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Abstract

Minutes for 802.11me (REVme – TGme) during the 2022 July IEEE 802 Mixed-mode Plenary.

There were 5 meetings (slot times) from July 11-14, 2022.

R0: Initial set of minutes.

R1: Fixed minor typos (@5.6.5 1371 -> 1373; @5.6.8 2372 -> 2373)

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Monday, July 11, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:03pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. Introductions of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. **See slides 3, 10-19 in11-22/854r2:**
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-02-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
	4. **Review agenda – 11-22/854r2:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-02-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
		2. See Slide 5 for plan for week.
		3. It was noted that there is an error in the minutes, so we will defer the motion for Minutes until Thursday and review the correction then.
		4. No objection to change to agenda.
	5. **Editor Report**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-09-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
		2. **Draft: P802.11REVme D 1.3 (members’ area)**
		3. **Comment Status**



* 1. **Withdrawn CIDS**:
		1. CIDs 1008 (MAC), 1047 (MAC), 2204 (GEN), 2205 (GEN), 2206 (GEN), 2207 (MAC) 2208 (MAC), 2209 (PHY) withdrawn.
		2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; Commenter has withdrawn the comment.
		3. Mark Ready for Motion.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/722r2** – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0722-02-000m-tdls-related-comment-resolutions-on-revme-draft-1-0.docx>
		2. CID 1415 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected This comment does not contain sufficient detail to identify an issue in the standard.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1692 (SEC)
			1. Comment was done last Feb, and was an Accepted (Motion #45)
		4. CID 1739 (GEN)
			1. Comment was done last June and was Revised (Motion #66)
		5. CID 1748 (MAC)
			1. CIDs 1748, 1749 and 1750 are effectively duplicates...
				1. different proposed changes for each one.
			2. Review CID 1748.
			3. Discussion on the use of the 4-way handshake.
			4. All 3 CIDs have proposed resolutions 2 revised, 1 rejected.
			5. Discussion and updates were made to get the resolution correct.
			6. Proposed Resolutions: CID 1749 and 1750 (MAC) as Revised
				1. CID 1749 (MAC): updated... REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-11 20:31:23Z): After the cited sentence add "The Dialog Token field of the unsolicited TDLS Discovery Response frame may me set to any value." which resolves the comment in the direction suggested by the commenter.
				2. CID 1750 (MAC): updated... REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-11 20:32:44Z): After the cited sentence add "The Link Identifier field shall be populated as specified for the TDLS Discovery Request frame." which resolves the comment in the direction suggested by the commenter.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 1748 (MAC): Revised; After the cited text, add “NOTE--The first STA might then proceed with TDLS direct-link establishment on reception of the TDLS Discovery Response frame from the second STA.”
			8. No Objection – Mark all 3 CIDs as Ready for Motion.
		6. CID 1712 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context
			3. Review proposed resolution.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1712 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-11 20:45:31Z): The intent of this limitation is to avoid that multiple TDLS discovery requests will arrive at a given STA after a DTIM, when the STA is in power save mode.

However, it is unclear how detrimental this might be, while sending multiple TDLS discovery requests may improve TDLS discovery.

Therefore, delete the cited sentence and deprecate the related MIB variable from the MIB (dot11TDLSDiscoveryRequestWindow) per the usual procedure.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1751 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Review the context on page 2866 L47 as possible target.
			4. Proposed resolution: CID 1751 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-11 20:50:03Z): Delete the cited sentence.

At 2866.47 (in 11.20.3), insert

"A TDLS Discovery Response frame that is a response to a TDLS Discovery Request frame or to an unsolicited TDLS Discovery Response frame is transmitted (i.e., not via the AP) to the TDLS peer STA that sent the corresponding TDLS Discovery Request frame or unsolicited TDLS Discovery Response frame.

* + - 1. “No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2118 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. The proposed change could maybe work in 11.20, but outside 11.20, there are other “awake window” that the rule would not be applied.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2118 (PHY): Rejected. The proposed change would be an editorial improvement, but the proposed editing instruction is not sufficient. The TDLS awake window also occurs outside 11.20, for example in 9.4.2.62 (Wakeup Schedule element).

The type of awake window is clear from the context in which it is used. The comment does not identify a technical error.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion
		1. CID 1434 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion of the consequence of changing the text to a NOTE.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1434 (SEC): Revised.
			5. At 3230.11 change

"A STA may refuse to set up a TDLS link when the protection on the STA link to the AP is secured with a weak algorithm or when the link between the STA and the AP is not using any security."

to (should be a NOTE because a STA may refuse for lots of other reasons)

"NOTE--A STA might refuse to set up a TDLS direct link when the STA link to the AP is secured with WEP-40, WEP-104 or TKIP, or is unsecured."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1845 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1845 (SEC): Rejected –

There is no need to rekey TPK since it uses a strong cipher and tearing down the direct link and setting up a new one will get a new TPK if the theoretical case of running out of PN space would be hit.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1943 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1943 (SEC): 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
		2. CID 2012 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Concern of the overload of TPK.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2012 (SEC): Revised.

