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Abstract

This file contains the minutes for the 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecons from August 3rd to August 7th, 2020.

R0: Minutes for August 3, 2020

R1: Minutes for August 4, 2020 added

R2: Minutes for August 5, 2020 added – minor corrections to Monday and Tuesday Minutes made

R3: Minutes for August 7, 2020 added - minor corrections to Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday Minutes made

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Monday, August 03, 2020 15:00-17:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order at 3:04** pm 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 14 attendees reported by WebEx

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TGmd | 12585 | 8/3 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 53922 | 8/3 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
|  | TGmd | 57126 | 8/3 | Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8114 | 8/3 | Fischer, Matthew | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 11843 | 8/3 | Goodall, David | Morse Micro |
|  | TGmd | 8390 | 8/3 | Kwon, Young Hoon | NXP Semiconductors |
|  | TGmd | 4622 | 8/3 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 61032 | 8/3 | Lindskog, Erik | SAMSUNG |
|  | TGmd | 8193 | 8/3 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 61804 | 8/3 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
|  | TGmd | 5030 | 8/3 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 14845 | 8/3 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
|  | TGmd | 2948 | 8/3 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |

* + 1. Missing from IMAT: None reported
  1. **Review Agenda 11-20/1001r10**:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-10-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx>
     2. **The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:**

1.       Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/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](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this Call for Potentially Essential Patents

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

b.      Patent, Participation and policy related slides: See slides 4-19 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0323-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-july-2020.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU –

see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156. Total of 820 comments.

See <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-27-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt> .

D3.4 is available and includes resolution approved in May and June motions.

3.       Comment resolution

1. **2020-08-03 Monday 3-5pm Eastern 2 hours**
   1. Edward AU – CID 4162, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0634-01-000m-resolution-for-gen-cids-4162-4256-4122-and-4102.docx>
   2. Mark HAMILTON
      1. MAC CIDs 4723, 4422, 4154
      2. CIDs 4806, 4805 – prepare reject for insufficient detail if resolution not available
      3. CIDs 4708 and 4709 – prepare reject for insufficient detail if resolution not available
      4. CID 4700
      5. CID 4205 – prepare reject for insufficient detail if resolution not available
      6. CID 4206
      7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1167-00-000m-timely-link-quality-feedback.pptx> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1168-00-000m-timely-link-quality-feedback-text.docx>
      8. Prepare reject for insufficient detail if complete resolutions not available: 4135, 4149, 4263, 4353, 4364, 4365, 4379, 4516, 4529, 4557, 4566, 4571, 4574, 4636, 4659, 4744, 4745
   3. Graham SMITH CID 4694 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-12-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx>
   4. Matthew FISCHER – CID 4157, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1778-05-000m-india-ch-167-169-173.pptx>
   5. Mark RISON – CIDs 4229/4266, 4616, 4620, and 4623 for direction, 4808 (re-visit), , see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
   6. Menzo WENTINK – including CIDs 4725, 4143, 4761, 4811 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>,
2. **2020-08-04 Tuesday 3-5pm Eastern 2 hours**
   1. Osama ABOUL-MAGD - https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0814-02-000m-proposed-resolutions-to-cids-4145-4146-and-4147.docx
   2. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs 4458
   3. Mark Hamilton MAC CIDs
   4. Mark Rison – CIDs 4565, 4616, 4620, and 4623 for direction, 4808 (re-visit), 4229/4266, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
3. **2020-08-05 Wednesday 4-6pm Eastern 2 hours**
   1. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs
   2. Mark Rison – CIDs 4565, 4616, 4620, and 4623 for direction, 4808 (re-visit), 4229/4266, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
   3. Gaurav PATWARDHAN - non-AP STA TXOP frame bursting, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1076-01-000m-non-ap-sta-txop-frame-bursting.pptx> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1104-01-000m-proposed-changes-in-scs-10-23-2-2-and-10-23-2-9.docx>
4. **2020-08-07 Friday 10 am Eastern 2 hours: Proposed motions, Motion for recirculation**
   1. **Motion – MAC**
   2. **Motion- GEN**
   3. **Motion – PHY**
   4. **Motion – Additional fixes – Remove vestigial occurrences of "DLS" and “PCO” outside the MIB**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx) **on page 3, under “CID y” and “CID z” “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   5. **Motion – Additional fixes – Backoff procedure editing correction**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx)
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   6. **Motion - Additional CDMG fixes**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-00-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-00-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx) **after “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   7. **Motion – MAC Insufficient detail**
      1. **Announce next set of teleconferences:**

4.       AOB

Review TGmd schedule –

Target D 4.0 in August; D5.0 in September

(August 7th motion for recirculation, August 21 – Editors have draft, 15-20 day recirc, end by September 8. )

Hold several meetings during September plenary for comment resolution.

Sept/early Oct D5.0 WG approval to send to EC for forwarding to RevCom – likely electronic

Sept/Oct – D5.0 Unchanged recirc

6 Oct – 802 EC Approval, Draft TGme PAR (next revision)

13 October – Draft to RevCom

2020 Dec RevCom/SASB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Review Agenda
    2. No objections to agenda as described.
  1. **Editor Report** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. No changes since Friday.
     2. No Questions
  2. **Review doc CID 4162 -** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0634-01-000m-resolution-for-gen-cids-4162-4256-4122-and-4102.docx>
     2. CID 4162 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review proposed change:
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-08-03 19:42:28Z); Incorporate the changes in 11-20/634r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0634-01-000m-resolution-for-gen-cids-4162-4256-4122-and-4102.docx>> which makes changes in Table E-5.
        4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  3. **MAC CIDS –** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-15-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
     2. CID 4723 (MAC)
        1. Not ready for today – move to Tuesday Agenda.
     3. CID 4422 (MAC)
        1. Hold off until we finish Osama’s set of CIDs.
     4. Mark Dropped off…move to Graham’s Document.
  4. **Review document 11-20/272r12** **CID 4694** - Graham SMITH (SR Technology)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-12-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx>
     2. CID 4694 (PHY)
        1. Review history of submission.
        2. We have reviewed most of the proposed changes already.
        3. P1717.64 D3.0 change to P1707.61 D3.4.
        4. Review changes for P1707.61 and P1721.14 (both in D3.4).
        5. The Changes reviewed are in R13 not in R12.
        6. Needed to have R13 posted
        7. Posted R13, but R14 in display was to catch the changes on the call.
        8. Discussion on proposed changes – final version of the changes to be captured in R14.
        9. Review changes at 1721.14 in D3.4 – Review the two options. Need to change another location to remove an “off the BSS”.
        10. Proposed Resolution: Revised incorporate the changes in doc 11-20/0272r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0272-12-000m-cids-from-mike-to-graham-2.docx> > which makes the changes in the direction requested.
        11. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  5. **Review doc 11-20/338r15 - MAC CIDS –** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-15-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
     2. CID 4422 (MAC)
        1. Waiting on Osama.
        2. If no changes or even if some changes, this may be just an Accept.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        4. May be some relation to some CIDs in Mark RISON’s submission as well, but he would need to adjust if needed.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 4154 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Mark RISON has some changes in bullet A, and this CID is changing the leading sentence.
        3. Related to CID 4365, CID 4364, CID 4574. These three are included in 11-20/435r10.
     4. CID 4806 and 4805 (MAC)
        1. Review comments
        2. Not ready until tomorrow.
     5. CID 4708 and 4709 (MAC)
        1. Review comments.
        2. May need to merge CMMG rules into an earlier clause to clean up some confusion.
        3. More work will need to be done.
        4. This will have to be an Insufficient Detail on these two CIDs.
        5. Proposed resolution: Reject – Insufficient details.
        6. No-objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 4700 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review submission discussion.
        3. Proposed resolution: Revised.

Replace the bullet at P1475.29 with:

"The Language Code field contains an ASCII-encoded language code selected from ISO 639, and defines the language used in the Venue Name field. A two-character language code has 0 (ASCII NUL) appended."

Replace the paragraph at P1488.56 with:

"The Language Code field contains an ASCII-encoded language code selected from ISO 639, and defines the language used in the Cost Information field. A two-character language code has 0 (ASCII NUL) appended."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Using the MAC CID database:**
     1. CID 4205 and 4206 (MAC)
        1. Look for resolution on Tuesday.
     2. CID 4135 (MAC)
        1. Assigned to Laurent.
        2. Prepare insufficient detail resolution in case no response.
        3. Proposed from Laurent for last Friday.
        4. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     3. CID 4149 (MAC)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     4. CID 4529 (MAC)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     5. CID 4571 (MAC)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     6. CID 4636 (MAC) and 4637 (EDITOR)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
        3. CID 4637 indicates a document that is not complete was being prepared.
     7. CID 4659 (MAC)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     8. CID 4744 (MAC)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     9. CID 4745 (MAC)
        1. Prepare for Insufficient Detail.
        2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     10. CID 4616 (EDITOR)
         1. Discussion on the need for “Std” when citing standards.
         2. Direction noted that “Std” is needed when talking about a standard.
         3. Prepared for Insufficient Detail.
         4. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
     11. CID 4620 (EDITOR)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Rejection has been prepared.
         3. Already fixed in D3.4, so no change is necessary.
         4. Please change the resolution to revised and indicate the CID that caused the changes.
         5. Mark Ready for Motion
     12. CID 4623 (EDITOR)
         1. Prepared for Insufficient Detail.
         2. Mark Ready for Motion – insufficient detail
  2. **Review doc 11-20/1167r0** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1167-00-000m-timely-link-quality-feedback.pptx>
     2. Abstract: A proposal is made to provide transmitters with real-time feedback on the remote peer’s perception of received signal strength.
     3. Review submission.
     4. Proposal: Use a similar immediate and constant feedback, to understand the transmit direction link quality. Note it is Too late to add this to PPDU headers, like DMG did, but we can add/negotiate additional “BA information” in BlockAck frames, without backward compatibility concerns
     5. Text changes about a page and a half in doc 11-20/1168r0
        1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1168-00-000m-timely-link-quality-feedback-text.docx>
     6. Belief is minimal changes.
     7. Review proposed changes as described in 11-20/1168r0.
     8. Discussion on possibly similar proposal being discussed in TGbe, but they are looking to use MCS. Why not pass MCS information?
     9. At time.
  3. **Review doc 11-19/1778r5** - **CID 4157 –**- Matthew FISCHER (Broadcom)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1778-05-000m-india-ch-167-169-173.pptx>
     2. CID 4157 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment and the history of the document.
        2. Review changes being proposed.
        3. Discussion on the use of “Operating classes”
        4. Discussion on the changes shown in the underline.
        5. Discussion on the other alternatives in the submission are not part of the CID.
        6. Proposed resolution: Revised; incorporate the changes on slide 5 in document 11-19/1778r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1778-05-000m-india-ch-167-169-173.pptx> > which adds the updates to the India Operating Classes.
        7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  4. **Review doc 11-20/435r10** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
     2. CID 4229 (MAC) and 4266 (PHY)
        1. Review comments.
        2. Review submission discussion.
        3. Review proposed changes.
        4. An Alternate proposal see 11-20/1081r0 Sean Coffey (Realtek).
           1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1081-00-000m-operational-rates-and-mcss-8213-revmd-sb1-cid-4229.docx>
           2. Review abstract:

CID 4229 and doc. 11-20/0435r6 propose modifying a note in 11.1.4.6 to add the underlined text:

“NOTE 1—A STA is not required to include all mandatory rates or MCSes in its operational rate or MCS set, respectively”.

and to add a definition for operational MCS set, with some sundry supporting changes.

We should not adopt the proposed resolution, because

Many (most?) STAs are required to include all mandatory MCSs in (the proposed definition of) their operational MCS set, so the addition is incorrect;

Many (most?) STAs are required to include all mandatory rates in their operational rate set, so the note is incorrect.

A separate note in 10.3 is similar but not identical, and 11.1.4.6 proposes extending that note to MCSs also. The applicability of that note is at best limited, since it would not apply for HT or VHT STAs, and its wording needs work anyway. The changes hardly seem worth it, and in any case do not match the comment.

The comment should be rejected.

* + - * 1. This submission proposes a reject resolution:
      1. Proposed resolution: “Rejected. Many (most?) STAs are required to include all mandatory MCSs in (the proposed definition of) their operational MCS set. See 11/20-1081r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1081-00-000m-operational-rates-and-mcss-8213-revmd-sb1-cid-4229.docx>>.”
      2. Discussion on what is required or not for supporting Mandatory MCS rates.
      3. Discussion on the fact that the alternate proposal is just to reject CID 4229.
      4. Review the proposed Changes in 11-20/435r10 for the Notes.
      5. Review history of these notes being added during the TGmd process, the NOTE was purported to not be present in TGmc. The NOTE in 10.3.1 was in 802.11-2016. Added via REVmc CID 8171.
      6. One proposal was to just delete the NOTE as they are not normative, and just informative.
      7. Discussion on the Operational Rate Set definition is incorrect and should be updated/corrected.
      8. Discussion on the rational to keep the Notes was given.
      9. Proposal to just leave them as is and not constantly tinker with them.
      10. Need to have a straw poll on these CIDs later in the week.
  1. Reviewed Agenda for tomorrow. Aug 4 – 3-5pm ET
  2. Adjourned 5:03pm

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Tuesday Aug 4th, 2020 15:00-17:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order at 3:03** pm 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 | 8/4 | Aboulmagd, Osama | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Fischer, Matthew | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus Wireless |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Kwon, Young Hoon | NXP Semiconductors |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Lindskog, Erik | SAMSUNG |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 8/4 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |

* + 1. Missing from IMAT: None reported
  1. **Review Agenda** 11-20/1001r11:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-11-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx>
     2. **The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:**

1.       Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/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](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this Call for Potentially Essential Patents

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

b.      Patent, Participation and policy related slides: See slides 4-19 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0323-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-july-2020.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU – see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156. Total of 820 comments. See <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-27-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt> .

D3.4 is available and includes resolution approved in May and June motions.

3.       Comment resolution

* + 1. **2020-08-04 Tuesday 3-5pm Eastern 2 hours**

1. Mark Hamilton MAC CIDs: 4723, 4806, 4805
2. Osama ABOUL-MAGD - https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0814-02-000m-proposed-resolutions-to-cids-4145-4146-and-4147.docx
3. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs 4458
4. Mark Rison – CIDs 4565, 4616, 4620, and 4623 for direction, 4808 (re-visit), 4229/4266, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
   * + 1. **2020-08-05 Wednesday 4-6pm Eastern 2 hours**
          1. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs
          2. Mark Rison – CIDs 4565, 4616, 4620, and 4623 for direction, 4808 (re-visit), 4229/4266, see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
          3. Gaurav PATWARDHAN - non-AP STA TXOP frame bursting, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1076-01-000m-non-ap-sta-txop-frame-bursting.pptx> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1104-01-000m-proposed-changes-in-scs-10-23-2-2-and-10-23-2-9.docx>
5. **2020-08-07 Friday 10 am Eastern 2 hours: Proposed motions, Motion for recirculation**
   1. **Motion – MAC**
   2. **Motion- GEN**
   3. **Motion – PHY**
   4. **Motion – Additional fixes – Remove vestigial occurrences of "DLS" and “PCO” outside the MIB**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx) **on page 3, under “CID y” and “CID z” “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   5. **Motion – Additional fixes – Backoff procedure editing correction**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx)
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   6. **Motion - Additional CDMG fixes**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-00-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-00-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx) **after “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   7. **Motion – MAC Insufficient detail**
6. **Announce next set of teleconferences:**

4.       AOB

Review TGmd schedule –target D 4.0 in August; D5.0 in September

(August 7th motion for recirculation, August 21 – Editors have draft, 15-20 day recirc, end by September 8.

Hold several meetings during September plenary for comment resolution.

Sept/early Oct D5.0 WG approval to send to EC for forwarding to RevCom – likely electronic

Sept/Oct – D5.0 Unchanged recirc

6 Oct – 802 EC Aproval, Draft TGme PAR (next revision)

13 October – Draft to RevCom

2020 Dec RevCom/SASB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Review Agenda
    2. No objections to agenda as described.
  1. **Editor Report** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. No changes since Friday.
     2. No Questions
  2. **Review doc 11-20/338r17** - MAC CIDs: 4723, 4806, 4805 - Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/CommScope)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0338-17-000m-revmd-initial-sa-comments-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
     2. CID 4273 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review submission discussion.
        3. Review proposed changes and the history of the previous changes.
        4. Proposed Resolution: 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).

In Figure 4-32, replace “Encrypted (GTK, IGTK, BIGTK)” with “Wrapped GTK, Wrapped IGTK, Wrapped BIGTK” In Figure 4-33, replace “Encrypted” with “Wrapped” (3x). In figure 4-33 replace “Encrypte” with “Wrap”

In 13.8.5 (P2748.59), change

“If a GTK, an IGTK or a BIGTK(#2116) are included, (#102)the Key field of the subelement shall be encrypted using KEK (#102)(when the negotiated AKM is 00-0F-AC:3, 00-0FAC:4, 00-0F-AC:9, or 00-0F-AC:13) or KEK2 (when the negotiated AKM is 00-0F-AC:16 or 00-0F-AC:17) and the NIST AES key wrap algorithm. The Key field shall be padded before encrypting if the key length is less than 16 octets or if it is not a multiple of 8.”

to

“If a GTK, an IGTK or a BIGTK are included, the Key field of the subelement shall be wrapped using KEK or KEK2 and the appropriate key wrap algorithm, as specified in Table 12-10 and clause 12.7.2.”

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

* + - 1. Add “In figure 4-33 replace “Encrypte” with “Wrap” “ to the resolution for a change on line 45.
      2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4806, 4805 (MAC)
       1. Review comments
       2. Review discussion in submission.
       3. Proposed Resolution CID 4806 (MAC): Revised.

At P2235.39, after bullet (m)(2) add:

“NOTE—When Single AID field is 0, a separate association request/response exchange must be done for each STA specified in the MMS element, and this assigns the multiple AIDs for the STAs.”

Add at P2239.64.

“NOTE—When Single AID field is 0, a separate reassociation request/response exchange must be done for each STA specified in the MMS element, and this assigns the multiple AIDs for the STAs.”

Add the same NOTE at P2239.64.

Note to Editor: number the NOTEs appropriately.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. Proposed resolution: CID 4805 (MAC): Revised.

In subclause 6.3.7.5.2 (Semantics of the [MLME-ASSOCIATE.response] service primitive) add a parameter in the parameter list: “MMS”, before the “FILSHLPContainer” parameter. Add a row in the parameter description table before the “FILSHLPContainer” row, with:

Name=”MMS”,

Type=”Multiple MAC Sublayers element”,

Valid range=”As defined in 9.4.2.152”, and

Description=”Specifies the parameters within the Multiple MAC Sublayers element that are supported by the MAC entity, and negotiated for the association. The parameter is present if dot11MultipleMACActivated is true and is absent otherwise.”

