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Abstract

IEEE 802.11me REVme AdHoc held Dec 7-8, 2023, in Piscataway, NJ.

R0: Original posted minutes.

R1: Dec 12 – corrections posted. (See 1.8.2.3, 1.11.4, 4.8.3.8.1, 5.0, 5.7.3.4.1, 5.7.8, and 5.5.9)

6 ACTION ITEMS numbered.

1.0 **TGme (REVme) AdHoc Mixed Mode –Thursday, December 7, 2023, at 09:00-12:00 ET.**

* 1. **Called to order** 9:10am EST 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. **AdHoc Attendance – Dec 7, 2023 – Attended at some point during the day**
     1. IMAT Reported**:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 3 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 4 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 5 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 6 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 7 | Hart, Brian | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 8 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | Petrick, Albert | Jones-Petrick and Associates, LLC. |
| 10 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 11 | Namvar, Nima | Charter Communications |
| 12 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 13 | Hedayat, Reza | Apple |
| 14 | Jain, Gaurav | HPE |
| 15 | Rodriquez, Steve | Cisco |
| 16 | Au, Edward | Huawei |
| 17 | Mukkapati, Lakshmi | Wi-Fi Alliance |
| 18 | \*Ptasinski, Henry | Micro Morse |
| 19 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 20 | \*ABIDRABBU, Shaima | VESTEL |

\* = Webex only - Not registered in IMAT

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
     1. No Issues noted.
  2. **Review Agenda 11-23/2149r1**:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2149-01-000m-revme-december-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx>
     2. Review agenda

**2023 Dec 7-8 REVme AdHoc Agenda**

1.       Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/attendance> ), and patent and copyright policy

a.       **Patent Policy: Ways to inform IEEE:**

1. Cause an LOA to be submitted to the IEEE-SA ([patcom@ieee.org](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this Call for Potentially Essential Patents

If anyone in this meeting is personally aware of the holder of any patent claims that are potentially essential to implementation of the proposed standard(s) under consideration by this group and that are not already the subject of an Accepted Letter of Assurance, please respond at this time by providing relevant information to the WG Chair

b. **Copyright Policy:**

* + 1. By participating in this activity, you agree to comply with the IEEE Code of Ethics, all applicable laws, and all IEEE policies and procedures including, but not limited to, the IEEE SA Copyright Policy.

c.**Participation and policy related (including Patent and Copyright) slides: See p4-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1337-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-september-2023.pptx>

d.**Agenda Approval**

2.       **Editor report** – Emily QI/Edward A

**Comment Resolution**

**Thursday December 7, 2023**

* 1. AM1 – 09:00-12:00 ET
     1. CID 6181 (ED1) – doc 11 – Levy (InterDigital)
     2. CID 6578 (MAC) – doc – McCann (Huawei)
     3. CID 6058 (MAC) – doc 11-23/1735 – McCann (Huawei)
     4. CIDs 6116, 6117, 6123 (PHY) – doc – Levy (InterDigital).
     5. CID 6256 – doc – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope)
     6. MAC Review CIDs
  2. PM1 – 13:00-15:00 ET
     1. CID 6068 – doc 11-23/2143 – Map Registration – Hart (Cisco)
     2. CIDs 6070, 6071, 6072, 6073, 6075, 6074 – doc 11-23/1924 – Hart (Cisco)
     3. CIDs 6081, 6082, 6083 – doc 11-23/2144 – Hart (Cisco)
     4. CID 6054 (MAC) – doc 11-23/1777 – Ptasinski (Morse Micro)
     5. CID 6094, 6095, 6096 (ED2) – doc – Ptasinski (Morse Micro)
     6. MAC Review CIDs
  3. PM2 – 15:15-17:00 ET
     1. CID 6041 – doc 11-23/2058 – Gidvani (Samsung)
     2. GEN discuss CIDs.
     3. PHY review/discuss CIDs.
  4. Recess

**Friday December 8, 2023**

* 1. AM1 – 09:00-12:00 ET
     1. SEC CIDs – doc 11-23/2136 – Montemurro (Huawei)
     2. “Silently Discard” SEC adhoc comments – Montemurro (Huawei)
     3. CID 6085, 6086, 6087, 6088 (others) – doc 11-23/1236 – Malinen (Qualcomm)>
  2. PM1 – 13:00-15:30 ET
     1. No CID – doc 11-23/2154 – Patwardhan (HPE)
     2. No CID – PMKSA for PASN – doc 11-23/2146 - Huang (Intel)
     3. MAC Review CIDs

