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Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11me (REVme) for the meetings held during the 2023 September 802 Wireless Interim held at the Grand Hyatt Atlanta, Buckhead, GA.

R0: Original Minutes posted.

1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Monday, September 11, 2023, at 016:00-18:00 ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 4:06pm 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 July 802 Plenary.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda 11-23/1343r1**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1343-01-000m-revme-agenda-september-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Monday September 11 10, 4pm ET
2. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
3. Approve agenda.
4. Motions
	1. July Plenary minutes (Slide 7)
5. Reminder – TGme adhoc – Oct 12-14 - Toronto
6. Editor Report
7. Presentations
	1. Comment feedback – Rison (Samsung)
8. Recess
	* + 1. Approve agenda without objection.
	1. **Motions: REVme minutes approval**
		1. Approve the minutes in document for July Plenary – doc 11-23/1208r1:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1208-01-000m-minutes-for-revme-2023-july-802-plenary-berlin.docx>

* + 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
		2. Seconded: Stephen MCANN
		3. Results: No Objection – Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes.
	1. **Editor Report: doc 11-21/00687r17 - Emily QI (Intel)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-17-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
		2. D4.0 is available in Member’s Area
		3. WG LB Comments were resolved.
		4. Amendment Roll-in Plan reviewed.
		5. Need to include Cor 2-2024 in plan.
	2. Review doc 11-23/1546 Comments from Mark RISON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1546-00-000m-some-comments-for-possible-discussion-during-initial-revme-sa-ballot.xls>
		2. Discussion of MAC comments to be the focus.
		3. CID 4259/4274
			1. Discus the history of the CID.
			2. Limited Feedback on the issue.
		4. CID 5037
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Suggested interest to assist in helping describe case a.
			3. No feedback on case b.
			4. New Band rules have to be followed.
			5. When can the RSNE change?
			6. Discussion on the use of RSNE.
			7. Discussion on if the standard needs a change, or just another set of notes.
			8. RSNE cannot change during the lifetime of the BSS.
		5. CID 5043
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Concern that the change would be interoperable.
			3. Would need negotiation.
		6. CID 5075
			1. Review Comment.
			2. No feedback
		7. CID 5102 and 5105
			1. Similar to 5037
		8. CID 4229
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Change would not be interoperable.
			3. Would need capability negation.
			4. No one does PMF with TDLS nor pays attention to the number of replay counters advertised. So RSN Capabilities would need to indicate.
		9. CID 4232
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review proposed change.
			3. See 4229 for more details.
		10. CID 4235
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Discussion on possible changes.
		11. CID 4133
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. No Feedback
		12. CID 4151
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Changing “elements” to “sub elements”
			3. Mark H will look it up.
		13. CID 4155
			1. Skipping this comment
			2. Submission needs to be prepared.
		14. CID 4160
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Hyphenated terms rules
			3. Need to have editor investigate the style guidelines.
			4. Emily noted that uppercase all words in field names, including after the Hyphen.
		15. CID 4168
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Discussion on what the change would look like if applied.
			3. Discussion on fragmentation rules.
			4. More study may be needed.
			5. We may need a new MIB variable rather than reuse the existing MIB variable.
			6. The new MIB variable may need a set of thresholds be set.
			7. Discussion on how fragmentation for A-MSDU is handled.
		16. CID 4171
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Request for a xref in proposed changes.
			3. No Feedback – No SME in the room.
		17. CID 4205
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Concern with non-HT block ack reference leftovers.
			3. Need to get updated reference to D4.0 document.
		18. CID 4207
			1. Review Comment.
			2. 10.25 Block ack and 11.5 Block ack operation need to be harmonized.
			3. No Feedback.
		19. CID 4210
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Reference to 2023-01-06 telecon that suggested figures should not have numeric field values.
			3. The normatively stated value should be in the text and not in the figure.
			4. Suggest taking to the Editors group.
		20. CID 4224
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Average energy of the OFDM Symbols discussion.
			3. Suggestion to check with Youhan.
		21. CID 4248
			1. Review Comment.
			2. There is no dot11BSSAverage variable.
			3. Page 5053 has a variable without “dot11” prepended to it.
		22. CID 4260
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review context of element.
			3. The element cited is part of a GAS element, so not separate.
			4. See figure H-1 MSDU with EtherType 89-0d frame.
			5. Discussion of if additional signaling is needed.
			6. Proposed change may be a good change.
			7. The Payload would only contain the RLQP element, and not the Advertising protocol element.
		23. CID 4276
			1. Review Comment.
			2. QAP is used by AP itself, other one is what it advertises to STAs.
		24. CID 4281
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Need a CMMG expert to replace.