* + - 1. The parameter ”MMS” is not in the reassociation. Need to add.
      2. P355 reviewed the request case.
      3. Need to add parameter in reassociation case.
      4. UPDATED Proposed resolution for CID 4805 (MAC): Revised. In subclause 6.3.7.5.2 (Semantics of the [MLME-ASSOCIATE.response] service primitive) add a parameter in the parameter list: “MMS”, before the “FILSHLPContainer” parameter. Add a row in the parameter description table before the “FILSHLPContainer” row, with:

- Name=”MMS”,

- Type=”Multiple MAC Sublayers element”,

- Valid range=”As defined in 9.4.2.152”, and

- Description=”Specifies the parameters within the Multiple MAC Sublayers element that are supported by the MAC entity, and negotiated for the association. The parameter is present if dot11MultipleMACActivated is true and is absent otherwise.”

Add the same MMS parameter to the MLME-REASSOCIATE.response service primitive, in subclause 6.3.8.5.2, in the parameter list and the parameters table.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc 11-20/814r2** - Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0814-02-000m-proposed-resolutions-to-cids-4145-4146-and-4147.docx>
     2. Offline discussion has not found consensus.
     3. Will reject the comments for now and have the discussion in TGme in the next revision.
     4. ACTION ITEM: Mark HAMILTON will prepare a rejection reason for the 3 CIDs (4145, 4146, and 4147). The Task Group did not come to consensus.
     5. Additional CIDs that was also added to Osama’s document.
        1. CID 4144 – Motion #219 – Rejected. – No further action required.
        2. CID 4751 (PHY) – Change resolution to match these.
        3. Disagreement on changing the CID that was already motioned.
        4. ACTION ITEM: Michael MONTEMURRO to Add CID 4751 rejection reason to be the same as the other 3. (coordinating with Mark HAMILTON).
  2. **Review doc 11-20/1172r0** – CID 4783 - Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1172-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4783.docx>
     2. CID 4783 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Discussion on deprecating the Activated version and fixing the Implementing version.
        4. Discussion on determining if we need to know if implemented to activated? No, there is no need to have both MIB entries.
        5. Preference to deprecated Implemented and fix Activated.
        6. More work will need to be done and will be on Wednesday agenda.
        7. Continuing on reviewing the 2nd and 3rd part of comment changes.
        8. Discussion on if we can change the name rather than deprecate the MIB variable. Change name may not be allowed according to the Editor’s guidelines. May need to update the guidelines to account for this case.
        9. The Rule is that we cannot delete a MIB variable – but we can change a field name so that the size of the MIB is not being changed.
        10. Edward’s method of deprecation is the path to follow.
        11. Request to double check the spelling to ensure MIB names are correct.
        12. Add to Agenda for Wednesday.
  3. **Review GEN CIDs** – Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
     1. CID 4082 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment.
        2. No consensus.
        3. Mark H to craft a rejection reason.
     2. CID 4081/4080 (GEN):
        1. Review comments
        2. These are local to the MLME and MAC.
        3. This is the MLME telling the MAC how to behave.
        4. No consensus on direction or need for change.
        5. Mark H to expand in a rejection reason.
        6. From Chat Window:
           1. REJECTEDThe purpose of the ReceiveDTIMs parameter of the MLME-POWERMGT.request primitive is to allow the SME to choose whether:a) To instruct the STA that it must awaken prior to every expected DTIM, so that it can receive itb) To inform the STA that it is not required to awaken prior to every expected DTIM, so it might miss some
           2. There is no behaviour on the AP, the AP just sends DTIMs on its regular schedule as always.
           3. from [V] Joseph Levy InterDigital to everyone: 2:43 PM

Mark, I view this much differently. I think the only behavior is on the AP side. As it is up to the AP to decide if it tries to send the buffered frames in the next DTIM priod or not. If the STA PS mode has this parameter set, the AP may assume a non-response (ACK) from a STA means the STA is no longer present and hence the buffered data need not be maintained till the next DTIM. The STA aware of the APs buffering and transmit would need to "wake" to receive it's data at each DTIM, but the specification should be on the AP behavior, not the STA's behavior. As the AP's behavior is testable and verifiable - as it is a transmission. The act of listening is not testable or verifiable.

* + 1. CID 4036 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Operating Class CID
       3. Assign to Matthew FISCHER
    2. CID 4034 (GEN) –
       1. Review Comment
       2. Pursue Reject. Insufficient details.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 4034 (GEN) REJECTED (GEN: 2020-08-04 20:36:51Z) The comment 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.
  1. **Review doc 11-20/435r10** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
     2. Mark Rison – CIDs 4205, 4206, 4265, [4574, 4364, 4365, 4154], 4565, 4263, 4353, 4379, 4516, 4557, 4566, 4574, 4229/4266, 4808 (already motioned, additional changes) see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
     3. CID 4574, 4364, 4365, 4154 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Review proposed changes.
        4. Discussion on the use of EDCAF.
        5. CID 4574 is assigned to Menzo, and in 11-20/150r17.
        6. Discussion on item b) when striking “and the AC was a primary AC” the reference may need to be deleted also.
        7. Move ahead with the resolution of CID 4574, 4364, 4365, 4154 (MAC) with Revised; Incorporate 11-20/435r11.
        8. Proposed resolution: CIDs 4574, 4364, 4365, 4154 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-08-04 20:50:39Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-20/0435r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>) indicated for CIDs 4574, 4364, 4365 and 4154.
        9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 4458 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review submission discussion.
        3. Review minutes from July 29th:

3.11.6 CID 4458 (GEN)

3.11.6.1 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>

3.11.6.2 Review Comment

3.11.6.3 Review the submission discussion.

3.11.6.4 Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-07-29 21:52:12Z) Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 4458 in 11-20/0435r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>>, which address the issue raised by the commenter, including the interplay between dot11ExtendedChannelSwitchActivated and dot11OperatingClassesRequired.

3.11.6.5 Discussion on Operating Classes “required” vs “implemented”. There is a difference between “implemented” and “required”. “required” means the STA must do something.

3.11.6.6 The changes take into account when a feature is required.

3.11.6.7 More work needed. The changes need to be reviewed.

3.11.6.8 Leave it open to check the changes.

3.11.7 Schedule to revisit GEN CID 4458 (Mark R.) as well as CIDs 4272 (Mark R.) and 4162 (Edward) on Tuesday August 4.

* + - 1. No objection with moving forward with the resolution.
      2. Discussion on changes in 11.9.1 General –
      3. Discussion on taking the proposed change as it will not hurt as proposed.
      4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-08-04 20:57:56Z) Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 4458 in 11-20/0435r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>>, which address the issue raised by the commenter, including the interplay between dot11ExtendedChannelSwitchActivated and dot11OperatingClassesRequired.
      5. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
  1. Review Telecon Agenda for Aug 5th Note from 4-6pm ET
  2. Adjourned 5:02pm ET

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Wednesday, August 05, 2020 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order at 4:04** pm 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 13 attendees reported by WebEx

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Fischer, Matthew | Broadcom Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Goodall, David | Morse Micro |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus Wireless |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Lindskog, Erik | SAMSUNG |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | NANDAGOPALAN, SAI SHANKAR | Cypress Semiconductor Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
|  | TGmd | 8/5 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |

* + 1. Missing from IMAT: None reported
  1. Review Agenda 11-20/1001r12:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-12-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx>
     2. **The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:**

1.       Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/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](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this Call for Potentially Essential Patents

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

b.      Patent, Participation and policy related slides: See slides 4-19 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0323-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-july-2020.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU –

see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156. Total of 820 comments.

See <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-27-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt> .

D3.4 is available and includes resolution approved in May and June motions.

3.       Comment resolution

1. **2020-08-05 Wednesday 4-6 pm Eastern 2 hours**
   1. Mark Hamilton – CIDs 4081 (GEN), 4082 (GEN), 4080 (GEN)
   2. Matthew Fischer – CID 4036 (GEN)
   3. Jon ROSDAHL – GEN CIDs, 4001, also 4783 (Edward Au) <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1172-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4783.docx>
   4. Mark Rison – CIDs 4205, 4206, 4565, 4263, 4353, 4379, 4516, 4557, 4566, 4574, 4229/4266, 4272, 4808 (already motioned, additional changes) see <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
   5. Menzo WENTINK – including CIDs 4725, 4143, 4761, 4811 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>,

Gaurav PATWARDHAN - non-AP STA TXOP frame bursting, <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1076-01-000m-non-ap-sta-txop-frame-bursting.pptx> and <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1104-01-000m-proposed-changes-in-scs-10-23-2-2-and-10-23-2-9.docx>

4.       AOB

* Review TGmd schedule –

Target D 4.0 in August; D5.0 in September

(August 7th motion for recirculation, August 21 – Editors have draft, 15-20 day recirc, end by September 8. )

Hold several meetings during September plenary for comment resolution.

