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Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11me (REVme) for the meetings held during the 802 Wireless Mixed-mode Interim held at the Hilton Baltimore Inner Harbor Hotel – Baltimore, MD USA January 16-19, 2023.

A

ACTION ITEMS:

3.11.2.5 ACTION ITEM #1: Mark RISON to provide update to Figures for CID 3480.

3.11.4.5 ACTION ITEM #2: Mark RISON to send to the 802.11 reflector the resolution for further confirmation and any feedback.

4.7.8 ACTION ITEM #3: Emily QI – Removed the Shared Key ANA reference and getting it mark RESERVED. Also, WEP cipher suite selectors into that 3.7.7

1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Monday, January 16, 2023, at 016:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:05pm 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. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 January 802 Wireless Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda:** 11-22/2120r2:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2120-02-000m-revme-agenda-january-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda: Monday Jan 16, 4 pm ET
2. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
3. Approve agenda
4. Motions
	1. September Interim minutes (Slide 7)
5. Editor Report
6. Comment Resolution
	1. CID 3613 (GEN) – doc 11-22/2210 – (Huawei)
	2. CID 3506. 3507, 3413 (ED2) – (Huawei)
	3. CID 3078 (GEN) – (Qualcomm)
	4. CID 3181 (GEN) – (Samsung)
	5. Misc MAC CIDs – doc 11-22/2208 – PATIL (Qualcomm)
7. Recess
	* 1. No Objection to approving
	1. **Motions** – Prior Minutes
		1. Approve the minutes in documents:
* November Plenary 11-22/1712r0: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1712-00-000m-minutes-for-revme-2022-november-plenary.docx>
* December AdHoc 11-22/2110r1: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2110-01-000m-minutes-for-revme-2022-december-adhoc-piscataway.docx>
* Teleconferences (Nov-Dec) 11-22/2074r6: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2074-06-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-november-december-2022.docx>
* Teleconferences (January) 11-22/2121r1: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2121-01-000m-minutes-for-revme-2023-january-6-and-9-telecon.docx>
	+ 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
		2. 2nd: Mark Hamilton
		3. Results: Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes.
	1. **Editor Report**. – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. Doc 11-21/0687r13
		2. Editor's report: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-13-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
			1. Draft 2.1 is with the Chair and nearly ready to post (today or tomorrow).
			2. WG LB Comments – doc 11-22/0065r14 has all comments.
			3. Amendment Roll-in Plan
				1. 802.11 2020, 11x, 11ay, 11ba done
			4. Publishing
				1. 11az, 11bd by March 2023
			5. Review LB270 status
				1. 232 resolved.
				2. 45 Ready for Motion at start of week.
				3. Still have lots of work to do.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/2210** - CID 3613 (GEN) –– Au (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2210-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-lb270-comments-part-4.docx>
		2. CID 3613 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in Submission
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Insert the following sentence as the first paragraph of subclause 10.14 (DMG A-PPDU and EDMG A-PPDU operation) at 1873.18 in D2.0:A DMG STA is a QoS STA and shall set dot11QosOptionImplemented to true.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3506. 3507, 3413 (ED2) – Au (Huawei)
			1. Move to Wednesday PM2
	3. **Review doc 11-23/0053r0** - CID 3078 (GEN) – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0053-00-000m-cid-3078-definition-of-mcs-and-basic-rate-set.docx>
		2. CID 3078 (GEN):
			1. Was reviewed In November. Further work was suggested.
			2. Actual change is changing “at” to “using”.
			3. Reviewed the November minutes on this CID.
			4. Noted that in the proposed text to review, that acronyms need to be spelled out at first use (which has moved around).
			5. Q: We agreed (I think) that in clause 3 we talk about things like “management frames” in lower case – should elements be that way, also, or not? R: (from Editor): This will be discussed in the Editor’s meeting tomorrow morning. C: But, in this case, we are referring to operation elements in a general sense, not using their proper names. C: Not how I see it. Let’s let the Editors sort this out.
			6. C: change “A set of MCSs designated by the STA … is fixed …” to “This set of MCSs is designed by the STA … is fixed …” Add an “at” at the end of the first sentence.
			7. C: Think we should start (the first sentence) with the critical part of the definition, which is the set that the STA that started the BSS said it is. Then, what is now the first sentence, is a nice-to-have follow on. Switch the first two sentences, and word-smith appropriately. C: Agree with the intent of that.
			8. C: The commenter only wanted to replace “at” with “using”, and it seems that is the only change needed, or appropriate.
			9. Propose, accepting the suggested change. Also, change basic rate set with the same change. So, Revised, with those two changes.
			10. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-01-16 22:03:04Z) Make the change proposed by the commenter at d2.0-p205 line 20. Also make the equivalent change in the basic rate set definition. d2.0-p205 line 31
			11. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. Doc 11-23/0053r1 to be posted to Mentor:
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0053-01-000m-cid-3078-definition-of-mcs-and-basic-rate-set.docx>
	4. **CID 3181 (GEN)** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		+ 1. CID 3181 (GEN)
				1. Review comment
				2. Looking for clarification.
				3. Review context p408.51
				4. Discussion on how the BSS has an operating class.
				5. Should a 1.4 addition help this situation.
				6. Ad hoc notes: group had no objection to the concept that to be precise an OC is a property of a channel (the other being the index), though it could be understood generically for AP/BSS as being the OC of the channel the AP/BSS operates on
				7. Set to More Work Required
				8. Assign to Mark RISON
				9. Schedule to bring back in 2nd conference call in February.
	5. **Misc MAC CIDs – doc 11-22/2208** – Patil (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2208-01-000m-lb270-resolution-for-mics-cids.docx>
		2. CID 3000 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes in submission
			3. Discussion on what the changes may mean.
			4. Discussion on how the new text clarifies the existing first sentence.
			5. Discussion on what behavior should occur when an unknown value is received.
			6. The Standard should not use “undefined”…as that is what the standard is for. There should be some description of what occurs, but it should not be undefined.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes for CID 3000 in 11-22/2208r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2208-01-000m-lb270-resolution-for-mics-cids.docx>) which clarifies the sentence.
				1. Straw Poll:5 Do you agree to the resolution:

