IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
| Telecon Minutes for REVme – July 25 |
| Date: 2022-07-25 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. | 10871 N 5750 WHighland, UT 84003 | +1 801 492 4023 | jrosdahl @ ieee . org |
| Stephen McCann | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd | Southampton, UK |  | stephen.mccann@ieee.org  |

Abstract

Telecon Minutes for REVme (TGme) for Monday July 25, 2022.

R0: Thanks to Stephen MCCANN for helping with the minutes.

Action Items:

1.9.6.10 ACTION ITEM #1: Stephen MCCANN to contact Menzo about CID 2188 and reopen a discussion on the reflector.

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Monday, July 25, 2022, at 10:00-12:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 10:02 am 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. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| 2 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus Wireless |
| 3 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 4 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 5 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 7 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 8 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 9 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 10 | Thakore, Darshak | Cable Television Laboratories Inc. (CableLabs) |
| 11 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |

* + 1. Not in IMAT:
			1. Knect, Jarkko Apple
	1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	2. **Review agenda**:11-22/1173r1:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1173-01-000m-july-august-teleconference-agenda.docx>
		2. Comment resolution
1. No CID – doc 11-22/911 – Chen (Zeku) (20 min)
2. ED1 CID 1341 (10 min)
3. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm) (see comment list below)
4. MAC CIDs – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope) – (see comment list below)
	* 1. Notes from below:
* CIDs to be prioritized:
	+ ED1: 1341
	+ GEN: 1938, 1891, 1931, 1746
	+ MAC: 1757 (related to 1756 – resolved), 2008, 2067, 1635, 1596, 1576, 1904, 1612, 2323, 1631, 1621, 2063, 1945, 2125, 1669, 1896, 1804, 2138, 1522, 1812, 1711, 2325, 1579, 1913, 1634, 1651, 1620, 1865, 1215, 1216, 2183
	+ SEC: 1922, 1766, 1765, 2177, 1733, 1591, [1789, 1788,] 1578, 1839, 1832, 1786, 1822, 1709, [1237, 1822], [1568, 1575, 1569,] 1825, 1946, 1828, 1238, 1239, 1242, 1241, 1240, 1243, 1908, 1827, [1954, 1962,], 1824, 1721, 1475, 2043, 1710, 2286, 2289, 2292, 2294, 2296, 1863, 1342, 1588, 1344, 1088, 2370, 1605, 1061, 1609, 1606, [1375, 1376]
		1. No objection to agenda:
	1. **Editor Report:**
		1. Reviewing the resolutions and we note that often there are some “change to” text that does not give the full original text. This makes it hard to determine the location. Please help the editors with the locations of where the changes are to be made.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/0911r0**- FEC-padding for STBC case, in 11ax - Xiaogang CHEN (Zeku)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0911-00-000m-clarifications-of-pre-fec-padding-on-stbc.docx>
		2. Abstract: This document proposes the clarifications on Pre-FEC padding process for STBC in 11ax.
		3. No CID related to this submission.
		4. This submission came about from an issue in 11ax post publishing comment.
		5. Topic: FEC-padding for STBC case, in 11ax.
		6. Note that the embedded “(ax)” is not needed on the figure.
		7. A few editorial changes were made.
		8. Discussion on when to motion the document: Aug 29, 2022, is current plan to motion.
		9. Email was sent to stds-802-11 reflector on Wednesday, 20 July 2022.
		10. A new revision will be posted 11-22/911r1.
	3. **ED1 CID 1341 (10 min)** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus-Commscope)
		1. Show from Editor 1 Database.
		2. CID 1341 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the proposed changes – note that about 300 instances have not been checked yet.
			3. No objection to having Mark HAMILTON do the review and bring back at the AdHoc for discussion.
	4. **GEN comments –** Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. See doc 11-22/67r17: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-17-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
		2. CID 2005 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Proposal is to either:” reject” or “revised”, as described in the ad-hoc notes.
			3. C: The issue in the comment is slightly different from the proposed resolutions.
			4. Chair: This comment has been reviewed serval times and I would prefer to mark it as “submission required” and assign it back to the commenter.
			5. C: I would prefer not to accept the comment, as there are a couple of issues with the language within the proposed change.
			6. It has been marked as “GEN no consensus”.
			7. Submission Required. Assign to the commenter.
		3. CID 1399 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. C: There could be an issue with RAC terminology, and I’m concerned about this.
			3. C: If we avoid the text about EtherTypes, then the first part of the resolution is ok.
			4. C: I do not have any concerns about any RAC comments about this.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-07-25 14:37:10Z) at 2865.41 change

"TDLS frames shall use the formatting as specified in 11.20.2 (TDLS payload)"

to

"TDLS payloads (which are transmitted in one or more TDLS frames) shall use the formatting specified in 11.20.2 (TDLS payload)"

At 2865.46 change

 "Note that the TDLS Discovery Response frame is not a TDLS frame but a Public Action frame."

to

"Note that the TDLS Discovery Response frame is not a TDLS payload (in one or more TDLS frames) but a Public Action frame.".

