IEEE P802.11
Wireless LANs

|  |
| --- |
|  Telecon Minutes for REVme - November – December 2022 |
| Date: 2022-11-29 |
| Author(s): |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Stephen McCann | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd | Southampton, United Kingdom |  | stephen.mccann@ieee.org |

Abstract

Telecon Minutes for REVme - November – December 2022:

R0: November 28th Telecon. – Focus on SEC CIDs

Summary of Action Items:

3.2.7.5 Action #1: Mark R to post to the reflector - Deferred until Tuesday AM1 of the ad-hoc (December 6th 2022)

3.3.7.10 Action #2: Mark R to post to the reflector - Deferred until Tuesday AM1 of the ad-hoc (December 6th 2022)

4.1.5 Action #3: Various CIDs assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)

4.10.2 Action #4: For various CIDs, the direction seems to be ok. This will be discussed during the Wednesday AM of the ad-hoc (December 7th)

4.12.5 Action #5: Mark R to post to the reflector - This will be discussed on the January 6th 2023 teleconference.

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Monday, November 28, 2022, at 10:00-12:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 10:04 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. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | Coffey, Sean | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 3 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 5 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 7 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 8 | Rison, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 9 | Viger, Pascal | Canon |
| 10 | Wullert, John | Peraton Labs |
| 11 | Petrick, Al | InterDigital |
| 12 | Kamel, Mahmoud | InterDigital |
| 13  | Wei, Dong | NXP |
| 14 | Thakore, Darshak | CableLabs |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	2. **Review agenda**:11-22/2060r1:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2060-01-000m-november-january-teleconference-agenda.docx>

* + 1. Reviewed
		2. Please note that there is an ad-hoc in Piscataway, New Jersey, USA next week. There will be more information about this during the next REVme meeting.
		3. No changes
		4. No objection to approval of agenda
1. **Editor’s Report**
	1. Various comment resolutions from the November 2022 interim meeting have been incorporated into Draft 2.0 and a new draft D2.1 should be produced shortly.
2. **Presentation of 11-22-2050r0 CID SEC Michael Montemurro (Huawei)**
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2050-00-000m-lb270-sec-adhoc-comment-resolutions-part-1.docx>
	2. Chair changed to Edward Au, for this presentation.
		1. CID 3129 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Q: Are these proposed action frames protected?
			3. A: No.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3244 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The resolution appears to be fine.
			3. Q: Apparently there may be other places in the document with the same issue.
			4. Note: Other locations should be checked for the same issue, although this action does not affect this comment.
			5. C: I think this comment should be Accepted.
			6. Proposed Resolution: accepted
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3194 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The resolution appears to be fine.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 3130 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The resolution appears to be fine.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 3124 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The resolution appears to be fine. Temporal key should be temporal keys.
			3. C: Perhaps we could use “temporal key(s)”.
			4. Q: The STA only chooses one temporal key at a time.
			5. A: Yes, although for a multi-band device, this may be different.
			6. Q: Does this also apply to the first change?
			7. A: Not necessarily. I’ll just re-arrange the resolution.
			8. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At P2781 L32, replace "established temporal key" with "establishedtemporal key(s)".At P2782 L5, replace "established temporal key" with "establishedtemporal key(s)".At P2782 L44, replace "established temporal key" with "establishedtemporal key(s)".
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 3123 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 3122 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Q: Step 4 only refers to 802.1X. Do we need some text to describe how 802.1X is used in FT?
			3. A: It’s ok, as 802.1X is not used in FT. In this case, the text discuses using 802.1X to authenticate. Once 802.1X has completed, FT can then be used.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. Action: Mark R to post to the reflector - Deferred until Tuesday AM1 of the ad-hoc (December 6th 2022)
		8. CID 3121 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 3120 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised:
			3. Q: Is 802.1X authentication used in an IBSS?
			4. A: No
			5. Q: So, perhaps this text should be removed to another clause, as it is confusing. Item b) appears to be a 802.1X specific clause.
			6. A: Ok, how about deleting “IBSS” within item b) ?
			7. C: I would prefer to pull out the IBSS items and place them in a separate item.
			8. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 2784.14, replace

“The STA shares authentication credentials with the AS utilized by the selected AP or, in the case of PSK, the selected AP.”

with

“In an ESS, the STA shares authentication credentials with the AS utilized by the selected AP or, in the case of PSK, the selected AP.”