Revised

 Reject

 Do More Work

 Abstain

* + - * 1. Results: 5- 2- 3 -3
			1. CID 3000 (MAC): status set to: More Work Required.
			2. Assign to Abhi. PATIL
			3. Schedule for a teleconference in February.
		1. CID 3007 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 3007 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-16 22:34:48Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2208r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2208-01-000m-lb270-resolution-for-mics-cids.docx>) for CID 3007.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3015 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the proposed changes and use of GCR-MU BAR.
			3. Editorial Changes discussed.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 3015 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-16 22:37:43Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2208r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2208-02-000m-lb270-resolution-for-mics-cids.docx>) for CID 3015.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3006 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion of the format of the elements vs sub-elements
			3. Review the proposed changes in the submission.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 3006 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-16 22:39:49Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2208r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2208-02-000m-lb270-resolution-for-mics-cids.docx>) for CID 3006.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 3005 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review proposed Changes: CID 3005 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-16 22:44:56Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2208r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2208-02-000m-lb270-resolution-for-mics-cids.docx>) for CID 3005.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. Return to CID 3000 (MAC)
			1. No Objection to return to CID 3000 (MAC)
			2. Discussion on why the “non-reserved” is needed.
			3. We have one sentence with “reserved fields and subfields” and the 2nd sentence is about the “non-reserved” fields and subfields.
			4. Keeping the sentences in the same structural order seemed to be agreeable.
			5. Discussion on what the change of the sentence might be.
			6. Possible sentences: In non-reserved fields and subfields, reserved values are not used upon transmission. In non-reserved fields and subfields, reserved values result in undefined behavior upon reception.
			7. Discussion on the combination of Reserved Values in non-reserved fields.
			8. We want STAs implementing this version of standard to behave in a reasonable manner when receiving a value that is reserved for future extensions
			9. Standards define undefined behavior.
			10. Trying to find the right words for what the reserved values are when transmitted vs received.
			11. Discussion on what we may need to use for definition
			12. The Discussion gave Abhi additional feedback, but no change to CID 3000's status.
			13. Still scheduled for a telecon in February.
	1. **Recess at 6pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Tuesday, January 17, 2023, at 08:00-10:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 8:09am 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. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 January 802 Wireless Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda:** 11-22/2120r3:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2120-03-000m-revme-agenda-january-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda: Tuesday Jan 17, 8am ET
2. Comment Resolution
	1. CID 3726 (ED2) – RISON (Samsung)
	2. CID 3653, 3654, 3655, 3656, 3522, 3502, 3503, 3089, 3396 (MAC) – RISON (Samsung)
	3. Misc GEN CIDs – doc 11-22/2082 – MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
3. AoB
4. Recess
	* 1. No objection
	1. **Review doc 11-22/2069r2** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. **Additional documents:**11-22/65r14 and 11-22/353r10–
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>
			2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0065-14-000m-revme-wg-ballot-comments.xls>
			3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CID 3726 (ED2)
			1. Mark More Work Required
			2. Assign to Mark RISON
			3. Schedule for later February Telecon
		3. CID 3653-3656 (MAC)
			1. Review CIDs
			2. Discussion on the possible solutions.
			3. Discussion on the final version of the proposed changes.
			4. We bounced between the three documents in the presentation of the CIDs.
			5. We updated the 11-22/0353 to R11 and included labeling to make it clear what the changes being proposed matched the CIDs being discussed.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 3653-3656 (MAC): Revised. Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0353r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>), under "Proposed changes for CIDs 3653, 3654, 3655, 3656".
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 3522 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in 11-22/2069r2
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>
			3. In general, changing “field value” to “field” and adding “field” in places where it seemed to be missing.
			4. Discussion on removing “value”.
			5. Remove “Field value” from RA/TA instances as RA or TA is sufficient.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 3522 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-17 13:53:00Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2069r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>) for CID 3522.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 3502/3503 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in 11-22/2069r2
			3. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 3502 and 3503 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-17 14:00:17Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/2069r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>) for CIDs 3502 and 3503.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CIDs 3089 and 3396 (MAC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in 11-22/2069r2
			3. Proposed resolution: CIDs 3089 and 3396 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-17 14:05:48Z) - In NOTE 1 at 1820.18 and 1821.40 change “be consecutive” to “increment in steps of 1” and add “, A-MSDU” after “MSDU”. Add a full stop at the end of the sentence at 1821.40. At 2845.8 and 2854.50 add “, A-MSDUs” after “MSDUs”. At 2587.6 change “be consecutive” to “increment in steps of 1”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **Change of Chair** to Mark RISON
	2. **Review doc 11-22/2082r0** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2082-00-000m-tgme-lb270-gen-comment-resolutions.docx>

