single row.

The readability of Table 9-321 (1567.1) needs to be improved. Suggest insert the reserved values in corresponding rows, separately.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: CID 1005 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-08 22:47:36Z) - revised. In Table 9-321, insert the reserved values in corresponding rows, separately.

Note to editor/commenter: there is no change to other locations.

Editors will discuss changes to the style guide in the editors meeting.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 2211 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on if “May be set to 1….” should be a sub-bullet or not.
       3. The TGay amendment did have it as a sub-bullet, and so we can mark it as revised.
       4. Proposed resolution: CID 2211 (ED1): Revised. Change the para at 2187.41 - 2187.44 to a bullet.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 1294 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 2297 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on the use of Hyphen in “high-throughput”
       3. Mark this CID as Submission Required – Assign to Mark RISON.
  1. **Recess at 6:02 PM**

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Wednesday, March 9, 2022 at 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** 4:01pm 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. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      2. Absent:
         1. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
   2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
      1. **See slides 11-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
      2. No issues were noted.
   3. **Review agenda**:11-22/270r2:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-02-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
      2. Wednesday Mar 9, 4pm ET
2. Comment Resolution focus on Security topics
3. CID 1088 – 11-22/0386 – Qi (Intel)
4. CID 1084 – Document 11-22/305r0 – Harkins (HPE) - Mar 9
5. PMK for SAE – 11-22/399 – Huang (Intel) – Mar 9
6. SEC CIDs – Montemurro (Huawei)
7. Recess

Thursday Mar 10, 4pm ET

1. Comment Resolution
2. 11-22/329 – Kneckt (Apple)
3. CID 1218 – Coffey (Realtek)
4. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
5. CID 2323 – 11-22/0350 – Myles (Cisco)
6. ED1 CIDs – 11-22/0073 – Qi (Intel)
7. Recess

Friday, Mar 11, 1:30pm ET

1. Comment Resolution
2. CIDs 1497, 1498, 1499. and 1557 – 11-22/365 – McCann (Huawei)
3. CID 2273 – Chen (Intel)
4. ED2 CIDs – 11-22/0218 – Au (Huawei)
5. Recess

Monday Mar 14, 4pm ET

1. Motions
2. 11-22/0059r6 – slides x-y
3. Comment Resolution
4. 11-22/398 – Qi (Intel)
5. PHY CIDs – Rison (Samsung)
6. Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for May
7. AoB
8. Adjourn
   * 1. No objection on the agenda.
     2. Submission 253/359 new revisions are available.
   1. **Review doc 11-22/0386r1 – CID 1088** – Emily Qi (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0386-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1088.docx>
      2. CID 1088 (SEC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review submission
         3. Discussion on if CDMG MIB objects need more work.
         4. More work required, will add to agenda when ready.
   2. **Review doc 11-22/305r1 - CID 1084** (SEC) – Document – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0305-01-000m-adding-owe.docx>
      2. CID 1084 (SEC)
         1. Review the changes to 11-22/305 since presented last time.
         2. Description of OWE reviewed.
         3. Need to include IETF prior to “RFC” when citing references.
         4. Discussion on if DMG specifically needs to be identified.
         5. P2168.4 has some numbering issue in the submission. Editor to fix it.
         6. Add “non-DMG Sta” prior to 802.1X and the new text being added.
         7. Proposed Resolution REVISED (SEC: 2022-03-09 23:05:44Z)

Incorporate the change in document 111-22/0399r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0399-02-000m-determine-sae-pmk-length.docx>>.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc 11-22/399r2 – PMK for SAE** – Po-Kai HUANG (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0399-02-000m-determine-sae-pmk-length.docx>
     2. Abstract: This document proposes a way to differentiate when to use 256 bit PMK and when to use 384 bit PMK for SAE.
     3. No CIDs
     4. Review submission
     5. Discussion on the submission being presented vs what is on server.
     6. 12.4.5.3 section discussed.
     7. Support of the direction was given. How to derive the different PMK lengths is important.
     8. Discussion on potential changes. (Minor edits, and field values).
     9. Discussion on tool usage.
     10. Concern on AKM and adding a new RSNA element – don’t break the 4-way handshake.
     11. More discussion will need to be taken offline. – Po-Kai will work with Jouni
     12. More discussions on use of AKM and expanded RSNA usage.
     13. More concerns on the new proposal here makes things a bit more complicated and subject to new errors.
     14. More work will need to be done and will be taken offline.
  2. **SEC CIDs –** Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. Chair passed to Mark HAMILTON so Michael can present.
     2. Doc 11-22/105r4 – EAPoL Request Tab
     3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0105-04-000m-revme-lb258-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
     4. CID 1273 (SEC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review proposed change
        3. Many related comments: CIDs 1449, 1476, 1450, 1451, 1452
        4. The direction of one of these CIDs is what Mark RISON would like us to consider, but we had a hard time finding which CID to start with.
        5. Starting review of CID 1476.
           1. Proposed change:

