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Abstract

**FEBRUARY 18-19-20 Adhoc Session held at**

**SR Technologies  
1613 NW 136th Ave, Bldg C  
Sunrise, Florida, 33323**

Thanks to Graham Smith for Hosting our AdHoc Session

**IEEE 802.11md -REVmd CRC AdHoc in Sunrise Florida Feb 18-20, 2020 9am to 5pm**

1. **REVmd CRC Tuesday 2020-02-18 9:00 – 11:30 pm** 
   1. **Called to order** by the TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (Intel) at 9:05am
   2. **Attendance**:
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry) (arrived 11:20am)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
         3. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Review Participation policy**
   5. **Review Agenda** 11-20/234r6
      1. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-06-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-06-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx)
      2. FEBRUARY 18-19-20 Agenda
2. Tuesday February 18, AM1 9:00 am-11:30 am Eastern
   1. Edward AU - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx>
   2. Mark RISON CIDs – 1 hour
3. Tuesday February 18, PM1 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
   1. Emily QI - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-02-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc> and
   2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0281-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-d3-0-public-review-comment.doc>
   3. Mark HAMILTON - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-00-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
4. Tuesday February 18, PM2 3:30-5:30pm
   1. Graham SMITH - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-01-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx>
   2. Michael MONTEMURRO - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2024-02-000m-mac-address-change.docx>
   3. Mark HAMILTON - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-00-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
5. Wednesday February 19, AM1 9:00 am-11:30 am Eastern
   1. Jouni MALINEN - https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-00-000m-rsnxe-interoperability-issue.docx
   2. Nehru BHANDARU - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246>
   3. Mark Rison CIDs – 1 hour
6. Wednesday February 19, PM1 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
   1. Mark HAMILTON - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-00-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
   2. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs
7. Wednesday February 19, PM2 3:30-5:30pm
   1. Roger MARKS - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0245-00-000m-corrections-to-epd-and-lpd-terminology.docx>
   2. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs
8. Thursday February 20, AM1 9:00 am-11:30 am Eastern
   1. Edward AU - https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0235-02-000m-resolution-for-cmmg-related-comments.docx and
   2. https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0270-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0-part-ii.docx
   3. Mark RISON CIDs – 1 hour
9. Thursday February 20, PM1 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
   1. Motions
   2. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs
10. Thursday February 20, PM2 3:30-5:30pm
    1. Comment resolution topics TBD
       1. Add Emily to Wednesday 3:30-5:30pm
       2. Add Mark HAMILTON to Thursday
       3. Approved Agenda is in 11-20/234r7
          1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-07-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
       4. Agenda approved with no objection –
    2. **Review doc 11-19/2163r9** Edward AU (Huawei)
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx>
       2. CID 4111 (EDITOR2)
          1. Review comment
          2. Review discussion
          3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected.

“The name of the field is “DMG AP Or PCP Capability Information” as shown in Figure 9-549 of Draft 3.0, instead of “DMG AP or PCP Capability Information” as suggested by the commenter.”

* + - 1. There is an “Or” that cause some concern.
         1. Do we want to have small “o” or capitalized “O”?
      2. No objection to the Resolution – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4219 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Discussion on changing “Ceil” vs brackets.
       4. For 1457l.55 discussion on “Ceil(m/8)” as it is in a sentence then leave it.
       5. For 2530.43, discussion on the formula use.
       6. After more discussion, we decided to have Ceil for the 2 parmeter form, and the bracket for the single parameter form.
       7. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Revised; Change “Ceil” to the ceiling glyphs at 1457.55 and 2530.43.

Note to the commenter: The two-parameter form cannot be represented by the glyphs.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4428 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised Incorporate the changes in 11-19/2163r10 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx>> which makes the changes in the direction suggested by the commenter.
       4. No objection - Mark Ready for motion
    2. CID 4517 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. D3.0 – p2604 and p2605 have the instances of “SC”
       4. Discussion of the options suggested.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. “SC” is a local variable used in clause 12.5.3.3.3 and J.11.1 of Draft 3.0.
       6. Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 4073 and 4074 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comments
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution for CID 4073 and CID 4074: Revised.

At 2059.63, replace “to the following PPDU transmitted to the initiator in the same allocation, with an MCS index greater than 0” with “to the next PPDU that is transmitted to the initiator in the same allocation and that employs an MCS index greater than 0”.

At 2060.1 and 2064.25, replace “the following PPDU from the responder to the initiator” with “that PPDU”.

At 2064.24, replace “the following PPDU” with “the next PPDU”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4627 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. What is RCPI?
       4. Discussion of RXVECTOR fields and it does not contain RCPI.
       5. 15.2.3.6 should probably be moved to after the definitions of RXVECTOR.
       6. We used to pass out the RXVECTOR that had RCPI that was sent out in the RXEND.
       7. CID 2560 changed the title and left some of these changes.
          1. CID 2560 (EDITOR) introduced the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1321-04-000m-resolutions-to-cids-2559-and-2560.docx> . Those changes created this situation.
       8. We may want to move it to match the newer PHYs.
       9. Proposed Resolution: Revised:

At 3509.45 in subclause 25.3.13, change “Received RCPI parameter” to “RCPI”.

At 2871.16 in subclause 15.2.3.6, change “RCPI parameter” to “RCPI”.

At 2927.54 in subclause 17.2.3.6, change “RCPI parameter” to “RCPI”.

At 2960.10 in subclause 17.3.10.7, change “RCPI indicator” to “RCPI”.

At 2922.25 in subclause 16.3.8.6, change “RCPI indicator” to “RCPI”.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4643 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change the title of Table 10-30 to “Beam tracking time limit determination” as suggested by the commenter.

At 2061.54, change “The setting of the beam tracking time limit is according to Table 10-30 (Beam Tracking Time Limit negotiation(#2066))” to “The beam tracking time limit is determined according to Table 10-30 (Beam tracking time limit determination)”.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4372 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised

At 1391.10, replace “GrpIDs” with “Group IDs”.

At 1391.38, replace “The Number of Groups field indicates the number of GrpID subfields in the GrpIDs field following this field.” with “The Number of Groups field indicates the number of Group ID subfields in the Group IDs field following this field.”.

At 1391.42, replace “Each GrpID subfield is 6 bits” with “Each Group ID subfield is 6 bits”.

At 1391.53, replace “it indicates the grpID allocated to that STA to be used” with “it indicates the group ID allocated to that STA to be used”.

At 1391.57, replace “By default all the STAs that support group sectorization consider themselves in grpID 0 unless is specified otherwise via the Association Response frame” with “By default all the STAs that support group sectorization consider themselves in group ID 0 unless is specified otherwise via the Association Response frame”.

At 1391.61, replace “STAs receive a nonzero grpID” with “STAs receive a nonzero group ID”.

At 1392.7, replace “The grpID that identifies” with “The group ID that identifies”.

At 1392.17, replace “have the grpID listed in the S1G Sector Operation element” with “have the group ID listed in the S1G Sector Operation element”.

At 2107.61, replace “whose group ID (grpID) is contained in the list of group IDs” with “whose group ID ~~(grpID)~~ is contained in the list of group IDs”.

At 2107.63, replace “all STAs have grpID 0 unless otherwise specified at the association” with “all STAs have group ID 0 unless otherwise specified at the association”.

At 2107.65, replace “support group sectorization belong to grpID 0 before association” with “support group sectorization belong to group ID 0 before association”.

At 2108.1, replace “STAs receive a nonzero grpID” with “STAs receive a nonzero group ID”.

Note to the commenter: The resolution is Revised rather than Accepted because there are only 12 appearances of “GrpID” or “grpID” to replace. For the remaining one, it is at 2107.61 to delete “(grpID)”.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4328 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review examples in discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; In 2464.25 of Draft 3.0, replace “Re-beamforming” with “Rebeamforming”.

In 2635.24 of Draft 3.0, replace “pre-authentication” with “preauthentication”.

