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Abstract

Telecon Minutes for REVme - November – December 2022:

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

R0: December 2nd Telecon. – Focus on ED2 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 Rison to post to the reflector - This will be discussed on the January 6th 2023 teleconference.

* + 1. Action #6: Mark Rison to create a submission and this will be presented in the December 2022 ad-hoc.
		2. Action #7: Discuss again at the December 2022 ad hoc. First thing Wed AM
		3. Action #8: Re-assign CID 3532 to Mark Rison for further work. It will be re-presented in the December 2022 ad-hoc next week.
		4. Action #9: Emily Qi: Bring CID 3729's intent up in the Editor's meeting, for future consistency.
		5. Action #10: Mark as "More work required". Action Edward Au to check with Youhan that all the changes are correct. Will be re-presented during the December 2022 ad-hoc next Wednesday.
		6. Action #11: Editors: Please check if a new dot11Groups is required.
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) [Stephen McCann (Huawei) for this meeting]
	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**:11-22/2060r0:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2060-00-000m-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**
4. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Friday, December 2, 2022, at 10:00-12:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 10:03 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) [Stephen McCann (Huawei) for this meeting]
	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 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 5 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 7 | Rison, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 8 | Das, Subir | Peraton Labs |
| 9 | Petrick, Al | InterDigital |
| 10 | Halasz, Dave | Morse Micro |
| 11  | Wei, Dong | NXP |
| 12 | Thakore, Darshak | CableLabs |
| 13 | Yang, Ray | InterDigital |
| 14 | Kamel, Mahmoud | InterDigital |

* 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 with some changes
		2. Agenda approved with no objections
1. **Editor’s Report**
	1. None
2. **Presentation of PHY CIDs Mark Rison (Samsung) [an email was presented]**
	1. CID 3510 (PHY)
		1. <https://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11-tgm/msg03044.html>
		2. Review draft comment resolution
		3. Q: regarding the 2nd bullet, what will this be changed to?
		4. A: Either add “optionally present” or make it into a note.
		5. Action: Mark R to create a submission and this will be presented in the December 2022 ad-hoc.
3. **Presentation of 11-22-2001r2 CID Editorial Edward Au (Huawei)**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2001-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments.docx>

* 1. CID 3814 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment

Proposed Resolution: Accepted.

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. CID 3815 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: So, it will be only “L-SIG”, as opposed to “L-SIG field”.
		3. A: Yes
		4. Action: Mark RISON to check for other uses of just "L-SIG", versus "L-SIG field"
		5. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. CID 3797 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: What does EMPTY on line 46 mean?
		3. A: It can be deleted as an editorial update.
		4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 4721.53, 4721.63, and 4722.13, replace the reference 11.6.2 (Procedure at the STA)” with 11.8.3 (Quieting channels for testing). Also, delete "EMPTY" on the SM7 line.
		5. Note to editor, also delete "EMPTY" in HTP2.12.
		6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. Return to CID 3815 (ED2)
		1. The spec is currently inconsistent on use of "field" after L-SIG. So, no additional changes at this time.
	4. CID 3229 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. CID 3240 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. CID 3250 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	7. CID 3387 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	8. CID 3506 & 3507 (ED2)
		1. Review Comments
		2. C: This comment was discussed in a previous round and was rejected:
		3. “REJECTED (ED1: 2022-08-25 17:39:23Z)- Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; after review of the CID, the group determined that a change was not wanted. See Straw Poll Results from Aug 25, 2022:a) Rename the operator: 3

b) Keep the operator name: 5c) Abstain :2”