Change to "If the EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1 has a key type of Group, the Authenticator is not currently performing GTK rekeying and the requesting Supplicant has not recently made such a request, the Authenticator shall generate a new GTK with a new key ID (see 12.7.10 (RSNA Authenticator key management state machine)) and then execute the group key handshake with all Supplicants that are not in WNM sleep mode to deliver them, except a Supplicant for which it is currently performing PTK rekeying, in which case if it has not yet transmitted message 3 it shall deliver them in that message instead, and if it has already transmitted message 3 it shall perform the group key handshake after the end of the 4-way handshake."

* + - 1. Suggest that we remove the 4-way handshake part.
      2. Suggest changing the requirement to “may” was debated.
      3. Discussion on possible changes, but worried that we may break things.
      4. Discussion on the usage of GTK
      5. Discuss why we want to prevent numerus GTK rekeying from occurring.
      6. Maybe we want to move this text to another clause.
      7. 6 CIDs and we have multiple issues that are not clear.
      8. A Separate presentation that combines the CIDs in one submission and a harmonized solution.
      9. Assign to Mark RISON - CIDs 1449, 1476, 1450, 1451, 1452, 1273, 1848
      10. Mark Submission required for all the CIDs
      11. 2 separate issues – the may/shall condition and the removal of 4-way handshake.
      12. So far we have captured:

- Agreement on removing the 4-way handshake statement. - no objection

- "shall change the GTK" to "may change the GTK" - compromise as "should" with a note

- "shall change the GTK" to "shall with conditions"

- additional conditions on executing a 4-way handshake

* + - 1. Two alternatives A or B:

The cited text in context is: At cited location,

change

"If the EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1 has a key type of Group, the Authenticator shall change the GTK, initiate a 4-way handshake with the Supplicant, and then execute the group key handshake to all Supplicants."

to

A. "If the EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1 has a key type of Group, the Authenticator may change the GTK, and then execute the group key handshake to all Supplicants."

B. Change to "If the EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1 has a key type of Group, the Authenticator is not currently performing GTK rekeying and the requesting Supplicant has not recently made such a request, the Authenticator shall generate a new GTK with a new key ID (see 12.7.10 (RSNA Authenticator key management state machine)) and then execute the group key handshake with all Supplicants that are not in WNM sleep mode to deliver them, except a Supplicant for which it is currently performing PTK rekeying, in which case if it has not yet transmitted message 3 it shall deliver them in that message instead, and if it has already transmitted message 3 it shall perform the group key handshake after the end of the 4-way handshake."

* + - 1. There was no objection to the direction of “Should” with a note.
    1. CID 1272 SEC
       1. Review comment – follows as part of the previous discussion.
       2. Proposed resolution: Accept
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 1571 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Change “of” to “or” in the proposed change.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-03-09 22:53:44Z) At 218.55, change:

"EAPOL-Key request frame: A Data frame that carries all of part of an IEEE 802.1X EAPOL-Key protocol data unit (PDU) with the Request bit in the Key Information field in the IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor set to 1."

to

"EAPOL-Key request frame: A Data frame that carries all or part of an IEEE 802.1X EAPOL-Key protocol data unit (PDU) with the Request bit in the Key Information field in the IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor set to 1 and the Error bit set to 0."

