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Abstract

Minutes for the REVme (TGme) ad-hoc meeting in New York City April 26 - 28, 2022

Thanks To Stephen McCann for stepping in and taking notes as needed through out the Face to Face AdHoc Meeting.

Thanks To Joseph Levy and Interdigital for hosting the AdHoc at the Interdigital facilities.

Attendance is recorded on page 41.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

* + - 1. **ACTION ITEM #1:** Guogang HUANG to post an email to the reflector to see if any objections are raised on CID 2200 and 2377.
			2. **ACTION ITEM #2:** Mark RISON to post the resolution for CID 1648 to the reflector pending any feedback.
			3. **ACTION ITEM #3:** Editors to confirm the more general direction of this resolution in CID 1254 (PHY) regarding “is equal to”.

**1.7.19.5** **ACTION ITEM #4:** Sean COFFEY to investigate ETSI regulatory rules that do/might reference these values RE CID 1220 (PHY).

**4.6.15.4 ACTION ITEM #5:** Jon ROSDAHL to send an email to the reflector to receive feedback on CID 1281(GEN). Is SISO a single space-time stream, single spatial stream, or single antenna?

* + - 1. **ACTION ITEM #6:** Stephen MCCANN to contact Menzo about CID 2188 and open a discussion on the reflector.

**5.5.19.7 ACTION ITEM #7:** Mark HAMILTON to contact regulatory Experts and start a reflector discussion for CID 2321.

**7.4.13.6 ACTION ITEM #8**; Joseph Levy include a clean-up of the related detail in clause 4 for CID 1349 (SEC).

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, April 26, 2022 at 09:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 09:04 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. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. **See slides 4-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0208-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-march-2022.pptx>
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-22/629r2:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0629-02-000m-tgme-april-2022-adhoc-agenda.docx>
		2. No objection to the updated Agenda.
		3. An r3 will be posted to the server later in the meeting.
	4. **Editor’s report**
		1. No comments
	5. **Review doc 11-22/0565r1** – CIDs 2220 and 2224 – Guogang HUANG (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0565-01-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cid-2220-and-2224.docx>
		2. CID 2220 & 2224
			1. Review proposed changes
			2. Some editorial changes were made to the text.
			3. Why are these changes necessary to this clause?
			4. It’s to clarify the behavior of the BSS Transition Management Frame.
			5. I don’t think these frames are ever going to be multicast.
			6. This change is a technical change and not just an editorial change. However, the proposed change is ok.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 2220 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-04-26 13:28:45Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0565r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0565-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cid-2220-and-2224.docx>) for CID 2220.
			8. Proposed Resolution: CID 2224 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-04-26 13:27:05Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0565r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0565-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cid-2220-and-2224.docx>) for CID 2224.
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			10. **ACTION ITEM #1:** Guogang HUANG to post an email to the reflector to see if any objections are raised on CID 2200 and 2377.
	6. **Review doc 11-22/529r0** – CID 2189 - Ming GAN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0529-00-000m-lb258-cr-for-cid-2189.docx>
		2. CID 2189
			1. I think this makes it difficult to maintain the standard. Perhaps there are alternatives ways of solving this issue. Look at Table 9-128 as an example.
			2. I think it’s more of a maintenance problem.
			3. Chair: If someone is prepared to create an alternative solution, then that would be great. In the meantime this solution is adequate.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 2189 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-04-26 13:32:10Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0529r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0529-00-000m-lb258-cr-for-cid-2189.docx>>
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	7. **Review doc 11-21/0727r10** – PHY CIDs for discussion – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-10-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>
		2. CID 1648 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Some editorial changes were proposed to clarify the sentences in different places.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. **ACTION ITEM #2:** Mark RISON to post the resolution for CID 1648 to the reflector pending any feedback.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1707 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Time priority Management frames.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 1939 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Some small changes are suggested here.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 1245 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Return to this CID at a later point.
			3. Submission required. Assigned to Joseph Levy (Interdigital)
		6. CID 2260 PHY
			1. This will be presented at a later point in the meeting - Thursday.
		7. CID 1246 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission required. Assigned to Joseph Levy (Interdigital)
		8. CID 1603 & 1604 PHY
			1. These will be presented at a later point in the meeting - Thursday.
		9. CID 1254 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Sometimes “is” is just as good as “is equal to”. What do the editors think about this? This is mentioned in Clause 1.4.
			3. Perhaps this can be taken to the next editor’s meeting for consideration.
			4. I would prefer that all these CIDs are decided individually, as opposed to starting general conversations.
			5. Possibly Assign to Joseph LEVY (Interdigital). Group with his other assigned comments on "is", "is set to" and "is equal to" Needs a submission to review the details.
			6. NOTE: This should be updated/clarified in the Style Guide, with whatever direction is decided.
			7. **Straw Poll:**
				1. Do you agree that CID 1254 should be accepted?

Yes: 6

No: 2

Abstain: 3

* + - 1. **ACTION ITEM #3:** Editors to confirm the more general direction of this resolution in CID 1254 (PHY) regarding “is equal to”.
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1254 (PHY): Accepted. Ready for motion.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
			4. Use this CID (1254) as suggested direction from REVme to the Editors, for the larger discussion.
		1. CID 2160 (PHY)
			1. Youhan KIM will cover this in his doc.
		2. CID 1255 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission required. Assigned to Joseph Levy (Interdigital)
		3. CID 1244 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 2240 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. I think dBm in the table is correct.
			3. Submission required. Assigned to Rui DU (Interdigital)
		5. CID 1048 & 1049 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission required. Assigned to Youhan Kim (Qualcomm)
		6. CID 1297 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Submission required. Assigned to Youhan Kim (Qualcomm). Note similar to CID 2341.
		7. CID 2250 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Effectively accept, except fix "cross talk" -> "crosstalk"
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Effectively accept, except fix "cross talk" -> "crosstalk"
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		8. CID 1066 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. This appears to be a correct change, but it is not really required.
			3. The missing article “a” has been noted by the editors.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1066 (PHY): Rejected. The current language is technically correct.

Editors noted that the article ("a") is missing.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1219 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. I think there is a misunderstanding in the text, and this requires to be updated.
			3. My opinion is that this text should be corrected. Note, this comment is similar to CID 1220.
			4. No consensus. The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language.
			5. Straw Poll:
				1. Do you want to mark CID 1219 as accepted?