		25. CID 4289
			1. Review Comment.
			2. When to use Public Action or Protected dual of Public Action
		26. CID 4290
			1. Non-EMDG should not mean DMG but not EDMG.
			2. During the 11ay ballot a change like this was suggested. This change is not as simple and we may have to do more checking.
			3. The Term needs to be “not-X” so this is a problem of getting the right term that we can find. “Non-EDMG DMG” may be one term to consider.
		27. CID 4305
			1. Review Comment.
			2. CID #3504 Note is not complete.
			3. The change may be ok, but not justified to make the change just to make the change.
			4. If no one is using the MIB, then why spend time on it.
		28. CID 4307
			1. Skip
		29. CID 4314
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review context.
			3. The Standard is not incorrect.
			4. Rule might already be expressed outside C12.
		30. CID 4323
			1. Review Comment.
			2. I you have some encrypted with the old keys, and a new key is being used to rekey, and if old frames come later, they would be rejected.
			3. Non-AP STA wording should be flexible enough; AP should be left to vendors wisdom. (but maybe make slightly more flexible “after all order frames have been…”).
	3. Recess at 5:58pm ET
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 016:00-18:00 ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 4:02pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of** Officers
		1. present:
		2. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		3. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		4. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		6. Not present
			1. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 July 802 Plenary.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda 11-23/1343r2**:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1343-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda for Today is to resume comment resolution of Mark’s Doc 11-23/1546r0
			1. No Objection
	6. **Continue Review Doc 11-23/1546r0** – Mark RISON
		1. CID 4326
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Should it be reserved.
			3. Some concerned about making a change.
			4. Unsure of the need to make this change.
		2. CID 4327
			1. Review Comment.
			2. As a MIB variable in general or specifically would make a difference in how to resolve this idea.
			3. The Activated vs Implemented configuration question was discussed.
			4. Discussion on what does it mean to have something enabled when things are not implemented.
			5. Do we want to designate a “master switch”.
			6. The hierarchy may be hard to indicate.
		3. CID 4328
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Question is whether MIB attributes exist in all STAs; if we do have MIB attributes only used by AP, agree should add it in the Description (note Channel switch is STA capability not BSS Permission). This is a possibility.
			3. Would need large effort to identify all the cases.
		4. CID 4335
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Question on what “from existing TWT values”?
			3. Discussion on the wording for selecting TWT from existing values. (See page 2613 and 3922).
			4. Review the TWT information Field format. (See page 1710, 823)
			5. Something like “from value of the Next TWT field used for existing TWT agreements”.
		5. CID 4336
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Consensus is a future item to be considered, but the legacy we are not looking to change. Too much work to consider all.
			3. The specific field name was asked to be changed for about 30 instances. (some are just cross references).
			4. This is in the Style guide, but for legacy, it is not changing.
		6. CID 4344
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Security type
			3. Skip the security CIDs for now, as there as been some offline work on them already.
			4. Similar CIDS will be skipped as well.
		7. CID 4358
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Related to 4305,
			3. Review context
			4. In Theory, a note may work, but maybe no-one cares enough to do the work.
			5. So, we could consider getting rid of the Note.
			6. Previously we had discussion and did not find any better wording for the Note.
		8. CID 4361
			1. Review Comment.
			2. This is a missing cross reference.
			3. But the information should be there, and a better name to the clause should be crafted.
			4. This should be a technical comment if it is submitted.
		9. CID 4368
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review context
			3. Some say it is unnecessary to say that.
			4. Look to consider changing “not covered”.
		10. CID 5026
			1. Review Comment.
			2. No Feedback
			3. Probably not Editorial though and we should not use a different field name to refer to the same field.
			4. The RA/TA names should not be changed.
			5. However, the field name for SS Allocation Field may need to be better consistently used.
			6. This would be a technical issue to consider.
		11. CID 5029
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context on P1796
			3. Concern with what is wrong with exiting text.
			4. Discussion on the who is the Sender of the CTS.
			5. This is the sentence under consideration: “The reception of the CTS frame sent by the recipient of the RTS frame.”
		12. CID 5050
			1. Review Comment
			2. The cited field may be a variable that should start with an “a” prefix.
			3. So, remove the space between the “a” and PSDUMaxLength.
		13. CID 5059
			1. See CID 4336
		14. CID 5560
			1. Review Comment
			2. See CID 4210
		15. CID 5070
			1. Review Comment
			2. Concerned that Brian may have started this one already.
			3. Having the MPDU length defined close to where the MPDU is defined is a better way than trying to have a consolidated clause of the definitions.