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4015 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Note that the proposed change has a plural that is not needed.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change "Procedure" to "ASEL frame exchange procedure"
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4016 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. When we use the phrase “Frame exchange sequence” then referring to Annex G would be appropriate, but in this case, we have a distinct frame sequence that does not have a need to be referred to Annex G as it is not defined there.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Use of the phrase "frame exchange sequence" need the reference to Annex G, to help specify the term. However, every frame exchange sequence that gets mentioned in body text does need this reference to Annex G, to be understood. See D3.0 p788.49 for an example of the useful, existing occurrence.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. Draft 10 will be posted shortly. There is time later this week to complete the review of CIDs in this document that remain.
  1. **Review CIDs assigned to Mark RISON** (Samsung)
     1. CID 4194 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. See reference D3.0 - p802.53
        3. General agreement in the direction.
        4. Mark as accepted and need to check with DMG experts.
        5. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-02-18 15:40:55Z). To be double-checked with Carlos and Claudio, just to be sure.
        6. Mark Ready for motion –
           1. ACTION ITEM: Emily QI - To be double-checked with Carlos and Claudio, just to be sure.
     2. CID 4205 and 4206 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on if Table 9-151 row 3 and 5 need to be distict to avoid ambiguity of overlap
        3. Row 5 could possibly be fixed with “Non-FT Authentication…”
        4. A Submission will be needed.
     3. CID 4212 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion of proposed change
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 4212 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-02-18 15:49:08Z)
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 4213 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-02-18 15:50:59Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CIDs 4217 and 4218 (MAC):
        1. Assign to Edward AU
     6. CID 4229 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Two different spelling styles in the cited sentence.
        3. Class 3 devices have to support all the mandatory rates.
        4. We may want to refer this CID to Sean COFFEY
        5. ACTION ITEM: Mark HAMILTON to contact Sean.
        6. Assign CID 4229 to Sean COFFEY.
     7. CID 4245 (MAC)
        1. Review history of discussion by Mark R. and Kaz.
        2. A resolution needs to be prepared.
     8. CID 4250 (MAC)
        1. Assign to Edward AU
     9. CID 4259 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on the definition of QoS Data – see Table 9-1 (p786.1)
        3. See p846.44 for an example of QoS Data Frames being all the subfields.
        4. Discussion on if QoS Data has all subtypes or if we need to identify the difference where explicit QoS Data types are needed to be different.
        5. There is a specific Frame QoS Data (1000) and the generic QoS Data (set of frames) that all are to be included.
        6. This will need a submission to clarify the usages.
     10. CID 4267 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Text at p801.25 has a sentence that is duplicative with Table 9-10.
         3. Discussion on if the sentence should be in clause 9.
         4. Proposed resolution: CID 4267 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-02-18 16:19:33Z)
         5. No objection Mark ready for Motion
     11. CID 4269 (MAC)
         1. It is assigned to Alfred.
     12. CID 4283 (MAC)
         1. It is assigned to Chris HANSEN
     13. CID 4284 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. We may want to have DMG folks look into this.
         3. We will need a submission to resolve this other than rejected.
         4. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON – Contact Claudio and Carlos about this CID.
     14. CID 4287 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Discussion of the cited location values.
         3. This could be rewritten to be clearer.
         4. Discussion on what the sentence could be written.
         5. The issue is that “for at least one n” is not necessary, and “the Set has a maximum range ..”. discussion on if Maximum is needed.
         6. One alternative “The size of the set is 2^n, for a selected n, 1 <= n <= 46.”
         7. Another alternative “The size of the set is 2^n for a selected n, where 1< n<46”
         8. We should include a statement of how “n” is selected.
         9. Discussion of if range or size is better to describe the set parameters.
         10. Discussion on if the criteria is conflicting. It was argued both ways.
         11. Proposed resolution: CID 4287 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-02-18 16:41:52Z): Replace "The set has a maximum range of 2n for at least one n, where 1 ≤ n ≤ 46." with "The size of the set is 2^n, for a selected value of n, 1 <= n <= 46."
         12. Mark Ready for Motion.
  2. Time check – we are at lunch
  3. When we come back, we will start with Emily QI, .
  4. Recess until 1pm ET.

1. **REVmd CRC Tuesday 2020-02-18 1:00 – 3:00pm** 
   1. **Called to Order** by the TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 1:08pm
   2. **Attendance**:
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY
         2. Jon ROSDAHL
         3. Joseph Levy
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Reminder of Patent Policy**
      1. No issues noted.
   4. **Continue from this morning’s proposed Agenda**
   5. **Review doc 11-20/0281r0** Emily QI (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0281-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-d3-0-public-review-comment.doc>
      2. Public Review Comments
         1. Review comment
         2. Review authoritative source for abbreviations
         3. Therefore, the unit symbol "b/s" is correctly used in D3.0.
         4. One instance of using “bits/second” was found.
         5. 6 instances of using “bit/s” were found.
         6. Those instances should be changed to “b/s”.
      3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. According to IEEE std 260.1 (Table 3), “b/s” is correct.

Changes are based on D3.0.

At 4145.23, 4145.33, 4145.44, 4145.54, 4145.64, and 4146.8: Change “kbit/s” to “kb/s”.

At 4612.55, change “bits/second” to “b/s”.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion –
      2. Dorothy has to respond specially to the Public Review process.
  1. **Review doc 11-20-0141r3** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-03-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc>
     2. Trivial Editorial comments, arising from other CID resolutions, but not directly on any CID.
     3. Item D3.1-1:
        1. Related to CID 4461
        2. Look at “peer-to-peer link” to change to “peer-to-peer link event report”.
        3. Discussion on possible change “the” to “this:’
        4. Edward will move to EDITOR2 CID that is similar to CID 4461. The proposed change was to be additional to that change.
        5. Need to make a motion to approve the change indicated.
        6. There is a concern that the article “the” should be changed to “This”.
        7. So to make this a complete solution, the articles for the changes should be included.
        8. CID 4461 was already done. This can't be added, easily.

Will wordsmith off-line (especially the article "the" versus "this), and bring back as a standalone change.

* + 1. Item D3.1-2:
       1. Related to CID 4595
       2. Additional items found that were not in scope of CID 4595 for other figures.
       3. MDR should catch these.
       4. Editor found that there were 29 in D3.1 that need to be fixed.
       5. Review proposed changes
       6. Propose to have a motion to approve this change.
       7. Dorothy will prepare a motion.
    2. Item D3.1-3:
       1. Related to CID 4140
       2. Need to update the resolution to CID 4140
       3. Proposed Updated Resolution: Revised: Change the status of CID 4140 to “Revised”.

At 1710.33 (D3.1), change

“This field is (#4140)used when the NDP BlockAck is used

during a BlockAck session and is defined in 10.3.2.12 (Fragment BA procedure(11ah)) when it is used

during a fragment BA session.” to

"This field is defined in 10.25.6.5 (Generation and transmission of BlockAck frames by an HT STA, DMG STA, or S1G STA(11ah)) when the NDP BlockAck is used during a BlockAck session and is defined in 10.3.2.12 (Fragment BA procedure(11ah)) when it is used during a fragment BA session."

* + - 1. A Separate motion will be prepared
    1. CID 4499 (EDITOR):
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. IEEE Editor completed MEC with TGmd draft 2.1. There is no issue with the term “Master”.
       3. No objection - Mark Ready for motion
    2. CID 4801 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accept; Note to Editor: Remove 9.9 and insert the contents of 9.9 after 23.3.11 as a new clause 23.3.12.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 4800 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review definitions of “collocated” and “collocated”.
       3. Note that the Collocated usage was not looking to be changed.
       4. Discussion on choosing a single choice of the spelling. The use of single “l” is for collocated BSSIDs and the “ll” is for interference type issue.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Change “co-located” to “colocated”, 13 instances.

Change “Co-Located” to “Colocated”, 22 instances.

Change “Co-located” to “Colocated”, 1 instance.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4691 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed changes
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Throughout the draft, change

“Reporting subelement data field format” to

“Reporting subelement Data field format”

4 instances.

Throughout the draft, change

“Reporting data field format” to

“Reporting subelement Data field format”.

12 instances including the reference locations.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4689 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Discussion on the element vs sub-element
       4. Proposed resolution: Rejected.

In 9.4.3, subelements are within an element. In 9.6.7.37 and 9.6.7.38, subelements are within a field. Therefore, cannot change t o refer to 9.4.3 in 9.6.7.37 and 9.6.7.38.

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4679 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The description of Address fields in 9.3.3 are needed as they are specific to Management frames.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4661 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed change to remove “section”
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

9.4.2.47, at 1166.47, change

“section 9.4.2.236 (OCI element(M58)(#2328)).” To

“9.4.2.236 (OCI element(M58)(#2328)).

In 9.6.13.19, at 1609.5, change

“section 9.4.2.236 (OCI element(M58)(#2328)).” To

“9.4.2.236 (OCI element(M58)(#2328)).”

In 12.4.2, at 2563.15, change

“sections 12.4.4.2.2 (Generation of the password element with ECC groups by looping(M137))” to

“12.4.4.2.2 (Generation of the password element with ECC groups by looping(M137))”

In 12.7.1.6.5, at 2657.49, delete “section”.

In 12.7.2, at 2663.14, 2666.48, 2667.39, delete “section”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready For Motoin
    1. CID 4625 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Note that the comment number should be 4625 (not 4615).
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4608 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 162.45, change

“group addressed: A group addressed medium access control (MAC) service data unit (MSDU) is an MSDU that has a group address as its destination address (DA). A group addressed MAC protocol data unit (MPDU) is an MPDU that has a group address in its Address 1 field. Syn: multicast.”