"TPK" in 12.6.1.2 is clearly referring to the "TPK" whose derivation is defined in 12.7.8.2 (TPK handshake). The comment is correct in "TPK" being defined as "TDLS PeerKey" elsewhere and these two instances of "TPK" being somewhat different. But the current use of "TPK" in 12.6.1.2 is consistent with 12.7.8.2 which defines how this key is derived (and how TPK-KCK and TPK-TK are extracted from it). As such, it would not be appropriate to rename this to "TDLS peer key" in 12.6.1.2.

Changing this to "TPK, which is a transient key consisting of the TPK-KCK and TPK-TK" could be fine, however, it seems better to

not change 12.6.1.2 for this and instead change 12.7.8.2, e.g., by replacing "Each TPK has two component keys" to "A TPK is a transient key. Each TPK has two component keys".

Therefore, in 12.7.8.2 at 3231.38, change

“Each TPK has two component keys...”

to

“A TPK is a transient key. Each TPK has two component keys...”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			2. \*\**Updated after the meeting adjourned:*
			REVISED (SEC: 2022-07-12 12:38:45Z) - Changing this to "TPK, which is a transient key consisting of the TPK-KCK and TPK-TK" could be fine, however, it seems better to not change 12.6.1.2 for this and instead change 12.7.8.2, e.g., by replacing "Each TPK has two component keys" to "A TPK is a transient key. Each TPK has two component keys".

Therefore, in 12.7.8.2 at 3231.38, change

“Each TPK has two component keys...”

to

“A TPK is a transient key. Each TPK has two component keys…”

* + 1. CID 2013 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 2013 (SEC): 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

In theory, the suggested approach could be the cleanest and most appropriate. However, it requires a redline document showing the exact changes (note that some instances of TPK might not be trivial to determine as being really "TPK" vs. this new "TPTK").

In addition, "TPTK" is a bad choice since it is used as a variable name in the current standard for something completely different.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/876r2** – Edward AU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0876-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb258-comments.docx>
		2. CIDs 1441, 1442 (ED2)
			1. Review comments
			2. Proposed Resolutions:
				1. CID 1441 (ED2): Revised; Change “authenticator” to “Authenticator” at 191.27, 250.15/60, 1339.30 (2x), 1580.14, 3152.46/49/52, 3180.38, 3186.43, 5387.14/16/17.

Change “supplicant” to “Supplicant” at 261.51/55, 3186.43, 3295.44, and 6028.37/41/52.

* + - * 1. CID 1442 (ED2): Revised; Change “authenticator” to “Authenticator” at 191.27, 250.15/60, 1339.30 (2x), 1580.14, 3152.46/49/52, 3180.38, 3186.43, 5387.14/16/17.

Change “supplicant” to “Supplicant” at 261.51/55, 3186.43, 3295.44, and 6028.37/41/52.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1774 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1774 (ED2): Accepted.

Note to the Editors: The locations of D1.0 are 5945.14, 5946.5/59, 5947.29, and 5959.49.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1831 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Nearly the same as proposed change, but needed to update minor editorial change.
			3. Need to correct a change, and a new revision (R3) would need to be posted.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1831 (ED2): Revised. Change “When the negotiated AKM is 00-0F-AC:14, 00-0F-AC:15, 00-0F-AC:16, or 00-0F-AC:17, this Key MIC bit is set to 0 regardless of the M parameter value.” to “When using an AEAD cipher, this Key MIC bit is set to 0 regardless of the M parameter value” at 3214.41/58 in D1.0.

Note to the commenter: The main reason it is revised because the commenter asked to replace the identified text with “using an AEAD cipher” without “When”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1909 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Locations were provided
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1909 (ED2): Accepted.

Note to the Editors: The locations of D1.0 are 269.31 (2x), 339.22, 340.15 (2x), 341.31, 343.12 (2x), 355.19 (2x), 356.15 (2x), 357.30, 359.19 (2x), 3087.1, 3176.43, and 6040.56.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1912 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2137 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Locations were provided.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2137 (ED2): Accepted.

Note to the Editors: The locations of D1.0 are 2353.25, 3537.49, 3603.7/9, 3988.1, 4096.51, and 4097.39.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2164 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Locations were provided.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2164 (ED2): Revised.

At 399.41 and 469.19 in D1.0, replace “the Interworking capabilities of STA” with “the interworking capabilities of the STA”.

At 5079.12, replace “Information” with “information”.

At 5676.58, replace “Interworking capabilities” with “interworking capabilities”.

