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Abstract

Minutes for the 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecons for June 10 and 12, 2020.

R0: Minutes for June 10 – Thanks Michael Montemurro for taking the minutes.

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Wednesday June 10, 2020 16:00-18:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order at 4:03pm** ET by the TG Chair Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
	2. **Review Patent and Participation Policy**
		1. No Issues noted.
	3. **Attendance:** -please log with IMAT:
		1. About 12 attendees reported by WebEx

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Aboulmagd, Osama | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Goodall, David | Morse Micro |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus Wireless |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Kang, Sugbong | Apple, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Montemurro, Michael | BlackBerry |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
|  | TGmd | 6/10 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |

* + 1. Missing from IMAT: None reported
	1. **Review Agenda**: 11-20/535r22:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0535-22-000m-2020-april-july-teleconference-agendas.docx>
		2. **The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:**

1.       Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

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

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

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

b.      Patent, Participation slides: See slides 5-12 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0308-00-000m-2020-march-tgmd-agenda.pptx>

2.  Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU

3.  Comment resolution:

a) 2020-06-10 Wednesday 4-6pm Eastern 2 hours

i.Mark HAMILTON CIDs

ii.Mark RISON CIDs

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Discussion of Agenda
			1. No objection to updated Agenda see R23
	1. **Editor Report –** Emily Qi (Intel)
		1. Master comment spreadsheet is posted as: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156-11-000m-revmd-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>
		2. The 202005-approved tab contains CIDs approved in May.
		3. Added a tab in the document to report on resolved comments
		4. Of the 20 remaining comments, Mark Rison needs direction for the group on at least 10 CIDs.
		5. Mark Rison has agenda time today to review these comments.
	2. **Review Document 11-20/338r7** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-07-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
		2. R7 is posted. The result of today’s discussion will be posted as R8
		3. CID 4723 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. With respect to Figure 4-32 and Figure 4-33, the convention should match the use of KDE’s in message 3 of the 4-way handshake and message 1 of the group-key exchange, respectively.
			3. There are two locations where there is a hyphen between key and wrap. This resolution should be updated to remove the hyphen.
			4. There is usage of a wrapped MGTK.
			5. ACTION ITEM: Mark Hamilton to investigate “wrapped MGTK” usage.
			6. Proposed resolution: CID 4723 (MAC): Revised. Change “encrypted GTK” to “wrapped GTK” (as requested by the commenter). Same thing at P2698.15 (in the description of the Authenticator state machine).

Similarly, replace “Encrypted” with “Wrapped” in Figures 4-32 and 4-33.

In 13.8.5 (P2748.59), change “shall be encrypted using KEK … and the NIST AES key wrap algorithm.” to “shall be wrapped with the NIST AES key wrap algorithm using KEK … or KEK2 …” (Delete the “and the NIST AES key wrap algorithm” from the end of the sentence.)

At P2668.7 and P2668.10, change “key-wrap” to “key wrap”

* + - 1. Mark Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 4221 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. More work needed.
		2. CID 4193 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 4193 (MAC) Accepted.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 4068 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 4068 (MAC): Revised. At 1503.49, replace “needs” with “requests”. At 1503.44, replace “need” with “request”.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 4067 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 4067 (MAC): Revised. Reword to "The L-RX field contains an unsigned integer in the range 0 to 16. Values outside this range are reserved. The number of requested TRN-R subfields is equal to the value of the L-RX subfield multiplied by 4."
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 4243 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 4243 (MAC): Accepted.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 4377 (MAC)
			1. With Fig 9-12, you could argue that this is a sub-field and the bit numbering could start at 1
			2. Fig 9-13 is more problematic. There should only be a single convention for bit numbering.
			3. It seems like bit numbering should start with 0. However, there could be issues with implementations in the field.
			4. Any changes to the document would not likely affect implementations in the field.
			5. This is an internal specification issue. The change that the commenter is suggesting would not affect an implementation.
			6. More work needed. Mark Hamilton to prepare a revised resolution in the direction proposed by the commenter.
		7. CID 4056 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. There are few other locations with similar numbers in parenthesis:
				1. Figure 9-169—ERP element format
				2. Figure 9-292—BSS Load element format
				3. Figure 9-293—EDCA Parameter Set element format
				4. Figure 9-330—TS Delay element format
				5. Figure 9-331—TCLAS Processing element format
				6. Figure 9-332—Schedule element format
				7. Figure 9-334—QoS Capability element format
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 4056 (MAC): Revised. Delete “(55)” as proposed. Also, similarly in Figures 9-169, 9-292, 9-293, 9-330, 9-331, 9-332, 9-334.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion.
		8. CID 4485 (MAC)
			1. The word “reserved” should be used rather than “invalid”. There are several examples where “reserved” is used. There is a convention for using the term “reserved”. We could add something to conventions to indicate that “reserved” means it shall be set to 0 on transmit.
			2. If we went in this direction, we would have to add a statement in Clause 9.2.2 – Conventions.
			3. Whether a field is reserved is different from a value of a field that is reserved. This came up in preparation of a previous submission.
			4. Other standards make use of values that are reserved by this standard.
			5. The last sentence of 9.2.2 could be modified to address the convention.
			6. ACTION ITEM: Mark Rison and Mark Hamilton to propose text changes to 9.2.2.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 4485 (MAC): Revised. Replace “A value of 0 indicates that the low rate TIM frame is not transmitted.” with “A value of 0 is reserved.”
			8. Mark Ready for Motion.
		9. CID 4454 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 4454 (MAC) Revised. At the cited location, replace