Sept/early Oct D5.0 WG approval to send to EC for forwarding to RevCom – likely electronic

Sept/Oct – D5.0 Unchanged recirc

6 Oct – 802 EC Approval, Draft TGme PAR (next revision)

13 October – Draft to RevCom

2020 Dec RevCom/SASB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Review Agenda – R12
    2. No objections to agenda as described.
  1. **Editor Report** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. All the previous resolutions have been implemented from last Motion day.
     2. We can start Friday with the new set of resolutions.
     3. No Questions
  2. **CIDs 4081 (GEN), 4082 (GEN), 4080 (GEN)** - Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
     1. CID 4080/4081 (GEN)
        1. Review Proposed Rejection reason:
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2020-08-05 20:11:17Z) - The CRC discussed this comment at length and did not come to consensus to make the change. Concerns raised include: The point-of-view of the MLME-POWERMGT service primitives – are these purely local within a STA, or do they affect or imply actions of the AP? If the latter, what is the connection from the issuing MLME (of the .request) to the AP, to “allow” anything? What about STAs that issue this primitive saying they are in POWER\_SAVE state, but don’t actually wake up to receive (every) DTIMs or S1G TIMs?
        3. Mark Both Ready for Motion
     2. CID 4082 (GEN)
        1. Discussion on the possible solutions.
        2. There are conflicting views,
        3. One view put in chat window:
           1. active mode: A power management mode in which a nonmesh station (STA) remains in the awake state,and a mesh power management mode with respect to a neighbor peer mesh STA in which a mesh stationremains in the awake state and is expected to receive frames from this neighbor peer mesh STA.A peer STA can transmit to a STA in active mode at any time.power save (PS) mode: A power management mode in which a nonmesh station (STA) alternates betweenawake and doze states. A peer STA cannot transmit to a STA in PS mode without first establishing thatthe STA is in the awake state.[Slight concern that there may pedantically be additional constraints,e.g. even if the STA is in AM you can't transmit to it because of CS or ACM.
        4. We will take up on Friday.
  3. **Review doc 11-20/1182r2 - CID 4036 (GEN)** - Matthew Fischer (Broadcom) –
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1182-02-000m-s1g-eu-new-band.pptx>
     2. Matthew was not available, so David GOODALL (Morse Micro) presented the slides.
     3. CID 4036 (GEN)
        1. Review comment “The 915.8 MHz to 919.4 MHz band has become available for use by S1G devices in Europe.”
        2. Review the submission.
        3. Review Proposed changes to be made to add channels.
        4. There are two proposed changes –
        5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in doc 11-20/1182r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1182-02-000m-s1g-eu-new-band.pptx>> on slide 14 and 15 which adds the new operating classes.
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  4. **Review document 11-20/1172r1** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1172-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4783.docx>
     2. CID 4783 (GEN)
        1. Review the updates from yesterday.
        2. Updates based on feedback received from yesterday and email.
        3. Spelling was checked for MIB variables, but still found one in the review on screen. Found 7 errors.
        4. Discussion on the need to follow rules in 11-19/40r2.
        5. Proposed resolution: Revised; incorporate the changes in doc 11-20/1172r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1172-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4783.docx>> which updates the MIB Variables by changing from Implemented to Activated.
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for motion
  5. **Review doc 11-20/435r10** - Mark Rison (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
     2. CID 4205, 4206 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review submission discussion.
        3. Review proposed changes.
        4. For the proposed change for Table 9-153, the “See below” was discussed.
        5. Discussion on how to direct the reader to the new restriction text below.
        6. Need to be able to determine the difference between 11 and 12 entries in the table.
        7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2020-08-05 20:46:54Z): In D3.4:

In Table 9-153—AKM suite selectors delete “using PSK” in the Key management type cell for the :2, :6 and :20 rows.

In Table 9-153—AKM suite selectors, for the :11, :12 and :13 rows, at the bottom of the four rightmost cells, create a new merged cell with contents “See below for restrictions on the cipher suites used with this AKM suite selector”.

In 9.4.2.24.3 AKM suites after “Each AKM suite selector specifies an AKMP. Table 9-153 (AKM suite selectors) gives the AKM suite selectors defined by this standard.” add “If more than one selector’s authentication type, key management type and key derivation type apply to a security association, the most specific selector is used.”

* + - 1. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON - Review with Jouni for completeness in review.
      2. Mark Ready for Motion – Will get final check status on Friday.
    1. CID 4263 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review the submission discussion
       3. Review the proposed changes.
       4. Discussion on the difference of “creating” vs “starting” changes to “starting”.
       5. Proposed resolution: CID 4263 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-08-05 20:58:31Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-20/0435r10 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx) for CID 4263, which ensure that the behaviour for TVHT STAs joining a TVHT BSS is specified, and also use the term "start" consistently in relation to a BSS (not "create"). Note to the commenter: the VHT behaviour is already specified, in 11.39.7.
       6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4353, 4560 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review submission discussion.
       3. Review Proposed Changes.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2020-08-05 21:03:13Z):

Incorporate the changes shown under "Proposed changes" for CIDs 4353 and 4560 in 11-20/0435r10 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx), which address the issue raised by the commenter, bringing PBSSes within the same umbrella as other BSSes and extending the description to Management frames transmitted between TDLS peer STAs.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 4379 (MAC)
       1. Should be insufficient Detail
       2. Proposed resolution Rejected; Insufficient detail.
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 4451, 4557 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review submission discussion.
       3. Review proposed resolution.
       4. Discussion on if the proposed changes are compatible with CID 4422.
       5. Change CID 4422 (MAC):
          1. Revisit. Align resolution with these two CIDs.
       6. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 4451, 4557, 4422 (MAC) - the latter being a revisit - REVISED (MAC: 2020-08-05 21:11:46Z):

Incorporate the changes shown under "Proposed changes" for CID 4451 and CID 4557 in 11-20/0435r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>), which address the issues raised by the commenter in the direction suggested.

* + - 1. Mark All Three CIDs Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 4516 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review proposed changes.
       3. This was ready back in R3/R4 and an email exchange did not require any changes.
       4. Proposed Resolution: CID 4516 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2020-05-29 14:15:54Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-20/0435r11 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx), which allow for OMN (and NCW) frames to be broadcast.
       5. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CIDE 4566 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed change.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; In D3.4:

In 9.4.2.21.13 Location Civic report change “The Map Type field value “URL Defined” indicates the Map URL field value has a file extension, defined as a mime type and is self-descriptive.” to “The Map Type field value “URL Defined” indicates the Map URL field value has a file extension, and that the type of map referred to by the Map URL field is to be determined from this.”

In Table 9-143—Map Types change “fiff” to “tiff”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      2. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to send email to Stephen MCCANN to review.
    1. CID 4229 (MAC), CID 4266 (PHY)
       1. Discussion on the status.
       2. There is not consensus yet.
       3. Request to keep working on it, but Friday needs to wrap it up.
       4. A request to do a straight reject on CID 4229 (MAC).
          1. For the Alternate proposal see 11-20/1081r0
       5. ACTION ITEM: Sean COFFEY to send rejection reason for CID 4229 (MAC)
          1. Chat Window: From [V] Sean Coffey Realtek to everyone: 2:37 PM
          2. Proposed resolution for CID 4229: "Rejected. Many (most?) STAs are required to include all mandatory MCSs in (the proposed definition of) their operational MCS set. See 11/20-1081r0. The group discussed various possible modifications to the draft, including modifying the definition of operational rate set and modifying the cited note in 11.1.4.6 and a similar one in 10.3, to address related issues, but did not come to a consensus on any modification.”
       6. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to split the resolution for CID 4266 (PHY to be separate from CID 4229.
  1. **Review doc 11-20/150r17** Menzo WENTINK (Jon ROSDAHL presenting on Menzo’s behalf) (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>
     2. CID 4001 (GEN):
        1. Discussed off-line with Andrew MYLES. Proposal and counterproposal, since Jan 2020.
        2. Came to conclusion to support Beacons at PIFS
        3. Discussion of collision likelihood of Beacons at PIFS versus random backoff. If medium is busy for 5ms, then it could be a 5% collision probability.
        4. Added note to commenter to capture the collision discussion, including the 5% probability.
        5. Should we pick one rule: use a PIFS, or use a backoff – don’t leave it a may? General agreement to leave it as may.
        6. Note, Graham SMITH asked that it be noted in the minutes that he strongly objects to this resolution:
           1. An AP contends for Beacons using AC\_VO with AISFN of 1 and CWmin of 3. Hence, 1 in 4 Beacons can be sent at PIFS and 50% sent within DIFS or less. This has been fine for decades. Now this resolution says - APs have to choose whether to contend or use PIFS? How do they choose? Busy medium? How busy? Guess what they will do? They will go at PIFS and introduce a major change with no real justification for any improvement - Matthew pointed out that 5% collisions could occur, for what advantage, I did not hear one? I contend that the existing scheme of 1 in 4 beacons going at PIFS, 50% at DIFS or less, is fine and we should not change it, especially as traffic is increasing daily.
           2. Graham SMITH strongly opposes this resolution, the present scheme is fine.
        7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2020-08-05 21:43:54Z) – at 1730.30 add

"–A STA transmitting a Beacon frame, as described in 11.1.3.2 (Beacon generation in non-DMG infrastructure networks).

NOTE–An extended period during which the medium is busy after the TBTT can increase the probability for collisions between PIFS transmissions from nearby STAs on the same channel. The use of a random backoff instead of PIFS can reduce the collision probability in this case."

Note to the Commenter:

This change allows beacons to be transmitted at PIFS.

It is possible that clock drift causes TBTTs at two nearby APs to line up within 9 us and that a beacon collision occurs. However, the time this happens would only be 0.009% for a 100 ms beacon period. This fraction may be increased some by CCA busy events occurring around the TBTT, but the odds will still be low.

A medium busy time after the TBTT of for example 1 ms will increase this collision probability to 1%.