At 3206.24, 3206.25, and 3245.31, change "EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1" to "EAPOL-Key request frame"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 1440 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed resolution is to accept but put AdHoc Notes in the resolution for the Editor
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accept; Note to editor:

At 3186.43, Change

"an EAPOL request message"

to

"an EAPOL-key request frame"

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 1854 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Concern with where the behaviour is being described.
       3. Suggestion that the movement of behaviours being moved will need to be part of a submission.
       4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (SEC: 2022-03-09 23:00:36Z) -

At 3206.21, change:

"If an EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1" to

"If an EAPOL-Key frame in which the Request bit is 1 and the Error bit is 0"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Recess at 6:00pm ET.**

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Thursday, March 10, 2022 at 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** 4:02pm 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 slides 11-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
      2. No issues were noted.
   3. **Review agenda**:11-22/270r2:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-02-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>

Thursday Mar 10, 4pm ET

1. Comment Resolution
   * + 1. 11-22/329 – KNECKT (Apple)
       2. CID 1218 – COFFEY (Realtek)
       3. Doc 11-22/436r0 – Country Element – Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
       4. GEN CIDs – ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
       5. CID 2323 – 11-22/0350 – Myles (Cisco)
       6. ED1 CIDs – 11-22/0073 – Qi (Intel)
2. Recess
   * 1. No objection on the agenda for today.
   1. **Review doc 11-22/329r0** – Jakrko KNECKT (Apple)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0329-00-000m-resolutions-to-cids-1195-1198.docx>
      2. CID 1198 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. Review proposed changes.
         4. Editorial changes made to the proposed changes.
         5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1198 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-03-10 21:10:54Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-20/0329r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0329-00-000m-resolutions-to-cids-1195-1198.docx) for CID 1198.
         6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 1197 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review discussion in submission
         3. Review proposed changes.
         4. Discussion on what the Beacon Type being 24 Mbps or less.
         5. Discussion on the way Beacons are transmitted.
         6. Concern with the side effect of having the new bit value defined.
         7. Suggestion that the wording does not match the verbal explanation.
         8. Clause 11.49 should not duplicate the wording in Clause 9.
         9. Discussion on what the Beacon Type value should mean. 0 should be what is being done now and the “1” should be the new case. Then a possible change to the polarity 1 for normal and 0 for new.
         10. ACTION ITEM: Jarkko to take discussion to the REVme Reflector.
      4. CID 1196 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. Discussion on the values of changing from “shall” to “may”.
         4. Discussion on maybe using “should” or “shall attempt”.
         5. An alternative wording: “AP should attempt to disassociate all STAs prior to termination of the BSS”
         6. Discussion on the loss of “immediately” being removed.
         7. There is the dissociation frame, and the disassociate state that needs to happen without fail.
         8. An Alternative wording: “The AP shall disassociate all STAs immediately prior to termination of the BSS, and may send a Disassociation frame if possible."
         9. Another Alternative wording: “The AP should attempt to send a Disassociation frame to all STAs prior to termination of the BSS and shall disassociate all STAs immediately prior to termination of the BSS."
         10. Discussion on the way an AP terminates the BSS and the information that needs to be transmitted or conveyed.
         11. Discussion on why rejection of this CID is better.
         12. Straw poll to see if consensus for rejection (keep text as is) and if that fails, then Jarkko will start a reflector discussion.
         13. Straw Poll: CID 1196 (MAC): Straw Poll: Do you agree with rejecting CID 1196?
         14. Results: Result: 14-5-7 (-25)
         15. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-03-10 21:42:23Z): No consensus. The task group discussed the technical details and best way to describe the disassociation behavior on March 10, 2022. Some points raised: Is this best expressed as a "shall", or a "may", or maybe a "should"? What does "immediately" mean here, and is it necessary? There can be disassociation without a Disassociate frame being delivered, we should be clear which is important here. Alternate wordings were suggested, none were felt particularly better than the current text. A straw poll was held, to reject the comment, results: 14Y-5N-7A.
         16. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 1195 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment.
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. Discussion on the ramifications of the change.