Yes: 4

No: 4

Abstain: 3

No answer: 3

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: CID 1219 (PHY): Rejected; No consensus. The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language. SP results: 4Y/4N/3A.
			2. Related to CID 1220
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1220 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note from the commenter, that he meant the numbers to be 3 dB more sensitive (-85, ...).
			3. Do any regulatory bodies look at these table values?
			4. I’m not completely sure, but I think the regulatory values are a lot higher.
			5. **ACTION ITEM #4:** Sean COFFEY to investigate ETSI regulatory rules that do/might reference these values RE CID 1220 (PHY).
			6. Submission required. Assigned to Sean Coffey (Realtek)
		2. CID 1221 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. This is similar to CID 1219 (PHY):
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-26 15:22:58Z); No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language). The text referred to in CID 1221 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219. This is a similar comment to that of CID 1219 PHY.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1222 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Same resolution as CID 1221
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-26 15:22:58Z); No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language). The text referred to in CID 1221 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219. This is a similar comment to that of CID 1219 PHY.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1223 PHY
			1. Review Comment
			2. Same resolution as CID 1221
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-26 15:22:58Z); No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language). The text referred to in CID 1221 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219. This is a similar comment to that of CID 1219 PHY.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess:** 11:34am ET.
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, April 26, 2022 at 13:00-15:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 13:03 ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. **See slides 4-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0208-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-march-2022.pptx>
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-22/629r3:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0629-03-000m-tgme-april-2022-adhoc-agenda.docx>
		2. Continue with Agenda from this morning.
		3. Discussion on Agenda –
			1. No objection to updated agenda (see 629r4)
			2. Updated times: 13:00-15:30 and 16:00-17:00
			3. Question on order of 655 and 652 please look at 652 after 655.
			4. Discussion on the rest of the week to match the announced times.
			5. Plan on Thursday to have an extra half hour – 2-hour session.
		4. No objection on updated plan – updated Agenda to be posted.
	4. **Review Document 11-22/510r1** - CIDs 1208 and 1209 –– Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0510-01-000m-proxy-nd-discovery-text-proposal.docx>
		2. Abstract; 802.11-2029 11.21.14 describes a WNM STA ARP Proxy, and also adds an IPv6 ARP Proxy. However, there is no such thing as ARP in IPv6. The equivalent function to IPv4 ARP Proxy is IPv6 ND Service. This function operates differently from what 11.21.14 describes, as assuming equivalence with IPv4 ARP Proxy is an oversimplification. Using the same term for both is confusing. This submission proposes a correction to the text, aiming at accurately stating the function description.
		3. CID 1208 (GEN) and 1209 (MAC)
			1. Review changes that were made since last presentation.
			2. This split the V4 and V6 statements apart to be more specific respectively.
			3. Proposed resolution for CID 1208 (GEN): Revised: Incorporate the changes in 11-22/510r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0510-01-000m-proxy-nd-discovery-text-proposal.docx>>
			4. Proposed Resolution for CID 1209 (MAC): Revised: Incorporate the changes in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0510-01-000m-proxy-nd-discovery-text-proposal.docx
			5. No objection – Mark Both Ready for Motion
	5. **Review doc 11-22-627r0** GEN Direction discussion – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0627-00-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-gen-cids.docx>
		2. CID 1033 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-26 17:25:09Z) The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1268 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if it obsolete, or deprecated is the right path.
			3. The comment is “What is MSGCF and should it be maintained in the spec? Isn't ESS management provided by the DS?”
		4. Is 802.21 not valid anymore?
		5. Discussion on use of different parts of the standard may not be used by all STA or services.
		6. Concern that the 802 revisions may make use of this.
		7. GLK was added most likely without regard to MSGCF.
		8. Proposed resolution: Revised: Add the following text to the start of clauses 4.9.2 (P331L56) and 6.4 (P845L46): “MSGCF is deprecated”.
		9. Alternate Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-26 17:36:18Z) There are uses of 802.11 that do not use a DS and even for scenarios that use a DS, MSGCF may provide further functionality.
		10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1374 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on what Amendments will be included in the new revision.
			3. A Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			4. Updated Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-26 17:49:23Z)

The PAR scope is to “roll-up” published amendments at the time of going to SA ballot and prior to when the balloting is complete.

There is IEEE SA policy that describes the number of amendments that must be included in the revision that must be completed in a timely manner.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1392 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discuss the use of “Either”
			3. Standard dictionaries generally accept the use of “either” or “neither” to introduce a series of more than two items. Merriam-Webster Unabridged, for example, says “either” can be used “before two or more coordinate words, phrases, or clauses joined usually by or.” It defines “neither” as “not one of two or more.”
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changed for CID 1392 in doc 11-22/627r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0627-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-gen-cids.docx>>.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motoin
		2. CID 1489 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if this is a revised or accepted.
			3. Discussion on how to indicate if there were alterations to the proposed changes.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-26 17:55:36Z) Incorporate the changed for CID 1489 in doc 11-22/627r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0627-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-gen-cids.docx>>.

The proposed changes are shown in redline with the document.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1516 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if a port is attached or detached.
			3. Definition of GLK Ports has Attached Ports on purpose.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-26 18:17:19Z)

Not all uses of “bridge port” are either “attached” or “not attached”. There are several uses of ""bridge port" as a distinct logical entity:

Deleting the adjective “attached” from “bridge port” is an incorrect change.

* + - 1. Put in Separate Motion
			2. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1542 (GEN) and CID 1364 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar comment CID 1364 (GEN)
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod" at P410L21 and also the “BSSMaxIdlePeriod” row within the table at P411L6.

D1.0: P435.60, P436.55 for CID 1364 (GEN)

* + - 1. Updated Proposed Resolution: CID 1364 (GEN) REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-26 18:27:45Z) Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod" at P410L21 and also the “BSSMaxIdlePeriod” row within the table at P411L6.

Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod" at P435L60 and also the “BSSMaxIdlePeriod” row within the table at P436L55.

Note to editor: This is the same resolution as CID 1542

* + - 1. Updated Proposed Resolution: CID 1542 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-26 18:27:45Z) Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod" at P410L21 and also the “BSSMaxIdlePeriod” row within the table at P411L6.

Delete "BSSMaxIdlePeriod" at P435L60 and also the “BSSMaxIdlePeriod” row within the table at P436L55.

Note to editor: This is the same resolution as CID 1364

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Both CIDs Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1791 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. This has been discussed before.
			3. Not sure that a note in 1.4 was necessary.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: It is not possible for the context of this comment to be determined. In addition, clause 1.5 “Terminology for mathematical, logical, and bit operations” is not an appropriate place to add such a definition.
			5. It was noted that the comment said 1.5, but really it was wanting 1.4.
			6. More work is needed, and this should be discussed in SEC.
			7. Move to SEC AdHoc.
		2. CID 2040 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if the note was necessary.
			3. P865 context of comment reviewed.
			4. Straw Poll: Do you agree the proposed resolution is Accepted for CID 2040?
				1. Y/N/A
				2. Results: 4Y/2N/2A -
				3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-26 18:47:46Z): The group could not come to any consensus. The discussion about whether the additional note was necessary was inconclusive. The results of the straw poll “Do you accept the proposed resolution of accept” were Y4/N2/A2.ted;
			5. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/652r2** – CID 2243 2244 2390 2391 – Zinan LIN (InterDigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>
		2. CID 2243, 2244, 2390, 2391 (MAC)
			1. Review comments and proposed changes.
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: 2243: Revised: Agree in principle with comments. It is similar to CID 2391. Please refer to CID 2391.

TGm editor: please incorporate changes shown in 11-22/0652r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>> under the tag 2243

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: 2244: Revised: Agree in principle with comments. It is similar to CID 2390. Please refer to CID 2390

TGm editor: please incorporate changes shown in 11-22/0652r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>> under the tag 2244