* + 1. C: There is no new material in the comment since the last round, so the resolution should be the same.
		2. **Straw Poll: Do you agree to resolve CID 3506 and CID 3507 by replacing the function “L()” and adding a reference?**
		3. Yes: 1
		4. No: 2
		5. Abstain: 5
		6. Chair: I think a reject resolution would therefore be appropriate.
		7. C: I voted abstain on the straw poll, as I don’t think it makes sense. If L is replaced with Slice, the reference is no longer needed.
		8. Q: The proposed resolution for CID 3507 is slightly different than that proposed. Can we change the straw poll please?
		9. Chair: Not at this time.
		10. Action: Discuss again at the December 2022 ad hoc. First thing Wed AM
	1. CID 3092 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. CID 3201 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. CID 3308 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. CID 3320 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. CID 3532 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. C: Commented referenced the wrong table, but Table 12-7 also has odd row ordering.
		3. Q: Why are the bits in this order?
		4. A: To make it consistent with other similar tables.
		5. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-22/2001r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2001-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments.docx) under CID 3532.
		6. Action: Re-assign CID 3532 to Mark Rison for further work. It will be re-presented in the December 2022 ad-hoc next week.
		7. May consider both tables 12-7 and 12-8
1. **Presentation of 11-22-2063r0 CID Editorial Edward Au (Huawei)**

 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2063-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments-part-2.docx>