“The QoS Action field is defined in 9.6.3.1 (General). representing ADDTS Reserve Response. The Higher Layer Stream ID element is defined in 9.4.2.124 (Higher Layer Stream ID element).”

with

“The QoS Action field is defined in 9.6.3.1 (General). The Higher Layer Stream ID field contains a Higher Layer Stream ID element (see 9.4.2.124 (Higher Layer Stream ID element))."

In subclause 9.6.3.7, replace

“The QoS Action field is defined in 9.6.3.1 (General). ADDTS Reserve Request.”

with

“The QoS Action field is defined in 9.6.3.1 (General).”

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 4447 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. “uses of UP” should be something like “uses of a UP” or “uses of each UP”
			3. Note to Editor to change “implementation-specific” to “implementation specific”. In D3.2, the locations are 1128.60, 1346.43, 1891.30, 2551.3, 2662.41, and 2673.60
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 4447 (MAC). Revised; While unused elsewhere in the Standard, the Designation column is helpful to a reader trying to become familiar with the 802.11 QoS prioritization mechanism and its purposes.

REVmd Editor: Add a NOTE at the bottom of Table 10-1, “NOTE—The Designation column is an indication of general usage and guidance. Actual uses of each UP are implementation specific.”

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Document 11-20/435r4** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
		2. CID 4314 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The recommendation was to delete 3 sentences from Clause 9. The proposed resolution is different.
			3. ACTION ITEM: Mark Rison to confirm the resolution details with Jouni and Dan to confirm the resolution. Mike Montemurro to update the adhoc notes with this action.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 4314 (PHY). REVISED (PHY: 2020-06-10 22:05:18Z) - Incorporate the changes under “Proposed Changes:” for CID 4314 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
			5. Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 4423 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. In some of these cases, the field names have been changed. We have tried to avoid changing field names.
			3. In 9.4.2.100, the text is not consistent with the field names.
			4. “Recovery Time Duration” is a field name. This looks to be an S1G field name.
			5. Energy limited operation is not widely implemented at this time.
			6. For this feature, there is an EL timer. It would be better to change “Recovery Time Duration” to “Recovery Timer”.
			7. Need to fix “Max Awake Duration” as well.
			8. In Table 9-85, the proposed change in Time Slot Protection Request definition does not make sense.
			9. ACTION ITEM: CID 4423 (PHY) MORE WORK NEEDED – People are encouraged to review the changes in the uploaded document.
		4. CID 4178 (PHY), CID 4575 (Editor), CID 4576 (Editor), CID 4177 (PHY)
			1. Review Comments
			2. An AP can only operate a single BSSID. What could an AP do that’s not in the context of a BSSID.
			3. An AP and a BSS is a different logical entity.
			4. CID 4177 is already resolved by document 11-20/272 and the changes have been made.
			5. CID 4179 has already been resolved.
			6. ACTION ITEM: CID 4178 (PHY), CID 4575 (Editor), CID 4576 (Editor), CID 4177 (PHY) MORE WORK NEEDED – People are encouraged to review the changes in the uploaded document
		5. CID 4746 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The concerns are whether a STA with MFP can even receive a MLME-Deauthenticate indication from a frame that is not protected.
			3. ACTION ITEM: CID 4746 (PHY). MORE WORK NEEDED – People are encouraged to review the changes in the uploaded document
	2. **Review agenda for June 12 teleconference**
	3. **Adjourn at 6:02 pm.**

**References:**