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: 2390: Revised: TGm editor: please incorporate changes shown in 11-22/0652r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>> under the tag 2390
			2. Proposed Resolution 2391: Revised: TGm editor: please incorporate changes shown in 11-22/0652r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>> under the tag 2391
			3. The Discussion does reference TGbe, but the discussion notes changes that need to be made in the text rolled-in by 11ax.
			4. Review proposed changes to be made.
			5. Minor updates were made as review of changes was completed.
			6. Discussion on the usage of PSR in the signalling being done for which bandwidth.
			7. Request for more reflector discussion should be done.
			8. More discussion could be done after it is updated.
		1. **Recess at 15:35pm**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, April 26, 2022, at 16:00-17:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 16:02 ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-22/629r4:
		1. Discussion on the times.
		2. Change to use 9-11:30; 1300- 15:00; 15:30-17:30 (Wednesday and Thursday).
		3. Continue with agenda See 11-22/629r4
	4. **Review doc 11-22/655r1** **-** CID 2240 & CIDs 2245 – Rui YANG (Interdigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0655-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2245.docx>
		2. CID 2245 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. See Clause 26.10.3.2 – p4241.20
			3. Review submission discussion.
			4. Discussion on OBSS STA may issue a Phy-CCARESET.request for a STA on a different channel?
				1. That part of the figure did not change, so it may be a different question.
				2. The arrow should not post from one STA to another, and maybe could be deleted or made shorter.
			5. Edit to add … last symbol on the air of the triggering PPDU (which is also the PSRR PPDU), provided …
			6. Then edit some articles and PSRR PPDU as needed. See R2 of document.
			7. Change in the Figure 26-13: PSRR PPDU -> Triggering PPDU (PSRR PPDU)
			8. Add a Diamond for the reset as it is an event. Put on STA OBSSa line.
			9. Discussion on what type of “BlockAck” is being sent in response to the PSRT PPDU.
			10. If OBSS-STAb is the one responding to the PSRT PPDU with an immediate BlockAck after SIFs time.
			11. The CCA test and requirements are in an wired case.
			12. Edited the figure 26-13, and the VISO Files will be sent to the editor as well as posting the updated document.
			13. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-22/655r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0655-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2245.docx> >and the VISO File will be posted separately with the Editor.
			14. No objection – Mark Ready Motion
	5. **MAC Review Comments** – Mark HAMILTON (Comscope/Ruckus)
		1. MAC CID file – 11-21/0793r17
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-17-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>
		2. CID 1536 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Assigned to Mark RISON – he has it in doc 11-22/353
		3. CID 1477 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accepted
			3. Request to delay for now and come back after next CID.
		4. CID 1478 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Reference may be incorrect.
			3. There is a similar issue in two other locations, and these need citations better. P2225.25 and P2226.44 also need to be included.
			4. Similar Issue with 10.23.10.5
			5. Similar to CID 2188 (GEN) –
				1. The resolution can be reviewed, but in the meantime, this CID may be ok to just accept.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Accepted – Note to Editor, at P2225.24 the original text cited 10.23.2.5.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1477 (MAC)
			1. Return to look at the context of “rule j”. p2211.6
			2. If we are transmitting on 80 MHz, then the 20 MHz would not be the only idle channel. (Secondary 40 MHZ).
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED; In NOTE 3, change “there is” to “there was”
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 2069 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1466 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if we Accepted or we can assign back to Mark RISON for more research.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1818 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 2181 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 1541 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1782 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the changes proposed being in the right location.
			3. Is it enough to say Dynamic Bandwidth without citing Static Dynamic.
			4. There are multiple changes, so review them again one at a time.
			5. P2099.41 – Change to add “as the RTS Originator”
			6. P2100.13 – change to add “as the RTS Originator”
			7. More time needed on discussion for this CID.
	6. **Recess until Tomorrow Morning 5:30pm ET.**
2. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, April 27, 2022, at 9:00-11:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 09:02 ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Agenda Review**
		1. See 11-22/629r3 (r4 not posted yet).
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0629-03-000m-tgme-april-2022-adhoc-agenda.docx>
		2. Will post 11-22/629r4
		3. Will reorder for those present.
		4. Start with Mark RISON
		5. No Objection
	4. **PHY CIDs** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. Doc 11-21/0727r10: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-10-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>
		2. CID 1224 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context - Table 27-52.
			3. Discussion on what the values should be.
				1. 16 -> 19 for example.
				2. Concern that this table is related to other sensitivity tables and should not change unless we change the correlated table.
			4. Similar resolution from yesterday CID 1219 and CID 1224
			5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The Group could not come to a consensus on related comment 1219. It was agreed that this set of related comments should be resolved consistently. A SP on Accepting the proposed changes for CID 1219 yielded 4Y/4N/3A/3 NA.
		3. CID 1226 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar comment as CID 1223 (PHY)
			3. Proposed Resolution REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-26 15:22:58Z)

This is similar to CID 1219 (PHY): No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language. SP results for accepting CID 1219: 4Y/4N/3A.) The text referred to in CID 1221 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1225 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar comment as CID 1223 (PHY)
			3. Proposed Resolution REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-26 15:22:58Z)

This is similar to CID 1219 (PHY): No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language. SP results for accepting CID 1219: 4Y/4N/3A.) The text referred to in CID 1221 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1227 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-26 15:22:58Z)

This is similar to CID 1219 (PHY): No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language. SP results for accepting CID 1219: 4Y/4N/3A.) The text referred to in CID 1221 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1228 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (PHY: 2022-04-27 13:16:01Z)

This is similar to CID 1219 (PHY): No consensus. (The language is technically correct, currently, or if changed. It was suggested that simulation is more consistent with different bandwidths, with the current language. SP results for accepting CID 1219: 4Y/4N/3A.) The text referred to in CID 1226 should be consistent with that referred to in CID 1219.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1229 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discuss on the value of making the change here and not in other similar places (different PHY).
			3. Straw Poll: Do you support resolution for CID 1229 with Accepted?
				1. Y/N/A
				2. Results: 6/2/1
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted. Editors will correct the typo in "channel"
		2. CID 1064 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Decided that some more time is required for offline discussions
			3. Assign to Youhan KIM – Mark Submission required.
		3. CID 2380 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 2348 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on value of the cited sentence.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The current text is technically correct and complete as it is.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 1127 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context: 4879.32
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 1127 (PHY): Rejected; This NOTE is a counterpoint to the previous sentence, to make it clear that a non-AP WUR STA is required to support WUR PPDU rx but not required to support WUR PPDU tx, though it might.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		6. CID 1137 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the example shown in the draft.
			3. The text has a “should” – discuss if it might be changed to “may”.
			4. If there was significant discussion in the TGba, then the text should not be changed without more expert review.
			5. We will create a Revised reason, and Youhan KIM will take for review with the WUR Experts.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 1137 (PHY): Revised. This text gives a recommended method for achieving the required waveform, but other methods are possible. Change "center 13" to "the center 13" in the cited text.
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1141 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review p4888.53 for context
			3. The Cited page did not seem to match the text – p4889.30 seems to be the quoted text.
			4. Discussion on the use of “should” vs “could be” vs “is”.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1141 (PHY): Rejected. This text gives a recommended method for achieving the required waveform, but other methods are possible.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1140 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1140 (PHY): Rejected. This text gives a recommended method for achieving the required waveform, but other methods are possible.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 1139 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 1139 (PHY): Revised. This text gives a recommended method for achieving the required waveform, but other methods are possible. Change "center 13" to "the center 13" in the cited text.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 1138 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1138 (PHY): Rejected. This text gives a recommended method for achieving the required waveform, but other methods are possible.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1130 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 1130 (PHY): Rejected. This text gives a recommended method for achieving the required waveform, but other methods are possible.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 2128 (PHY)
			1. This was discussed back on January 19, 2022.
			2. Some Comments were sent offline from Emily to Mark R.
			3. The final Discussion noted in the January 19th Minutes (11-22/108r0). The CIDs being resolved with 11-21/1128r3 – the document did not indicate which part of the text was resolving which CIDs.
			4. Three CIDs related: CID 2128 / CID 1956 (SEC) / CID 1957 (SEC)
			5. There is a version of the document that has a lot of margin comments, and it is not clear what the final changes being suggested would be.
			6. This will need more work and come back on a later agenda item.
	1. **Change to Agenda** as those scheduled are not present. – Continue with GEN Review CIDS.
	2. GEN Review Comments
		1. 11-22/67r7: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-07-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
		2. CID 1144 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1154 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval" at cited location.
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1155 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval" at cited location.
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1156 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The text is correct. "Periods per second" is the unit, similar to "meters per second". No change required.
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1159 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. To be consistent with other changes approved in other CIDs, (change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval”), no change should be made in this location.
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1158 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. to be consistent with other changes approved in other CIDs, ( "change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval" at cited location.") no change should be made in this location.
			3. Rejected – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1157 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. To be consistent with other changes approved in other CIDs, (change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval" ), no change should be made in this location.
			3. Rejected – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 1160 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. To be consistent with other changes approved in other CIDs, (change "within a 1 second interval" to "within a one second interval" ), no change should be made in this location.
			3. Rejected – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 1161 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 14:42:41Z) change at cited location: "an unsigned integer and in the unit of kilobits per second." to "an unsigned integer in kb/s."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1162 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1162 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 14:47:25Z) At 6055.44 replace "in multiples of 32 us per second" with "in units of 32 us/s". And, at 6055.46, replace "multiples of 32 us over a 1 s period" to "in units of 32 us/s"
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 1164 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 14:50:14Z) at 6059.31 replace "requirement for the OBSSs in multiples of 32 μs per second." With "requirement for the OBSSs in units of 32 μs/s."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		13. CID 1163 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 14:52:27Z) at 6059.22 replace "This overlap traffic value is in multiples of 32 μs per second." with "This overlap traffic value is in units of 32 μs/s."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		14. CID 1326 GEN
			1. Submission required. Assigned to Mark Hamilton (Ruckus)
		15. CID 1281 GEN CIDs 2255 and 1869 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Same as CIDs 2255 and 1869.
			3. Revisit this CID in May 2022. Note that CIDs 2255 and 1869 go with CID 1281.
			4. **ACTION ITEM #5:** Jon ROSDAHL to send an email to the reflector to receive feedback on CID 1281(GEN). Is SISO a single space-time stream, single spatial stream, or single antenna?
			5. Add to AdHoc Notes: GEN: 2022-04-27 15:14:43Z - status set to: Discuss - Concern with how the SISO is defined. -- Single Spatial Stream vs single space-time stream vs receiver uses a single antenna. This needs to have a reflector discussion to clarify and harmonize the definition.
		16. CID 1028 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. From the AdHoc notes: The parenthesis usage is correct, and the respective definitions are for 1 MHz and 2 MHz respectfully.