         4. The first paragraph gives a list of exceptions, so the 2nd paragraph should not be trying to compensate for that.
         5. In 6 GHz usage, the use of non-HT Duplicate PPDU should be precluded. For long range, use 2.4 GHz or 5 GHz bands. Don’t use 6 GHz band.
         6. Further discussion on the reflector is going to be required.
   2. Review CID 1218 – Coffey (Realtek)
      1. Submission is not ready today.
      2. Commenter is considering withdrawing and resubmitting the comment with a different proposed change.
      3. The Proposed resolution is not realliy ready for prime time now.
      4. Commenter Withdrew the comment.
      5. An Email will be sent to the TG Chair indicating the withdrawal.
      6. Proposed Resolution: CID 1218 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-03-10 21:56:33Z): The commenter has withdrawn the comment.
   3. **Review doc 11-22/0436r0** – Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0436-00-000m-country-element.docx>
      2. CID 1988 and 2089 (MAC)
         1. Review comments
         2. Review submission
         3. REVme while processing CID 22 in CC35 changed the Threshold from 200 to 233, which causes interoperability issues.
         4. The new CIDs also provides some editorial updates to help clean up the text.
         5. Review the proposed changes
         6. This corrects the technical error introduced by CID 22 (CC35).
         7. Discussion on purpose of the Country Element usage.
         8. The UNII 8 band starts at channel 189.
         9. We do not have any regulatory region that would cause a problem with the current channel allocation scheme.
         10. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-22/436r0
         11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   4. **GEN CIDS – 11-22/0067r2** - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-02-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
      2. Thanks To Mark HAMILTON for taking notes during GEN CIDs discussion.
      3. Presentation From the database: - Follow along on Tab/Comment Group: “Corrected Units”
      4. CID 1165 (GEN):
         1. Reviewed comment.
         2. Are we consistent saying “per <quantity> <units>” everywhere else? If not, why worry about these?
         3. Checked other similar comments.
         4. These look different from the first one. Some are about doing the units per standard convention, some are about whether it’s okay to spell out second or not, and those are different situations.
         5. Could change “frames per second” to “frames/s”.
         6. No objection.
         7. Revised. Replace "[...] transmitting at a rate of 10^4 frames per second." with "[...] transmitting at a rate of 10^4 frames/s."
         8. Ready for motion.
      5. CID 1145 (GEN):
         1. ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-03-10 22:24:03Z). Note to Editor: Original Proposed Change: Replace "1 us" with "1 µs" (Unicode 039C and 0073)
         2. Ready for motion.
      6. CID 1169 (GEN):
         1. Accepted.
         2. Ready for motion.
      7. CID 1168 (GEN):
         1. Accepted.
         2. Ready for motion.
      8. CID 1167 (GEN):
         1. Is “b/s” defined in the Standard? Editor answered that IEEE guidelines cover this, yes.
         2. Accepted.
         3. Ready for motion.
      9. CID 1166 (GEN):
         1. Accepted.
         2. Ready for motion.
      10. CID 1170 (GEN):
          1. Accepted.
          2. Ready for motion.
      11. CID 1172 (GEN):
          1. Tracking the line number in the comment, this seems to be on the line that says, “Meters per second”, not “Centimeters per second”.
          2. Revised. Replace "Meters for second" with "m/s". Ready for Motion.
          3. Ready for motion.
      12. CID 1171 (GEN):
          1. Accepted
          2. Ready for motion.
      13. CID 1173 (GEN):
          1. Two options offered, so we have to do a “Revised”.
          2. Chose the “32 us/s” version.
          3. No objection.
          4. Revised. At1485.63, Replace "[…] in units of 32 μs per second." with "[…] in units of 32 μs/s."
          5. Ready for motion.
      14. CID 1174 (GEN):
          1. REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-10 22:33:32Z) At p1486.17, Replace "[…] in units of 32 μs per second." with "[…] in units of 32 μs/s."
          2. Ready for motion.
      15. CID 1146 (GEN):
          1. Accepted
          2. Ready for motion.
      16. CID 1176 (GEN):
          1. REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-10 22:35:39Z) Revised; At 2974.57, Replace "[…] in multiples of 32 μs per second." with "[…] in multiples of 32 μs/s."
          2. Ready for motion.
      17. CID 1175 (GEN):
          1. REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-10 22:36:18Z) Revised; At 2974.50, Replace "[…] in multiples of 32 μs per second." with "[…] in multiples of 32 μs/s."
          2. Ready for motion.
      18. CID 1177 (GEN):
          1. REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-10 22:37:09Z) Revised; At 2975.4, Replace "[…] in multiples of 32 μs per second." with "[…] in multiples of 32 μs/s."
          2. Ready for motion.
      19. CID 1153 (GEN):
          1. Discussion on which is best in this scenario.
          2. No strong opinions, either way.
          3. Suggestion of “one second”.
          4. But we have “1 dB” later in the sentence, should we be consistent?
          5. Suggestion of “one-second”. But that opposes the IEEE rule about avoiding hyphens.
          6. No objection to “within a one second interval”