9.       **AOB**

10. **Adjourn**

* + 1. Mark RISON has an hour he will be absent or limited interaction, please avoid for PHY Comments during that time.
    2. Emily QI to take Joseph’s First Slot today. (CID 6016 ED1) 11-23/2035r2
    3. Joseph’s 2nd slot = 11-23/2091
    4. Already done with CID 6256 (GEN).
    5. No objection to the updated Agenda (see 11-23/2149r2).
  1. **Editor Report** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. Completed 11bd CID roll-in
     2. Completed 11bb roll-in
     3. Need source files for 11bc to be able to roll in.
     4. Editor reported that amendments that don’t use FrameMaker, it is an additional effort to be able to roll-in (full write in of the amendment.)
  2. **Review doc 11-23/2035r2** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2035-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-sb1-cid-6016-and-more.docx>
     2. Review History of the submission.
     3. CID 6016 (MAC), 6017 (MAC), 6169 (MAC):
        1. Review details in the submission.
        2. No questions initially on review.
        3. Discussion
           1. Channel Switch announcement and features discussed.
           2. dot11ChannelUsageActivated usage discussed.
        4. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 6016, 6017, 6169 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 14:25:23Z): Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2035-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-sb1-cid-6016-and-more.docx>.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **Review doc 11-23/1901r1** - Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1901-01-000m-cid-6578-comment-resolution.docx>
     2. CID 6578 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review the history of the discussion.
        3. Proposed Resolution reviewed.
        4. Missing “AP” in the draft before “Geospatial Location ANQP-element.
        5. Discussion on the use of the Table in the MIB.
        6. Confusion of the proposed text suggests the need to be reworked.
        7. Discussion on having a “only one of the values is used” as the end of the Note.
        8. Discussion on having similar Note in 9.4.5.13 as well.
        9. Discussion on more wording was done.
        10. Proposed Resolution: CID 6578 (PHY): Revised:

Change the description of the MIB variable dot11APCivicLocationTable on P5572L60 in D4.1 to:  
"This table represents the Geospatial location of the AP as specified in 9.4.2.20.10 (LCI report (Location configuration information report)). When this table is used for the AP Geospatial Location ANQP-element, only one of the entries is used."  
Change the description of the MIB variable dot11APLCITable on P5576L54 in D4.1 to:  
“This table represents the location of the AP in civic format using the Civic Address Type elements defined in IETF RFC 5139 [B46]. When this table is used for the AP Civic Location ANQP-element, only one of the entries is used."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **Review doc 11-23/1736r2 and 11-23/1735r1 -** Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1736-02-000m-gas-fragmentation-description.pptx>
     2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1735-01-000m-gas-query-request-fragmentation.docx>
     3. CID 6058 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review the PowerPoint document presentation which provides a history of discussion and feedback that was given.
        3. Size Negotiation used in other locations or other specifications could be used for an example of how to solve this issue.
        4. Discussion on how to indicate the total length. Use of some reserved bits can make it work.
        5. Use of Extension element may help resolve this issue.
        6. Added a new GAS Comeback Request Fragment Frame.
        7. Discussion on the request/response process and what a NACK or ACK response would be.
        8. Work on some changes, and an update will be recirculated.
        9. AdHoc Notes:

CID 6058 (MAC): MAC: 2023-12-07 15:06:38Z - status set to: More work required.

MAC: 2023-12-07 15:00:22Z - Considered <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1735-01-000m-gas-query-request-fragmentation.docx> . Would like to add a "size negotiation" so the AP can refuse (what will be) too large a request for its resources (maybe similar to EAP Requests?). Add protected dual of the new Request Fragment frame. Also, some minor corrections suggested. Bring back on Jan 5.

* + - 1. Mark More Work Required
      2. Schedule for January 5th Telecon
  1. **Review doc 11-23/2091r0** Joe LEVY (InterDigital)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2091-00-000m-proposed-resolution-of-tgme-cids-6116-6117-and-6123.docx>
     2. CIDs 6116, 6117, 6123 (PHY):
        1. Review context of the comments.
        2. Review discussion in the submission.
        3. Change to “medium/antenna interface.”
        4. Discussion on when time 0 from the “on the air” point in time.
        5. PHY is issuing to the MAC a time received start value (TOA).
        6. Review 1581.62 (d3.0). (1634 in d4.1) for context.
        7. Note that 11az made changes in this area, so more work will need to be done.
        8. Mark More Work Required.
        9. Schedule for January 5th Telecon
  2. MAC Review CIDs.
     1. CID 6549 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review context 9.7.2 – phrase not found.
        3. Checked in D4.1 and D4.0
        4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6549 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2023-12-07 15:39:05Z): The phrase "Any MPDU" cannot be found in 9.7.2.:
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 6546 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review context of the cited subclause.
        3. Existing NOTE is there, so may not be a need to add another NOTE.
        4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6546 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2023-12-07 15:42:32Z): The current draft already covers the case of DoS attack with the existing NOTE in the subclause.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 6213 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Prefer to have an SME for S1G review the proposals.
        3. Mark Mork Work Required.
        4. Schedule for January 5th (but if answer comes sooner may consider it then).
     4. CID 6277 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review context D4.1 - p1856.21 and p2026.37
        3. Discussion on making both instances of the sentence as a NOTE.
        4. Discussion on making one a NOTE and leaving the other.
        5. The 2nd paragraph needs to be reworked if we make them notes.
        6. More discussion needs to be done with the SME for S1G.
        7. Mark More Work Required.
        8. Assign to Mark RISON
        9. Schedule for January 5th Telecon.
     5. CID 6289 (MAC)
        1. Review comments
        2. Discussion on if appropriate to redefine the element.
        3. Review context D4.1 p1354.
        4. The text and the figure seem to match, and the link in this paragraph is not a hotlink and did not get updated. It should be 9.4.2.29.
        5. Disagreement if the text and the figure match.
        6. Discussion on what the Vendor specific field really is.
        7. After discussing options, we decided to revise what the commentor proposed changes requested.
        8. Proposed Resolution: CID 6289 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 16:14:14Z): In D4.1:  
             
           Insert an Organization Identifier field before the Requested Vendor Specific Information field in Figure 9-826—Request Tuple field format.  The field length (for the OI) should be indicated as "variable".  
             