To

“group addressed: When applied to a medium access control (MAC) service data unit (MSDU), it is an MSDU with a group address as the destination address (DA). When applied to a MAC protocol data unit (MPDU), it is an MPDU with a group address in the Address 1 field. Syn: multicast. “

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 4597 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. Reason: the note is not necessary as the Relay Capability element (whole subclause) is for the STA participating in relay operation to advertise its capabilities. The A/C Power subfield is a subfield of Relay Capability Information field. Obviously, an implementation can use this data for relay operation decisions.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4591 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Discussion on the use of “UTF-8” vs “UTF-8 encoding”.
       4. The octets sent over the air indicating the SSID are not encoded bits, but UTF-8
       5. Discussion on use of String vs encoded code points
       6. Discussion on if we change 4 locations UTF-8 strings to UTF-8 encoded.”
       7. See 1480.46 – change “UTF-8 Character String” to “UTF-8 encoded code points”
       8. See 1490.6 – “change “UTF-8 formatted string” to “UTF-8 encoded code points”.
       9. See 1489.1 -Change “UTF-8 formatted field” to “field containing a UTF-8 encoded code points.”
       10. Other locations were identified for change to make the UTF-8 encoding consistent.
       11. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 1217.8:

Change “The Certificate ID field contains an UTF-8 string indicating” to “The Certificate ID field contains a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points indicating”

At 2577.29

Change “If a password identifier is used in generation of the password element (PWE) the Password identifier element shall be present and the identifier shall be encoded as a UTF-8 string in the Identifier portion of the element (see 9.4.2.216 (Password Identifier element.”

To “If a password identifier is used in generation of the password element (PWE) the Password identifier element shall be present and the identifier shall be a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points in the Identifier portion of the element (see 9.4.2.216 (Password Identifier element. “

At 4103.25:

Change “This variable is a UTF-8 string that an implementation uses to uniquely”

To “This variable is a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points that an implementation uses to uniquely”

At 1480.46:

Change “It is a UTF-8 encoded character string that” To “it is a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points that”

At1490.6

Change “This is a UTF-8 formatted string.” To “This is a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points.”

At1489.1

Change “a variable length UTF-8 formatted field” to “a variable length field containing a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points”

At1475.35

Change “The Venue Name field is a variable length(#183) UTF-8 encoded field containing the venue’s name.”

To “The Venue Name field is a variable length field containing a sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points.”

At1476.22

Change “The Emergency Call Number field is a variable length(#183) UTF-8 encoded field containing information, used to reach emergency services,”

To “The Emergency Call Number field is a variable length sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points containing information, used to reach emergency services,”

At1486.19

Change “The Emergency NAI Information field is a variable length(#183) field encoded using UTF-8”

To “The Emergency NAI Information field is a variable length(#183) sequence of UTF-8 encoded code points”;

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Recess 3:15pm** (will return 3:30pm)

1. **REVmd CRC Tuesday 2020-02-18 3:30 – 5:30pm** 
   1. **Called to Order** by the TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE) at 3:32pm
   2. **Attendance**:
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Joseph LEY (Interdigital)
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
         8. Nicolas HURTADO (Lennar Corporation)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Reminder of Patent Policy** and participation Policies
      1. No issues noted
   4. Continue from this morning’s proposed Agenda
   5. **Review doc 11-20/0272r4** – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-03-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx>
      2. CID 4177 (PHY)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review proposed changes
         3. There are some extra locations from the original comment and in R2, so this is the additional changes to add “frame”
         4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-18 20:43:59Z) - Incorporate the changes for CID 4177 in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-04-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx which resolve the comment in the direction proposed by the commenter.
         5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 4189 (PHY)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review proposed changes.
         3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-18 20:51:13Z) - Incorporate the changes for CID 4189 in document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-04-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx which resolve the comment in the direction proposed by the commenter.
         4. Mark Ready for Motion
      4. CID 4325 (PHY)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review proposed changes.
         3. Discussion on AC Parameters – what are they? Local variables? AP or non-AP STA side?
         4. Discussion of if the AC parameter fields or the full set of EDCA Parameter fields are needed to be watched.
         5. Discussion on the EDCA Parameter Set vs AC Parameter Set.
         6. Maybe more time is needed to look at this some more.
         7. EDCA parameters used by the AP and what is sent to the non-AP STA was debated.
      5. CID 4436 (PHY)
         1. Still working on this one.
      6. CID 4438 and 4439 (PHY)
         1. Work is ongoing. Menzo and Graham are still working on it.
      7. CID 4445 (PHY)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Short discussion occurred.
      8. At time move to next topic
   6. **Review Doc 11-20/336r0** - Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0336-00-000m-mac-privacy-and-pmksa-caching.pptx>
         1. CID 4040 (PHY)
         2. Previous LB CID 2689 was making a similar request, and was rejected (withdrawn), until a solution could be worked off-line.
         3. High Level Solution Description: (slide 3)

* The model for association is as follows:
* Device associates to a BSS with a random MAC address and generates a SA
* As part of the security association, a PMKID is generated.
* Device disassociates from network
* Device changes MAC address to new random address.
* Device attempts to associate to BSS with cached PMK the PMKID.
* AP recognizes the PMKID and STA establishes a new SA (and generates a new PMKID)
* Note that any network state associated with the old MAC address would be lost.
  + - 1. Review the requirements (Slide 4)
      2. Review proposed solution (slide 5)
      3. Review PMKID Derivation options (Slide 7)
         1. Looking for more feedback
      4. Concern that this may need to have a draft available sooner than later.
      5. Concern that this is currently a high-risk activity that may need to be pushed to another amendment (TGbe or an RCM).
  1. **Review doc 11-29-141r4** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-04-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc>
     2. CID 4589 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected.
        3. Reason: “Extended Capabilities” was introduced in IEEE802.11-2007. It was used since then. It is a well-known word and should not be renamed.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 4509 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 4482 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the removal of “Element” in the table or not.
        3. Discussion on the format of the table and information.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Revised: At 1511.62, 1511.64, and 1512.3 delete “Element”.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 4474 (EDITOR)
        1. Review comment
        2. There are 8 instances. 5 are adjective or adverb. 3 locations need to be changed as listed by the commenter.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 4467 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion and proposed changes.
        3. Discussion on examples
        4. When used as adjective, the “robust management frames… should be lower case.
        5. Discussion on if “robust” is needed or not.
        6. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 2328.50:

Change “Group addressed robust management frame procedures” to “Group addressed management frame protection procedures”

At 3839.56, change

“robust management frames protection.” To

“management frame protection. “

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4435 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review the proposed changes
       3. There is also CID 4319 (EDITOR2)
       4. Better to solve both CIDs together.
       5. Look to resolve this CID and then if we do, it may be used for the other CID.
       6. Discussion on need to add ““All of the numeric fields are transmitted in unsigned binary format, LSB first.”.
       7. Discussion on the possible sentence.
       8. Discussion on LSB vs least significant bit.
       9. Proposed Resolution: CID 4435 (EDITOR) and CID 4319 (EDITOR2):

Revised.

Delete cited sentences in the cited locations in the comment.

At the end of each of following subclauses:

19.3.9.4.1 Introduction (in 19.3.9.4 HT portion of HT-mixed format preamble)

20.3.6.1 General (in 20.3.6 Common preamble)

21.3.8.3.1 Introduction (in 21.3.8.3 VHT portion of VHT format preamble)

23.3.8.1 Introduction (in 23.3.8 S1G preamble)

24.3.6.1 General (in 24.3.6 Common preamble)

25.3.9.1 General (in 25.3.9 CMMG SIG)

add a paragraph:

“All numeric fields are transmitted in unsigned format, LSB first.”

At 3016.14, replace “NOTE 2” with “NOTE”.

* 1. Review agenda for tomorrow
     1. Change Roger Marks Comments from PM2 to PM1 Wednesday.
     2. Remove GEN from PM1
     3. Continue with Emily PM2:
  2. Recess at 5:47 pm

1. **REVmd CRC Wednesday 2020-02-19 9:00-11:30am** 
   1. **Called to order** at 9:04am by TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Attendance:**
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Joseph LEY (Interdigital)
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
         3. Nehru BHANDARU (Broadcom)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Review Agenda 11-234r8**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-08-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
      2. **Wednesday February 19, AM1 9:00 am-11:30 am Eastern**
      3. Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm) - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-00-000m-rsnxe-interoperability-issue.docx>
      4. Nehru BHANDARU (Broadcom) - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246>
      5. Mark Rison CIDs – 1 hour
      6. No changes. Approve R8 without objection.
   5. **Review doc 11-20/332r1** – Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-01-000m-rsnxe-interoperability-issue.docx>
      2. Abstract:

This document discusses an interoperability issue with the way RSNXE was added in P802.11-REVmd. This results in FT protocol failing to succeed between an IEEE Std 802.11-2016 based STA and an IEEE P802.11-REVmd/D3.0 based STA. A way to work around this in a backwards compatible manner is also proposed.