      20. REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-10 22:42:01Z) Revised: change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval" at cited location.
      21. Ready for motion.
   5. **Review doc 11-22/350r1** – Andrew MYLES (Cisco)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0350-01-000m-discussion-of-cid2323.pptx>
      2. CID 2323 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Presentation of submission.
         3. Discussion - New values of 5, 6, 7 would need to be ANA assigned.
         4. C2C is Client to Client – needs definition specifically called out.
         5. Assign CID 2120 to Andrew also, as it is regarding Annex E also.
         6. Discussion on Shall not … - we may need different language.
         7. Why does AP need to signal this information, or can the STA get some of this information based on location?
            1. The AP would more likely have better database of regulatory information.
         8. More discussion will be started on the .11me reflector to start.
   6. **Recess at 6:01pm ET**
3. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Friday, March 11, 2022 at 13:30-15:30 ET**
   1. **Called to order** 1:35pm 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 slides 11-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
      2. No issues were noted.
   3. **Review agenda**:11-22/270r3:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-03-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
      2. Friday, Mar 11, 1:30pm ET
4. Comment Resolution
5. CIDs 1497, 1498, 1499. and 1557 – 11-22/365 – McCann (Huawei)
6. CID 2273 – Chen (Intel)
7. ED2 CIDs – 11-22/0218 – Au (Huawei)
8. ED1 CIDs – 11-22/0073 – Qi (Intel)
9. Recess
   * 1. Added “CID 2311 – Withdrawal” to Agenda.
     2. No Objection to approve today’s agenda.
   1. **CID 2311 withdrawal.** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
      1. CID 2311 (GEN)
         1. Prepare Resolution for Reject CID 2311 withdrawal.
         2. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-03-11 13:40:29Z) - Comment Withdrawn by Commenter.
         3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   2. **Review doc 11-22/365-** CIDs 1497, 1498, 1499. and 1557 – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
      1. Document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0365-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-location-shapes.docx>
      2. CIDs 1497, 1498, 1499. and 1557 (All MAC)
         1. Review Each Comment and the proposed resolutions.
         2. Discussion on what the units should be specified.
         3. Review the various proposed changes.
         4. Correct typos during the review – will post R1 shortly.
         5. Discussion on keeping the range of the angle specified.
         6. Discussion on where to indicate that the angle in degrees, is an integer.
         7. Suggested text: "All shape field that are 2-octet angles are integers (see 9.2.2) in degrees, between 0 and 359."
         8. Removed “in degrees” from several places.
         9. R2 will need to be posted.
         10. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1497, 1498, 1499, 1557 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-03-11 18:40:46Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0365r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0365-02-000m-comment-resolution-for-location-shapes.docx>).
         11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   3. **Review doc 11-22/0455r0** - CID 2273 – Xiaogang Chen (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0455-00-000m-cr-cid2273.docx>
      2. CID 2273 (PHY)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. The Rejection should identify 802.15, not BlueTooth specifically.
         4. 802.15.4 has about 30 different PHYs defined.
         5. Remove the reason that may not be correct about 802.15.
         6. Proposed Resolution: CID 2273 (PHY) Rejected- The Comment was discussed in TGme, and the discussion is captured in doc11-22/0455r1 https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0455-01-000m-cr-cid2273.docxRejected- 4.6.3 Proposed Resolution: Rejected- The Comment was discussed in TGme, and the discussion is captured in doc11-22/0455r1 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0455-01-000m-cr-cid2273.docx>
         7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   4. **Review Doc - 11-22/0218** – ED2 CIDs –Edward AU (Huawei)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0218-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-comments-part-2.docx>
      2. CID 1545 and 1455 (ED2)
         1. Review comments
         2. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1454, 1455 (ED2): Revised. The commenter provides the Editors an updated visio figure. The Editors integrate the updated figure to the draft standard and the commenter confirms that the figure is now searchable in the document.
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 1586 (ED2)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review discussion in submission
         3. After presentation of the reject reason, a request to straw poll for consensus.
         4. Straw poll: Do you support this rejection reason for CID 1586: “Rejected. The sentence “The default is time-based, once per day” does not have any technical error.
            1. Results of straw poll: 13y-1n-8a
         5. Mark Ready for Motion – put as separate motion.
   5. Request to adjust agenda to discuss another CID.
      1. No objection.
   6. CID 2297 (ED1)
      1. From the email exchange:

Discussion:

It is not clear whether “high-throughput” should have a hyphen. Grammatically, as an adjective, it should, but IEEE 802.11 hates hyphens, and “high-throughput” is not on the list of exceptional permissions to use hyphens. Note also that “very high throughput” doesn’t have hyphens either.

Proposed resolution #1:

REVISED.

Change “high throughput” to “high-throughput” at 2.18, 214.49, 229.40.

Change “High Throughput SIGNAL field” to “high-throughput SIGNAL field” at 239.59.

Change “High Throughput” to “High-Throughput” at 1338.37 (leftmost instance), 1339.55, 1339.59, 5389.46.

Proposed resolution #2:

REVISED

Change “high-throughput” to “high throughput”, except in “non-high-throughput”, case-insensitively (~40 instances, mostly in Clause 3).

* + 1. There was no objection to Proposed Resolution #2 if the locations were identified explicitly in a submission.
    2. Mark RISON to bring to TG for discussion at a later telecon.
  1. **CID 2258 (ED1)** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. Review comment
     2. Discussion on the email exchange on the TGm reflector
     3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2258 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-11 19:31:23Z) - At 2074.61,

change “Figure 10-1—Non-DMG non-CMMG non-S1G STA MAC architecture” to “Figure 10-1—STA MAC architecture (non-DMG non-CMMG non-S1G)”

at 2074.64,

From “In a non-DMG non-CMMG non-S1G STA:” to: “In a STA that is not a DMG STA, nor a CMMG STA, nor an S1G STA:”

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc 11-22/0073r6** – ED1 CIDS - Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-06-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
     2. CID 2307 (ED1)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the proposed changes.
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2307 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-11 19:36:14Z)- change cited sentence to

"orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA): An orthogonal frequency division multiple (OFDM)-based multiple access technique by which multiple stations (STAs) either simultaneously transmit to a single STA, or simultaneously receive from a single STA, independent data streams over different groups of subcarriers."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 2312 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review context on p228.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2312 (ED1): REJECTED (ED1: 2022-03-11 19:40:04Z). Reject Reason: The cited text is for soliciting the block acknowledgment mechanism.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 2318 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Debate on if the article is a or an.
       3. Discussion on how to change the sentence to make it so that an article is not necessary.
       4. We looked at the 10 locations of "an UL", and agreed to try to reword around the problem (rather the choose a specific article)
       5. ACTION: Emily to try to remove the article in the 10 locations of "an UL"
       6. More work needed offline.
    3. CID 1036 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Similar to CID 1834 (GEN)
       3. Discussion on best path of change.
       4. Proposed Resolution CID 1036 (ED1) and CID 1834 (GEN): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-11 19:51:54Z) - Change cited sentence to "