           Change the para below to "The Length of Request field is the length of the Organization Identifier and Requested Vendor Specific Information fields. The Organization Identifier field is described in 9.4.1.29 (Organization Identifier field).  The Requested Vendor Specific Information field is a sequence of octets that comprise individual request."  And, make sure 9.4.1.29 is a hot-link.
        9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 6509 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6509 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2023-12-07 16:16:28Z) The text already says (as quoted): "If a TSPEC element is not present, then the TCLAS element is not present." which covers the commented situation.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     7. CID 6485 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Mark This as Submission Required.
        3. Assign to Mark RISON
     8. CID 6551 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review context 10.23.2.9
        3. This issue was addressed with CID 3619 in the past.
        4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6551 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2023-12-07 16:23:08Z): The xref is correct in D4.0.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     9. CID 6261 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the comment – pulled into AdHoc notes and white space added to be able to parse the text.
        3. Deleting the existing commas and then add one prior to “less the shortest”
        4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6261 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 16:32:24Z): Replace the sentence with a bulleted list sentence, as:  
           "The maximum size of an MMPDU that is carried in one or more VHT or S1G PPDUs (in whole or in part) is:  
           - the maximum MPDU size supported by the recipient, or  
           - if there is more than one recipient, the smallest of the maximum MPDU sizes supported by the recipients  
           less the shortest Management frame MAC header and FCS."
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     10. CID 6185 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. See 9.2.2 for context.
         3. Reception is defined in 9.2.2.
         4. Discussion on what the meaning of reception means.
         5. Searched for “received”. Only 2 instances.
         6. Discussion on what changes are required for completeness.
         7. Proposed Resolution: CID 6185 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 16:51:13Z): Replace the cited text with: "Without further qualification, reception by the MAC sublayer implies that the frame contents are valid, and that the protocol version is supported (see 9.2.4.1.2 (Protocol Version subfield)), with no implication regarding frame addressing or regarding whether the frame type or other fields in the MAC header are meaningful to the MAC entity, where the frame is addressed to the STA (individually addressed or group addressed)."
         8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     11. CID 6072 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Context in Table 9-67
         3. To align the singular and plural, more work will need to be done.
         4. AdHoc Notes: CID 6072 (MAC): MAC: 2023-12-07 16:55:25Z - status set to: More work required.  Bring back at Jan interim.  
            MAC: 2023-12-07 16:54:29Z - Usage in Probe Request, both frame format and the MLME primitive(s) needs to also be aligned with this, and we need to decide if this is singular or plural and fix appropriately.
         5. Assign to Stephen OR,
         6. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark HAMILTON to contact Stephen OR to work with getting a resolution prepared.
         7. Mark More Work Required.
         8. Schedule for January Interim
     12. CID 6311 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     13. CID 6593 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review Context
         3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  3. **Recess at 12:00pm ET**

1. **REVme AdHoc – Thursday Afternoon – 1pm EST to 3pm EST**
   1. **Called to order** 1:02pm EST by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
      1. No Issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda 11-23/2149r2**:
      1. No Changes
      2. No objections to continue following the agenda.
   4. **Review doc 11-23/2143r0** - Brian HART (Cisco)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2143-00-000m-map-registration-comment-resolution.docx>
      2. CID 6068 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Proposed Text Changes in the submission.
         3. Discussion on the use of “m” vs “meter” also if we want 7 digits of precision in the example, or to call out the precision in general.
         4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6068 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 18:19:34Z): Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2143-01-000m-map-registration-comment-resolution.docx>.
         5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **Review Doc 11-23/1924r1** Brian HART (Cisco)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1924-01-000m-channel-usage-cids.docx>
     2. CIDs 6070 (GEN), 6071 (MAC), 6072 (MAC), 6073 (MAC), 6075 (MAC), 6074 (MAC)... (One at a time)
     3. CID 6070 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on the definition of infrastructure BSS. Added “which…” to enable access to a DS.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-12-07 18:33:52Z) add a definition to 3.1 Definitions.