R1: fix additional issues with missing RSNXE edits in 13.4.2 and other editorial errors in that subclause

* + 1. Review submission discussion.
    2. Discussion on why we do not protect the full frame.
    3. Review Proposed changes.
       1. Discussion on how to determine 3rd or 4th message. (9.3.3.7 and 9.3.3.8)
       2. Changes are consistent with Table 13-1 (Clause 13).
       3. Current testing has not identified any issues to date.
       4. Clarify that RSNXE containing the FTE indicates if RXNE elements are included.
       5. Figure 13-2 is the original figure, and the edits to be done are described below the figure.
       6. Minor typos noted, and discussion on some indications.
       7. Highlight the rules for when STA and AP have RSNXE is present.
    4. No major items noted
    5. Request to get it completed by time to include in D4.0.
    6. Need to get complete by week of March 15th.
    7. Plan to motion on March 19th as part of the motions for the session.
  1. **Review doc 11-20/246r2** Nehru BHANDARU (Broadcom) –
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-02-000m-d30crs.docx>
     2. 4031 (PHY), 4032 (GEN), 4033 (PHY)
        1. Review Comments
        2. All 3 comments are resolved as noted in R2.
        3. Discussion on the 48-bit PN.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-19 15:08:03Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-20/246r3

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-03-000m-d30crs.docx>> for CID 4031 which resolve the comment in the direction of the proposed resolution.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution for CID 4032 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2020-02-19 15:12:11Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-20/246r3

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-03-000m-d30crs.docx>> for CID 4032 which resolve the comment in the direction of the proposed resolution.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution For CID 4033 (PHY): REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-19 15:08:03Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-20/246r3

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-03-000m-d30crs.docx>> for CID 4033 which resolve the comment in the direction of the proposed resolution.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4086 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review proposed changes
       3. Discussion: From chat: from Mark RISON (Samsung) to everyone:

- In 12.5.5.1 change “GCM requires a fresh temporal key for every session. GCM also requires a unique nonce value for each frame

protected by a given temporal key, and GCMP uses a 96-bit nonce that includes a 48-bit packet number (PN)

for this purpose. Reuse of a PN with the same temporal key voids all security guarantees.” to “GCM requires a fresh temporal key for every session. GCM also requires a unique nonce value for each frame

protected by a given temporal key. Reuse of a nonce value with the same temporal key voids all security guarantees.”

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-19 15:17:51Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-20/246r3

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-03-000m-d30crs.docx>> for CID 4086 which resolve the comments in the direction of the commenter.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4087 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on if the CCM encryption encrypts the DATA or MIC or not.
       3. When the MIC and DATA are encrypted, then we need to show the decryption on the other side.
       4. Review Figure 12-29.
       5. Discussion on if there is a need for change or not.
       6. Figure 12-18 – shows “Encrypted Data, MIC” unsure how to parse.
       7. Change to show when DATA and MIC are Encrypted or not.
       8. Straw Poll:

1. Direction of Rejection and no change
2. Or Make a set of change?
3. abstain
   * + - 1. Results: a=3 b= 5 abstain = 1
         2. Slight preference to make a change.
       1. Changes were then discussed.
       2. There is a set of comments that also note some changes in this area, and we need to ensure we have all the CIDs addressed in the same set of changes.
       3. More discussion needs with addition of other CIDs: 4088, 4089, 4090, 4091. This group will be taken together.
       4. The request is to have a single document with all the redline for the changes for CCM and then that can be used for resolution of the set of comments.
       5. We could not find a volunteer to create such a submission, so we will go back and reject 4087-4091.
       6. ACTION ITEM: Mike to check with Commenter and get a submission for the completed changes. If no submission, a rejection will be prepared for the set of Comments.
     1. CID 4092 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-19 15:17:51Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-20/246r3

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-03-000m-d30crs.docx>> for CID 4092 which resolve the comments in the direction of the commenter.

* + - 1. No objection -Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4093 (PHY)
       1. Add to the CCM set of CIDs.
    2. CID 4188 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review context
       3. Discussion on the way to change the sentence.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-19 15:56:11Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-20/246r3

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0246-03-000m-d30crs.docx>> for CID 4188 which resolve the comments in the direction of the commenter.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. Look for another time for Nehru to present:
       1. March 13th Telecom is tentative plan.
  1. **Mark RISON CIDs**
     1. CID 4292 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. The claim is that the sentence can be deleted as it is in the table.
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 4294 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-02-19 16:06:13Z)
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 4343 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review 9.4.2.39. (DMG and Non-DMG cases).
        3. P1056.49 – discussion on antennas
        4. Clause 9.4.2.39 does not seem to handle the multiple antennas and the histogram.
        5. The DMG cannot use antenna ID 0 for unknown, as it is in the non-DMG. Discussion on if a set of antennas act as a single antenna or not.
        6. Need to have some DMG experts take this further.
        7. We need to resolve the case when you are listening for Noise.
        8. More work will need to be done.
     3. CID 4345 (MAC)
        1. Assigned to Menzo
     4. CID 4361 and 4362 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review p905.50 – “row 35 – EXCEEDED\_TXOP”
        3. Discussion on the possible use of this reason code.
        4. Discussion on possible reason codes for error conditions.
        5. Do we want a generic “NONCOMPLIANT” or specific reason codes.
        6. We have options of no change or make a change.
        7. Straw Poll:

1. No change
2. Make a change
   * + - 1. Results: a – 7 b – 1
         2. Suggest rejection
       1. Proposed Resolution: Will be rejected. Reason to be crafted off-line.
     1. CID 4364 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review context: p1828.11.
        3. Discussion of possible changes: Change “the” to “an” and “has completed” to “successfully”
        4. The phrase “Back-off is being invoked” is due to any one of several conditions.
     2. CID 4365 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Possible deletion of “the MPDU in”
        3. CID 4365 and CID 4364 should be resolved together.
        4. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to contact Menzo and Mark HAMILTON about CID 4364 and 4365.
     3. CID 4381 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Context - P2379.42
        3. Discussion on the initial FTM frame being exchanged.
        4. Discussion on the proposed changes.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2020-02-19 16:45:19Z);

Change

"The responding STA should transmit Fine Timing Measurement frames with the format and bandwidth it

indicated.

For the Fine Timing Measurement frames transmitted during the FTM session:

-- The responding STA shall not use a bandwidth wider than that indicated by the STA in the initial

Fine Timing Measurement frame.

-- The responding STA shall not use a VHT format if the STA indicated HT-mixed or non-HT format

in the initial Fine Timing Measurement frame.

-- The responding STA shall not use an HT format if the STA indicated non-HT format in the initial

Fine Timing Measurement frame."

to

"The responding STA should transmit Fine Timing Measurement frames with the format and bandwidth it

indicated in the initial Fine Timing Measurement frame.

For the Fine Timing Measurement frames transmitted during the FTM session:

-- The responding STA shall not use a bandwidth wider than it indicated in the initial

Fine Timing Measurement frame.

-- The responding STA shall not use a VHT format if it indicated HT-mixed or non-HT format

in the initial Fine Timing Measurement frame.

-- The responding STA shall not use an HT format if it indicated non-HT format in the initial

Fine Timing Measurement frame."

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

1. **REVmd CRC Wednesday 2020-02-19 1:00 – 3:00pm** 
   1. **Called to order** at 1:05pm by TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Attendance:**
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Joseph LEY (Interdigital)
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
         3. Roger MARKS (EthAirNet Associates)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Review doc 11-20/338r1 Mark HAMILTON** (Ruckus/CommScope)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-01-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
      2. CID 4553 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review Proposed Changes
         3. Discussion on putting a “, as described…” in the resolution
         4. Discussion on fragmentation usage in S1G.
         5. More discussion on the paragraph with other possible changes.
         6. At line 13, replace “sending frames” with “sending an MSDU or MMPDU (whether fragmented or not”
         7. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At P1748.17, delete “described in this subclause”. Same thing at P1748.18.

at P1748.14, change “described in this subclause” to “, as described in this subclause”. At line 13, replace “sending frames” with “sending an MSDU or MMPDU (whether fragmented or not).”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4809 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4599 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion of the change
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Replace

A receiving TR-MLME may silently ignore the received On-channel Tunnel Request frame if

that frame is not targeting an NT-MLME in the same multi-band capable device with the TR-MLME.

with

A receiving TR-MLME shall ignore the received On-channel Tunnel Request frame if

that frame is not targeting an NT-MLME in the same multi-band capable device as the TR-MLME.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4594 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4570 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 4642 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
       5. ACTION: Edward AU to contact Assaf to review changes to referenced table.
    4. CID 4555 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 4652 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Discussion on “conditionally present” vs optionally.
       4. These are “if and only if” type statements that we have chosen to remove in the past.
       5. Other locations p1381.4 for consideration. – in this example it is ok for “conditionally”. P885.35 “Optionally present” vs “Conditionally present”. Need to understand the reasons for which is proper to use.
       6. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       7. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    6. CID 4534 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Remove the field “Multicast Triggered Reporting (optional)” from Figure 9-211. Move the text from P1037.31 through P1038.10 to appear after the text at P1038.14 and Table 9-117 and before the text at P1038. 32..
       4. Review P1037.31 – note that the removal of the field causes the text that is proposed to be moved no longer correct.
       5. Optional fields need to have a subelement ID and then the subsequent optional fields can be identified. Having a strange tag for identifying the 4th field is strange.
       6. More Work is needed to address the moving of the text.
    7. CID 4528 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Proposed change.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At P1354.45, replace the “and” with a comma.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    8. CID 4524 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: At P2487.15, insert a new paragraph:

‘In the following procedure, a “request tunnelled MMPDU” is an MMPDU generated in the context of an MLME .request primitive. A “response tunnelled MMPDU” is an MMPDU generated in the context of an MLME .response primitive.’