At 5676.59, replace “Interworking Capability” with “Interworking capability”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1934 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/0680r3** - Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0680-03-000m-cid-1469.docx>
		2. CIDs 1469 and 1658 (MAC):
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion of “ought not” to avoid a “should not”
			4. This may also resolve CID 1659 (PHY)
			5. Proposed Resolution for 1469, 1658 (MAC), and 1659 (PHY):
				1. CIDs 1469 and 1658 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-11 21:28:00Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0680r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0680-03-000m-cid-1469.docx>).
				2. CID 1659 (PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0680r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0680-03-000m-cid-1469.docx>).
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-22/644r3** - Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0644-03-000m-cid-1490.docx>
		2. CID 1490 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Review proposed resolution.
			4. Discussion on “would not be” terms.
			5. Different options to be consider:
				1. If the value calculated fo the xx field is not an integer…
				2. If a calculated time is not an integer, the value inserted in the field is round up etc.
				3. Even if the calculated value is the integer 20 (US), the value has beo be rounded up (to 1 in this case).
				4. If a calculated Duration/ID value is not an integer, the Duration/ID value is the calculated value rounded up to the next higher integer.
			6. Proposed change for 9.2.5.1 2nd sentence: Change to “If the value calculated for the Duration/ID field is not an integer, the value inserted in the Duration/ID field is rounded up to the next higher integer.
			7. Make similar changes for the 3rd Sentence and the change for 10.3.2.4.
				1. If the value calculated for the Duration/ID field is not an integer the value inserted in the Duration/ID field is round up to the next higher integer.
			8. Proposed Resolution: CID 1490 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-11 21:33:58Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0644r4 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0644-04-000m-cid-1490.docx>).
			9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Recess at 5:55pm**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Tuesday, July 12, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:03pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. Introductions of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. **See slides 4-19 in 11-22/854r4:**
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-04-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
	4. **Review agenda – 11-22/854r4:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-04-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
		2. **Comment Resolution:**
2. CID 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1122, 1123, 2185. - Withdrawn
3. CID 2347 – doc 11-22/775 – Wang (InterDigital)
4. CID 2243, 2244, 2390, 2391 – doc 11-22-652 Lin (InterDigital)
5. CID 2377, 2379, 2374 – doc 11/22-480 – Yujin Noh (Senscom)
6. ED1 comments – doc 11-22/319r5 – Qi (Intel)
7. SEC CIDs – Montemurro (Huawei)
8. Recess
	* 1. No objection to proposed agenda.
	1. **Withdrawn comments:**
		1. **CID 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1122, 1123 (MAC), 2185(GEN). - Withdrawn**
		2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: Commentor Withdrew comment.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/775** - CID 2347 - Xiaofei WANG (InterDigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0775-01-000m-cr-for-cid-2347.docx>
		2. CID 2347 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on proposed changes.
			3. Updates to be posted to 11-22/0775r2:
				1. 11-22/0775r2: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0775-02-000m-cr-for-cid-2347.docx>
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 2347 (SEC): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0775r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0775-02-000m-cr-for-cid-2347.docx>)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Review doc 11-22-652** - CID 2243, 2244, 2390, 2391 – Zinan LIN (InterDigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-05-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>
		2. CIDs 2243 2244 2390 2391 (all MAC):
			1. Review submission.
			2. Request to remove “NOTE:” will remove but need to make a new revision.
			3. Review page 4 – Change to “signal power in units of dBm/20 Mhz…”
			4. Discussion of other editorial changes.
			5. Will Post 11-22/652r6
				1. 11-22/652r6: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-06-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>
			6. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 2243 2244 2390 2391 (all MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-12 20:27:59Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0652r6 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0652-06-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb258-cid-2243-2244-2390-2391.docx>).
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Review 11-22/480** - CID 2377, 2379, 2374 – Yujin NOH (Senscomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0480-01-000m-cid2377-cid2379-cid2374-in-11ax-resolution.docx>
		2. CID 2374 (MAC)
			1. Review submission.
			2. Discussion on possible adjustments to submission.
			3. Discussion on possible changes to the figure in the future.
			4. Update version 11-22/048R2:
				1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0480-02-000m-cid2377-cid2379-cid2374-in-11ax-resolution.docx
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 2374 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-12 20:36:30Z): Incorporate the changes indicated in 11-22/0480r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0480-02-000m-cid2377-cid2379-cid2374-in-11ax-resolution.docx>), for CID 2374.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	5. **Review doc 11-22/319r5** - ED1 comments – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0319-06-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx>
		2. CID 1361 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Explain on use of hot cross reference, but why not link to clause itself.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1361 (ED1): Revised. Change "10.23.2.4" to "10.23.2.2 (see item (d))". Note to editor: if xref to (d) can be added, do so.;
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1192 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on what WLAN should be expanded, Editor to resolve.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1192 (ED1): Accepted. Note to Editor, confirm the first use of WLAN shows the expansion to "Wireless LAN"
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1295 (ED1)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Discussion on proposed change.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1295 (ED1): Revised. Change “non-access-point (non-AP)” to ““non–access point (non-AP)” through the draft, 23 instances in 3.2 in D1.0.

Note that “–” is an en-dash, not regular dash (“-”).

* + - 1. Ready for motion, with an abstention from Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. CID 1630 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the capitalization of the definition of the name.
			3. Other examples of other locations are outside the scope of this comment.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1630 (ED1): Rejected. The location for the cited term is 235.25. The cited term is in the definition in 3.2. A general convention is that words that are being defined are in all lower case (except the acronyms, which are also spelled out and their constituent words are in lower case).
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2318 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on “an” vs “a”.
			3. Note that the Publication Editor may undo the changes.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1422 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on why using the “packet number” or some other option.
			3. Lots of discussion on possible changes.
			4. Possible “Change “the BIPN Contains” to “the BIPN Field contains”.”
			5. Another option: Change “The BIPN corresponds to the BIPN value” to The BIPN Field Contains the BIPN”.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 3155.13/20/26, delete “value”.

At 3212.36, change “The BIPN corresponds to the BIPN value” to “The BIPN field contains the BIPN”.