"infrastructure basic service set (BSS): [infrastructure BSS] A BSS that includes an access point (AP), which enables access to a distribution system (DS)."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 6071 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion in submission.
       3. Noninfrastructure BSS definition is not clear.
       4. This subject may need to go to ARC for a holistic solution approach.
       5. Not a lot of support for using prefix-“infrastructure” named feature.
       6. Discussion on other possible names that do something similar, Wi-Fi Aware, or Wi-Fi Direct “soft AP” – no cross-connect” aka no portal.
       7. There is a stand-alone infrastructure definition already in the standard, and it has a suffix that follows that defines specific things.
       8. Discussion on Don’t touch the “noninfrastructure BSS” definition.
       9. New term seemed to have more support than trying to change the definition of noninfrastructure.
       10. Aiding or aid-able AP could be some alternative name forms.
       11. MBSS is another example of of noninfrastructure BSS.
       12. Suggestion to leave CID 6070 as approved earlier but have a larger discussion on this subject in 802.11 ARC or at very least offline.
       13. ACTION ITEM #2 – Brian HART to prepare a submission to discuss in ARC.
       14. More Work Required
       15. Schedule for January Interim
    2. CID 6072 (MAC)
       1. Brian said he would like to discuss this CID in spite of the assignment this morning.
       2. Review comment
       3. Review proposed changes suggested by Brian.
       4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6072 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 19:11:36Z): Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1924-02-000m-channel-usage-cids.docx> for CID 6072.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 6073 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on the proposed changes. Concern on removal of a paragraph does not clarify anything and may add to the ambiguities.
       3. More concerns were expressed for removal of the paragraph, and no need to add “with or without a Channel Entry Field”. The existing text said Channel Usage Element set to 3 and without a Channel Entry Field, but the proposal indicated that with or without, so the whole phrase can be removed.
       4. AdHoc notes: CID 6073 (MAC): MAC: 2023-12-07 19:23:11Z - status set to: More work required.  Bring back at Jan interim. Assign to Brian HART.
       5. More offline discussion will be needed.
       6. Assign to Brian HART
       7. Mark More Work Required
       8. Schedule for 2024 January Interim.
    2. CID 6074 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion from submission reviewed.
       3. Assign to Brian Hart
       4. Mark Submission Required.
    3. CID 6075 (MAC)
       1. Review the comment.
       2. Review the discussion in the submission.
       3. We had some Channel Usage subject we discussed this morning, but not this topic.
       4. This proposal is to clean up the usage for Channel Usage.
       5. Changing the channel of the P2P link is what is trying to be clarified.
       6. Potential CIDs that have similar or closely aligned topics CID 6016, 6017, 6198.
       7. Editor said that these are not overlapping while having a similar term.
       8. Proposed Resolution: CID 6075 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 19:36:04Z): Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1924-02-000m-channel-usage-cids.docx> for CID 6075.
       9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc 11-23/1777r3** - Henry PTASINSKI (More Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1777-03-000m-s1g-beacon-protection-text.docx>
     2. CID 6054 (MAC):
        1. Review comment history
        2. Discussion on changes being proposed.
        3. Discussion on the impact on legacy STAs.
        4. Correction of several capitalization issues.
        5. Figure 12-23a name and what is in the figure was questioned.
        6. AdHoc Notes: CID 6054 (MAC): MAC: 2023-12-07 19:46:51Z - status set to: More work required.  (Align the existing BIP (near Figure 12-23).)  Bring back at next telecon.
        7. More work required.
        8. Schedule for December 15th
  2. **Review doc 11-23/2079r0** Henry PTASINSKI (More Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2079-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cids-6092-6096.docx>
     2. CIDs 6092, 6093, 6094, 6095, 6096 (these are all ED2)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Concern with the proposed changes.
        3. Discussion on how equations are identified.
        4. See equation number would need to have a hotlink added as well.
        5. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 6092, 6093, 6094, 6095, 6096 (ED2): Incorporate the changes in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2079-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cids-6092-6096.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2079-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cids-6092-6096.docx)
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  3. **Recess at 3:07 EST**

1. **REVme AdHoc – Thursday Afternoon – 3:18 pm EST to 5pm EST**
   1. **Called to order** 3:18pm EST by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
      1. No Issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda 11-23/2149r2**:
      1. Reschedule CID 6041 to 2024 January Interim
      2. No other changes
      3. Continue with agenda.
   4. **Doc 11-23/2156r0** Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2156-00-000m-miscellaneous-gen-and-mac-comments.docx>
      2. CID 6140 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Changes from Commentor were to replace lower case letter with upper case letters.
         3. Changes in the resolution will be in reference to D4.0.
         4. Review proposed changes and discussion.
         5. Would like to have the Editors discuss this in the Editors meeting and include in the 802.11 style guide.
         6. It was noted that there is effort to get this added to the IEEE style guide also.
         7. Concern with the use of quotes, then the characters are text not hex decimals.
         8. Discussion on if the string is hex values or text values.
         9. URL having lower case and upper case does not matter.
         10. The first change requested has a sentence that says it is lower case immediately before it, so it should not change.
         11. It was noted that p2806 and p2808 changes are in TKIP and it is deprecated. We have not been willing to change any deprecated text in the past. Discussion on if this is minimal issue or if this is part of the hard stance to not change.
         12. Straw Poll
             1. Should we include the changes at p2806 and p2808 even though in TKIP Deprecated clause?
             2. Results: 1 yes, 4 No,
             3. Question on Not Including the changes:

No objection.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-12-07 20:26:46Z) Relative to D4.0 Change the hex values at the following locations from lower to upper case:

p. 2658, l. 12 - 0x1234567890abcdef

p. 2661, l. 46-47 – “the Service Information Response ANQP-element is “bfd39037d25c,” and the service hash used as input to compute the Bloom Filter Bit Array field is “0xbfd39037d25c.”.

p. 2911, l. 43, 49 – 0xdd

p. 2912, l. 50 – 0xdd

p. 3002, l. 61 – 0xdd

Note that this is making the changes proposed by the commenter with the exception of the locations that reference C code or test vector output.

Note to Editor: Please Request that the use of capitalized A-F be used for HEX digits.