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4585 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. The Neighbor Report element where “r” should be “R” is important.
       4. From discussion: Rejected. The elements listed in Table 9-173 appear wherever “Neighbor Report elements” are called out. Conceptually, this could be in both the Neighbor Report Response from the AP to the non-AP STA (and other informational frames from the AP) as well as in the Neighbor Report Request from the non-AP STA to the AP – which is what the commenter questioned. However, currently the Neighbor Report elements in fact only occur in frames from the AP to the non-AP STA, anyway.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change the title of Table 9-173 to have an upper-case “R”, (“Neighbor Report”).

Note to commenter: The elements listed in Table 9-173 appear wherever “Neighbor Report elements” are called out. Conceptually, this could be in both the Neighbor Report Response from the AP to the non-AP STA (and other informational frames from the AP) as well as in the Neighbor Report Request from the non-AP STA to the AP – which is what the commenter questioned. However, currently the Neighbor Report elements in fact only occur in frames from the AP to the non-AP STA, anyway.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4567 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. Discussion on the potential of having lost the “*if at least one Data or Management frame was received”. Sentence fragment.*
       4. Sending an empty report may be needed in this set.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Replace:

If the MAC Address field included in the Frame request was not set to the broadcast address, a Frame Report Entry field where Transmitter Address (TA) matching the MAC address field value shall be included in the Frame report if at least one Data or Management frame was received with this Transmitter Address during the measurement duration.

with:

If the MAC Address field included in the Frame request was not set to the broadcast address, the measuring station shall report, in one or more Frame reports, only those Data or Management frames received during the measurement duration with a TA field matching the MAC Address field of the Frame request.

* + - 1. More work is needed, will bring back
  1. **Review doc 11-20/245r1** – Roger MARKS (EthAirNet Associates)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0245-01-000m-corrections-to-epd-and-lpd-terminology.docx>
     2. Abstract:

This contribution proposes changes to IEEE P802.11-REVmd/D3.0 in order to correct the usage of EtherType protocol discrimination (EPD) and LLC protocol discrimination (LPD) terminology and align it with that of IEEE Std 802-2014.

* + 1. Submission presented.
    2. Discussion of the history of how the standard may have diverged from 802.
    3. Discussion of proposed changes to be made.
    4. At time, it was noted that if this is not incorporated in 11md, then it could be considered for a future revision.
    5. Note: 5.1.4 MSDU Format p302. Should be reviewed by the author.
  1. **Return to review of doc 11-20/338r1 Mark HAMILTON** (Ruckus/CommScope)
     1. CID 4511 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion.
        3. The TXVECTOR rules are used in forming PPDU, which contains the MPDU (same as the MSDU).
        4. These proposed changes do correct the S1G section.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Revised;

At P1769.56 and P1769.57, replace "frames with the TXVECTOR" with "PSDUs with the TXVECTOR".

At P2988.14, replace "frames with the TXVECTOR" with "PSDUs with the TXVECTOR".

At P2126.39, replace “frame with the TXVECTOR” with “PSDU with the TXVECTOR”. Same thing at P2129.25.

Note to the commenter, there are also occurrences of “control response frame [singular] with the TXVECTOR”. Coincidentally, these occurrences all involve noting the MPDU frame type of the referenced frame, and so these are left using the term “frame”. Thus, there is inherent inconsistency in the Draft around this wording, depending on the context.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4507 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4492 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At P997.8, after “the Length field of the TIM element is set to 2." add "The Bitmap Control field is present if the Partial Virtual Bitmap field is present." Note to the Commenter, this is the requested change, with the location for the inserted text clarified.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4491 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4561 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Recess at 3:03pm**

1. **REVmd CRC Wednesday 2020-02-19 3:30 – 5:30pm** 
   1. **Called to order** at 3:34 pm by TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Attendance:**
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Joseph LEY (Interdigital)
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Continue with Agenda R8**
   5. **Review doc 11-0141r5** Emily QI (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-05-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc>
      2. CID 4331 (Editor)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review discussion.
         3. Discussion on the difference of the subfield names for Nc and Nr
         4. Proposed change given by Mark RISON: “shall set the Nr Index subfield in the MIMO Control field of the feedback frame to indicate the same value as”
         5. D3.0 p2989.31 These are defined and not the field. “shall set the Nr Index subfield in the MIMO Control field of the feedback frame to indicate the same value as’
         6. at 1944.36 - "An HT beamformee that transmits a feedback frame of type Compressed Beamforming in response to asounding PPDU sent by an HT beamformer shall set the value of Nr in the MIMO Control field of the feedbackframe to be the same value as the number of streams in the sounding PPDU."
         7. Do we have all the instances in T9-90?
         8. Do we have all the subscripted labels correct?
         9. ACTION ITEM: Edward AU – Check with the CMMG folks about the changes to the subscripts in CID 2331.
         10. Proposed Resolution: Revised:

Desubscript the a in Na at the following locations: 973.14, 974.2, 974.18, 974.21, 974.24 and 974.29.

Desubscript the r in Nr and c in Nc at 973.14, 972.21, 972.24. 974.16, 974.17.

Desubscript the s in Ns 974.30, 974.36, 974.37, 974.40, 975.9 (x2), 976.6 (x2)

At 1947.57,

Change “shall set the value of Nr in the MIMO Control field of the

feedback frame to be the same value as”

To

“shall set the Nr Index subfield in the MIMO Control field of the feedback frame to indicate the same value as “

at 1944.36:

Change “An HT beamformee that transmits a feedback frame of type Compressed Beamforming in response to a sounding PPDU sent by an HT beamformer shall set the value of Nr in the MIMO Control field of the feedback frame to be the same value as the number of streams in the sounding PPDU.”

To "An HT beamformee that transmits a feedback frame of type Compressed Beamforming in response to a sounding PPDU sent by an HT beamformer shall set the Nr Index subfield in the MIMO Control field of the feedback frame to indicate the same value as the number of streams in the sounding PPDU."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4403 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4355, 4354 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. More instances of references to 10.3.2.7 that should be pointing to 10.3.2.8.
       4. See p1702.30 – should be 10.3.2.8
       5. List from Edward for changes: 1703.8, 1786.40, 2340.33, 2357.50, 2357.55, 3764.44, 3765.17, 3765.21, 3794.61, 4400.35.
       6. ACTION ITEM: Edward AU – does the 11aj references need to include how to do the bandwidth signalling TA
       7. Is there more text that was missing from 11aj draft text addition?
       8. The 11aj draft did have the section after the VHT and SIG clause.
       9. The changes proposed are better references.
       10. There are some CTS and DMG CTS procedure references that need correction.
       11. There may be more references that are wrong, but this fixes a lot of them. If you find wrong references, send to Editors.
       12. Proposed Resolution:

Revised.

Change “10.3.2.7 (CMMG RTS procedure(11aj))” to “10.3.2.8 (VHT and S1G RTS procedure(11ah))”

Make the same change at 1786.40, 2340.33, 2357.50, 2357.55, 3764.44, 3765.17, 3765.21, 3794.61, 4400.35.

At 1702.30, 1703.8, change “10.3.2.7 (CMMG RTS procedure(11aj))” to “10.3.2.9 (CTS and DMG CTS procedure)”

Move subclause of “10.3.2.7 (CMMG RTS procedure(11aj))”to follow subclause of “10.3.2.8 (VHT and S1G RTS procedure(11ah))”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4208 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Throughout Clause 2 and Annex A

change “Sept.” or “Sep” to “September” .

change “Nov.” to “November”.

change “Feb.” to “February” .

Change “Jan.” to “January”.

Change “Apr.” to “April”.

Change “Mar.” to “March”.

And all months.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4203 (EITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. See CID 4312.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected.

WG editor will update 802.11 Editorial Style guide 09/1034 to add a new rule including preposition and conjunction capitalization in the (sub)field and (sub)element names. This rule applies for new amendments. As stated in the style guide, “This rule does not apply to legacy text; these remain unchanged since the effort involved in changing all instances is substantial and no harm has been demonstrated.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4198 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Check the cited location.
       3. Proposed resolution; Revised; at 1105.52 add a row for “00-0F-AC18/Reserved/Reserved/Reserved/Reserved”.

At 1106.21, delete “18”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4037 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. From Discussion: The value of Extended Capabilities field is assigned by ANA. Value “86” is assigned to another task group.