At 3212.52, change “The WIPN corresponds to the WIPN value” to “The WIPN field contains the WIPN”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CIDs 1319, 1320, 2048 and 2210 (all ED1)
			1. Review comments.
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. We have discussed this several times. In the last revision process (REVmd). The publication editor and WG Editor indicate “colocate”.
			4. The Oxford Dictionaries website spells it “colocate” in American English and “co-locate” in British English.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1319, 1320, 2048 and 2210 (all ED1): Revised. Change “collocated” and “co-located” to “colocated” throughout the draft.
			6. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **SEC Review CIDs** – Montemurro (Huawei)
		1. SEC AdHoc Comment file: 11-22/0105r13: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0105-13-000m-revme-lb258-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
		2. CID 1607 and 1608 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution; Accepted; Note to Editor: the locations are 6029.17 and 6029.55.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1677 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Device is used 1019 in the standard and Device Capabilities is used 394 times.
			3. Straw Poll #1:
				1. How to resolve CID 1677?

Accept/Reject/Abstain

 Results: 2/6/1 –

Plan to Craft a rejection Reason.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution:

REJECTED (SEC: 2022-07-12 21:36:02Z)

There was no consensus on accepting the proposed changes for the comment.

How do you propose to resolve CID 1677?

 A. Accept 2/14 (14%)

 B. Reject 6/14 (43%)

 C. Abstain 1/14 ( 7%)

No Answer 5/14 (36%)

One of the comments indicated that device was likely already defined in the IEEE dictionary.

* + - 1. Discussion on if “no consensus” can be used.
			2. Mark Ready for Motion
			3. *\*\*\* Resolution updated after Adjourn:*
				1. *Note from the Chair: I updated the resolution to CID 1677 (SEC). When I was reviewing the comments yesterday, the explanation for the rejection did not really make grammatical sense.*
				2. Updated Proposed Resolution: CID 1677: REJECTED (SEC: 2022-07-12 21:36:02Z)

There was no consensus on accepting the proposed changes for the comment. It was noted that there is likely a definition for a device in the IEEE dictionary. The term device is used 1019 times in the standard and the term "device capabilites" is used 394 times in the MIB, so any definition would have to be checked against all uses of the term in the standard.

Adding the definition in the proposed resolution was considered and the following straw poll was conducted on accepting the definition in the proposed resolution:

How do you propose to resolve CID 1677?

 A. Accept 2/14 ( 14%)

 B. Reject 6/14 ( 43%)

C. Abstain 1/14 ( 7%)

No Answer 5/14 ( 36%)

* + 1. CID 1815 (SEC)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Read out from the AdHoc Notes:

SEC: 2022-01-27 19:37:10Z - status set to: Review

First cited text is in 10.2.8 (2083.50). The full quote is:

" In the case of a non-GLK STA receiver, when the Address 1 field or DA field contains a group address, address filtering is performed by comparing the value in the Address 1 field or DA field to all values in the

dot11GroupAddressesTable, and the STA also validates the BSSID to verify either that the group addressed

frame originated from a STA in the BSS of which the receiving STA is a member, or that it contains the

wildcard BSSID value, indicating a Data frame sent outside the context of a BSS (dot11OCBActivated is true

in the transmitting STA).

Could not find the second quoted text.

- From IEEE 802-2014 (clause 8.2.2): "The all-stations broadcast MAC address is a special group MAC address of all 1’s." So frames with a DA of the broadcast MAC address are destined for all STAs.

- Multicast group addressed frames are special in a sense that they are typically targeted to STAs that elect to receive the multicast stream.

5569.48 describes the dot11GroupAddressesTable as "A conceptual table containing a set of MAC addresses identifying the multicast-group addresses for which this STA receives frames." So this is where a STA is configured to filter multicast group addresses of interest.

* + - 1. Discussion on the rational.
			2. See page 2132 for second location.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-07-12 21:45:10Z) - At 2083.50, change

"comparing the value in the Address 1 field or DA field to all values in the dot11GroupAddressesTable"

to

"comparing the value in the Address 1 field or DA field to all values in the dot11GroupAddressesTable and the broadcast address value"