For example:

1 MHz mask physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU): A PPDU that is transmitted using the 1 MHz transmit spectral mask defined in Clause 23 (Sub 1 GHz (S1G) PHY specification) and that is a 1 MHz sub 1 GHz (S1G) PPDU (TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1).

(PHY) acronym for physical layer defined

(PPDU) Acronym for physical layer protocol data unit defined.

(S1G) acronym for Sub 1 GHz defined

(Sub 1 GHz (S1G) PHY specification) is name of Clause 23

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1) indicates the TXVECTOR parameter value for CH\_BANDWIDTH in the 1 MHz S1G PPDU case.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 15:21:33Z)The parenthesis usage is correct, and the respective definitions are for 1 MHz and 2 MHz respectfully.

For example:

1 MHz mask physical layer (PHY) protocol data unit (PPDU): A PPDU that is transmitted using

the 1 MHz transmit spectral mask defined in Clause 23 (Sub 1 GHz (S1G) PHY specification) and that is a 1

MHz sub 1 GHz (S1G) PPDU (TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1).

(PHY) acronym for physical layer defined

(PPDU) Acronym for physical layer protocol data unit defined.

(S1G) acronym for Sub 1 GHz defined

(Sub 1 GHz (S1G) PHY specification) is name of Clause 23

(TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH equal to CBW1) indicates the TXVECTOR parameter value for CH\_BANDWIDTH in the 1 MHz S1G PPDU case.

* + - 1. Rejected – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1264 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 15:28:59Z): Change the definition of active mode to be:

active mode: A power management mode of an associated station (STA) in which an AP may transmit physical layer (PHY) protocol data units (PPDUs) to an associated STA at any time. For a mesh STA it is a mesh power management mode in which a neighbor peer mesh STA may transmit PPDUs to the mesh STA at any time.

NOTE -- This mode is equivalent to an associated STA or mesh STA being continuously in the awake state.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2303 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. CID 2303 (GEN): Ran out of time. Will pick up at the next GEN agenda item.
	1. **Recessed until 13:00 ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, April 27, 2022, at 13:00-15:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 13:02 ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Agenda Review**
		1. Reorder the agenda for those that are in attendance.
		2. Start with Stephen MCCANN
		3. No objection.
	4. **Review Doc 11-22/627r1** – GEN Discuss CIDs - Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0627-01-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-gen-cids.docx>
		2. CID 2188 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in Submission
			3. Discussion on use of Count or Counter (Timer).
			4. Review Context of 10.23.2.5 Paragraph.
			5. Concern that we had discussed Backoff/retry in the past, and want to ensure we are consistent. Suggest that Menzo be made aware of the proposal.
			6. The Reference is noted as incorrect and should be updated.
			7. **ACTION ITEM #6:** Stephen MCCANN to contact Menzo about CID 2188 and open a discussion on the reflector.
		3. CID 2252 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Reject reason of not specific changes were made.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 2360 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. C: The commenter has a point. This is not exactly the syntax implied by the 1.4 notation definition, because the item to which the bit-slice is applied is not clear.
			3. Suggest "TSF[10:25]"
			4. Discussion if we need to identify more clearly the TSF value that "corresponds..." is trying to reference.
			5. Suggest "to TSF[10:25], where TSF corresponds..."
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 17:32:39Z) - Replace “to the TSF timer [10: 25] that corresponds” with “to TSF[10:25], where TSF corresponds”
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **MAC Review CIDs** Mark HAMILTON
		1. CID 1468 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1793 (MAC)
			1. Review comment (Quoted comment)
				1. "A STA that is not an S1G relay STA shall discard an MPDU with a group address in the Address 1 field unless

one of the following cases applies: (1) the value in the Address 1 field matches any value in the dot11GroupAddressesTable or matches the broadcast address value, or (2) the STA is a GLK STA and the

address in the Address 1 field is a SYNRA." -- if you don't want (1) to apply to GLK STAs you need to spell it out