* + 1. CID 3090 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context p105
			3. Discussion on if DTIM is an interval or something like a Beacon.
			4. Context on 207.48 – another example.
			5. Use of “DTIM interval”
			6. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3593 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if a definition or rejection be crafted.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:19:06Z). Extend the definition of multicast group address to describe a multicast group.

At 188.15, change:

“multicast-group address: A medium access control (MAC) address associated by higher level convention with a group of logically related stations (STAs).”

To

“multicast-group address: A medium access control (MAC) address associated by higher level convention with a group of logically related stations (STAs). The group of STAs is referred to as a multicast group.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3456 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:20:33Z)Use “data transfer”.

At 354.21, 354.33, 357.10, 357.15, 360.39, 360.43, change “data unit transfer” to “data transfer”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 3317 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the rationale for the rejection.
			3. Review Page 384 for Context.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:22:38Z) The comment asserts that the (“HE”) BSS Color Change Announcement “is not of interest to the SME but does not give any explanation why the “BSS Color Change Announcement” would not be of interest.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. CID 3315 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion if there is anything about what is allowed for these frames?
				1. Not clearly done, but no proposed change to address this question.
			4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:28:29Z)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 3288 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:33:12Z) In last sentence in the same paragraph quoted from the IEEE SA Style Manual states, “Note that footnotes to tables and figures follow different rules (see 16.4 and 17.3) and may contain normative information.” This draft uses footnotes in a style consistent with IEEE Std 802.11-2020.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 3275 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. One instance was identified that may require “attach” to be added.
			4. Original Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:36:05Z) The use of “attached” before “bridge port” is used in a correct context in the draft. The three locations identified by the commenter correctly refer to attached bridge ports
			5. Updated Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:45:21Z) at 284.45, change “bridge port” to “attached bridge port”. The other locations correctly refer to “bridge ports”.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 3214 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:46:45Z) - Change the cited definition to:

“A station (STA) that uses an antenna selection procedure to perform the mapping of signals at radio frequency (RF) chains onto antenna elements when the number of RF chains is smaller than the number of antenna elements.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 3086 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-01-17 14:50:35Z) Make the proposed change to the text in the “Notes” column at the cited location (694.33) and the following locations: 1563.11, 1608.42, 1644.42, 1646.30, 700.12, 703.41, 708.27, 712.26, 718.24, and 722.6.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. CID 3316 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Not currently in the 11-22/2082r0 document.
			3. Review context at 6.5.9.2.2.
			4. Review the context of 6.3.9.2.2 in the 802.11-2020 standard.
			5. Discussion on why they may have primitives.
			6. They were in the 802.11-2016 and look to have the primitives restored as one path forward. Removed between 2012 and 2016.
			7. Mark CID More Work Required
			8. Assign to Graham SMITH
			9. Schedule for February Telecon.
	1. **Recess at 10:05am ET**.
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Tuesday, January 17, 2023, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:05pm 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. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 January 802 Wireless Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda: 11-22/2120r3:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2120-03-000m-revme-agenda-january-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda: Tuesday Jan 17, 4pm ET

4.Comment Resolution:

1. Doc 11-23/0039 - HALASZ (Morse Micro) - Announcement
2. CID 3057 (PHY) – SMITH (SRT)
3. CID 3097, 3098 (PHY) – doc 11-23/101 – LEVY (InterDigital)
4. CID 3077 (PHY) – COFFEY (Realtek)
5. CID 3299, 3739, 3291, 3818 (PHY) – 11-23/99 – KIM (Qualcomm)
6. CID 3480, 3485, 3488 (PHY) – doc 11-22/2069 – RISON (Samsung)

**At 5pm**

WUR – doc 11-23/104 – Levy (InterDIgital)

WUR – doc 11-22/2090 – Shellhammer (Qualcomm)