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2143 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 2143 (SEC): Rejected. dot11SPPAMSDUCapable and dot11SPPAMSDURequired are already present (see page 5279.22 to 5279.49).
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1280 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Related to CID 1448 (SEC)
			3. Review Comments
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1280 (SEC) Accepted.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1448 (SEC): Revised. Delete "Since Key ID 0 is reserved for individually addressed frame transmission, there are at most three available Key IDs (only two if extended Key IDs for individually addressed frames are in use), and the different MGTKs would contend for the single remaining Key ID upon rollover." also "Note to Editor, this is the same resolution as for CID 1280"
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1920 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on affects of deleting cited text.
			3. We may have discussed this topic before.
			4. CID 1919 was resolved with “REJECTED (SEC: 2022-06-20 15:43:22Z) - The receipt of these frames would be unexpected. A clear "shall" requirement is desirable for non-compliant peer behavior for security features.”
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1919 (SEC): REJECTED (SEC: 2022-07-12 22:01:43Z) - The receipt of these frames would be unexpected. A clear "shall" requirement is desirable for non-compliant peer behavior for security features.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess at 6:00pm**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Wednesday, July 13, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:03pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. Introductions of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See slides 4-19 in 11-22/854r5:
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-05-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
	4. **Review agenda 11-22/854r6:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-06-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Comment Resolution
2. CIDs 1073, 2327, 2328, 2329 – doc 11-22/0838 – Handte (Sony)
3. CID 2022 – doc 11-22/702 – Naik (Qualcomm)
4. CID 1011 – doc 11-22/115 – Patil (Qualcomm)
5. CIDs – doc 11-22/353 – Rison (Samsung)
6. MAC CIDs – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
	* 1. No Objection to agenda for today.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/0838** -- CIDs 1073, 2327, 2328, 2329 - Thomas HANDTE (Sony)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0838-00-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-1073-2327-2328-2329.docx>
		2. CID 2327 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Proposal: CID 2327 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:15:45Z): In the paragraph at P1722.14, insert as a new second sentence, "The highest supported receive EDMG SC mode MCS is also valid for reception of NUC if supported ".
			4. Alternative proposal: “and the index of the highest supported receive EDMG SC mode MCS with NUC if supported”
			5. Discussion on how to modify the two proposals.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:15:45Z): In the paragraph at P1722.14, insert at the end of the first sentence, ", including with NUC if supported."
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1073 (MAC) 2328 (MAC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Proposed Resolution for both CID 1073 and 2328 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:31:00Z): Insert a new second sentence in the paragraph starting at 2522.38, "In dynamic grouping, the selection of subcarriers that are fed back targets minimization of the re-construction error at the STA receiving the feedback."
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 2329 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on “is used by” vs “for use by”.
			3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:36:34Z): At the cited location, change "can be used" to "is used".
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review Document: 11-22/702r1** – CID 1106 and 1110 - Gaurav NAIK (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0702-01-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cid-1106-and-1110.docx>
		2. CID 1106 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1106 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:41:56Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-22/0702r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0702-01-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cid-1106-and-1110.docx), marked with "[CID 1106]".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1110 (MAC)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1110 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:43:56Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-22/0702r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0702-01-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cid-1106-and-1110.docx), marked with "[CID 1110]".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	3. **Review Document: 11-22/115** – CID 1011 – Youhan KIM (Qualcomm))
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0115-08-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-fd-frame.docx>
		2. CID 1011 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the proposed change.
			3. Discussion on the deletion of a line.
			4. Correction on how the center frequency which the BSS operations, if BSS bandwidth is 80 MHZ.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1011 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-13 20:48:08Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0115r9 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0115-09-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-fd-frame.docx>) for CID 1011.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Review doc 11-22/353**- CIDs – Rison (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CID 1398 (PHY), 1397 (SEC), and 1794 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Straw Poll #2: 11r assumptions
				1. Do you want to add “Note – The means by which this is achieved is outside the scope of the standard.” To all the 11r assumptions?
				2. Yes/No/Abstain
				3. Results: 0, 10, 8 –
				4. No one wants to add the notes.
			4. Discussion on if the changes proposed would have support for change.
			5. Discussion on what happens to implementations already deployed.
			6. Discussion on where the Requirements are stated and indicated.
			7. Discussion on other “Shall” statements on the DS.
			8. Straw Poll #3: on changes to 353.25 –
				1. Do you want to change the wording from "In order for the MAC to operate properly, this standard assumes that the DS meets the MSDU (“object”) reordering requirements of IEEE Std 802.1AC-2012 [B17]." to "To ensure the MAC operates properly, the DS shall meet the MSDU (“object”) reordering requirements of IEEE Std 802.1AC-2012 [B17]."?
				2. A. Yes 2/25
				3. B. No 13/25
				4. C. Abstain 3/25
				5. Results: 2/13/3
				6. No agreement to make the change.
			9. Discussion on 2927.51
				1. No Support for a change.
			10. Discussion on 2960.50
				1. No support for a change.
			11. Discussion on 3168.25:
				1. No objection to this change.
			12. Discussion on 3176.40
				1. No objection to this change.
			13. Discussion on 3177.5
				1. No Objection to this change.
			14. Discussion on 3177.16
				1. No Objection to this change.
			15. Discussion 3182.3
				1. Discussion on how 802.1X works, and the change may affect how the interpretation of 802.1X is used.
				2. See 12.2.5, lists out how this is explained.
			16. Skip over 3182.3 to 3271.23
			17. Return to 3177.16
				1. Clarify that there is no change to the last sentence.