* + - 1. Discussion on GLK Rules. They send SYNRA only frames.
			2. Only Broadcast frames in SYNRA frames can be received by GLK.
			3. Data Frames are only transmitted with SYNRA
			4. See contact p2132.62.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; In a GLK BSS, there are no group addressed data frames, other than addressed to a SYNRA address
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1669 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 1989 (PHY) (old CID 177 and doc 11-21/0829)
			3. Assign to Mark RISON – Mark Submission Required.
		2. CID 1042 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. See context p2514.15
			3. Proposed Resolution; Revised: Replace the cited text with, “A SIFS after receiving a MIMO BF poll frame”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1043 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. See context p2516.57
			3. Proposed Resolution; Revised: Replace the cited text with, “A SIFS after receiving a MIMO BF poll frame”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1044 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. See context p2523.48
			3. Proposed Resolution; Revised: Replace the cited text with, “A SIFS after receiving a IMO BF poll frame”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1045 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. See context p2586.43
			3. Proposed Resolution; Revised: Replace the cited text with, “A SIFS after receiving an NDP Paging Request”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1046 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. See context 2623.52
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-04-27 18:02:46Z): Replace the cited text with "A SIFS after receiving the AID Switch Request frame".
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1313 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Change: Change "broadcast destination address" to "broadcast address". Also at P2667.48, P2669.56, P2670.7, P2670.14, P2670.23, P2681.54, P2817.64 (and delete "(DA)" at this location), P4274.1, P4274.6, P4274.8, P4275.33, P4275.36, P4275.41, P4275.48, P4275.53, P4275.58, P4275.64, P4276.2, P4276.17, P4276.26, P4276.36, P4276.41, and P4276.45.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. Similar to CID 2066 (ED2)
				1. Same Resolution can be applied.
			5. CID 2066 (ED2)
				1. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Change "broadcast destination address" to "broadcast address". Also at P2667.48, P2669.56, P2670.7, P2670.14, P2670.23, P2681.54, P2817.64 (and delete "(DA)" at this location), P4274.1, P4274.6, P4274.8, P4275.33, P4275.36, P4275.41, P4275.48, P4275.53, P4275.58, P4275.64, P4276.2, P4276.17, P4276.26, P4276.36, P4276.41, and P4276.45.
			6. Mark Both CIDs as Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1708 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 1274 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on when RSN is used.
			3. Looking at the paragraph, you have “If RSN is used with management” and another sentence of “If RSN is used without management” and some other side sentences, so we should put a paragraph break prior to the “If RSN is used without management” sentence.
			4. So, we add the new paragraph point and the requested sentence.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-04-27 18:14:06Z): Make the Proposed Change. Also, add a paragraph break after the second sentence in the cited paragraph.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 1671 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. See context – p2727.7
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1672 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. See context p2730.42
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 1257 (MAC)
			1. Add to AdHoc Notes: Also Change “ASAP” to “The ASAP field”.
			2. Will be included when Joseph LEVY reports in his submission.
		13. CID 1675 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		14. CID 1561 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if the Note on documenting Security issues.
			3. Straw Poll: Do you agree with marking CID 1561 as Accepted?
				1. Y/N/A
				2. Results: 3/2/1/4
			4. Discussion on how to find consensus.
			5. What other Straw Polls could we run?
			6. Proposed idea for a straw Poll: STA A should enable management frame protection to avoid being used in a relayed denial-of-service attack.
			7. Straw Poll: Do you agree with resolving CID 1561 as Revised, with a change that STA A should negotiate PMF to avoid being used to relay a DoS attack?
				1. Y/n/a
				2. Results: 3/2/1/4
			8. No Consensus. – Resolve the CID with a Non-Consensus rejection.
			9. Proposed Resolution: CID 1561 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-04-27 18:39:10Z): The group could not come to consensus on a set of changes to the draft that would satisfy the commenter. Straw Polls were run to accept the comment as proposed, or to add text that STA A should enable PMF to avoid being used as a relay for a DoS attack. Results for Straw poll one for possible Accept = 3Y/2N/1A/4DNV and for Straw poll two for possible Revised resolution = 3Y/2N/1A/4DNV
			10. Mark This as ready for motion
			11. Will be run as a separate Motion.
		15. CID 1251 (MAC)
			1. Assign to Joseph Levy – Mark Submission Required.
		16. CID 1252 (MAC)
			1. Assign to Joseph Levy – Mark Submission Required.
		17. CID 2321 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Change: Modify the sentence starting on p2791 line 55 to say "If an AP, IBSS STA, or mesh STA is operating in the 6 GHz band as an Indoor AP, Standard power AP or Indoor standard power AP (see Table E-12), it shall include Transmit Power Envelope element(s) in Beacon and Probe Response frames as follows:".

In addition, a new paragraph (without inset) after Note 8 on p2792 as follows: "If an AP, IBSS STA, or mesh STA is operating in the 6 GHz band as a Very low power AP or Indoor enabled AP (see Table E-12), it shall not indicate any regulatory client maximum transmit powers in any Transmit Power Envelope elements that it transmits."

* + - 1. Discussion on how to make the second change clear.
			2. Discussion on p1554.28 –figure 9-692 – Transmit power Information field format.
			3. Commenter is noting that there is a regulatory limitation that must be followed that is lower than in the specification.
			4. Will take offline and work on this CID to find a good resolution.
			5. ACTION ITEM #7: Mark HAMILTON to contact regulatory Experts and start a reflector discussion for CID 2321.
	1. **Recess at 3:02pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, April 27, 2022, at 15:30-17:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 15:02 ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Agenda Review**
		1. Continue as previously approved.
	4. **GEN Review CIDs** – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. Follow along in 11-22/67r7: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-07-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
		2. CID 2304 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 19:45:34Z) Change the cited note: "NOTE—For purposes of this definition, a Management frame is treated as if it had a TID 15."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 2303 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 19:48:06Z) REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 19:45:34Z) Change the cited note: "NOTE—For purposes of this definition, a Management frame is treated as if it had a TID 15."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1311 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 19:49:12Z).
			3. The editors will add a missing full stop.
			4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 2256 GEN
			1. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 19:51:04Z)
			2. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1231 GEN
			1. Mark Submission Required
			2. Change Assignment to Stephen MCCANN to include this CID in doc 11-22/311, with CID 2310 in the submission.
		7. CID 1232 MAC
			1. Review Comment (We jumped to MAC CIDs, but continue).
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Replace on page 918.38

"The Queue Size subfield is an 8-bit field that indicates the amount of buffered traffic for a given TC or TS at the non-AP non-HE STA sending the frame that contains this subfield and the amount of buffered traffic for a given TC or TS at the non-AP HE STA for transmission to the HE STA identified by the receiver address of the frame that contains this subfield."

with

"The Queue Size subfield is an 8-bit field that indicates the amount of buffered traffic for a given TC or TS:

- at a non-AP non-HE STA sending the frame that contains this subfield,

or

- at a non-AP HE STA for transmission to the HE STA identified by the receiver address of the frame that contains this subfield."

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2190 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At P221L21 delete the sentence "These processes are described in 5.8.1.9 of ISO/IEC 7498-1:1994."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2241 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Straw poll 1: Do you support resolving CID 2241 with “Accept”? Y3/N1/A1 (no answer 5)
			3. Straw poll 2: Do you support resolving CID 2241 with “Rejected: The definition does not require all subcarriers to carry energy, only that at least two subcarriers carry energy.”? Y2/N3/A0 (no answer 5)
			4. This will be considered as a separate motion using the outcome of straw poll 1.
			5. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 20:26:53Z)
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1867 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Same as CID 2367 (GEN)
			3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 20:33:53Z)
			4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 2367 GEN
			1. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 20:35:02Z)
			2. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 2333 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note similar to CID 2367 and CID 1867.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 20:35:56Z) Change "5.950" to "5.925 or 5.950". (Same Resolution as CID 2367 and CID 1867)
			4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1773 GEN
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 20:37:43Z)
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1524 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-27 20:48:27Z) at P243.1 change the definition to "time priority Management frame: A Management frame that is transmitted outside of the normal MAC queuing process. See 10.2.3.1."
			3. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 2346 GEN
			1. Straw Poll:
1. Reject - MC-OOK was added by 11ba and indicates the symbols used by 11ba. The definition is for a multicarrier on-off keying (MC-OOK) symbol. There is no use of just "OOK", only this definition and usage. Y/4, N/2, No answer/6
2. Revised: Delete the definition at p277.49.

 Y/2, N/5, No answer/5

3. Reject - Insufficient details. Y/4, N/2, No answer/6

* + - 1. Straw Poll Option 1 was chosen.
			2. This will be run as a separate motion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 21:11:08Z) MC-OOK was added by 11ba and indicates the symbols used by 11ba. The definition is for a multicarrier on-off keying (MC-OOK) symbol. There is no use of just "OOK", only this definition and usage.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2120 GEN
			1. Review comment
			2. This is related to CID 2119
			3. An operating class is used in conjunction with a channel number to specify an operating channel and bandwidth. It also indicates other constraints such as transmit power. Operating channel is used extensively within today deployments.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 21:19:07Z) There is consensus to maintain Annex E.