* + - 1. There was at least one objection to the comment resolution. (Jouni MALINEN)
      2. We will make this as a separate motion.
    1. CIDs 6136, 6137, 6138, 6139 (MAC):
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion in the Submission.
       3. Discussion on correcting some editorial issues.
       4. Discussion on the ID field and the WUR Vendor Specific OUI Values.
       5. RAC Objects to use of ½ OUI being used in a field that seems to be called OUI…OUI1.
       6. Further changes were made to make the consistent definitions of which bits were used of the OUI or CID.
       7. Proposed Resolution: CID 6136 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-07 21:04:30Z):  
          Clarify the format of a WUR Vendor Specific frame format with the following changes:  
            
          In the last row of table 9-645 (1760.9) replace the first column, changing  
          “OUI1” to “WUR Vendor ID”  
            
          And replace the second column, changing  
          “The 12 LSBs of the OUI (see 9.4.1.29 (Organization Identifier field))"  
          to  
          “The identifier is a public unique identifier assigned by the IEEE Registration  
          Authority as a 24-bit OUI or a 24-bit CID (see [B15] and [B16]). The 12 LSBs of the identifier are carried in the ID field and the 12 MSBs are carried in the Type Dependent Control field.”   
            
          Update the description of the Type Dependent Control field for the WUR Vendor Specific frame to reference Table 9-645:  
          At 1765.1, replace   
          “The Type Dependent Control field is set to the 12 MSBs of the OUI (see 9.4.1.29 (Organization Identifier field))."  
          With  
          “The Type Dependent Control field is set to the 12 MSBs of the OUI or CID (see Table 9-645).”
       8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **GEN Discuss CIDs.** – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm).
     1. CID 6215 (GEN)
        1. Discussion on capitalization between hyphenated words. Upper case for both words between the hyphen for terms moving forward.
        2. The guidelines apply to future terms and amendments.
        3. This was discussed at the November 2023 plenary.
        4. Mark Submission required.
        5. Assign to commenter.
     2. CID 6151 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment
        2. Mark Submission required.
        3. Assign to commenter – Mark RISON
     3. CID 6716 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment.
        2. Submission required.
        3. Assign to commenter.

* + 1. CID 6259 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-12-07 21:52:44Z) at p340.58 change "received by an AP" to "received by an AP or PCP"
       3. ACTION ITEM #3: Need to also send this to the Reflector for confirmation of the change from SME experts on PCP.
    2. CID 6332 (GEN):
       1. Review comment
       2. Assign to Mark R.
       3. More work required.
       4. Schedule to Bring back in Jan.
       5. ACTION ITEM #4: Those with comments on this CID please email Mark R.
       6. AdHoc Notes: GEN: 2023-12-07 22:03:41Z - status set to: More work required - Schedule for January Interim - Input requested from Mark HAMILTON and Joseph LEVY
  1. **Recess at 5:05pm**

1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc Mixed Mode –Friday, December 8, 2023, at 09:00-12:00 EST.**
   1. **Called to order** 9:03pm EST 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. **AdHoc Attendance – Dec 7, 2023 – Attended at some point during the day**
      1. IMAT Reported**:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Ajami, Abdel Karim | Apple Inc. |
| 2 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 3 | Hart, Brian | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 4 | Hedayat, Ahmadreza | Apple Inc. |
| 5 | Huang, Po-Kai | Intel |
| 6 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple, Inc. |
| 7 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 8 | Liu, Yong | Apple, Inc. |
| 9 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 10 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 11 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 12 | Namvar, Nima | Charter Communications |
| 13 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 14 | Petrick, Albert | Jones-Petrick and Associates, LLC. |
| 15 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 16 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 17 | Yong, Su Khiong | Apple, Inc. |
| 18 | Zuniga, Juan Carlos | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 19 | \*Wu Kanke | Apple, Inc. |
| 20 | \*Singh, Aditi | Charter Communications |
| 21 | \*Thakur, Sid | Apple, Inc. |
| 22 | \*Emily Qi | Intel |
| 23 | \*Jiang, Jinjing | Apple, Inc. |
| 24 | \*Liu, Young | Apple, Inc. |

\*=Webex only - Not registered in IMAT

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
     1. No Issues noted.
  2. **Review Agenda 11-23/2149r2**:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2149-02-000m-revme-december-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx>
        1. No objection to the updated agenda.
  3. **Review doc 11-23/2136r1** Michael Montemurro (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2136-00-000m-sb-security-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 6240 and 6241 (SEC)
        1. Review comments
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 6240 and 6241 (SEC): REVISED. Incorporate the changes in 11-23/1745r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1745-01-000m-cr-for-cid-6020.docx>>.  
           Note to editor: This comment is resolved by the changes in the resolution to CID 6020.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 6606 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 6605 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 6605 (SEC): REVISED.

Make the changes proposed by the commenter.

Also update BIPN and WIPN  
  
At 2919.38 Change:  
“BIPN is the current BIGTK  
replay counter value provided by the BIGTK KDE"  
to  
“BIPN is the last BIPN, as  
provided by the BIGTK KDE"  
  
At 2919.40 Change  
“WIPN is the current WIGTK  
replay counter value provided by the WIGTK KDE"  
to  
“WIPN is the last WIPN, as  
provided by the WIGTK KDE".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. ACTION ITEM #5: Mike Montemurro to update the EAPOL Key Notation document (11-21/772) to incorporate the changes (in CID 6605 (SEC)) To incorporate the change to ""RSC is the last PN, as provided by the RSC field"

* + 1. CID 6386 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 6308 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 6301 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Review proposed changes.
       4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 6301 (SEC): REVISED. Make the changes proposed by the commenter but update the text into multiple paragraphs.  
  