			18. Discussion of 335.63
				1. No Objection to this change.
			19. Discussion of 336.4
				1. No objection to this change.
			20. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1398 (PHY), 1397 (SEC), and 1794 (SEC): Revised; Make the changes highlighted in green shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1398, 1397 and 1794 in 11-22/0353r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which convert assumption into either requirements or informational material.
			21. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1823 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on where some “equal to” and “set to” needs to be used.
			3. Discussion on adding references to 12-33.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1823 (PHY): Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1823 in 11-22/0353r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which clarify that the Key MIC field is not present when using an AEAD cipher, and is otherwise present but 0 if the Key MIC subfield of the Key Information field is 0.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1406 (PHY), 1814 (SEC), 2136 (ED2), 2149 (ED2), 2151 (ED2):
			1. Review comments.
			2. Review proposed changes for the CIDs
			3. One change at 1585.30 updated.
			4. One change 1585.46 was removed.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1406 (PHY), 1814 (SEC), 2136 (ED2), 2149 (ED2), 2151 (ED2): Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1406 in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx, which make the suggested changes.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1521 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Check if there are still two definitions.
			4. Ran out of time.
	5. **Recess at 6:00 pm**
7. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Thursday, July 14, 2022, at 10:30-12:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 10:30am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. Introductions of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. **See slides 4-19 in 11-22/0854r7:**
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-07-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
	4. **Review agenda: 11-22/0854r7:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-07-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Comment Resolution
8. PHY and low-level CIDs – doc 11-22/576 – Hart (Cisco)
9. CID 2355, 2356 – doc 11-22/669 – Fang (Mediatek)
10. CIDs 2362, 2363 – doc 11-22/691 – Fang (Mediatek)
11. Misc MAC CIDs – doc 11-22/878 – Montemurro (Huawei)
12. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
	* 1. No objection – Agenda approved.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/576** - PHY and low-level CIDs –– Brian HART (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-04-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>
		2. CID 1052 (PHY)
			1. Will take up later.
		3. CID 1056 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes in submission.
			3. Discussion on why a Vendor Specific Trigger frame is needed.
			4. Concern with the proposal.
			5. Suggestion to move to end for Vender Specific item.
			6. Suggested text to add “The Vendor Specific Content field is a variable length field whose content is defined by the entity identifiedin the Organization Identifier field."
			7. Concern expressed for adding features that were not tested/prototyped.
			8. More work needed.
		4. CID 1058 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Discussion on identifying the specific PSDU
			4. Need more time to digest/review the proposal.
			5. Discussion on the air propagation time.
			6. Discussion on how to measure the delay and when it triggers the measurement.
			7. More time is needed - in particular, more time for off-line review.
		5. CID 1059 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Question on is this similar to CID 2109 (MAC).
			4. Proposed change: "In the row defining aRxPHYStartDelay in the middle cell change "Integer" to "Dictionary of integers indexed by PPDU format; the STA chooses the largest value among all those corresponding to the PPDU formats that are valid at the point the PHY start delay is required""
			5. Alternative method to resolve this issue discussed.
			6. Discussion on how to have one start delay number (or at least reduce the number we are creating).
			7. Discussion on how to pick the RxPHYStart.
			8. Need more reflector discussion – use 802.11 reflector for broader audience.
		6. CID 1062 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on the station types not being a dynamic list.
			4. Discussion on complexities of operation.
			5. Alternate proposal reviewed: XXXXFor a STA that includes cupport for a Clause 17 PHY (e.g. an HT STA),…/XXXX
			6. Use the same notation of other PHYs introduction. But “based on” vs “uses” are two different meanings.
			7. More work is needed.
		7. CID 1065 (PHY) and 2275 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on if renaming PE was appropriate or not.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1065 and 2275 (both PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0576r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-05-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>), for CIDs 1065 and 2275.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-22/878r3** – Misc MAC CIDs – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0878-03-000m-tgme-lb258-misc-mac-comment-resolutions.docx>
		2. CID 1388 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion when the PN vs Keys are reset.
			3. Review page 2750L54 – Page number is in the list of reset items.
			4. Review the items that get reset.
			5. The “4) Packet Number” is not correct in this list.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At 2750L54 delete “4) Packet Number” and renumber list.
			7. Discussion on if we should add something about packet number somewhere else.
				1. Look at 2754L39 – States AP does same as 11.3.5.4.
			8. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1464 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1464 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-07-14 15:49:37Z).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 1465 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context
			3. Proposed Resolution CID 1465 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-07-14 15:50:29Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 1515 (MAC)
			1. CID 1515 (MAC): Already done, with a similar change.
		6. CID 1528 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on protection being added for broadcast vs unicast cases.
			4. Discussion on Robust protection in general, and maybe a note could be made, but not something that is going to be supported.
			5. The validation of the probe response is not a simple compare with the beacon.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 1528 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-07-14 15:53:02Z): Beacon protection only provides protection to associated STAs. It does not apply to unassociated STAs. Unassociated STAs can use broadcast Probe Response frames and FILS discovery frames to discover APs however, the information received in such frames cannot be trusted. The proposed change would limit the STAs ability to discover APs.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		7. CID 1689 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1689 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-14 15:58:27Z): The resolution to CID 1813 addresses the issue described in this comment. Make the changes marked as "The proposed changes for CID 1813" in 11-22/0740r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0740-03-000m-proposed-resolutions-to-some-lb258-comments.docx>).