At the bottom of the table, Add a row “88-n”/ “Reserved”

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At the bottom of the table, Add a row “88-n”/ “Reserved”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4026 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

Change "In Control frames of subtype PS-Poll other than PS-Poll+BDT frames"

to

"In Control frames of subtype PS-Poll other than PS-Poll+BDT frames, and for broadcast transmissions in S1G PPDUs"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **GEN CIDS – DOCUMENT 11-20-147r3** - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-03-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls> –
     2. In the document, this is tab "Minor Technical", for those marked with "Review" in the "Ad-hoc status" column.
     3. CID 4408 (GEN)
        1. No objection to accepting the proposed resolution.
        2. From Annex P, FTM exchange is the same of the FTM message exchange.
        3. There are three occurrences of “FTM message exchange”. They are all in Annex P.
        4. FTM stands for “Fine Timing Measurement”. Generally, we don’t abbreviate frames.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-02-19 22:04:41Z) - Change "FTM exchanges" to "Fine Timing Measurement frames"

Change Figure P-1 captions to "Parameters recorded by Observing STA when monitoring Fine Timing Measurement frames"

* + - 1. Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4391 (GEN)
       1. In 270.23, the term that is used is mechanisms.
       2. The “P” in CCMP, GCMP, and TKIP, stands for protocols
       3. On page 270, we need a descriptive term for use in this clause.
       4. We could reword page 301 to align with page 270.
       5. We could use “encapsulation mechanisms”
       6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-02-19 22:10:19Z) change "the CCMP, GCMP, and BIP mechanisms" to "CCMP, GCMP, and BIP"
       7. Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4390 (GEN)
       1. One STA address is the originator and the other is the destination. The parameter names should not be the same.
       2. The changes for DMG do not look consistent with the DELTS primitive.
       3. It’s within the scope of the comment to determine whether the second STAAddress parameter needs to be deleted, or not.
       4. CID 4390 (GEN) AdHoc Notes: GEN: 2020-02-19 22:17:50Z - PTP Spec is DMG concept? Need to get some DMG expert input.
       5. The STAAddress in the primitive should be uniquely named. Jon to follow-up.
       6. ACTION ITEM: Jon to investigate further on how to address the comment.
       7. This is a combination of DMG and non-DMG functionality
       8. The same resolution will apply to CID 4389 an CID 4390 - adhoc Notes: GEN: 2020-02-19 22:17:50Z - PTP Spec is DMG concept? Need to get some DMG expert input. The STAAddress in the primitive should be uniquely named. Jon to follow-up. We may be able to delete the parameter, but the descriptions may need to be rolled-up together.
    3. CID 4380 (GEN)
       1. Comment has to do with the neighbor report
       2. Transfer from GEN adhoc to MAC adhoc
    4. CID 4369 (GEN)
       1. For Dp, there is only one occurrence in definition.
       2. This abbreviation was removed from the body when Frequency Hopping PHY was removed.
       3. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED
       4. Ready for Motion
    5. CID 4360 (GEN)
       1. The change is “might be present” to “is present”
       2. The term “optional” must be present in the text.
       3. If any of the fields are non-zero, you include the element.
    6. The session limit has been reached at 17:30.
    7. Recess until tomorrow morning at 09:00

1. **REVmd CRC Thursday 2020-02-20 9:00 – 11:30am** 
   1. **Called to order** at 9:02am by TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Attendance**:
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Joseph LEY (Interdigital)
         4. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         5. Emily QI (Intel)
         6. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         7. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Review Agenda 11-20/0234r9**:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-09-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
      2. **Thursday February 20, AM1 9:00 am-11:30 am Eastern**

a. Edward AU - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx> and if time, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0235-02-000m-resolution-for-cmmg-related-comments.docx> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0270-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0-part-ii.docx>

b. Mark RISON CIDs – 1 hour

c. Emily QI CIDs - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-03-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc>

* + 1. Motions at 2:30pm today
    2. Review Motion plan for today
    3. No objection to the updated Agenda
  1. **Review doc 11-19/2163r10** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx>
     2. CID 4207 (EDITOR2)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review proposed changes.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Revised

Change “subclause” with “Subclause” at 1106.61, 2574.57, and 2575.14.

Change “clause” to “Clause” at 780.62, 3069.23.

Delete “clause” at 3199.52.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4261 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised

At 2604.30, replace “the AAD construction” with “AAD construction”.

At 2611.39, replace “The BIP Additional Authentication Data (AAD) shall be constructed from the MPDU header. The AAD construction shall use the following fields copied from the MPDU header.” with “The BIP Additional Authentication Data (AAD) is constructed from the MPDU header. AAD construction is performed as follows”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4207 (EDITOR2)
       1. Revisit to verify if Clause is needed?
       2. Change the resolution to delete “subclause”
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised

Change “clause” to “Clause” at 780.62, 3069.23.

Delete “clause” at 3199.52.

Delete “subclause” at 1106.61, 2574.57, and 2575.14.

* + - 1. Updated Resolution – still ready for motion
    1. CID 4386 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion:
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised;

At 2617.22, replace “The GCM originator processing” with “GCM originator processing”.

At 2617.24, replace “the GCM originator processing” with “GCM originator processing”.

For 2618.29 and 2619.1, replace “The GCM recipient processing” with “GCM recipient processing”.

For 2618.33, replace “the GCM recipient processing” “GCM recipient processing”.

At 2608.50 and 2609.8, replace “in the CCM integrity checking” with “in CCM integrity checking”:

At 2618.29, replace “the GCM integrity checking” with “GCM integrity checking”:

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4125 and 4126 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comments
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised

Incorporate changes for CID 4125/4126 from 11-19/2163r11 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx> which makes the changes along the lines suggested by the commenter.

* + - 1. Discussion on how the changes are shown in the document.
      2. The Figure is what is being updated.
      3. Need to update the Proposed Resolution to clearly identify the change.
      4. Updated Proposed Resolution for 4125 and 4126 (EDITOR2): REVISED (EDITOR2: 2020-02-20 15:35:13Z) Incorporate the figure shown under the proposed resolution for CIDs 4125 and 4126 of 11-19/2163r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx>).
      5. No Objections– Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4590 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       4. No Objections– Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4382 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       4. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 4321 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review discussion.
       3. Discussion on the use of “non-AP non-PCP DMG” vs “non-AP and non-PCP DMG”.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised

At 1513.48, change

“The TCLAS element is optional and can be present only when a TSPEC element is present; it is used to identify the destination non-AP and non-PCP DMG STA of the ADDTS Request frame.”

to

“The optional TCLAS element is used to identify the destination non-AP and non-PCP DMG STA of the ADDTS Request frame. If a TSPEC element is not present, then the TCLAS element is not present.”

At 334.23, 334.31, 334.40, 334.50, 334.60, 335.17, 335.26, 335.35, and 336.7, replace “is optionally present only” with “is optionally present”.

* + - 1. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 4320 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion.
       3. Discussion on changing “may” to “might”.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised, At 4371.59 and 4373.41, replace “may only permit” with “might permit only”.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 4274 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The commenter fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 4766 (EDITOR2)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; incorporate the Revised Figure as given in 11-19/2163r11: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2163-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-initial-sa-ballot-comments-on-11md-d3-0.docx>> under CID 4766.
       4. We will need to adjust the figure to put the dots after the arrow just above “Data”.
       5. We need to address the “32 us” part of the comment.
       6. Need a bit more work to look at the figure.
       7. ACTION ITEM: Edward AU: Post to reflector an invite to discuss the changes on CID 4766 and the updated figure.
       8. Need to make consistency on “8.0 us” need the “.0” to be consistent.
       9. Discussion if 32 us is really the minimum or not.
       10. Will bring back later.
  1. **Review doc 11-20-0235r2** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0235-02-000m-resolution-for-cmmg-related-comments.docx>
     2. CID 4235 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. Discussion on what is preamble includes.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (PHY: 2020-02-20 15:04:02Z) –

At 3528.41, change “If the channel bandwidth is 1080 MHz, the modulated SIG symbols are transmitted using duplication style as described in 25.3.10.” to “If the channel bandwidth is 1080 MHz, the modulated SIG symbols are duplicated as described in 25.3.10.”

Remove the notes at 3497.50, 3499.1, and 3500.1.

At 3496.50, change “NOTE” to “NOTE 1”.

At 3496.54, add the second note as follows:

“NOTE 2–For CMMG Control mode and CMMG SC mode preambles, all fields are transmitted with SC mode transmission. For CMMG OFDM mode preamble, the STFs, the CEFs, and the SIG fields are transmitted with SC mode transmission. For 1080 MHz SC transmission, the STFs, the CEFs, and the SIG fields are transmitted in duplicate format as defined in 25.3.10 (Duplication transmission on a 1080 MHz channel).”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4237 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (PHY: 2020-02-20 15:05:24Z)
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. Edward will have other comment resolutions ready for discussion on a teleconference.
  1. **CIDs from Mark RISON**
     1. CID 4393 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on why “(no data)” should be deleted.
        3. P790.79 is example of when we have it and when we don’t.
        4. There are 24 locations of (no data)
        5. The “(no data)” is unnecessary. The text does not add to the description of the frames that carry no data. QoS NULL is the name of the QoS NULL frame.
        6. QoS CF-Poll has no data
        7. A submission is required to prepare the changes and the cited locations.
        8. There was no specific objection to making this change.
        9. Request to have a submission prepared to see the actual changes.
        10. Will come back with submission
     2. CID 4400 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2020-02-20 15:22:04Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 4432 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. No Resolution prepared.
        3. Will need to come back with a resolution.
     4. CID 4433 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review table 10-22 (p1902.37)
        3. Question on if the proposed change is applicable to “HT”.
        4. See 10.27.5 – Protection rules for VHT STAs.
           1. Maybe a VHT table needs to be added.
           2. A VHT STA does all that the HT does but with a small change.
        5. 10.27.3 is Protection mechanisms for transmissions of HT PPDUs. And 10.27.5 is a general protection mechanisms description that infers that 10.27.3 has the rules.
        6. Discussion on what is missing or should be changed, and where should the change be made. It was thought that 10.27.5 is where the change should be made.
        7. More work will need to be done
     5. CID 4441 (MAC)
        1. Assigned to Alfred ASTERJADHI
     6. CID 4443 (MAC)
        1. Assigned to Alfred ASTERJADHI
        2. Similar to 4441 (MAC)
        3. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to contact Alfred.
     7. CID 4444 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Suggestion is to constrain the use of PIFS to HCCA contexts.
        3. Should create a proposed resolution.
        4. Assign to Graham SMITH.
     8. CID 4451 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review reference 10.21.2.7 –
        3. Discussion on what the rewording should be for the exceptions.
        4. Caution on changing wording in this clause. Need wide review.
        5. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON – Craft the proposal and post a document for review.
     9. CID 4457 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review the context in the draft (p1688.11).
        3. 11ah added the 2nd sentence at cited sentence.
        4. Suggested edits Change first sentence to " BRP +HTC frames. Action No Ack +HTC frames containing an explicit feedback response."
        5. Proposed changes to 2nd sentence – “Action No Ack frames that are a Flow Suspension frames or Flow Resumption frames.
        6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2020-02-20 16:04:52Z):: At the cited location change from “+HTC Action No Ack frames carrying a Management Action Body containing an explicit feedback response or BRP frame.Flow Control Action No Ack frames carrying a flow suspension frame or a flow resumption frame.(11ah)”to "BRP +HTC frames.Action No Ack +HTC frames containing an explicit feedback response.Action No Ack frames that are Flow Suspension frames or Flow Resumption frames. (11ah)”
        7. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc 11-20/141r6 Edward AU**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-06-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc>
     2. CID 4024 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion.
        3. Discussion on which column is really being cited.
        4. There is a “Element ID Extension present” in table 9-94. There is no change needed.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; “Element ID Extension present” is an entry in the column “Element”, and is shown on 989.26.

The title of “Element ID Extension” is correct.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4688 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. There are 8 instances for “multicast MSDU”.
       3. There are 3 instances for “unicast MSDU”.
       4. These should be group addressed or individually address respectfully.
       5. P2397.7 as an example.
       6. Discussion on if the sentence at P2397.7 is valid or not.
       7. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.

Note to editor: 8 instances for “multicast MSDU”/Multicast MSDU”. 3 instances for “unicast MSDU”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4593 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. 17 instances are all field names.
       3. We discussed the fact that the field name is not being changed.
       4. From CID 2236 (on Forty MHz intolerant):
          1. GEN: 2019-04-26 15:12:13Z - Strawpoll:
          2. Do you support changing the field name "Forty MHz Intolerance Field" name to "40MHz Intolerance field"?
          3. Yes: No: Abstain:
          4. Results: 1-4-3
       5. Proposed Resolution: Reject; Reason: In general, we prefer not to change the field name. This field name has been there since 2009.
       6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4592 (EDITOR)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Editor couldn’t find “that had received”.
       3. Editor found 5 instances of “that has received”.
       4. Proposed resolution: Revised.

At 781.50 and 1741.31:

Change “that has received” to “that receives”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4501 (EDITOR)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion on ACM usage.
       3. There are about 28 instances of ACM something
       4. Trivial to search for the terms (2x ACM flag, 18x ACM bit, 8x ACM field (note not QACM))
          1. However, these are not just referencing a field or subfield used in a protocol.
       5. More work needs to be done on this CID.
       6. Assign to Mark RISON to bring submission.
  1. **Recess at 11:40am**

1. **REVmd CRC Thursday 2020-02-20 13:00 – 15:00am** 
   1. Called to order at 1:05pm by TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. Attendance:
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         4. Emily QI (Intel)
         5. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         6. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Review Agenda R10**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-10-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
      2. Change to Agenda to review Email from Mark RISON about potential CIDS on the prepared Motions.
   5. **Review Email from Mark RISON** –
      1. Concern with some of the EDITOR CIDs that were subject to motion today.
      2. 9 CIDs were requested to be pulled.
      3. CID 4499 (EDITOR)
         1. Review history
         2. Request to put in separate motion.
      4. CID 4591 (EDITOR)
         1. Review history of discussion.
         2. Concern with the use of “UTF-8 string”, if we are going to remove, we should remove all instances. The believe is that this CID has addressed each instance.
      5. CID 4661 (EDITOR)
         1. Review history of discussion.
         2. Discussion on why not just accepted.
         3. Delete rather than rename.
      6. Concern with not being able to have time to confirm the changes with personal records.
   6. **GEN CIDS doc 11-20-147r3** - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-03-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls> –
      2. CID 4297 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. See page 3913.52-53 – dot11RMLCIConfigured.
         3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2020-02-20 18:32:24Z)
         4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 4288 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review definition of BU.
         3. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2020-02-20 18:37:28Z)
         4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
         5. Prefer to review the “in question” wording before motioning.
         6. Move to “Discuss” – Comment Group: Misc GEN.
         7. Will need to review again.
      4. CID 4265 (GEN)
         1. Review comment
         2. P198.34 – S-MPDU definition.
         3. P187.37 location of note to change.
         4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2020-02-20 18:45:12Z)
         5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 4258 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Proposed Change:

After the cited text add

"This primitive is not issued by the PHY if IPI reporting was turned off prior to the receipt of the latest PHY-CCARESET.request primitive.".

In the next subclause delete

"The IPI-REPORT parameter is present if dot11RadioMeasurementActivated is true and if IPI reporting was

turned on prior to the receipt of the latest PHY-CCARESET.request primitive."

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2020-02-20 18:49:51Z)
      2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4248 (GEN) 4247 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. In general, all the MIB attributes do have default values.
       3. A quick search of the CIDs found 4247 being similar.
       4. Examples See p3841.9, 3841.17, 3841.51, 3841.31, 3859.54, 3880.32, 3898.48, 3899.34, 4135.17, 4136.48, 4139.46, 4140.35, 4140.50, 4140.63, 4141.11, 4141.20, 4141.38, etc.
       5. We would need to find those MIB capabilities Variable with a default value is suggested to delete.
       6. ACTION ITEM: Emily will send the MIB txt file to Mark HAMILTON.
       7. Move CID 4248 to discuss so that both CIDs are in same state.
  1. **Review 11-19-2024r3** Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2024-03-000m-mac-address-change.docx>
     2. Submission Background:

Prior to this proposal, the only mechanisms available for changing a MAC address in IEEE 802.11 STA involve changing a MIB variable or using the MLME-reset primitive.

In IEEE Std1609.4, an UpdateSTAAddress MLME primitive for the IEEE 802.11 MAC was specified to allow an IEEE 802.11 STA to update its MAC address while operating in OCB mode. The rationale in defining the UPDATEMACADDRESS primitive was to preserve all the backoff timers for channel access and all frames queued in the MAC.

* + 1. CID 4039 (PHY)
       1. Review submission
       2. Discussion on the primitive parameters.
       3. This allows for IEEE 1609.4 to drop the primitive that they have added there. It belongs in the 802.11 standard.
       4. The request can ask for a MAC address change, but we cannot guarantee that the device can make the change. So we should “attempt to change” and the report whether it was done.
       5. Discussion on what other reporting values need to be included.
       6. Discussion on Failure conditions.
    2. More discussion will be done between now and March.
       1. Look to possibly motion in March.
  1. **MOTIONS:** 
     1. Prepared motions are in 11-20/234r10.
        1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-10-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
     2. **Motion 157: Motion for public review comment**
        1. Incorporate changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0281-01-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-d3-0-public-review-comment.doc> , which resolves the public review comment.
        2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
        3. Seconded: Emily QI
        4. Discussion: none
        5. **Result Motion #157:**   7-0-0 - Motion Passes
     3. **Motion 158: Motion for Editor changes in Item D3.1-2**
        1. Incorporate changes in “Proposed changes for Item D3.1-2” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0141-06-000m-sa1-proposed-resolutions-for-editor-adhoc.doc>.
        2. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
        3. Seconded: Edward AU
        4. Discussion: None
        5. **Result Motion #158**: Approved by Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
     4. **Motion 159: Motion for CID 4140** 
        1. Approve changes and resolve CID 4140 as follows: Change the Resolution of CID 4140 to “Revised”.At 1710.33 (D3.1), change

“This field is (#4140) used when the NDP BlockAck is used during a BlockAck session and is defined in 10.3.2.12 (Fragment BA procedure(11ah)) when it is used during a fragment BA session.”

To

"This field is defined in 10.25.6.5 (Generation and transmission of BlockAck frames by an HT STA, DMG STA, or S1G STA(11ah)) when the NDP BlockAck is used during a BlockAck session and is defined in 10.3.2.12 (Fragment BA procedure(11ah)) when it is used during a fragment BA session."