* + - 1. Mark Ready for motion.
		1. CID 1069 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. C: I propose reject for this comment, as no conclusion can be found.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-07-25 14:44:23Z) The CRG could not reach consensus solution. We have debated the use of "antenna connector" many times as each revision project is done. The comment lacks sufficient detail to resolve at this time.
			4. Mark Ready for motion
		2. CID 1864 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Viewed 11-22-0990r5 page #39.
			3. The proposed resolution is accepted.
			4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-07-25 14:48:43Z).
			5. Mark Ready for motion
		3. CID 2188 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Action item has not been completed, due to no response.
			3. C: I think the proposed change in 11-22-0627r2 is ok.
			4. C: I’m not sure about these changes.
			5. C: I think we should have a straw poll please.
			6. Straw poll:
				1. Do you support a resolution for 2188 of "Revised; incorporate the changes for CID 2188 in 11-22/627r2?
				2. Straw poll Result: Y: 2, N: 3, A: 3, No answer: 3
			7. Chair: Please move to the “GEN No Consensus” comment group.
			8. More work required.
			9. Mark as Submission Required.
			10. ACTION ITEM #1: Stephen MCCANN to contact Menzo about CID 2188 and reopen a discussion on the reflector.
		4. CID 1891 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Chair: Please re-assign back to commentor.
			3. Assign to commenter- mark Submission Required - assign to “Gen No Consensus” Comment Group.
			4. More work needed.
		5. CID 1938 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. C: I think the reference should be 1.4 as opposed to 1.5
			3. C: I don’t think adding this to 1.4 helps.
			4. C: There are 22 instances of “sequence counter” within the spec.
			5. C: I think all these instances need to be fixed individually.
			6. Assign to commenter- Mark Submission Required – add to “Gen No Consensus” Comment Group.
		6. CID 1931 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:14:14Z)
			3. Mark Ready for motion
		7. CID 1746 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. C: I’m not very happy with the current resolution. I don’t think this is a broadcast frame.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:17:13Z) We have no term for a non-AP broadcast frame. Frames are either individually address or group addressed, and those cases are clear in the existing text. No Change Required.
			4. Mark Ready for motion
		8. CID 1302 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. C: This comment is talking about an IBSS. Non-AP STA implies an infrastructure BSS, which is not necessarily true. I think we require a term for a non-AP STA in an infrastructure BSS.
			3. Chair: Could the ARC group work on this, in the context of “What is a STA?”.
			4. Q: So there’s a difference between Independent BSSS and Infrastructure BSS in this context.
			5. A: Yes, sort of. Non-AP STA also includes STAs in an IBSS and PBSS., which are not commonly thought about.
			6. Mark as Submission Required – Assign to Mark HAMILTON
		9. CID 1308 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. C: As this is a definition, I think this needs to be a precise reference.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:35:17Z) at page 182.40 after the sentence, add "ASCII refers to 7-bit US-ASCII per IETF RFC 20."

Add a reference to RFC 20 in clause 2. "IETF RFC 20, ASCII format for Network Interchange, October 1969"

* + - 1. Mark Ready for motion.
		1. **CIDs 2030, 2031, 2023, 2033 (GEN):**
			1. All 4 comments are basically the same comment but with a different proposed resolution.
		2. CID 2031 (GEN)
			1. Commenter preferred this resolution over the one in CID 2030.
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:39:02Z)
			3. Mark Ready for motion
		3. CID 2030 (GEN)
			1. Proposed change is opposite from CID 2030
			2. Proposed resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:39:39Z) Change "associated with" to "that is the AC of"

Note to Editor: Same resolution as CID 2031.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for motion.
		1. CID 2032 (GEN)
			1. After discussion, preference for this proposed change.
			2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:51:31Z)
			3. Mark Ready for motion.
		2. CID 2033 (GEN)
			1. Proposed change is opposite from CID 2032
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-07-25 15:51:50Z) Add a "NOTE---If an EDCAF gains channel access, and an RDG is granted to another STA, that STA is transmitting under the primary AC"

Note to Editor: Same Resolution as CID 2032.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for motion.
		1. CID 1341 (ED1)
			1. Revisit from earlier today.
			2. Editor is concerned with the proposed number of changes.
			3. C: I’m not in support of all these stated changes.
			4. C: This issue has been addressed by other comment resolutions, but these are instances that have been missed. The work to change these needs to be done.
			5. C: Perhaps we should add some more explanation to clause 1.4
			6. The global statement in clause 1.4 would not apply equally to each instance and would add more ambiguity.
			7. Chair: We are out of time now.
	1. **Adjourn 12:00 PM ET**
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