		16. CID 5071
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context – p2983
			3. The PMKR1Name should be the same as the one calculated.
			4. Need to address the case of when they don’t match.
			5. There was objection to the discussion.
			6. This section is about generating response not validation.
		17. CID 5072
			1. See also 5070.
			2. But the S1G text move is desirable in any case.
			3. Maybe better as 2 comments.
		18. CID 5082
			1. Review Comment
			2. Does the generic xxx STA mean a STA that implements XXX
			3. There is something already defined in 1.4 that does this already.
			4. No Change needed. – we may need to check that it is used consistently as defined. May need two terms?
		19. CID 5097
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note that the first instance has no comma before “and’ which is taken as a higher precedence.
			3. Review context 2979.
		20. CID 5103
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context on P860L32
			3. “The SSID Element Indicates the identity of an ESS or IBSS”
			4. In Clause 4 – All BSSs in an ESS have the same SSID.
			5. Discussion on what same vs identical may mean.
			6. What becomes first, the ESS or a set of BSSs.
			7. The Definition of the ESS is a a collection of BSSs that are tied together in a DS.
			8. The Existing sentence may be sufficient.
			9. “An ESS is the union of the infrastructure BSSs with the same SSID connected by a DS" was the old 4.3.5.2 before we updated that in a maintenance effort.”
			10. Discussion on what is a LAN.
			11. Discussion on what is a DS.
			12. No Consensus on the direction.
	7. **Modify agenda to discuss Searchable terms.**
		1. Need to get prepared from the previous minutes from both TGme and the Editors Meeting.
		2. There was discussion in both TGme and Editors meeting.
		3. AI: Robert STACEY to bring both minutes together for discussion.
	8. Return to Mark RISON – proceed with PHY CIDs.
		1. CID 4191
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if this topic would be worth pursuing.
			3. Proposed changes would need to be proposed before deciding.
			4. What is the problem that is being solved?
			5. We should not specify implementation choices.
		2. CID 4132
			1. Review comment
			2. PICs should not refer to Clause 9.
			3. FR is Frame reception requirements.
			4. Suggestion that the behavioral shalls should be referenced.
			5. What is in the PICs seems to be changing by the wind direction.
			6. Discussion on what the purpose of the PICS is really for.
	9. **Recess at 5:59pm**
2. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Wednesday, September 13, 2023, at 016:00-18:00 ET.**
	1. **Called to order** 4:02pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Officers**
		1. present:
		2. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		3. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		4. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		6. Not present
			1. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2023 July 802 Plenary.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda 11-23/1343r2**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1343-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2023-session.pptx>
		2. Wednesday September 13, 4pm ET
* Presentations
	+ SAE Password identifiers. – Doc 11-23/1576r0 - Dan HARKINS (HPE)
	+ Discussion on Searchable Terms – Robert STACEY
	+ Comment Feedback Document – Mark RISON (Samsung).
* Motions
	+ Adhoc for December
* Teleon and plans for November Plenary.
* AoB
* Adjourn
	+ 1. No Objection to Agenda
	1. **Review Doc 11-23/1576r0** – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1576-00-000m-ppi-next-steps.pptx>
		2. Review submission.
		3. Identify the problem.
		4. Discussion on the possible path forward.
		5. Discussion on the use cases that this can help with.
		6. Discussion on beacon bloat and how much of an issue it is.
		7. Discussion on some alternatives that could be considered.
		8. A New Public Action Frame or a Probe Request Frame with the element that requests something specific to be included in the response.
		9. Straw polls:
			1. Straw Poll #1 Do you believe: “Removing the public key from beacons and using ANQP to distribute public keys would improve the HPKE-protected password identifier scheme”
				1. Yes/No/Abstain
				2. Results: 6-16-3 (30 in Webex)
			2. Straw Poll #2: Do you believe: “Using a unique AKM exclusively for protected password identifiers would improve the HPKE-protected password identifier scheme”.