Matthew FISCHER suggested: A medium busy time after the TBTT of for example 5 ms will increase this collision probability to 5%.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. CID 4169 (GEN):
     1. Related to CID 4170 (GEN): which was discussed on June 17. That raised a backward compatibility concern. It isn’t resolved.
     2. ACTION ITEM: Mark HAMILTION to craft a rejection for no consensus, noting the backward compatibility concerns for both CID 4169 (GEN) and 4170 (GEN).
  2. CID 4149 (MAC):
     1. Discussed very briefly today.
     2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The scheduler between the alternate queues is implementation specific, which can mean higher priority / lower priority, but any other type of scheduler is also possible. Hence the term "alternate" is appropriate here.
     3. ACTION ITEM: Mark HAMILTON to craft a rejection, based on the suggested rejection in Menzo’s 11-20/0150r18 document.
  3. Adjourn 6:01pm ET

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Friday, Aug 7th, 2020 10:00-12:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order at 10:02** am 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 25 attendees reported by WebEx

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* + 1. Missing from IMAT: None reported
  1. **Review Agenda** 11-20/1001r14:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-11-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx>
     2. **The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:**

1.       Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/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](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)); or
2. Provide the chair of this group with the identity of the holder(s) of any and all such claims as soon as possible; or
3. Speak up now and respond to this Call for Potentially Essential Patents

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

b.      Patent, Participation and policy related slides: See slides 4-19 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0323-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-july-2020.pptx>

2.       Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU – see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156. Total of 820 comments. See <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0920-27-000m-802-11revmd-editor-s-report.ppt> .

D3.4 is available and includes resolution approved in May and June motions.

3.       Comment resolution

1. **2020-08-07 Friday 10 am Eastern 2 hours: Motions**
   1. **Motion: Approve the following minutes documents:**
      1. **July 22-24,** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0915-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmd-crc-june-17-19-2020.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0915-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmd-crc-june-17-19-2020.docx)
      2. **July 29-31,** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0956-04-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmd-crc-june-24-30-2020.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0956-04-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmd-crc-june-24-30-2020.docx)
      3. **Moved:**
      4. **Seconded:**
      5. **Result:**
   2. **Motion 224 –EDITOR (4 CIDs)**
      1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion-EDITOR-Y” tab in** : <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-11-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   3. **Motion 22x– EDITOR2 (1 CID)**
      1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion-EDITOR2-U” tab in** : <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2160-12-000m-revmd-editor2-standards-association-ballot-comments.xlsx>
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   4. **Motion : 22x PHY (5 CIDs)**
      1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “PHY Motion H” tab in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0145-16-000m-sb1-revmd-phy-sec-comments.xlsx**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   5. **Motion 22x– MAC (41 CIDs)**
      1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion MAC-AR” tab in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-64-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-64-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls) **except for CIDs 4205 and 4206**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   6. **Motion 22x – GEN (13 CIDs)**
      1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “Gen Motion Aug 7” tab in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-13-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-13-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls) **except for CID 4001**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   7. **Motion 22x– Additional fixes – Remove vestigial occurrences of "DLS" and “PCO” outside the MIB**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx) **on page 3, under “CID y” and “CID z” “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   8. **Motion 2xx– Additional fixes – Backoff procedure editing correction**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx)
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   9. **Motion 2xx- Additional CDMG fixes**
      1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-00-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-00-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx) **after “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
      2. **Moved:**
      3. **Seconded:**
      4. **Result:**
   10. **Motion 2xx– Insufficient Detail CIDs – EDITOR (3 CIDs)** 
       1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “Insufficient Detail II” tab in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-11-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-11-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls)
       2. **Moved:**
       3. **Seconded:**
       4. **Result:**
   11. **Motion 2xxx– CID 4229**
       1. **Resolve CID 4229 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “Many (most?) STAs are required to include all mandatory MCSs in (the proposed definition of) their operational MCS set. See** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1081-00-000m-operational-rates-and-mcss-8213-revmd-sb1-cid-4229.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1081-00-000m-operational-rates-and-mcss-8213-revmd-sb1-cid-4229.docx) **. The group discussed various possible modifications to the draft, including modifying the definition of operational rate set and modifying the cited note in 11.1.4.6 and a similar one in 10.3, to address related issues, but did not come to a consensus on any modification.”**
       2. **Moved:**
       3. **Seconded:**
       4. **Result:**
   12. **Motion 2xx – CIDs 4169, 4170 GEN Rejected CIDs**
       1. **Approve the comment resolutions in the “Gen Motion Rejects” tab in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-13-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-13-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls)
       2. **Moved:**
       3. **Seconded:**
       4. **Result:**
   13. **Motion – CIDs 4205, 4206**
       1. **Resolve CIDs 4205 and 4206 as “Rejected” with a resolution of   
          “The Authentication and Key Management (AKM) Suite Selectors are used by STAs to negotiate the authentication, key hierarchy and key derivation method for a security association. Although the authentication mechanism for an AKM Suite Selector may be the same, each AKM Suite Selector refers to a unique combination of security requirements.  The CRC could not come to consensus on a set of changes that would address the comment.**
       2. **Moved:**
       3. **Seconded:**
       4. **Result:**
   14. **Motion – CIDs 4205, 4206**
       1. **Resolve CIDs 4205 and 4206 as “Revised” with a resolution of   
          “In D3.4, Table 9-153—AKM suite selectors, delete “using PSK” in the Key management type cell for the :2, :6 and :20 rows**

**In Table 9-153—AKM suite selectors, for the :11, :12 and :13 rows, at the bottom of the four rightmost cells, create a new merged cell with contents “NOTE—Restrictions apply to the use of this AKM suite selector that are outside the scope of this standard”**

* + 1. **Moved:**
    2. **Seconded:**
    3. **Result:**
  1. **Motion – CID 4001**
     1. **Approve the comment resolution for CID 4001 in the “Gen Motion Aug 7” tab in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-13-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-13-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls)
     2. **Moved:**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  2. **Motion – CID 4001**
     1. **Resolve CIDs 4001 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “An AP contends for Beacons using AC\_VO with AISFN of 1 and CWmin of 3.  Hence, 1 in 4 Beacons can be sent at PIFS and 50% sent within DIFS or less.  This has been fine for decades.  No change is needed. Enabing all Beacon frames to be sent at PIFS introduces a major change with no real justification for any improvement - 5% collisions could occur, for an unclear advantage.”**
     2. **Moved:**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  3. **Motion 2xx– Remaining CIDs insufficient detail**
     1. **Resolve the following CIDs as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”**
        1. **MAC CIDs: 4143, 4727, 4761, 4811**
     2. **Moved:**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  4. **Motion 2xx– Remaining CIDs previously discussed, rejected direction or no submission forthcoming**
     1. **Resolve CID 4378 as “Rejected” with a resolution of "The proposed change is insufficient; normative text describing how this list of integers is used or indexed, and when a worst case must be used, is required"**
     2. **Resolve CID 4017 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter's proposed change is not complete - need to clarify why DMG in sequence and needs to be invoked by parent sequence”**
     3. **Resolve CID 4018 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter’s proposed change was reviewed. The change, applied at the cited location is not technically correct.”**
     4. **Resolve CID 4109 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “No issue is identified in the comment. The current text is accurate.”**
     5. **Resolve CID 4725 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The CRC agrees with the commenter that adding a retry cut-off at the frame’s relevant lifetime is useful.  However, the CRC could not reach consensus on removing the existing retry cut-off at the “relevant retry limit”, because it might have effects on upper-layers that are expecting the frame to be discarded at its lifetime.”**
     6. **Moved:**
     7. **Seconded:**
     8. **Result:**
  5. **Motion 2xx– Remaining CIDs previously discussed, revised direction** 
     1. **Resolve CID 4416 as “Revised” with a resolution of "Make the changes specified in 11-20/150r17 <**[**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx)**> for CID 4271. Note to commenter:  Instead of making these entries read-only, the dot11EDCATable MIB attributes are modified so they can also be used at the AP to define the EDCA parameters to be communicated to the non-AP STAs. "**
     2. **Resolve CIDs 4389, 4390 as "Revised", with a resolution of "Incorporate the text changes in** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0647-00-000m-sa-ballot-1-cid-4389-and-4390-two-staaddress-parameter.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0647-00-000m-sa-ballot-1-cid-4389-and-4390-two-staaddress-parameter.docx)**which modify the text to indicate two distinct STA addresses"**
     3. **Resolve CID 4035 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Add dot11RSNAStatsGCMPReplays and dot11RSNAStatsRobustMgmtGCMPReplays to Dot11RSNAConfigEntry and dot11RSNBase2.”**
     4. **Moved:**
     5. **Seconded:**
     6. **Result:**
  6. **Motion - CID 4108**
     1. **Resolve CID 4108 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes in doc 11-20/143r0 <**[**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0143-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4108.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0143-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4108.docx)**> which adds lower 45MHz of 5.9 band.**
     2. **Moved**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  7. **Motion:** 
     1. **Resolve the following CIDs as indicated:**
        1. **CID 4077 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Replace the first two paragraphs of 11.2.1 with: A STA is either in an active mode, or can optionally support the power save mode. A STA in active mode is always in awake state. A STA in power save mode transitions between awake and doze states as determined by its power management mode and as reflected in dot11PowerManagementMode.”**
        2. **CID 4564 as “Accepted”**
        3. **CID 4572 as “Accepted”**
        4. **CID 4648 as“Accepted”**
        5. **CID 4687 as “Accepted”**
        6. **CID 4701 as “Accepted”**
        7. **CID 4707 as “Accepted”**
        8. **CID 4272 as “Accepted”**
        9. **CID 4082 as**
     2. **Moved:**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  8. **Motion - GEN CID 4266 – No consensus**
     1. **Resolve CID 4266 as “” with a resolution of “”**
     2. **Moved:**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  9. **Motion - GEN CID 4082**
     1. **Resolve CID 4226 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “”**
     2. **Moved:**
     3. **Seconded:**
     4. **Result:**
  10. **SA Ballot Recirculation Motion**
      1. **Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the initial SA ballot on P802.11REVmd as indicated in document** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156-16-000m-revmd-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156-16-000m-revmd-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls) **and as indicated by motion in this document** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-14-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-14-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx) **,**
      2. **Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 4.0 incorporating these resolutions and**
      3. **Approve a 15 day Sponsor Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11REVmd D4.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”**
      4. **Moved:**
      5. **Seconded:**
      6. **Result:**

1. **Announce next set of teleconferences:** 
   1. **Week August 17th:  
      Week August 24th:**

4.       AOB

Review TGmd schedule –target D 4.0 in August; D5.0 in September

(August 7th motion for recirculation, August 21 – Editors have draft, 15 day recirc, end by September 8. 🡨 update

Hold several meetings during September plenary for comment resolution.

