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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.

R1: Minutes for June 12

 – Note All CIDs and submissions approved through June 12 will be subject of Motions on June 19.

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 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.**
1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Friday June 5, 2020 10:00-12:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order at 10:03am** 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 17 attendees reported by WebEx

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Bhandaru, Nehru | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus Wireless |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Harkins, Daniel | Aruba Networks, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Kwon, Young Hoon | NXP Semiconductors |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Liu, Yong | Apple, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | McCann, Stephen | BlackBerry |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Montemurro, Michael | BlackBerry |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
|  | TGmd | 6/12 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |

* + 1. Missing from IMAT: None reported
	1. **Review Agenda**: 11-20/535r23:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0535-23-000m-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:

1. **2020-06-12 Friday 10 am Eastern 2 hours**
	1. **Jouni Malinen -** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-04-000m-rsnxe-interoperability-issue.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-04-000m-rsnxe-interoperability-issue.docx)
	2. **Stephen MCCANN -** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0820-00-000m-gas-and-rlqp-comments-proposed-resolutions.doc**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0820-00-000m-gas-and-rlqp-comments-proposed-resolutions.doc)
	3. **Michael MONTEMURRO –** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0568-01-000m-remove-channel-14.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0568-01-000m-remove-channel-14.docx)
	4. **Emily QI – CID 4049 -** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0247-04-000m-initial-sb-proposed-resolutions-for-bp-comments.doc**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0247-04-000m-initial-sb-proposed-resolutions-for-bp-comments.doc)
	5. **Placeholder – possible CID 4731 straw poll(s) – Password identifier security**

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Discussion of Agenda
			1. Change order to put Michael first –
			2. Last night an email on the possible strawpoll info sent.
			3. Jouni has another doc 11-20/890 to review as well.
			4. Stephen – 11-20/820r1 is the version to review today.
			5. Emily – No Editor Update, so we can skip that, but doc 11-20/247r5 will be presented today.
		2. No objection to updated Agenda see R24
	1. **Review doc 11-20/568r1** Michael MONTEMURRO (Blackberry)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0568-01-000m-remove-channel-14.docx>
		2. Not associated with a CID.
		3. The current state of regulations in Japan, channel 14 is still allowed. Furthermore, it was noted that Annex E was out of date on allowed channels for Japan in the 5 GHz band. In particular:
* channel 144 should be added in operating classes 34, 44, and 58;
* channel 140 should be added in operating class 39;
* channel 138 should be added in operating classes 128 and 130.
	+ 1. This is not actually removing channel 14, after off-line discussion. It is an update to the information for channel 14 in Annexes D and E

- Channel 14 is still allowed, but only for DSSS rates. Added “DSSSonly” in Table D-2 and E-3.

- Channels 138, 140, 144 also updated in 5 GHz.

* + 1. Review the proposed changes for Annex E – (Table 3 and Table 4)
		2. Discussion on the updating and maintaining the table going forward.
		3. Discussion on the use of Global Operating Class rather than country specific channels.
		4. More discussion should occur on this in the future.
		5. Discussion on if the indication of Global Operating Class indicates support for all channels, that may be a problem, and we will definitely need more discussion.
		6. When we talked about the way to update the tables when we talked about the India update before, we have not completed the plan to facilitate the fast update of these tables.
		7. What is the value of Operating Class? If you add new things after the Operating Class after it is first published, you do not know if the device supports all the channels or not. Not all agree with the idea of low value, but rather we need to discuss how to express what Operating Class is used for and how it indicates the channels are being supported.
		8. The Country Element and the Operating Class gives a clear way to indicate the channels being used.
		9. There will be a motion to incorporate this document on June 19th.
		10. Request to have any feedback be put on the reflector to get wide review.
	1. **Review doc 11-20/332r4** - Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-04-000m-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.
		3. This was prepared for March Plenary, but due to the cancellation, it ws not presented then.
		4. Reviewed changes in R4.
		5. Discussion on the changes.
		6. A Motion will be prepared for this submission to be incorporated on June 19th.
	2. **Review doc 11-20/890r0** - Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0890-00-000m-sae-h2e-capability-indication.docx>
		2. Abstract: This document discusses how support for SAE H2E is indicated in P802.11-REVmd and proposed a small change to this to enable additional protection against downgrade attacks.
		3. Review Submission
		4. Actual change is to change "AP" to "STA" in the description of bit 5 in Table 9-323.
		5. Discussion on statement below Table 9-323 “If a STA does not support any of capabilities defined in the RSNXE, then the STA is not required to transmit the RSNXE.” Can we add some language to help understand the normative language in other clauses?
		6. Propose change to “If a STA does not support any of capabilities defined in the RSNXE, then the STA ~~is~~ does not ~~required to~~ transmit the RSNXE.”
		7. This will have a unique motion prepared for next week (June 19th).
	3. **Review doc 11-20/820r1 -** Stephen MCCANN (Blackberry)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0820-01-000m-gas-and-rlqp-comments-proposed-resolutions.doc>
		2. Abstract: This document proposes resolutions to REVmd D3.0 for the following CIDs:

4096, 4097, 4131 and 4596 regarding GAS and RLQP

* + 1. CID 4096 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the use of “uses” vs “might”.
			4. Discussion on the GAS frames using protected frames.
			5. Discussion on when RLQP is required to be used.
			6. Concern on the potential technical change that this may cause.
			7. Discussion on “might be required to” being used.
			8. Discussion on if a Note should be added or not.
			9. The changes seem to lose the point of what to do and now only says what not to do. The Ethertype usage is confusing and should be clarified in the modification.
			10. More work needed. Confirm/clarify if this is always required ("uses") or a conditional requirement ("might be required to").
		2. CID 4097 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. Discussion on using a payload descriptor rather than GAS payload that is not used anywhere.
			4. Jouni suggestion that the sentence starts: “The GAS Query Request and Query Response fields contain…”
			5. More work needed.
			6. CID 4097 (MAC): More work off-line, in the direction of Jouni's suggestion.
		3. CID 4131 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on what “Channel Availability Query RLQP-element response” means.
			3. Review context in 9.4.6.2 –
			4. The proposed change reviewed again.
			5. Proposed resolution: CID 4131 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-06-12 15:20:11Z): Change:

“NOTE—For the CAQ process, the RLSS provides the list of available channels for the location(s) provided by the requesting STA in the Query Response. In some regulatory domains, the RLSS can perform access to a GDB to derive its response for channel query request and the associated information it provides in its Query Response.”

to

“NOTE—For the CAQ process, the RLSS provides the list of available channels for the location(s) provided by the requesting STA in the Channel Availability Query RLQP-element response. In some regulatory domains, the RLSS can perform access to a GDB to derive its response for the Channel Availability Query RLQP-element request and the associated information it provides in its Channel Availability Query RLQP-element response.”:

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 4596 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Question on if the protocols should be marked as deprecated?
				1. There is similar CID 2402 in referenced document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0574-06-000m-resolutions-for-backoff-and-obsolete-comments-d2.docx>. Resolved with : “Rejected; These Advertisements Protocols are defined, and therefore still exist within IEEE 802.21-2017 - they should not be deprecated. A liaison or request could be sent to the IEEE 802.21 WG asking for assistance and clarification with these Advertisement Protocols format if one wished to pursue deprecation.”
				2. Discussion on if the protocols are well defined or not.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 4596 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2020-06-12 15:25:37Z): These Advertisements Protocols are defined, and therefore still exist within IEEE 802.21-2017 - they should not be deprecated. A liaison or request could be sent to the IEEE 802.21 WG asking for assistance and clarification with these Advertisement Protocols format if one wished to pursue deprecation.
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-20/0247r5 -** CID 4049 - Emily QI (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0247-05-000m-initial-sb-proposed-resolutions-for-bp-comments.doc>
		2. CID 4049 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Reference Table 12-10 (Page 2668):
			3. Review submission discussion.
			4. Discussion on changing a shall to may, as it may cause a backward compatibility issue. So, for Value 2 it should keep the “shall”.
			5. Discussion on the changes and how the table vs the text balance of what goes in each place and how complex it may be. The deprecated row needs to be marked appropriately.
			6. Discussion on if TKIP is an option in the two different values for AKM.
			7. Some of the discussion noted potential changes that would be outside the scope of the CID.
			8. There will be an R6 posted.
			9. The proposed resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes for CID 4049 in doc 11-20/247r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0247-06-000m-initial-sb-proposed-resolutions-for-bp-comments.doc>>
			10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **CID 4731 Straw poll – Password identifier security**
		1. Discussion on the straw poll.
			1. There is a CID 4731 that is on this topic.
			2. There were some other specific changes made previously, but none on privacy in this ballot review.
		2. Straw poll: I prefer addressing password identifier privacy with
1. A specific solution now or
2. Later, as part of generic solution for identifier privacy (non-TGmd)
	* + 1. Results: 1(-6), 2(-9)
			2. While both has support, we will craft a rejection reason for CID 4731 and proceed with this topic post TGmd.
		1. ACTION ITEM: Nehru to craft a rejection reason for CID 4731.
		2. ACTION ITEM: Dorothy to craft separate motion for CID 4731.
	1. **Review plan for Upcoming Calls:**
		1. Wednesday – GEN and MAC CIDs. (not subject to motions on Friday June 19th).
		2. Friday will be motions:
			1. ACTION ITEM for Adhoc leads, please update tabs and post files for all comments through today. (post by Monday).
			2. Review list of potential motions (agenda to be posted by Monday with updated proposed motions).
		3. Review future calls
			1. Remember we have cancelled July 1 and 3 but have calls on June 29 and 30.
		4. ACTION ITEM: Prepare Insufficient detail tabs for comments not being worked or are insufficient with proposed rejection resolutions to reject if necessary, during the July plenary call.
	2. **Adjourned 11:59am ET.**
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4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-07-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>

**June 12:**

1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0535-23-000m-2020-april-july-teleconference-agendas.docx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0308-00-000m-2020-march-tgmd-agenda.pptx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0568-01-000m-remove-channel-14.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0332-04-000m-rsnxe-interoperability-issue.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0890-00-000m-sae-h2e-capability-indication.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0820-01-000m-gas-and-rlqp-comments-proposed-resolutions.doc>