5. Recess

* + 1. Request for Emily for 10 Minutes - give time tomorrow (Wednesday).
		2. No Objection to approving Agenda
	1. **Review Document 11-23/0039** – David HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0039-02-000m-s1g-1024qam.docx>
		2. Announcement - Would like to schedule a telecon to discuss this submission.
		3. Please send Feedback to David HALASZ
		4. Just noted/announced - will discuss later. (S1G 1024 QAM)
	2. **CID 3057 (PHY) Graham** SMITH (SRT)
		1. Was not prepared -Schedule time for February Telecon
	3. **Review doc 11-23/0111r1** CID 3097 and 3098 (PHY) Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0111-01-000m-cid-3097-and-3096-lb258-802-11revme.docx>
		2. CID 3097 and 3098 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. No response from emails sent to the Subject Matter Experts (SME).
			3. No one seemed to care about this parameter.
			4. This was used in Clause 6.3.55.1, but it does not seem to be in D2.0.
			5. Discussion on the use of Antenna Connector vs Antenna.
			6. There was an email that was sent that did was overlooked, so we will skip over this for now and let Joseph look at the email and then try to come back if there is time.
		3. CID 3077 (PHY)
			1. Withdrew by Commentor
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – Withdrew by Commenter.
			3. Note CID already processed in Dec 2022: : REJECTED (PHY: 2022-12-06 16:35:49Z) The commenter has withdrawn the comment and resolution was approved by Motion #90
	4. **Return to CID 3097 and 3098 (PHY) – Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)**
		1. CID 3097 and 3098 (PHY)
		2. After looking at the email, the information was that it does not matter.
		3. So, this is most likely unused by 11az, and so we may not find it useful.
		4. Discussion on if it is not used, why make a change.
		5. Discussion on the process of how the RX\_START\_OF\_FRAME\_OFFSET is created.
		6. Discussion on why the word “connector” is needed to provide a single point regardless of how many receive antennas you may have.
		7. There was a concern that locations were not correct.
		8. CIDs 3097 and 3098 (PHY)): The commenter will withdraw both comments
		9. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – Commenter withdrew the comment.
		10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	5. **Review doc 11-23/99r0 Youhan** KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0099-00-000m-lb270-misc-comments.docx>
		2. CID 3291 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. This restores what was removed last ballot, and harmonized with an equation that changed also.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 3291 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/0099r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0099-00-000m-lb270-misc-comments.docx>) for CID 3291
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 3299 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Review the proposed changes being suggested in submission.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 3299 (PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-21/0099r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0099-00-000m-lb270-misc-comments.docx>) for CID 3299.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 3739 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 3739 (PHY): Rejected. REVme D2.0 P3987L1 lists requirements specific for non-AP HE STAs only.

Support for 1x HE-LTF and 1.6 us GI duration is common for both AP and non-AP HE STAs, and hence is listed at REVme D2.0 P3984L57: an HE STA shall support “full bandwidth UL MU-MIMO with a 1x HE-LTF and 1.6 us GI duration … if the STA supports UL MU-MIMO.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3818 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 3818 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-01-17 21:50:11Z):

Instruction to TGme Editor:

At REVme D2.0 P3970L1, change “maximum VHT NSS” to “maximum HE NSS”.

Note to Commenter:

REVme D2.0 P3970L1-17 specifies the normative relationship between the supported HE-MCSs and VHT-MCSs, which addresses the concern raised by the commenter.

There is a typo found on P3970L1, however, which is fixed in the above instruction to editor.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3471 – Previously completed.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/2069r2** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>
		2. CID 3480 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Will need to have updated figures from the commenter.
			4. Proposed resolution:

CID 3480 (PHY): Revised. Delete “Issue at the same time”/“Issued at the same time” (as appropriate) from Figure 19-25—PHY receive procedure for HT-mixed format PPDU, Figure 19-26—PHY receive procedure for HT-greenfield format PPDU, Figure 20-18—PHY receive procedure, Figure 27-60—PHY receive procedure for an HE SU PPDU, Figure 27-61—PHY receive procedure for an HE ER SU PPDU, Figure 27-62—PHY receive procedure for an HE MU PPDU, Figure 27-63—PHY receive procedure for an HE TB PPDU, and shorten the corresponding arrows to be the same as all the other arrows on that line.

At 4613.42 change “PHY receiver procedure” to “PHY receive procedure”.

(Action: Mark RISON to provide the updated Visio source figures)

* + - 1. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark RISON to provide update to Figures for CID 3480.
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3485 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Review proposed changes in submission
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 3485 (PHY): Revised. Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 3485 in 11-22/2069r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx) , which clarify the interplay between HE, VHT and HT requirements. Note to the commenter: dot11HEChannelWidthOptionImplemented is needed for 6 GHz operation.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3488 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Concern that this may be a technical change, changing from the entire element to just the content of the element. This may be one of those issues that needs more research to see if it is even implemented.
			4. ACTION: Mark Rison to post a summary and the resolution to the reflector, for comment
			5. ACTION ITEM #2: Mark RISON to send to the 802.11 reflector the resolution for further confirmation and any feedback.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 3488 (PHY): Revised. Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 3488 in 11-22/2069r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>) , which clarify the reference to the RSNE field in the RSNA event report.
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-23/0104r0** Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0104-00-000m-discussion-on-mc-ook.pptx>
		2. Abstract:

This contribution discusses the resolution of LB 270 CIDs: 3067-3068, 3070-3072, 3095-3096, 3278, 3283, 3458.