Note to Editor: No addition changes required.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1756 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1756 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-07-14 16:02:26Z)
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1792 and 1796 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments.
			2. See also CID 1815 and 1816 (SEC) may be related.
				1. Validated that this Is not in collision.
				2. CID 1815 was done Tuesday July 12 (2.10.4)
			3. Discussion on the proposed Change being considered here.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1792 and 1796 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-14 16:07:04Z): Change

", and the STA also validates the BSSID to verify either that the group addressed frame originated from a STA in the BSS of which the receiving STA is a member, or that it contains the wildcard BSSID value, indicating a Data frame sent outside the context of a BSS (dot11OCBActivated is true in the transmitting STA)."

To

". The STA also validates the BSSID to verify that it either corresponds to the BSS of which the receiving STA is a member, or if dot11OCBActivated is true, that it contains the wildcard BSSID value, indicating a Data frame sent outside the context of a BSS."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1816 (SEC)
			1. (Not in the document, but related to 1815 which we did yesterday, so clean it up, too. (see Tuesday July 12 (2.10.4))
			2. CID 1816 is the same comment as CID 1815, so same resolution:
			3. UPDATED Proposed Resolution: CID 1815 and CID 1816 (SEC): REVISED (SEC: 2022-07-12 21:45:10Z) - At 2083.50, change

"comparing the value in the Address 1 field or DA field to all values in the dot11GroupAddressesTable"

to

"comparing the value in the Address 1 field or DA field to all values in the dot11GroupAddressesTable and the broadcast address value"

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1835 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1835 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-14 16:16:03Z): Cross references to the LLC header definition cites ISO/IEC 8802-2:1998. At 1538.49, change “IEEE Std 802.2-1998” to “ISO/IEC 8802-2:1998” in two locations in the note.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1551 and 1552 (MAC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Not identical, but similar enough to discuss together.
			3. Review submission discussion
			4. Discussion on what the normative requirements may be required.
			5. Discussion if not restricted, it is permissible.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1551 and 1552 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-07-14 16:18:24Z): The cited text and the entire clause describe how cipher suites are encoded and how they are included in the appropriate RSNE fields. There can be multiple CCMP and GCMP suites advertised with different key lengths, so no additional clarification is needed at the cited location on cipher suites and how they relate to advertised BIP-CMAC cipher suites. The choice of unicast cipher suites, group cipher suite, and group management cipher suite are dependent on the security requirements of the deployment and interoperability of the STAs that connect to the network. Cipher suites can be advertised with different key lengths.
			7. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess 12:30pm ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Thursday, July 14, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:02pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions** of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See slides 4-19 in 11-22/854r8:
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-08-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
	4. **Review agenda: 11-22/854r8:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0854-08-000m-revme-agenda-july-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Comment Resolution
2. CID 2195 – doc 11-22/917 – Lee (Signify)
3. Misc CIDs - doc 11-22/990 – Kim (Qualcomm)
4. CIDs 1120, 1121, 1215 1230 – doc 11-22/981 – Coffey (Realtek)
5. CID 1230 (Editorial) – doc 11-22/994 – Coffey (Realtek)
6. CID 1032 – doc 11-22/522 – Asterjadhi (Qualcomm)
7. Misc CIDs – doc 11-22/936 - Asterjadhi (Qualcomm)
8. Motions - 11-22/0059r – slides 37-38 (at 17:30pm)
9. Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for September
10. AoB
11. Adjourn
	* 1. No objection – Follow agenda
	1. **Review doc 11-22/917** – CID 2195 – Nancy LEE (Signify)
		1. Document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0917-00-000m-resolution-for-lb258-cid-2195.docx>
		2. CID 2195 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on use if “is equal to” or “is set to”.
			3. Discussion on the need to make the change.
			4. Dynamic Fragmentation is allowed in A-MSDU.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 2195 (MAC) REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-14 20:10:16Z): Incorporate changes shown in 11-22/0917r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0917-00-000m-resolution-for-lb258-cid-2195.docx>).
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-22/990r4** – Misc CIDs - Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-04-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>
		2. CID 2011, 2060, 1377 and 1378 (all PHY):
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission Discussion.
			3. The proposed changes and resolutions were then reviewed for each.
			4. Discussion on the proposed resolution for 1377 and 1378.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1377 and CID 1378: Rejected; Whether the information that signal A is stronger than signal B is useful or not, and how it might be used I implementation specific.
			6. Discussion on why variables that are not in dB are valid and useful.
			7. See context in 9.4.2.37.
			8. See context in 25.3.13. channel measured over “data portion”. Needs to be checked.
			9. Proposed resolution: CID 2011, 2060, 1377 and 1378 (PHY), to: CID 2011, 2060, 1377 and 1378 (all PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0990r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx> ), for CIDs 2011, 2060, 1377, 1378.
			10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1372 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 1372 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0990r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>), for CID 1372.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1717 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-07-14 20:47:23Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1373 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1373 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0990r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>), for CID 1373.
		6. CID 1370 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1370 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0990r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx> ), for CID 1370.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 2378 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 2378 (PHY): Rejected. The line for CBW160 in Table 27-4 lists the valid puncturing patterns when transmitting non-HT duplicate PPDUs.

REVme D1.0 P4349L30 is saying that when an HE NDPA carried in a non-HT duplicate PPDU has puncturing in the secondary 80 MHz, then the CH\_BANDWIDTH parameter shall be set to CBW160. This line does not say what puncturing patterns are valid or invalid, and hence is not in conflict with Table 27-4.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2373 and 1053 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review different method of presenting the equation.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 2373 and 1053 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0990r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx> ), for CIDs 2373 and 1053.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1050 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1050 (PHY): Rejected. The commenter is correct that HE-SIG-B has 52 data subcarriers, while OFDM (Clause 17) has 48 data subcarriers.