				1. Yes/No/Abstain
				2. Results: 5-17-3
	2. **Discussion on Searchable Terms** – Robert STACEY
		1. Doc 11-23/1625r0
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1625-00-000m-searchable-definitions-revisited.docx>
		2. Review history of topic from Minutes from December 2022 and January 2023
		3. Review discussion from the document adopted.
		4. Suggest that compound Acronyms should be put after colon, but simple acronyms should not be moved.
		5. Discussion the use of square bracket vs parenthesis.
		6. Discussion on what the term should be in the definition clause.
		7. The Term being defined should be prior to colon. The insertion of the acronym in the middle of the term makes it unsearchable.
		8. The IEEE Searchable database is not really searchable because of these issues.
		9. The SA Level database is being undermined by our continuing to put the acronym in the left side.
		10. First use of the Term is different than definition of the term.
		11. The change of putting the searchable term after the colon is a good compromise.
		12. The searchable term of “Access point path” cannot be done when we put the Acronym in the middle of the term.
		13. Always had long discussion on the point that the acronym being used on first use in the clause 3 is definition, and first use is after clause 3.
		14. We may have moved the simple Acronyms to the right of colon may be too far.
		15. The TG editor would like to go to in the proposed direction, but the group chose this other direction.
		16. Do we need to be consistent with other Standards?
		17. The TGbe MDR has an issue to know the direction.
		18. The WG Editor says we are still working on defining the direction.
		19. The current D4.0 Style should be followed as of now.
		20. There will be more discussion when we resolve comments in the SA Ballot.
	3. **Review Comment doc 11-23/1546r0** Mark RISON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1546-00-000m-some-comments-for-possible-discussion-during-initial-revme-sa-ballot.xls>
		2. CID 4344
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion of options.
		3. CID 4345
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on PTK state transition.
			3. Discussion on what could get the state stuck.
		4. CID 4347
			1. Review comment
			2. No feedback
		5. CID 4348
			1. Review comment
			2. PTK rekeying
			3. No Feedback
		6. CID 4349
			1. Review Comment
			2. Seems to have two states with same conditions to move on. Rekey issues.
			3. No Feedback
		7. CID 4351
			1. Review comment
			2. INITIALIZE status reviewed – should be “else Pair = false”.
			3. Should be “to the Supplicant”.
		8. CID 4262
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context P2940
			3. Discussion on what security is allowed or not.
			4. No other feedback
		9. CID 4267
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on value of making a definition
			3. No other feedback.
			4. Which should be upper or lower case A-or SA-authentication frame?
		10. CID 4304
			1. Review Comment
			2. Suggest the proposed changes be made, need to identify the location in D4.0.
		11. CID 4321
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on direction.
			3. No other feedback.
		12. CID 4152
			1. Review comment
			2. Channel Switch timing element
			3. No Feedback
		13. CID 4164
			1. Review Comment
			2. Does not seem to be referenced anywhere. If the field happens to be eight bits, it may not be correct, so maybe just delete the incorrect statement.
			3. Remember to identify the specific locations for the changes.
		14. CID 4239
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if there is a need to make a change. This GMC was not added correctly to the DMG counters.
			3. Is there a problem with having the GCMP counts in the DMG counter’s entry. – Not really.
		15. Return to CID 4330
			1. This also applies to S1G and so it is fine as it is.
			2. 11.1.4.3.2 clarifies the issue, and applies to S1G
	4. **Plan going forward**
		1. Review Timeline slide 8 – 11-23/1343r2
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1343-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2023-session.pptx>
* **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**
* **July 2023 – D4.0 Recirculation**
* **Sep 2023 – D4.0 Initial SA Ballot**
* **Feb 2024 – D5.0 Recirculation SA Ballot (roll-in of published amendment 11az, 11bd, 11bc, 11bb)**
* **May 2024 – D6.0 Recirculation SA Ballot**
* **Jul 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot (clean recirculation)**
* **Sep 2024 – RevCom/SASB Approval**
	+ 1. **Plan for AHocs:**
			1. Oct 10-12 in Toronto – Hosted by Huawei
			2. Dec 7-8 in Piscataway – Hosted by IEEE SA
			3. **Motion**
				1. Authorize TGme to hold a Mixed-mode ad-hoc meeting on December 7 and 8 (Thursday and Friday) with the preferred venue being Piscataway, NJ, for the purpose of SA Ballot comment resolutions
				2. Moved Jon Rosdahl
				3. Seconded by: Mark HAMILTON
				4. Results: Unanimous – Motion passes. (18 present)
		2. **Telecons** –
			1. November 6, 20 10am ET 2 hours
			2. Jon R won’t be available on Nov 20 – will need minute taker.
	1. **Adjourned 5:54 pm**

**References:**