At the TGme ad hoc meeting in Piscataway NJ – Dec 5-7 resolutions were proposed for these CIDs: 11-22/2090r0 and 11-22-2083r1.

A straw poll supported continuing in the direction proposed by 1-22/2090r0.

This contributions questions that direction.

* + 1. Review the submission.
		2. CIDs 3067-3068, 3070-3072, 3095-3096, 3278, 3283, 3458, all (PHY):
		3. Stated assertion: **What is the “problem” with making MC-OOK a requirement?**

**IEEE Standards strictly require adherence to Antitrust, Competition and Commercial Terms Policies:**

**“**There are less obvious kinds of anticompetitive conduct. Technical standards necessarily include technical content, but that content must be technically justified. Technical requirements should never be included for the purpose of unreasonably impeding a company’s ability to compete, or unreasonably creating an advantage for one or a group of companies. This does not mean that the technical requirement has to be written so that all competitors can implement the standard without satisfying what would be a more rigorous standard’s requirement. But it does mean that you should guard against technical content being inserted for anticompetitive purposes. “

* + 1. Discussion on if this is the only waveform is there other ways to produce the waveform.
		2. If the receiver cannot tell how the waveform was created, then this would not need to be required in the standard.
		3. The contention is that this MC-OOK is an efficient method for the transmitter to produce the waveform.
		4. Still looking for an answer if the receiver can tell how the waveform was created.
		5. There may be different ways to generate a waveform, but this is utilizing blocks that are available (OFDM) that helps create in an efficient way.
		6. Draft should not have the prescribed requirements for exactly how to do things. If there is no objection, then that is fine to add it, but when there is some sustained objection, then we have to look to see how we are prescribing vs what alternative methods that can be used.
		7. Question on can you break the receiver if you don’t generate the waveform in a given manner.
		8. The intent is to reduce the power requirement when transmitting/receiving the waveform.
		9. The technical requirements for an ook signal does not necessarily require the MC-OOK specific signal.
		10. The Low-power requirement needs to be met regardless.
		11. While this discussion was interesting, we have a presentation on a proposed way to fix the text that matches the December AdHoc.
		12. Straw Poll from December:

8.6.17.1 SP2: Do you believe that the WUR receiver needs to know how the OOK waveform is generated?8.6.17.1.1 5y-5n -5A8.6.17.2 SP3: Do you believe that the WUR Transmitter should have requirements on the OOk waveform?8.6.17.2.1 13y-0n-2A8.6.17.3 SP4: Should the WUR OOK waveform be required to be a multi-carrier waveform?8.6.17.3.1 9y-2n-3

* 1. **Review doc 11-22/2090r1** – Steve Shellhammer.(Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2090-01-000m-cr-on-lb270-wur-comments.docx>
		2. CID 3066 (PHY) and 3067 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 3066 (PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-22/2090r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2090-01-000m-cr-on-lb270-wur-comments.docx> ), tagged for CID 3066.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 3067 (PHY): Accepted.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 3068 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if we should be requiring the MC-OOK or not.
			3. Change uses to “shall use” is the debate.
			4. Discussion on why a specific method will give improvement over some other method.
			5. There is a debate that what is there is not requirement enough, but the requirement that is being proposed for a specific MC-OOK is being debated as a specific method, but some are not happy with this method.
			6. The use of the term MC-OOK requires some shall’s for the name of the method.
			7. There seemed to be contention on this resolution/change, so we will come back to this one later.
		4. CID 3069 (PHY)
			1. Reviewed comment
			2. This would have been an accept, but found another location that also needed to be changed.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 3069(PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-22/2090r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2090-01-000m-cr-on-lb270-wur-comments.docx> ), tagged for CID 3069.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 3070 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 3070 (PHY): Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 3071, and 3072 (PHY)
			1. More work will be required.
			2. CIDs 3071, 3072 (PHY): Mark as More Work Required.
			3. Assign to Steve SHELLHAMMER.
			4. Schedule to bring back in a February teleconference.
		7. CID 3073 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed Change.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 3073 (PHY): Accepted. Note to Editor, the first location should be 4592.64.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		8. CID 3095 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. More Work will need to be done.
			3. CID 3095 (PHY): Mark as More Work Required.
			4. Assign to Steve SHELLHAMMER.
			5. Schedule to bring back in a February teleconference.
	2. **Ran out of time.**
	3. **Recess at 6:01pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Wednesday, PM2 - January 18, 2023, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:05pm 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. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 January 802 Wireless Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda: 11-22/2120r4:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2120-04-000m-revme-agenda-january-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda: Wednesday Jan 18, 4pm ET