An operating Class is used in conjunction with an operating channel and bandwidth and can indicate other regulatory constraints. It is used extensively in deployments in existing devices. For Example, Channel Switching between different bands would not work without communicating the Operating class information.

* + - 1. This will be run as a separate motion. “Gen Motion Reject Annex E Deletion” Comment Group.
			2. Objection from Mark Rison (Samsung)
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2186 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. The RAC has been revising the EtherType registries and this is an effort to clarify the usage of this term in within all IEEE 802 standards, including IEEE 802.11.
			3. Discussion on if we should change “:” to “-“ with this CID.
			4. Need submission on the “:” to “-“ proposal.
			5. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-27 21:35:44Z)
			6. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess 15:36 ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Thursday, April 29, 2022, at 9:00-11:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 9:02am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. See 11-22/629r5
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0629-05-000m-tgme-april-2022-adhoc-agenda.docx>
		3. No objection to proceeding with the Agenda.
	4. **SEC Review CIDs** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. See doc 11-22/105r7
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0105-07-000m-revme-lb258-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
		3. CID 1564 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1833 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The comment refers to the text at 3227.26 and 3228.37
			3. Discussion we could delete the cited text rather than add two more conditions.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-04-28 13:18:14Z) - The phrase is not required in the 4-way handshake sub-clauses because its specified in the EAPOL-key description (p3208)

Relative to 1.0, at 3218.14, 3220.2, and 3222.27, delete:

"– MIC computed over the body of this EAPOL-Key frame with the Key MIC field first initialized to 0"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1829 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The field is referred to as the Key MIC bit, or the "Key MIC bit of the Key Information field"
			3. Locations (in standard page. Line format D1.0) are: 3214.39, 3214.42, 3217.4, 3217.60, 3219.47, 3222.10, 3225.60, 3227.9, 3228.20
			4. Discussion on changes to the sub-field name not causing issues.
			5. 11 locations.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1814 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Clause 9.4.2.185 Key Delivery element (1585.30)

"The Key Delivery element contains the current Key RSC and one or more KDEs. This is used to communicate the Key RSC and one or more KDEs in a FILS authentication exchange. The format of the Key Delivery element is shown in Figure 9-736 (Key Delivery element format)."

* + - 1. Clause 6 (432.8, 445.16, 459.45)

KDE(s) and the current Key RSC. The parameter is present if dot11FILSActivated is true; otherwise not present."

* + - 1. Note that the field in the EAPOL-Key frame is called the Key RSC in clause 12.7.2 (3204.18) which includes a table 12-9 which defines the format of the field.
			2. Assign to Mark RISON – 11-22/0353 – submission Required.
		1. CID 1705 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review AdHoc Notes.
			3. Discussion on the policy and who enforces the policy.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-04-28 13:35:14Z) - At 331.12, replace

"In an IBSS each STA enforces its own security policy."

with

"In an IBSS, each STA enforces a uniform security policy across all STAs."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1567 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1507 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review p490.15 for context
			3. Discuss the changes to the 490.50 changes – Change to 2 sentences and keep the third as is.
			4. Discussion on when PN is initialized, and when over the air is never 0.
			5. 2nd Change on 3149.8 and 3159.6 initialized to 0 is the correct direction.
			6. 3rd change on 3151.30 and 3161.8 discuss proposed change and determined it was not needed.
			7. 4th Change – discussion ok
			8. 5th Change – 3153.41 – just delete “. The transmitter may reinitialize the sequence counter when the IGTK is refreshed”
			9. 6th Change 3151.51 change to just one sentence to change.
			10. 7th Change – adding notes. – discussion on the value of adding the notes.
			11. Instead of Notes – change “Increment the PN, to obtain a fresh PN for each MPDU,” to “Increment the PN, to obtain a fresh nonzero PN for each MPDU,: “
			12. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED (SEC: 2022-04-28 14:23:34Z) - At 490.50 change

"When the Key, Address, Key Type, and Key ID parameters identify a new key to be set, the MAC

initializes the transmitter TSC/PN/IPN/BIPN counter to 0."

 to

"When the Key Type parameter is Pairwise or PeerKey, and the Key, Key ID, and Address parameters identify a new key to be set, the MAC

initializes the transmitter TSC/PN/IPN/BIPN counter t 0When the Key Type parameter is not Pairwise or PeerKey, and the Key, Key ID, and Address parameters identify a new key to be set, the MAC

initializes the transmitter TSC/PN/IPN/BIPN counter to the value in the Receive Sequence Count parameter."

At 3149.8 and 3159.6 change

"The PN shall be implemented as a 48-bit strictly increasing integer, initialized

to 1 when the corresponding temporal key is initialized or refreshed."

to

"The PN shall be implemented as a 48-bit strictly increasing integer, initialized

to 0 when the corresponding temporal key is initialized or refreshed."

At 3153.41 delete

"The transmitter may reinitialize the sequence counter when the IGTK is

refresh."

At 3153.51 delete

"The transmitter may reinitialize the sequence counter when

the BIGTK is refresd."

At 3143.26, change

"Increment the PN, to obtain a fresh PN for each MPDU,"

to

"Increment the PN, to obtain a fresh nonzero PN for each MPDU,"

At 3157.33, change

"Increment the PN, to obtain a fresh PN for each MPDU"

to

"Increment the PN, to obtain a fresh nonzero PN for each MPDU"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1504 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1504 (SEC): Accepted. Noted the locations to the Editor
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1514 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1350 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Figure change is needed.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2022-04-28 14:33:24Z) - The "Group" refers to Key Type subfield set to Group in EAPOL-key frames.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 1349 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if we have too much detail in Clause 4, and if we could simply remove figure 4-31 and 4-32.
			3. Would need more work to be able to delete the references and examples.
			4. Assign to Joseph Levy and Submission Required – put on May Agenda.
			5. Use “Group keys” in place of the lists of keys and remove the figures.
			6. **ACTION ITEM #8**; Joseph Levy include a clean-up of the related detail in clause 4 for CID 1349 (SEC).
		5. CID 1742 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review AdHoc notes.
			3. Proposed Resolution REJECTED (SEC: 2022-04-28 14:48:20Z) - Only the pairwise cipher suite is used to protect Robust Management frames; not the Group Data Cipher Suite. Group robust management frames are protected using BIP, so it doesn't matter what the Group Data Cipher Suite is.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1513 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We discussed this earlier today. (CID 1507 (SEC)):

- At 490.50 change "When the Key, Address, Key Type, and Key ID parameters identify a new key to be set, the MACinitializes the transmitter TSC/PN/IPN/BIPN counter to 0." to "When the Key Type parameter is Pairwise or PeerKey, and the Key, Key ID, and Address parameters identify a new key to be set, the MACinitializes the transmitter TSC/PN/IPN/BIPN counter t 0When the Key Type parameter is not Pairwise or PeerKey, and the Key, Key ID, and Address parameters identify a new key to be set, the MACinitializes the transmitter TSC/PN/IPN/BIPN counter to the value in the Receive Sequence Count parameter."