Sept – D5.0 Unchanged recirc

28 Sept – Unchanged recirc must start

6 Oct – 802 EC Aproval, Draft TGme PAR (next revision)

13 October – Draft to RevCom

2020 Dec RevCom/SASB

5. Adjourn

* + 1. Review Agenda
       1. Discussion on extending for an additional hour.
       2. Discussion on modification of agenda.
       3. 3 Motion adjustments added to chat window.
       4. from [V] Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm) to everyone: 8:08 AM
          1. 1. correction for Previous Telecon Minutes Motion:

For i. Motion: Approve the following minutes documents:a. July 22, 24, 29, 31: 11-20/1125r3https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1125-03-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmd-crc-july-22-31-2020.docx

The Minutes for Aug 3, 4, and 5th are included in doc 11-20/1183 but there is an error that will be corrected with the Aug 7th Minutes (Also included in this document).

* + - * 1. 2. Add new item: xxiv: Motion GEN CID 4272

a. **Resolve CID 4272 as (either 1 or 2)**

GEN: 2020-08-06 18:02:17Z - IF review of doc 11-20/435r11 does not have acceptable resolution, then use :

**Proposed Resolution** #1: **Reject**; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.

**ELSE**

**Proposed Resolution #2 (from 11-20/435r11): Revised**; Change 5.1.5.1 as follows:

The MAC data plane architecture (i.e., processes that involve transport of all or part of an MSDU) is shown in Figure 5-1 (MAC data plane architecture(11ak)(#2273)) when transparent FST is not being used and shown in Figure 5-2 (MAC data plane architecture (transparent FST)(11ak)(#2467)(#2273)) when transparent FST is being used.   
  
The dotted line box labeled “Role-specific behaviors” is replaced by one of several options, depending on the role of the STA. See the following subclauses  
Editor refer to doc 11-20/0435r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>) for diagram.

* + - 1. from [V] Mark RISON (Samsung) to everyone: 8:11 AM
         1. Question: status of additional changes for CID 4808?4659 on Finite Cyclic Group resolution ready for discussionCID 4247 - Approved Motion 219 Rejected - Insufficient detailsCID 4746 - Approved Motion 216 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4220 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4477 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4523 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4629 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4602 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4527 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details CID 4699 - Approved Motion 218 Rejected - Insufficient details
      2. Added an addition item to agenda to consider.
      3. Note we will edit the motions as we go along.
      4. Concern on the process of acting on motions – objection was made to characterization of the concern.
      5. Updates were made to the agenda – see R15 of agenda.
    1. **Motion #TelconAug7-1:** 
       1. Approve Agenda as shown on screen with the extension of up to one hour of time. (see R15 after telecon)
       2. Moved: Emily QI
       3. Second: Michael MONTEMURRO
       4. **Results: 16-1-1 Motion approved.**
  1. **Editor Report** Emily QI (Intel)
     1. Master Spreadsheet is updated see 11-19/2156r17
     2. Updates all the proposed resolutions for today as of Aug 6th.
     3. No other Questions
  2. Motions:
     1. **Motion #TelconAug7-2**: **Previous Telecon Minutes**
     2. Approve the following minutes document:
* July 22, 24, 29, 31: 11-20/1125r3 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1125-03-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revmd-crc-july-22-31-2020.docx>
  + - 1. Note: The Minutes for Aug 3, 4, and 5th are included in doc 11-20/1183 but there is an error that will be corrected with the Aug 7th Minutes (Also included in this document (11-20/1183r3)).
      2. Results: Motion Approved by Unanimous Consent.
    1. **Motion #224 –EDITOR (4 CIDs)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion-EDITOR-Y” tab in : <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-11-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>
       2. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
       3. Seconded: Emily QI
       4. No discussion.
       5. **Result for Motion #224: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes.**
    2. **Motion #225– EDITOR2 (1 CID)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion-EDITOR2-U” tab in 11-19/2160r12 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2160-12-000m-revmd-editor2-standards-association-ballot-comments.xlsx>>
       2. Moved: Edward AU
       3. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
       4. No discussion
       5. **Result for Motion #225: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes.**
    3. **Motion #226 - PHY (5 CIDs)**

Approve the comment resolutions in the “PHY Motion H” tab in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0145-16-000m-sb1-revmd-phy-sec-comments.xlsx>

* + - 1. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Second: Assaf KASHER
      3. Discussion:
         1. Question if this motion covers CID 4116? As it does not, no further issue noted.
         2. Concern expressed for resolutions for CID 4286 and 4137.
      4. **Results for Motion #226: 14-0-4 – Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #227 – MAC (41 CIDs)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion MAC-AR” tab in 11-17/0927r64 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-64-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xls>> except for CIDs 4659, 4636, 4205 and 4206
       2. Moved: Mark RISON
       3. Seconded: Emily QI
       4. Discussion:
          1. Request to pull CID 4659, and 4636 from the motion.
          2. No other discussion
       5. **Result for Motion #227: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes.**
    2. **Motion #228 – GEN (13 CIDs)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Gen Motion Aug 7” tab in 11-20/0147r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-14-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls>> except for CID 4001
       2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
       3. Seconded: Michael MONTEMURRO
       4. Discussion: None
       5. **Result for Motion #228: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes.**
    3. **Motion #229– Additional fixes – Remove vestigial occurrences of "DLS" and “PCO” outside the MIB**
       1. Incorporate the changes indicated in11-20/150r15 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-15-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>> on page 3, under “CID y” and “CID z” “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4
       2. Moved: Graham SMITH
       3. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
       4. Discussion: None
       5. **Result for Motion #229: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes**.
    4. **Motion #230– Additional fixes – Backoff procedure editing correction**
       1. Incorporate the changes indicated in 11-20/1114r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1114-02-000m-revmd-backoff-procedure-correction.docx>>
       2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
       3. Seconded: Stephen MCCAAN
       4. Discussion: None
       5. **Result for Motion #230: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes.**
    5. **Motion #231- Additional CDMG fixes**
       1. **Incorporate the changes indicated in 11-20/1136r1 <**[**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-01-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1136-01-000m-sb1-resolution-to-cid-4763.docx)**> after “two issues were found”, pages 3 and 4**
       2. Moved: Assaf KASHER
       3. Seconded: Michael MONTEMURRO
       4. Discussion:
          1. Review doc and note it is R1
          2. No other objections.
       5. **Result for Motion #231: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes**.
    6. **Motion #232– Insufficient Detail CIDs – EDITOR (3 CIDs)** 
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Insufficient Detail II” tab in 11-20/0010r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-11-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>> except for CID 4637
       2. Moved: Emily QI
       3. Seconded: Mark RISON
       4. Discussion:
          1. Request to pull CID 4637
          2. No other discussion.
       5. **Result for Motion #232: Unanimous Consent – Motion passes.**
    7. **Motion #233– CID 4229**
       1. Resolve CID 4229 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “Many (most?) STAs are required to include all mandatory MCSs in (the proposed definition of) their operational MCS set. See 11-20/1081r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1081-00-000m-operational-rates-and-mcss-8213-revmd-sb1-cid-4229.docx>> . The group discussed various possible modifications to the draft, including modifying the definition of operational rate set and modifying the cited note in 11.1.4.6 and a similar one in 10.3, to address related issues, but did not come to a consensus on any modification.”
       2. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
       3. Seconded: Sean COFFEY
       4. Discussion:
          1. Objection to the resolution was made.
       5. Result **for Motion #233: 14-2-3 Motion Passes.**
    8. **Motion #234 – CIDs 4169, 4170 GEN Rejected CIDs**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Gen Motion Rejects” tab in 11-20/147r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-14-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls> >
       2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
       3. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
       4. Discussion:
          1. Note Both CIDs have exact same comment.
          2. Objection to the resolution was made.
          3. Discussion on need to consider channel switch changes and how to mitigate NAV resetting.
       5. **Result for Motion #234: 11-3-4 Motion Passes**
    9. **Motion #235– CIDs 4205, 4206 – Proposed Revised**
       1. Resolve CIDs 4205 and 4206 as “Revised” with a resolution of “In D3.4, Table 9-153—AKM suite selectors, delete “using PSK” in the Key management type cell for the :2, :6 and :20 rows

In Table 9-153—AKM suite selectors, for the :11, :12 and :13 rows, at the bottom of the four rightmost cells, create a new merged cell with contents “NOTE—Restrictions apply to the use of this AKM suite selector that are outside the scope of this standard.”

Note to the commenter: expressions such as "FT authentication" in the Authentication type column are an implicit reference to a particular and distinct key hierarchy, which allows AKM suite selectors to be distinguished.”