4. Comment Resolution

1. Removal of WEP - CID 3056, 3126, 3134, 3222, 3455, 3569, 3597, 3134 (SEC) – doc 11-22/2003 – Malinen (Qualcomm)
2. Pwd Ident Protection – doc 11-22/1988 – Harkins (HPE)
3. CID 3506. 3507 (ED2) – Au (Huawei)
4. SN protection – CID 3023, 3016, 3017 – doc 11-22/xxxx – Patil (Qualcomm)
5. Misc SEC CIDs – Montemurro (Huawei)

5. Recess

* + 1. Agenda updated to r5, adding CIDs 3419, 3167, 3168 – Emily QI (Intel)
	1. **Review doc 11-22/2072r4** Emily QI (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2072-04-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb270-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx>
		2. CID 3419 (ED1)
			1. We had agreed on a telecon to set this to Revised, changing “bit” to “subfield” at 3 locations.
			2. Emily had an action item to up in the Editors meeting, whether it should be “field” or “subfield”.
			3. Response from Editors is to use word that is we should be consistent with the local context, rather than a hard rule one way or another.
			4. In Table 9-190, most of the usages are “field”, but it is not consistent.
			5. The original comment requested to change “bit” to “field”, and that seems to fit best, so new proposal is to resolve this as “Accepted”.
			6. Q: There is no rule in the Editors Guide for “field” versus “subfield”? A: Correct.
			7. Q: What is the new advice from the Editors, to make sure we’re clear? A: Be consistent within the subclause (as consistent as possible).
			8. Q: Do we need to be consistent in what we call a given named (sub)field, and that is consistent across the document? A: The Editors didn’t discuss that explicitly. C: Note that if we are consistent across the document, for a given name, then we are necessarily not consistent within a subclause across different names (which might have differing uses in other subclauses).
			9. On this particular CID, however, agree that Accepted is okay.
			10. Proposed Resolution: CID 3419 (ED1): Accepted.
			11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 3167 (ED1):
			1. For CID 3167: In looking at the table, most of the uses are “field”, so let’s be consistent in the table.
			2. Propose Resolution: Revised. At 1355.35/36, change “subfield” to “field”.

Note to Commenter: In this case (Table 9-363), since most of fields are using “field”, the resolution should be “field”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 3168 (ED1):
			1. Propose: Revised. Change "The" to "A" throughout the table except for the first row (Field length). Locations are 1355L9, L12, L20, L24, L32.

Change the first sentence of the last cell for the third row to "A STA sets the SAE hash-to-element field to 1 when it supports the hash-to-element method to obtain the PWE instead of looping and sets it to 0 otherwise."

* 1. **Review Doc 11-22/2003r3** Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2003-03-000m-wep-removal.docx>
		2. Abstract: This document proposes resolution to the LB270 (REVme/D2.0) comments related to removal of WEP (CIDs 3056, 3134, 3569) and a couple of additional comments asking changes in related locations (CIDs 3126, 3222, 3455, 3547, 3597).
		3. Review from a high level the changes since December.
		4. CIDs 3056, 3134, 3569, 3126, 3222, 3455, 3547, 3597
			1. Review the proposed changes.
			2. Question on Value being removed in dot11AuthenticationAlgorithm in C.1
				1. Not thought to be important to mark reserved.
			3. Review P2915.58 and 2929.7 – q is this an ANA Removal item?
			4. Discussion on other minor changes that need to be considered.
			5. Discussion of 12.3.2 clause was left in for definition of TKIP.
				1. Could we remove the WEP Subclauses completely and create new subclauses in the TKIP Area instead.
				2. We could take it in steps to make it a tighter specification.
			6. Request to ensure that TKIP is made Obsolete for sure.
				1. It is Obsolete in clause 12.2.1.
			7. Suggest that we keep the changes he has proposed and then let us fix up the minor things that are left to do rather than continue to debate ad nauseum on the submission.
			8. Discussion on removing another few sub-clauses for the pair-wise.
		5. The Proposed Resolution: Take from the document a resolution for each CID referencing 11-22/2003r4 for CIDs 3056, 3134, 3569, 3126, 3222, 3455, 3547, 3597
		6. No Objection – Mark All CIDs Ready for Motion
		7. Will try to post R4 by Noon ET
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2003-04-000m-wep-removal.docx>
		8. ACTION ITEM #3: Emily QI – Removed the Shared Key ANA reference and getting it mark RESERVED. Also, WEP cipher suite selectors into that 3.7.7
		9. Run as a separate Motion on Thursday.
	2. **Review doc 11-23/0044r1**- Protected Password Identifiers for Privacy - Dan HARKINS (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0044-01-000m-hpke-protected-password-identifiers.docx>
		2. Abstract: This submission proposes a way to provide privacy protections to SAE password identifiers.
		3. No CID associated with the submission.
		4. Review submission.
		5. Discussion on the use of the public key element to protect the SAE keys.
		6. The network admin can configure the use of keys for their network.
		7. Discussion on the use of these features.
		8. Several Editorial changes to be sent separately.
		9. Discussion on the attributes in the new MIB.
			1. This is a table of entries in the MIB, one for each peer, i.e., that is fine for this use
		10. Discussion on several technical points to clarify.
			1. PT is defined in 12.4.4.2.3.
		11. Use of a Public Key across a LAN or DS may be useful.
		12. We may want to have a requirement in MLO for the MLD which has to have the same public key.
		13. Discussion on MIB changes to ensure the proper edits are made and the proper deprecation steps are taken.
		14. This proposal is a Public Key for the AP and then encrypts the items. How does fragmentation get handled.
		15. More offline discussion should be done.
		16. Schedule more time on a Telecon in February.
	3. **Change Agenda**:
		1. Edward and Abhi were not available.
	4. **SEC CIDS –11-22/2163r0** - Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2163-00-000m-lb270-sec-adhoc-comment-resolutions-part-2.docx>
		2. CID 3469 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the differences in 802.1X-2010 vs 802.1X-2020.
			3. Discussion on if the references in the newer doc are valid.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 3469 (SEC) – Accepted. Note to Editor: There are 40 occurrences throughout the draft.
			5. Discussion on if the change will be valid.
			6. Straw-Poll: Do you agree with resolving CID 3469 (SEC)?
				1. Result: 7/6/1
			7. When asked if someone would work on it, no one volunteered.
			8. Then the Chair asked if there was any objection to accepted.
			9. Proposed resolution: Accepted
			10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **Recess at 6pm**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Thursday, PM2 - January 19, 2023, at 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:04pm 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. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 January 802 Wireless Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda: 11-22/2120r5:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2120-05-000m-revme-agenda-january-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Review Agenda: Thursday Jan 19, 4pm ET