* + - 1. Discussion on the changes.
			2. There seems to be multiple CIDs that are on these same paragraphs:
				1. From SEC CIDS: 1513, 1512, 1505, 1507 (pull from ready for motion).
				2. From GEN CIDS: 2166, 1679, 1506 (Move to SEC)
			3. Assigned all the CIDs to Mark RISON and Submission Required.
		1. CID 1915 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1433 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if TKIP is used for Management Frames.
			3. Addition of the NOTE was discussed.
			4. Adding the Note about deprecation on TKIP and we could add as an alternative a Note about WEP also, but not part of this CID.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1852 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on what the change would result in.
			3. Discussion on the value of the sentence.
			4. Discussion on proposed alternatives
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-04-28 15:24:46Z) - At 3089.55, change

"When dot11RSNAActivated is true, an RSNA STA shall include the RSNE in Beacon, Probe Response,

Information Response, and (Re)Association Request frames and in message 2 and message 3 of the 4-way

handshake; shall set the DMG Privacy subfield to 1 within transmitted DMG Beacons; and may include the

RSNE in DMG Beacon and Announce frames."

to

"When dot11RSNAActivated is true, a STA uses the RSNE to advertise support for RSNAs. When dot11RSNAActivated is true, a DMG STA shall set the DMG Privacy subfield to 1 within transmitted DMG Beacon frames."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1898 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on reserved fields.
			3. Clause 12 Conventions, but the new language would be more explicit.
			4. More discussion on how to capture the rules for the handling of reserved fields.
			5. Past proposals have not been deemed complete enough. We would need to have more discussion on this on the reflector.
			6. Assign to Sean COFFEY – Mark Submission Required –
	1. **Recess at 11:35am**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Thursday, April 29, 2022, at 13:00-15:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 1:01pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. PM1 – 13:00-15:00 Eastern
			1. ED1 CIDs – Qi (Intel)
			2. Co-Hosted BSS CIDs – 11-22/88 – Patil (Qualcomm).
			3. FILS Discovery CIDs – document 11-22/115 – Patil (Qualcomm)
		2. No objection to proceeding with agenda 11-22/629r5
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0629-05-000m-tgme-april-2022-adhoc-agenda.docx>
	4. **ED1 CIDs** – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. See 11-22/0319r0 and database.
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0319-00-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx>
		3. CID 1091 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Two options, and option one proposed to follow.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1093 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion removal of arrow.
			3. Discussion on also
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes indicated by CID 1093 in doc 11-22/0319r1 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0319-01-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx>>
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1094 & 1095 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Need to send an Email to the chair to withdraw CID 1094 and 1095.
			3. Proposed resolution: Rejected: Commenter withdrew the comments.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1416 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution; Revised, at 269.50 delete “,” in “in which case,”. At 2421.41 and 2432.53 delete "then"
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1660 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: Revised. At the following locations: 1312.17/22, 1313.1, 1314.1, 2079.28, 4133.52/53, 4134.37/39, 5570.50, 5592.13, change "EDCA parameter values" to "EDCA parameters"
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1662 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED. Note to editor, Locations are 2666.1, 2837.20, 3320.34, 5587.35.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 1685 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change “beacon report” to “Beacon report” at the following locations: 1206.38/39, 1207.24, 2817.31/32, 2819.16/20 (2x), 2975.53/54.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 1755 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Change "Mesh ID" to "mesh ID" at 375.29 (2x), 469.34 rightmost, 1460.34, 2672.13 (2x), 3318.52 (2x), 3318.53, 3319.9, 5467.20, 14.2.6, and 14.13.3.2,

In 14.2.6, locations are: 3320.36 (rightmost), 3320.40/41/45/46/47 (leftmost)/48 (2x).

In 14.13.3.2, locations are: 3399.20/23/27

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1849 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on how to express the numbers in decimal vs hexadecimal
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Change “<x> expressed as hexidecimal value” to “i.e., <x> in decimal” at the following locations: 1289.20/21/31/32/42/43/52/53, 1290.4/5

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1850 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Suggest going to upper case rather than just lower case.
			3. The ones suggested to change to lower case locations are: 1289.22/28/33/39/44/47/54/60, 1290.6
			4. Return when we get list of locations for changing to upper case.
		2. CID 1875 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At the following locations 3476.44/55/60, 3483.31/43, 3549.60, 3551.3, 3563.18/19, 3616.27, 4476.33, change "field of the TXVECTOR" or "fields of the TXVECTOR" to "parameter of the TXVECTOR" or "parameters of the TXVECTOR", respectively.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1030 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (ED1: 2022-04-28 17:47:39Z)- Usually, no reference is added in clause 3.2.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1772 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on changes for sentence two.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED (ED1: 2022-04-28 18:02:57Z) - change the second sentence "All STAs use frames with the QoS subfield of the Subtype subfield set to 0 for nonconcealed GCR group addressed Data frames unless it is known to the transmitter that all STAs in the BSS that are members of the multicast group have QoS capability, in which case STAs use QoS Data frames." to "All STAs use frames with the QoS subfield of the Subtype subfield set to 0 for nonbroadcast nonconcealed GCR group addressed Data frames unless it is known to the transmitter that all STAs in the BSS that are members of the multicast group have QoS capability, in which case STAs use QoS Data frames."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1850 (ED1)
			1. Return –
			2. Thanks to Brian HART for providing locations.
			3. Proposed resolution: Change the first lowercase letter after "//" to uppercase in the following locations: D1.0P1289 lines 20, 21, 24, 26, 31, 32, 35, 37, 42, 43, 46, 48, 52, 53, 56, and 58, and D1.0P1290 lines 4, 5, 8, 11, and 14.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1261 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2022-04-28 18:07:54Z) - Delete "(which is directed to it)".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1306 ED1
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Reject: The lower line exists in both figures, so there is no problem.
			3. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1318 ED1
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required. Comment assigned to Mark HAMILTON
		5. CID 1338 ED1
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Make a para break at 2130.13 and 2130.17. Convert the footnote to a note and add the note to 2130.17
			3. This will be run as a separate motion
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/0088r3** Abhishek PATIL (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0088-03-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-co-hosted-bssid-set.docx>
		2. CID 1112
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Incorporate the changes for CID 1112 in doc 11-22/0088r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0088-04-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-co-hosted-bssid-set.docx>> submission 11-22-0088r4
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-22/0116r3** Abhishek Patil (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0116-03-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-multiple-bssid-set.docx>
		2. CID 1019 & 1020
			1. Similar resolutions within the submission 11-22-0116r3
			2. Proposed Resolution -CID 1019 and 1020: Revised: Incorporate the changes for CID 1019 and 1020 in doc 11-22-0116r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0116-04-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-multiple-bssid-set.docx>>
			3. No objection – Mark Both CIDs Ready for Motion
	3. **Recess 15:01**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Thursday, April 29, 2022, at 15:30-17:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 3:32pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Reminder of Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review Agenda**
		1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0629-05-000m-tgme-april-2022-adhoc-agenda.docx
			1. Agenda – 11-22/629r6 (will be posted).
		2. PM2 – 15:30-17:30 Eastern
			1. Document 11-22/520 – KIM (Qualcomm)
			2. Document 11-22/553 – KIM (Qualcomm)
			3. GEN CIDs – ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		3. No Objection to agenda
	4. **Review Doc Document 11-22/553** – Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0553-00-000m-lb258-cid-2368-stbc-in-ul-mu-mimo.docx>
		2. CID 2368 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in Submission.
			3.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-04-28 19:33:44Z):

Note to commenter:

Agree that STBC shall not be used with UL MU-MIMO. The proposed text below adopts the change suggested by the commenter, correcting a grammar error.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Add the following at the end of 26.5.2.2.1 (REVme D1.1 P4160L32):

"An AP shall not set the UL STBC subfield in the Common Info field in a Trigger frame it transmits if any of the RUs allocated in that Trigger frame are assigned to more than one user."

**Note to commenter:**

Agree that STBC shall not be used with UL MU-MIMO. The proposed text below adopts the change suggested by the commenter, correcting a grammar error.