However, 17.3.5.9 only talks about the pilot subcarrier location, and does not have any relevance to the number of data subcarriers. While it would also be OK to reference 19.3.11.10 (the pilot subcarriers subclause for HT), note that 19.3.11.10 has other ‘baggage’ to deal with multiple spatial streams. Hence, if we were to refer to 19.3.11.10, then we have to add additional text clarifying that HE-SIG-B needs to use only the one spatial stream portion of 19.3.11.10.

Since 17.3.5.9 has the same pilot subcarrier location as 19.3.11.10, it seems simpler to keep the current language.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1051 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 1051 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0990r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>), for CID 1051.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review document 11-22/981r1** – CID 1120/1121/1215/1216 – Sean COFFEY (Realtek)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0981-01-000m-revme-lb258-cr-for-1120-1121-1215-1216-spatial-reuse.docx>
		2. CID 1120 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission comment
			3. 26.10.2.2 new text changed from “and” to “or”.
			4. Discussion on how we may have got to the current state.
			5. Similar CIDs in 1215 and the other CIDs in this submission
			6. Need more work.
			7. Tentative: CID 1120 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-07-14 21:04:40Z): In D1.0/4232.25, in (b), add a comma and new line after “PPDU”. After “if”, add “(for either (a) or (b))”.
			8. Related to CID 1215 (MAC), on the same text.
			9. Also the same as CID 1216 (MAC), which is on the next page.

... and CID 1121 (MAC), is also the same problem as CID 1120, but on the next page.

* + - 1. All four (1120, 1215, 1121 and 1216) to take off-line and update the "may" fix...
	1. **Review document 11-22/994r0** - CID 1230 – Sean COFFEY (Realtek)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0994-00-000m-revme-lb258-cr-for-1230-editorial.docx>
		2. CID 1230 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution:
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **MOTIONS**: 11-22/0056r18:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0056-18-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
		2. **Motion #71 – ED1, ED2, CIDs (2022-07-14)**
			1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the**

“Motion-EDITOR1-1J” tab (11 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-13-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>.

“Motion ED2-258-09” tab (2 CIDs), “Motion ED2-258-10” tab (9 CIDs), “Motion ED2-258-11” tab (2 CIDs), and “Motion ED2-258-12” (2 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0064-12-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments-on-working-group-letter-ballots.xlsx>,

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
			2. 2nd: Stephen MCCANN
			3. Results for Motion #71: Unanimous consent – Motion Passes.
		1. **Motion #72 – GEN, MAC, PHY, SEC CIDs (2022-07-14)**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

“GEN Motion July A" (4 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-16-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>,

“Motion MAC-AT” (6 CIDs) and “Motion MAC-AU” tabs (37 CIDs), with the exception of CID 1466 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-23-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>,

“PHY Motion K” tab (8 CID) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-13-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>,

“Security Motion K” tab (23 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0105-14-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>,

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
			2. 2nd: Dan HARKINS
			3. Discussion:
				1. Discussion on CID 1677 concern for the resolution.
				2. Discussion on MAC CIDs location.
			4. Results for Motion #71: Nearly Unanimous, with one objection – Mark RISON. – Motion Passes.
		1. Motion Deck to be updated: 11-22/56r19:
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0056-19-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
	1. **Motion to approve previous REVme (TGme) minutes since May Interim.**
		+ 1. Approve the minutes in documents

May wireless interim: [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0782-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-may-802-wireless-interim.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0782-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-may-802-wireless-interim.docx)

May 27th teleconference: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0825-01-000m-minutes-for-revme-ad-hoc-may-27-2022.docx>

June teleconferences: [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0846-06-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-june-2022.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0846-05-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-june-2022.docx)

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. 2nd: Steven MCCANN
			3. Results: Unanimous – Motion passes.
	1. **Timeline check,**
* Feb 2021 – PAR Approval
* March 2021– Initial meeting, issue comment collection on IEEE Std 802.11-2020 (if published)
* March 2021 – Draft 0.00 available
* May 2021 – Process CC input, 11ax, 11ay, 11ba integration begins
* Nov 2021 – Initial D1.0 WG Letter ballot
* *Sep 2022 – D2.0 Recirculation LB*
* Mar 2023 – D3.0 Recirculation LB (11az + other amendments <11bc, 11bd, 11bb> )
* Sep 2023 – D4.0 Recirculation (<other amendments – if Jul>)
* Nov 2023 – D5.0 Initial SA Ballot
* Mar 2024 – D6.0 Recirculation SA Ballot
* May 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot
* Jun 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot (clean recirculation)
* Sep 2024 – RevCom/SASB Approval
	+ 1. Only the one item has changed. – D2.0 Recirc LB changed from July to Sept 2022.
		2. Hope we will not miss other targets.
	1. **Teleconference** – Meeting plan until September
		1. July 25, Aug8, 15, 29 – 10am ET, 2hrs.
			1. Motions to be run on August 29
		2. August AdHoc – Aug 23-25, San Diego, CA
		3. For September Interim: 5 mtgs.
			1. Request to avoid TGbi overlaps.
	2. **August AdHoc Mtg**
		1. Meeting to be held in San Diego,
		2. Will have Remote Access.
		3. Review Invite.
		4. Need RSVP by August 1st.
		5. Send Email to Jon ROSDAHL and cc Michael MONTEMURRO
	3. **Adjourn 5:50pm**
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