Change   
“The RSNXE is present in the first message if any subfield of the Extended RSN Capabilities field in this element is nonzero, except the Field Length subfield; otherwise, not present. The RSNXE is present in the third message if an RSNXE is present in a Beacon or Probe  
Response frame that the FTO has received from the target AP and the FTO set to 1 any subfield, except the Field Length subfield, of the Extended RSN Capabilities field in this element, and is present in the fourth message if an RSNXE was present in the third message and the target AP set to 1 any subfield, except the Field Length subfield, of the Extended RSN Capabilities field in this element.  
To  
“The RSNXE is present in the first message if any subfield of the Extended RSN Capabilities field in this element is nonzero, except the Field Length subfield.   
  
The RSNXE is present in the third message if an RSNXE is present in a Beacon or Probe  
Response frame that the FTO has received from the target AP and the FTO set to 1 any subfield, except the Field Length subfield, of the Extended RSN Capabilities field in this element.  
  
The RSNXE is present in the fourth message if an RSNXE was present in the third message and the target AP set to 1 any subfield, except the Field Length subfield, of the Extended RSN Capabilities field in this element.  
  
Otherwise the RSNXE is not present.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 6571 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6571 (SEC): REJECTED.  
          The cited text could not be found in the cited clause or anywhere else in the  
          draft.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 6084 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Discussion on Listen Interval.
       4. There is a possible location at D4.0 p3054.58 that is the same issue.
       5. Proposed Resolution: CID 6084 (SEC): REVISED.

Make the changes in line with the Proposed Change noting that there is always a listen interval but it can be set to 0.  
  
At P2933.60 (group HS),  P2927.35 (4-way HS) and P3054.58 (Mesh Group key HS) replace   
"The retransmit timeout value shall be 100 ms for the first timeout, half the listen interval for the second timeout, and the listen interval for subsequent timeouts. If there is no listen interval or the listen interval is zero, then 100 ms shall be used for all timeout values."   
with   
"The retransmit timeout value should be 100 ms for the first timeout, half the listen interval for the second timeout, and the listen interval for subsequent timeouts. If the listen interval is zero, then 100 ms should be used for all timeout values."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 6170 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Discussion on the updated NOTES.
       4. Change “old band” to explicitly name 2.4 GHz and 5GHz band.
       5. Proposed Resolution: CID 6170 (SEC): REVISED.

The BSS configuration, other than the operating channel does not change as a result of channel switching procedures.  
  
At the end of clause 11.8.8.1 at 2945.51, insert the following note:  
“NOTE---Only the extended channel switching procedure allows switching to a different operating class, and hence switching to a different band.”  
  
At the end of clause 11.9.1 at 2503.54, insert the following note:  
“NOTE---The RSN configuration does not change across a channel switch.  This means, for example, that a switch from the 2.4 GHz or 5 GHz band to the 6 GHz band is only possible if the RSNE and RSNXE advertised in the 2.4 GHz or 5 GHz band is also valid in the 6 GHz band.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 6167 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Discussion on the choices of Accepted or Revised.
       4. Straw Poll:
          1. How do you prefer to resolve CID 6167 (SEC)?

A. Accepted

B. Revised

C. Abstain

* + - * 1. Results: 3/2/5
      1. Suggest trying Accepted resolution..
         1. One Objection to Accepted:
      2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
      3. One Objection – Mark Ready for Motion – Run as a Separate Motion

* + 1. CID 6166 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Remove “This means that” from the Note Change.
       4. Discussion on how negotiation of RSNE Fields – Replay counters.
       5. Discussion on the replay counter negotiation and how to know how many in which direction.
       6. The Initiator needs to state the number of replay counters, and then if the responder supports that number, that is ok, otherwise it should reject the connection.
       7. Suggestion on getting feedback from the Initiator is not practical.
       8. We may want to change the wording to not have “hope”, “might” or “expectation”.
       9. Support of having a resolution that covers the discussion items.
       10. Discussion on how to proceed – take the discussion to the reflector was requested.
       11. There is a message from the Responder to the Initiator, and we could add a status code to help in the information.
       12. Discussion on what a possible status code was available.
       13. STRAW POLL: CID 6166 (SEC): Straw poll on direction - do you prefer: A) 2) require both sides to support 8 RCs (per comment) or B) 1) number of RC specified by initiator is used by responder too; if responder not happy then abort handshake?
           1. 1/5/12 (A\B\No Response)
       14. Mark CID More work required.
       15. Assign to commenter.
       16. Bring back at Jan F2F.
    2. 6163 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 6150 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Similar topic to CID 6166 and bring back at the same time.
       3. Mark CID More work required.
       4. Assign to commenter.
       5. Bring back at Jan F2F.

* + 1. CID 6114 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6114 (SEC): REVISED.  At 2870.40, change  
          “but its Supplicant  
          also deletes the PTKSA when it roams from the old AP. The Supplicant also deletes  
          the PTKSA when it disassociates/deauthenticates from all BSSIDs in the ESS.”  
          To  
          “but its Supplicant  
          also deletes the PTKSA when it transitions from the old AP. The Supplicant also  
          deletes the PTKSA when it disassociates/deauthenticates from all BSSIDs in the  
          ESS (see 11.3.5).”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 6102 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on the line number location. Comment is on P2850.1
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 6101 and 6100 (SEC):
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review proposed change.
       3. This is on a section that is deprecated, so we should not change it.
       4. There is a discussion on when changes are made and when they are not.
       5. In this case, the reference should have been updated automatically.
       6. The numbering of the reference should be updated in this case as this was broken by adding some new clause and renumbering. (This was correct in 2020, we broke this in REVme changes).
       7. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 6101 and 6100 (SEC): REVISED.