**Instruction to TGme Editor:**

Add the following at the end of 26.5.2.2.1 (REVme D1.1 P4160L32):

"An AP shall not set the UL STBC subfield in the Common Info field in a Trigger frame it transmits if any of the RUs allocated in that Trigger frame is assigned to more than one user."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/520** – Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-02-000m-lb258-phy-cids-part-1.docx>
		2. CID 2260 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Review new figure changes that will need VISO files submitted to Editor.
			4. Discussion on the changes to the figure.
			5. Proposed resolution: Revised.

Note to commenter:

The proposed text updates below essentially implement all the changes suggested by the commenter. The resolution is not marked as “ACCEPTED” because (1) one of the cited locations is incorrect (P3246L9 should have been P3426L9) and (b) we need to provide the updated Visio files to the Editor.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2260 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-02-000m-lb258-phy-cides-part-1.docx>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 1603 and 1604 (PHY)
			1. Review comments
			2. Proposed resolution Both CIDs: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Both CIDs Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1312 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 1312 (PHY): Revised.

Note to commenter:

Agree that the cited sentence is not needed.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Delete the sentence spanning D1.1 P3479L46-47 (“An illustration of … (SYNC))).”).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2160 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2160 (PHY):

Note to commenter:

The proposed text updates below extends the suggestion by the commenter by including the TXVECTOR parameters DYN\_BANDWIDTH\_IN\_NON\_HT and SCRAMBLER\_INITIAL\_VALUE.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2160 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-02-000m-lb258-phy-cides-part-1.docx>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1731 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. What is definition of the ERP-DSSS modes?
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

Note to commenter:

ERP-DSSS and ERP-CCK are defined terms in Clause 3.2. Commenter is correct that the reference 16.3.8.2 is on CCK, not DSSS. Hence, the proposed text updates below changes ERP-DSSS to ERP-CCK.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

At REVme D1.1 P3530L2, change “The PER of the ERP-DSSS modes shall be” to “The PER for ERP-CCK shall be”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2375 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

Note to commenter:

The proposed text updates fix the issue pointed out by the commenter on Equation (19-83), as well as fix the incorrect dimension of matrices in equations (19-83) and (19-84).

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2375 in 11-22/520r2 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-02-000m-lb258-phy-cides-part-1.docx>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			2. Editor to look for the 3-dot problem that causes a ding-bat character replacement.
		1. CID 1590 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed text updates.
			3. Discuss Figure
				1. Rx and test Parity box discussed.
				2. The “Parity or Rate” check should be “Parity and Rate”
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

Note to commenter:

All the necessary information needed to demodulate an HT-mixed format PPDU is contained within the HT-SIG. Hence, it is not necessary to have received the L-SIG correctly (e.g. L-SIG parity passes) in order to demodulate an HT-mixed format PPDU. Therefore, it is not appropriate to add in Figure 19-27 that the receiver should continue with the next steps of the demodulation only if the Parity check has passed. Instead, we decided to delete the text "RX and test Parity".

As for the comments on Figure 17-20 and Figure 27-63, the corresponding changes are made in the text changes below.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1590 in 11-22/520r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-03-000m-lb258-phy-cides-part-1.docx>

* + - 1. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1366 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar CID 1367, CID 2095.
			3. Discuss the removal of “format”
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1367 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar CID 1367, CID 2095.
			3. Discuss the removal of “format”
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised:

Note to commenter:

Agree that it should be “HT-mixed format PPDU”. There are one more location which needs similar change, hence the resolution is a “REVISED”.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Change “HT-greenfield PPDU” to “HT- greenfield format PPDU” at REVme D1.1

P3701L59

P3702L10

P3702L18

P3702L23

P5056L49

Change “HT- greenfield PPDUs” to “HT- greenfield format PPDUs” at REVme D1.1

P5053L9

P5053L11

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1935 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1935 (PHY): Rejected. 21.3.18 (VHT receiver specification) consists of six subclauses (21.3.18.1 – 21.3.18.6). All the tests are within those child clauses, and there are no tests at the 21.3.18 level itself. Hence there is no confusion that the statement “For tests in this subclause” refers to the tests in the child clauses of this subclause.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2247 and 2371 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

Note to commenter:

Figure has been updated to make the RU coloring clearer.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CIDs 2247, 2371 in 11-22/520r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-03-000m-lb258-phy-cides-part-1.docx>

(Same resolution for CIDs 2247 and 2371.)

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1063 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: REJECTED

21.3.20 (PHY receive procedure) does not have a normative requirement that a receiver shall classify a PPDU which is not long enough to be a potentially HT/VHT PPDU to be classified as a non-HT PPDU. Please note that 21.3.20 is a ‘typical’ PHY receive procedure, and does not prohibit an implementation from doing what the commenter has suggested, but such behavior is not mandatory either.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1057 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolutions: REVISED

Note to commenter:

The proposed text updates add L\_DATARATE to TX/RXVECTOR.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1057 in 11-22/520r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0520-03-000m-lb258-phy-cides-part-1.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **GEN Review CIDs** – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. GEN AdHoc comment file: 11-22/67r7
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-07-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
		3. CID 1308 GEN
			1. Need to add the full reference to the IETF RFC, although this is not the original reference.
			2. Assigned to Mark Hamilton (Ruckus) for further discussion
		4. CID 2237 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-04-28 20:54:11Z) at p268.39 Change "This causes the AP to notify the DS of the non-AP STA’s location within the network." to

"The AP notifies the DS at the completion of the association so that a destination mapping for that non-AP STA's address is established."

And change the last sentence of this paragraph

"The new AP updates the DS with the non-AP STA’s new location at the completion of the reassociation." to

"The new AP notifies the DS at the completion of the reassociation so that the destination mapping for that non-AP STA's address is updated."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1305 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-28 20:56:35Z)
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1418 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-28 21:00:23Z) Note to Editor on P320.52 Delete ", and if associated, disassociation"
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1737 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 320.51, add to the end of the sentence: "or there is no MIC to check, i.e. the frame is not protected."

Note to editor: The completed sentence with CID 1418 and 1737 applied:

"Deauthentication cannot be refused by the receiving STA except when management frame protection is negotiated and the message integrity check fails or there is no MIC to check, i.e., the frame is not protected."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1485 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-28 21:11:36Z) An ANQP Server and an 802.21 Information Server are not the same things.
			3. Rejection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1339 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Cryptographic encapsulation or decapsulation could be used instead of encrypt decrypt.
			3. Submission required. Assigned to Mark Hamilton (Ruckus)
		3. CID 1747 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-04-28 21:26:14Z) The sentence is technically correct and necessary.
			3. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1806 GEN
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-04-28 21:27:57Z)
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Discuss Next Teleconference May 6th**
		1. The group decided that this meeting should be cancelled due to a conflict with the Wireless Opening Plenary.
	2. **THANKS** to Joseph Levy and Interdigital
		1. The Conference room and A/V was great to facilitate the Mixed-Mode meeting.
		2. Thanks for being such great Hosts.
	3. **Adjourn at 17:33 ET**
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Attendance for the 802.11me – REVme AdHoc held at the Interdigital Offices in New York City.

Tuesday:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 3 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 5 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Kumari, Warren | Google |
| 6 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 7 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Lou, Hanqing | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 8 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 10 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Naik, Gaurang | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 12 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 13 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 14 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 15 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 16 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/26 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |

Wednesday:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 3 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 4 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Kumari, Warren | Google |
| 5 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 6 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 7 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 9 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 10 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 11 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/27 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |

Thursday

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 3 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 4 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 5 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 7 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 8 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 9 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 10 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 11 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |
| 12 | TGme - AdHoc | 4/28 | Wentink, Menzo | Qualcomm Incorporated |