* + - 1. Moved: Mark RISON
      2. Seconded: Jouni MALINEN
      3. Discussion:
         1. Concern that the resolution is not correct.
         2. Discussion on how the key is derived and explanation on why the deletion was proposed.
         3. Discussion on why the NOTE is being proposed.
         4. Support for the motion was voiced.
         5. Objection to the Note was noted that asserted the NOTE is not correct. Request to not make all language everywhere the same.
         6. Note that the WebEx poll limits characters
      4. **Result Motion #235: 7-7-2 Motion Fails.**
    1. **Motion #236 – CIDs 4205, 4206 – Proposed Reject**
       1. Resolve CIDs 4205 and 4206 as “Rejected” with a resolution of   
          “The Authentication and Key Management (AKM) Suite Selectors are used by STAs to negotiate the authentication, key hierarchy and key derivation method for a security association. Although the authentication mechanism for an AKM Suite Selector may be the same, each AKM Suite Selector refers to a unique combination of security requirements.  The CRC could not come to consensus on a set of changes that would address the comment.
       2. Moved: Jouni MALINEN
       3. Seconded: Michael MONTUMORRO
       4. Discussion:
          1. With the removal of Suite B, the point was to add a note to clarify the suite selectors.
          2. Other opinion was expressed that the no notes are needed.
       5. **Result for Motion #236: 11-2-3 Motion Passes.**
    2. **Motion #237 – CID 4001 – Proposed Revised**
       1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 4001 in the “Gen Motion Aug 7” tab in 11-20/147r14 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0147-14-000m-sb1-revmd-gen-comments.xls>>
       2. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
       3. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
       4. Discussion:
          1. Opposition to the motion was expressed.
          2. Discussion on why add PIFs as a choice and allow a change to the process without giving a rule for how to chose which method to use.
          3. Discussion on the use of AC\_VO and request to make any change.
          4. Without expressly allowing this, we may have an issue with the European regulations do not become unfavourable.
          5. Discussion on practice of when beacons would be allowed to go out for regulatory reasons.
       5. **Result for Motion #237: 8-4-3 Motion Fails**
    3. **Motion #238 – CID 4001 – Proposed Reject**
       1. Resolve CIDs 4001 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “An AP contends for Beacons using AC\_VO with AISFN of 1 and CWmin of 3. Hence, 1 in 4 Beacons can be sent at PIFS and 50% sent within DIFS or less. This has been fine for decades. No change is needed. Enabling all Beacon frames to be sent at PIFS introduces a major change with no real justification for any improvement - 5% collisions could occur, for an unclear advantage.”
       2. Moved: Graham SMITH
       3. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
       4. Discussion:
          1. Concern on Regulatory compatibility in Europe
          2. The Constraint is from ETSI to not use PIFs, so we should not change.
       5. **Result for Motion #238: 10-4-2 Motion Fails.**
    4. **Review doc 11-20/435r12 Mark RISON (Samsung)**
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
       2. Request to present on CID 4659 prior to next motion.
       3. CID 4659 (MAC)
          1. Review submission discussion.
          2. Discussion on the proposed resolution:

The proposed change would make the topic less clear.

Discussion on why the current wording does not tell what the 16-Bit list is.

Assertion that the change helps clarity.

* + - * 1. Proposed resolution: Incorporate the changes for CID 4659 in 11-20/0435r12 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>>
        2. Prepare motion
    1. **Motion #239 CID 4659** 
       1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 4659 as in 11-20/435r12 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>>.
       2. Moved: Mark RISON
       3. Seconded: Jerome HENRY
       4. Discussion:
          1. The standard does not tell how to find the values of the 16-bit values.
       5. **Result for Motion #239: 5-5-5 Motion Fails**
    2. **Motion #240– MAC (2 CIDs)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the “Motion MAC-AR” tab in 11-17/927r64 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/17/11-17-0927-64-000m-revmd-mac-comments.xl>s> for CIDs 4636, 4659
       2. Moved: Michael MONTEMURRO
       3. Seconded: Dan HARKINS
       4. Discussion:
          1. For CID 4636, there is an alternate proposal, and for CID 4656, the comment should be rejected.
       5. **Result for Motion #240: 9-3-2 Motion Passes**
    3. **Review doc 11-435r12** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
       1. CID 4637 (MAC)
          1. This is same as 4366
          2. Need more time, and this can be done later in the process.
          3. The goal is to go out for Recirc today and have a week off and then review what is ready.
          4. Proposed Resolve CID 4637 as “Rejected” with a resolution of "The group did not come to a consensus on modifications in 19/0856.
          5. Prepare a Motion
    4. **Motion #241– Insufficient Detail CIDs – EDITOR (1 CIDs)**
       1. Approve the comment resolution in the “Insufficient Detail lI” tab in 11-20/10r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0010-11-000m-revmd-sa1-comments-for-editor-ad-hoc.xls>> for CID 4637.
       2. Moved: Emily QI
       3. Second: Stephen MCCANN
       4. Discussion: none
       5. Results: 12-0-3 Motion passes
    5. **Motion #242– Remaining MAC CIDs insufficient detail**
       1. Resolve the following CIDs as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”

MAC CIDs: 4143, 4727, 4761, 4811

* + - 1. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
      2. Seconded: Michael MONTEMURRO
      3. Discussion:
         1. Concerns with CID 4727 and CID 4761 the “[:” comment.
      4. **Result for Motion #242: 12-1-4 Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #243– Remaining GEN CIDs previously discussed, rejected direction or no submission forthcoming**
       1. **Resolve the following CIDs as indicated:**
* Resolve CID 4738 as “Rejected” with a resolution of "The proposed change is insufficient; normative text describing how this list of integers is used or indexed, and when a worst case must be used, is required"
* Resolve CID 4017 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter's proposed change is not complete - need to clarify why DMG in sequence and needs to be invoked by parent sequence”
* Resolve CID 4018 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The commenter’s proposed change was reviewed. The change, applied at the cited location is not technically correct.”
* Resolve CID 4109 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “No issue is identified in the comment. The current text is accurate.”
  + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
      2. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
      3. Discussion: None
      4. **Result for Motion #243: 14-0-3 Motion Passes.**
    1. **Motion #244 – CID 4725 - Proposed Reject**
       1. Resolve CID 4725 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The CRC agrees with the commenter that adding a retry cut-off at the frame’s relevant lifetime is useful. However, the CRC could not reach consensus on removing the existing retry cut-off at the “relevant retry limit”, because it might have effects on upper-layers that are expecting the frame to be discarded at its lifetime.”
       2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
       3. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
       4. Discussion:
       5. Object to the rejection, an alternate resolution was prepared by Menzo, and was shared to the chat window by Mark R.
          1. 1763.38 add "or lifetime" after "retry limit". 4112.57 change "255" to "4294967295"(in dot11ShortDEIRetryLimit). 4113.27 change "255" to "4294967295" (in dot11UnsolicitedRetryLimit). 4151.53 change "255" to "4294967295"(in dot11ShortRetryLimit). Note to commenter: The proposed deletion of the items in 10.23.2.12.1 would take a lot of detail out of EDCA, which may not be desired. This detail associates the appropriate retry limit with the specific frame an MIB variable, so it should not be deleted.
       6. Believe that general wording was achieved.
       7. There was email exchange, but the value of the change was not agreed by the CRC
       8. The upper limit is the resolution point and the value.
       9. **Result for Motion #244: 13-4-2 Motion Passes**
    2. **Motion #245– Remaining GEN CIDs previously discussed, revised direction** 
       1. Resolve the following CIDs as indicated:
* Resolve CID 4416 as “Revised” with a resolution of "Make the changes specified in 11-20/150r17 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>> for CID 4271. Note to commenter:  Instead of making these entries read-only, the dot11EDCATable MIB attributes are modified so they can also be used at the AP to define the EDCA parameters to be communicated to the non-AP STAs. "
* Resolve CIDs 4389, 4390 as "Revised", with a resolution of "Incorporate the text changes in 11-20/647r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0647-00-000m-sa-ballot-1-cid-4389-and-4390-two-staaddress-parameter.docx>>  which modify the text to indicate two distinct STA addresses"
* Resolve CID 4035 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Add dot11RSNAStatsGCMPReplays and dot11RSNAStatsRobustMgmtGCMPReplays to Dot11RSNAConfigEntry and dot11RSNBase2.”
  + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
      2. Seconded: Emily QI
      3. Discussion:
         1. Question on dot11RSNBase2 being a member of compliance group?

Yes. But it is new group that is being created in TGmd so the addition is allowed.

* + - 1. **Result for Motion #245: Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes.**
    1. **CID 4108 – Discussion on possible Resolutions:**
       1. CID 4108 (GEN)
       2. Two possible resolution:
          1. Resolve CID 4108 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Incorporate the changes in doc 11-20/143r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0143-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4108.docx>> which adds lower 45MHz of 5.9 band.
          2. OR
          3. An Alternate Resolution: Reject; the addition of the bands should wait until the regulatory group finalizes the assignment.
       3. Discussion:
          1. Uncertain on the NPRM finalization.
          2. Discussion that we should not add to Annex E anything that is not Normative.
       4. Prepare Reject Resolution.
    2. **Motion #246 – CID 4108 – Proposed Reject**
       1. Moved: Resolve CID 4108 as Rejected; This request is based on an NPRM, and is not final yet. The addition of the bands should wait until the regulatory group finalizes the assignment.
       2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
       3. Seconded: Joseph LEVY
       4. **Result motion CID #246: Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes.**
    3. **Review doc 11-20/94r0 Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)**
       1. CID 4077 (MAC)
          1. Review comment
          2. Proposed resolution: CID 4077 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Replace the first two paragraphs of 11.2.1 with: A STA is either in an active mode or can optionally support the power save mode. A STA in active mode is always in awake state. A STA in power save mode transitions between awake and doze states as determined by its power management mode, as reflected in dot11PowerManagementMode.”
          3. Concern with full replacement causing the lose of “Doze” state definition.
          4. If there is lots of concern, we may need to put into bucket of no consensus and take up later.
          5. Discussion on if prefer the text proposed than what is there, or to add the text without deletion.
          6. We do not seem to have consensus so we will need to craft a reject resolution.
       2. CID 4564 (MAC)
          1. Review comment
          2. No objection to Accept
       3. CID 4572 (MAC)
          1. Review Comment
          2. No objection to Accept
       4. CID 4648 (MAC)
          1. Review Comment
          2. Editor can fixe the extraneous “a”
          3. No objection to Accept
       5. CID 4687 (MAC)
          1. Review Comment
          2. Discussion on the ack policy and if the table in 9-13 has all the behaviour.
          3. Discussion on if table 9-13 should be in clause 9 or 10.
          4. No objection to Accept
       6. CID 4701 (MAC)
          1. Review Comment
          2. No objection to Accept
       7. CID 4707 (MAC)
          1. Review Comment
          2. No objection to Accept
       8. Return to CID 4077 (MAC)
          1. Rejection reason needs to be prepared.
          2. Discussion on possibly using the text from CID 4082

Potential Resolution: CID 4082: Rejected. The CRC could not come to a consensus on proposed changes to resolve this comment. Some considerations were: The definitions need to cover all types of STAs and BSSs, not just infrastructure BSS. It’s not clear if this definition is meant to also cover TDLS active/power save mode. The wording of definitions that make the details of the application of the power save concept to a requesting STA, or to its peer STA, is very difficult in a short sentence, and this will require more work.