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
      2. Seconded: Graham SMITH
      3. Discussion: none
      4. **Result Motion #159:** Approved by Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
    1. **Motion 160: motion for all other comments from Editor ad hoc.** 
       1. Approve comments included in “Motion-EDITOR-S” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-05-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>

Except for CID 4591, 4499, 4661, 4608, 4679, 4689, 4691, and 4800.

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
      2. Seconded: Mark HAMILTON
      3. Discussion: None
      4. **Result Motion #160**: Approved by Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
    1. **Motion 161: motion for all other comments from Editor ad hoc.** 
       1. Approve comment resolution for CID 4499, 4661, 4608, 4679, 4689, 4691, and 4800 included in “Motion-EDITOR-S” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-05-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>
       2. Moved: Emily QI
       3. Seconded: Michael MONTEMURRO
       4. Discussion:
          1. Request to review each of the CIDs.

CID 4499 – word “Master”

CID 4461 – delete “section”

CID 4608 – Group address change

CID 4679 – rejected – duplication area.

CID 4689 – rejected - reference to optional sub-element list.

CID 4691 – Beacon Reporting field format

CID 4800 – Collocated vs Colocated.

* + - 1. **Result Motion #161**:   4-2-1 motion fails
    1. **Motion 162: motion for all other comments from Editor ad hoc.** 
       1. Approve comment resolution for CID 4499, 4661, 4608, 4679, 4689, and 4691 included in “Motion-EDITOR-S” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-05-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>
       2. Moved: Emily QI
       3. Seconded: Mark Hamilton
       4. Discussion: none.
       5. **Result Motion #161:**  6-1-0 motion passes.
    2. **Motion 163: EDITOR2 CIDs** 
       1. Approve comments included in “Motion-EDITOR2-N” in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2160-06-000m-revmd-editor2-standards-association-ballot-comments.xlsx>
       2. Moved: Edward AU
       3. Seconded: Jon Rosdahl
       4. Discussion: None
       5. **Result Motion #163**: 7-0-0 Motion Passes.
    3. **Motion 164: PHY CIDs** 
       1. Approve comments included in the “PHY Motion B” and “Annex G” tabs in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0145-03-000m-sb1-revmd-phy-sec-comments.xlsx>

Except 4270 and 4137

* + - 1. Moved: Michael Montemurro
      2. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
      3. Discussion: None
      4. **Result Motion #164:** Approved by Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
  1. **Recess at 3:04pm**

1. **REvmd CRC Thursday 2020-02-20 15:30 – 17:30** 
   1. **Called to order** at 3:31 pm by TG Chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Attendance**:
      1. In person:
         1. Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
         2. Jon ROSDAHL (QUALCOMM)
         3. Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
         4. Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
         5. Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
      2. Online:
         1. Mark RISON (Samsung)
         2. Edward AU (Huawei)
   3. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No items noted
   4. **Review Agenda**: Continue with R11 of the Agenda:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0234-11-000m-2020-jan-mar-teleconference-and-adhoc-agendas.docx>
      2. No changes or objections.
   5. **Motions:**
      1. **Motion 165: CID 4270**
         1. Approve the comment resolution included in the “CID 4270 Motion” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0145-04-000m-sb1-revmd-phy-sec-comments.xlsx>
         2. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
         3. Seconded: Mark HAMILTON
         4. **Result Motion #165**: Approved by Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
      2. **Motion 166: CID 4137**
         1. Approve the comment resolution included in the “CID 4137 Motion” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0145-04-000m-sb1-revmd-phy-sec-comments.xlsx>
         2. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
         3. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
         4. **Result Motion #166:**  4-2-0 Motion Fails.
         5. Assign CID 4137 to Mark RISON
         6. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to reach out to David GOODALL and Yujin Noh.
      3. **Motion 167: MAC CIDs** 
         1. Approve comments included in the "Motion MAC-AK" and "Motion MAC-AL" tabs in 11-17/927r55 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-55-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>> except for CID 4043, 4047, 4153, 4166, 4553, 4194, 4292, 4214, 4212 and 4213.
         2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
         3. Seconded: Mark RISON
         4. Discussion: none
         5. **Result Motion #167:** Approved by Unanimous Consent. - Motion passes
      4. **Motion 168: MAC CIDs** 
         1. Approve CID 4043, 4047, 4153, 4553, 4194, 4292, 4212 and 4213.included in the "Motion MAC-AK" and "Motion MAC-AL" tabs in 11-17/927r55 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-55-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>>
         2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
         3. Seconded: Michael MONTEMURRO
         4. Discussion:
            1. CID 4043 -- rejected – EIFS description
            2. CID 4047 – “Beacon” is missing “frame”
            3. CID 4153 – “AMPDU”
            4. CID 4553 -- “fragmented BA procedure”
            5. CID 4194 – reserved subfields. – Emily has checked.
            6. CID 4292 – GCR Mode subfield.
            7. CID 4212 – Group Data Cipher
            8. CID 4213 – similar to 4212
         5. **Result Motion #168:** 5-1-0- Motion passes
      5. **Motion #169: GEN CIDs** 
         1. Approve comments included in the “Motion Irvine - 2” and “Motion Feb Telcon” tabs in 11-20/0147r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-03-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls>>
         2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
         3. Seconded: Michael MONTEMURRO
         4. Discussion: None
         5. **Result Motion #169:**  5-0-1 -- Motion passes
   6. **Review doc 11-20/138r2** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-02-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
      2. CID 4774 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Discussion.
         3. Proposed resolution (CID 4774): Revised.

At 2187.02, delete "except those that have the StrictlyOrdered service class". Same thing at line 5.

Delete the paragraph at P299.29, discussing two service classes for non-QoS STAs.

In the (currently) last paragraph of 5.1.1.4, change “from a STA” to “at a QoS STA from any other STA”.

At the end of subclause 5.1.1.4, insert a paragraph, "In non-QoS STAs, the value of the service class parameter in invoked MAC service primitives (see 5.2) is ignored. The value of the service class parameter in generated MAC service primitives is set to ReorderableGroupAddressed."

In Figure 9-27, change the subfield “+HTC/Order” to be “+HTC”.

* + - 1. Discussion on the proposed changes.
      2. P299.29 (5.1.1.1.1 General) – review location.
      3. Review P318.29.
      4. Can we resolve CID 4392 with the same resolution?
      5. Yes, - Use the same Resolution for CID 4392 – Revised.
      6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion – Both CIDs.
  1. **Review doc 11-20/272** Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-05-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx>
     2. CID 4325 (PHY)
        1. Discussion on the discussion section and proposed changes.
        2. Discussion on the different set of parameters – in the AP, in non-AP STA and that are sent.
        3. See p4178.10 – a pseudo definition of EDCA Parameters in a description.
        4. The difference between use of AC Parameters that are in the AP or are the parameters being passed.
        5. Assign the comment to Mark Hamilton
     3. CID 4445 (PHY)
        1. Revisit Comment
        2. Discussion on changing “immediately before” vs “at”
        3. The argument of “at” the TBTT will start the change of channel, but you may have a race condition.
        4. The switch has to occur before the beacon is created.
        5. More discussion is needed.
        6. Assign to Mark Hamilton
     4. CID 4462 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review proposed changes.
        3. Discussion on the implication of the changes.
        4. Assign to Mark Hamilton
     5. CID 4582 (PHY)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Assign to Mark RISON for Submission.
     6. CID 4683 (PHY)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Defer to March Face to Face with wider audience.
     7. CID 4694 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. P1717.62 as a reference.

Change

“…from the AP of the BSS with which the STA is associated”.

To

“…from the AP of the BSS of which the STA is a member”.

OR

“…from the AP the STA is associated with”

OR

“…from the AP with which the STA is associated”

* + - 1. Discussion on the choice of changes.
         1. Seemed to have consensus for ““…from the AP with which the STA is associated”
      2. The context of the phrases needs to be considered.
      3. P1818.12 - Change

“the BSS with which the STA is associated”

To

“the BSS of which the STA is a member of”

* + - 1. More review is necessary
      2. An Updated version of this submission will be posted and will review in March Face to Face.
    1. CID 4719 and 4720 (PHY)
       1. There is some thought we had looked at this before.
       2. We will move back to the Commenter – Submission required. – Mark RISON.
       3. Consider the size of the audience to strawpoll the issue.
       4. We spent time in the past on LRC and SLRC etc.
       5. ACTION ITEM: Graham SMITH – identify the History of the CID topic.
  1. **AOB:**
     1. Propose New Teleconference for March 6th 10-am ET 2 hours.
        1. New Telecon with 10-day notice
        2. Edward, Nehru and Emily given time on that call.
     2. Telcon for March 13 Friday 10am 2 Hours
        1. Edward, Emily, Graham, and Mark RISON
     3. Proposed New Teleconference
        1. Discussion on times for March 9, 10, or 11
        2. Tried several times.
        3. Wed 11th at 4:30-6pm ET
        4. After several tries.
        5. Note that the UK Summertime changes prior to this call, so the time difference is only 4 hours.
  2. **THANKS to Graham SMITH** and SR Technologies for hosting us this week.
     1. Awesome lunches and breakfasts – Facilities were great!
     2. THANKS!
  3. **Adjourned at 5:31pm**
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