4. Motions

1. Doc 11-23/0024r0 slides 3 through 6

5. Comment Resolution

1. CID 3384 (MAC) – HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
2. CID 3787 (MAC) – January Interim – DAS (Periton Labs)
3. Misc SEC CIDs – MONTEMURRO (Huawei)

6. Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for March

7. AoB

8. Adjourn

* + 1. Add an Adjourn to the agenda (R6).
		2. No objection to the updated agenda.
	1. **Motions:11-23/24r0**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0024-00-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
		2. **Motion #92 – EDITOR1, EDITOR2 CIDs (2023-01-19)**
			1. **Move to approve the comment resolutions in the**

“Motion-EDITOR1-2B” (29 CIDs) except CIDs 3167, 3168, 3419 and “Motion-EDITOR1-2C” (3 CIDs) in 11-22/1976r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1976-03-000m-revme-wg-lb270-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>) with CID 3775 updated to include the CID number in the resolution,

And with CID 3430, insert at the beginning of the resolution, the following “Incorporate the “Proposed Resolution” for CID 3428 in doc 11-22/2072r3 ([https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2072-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb270-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx)](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2072-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-lb270-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx%29). Note to Editor”

“Motion ED2-270-05” (13 CIDs) in 11-22/1971r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1971-05-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments-on-lb270.xlsx>) ,

**and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.**

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
			2. Seconded: Mark Hamilton
			3. Result: No objection – Unanimous Approval – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #93 – GEN, MAC, PHY, SEC CIDs (2023-01-19)**
			1. **Move to approve the comment resolutions in the**

"GEN Motion C" (11 CIDs) in11-21/0699r19 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-19-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>),

“Motion MAC-BA” tabs (15 CIDs) in 11-21/0793r33 ([https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-33-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-08-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls)),

“PHY Motion O” tab (18 CIDs) in 11-21/0727r7 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-07-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>),

“Security Motion H” tab (1 CID) in 11-22/2022r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2020-03-000m-revme-lb270-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>)

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
			2. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
			3. Result: No objection – Unanimous Approval – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #94** – **WEP CIDs (2023-01-19)**
			1. Move to approve the comment resolutions on the “Security Motion WEP” tab (8 CIDs) in