At 2804.14 and 2800.45, change “(see 9.2.4.7 …” to “(see 9.2.4.8 …”

* + - 1. One Objection (Mark RISON) – Mark Ready for Motion – Separate Motion
    1. CID 6089 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. ACTION ITEM #6: Joseph LEVY to provide the updated VISO Figure 12-14.
       4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6089 (SEC): REVISED

Make the changes suggested by the commenter noting that the Figure to be changed is 12-14, not 12-4.  
Note to editor: Joe LEVY will supply an updated figure which includes the change.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 6266 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Discussion on the value of the text that was marked for deletion, but suggest making it into a note where “shall” is “does”.
       4. CID 1822 (August 2022) made changes to these paragraphs.
          1. CID 1822 Resolution:

REVISED (SEC: 2022-08-08 15:26:04Z) - At 3207.10, change

"The Authenticator should use the key replay counter to identify invalid messages to silently discard."

To be:

"The Authenticator shall use the key replay counter to identify invalid messages."

At 3207.13, change "should also" to "shall also"

At 3207.16, change "field should not be updated" to "field shall not be updated"

At 3207.17, change

"In other words, the Supplicant never updates" to

"In other words, the Supplicant shall not update"

* + - 1. Discussion on what the requirements are being created and we are not suggesting removing the requirements, but not restating them with multiple shalls.
      2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6266 (SEC): REVISED: At 2910, replace:  
         “In other words, the Supplicant (#1822)shall not update the Key Replay Counter field for message 1 in the 4-way handshake, as it includes no MIC. This implies the Supplicant needs to allow for retransmission of message 1 when checking for the key replay counter of message 3.”  
         With  
         “NOTE -- In other words, the Supplicant does not update its local Key Replay Counter field for message 1 in the 4-way handshake, as it includes no MIC. This implies the Supplicant needs to allow for retransmission of message 1 when checking for the key replay counter of message 3.”
      3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review SEC CIDS – Silent Discard** – Michael Montemurro
     1. CID 6110 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on of the list includes the introductory “Shall” is sufficient or not.
        3. The enumerated list could have the starting “shall” and then sprinkle “shall” to the list entries.
        4. Discussion on having every sentence that needs a shall get it added.
        5. More work will be needed on these listed items.
        6. These CIDs 6110, 6113, 6112, 6109, 6111, 6108 are all similar.
        7. Discussion on the work that may need to be done to distribute the shalls would be a substantial amount of work. We could review each CID explicitly, or we can work offline. Another alternative would be just to accept them for now, and review later.
        8. If the changes are to be made, we should remember the purpose of the “shall:”
        9. After debate, it was determined to just accept the 6 CIDs.
        10. Proposed resolution: CIDs 6110, 6113, 6112, 6109, 6111, 6108: Accepted.
        11. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc 11-23/1856r1** – Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1856-04-000m-assortment-of-sa-ballot-comment.docx>
     2. CID 6085 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment and history of discussion.
        2. Discussion on the previous proposed resolution:
           1. REJECTED (SEC: 2023-11-15 00:34:46Z) - The CRC considered the privacy protection mechanism for SAE password identifiers in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1236-03-000m-hpke-protected-sae-password-identifiers-for-privacy.docx. The CRC reviewed the proposal and did not agree to apply changes to the draft. The following straw poll was run to establish consensus on the proposal:Do you support the direction indicated in 11-23/1236r3? A.Yes 10/54 ( 19%) B.No 28/54 ( 52%) C.Abstain 6/54 (11%) No Answer 10/54 (19%)Proposals on privacy protection mechanisms for SAE password identifiers have been considered by the IEEE 802.11 working group letter ballots in CIDs 5006 and 4072 and the group could not establish consensus on updates to the REVme draft.
        3. Discussion on the topic has returned a few times.
        4. Some would like to Accept the comment.
        5. A Motion to reject could be prepared as a separate motion.
        6. One objection (Jon ROSDAHL) – Leave Marked as Ready for Motion
     3. CID 6086 (SEC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion and history of the CID discussion.
        3. Discussion on the use of DS and the SSID, and what is different in a LAN vs WAN.
        4. Discussion on how Multi BSSID mechanism is used, and beacon production was generated.
        5. Discussion on the impact to legacy devices.
        6. Discussion on the long period of time since the WPA2->WPA3, so is adding at this late stage appropriate.
        7. More work needs to be done on Multi-BSSIDs.
        8. Proposed resolution: CID 6086 (SEC): Insufficient details. (AdHoc Chair to provide exact text in database).
           1. ***Post Meeting resolution included:*** “REJECTED (SEC: 2023-12-11 18:30:24Z) The commenter provides insufficient detail to determine changes would satisfy the comment.”
        9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 6087 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review document 11-23/1857r0
           1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1857-00-000m-rsn-overriding.docx>
           2. Recommend a review of the document offline.
           3. Would like feedback on the document.
     5. Out of time, reschedule this set of documents and OWE for December 15 or the 2024 January Interim.
  3. **Recess at 12:00pm EST**