* 1. CID 3195 & 3196 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. CID 3195 - Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. CID 3196 – Proposed Resolution: Revised,
		4. At 2348.24 and 2348.43, replace “an Element ID and Element ID Extension” with “Element ID and Element ID Extension fields”.
		5. At 2348.45, replace “the same Element ID and Element ID Extension” with “the same Element ID and Element ID Extension fields”.
		6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. CID 3335 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. CID 3391 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. CID 3416 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. CID 3550 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. C: I’d like to ask the group for their opinion about this one.
		3. **Straw Poll: Do you agree to change Figure 10-21 from pseudo-3D to 2D?**
		4. Yes: 1
		5. No: 4
		6. Abstain: 3
		7. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: The commenter fails to identify an issue of the figure
		8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. CID 3692 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. C: I think we have to be careful about renaming frames, as it can affect existing implementations. It’s not just an editorial change.
		3. C: Perhaps this could be changed to a technical comments and be re-assigned.
		4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: While it may be weird that the feature is “TIM broadcast” but the corresponding frames are “TIM frames”, there is no technical concern to continue using “TIM frames”.
		5. **Point of order**: Please can you make this a separate motion in a later meeting.
		6. Chair: Yes, ok.
		7. There was 1 objection to this resolution – Mark Ready for Motion
	7. CID 3703 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: Is an “en dash” the same as a minus symbol?
		3. A: Yes
		4. Proposed Resolution: Revised:
		5. At 171.37, replace the hyphen of “x-y” with an en dash.
		6. At 171.38, replace the hyphen of “Bx-By” with an en dash.
		7. At 171.39, italicize “x”.
		8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	8. CID 3721 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. C: I need some direction from the group about whether to adopt option 1 or 2?
		3. Q: Did the search include words with “TX” in the middle of them, e.g. MIB attributes?
		4. A: No.
		5. C: I think a submission would be appropriate.
		6. Chair: Are there any other opinions?
		7. C: If there are many other Tx embedded in other words, I would probably leave the draft as it is.
		8. **Straw Poll: Are you in favor of resolving CID 3721 with the reason along the lines of "Rejected: While there is inconsistency on the terms “TX” and “Tx”, such inconsistency does not result in any issue."**
		9. Yes: 6
		10. No: 0
		11. Abstain: 1
		12. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: While there is inconsistency on the terms “TX” and “Tx”, such inconsistency does not result in any issue.
		13. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	9. CID 3729 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2063r0 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2063-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments-part-2.docx) under CID 3729.
		3. Action Emily: Bring CID 3729's intent up in the Editor's meeting, for future consistency.
		4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	10. CID 3363 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	11. CID 3412 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	12. CID 3251 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	13. CID 3426 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. C: on line 58, the font size is incorrect.
		3. A: That will be fixed.
		4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	14. CID 3464 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	15. CID 3260 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	16. CID 3360 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	17. CID 3413 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: Is there a similar problem in the previous sentence?
		3. A: Yes.
		4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Revised. At 4095.30, 4095.31 (x2) and 4095.32, replace "and" with "or"
		5. Action: Mark as "More work required". Edward Au to check with Youhan that all the changes are correct. Will be re-presented during the December 2022 ad-hoc next Wednesday.
	18. CID 3484 (PHY)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: Do we need to create a new group?
		3. A: I’m not sure.
		4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 5464.24, add the following two MIB attributes to the end of the dot11PhyHEComplianceGroup:
		5. dot11HEPuncturedSoundingOptionImplemented,
		6. dot11HEChannelWidthOptionImplemented.
		7. Action: Editors: Please check if a new dot11Groups is required.
		8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	19. CID 3441 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	20. CID 3474 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	21. CID 3476 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	22. CID 3482 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. Note to the Editors, the locations in D2.0 are listed as follows for your convenience:
		4. At 755.12, change “the range of 1 to 2007” to “the range 1 to 2007”.
		5. At 755.15, change “the range of 1 to 8191” to “the range 1 to 8191”.
		6. At 858.49, change “the range of 0 to 30” to “the range 0 to 30”.
		7. At 2283.40, change “the range of 0 to 30” to “the range 0 to 30”.
		8. At 2283.42, change “the range of 0 to 30” to “the range 0 to 30”.
		9. At 2298.52, change “the range of 1 to 15” to “the range 1 to 15”.
		10. At 2368.35, change “the range of 0 to 255” to “the range 0 to 255”.
		11. At 2917.15, change “the range of 0 to 1” to “the range 0 to 1”.
		12. At 3875.64, change “the range of 0 and OCW” to “the range 0 to OCW”.
		13. At 3991.19, change “the range of 1 to 4095” with “the range 1 to 4095”.
		14. At 3997.35, change “the range of 0 to aPSDUMaxLength octets” to “the range 0 to aPSDUMaxLength octets”.
		15. At 4006.35, change “the range of 0.5 to 2” to “the range 0.5 to 2”.
		16. At 4073.55, change “the range of 4 to 7” to “the range 4 to 7”.
		17. At 4073.56, change “the range of 4 to 7” to “the range 4 to 7”.
		18. At 4133.22, change “the range of 0 ≤ k ≤ NSD – 1” with “the range 0 ≤ k ≤ NSD – 1”.
		19. At 4133.22, change “the range of NSD ≤ q(k) ≤ 2NSD – 1” to “the range NSD ≤ q(k) ≤ 2NSD – 1”.
		20. At 4133.24, change “the range of 0 ≤ k ≤ NSD/2 – 1” with “the range 0 ≤ k ≤ NSD/2 – 1”.
		21. At 4133.24, change “the range of NSD/2 ≤ k ≤ NSD – 1” with “the range NSD/2 ≤ k ≤ NSD – 1”.
		22. At 4241.26, change “the range of 14 to 1023” to “the range 14 to 1023”.
		23. At 4243.17, change “the range of 1 to 8” to “the range 1 to 8”.
		24. At 4243.28, change “the range of 1 to 8” to “the range 1 to 8”.
		25. At 4440.42, change “the range of 0 to 255” to “the range 0 to 255”.
		26. At 4440.56, change “the range of 0 to 255” to “the range 0 to 255”.
		27. At 4582.48, change “the range of 0 to a MPDUMaxLength octets” to “the range 0 to a MPDUMaxLength octets”.
		28. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	23. CID 3496 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	24. CID 3728 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-22/2063r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2063-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments-part-2.docx) for CID 3728.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	25. CID 3505 (ED2)
		1. Review Comment
		2. Q: I think this proposal is slightly different from the comment in the previous round.
		3. A: Yes.
		4. Chair: Does anyone object to deleting capable or capability in the text?
		5. A: No objection.
		6. C: It appears that OCVC has two possible expansions.
		7. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 249.23 (subclause 3.4):
		8. Change
		9. “OCVC operating channel validation capable” to “OCVC operating channel validation capable or operating channel validation capability”
		10. At 2785.44, delete “capable”.
		11. At 2400.53, 2401.20, 2401.35, 2488.4, 2488.5, 2496.46, 2536.44, 2536.51, 2536.55, 2537.3, 2773.50 (x2), 2785.43, 2785.47, 2786.1, 2786.16, 2915.7, 2917.32, 2924.16, 2925.16, 2958.37, 2959.43, 2960.56, 2961.59, 2986.9, 2968.57, 2991.44, 2992.37, 3035.44, and 3036.49, delete “capability”.
		12. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
1. **AoB**
	1. None
2. **Adjourned 12:01pm ET**
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