* + - * 1. That won’t work.
        2. New Proposed resolution: Reject. The CRC could not come to a consensus on proposed changes to resolve this comment. While there is general agreement to not describe power save modes as “scheduled”, some concern was raised on how to describe the active and doze modes from the perspective of the PS STA or its peer.
        3. Prepare an updated motion.
    1. **Motion #247: MAC CIDs – (6 Accept and 1 reject)**
       1. Resolve the following CIDs as indicated:
* CID 4077 as “Reject. The CRC could not come to a consensus on proposed changes to resolve this comment. While there is general agreement to not describe power save modes as “scheduled”, some concern was raised on how to describe the active and doze modes from the perspective of the PS STA or its peer.”
* CID 4564 as “Accepted”
* CID 4572 as “Accepted”
* CID 4648 as “Accepted”
* CID 4687 as “Accepted”
* CID 4701 as “Accepted”
* CID 4707 as “Accepted”
  + - 1. Moved: Emily Qi
      2. Second: Michael MONTEMURRO
      3. Discussion: none
      4. **Results for Motion #247: Unanimous Consent - Motion Passes.**
    1. **Review doc 11-20/435r12 Mark RISON (Samsung)**
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>
       2. CID 4266 (MAC)
          1. Review comment discussion in submission.
          2. Discussion on the possible changes.
          3. Proposed alternate resolution: CID 4266: Rejected. The commenter's suggestion that the "basic rate set" remains fixed for the duration of the BSS seems reasonable. However, there is no definition of "basic rate set" in the draft. Some possible definitions were discussed, but the group did not come to a consensus. The group decided not to add clarifications to concepts that are not currently defined.
          4. Discussion on if there is a definition of Basic Rate set is in clause 10 or not.
          5. Review 10.3.1 general description (note that there are two CID 4266 references in the document we are referring to page 89).
          6. Prepare Motion

* + 1. **Motion #248: PHY CID 4266 – Proposed Revised**
       1. Resolve CID 4266 as “Revised” with a resolution of incorporate the resolution for CID 4266 starting on page 89 in 11-20/435r12 <[**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx)**>.**
       2. Moved: Mark RISON
       3. Second Michael MONTEMURRO
       4. **Result for Motion #248: 3-7-4 - Motion Fails.**
    2. **Motion #249 - PHY CID 4266 – Proposed Reject**
       1. "Resolve CID 4266 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The group discussed various possible modifications to the draft, including modifying the definition of basic rate set, basic MCS set but did not come to a consensus on any modification.
       2. Moved:
       3. Second “
       4. **Results for Motion #249: 12-2-1 Motion passes**
    3. **Motion #250 - CID 4082 (GEN) – Proposed Reject**
       1. Resolve CID 4082 as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The CRC could not come to a consensus on proposed changes to resolve this comment.  Some considerations were: The definitions need to cover all types of STAs and BSSs, not just infrastructure BSS.  It’s not clear if this definition is meant to also cover TDLS active/power save mode.  The wording of definitions that make the details of the application of the power save concept to a requesting STA, or to its peer STA, is very difficult in a short sentence, and this will require more work.”
       2. Moved: Mark HAMILTON
       3. Second: Emily QI
       4. Discussion: like to see more work done in this direction.
       5. **Results for Motion #250: 11-0-3 Motion passes.**
    4. **Motion #TelconAug7-3 - Request to stay on the call for an additional 30 minutes**:
       1. Motion to extend call time an additional 30 minutes
          1. Moved: Emily QI
          2. Second: Jon ROSDAHL
          3. **Results for Motion #TelconAug7-1: 12-2-1 Motion passes.**
    5. **Review CID 4272 (GEN)**
       1. CID 4272 (GEN)
       2. **Resolve CID 4272 as (either Resolution 1 or Resolution 2)**
       3. GEN: 2020-08-06 18:02:17Z - IF review of doc 11-20/435r11 does not have acceptable resolution, then use:
          1. **Proposed Resolution** #1: **Reject**; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
       4. **ELSE**
          1. **Proposed Resolution #2 (from 11-20/435r12): Revised**; Change 5.1.5.1 as follows:

The MAC data plane architecture (i.e., processes that involve transport of all or part of an MSDU) is shown in Figure 5-1 (MAC data plane architecture(11ak)(#2273)) when transparent FST is not being used and shown in Figure 5-2 (MAC data plane architecture (transparent FST)(11ak)(#2467)(#2273)) when transparent FST is being used.   
  
The dotted line box labeled “Role-specific behaviors” is replaced by one of several options, depending on the role of the STA. See the following subclauses  
Editor refer to doc 11-20/0435r11 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>) for diagram.

* + - 1. There was more to the resolution in 11-20/435r12 than had been captured, so the resolution would need to be changed.
      2. Proposed resolution: “Revised” with a resolution of “Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 4272 in 11-20/0435r12 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>> , which add a NOTE to clarify that MMPDUs share a lot of the processes with MSDUs, and that Control (and Extension) frames share the lowest-level ones.”
      3. Prepare Motion for Revised.
    1. **Motion #251 - GEN CID 4272**
       1. Resolve CID 4272 as “Revised” with a resolution of “Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 4272 in 11-20/0435r12 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435-12-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11md-d3-0-sb1.docx>>, which add a NOTE to clarify that MMPDUs share a lot of the processes with MSDUs, and that Control (and Extension) frames share the lowest-level ones.”
       2. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
       3. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
       4. **Result for Motion #251 – Unanimous Consent - Motion passes.**
    2. **Motion #252 – GEN CID 4001 – Proposed Reject – updated resolution.**
       1. Resolve CID 4001as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The group discussed the comment and did not come to consensus on a resolution. Concerns raised included that an AP contends for Beacons using AC\_VO with AISFN of 1 and CWmin of 3, hence, 1 in 4 Beacons can be sent at PIFS and 50% sent within DIFS or less and that a change to allow transmission might be needed for regulatory reasons.”
       2. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
       3. Second: Michael MONTEMURRO
       4. Discussion:
          1. The assertion of this needed in ETSI BRAN is not correct. There is a believe that 5% of the time can be sent without the backup.
          2. From the chat window:
          3. from [V] Guido R. Hiertz to everyone: 11:17 AM

ETSI TC BRAN discussed a proposal to reduce the use of Short Control Signaling in EN 301 893. In the current version of EN 301 893, Short Control Signaling permits transmissions of up to 2,500 µs duration in any 50 ms observation interval without backoff. Having learned of various IEEE 802.11 vendors transmitting beacon frames after PIFS of idle medium without backoff, the entity proposing to change SCS in EN 301 893 waived its proposal. Currently, there is no indication that ETSI TC BRAN intends to change the SCS rules. Thus, IEEE 802.11 decision to permit or to continue to prohibit beacon transmissions after PIFS will not impact the next revision of EN 301 893.

* + - 1. **Results for Motion #252: Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes.**
  1. **Confirmation for all the comments was made**.
     1. Editor Emily QI reports All CIDs have a resolution approved.
     2. The CIDs noted by Mark R for reconsideration or revisit can be considered further during subsequent recirculation process.
  2. **Motion #253: SA Ballot Recirculation Motion**
     1. Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the initial SA ballot on P802.11REVmd as indicated in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2156-17-000m-revmd-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls> and as indicated by motion in this document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1001-15-000m-2020-july-august-agendas.docx> ,

Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 4.0 incorporating these resolutions and

Approve a 15 day SA Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should P802.11REVmd D4.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”

* + 1. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
    2. Seconded: Emily QI
    3. Discussion: none
    4. **Result for Motion #253: 11-0-1 Motion Passes**
    5. Congratulations to all the CRC committee members for completion and all the hard work.
  1. **Thank you from the Chair again to all that helped**
  2. **Review steps going forward:**
     1. Editors now to produce the draft and then start the SA ballot.
     2. Please continue to work on outstanding issues and we will start working on them in about 1.5 weeks.
     3. Expected SA ballot to start by the 21st of August.
     4. October 13 is deadline to submit to RevCom
        1. We need to limit the items on D4.0 that really need to be addressed in order to meet the deadline to get approval in 2020.
     5. We can continue to discuss the CIDs that were rejected for insufficient detail while waiting on ballot to close from Menzo and Mark R documents.
     6. Chair to announce future Telecons (with 10-day notice).
  3. **Adjourned 1:23 pm**
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