1. **REVme AdHoc – Dec 8, 2023, Friday Afternoon – 1pm EST to 3:30pm EST**
   1. **Called to order** 1:02pm EST by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
      1. No Issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda 11-23/2149r2**:
      1. Add GEN AdHoc Discuss CIDs just before MAC AdHoc Review CIDs.
      2. No objections to continue following the agenda.
   4. **Review doc 11-23/2154r0** Gaurav Patwardhan (HPE)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2154-00-000m-lci-in-beacon-and-probe-response.pptx>
      2. No CID
      3. Abstract: This document presents a proposal to include Location Configuration Information (LCI) data in a standard information element (IE) that can be broadcast in Beacons and included in Probe Responses. Background and purpose of the proposal is provided.
      4. Review Submission.
      5. Discussion on why the original feature was determined, and question why making the changes would be worth it.
      6. Discussion on questions about the submission.
   5. **Review doc 11-23/2146r0** - Po-Kai HUANG (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2146-00-000m-pmksa-from-pasn-for-pmksa-caching.docx>
      2. No CID
      3. Abstract: This submission proposes texts for PMKSA from PASN for PMKSA caching on P802.11-REVme D4.1
      4. Review Submission
      5. Discussion on how to reuse the AKM.
      6. Discussion on the use of AKM in general.
      7. The Key point is to suggest a way to simplify the AKMP usage.
      8. Discussion on the tunneling of the packets.
      9. Plan to prepare a motion for Dec 15th for Motion.
      10. The Next version of the Draft 4.2 would include TGbb and TGbd.
      11. The Motions approved in November and December would also be in D4.2
   6. **GEN Discuss CIDS** – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      1. CID 6580 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Suggested direction, add "infrastructure" in places where this is known to be the concept, and thus we might not get them all, but we won't break anything.
         3. If we try to touch this, we're going to make the (already messy) Spec even more messy, and we'll start encouraging people to make more mess going forward.
         4. Assign to Mark Hamilton
         5. Mark CID More work required.
         6. Schedule to Bring back in Jan F2F.
      2. CID 6174 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2023-12-08 18:58:53Z) - After the definition of SSID (D4.0 p192.62) add "NOTE---All BSSs in an ESS have the same SSID (see 4.3.5.2), but two BSSs with the same SSID might not be in the same ESS."
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 6608 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on use of the cited reference.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 6608 (GEN) REJECTED (GEN: 2023-12-08 19:06:08Z) The Citation is used in Clause 9, and it is recommending a format and content of a field, so the TG determined it was better to leave it as is.
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   7. **MAC Review CIDs – Mark HAMILTON**
      1. CID 6059 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Line 25 and 32 on 953 have the same issue.
         3. Everything in this clause should be in present text and should be "is equal to".
         4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED.
         5. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion.
      2. CID 6060 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. The text was not modified with the other location comments considered yesterday.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 6060 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-08 19:27:07Z): Change the text to "Relative to the point indicated by the Location Reference field: a positive X-axis value corresponds to an easterly direction, a negative X-axis value corresponds to a westerly direction, a positive Y-axis value corresponds to a northerly direction, a negative Y-axis value corresponds to a southerly direction, a positive Z-axis value corresponds to an upward direction, and a negative Z-axis value corresponds to a downward direction."
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 6588 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on how to determine if the field is present or not.
         3. Unsure if the length of the field is 0 if that means present or not.
         4. Proposed Resolution: Reject – Non-Consensus reason.
            1. ***Post Meeting Resolution added:*** REJECTED (MAC: 2023-12-08 19:36:02Z): The comment does not provide sufficient detail to determine changes that would satisfy the commenter.
         5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      4. CID 6183 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6183 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-08 19:38:40Z): Delete "either" and "or PSK" from the cited sentence.
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 6388 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on the name of the column.
       3. OCI row may need to have the sub-element ID name put in.
       4. Discussion on the names in the column.
       5. Proposed Resolution: CID 6388 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-08 19:41:31Z): Change the column header to "Sublement Name".  Change the contents of the right column for rows: 1 to "R1KH-ID"; 3 to "R0KH-ID"; and 5 to "OCI".
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 6142 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Context at 9.4.2.101.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 6064 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review context on p1791.
       3. It is just 10% extra time being added.
       4. Review context for alternative wording to help realign the slot boundaries.
       5. Changing 10% to 0.1 does not seem to be a meaningful presentation.
       6. Change to “As soon as possible after aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% x (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime)”
       7. Change “As soon as possible after” to “Immediately after”
       8. SIFs has a tolerance as well. D4.0 P1783
       9. Proposed Resolution: CID 6064 MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-08 20:01:14Z): At the cited location, change to "Immediately after aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime)", and at P2110L26 replace "At aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime) interval"  with "Between aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime  and aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime) interval (see 10.3.2.3.3)".
       10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 6184 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context p1796.9
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 6097 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context 2001.59
       3. See Context of table 9-71.
       4. Chang to “to locate the MME, MIC element or Authenticated Mesh Peering Exchange element"
       5. Or we could reject the CID, or maybe have it withdrawn.
  1. **Ran out of time**.
  2. **Editor Requested Time** – Discussion of Roll-in of TGbc – Emily QI (Intel)
     1. Thanks for getting source files.
     2. We got the work in Progress version, there are over 100 Comments outstanding.
     3. we are still waiting for final version.
     4. We do not know when the final review will be completed.
     5. Emily will work with Robert to try to expedite the process.
  3. **Adjourned 3:30pm EST**

**References:**