One example mechanism, in the case where the DS is an IEEE 802 LAN, is to use an XID null frame (see ISO/IEC 8802-2:1998).".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Both CIDs Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 1470 (ED1)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed resolution: CID 1470 (ED1): ACCEPTED (ED1: 2022-01-15 17:42:36Z) Note to Editors: Locations for "whenever" are 1884.12 and 1930.41
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID1601 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 1613 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review context – p1812.53
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1613 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-11 20:06:00Z)- change cited text to "The NAI Realm Encoding Type subfield is set to 0 to indicate that each NAI realm in the NAI Realm subfield is formatted in accordance with IETF RFC 4282. It is set to 1 to indicate that each NAI realm is a UTF-8 string that is not formatted in accordance with IETF RFC 4282. ".
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 1614 (ED1)
       1. Proposed Resolution: CID 1613 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2022-03-11 20:06:00Z)- change cited text to "The NAI Realm Encoding Type subfield is set to 0 to indicate that each NAI realm in the NAI Realm subfield is formatted in accordance with IETF RFC 4282. It is set to 1 to indicate that each NAI realm is a UTF-8 string that is not formatted in accordance with IETF RFC 4282. ". NOTE TO EDITOR: This is the same resolution as CID 1613.
       2. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 1630 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context:
          1. protected dual of public action frame: An Action frame with the category value specified in 9.4.1.11 (Action field) (Table 9-79 (Category values)). For each Protected Dual of Public Action frame, there is a dual Action frame in a category that is specified with No in the Robust column of Table 9-79 (Category values).
          2. Note the capitalization of “Protected Dual of Public Action frame” is used in the description but not in the name of the definition.
       3. Examples of frame names defined in Clause 3.2:
          1. directional multi-gigabit (DMG) frame
          2. concealed groupcast with retries (GCR) frame
          3. broadcast wake-up radio (WUR) wake-up frame
          4. directed frame
          5. group addressed quality-of-service management frame (GQMF):
          6. group addressed wake-up radio (WUR) wake-up frame:
          7. groupcast with retries (GCR) frame:
          8. groupcast with retries (GCR) service period (GCR-SP) frame:
          9. individually addressed quality-of-service management frame (IQMF):
          10. nonaggregate medium access control (MAC) protocol data unit (non-A-MPDU) frame:
          11. nonconcealed groupcast with retries (GCR) frame:
          12. non-high-throughput (non-HT) duplicate frame:
          13. non-quality-of-service management frame (non-QMF) access point (AP):
          14. non-space-time-block-coding (non-STBC) frame:
          15. peer trigger frame:
          16. protected dual of public action frame:
          17. protected frame:
          18. quality-of-service (QoS) frame:
          19. quality-of-service management frame (QMF):
          20. self-protected action frame:
          21. space-time block coding (STBC) frame:
          22. trigger frame:
          23. triggering frame:
          24. tunneled direct-link setup (TDLS) frame (TDLS frame):
       4. Examples of Frame Names where some capitalizing is occurring:
          1. mesh Data frame:
          2. robust Action frame:
          3. robust Management frame:
          4. time priority Management frame:
       5. Special cases:
          1. EAPOL-Key frame:
          2. EAPOL-Key request frame:
          3. EAPOL-Start frame:
       6. More work will be done – Will discuss in Editors Group.
    6. CID 1650 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review the context of the changes.
       3. Changes “drops” to “shall drop” etc.
       4. There was a long discussion on the changes.
       5. Mark Submission required; Assign to Dan HARKINS
       6. Move CID to SEC AdHoc
    7. CID 1687 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
       3. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
    8. CID 1772 (ED1)
       1. Review comment
       2. Compare the parts that are thought to be the same.
       3. Ran out of time.
  1. **Recess 3:30 pm**

**References:**

**March 8:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
2. Approved previous TGme minutes in documents:
   1. January interim: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0108-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-jan-electronic-interim.docx>
   2. January 31 teleconference: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0247-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-january-31.docx>
   3. February teleconferences: [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0266-03-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-february.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0266-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-february.docx)
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-06-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0253-01-000m-cid-1276-protectedaidswitch.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0359-01-000m-cid-1428.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0404-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1090.docx>
7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-05-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>

**March 9:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-02-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0386-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1088.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0305-01-000m-adding-owe.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0399-02-000m-determine-sae-pmk-length.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0399-02-000m-determine-sae-pmk-length.docx>
7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0105-04-000m-revme-lb258-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

**March 10:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-02-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0329-00-000m-resolutions-to-cids-1195-1198.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0436-00-000m-country-element.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-02-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0350-01-000m-discussion-of-cid2323.pptx>

**March 11:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-01-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0270-03-000m-revme-agenda-march-2022-session.pptx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0365-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-location-shapes.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0365-02-000m-comment-resolution-for-location-shapes.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0455-00-000m-cr-cid2273.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0455-01-000m-cr-cid2273.docx>
7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0218-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-comments-part-2.docx>
8. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-06-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>