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2020-03-000m-revme-lb270-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Dan HARKINS
			2. Seconded: Mark RISON
			3. Result: No objection – Unanimous Approval – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #95** – **Related to CID 3069** (2023-01-19)
			1. Move to be consistent with the resolution to CID 3069, instruct the editor to change "constellation symbols" to "constellations“ at 4603.62 (relative to D2.0).
			2. Moved: Emily QI
			3. Seconded: Mark RISON
			4. Result: No objection – Unanimous Approval – Motion Passes
			5. Note that this edit will have a tag of “M95” in the draft.
	1. **CID 3384 (MAC)** – Mark HAMILTON
		1. Review the database.
		2. Review the history of the CID discussion.
		3. While it is not a duplicate, more work needs to be done.
		4. Need to assign the Dave HALASZ
		5. Mark Work Required.
		6. Schedule for Telecon in February
		7. Mark RISON has a submission that addresses this CID.
		8. Review Doc 11-22/2069r2
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2069-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d2-0-lb270.docx>
			2. CID 3384 (MAC)
				1. Review the discussion in the submission.
				2. Review the proposed changes for this CID.
				3. Discussion on the value of the proposal.
				4. Concern on the cross references being correct.
				5. The table 6.3.9 is likewise confusing and so we may need to update that along the line was well.
				6. Using Mark’s proposal as a starting point.
				7. Mark CID More Work Required
				8. Assign to Dave HALASZ
				9. Schedule for Telecon in Feb.
				10. AdHoc Notes: CID 3384 (MAC): MAC: 2023-01-19 21:34:43Z - Start of a fix in 11-22/2069r2. More work required, especially including clean up of Table 9-639 as well. Assign to Dave HALASZ. Bring back to a teleconference in Feb.
	2. **CID 3787 (MAC)** Subir DAS
		1. Not present
		2. More Work Required.
		3. Schedule time for February Telecon
		4. Adhoc Notes: CID 3787 (MAC): MAC: 2023-01-19 21:36:33Z - status set to: More Work Required. Assign to Subar DAS. Bring back at a teleconference in Feb.
	3. **Pass Chair** to Mark HAMILTON
	4. **MISC SEC CIDs –** doc 11-22/2163r1 - Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2163-01-000m-lb270-sec-adhoc-comment-resolutions-part-2.docx>
		2. CIDs 3467, 3468 (SEC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on figure 12-33.
			4. More Discussion on changes that may need to be made.
			5. Discussion on changes being proposed.
			6. Do we need to change some names in the table – No.
			7. Add a new paragraph after the table.
			8. Add a sentence: “The Packet Body Length field shall not indicate any octets after the end of the Key Data Field”.
			9. Discussion on the text to put in the resolutions for the two CIDs. The resolution will not be identical.
			10. The value of Packet Body Length was debated, and how the sentence should be crafted.
				1. Alternatives:

"The value of Packet Body Length field shall not include .."

"The Packet Body Length shall not include .."

“There shall be no octets in the Packet Body field after the Key Data field."

"There shall be no octets in the Packet Body field after the Key Data field."

"There shall be no octets in the Packet Body field of the EAPOL-Key PDU after the Key Data field."

* + - 1. Discussion on text for 2899.38.
				1. What is the IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor? 802.1X defines the descriptor, and 802.11 describes how it is used.
				2. Proposed additional sentence: “The IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor comprises the fields from and including the Descriptor Type field to and including the Key Data field in Figure 12-33.”
				3. Keeping the original in the paragraph also: “The IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor maps to the IEEE 802.1X Key Descriptor as described in this subclause.”
				4. Change reference to “See 11.3 of….”
				5. Review again the change at 2400.4

Do not make a change here.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: (3467) REVISED. Clarify the mapping of IEEE 802.1X fields in the IEEE 802.11 EAPOL-Key frame, including the Packet Body Length.

Delete the paragraph at 2899.36.

At the end of the paragraph starting at 2899.38, append the following sentences.

“The Protocol Version, Packet Type, Packet Body Length, and Packet Body fields are specified in 11.3 of IEEE Std 802.1X-2020.

<new paragraph> The IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor consists of the fields from and including the Descriptor Type field to and including the Key Data field in Figure 12-33. The IEEE 802.11 Key Descriptor maps to the IEEE 802.1X Key Descriptor as described in this subclause.

<new paragraph> There shall be no octets in the Packet Body field of the EAPOL-Key PDU after the Key Data field.”

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: (3468) REVISED. At 2899.65 add the following note:

“NOTE---There might be octets in the MSDU carrying the EAPOL-Key PDU after the Packet Body field (see 11.3 of IEEE Std 802.1X-2020)."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3394 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion if “Accepted” is clear.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 3182 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in the submission.
			3. Proposed resolution: Accepted

Note to Editor. The changed text with typos corrected is: “NOTE—The frame body of the retransmitted MPDU is not modified on retransmission.”

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 3811 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in the submission
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Return Chair** to Michael MONTEMURRO
	2. **Timeline, Teleconferences, Adhoc, Plan for March**
		1. Timeline:

**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 + 11bd)**

**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. Discussion on timeline.
			2. New Publication editor will be assigned to 11az and 11bd.
				1. There is a bit of work to convert from word to FrameMaker.
				2. There may be a couple weeks to get the review version and then there will be more editing.
				3. 11az may be ready by end of February, but 11bd will not be ready as it is a serial editing process.
			3. Discussion on alternatives to timeline changes.
			4. When should 11az and 11bd be rolled in and should the Clause 6 update be done prior to roll-in or after the recirculation. Or delay to SA Ballot.
			5. No consensus on a timeline change.
		1. Agenda allowed for extra 5 minutes.
		2. Teleconferences:
			1. Double up on Monday and Fridays.
			2. **Monday Feb 6, 13, 27 – 10am ET, 2hrs**
			3. **Friday Feb 3, 10, 17, 24, Mar 4, 24 – 10am ET, 2hrs**
			4. **For the March Plenary: 7 sessions**
	1. **Adjourn 6pm**

**References:**