At 2784.19, Insert the following paragraph “In an IBSS, the STA shares authentication credentials with the selected STA.”

At 2784.13, Remove “or IBSS”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3119 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Q: This appears to be more than just 802.1X?
			3. A: Yes, that is correct.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Add a paragraph break at 2784.15 before the sentence starting with “The SSID provides an...”.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3118 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3193 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 3446 (SEC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Add the following at 2900.63: “NOTE—AEAD cipher mode is described in 12.11.2.7.”
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. Chair changed to Joseph Levy
		1. CID 3490 (SEC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3443 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3442 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 3434 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 3341 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Q: So why is this normative text pointing to 12.6.5?
			3. A: Because this text is not mentioned in 12.6.5, so it needs to be mentioned in 12.6.15 However, this clause could be re-written if required. 12.6.5 does not mention anything about Beacon frames. I don’t think the requirement needs to be duplicated in both clauses.
			4. C: Ok, although I don’t think these clause are consistent.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 3759 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. C: The proposed resolution needs to be tidied up a little.
			3. Q: What is the Authentication-Request frame, spelt with a “-“?
			4. A: I’m not sure.
			5. Chair: The spelling of “Authentication-Request” needs to be checked.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revised: In the cited sentence beginning on 2974.57, change “FT Request” to “Authentication-Request” (2 locations).
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 3253 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Q: I think the GTK is a certain number of bits long. Therefore no bits are actually thrown away.
			3. A: Yes, that is ok.
			4. Q: I would prefer to remove that right box in the figure.
			5. C: I don’t think GMK is actually used in this way.
			6. C: I think a contribution is required here to clarify the confusion.
			7. C: Within Figure 12-31, I don’t think a change can be made to it. The text needs to change.
			8. C: I don’t see any value in this clause. It needs to be re-written.
			9. Proposed Resolution: Rejected:
			10. Action: Mark R to post to the reflector - Deferred until Tuesday AM1 of the ad-hoc (December 6th 2022)
		8. CID 3231 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. Presented ended, so Chair changed to Mike Montemurro
1. **Presentation of PHY CIDs Mark Rison (Samsung) [presented from the database]**
	1. CID 3066 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: I don’t think deleting OOK is helpful here.
		3. C: The OFDM PHY is specified somewhere else. Therefore the text is very confusing. It should be simplified.
		4. C: If you look at the EDMG PHY in clause 28.1.1, it appears to be a good model of how this clause should be written.
		5. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	2. CID 3067 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	3. CID 3068 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	4. CID 3069 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. CID 3070 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	6. CID 3072 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	7. CID 3073 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	8. CID 3075 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	9. CID 3076 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Action: Assigned to Sean Coffey. Deferred until Wednesday PM1 of the ad-hoc (December 7th 2022)
	10. CID 3291 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. The direction seems to be ok. This will be discussed during the Wednesday AM of the ad-hoc (December 7th)
	11. CID 3321 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. The direction seems to be ok. This will be discussed during the Wednesday AM of the ad-hoc (December 7th)
	12. CID 3375 (PHY) and 3514 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. C: I have no objection, this does appear to be a large change. There are 396 occurrences of “device capabilities”. Please can this comment be sent to the reflector first?
		3. C: I think just the MIB descriptions in C.3 need to be checked.
		4. C: I think the IEEE dictionary should be checked for a definition of device.
		5. Action: Mark R to post to the reflector - This will be discussed on the January 6th 2023 teleconference.
2. **AoB**
	1. None
3. **Adjourned 11:59am ET**
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