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Abstract

This file contains the minutes for the 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon on August 19th, 2020.

R0: Minutes for August 19, 2020

1. **IEEE 802.11md REVmd CRC Telecon Monday, August 19, 2020 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order at 4:02** 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 18 attendees reported by WebEx

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Au, Edward | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| Coffey, Sean | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
| Goodall, David | Morse Micro |
| Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| Lili Hervieu | CableLabs |
| Youhan Kim | Qualcomm |
| Mark Hamilton | Ruckus/CommScope |
| Menzo Wentink | Qualcomm |
| Payam Torab | Facebook |
| Jonathon Goldberg | IEEE Staff liaison |
| Jarrko Kneckt | Apple |
| Mike Montemurro | Self |
| Carol Ansley | Self |
| Reza Hedayat | Charter |

* 1. **Review Agenda 11-20/1211r00**:

* + 1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1211-00-000m-2020-august-sept-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>.

3.       Comment resolution

1. **2020-08-19 Wednesday 4-6pm Eastern 2 hours**
   1. Mark Rison <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0435> CIDs 4247, 4746, 4220, 4477, 4523, 4629, 4602, 4527, 4699, **“**Proposed additional changes” page 118 of the r12 document.
   2. Lili Hervieu – 5.9 band, https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0143
   3. Menzo WENTINK CIDs 4725, 4761, 4169, 4811 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150>

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. )

Hold several meetings during September plenary for comment resolution.

Sept – D5.0 Unchanged recirc

28 Sept – Unchanged recirc must start

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. Completed roll-in of all passed motions about two weeks ago, and reviewers have been through. Still fixing up minor edits found. All corrections anticipated to be complete today/tomorrow.
  2. **Review doc 11-20/0435r12 –** 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 4247 (EDITOR)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Propose to just remove the DEFVAL on the MIB attributes that claim to be capabilities.
        3. Discussion about attributes that are, or might be, mis-named as “Activated” or “Implemented” in terms of whether they really are capability attributes or not.
        4. What change makes sense to do now, until we have time to really check each one individually, to make sure it is correctly named and described?
        5. Investigated dot11TDLSPeerUAPSDBufferSTAActivated. It does appear to be used as a capability. Would be fine to remove the DEFVAL here. Could consider changing the name – perhaps in the future?
        6. We could request some volunteers to help look at these, off-line.
        7. dot11ManufacturerID and dot11ProductID are different. Their default value, which is only in the DESCRIPTION (not a DEFVAL) can’t be ‘null’ if the description is correct about what these “must contain”.
        8. Looked at dot11STATransmitPowerClass. It doesn’t appear to be used in the body text.
        9. Looked at dot11RelayActivated. This looks like a capability. The phrase in the body text (only one instance?) of “set to” should be rephrased as “is”.
        10. Back to dot11STATransmitPowerClass. Looked at Table D-5, D-7, etc. Seems like this is read-only and a capability, because it cannot change for a given instantiation.
        11. ACTION: Menzo will look at first 4 (TDLS ones).
        12. ACTION: Mike will look at next 4 (SSPN, MSGCF, Multiband and GAS).
        13. ACTION: Youhan will look at next 4 (RSNA, Lsig, PCO, and Mesh), or find help.
        14. ACTION: Edward will look at DMG, CMMG and CDMG ones (including RelayActivated).
        15. ACTION: Menzo will take TXOPSharing, S1GSector and ProtectedTWT.
        16. On the homework: Check if:

a) is it correctly described as a capability?b) is the MAX-ACCESS correct (should be read-only if capability)c) is the default a DEFVAL or text or what -- what should be deleted? (should be no default if capability)d) if capability, is it being said to be set somewhere (which is impossible)?

* + - 1. Will bring back, on Aug 26. Homework to be completed by then.
    1. CID 4746 (EDITOR):
       1. The existing SAPs are not sufficient to be able to do this procedure.
       2. Proposal is to add a NOTE to make it clear that the needed interactions between MAC, MLME and SME are outside the scope of the standard.
       3. Seems like we need a security expert to review this.
       4. The NOTE should go with the penultimate paragraph, where the procedure is described.
       5. General agreement with:

Add the following NOTE to the end of Subclause 11.13:

NOTE—The mechanism by which the MAC, MLME and SME coordinate the actions needed to effect the operations described in this subclause is outside the scope of this standard.

* + - 1. Mark RISON will take responsibility to submit this on the next SA ballot round. He’ll also check with Jouni.
    1. CID 4220 (EDITOR):
       1. Reviewed the comment and Proposed Changes.
       2. Not sure about the change to remove “at the start of” a data symbol appearing at the transmit antenna connector. No objections to keeping/putting in “at the start of”. Mark will work, off-line.
       3. Need time to review off-line.
       4. Will reconsider on Aug 21.
  1. **Review document 11-20/0143r1** **–** Lili HERVIEU (CableLabs)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0143-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-4108.docx>
     2. CID 4108 (EDITOR):
        1. Comment is to add support for FCC NPRM to add 5.9 GHz use.
        2. FCC have announced on May 4,2020 that STAs are being granted in this band. Also, that FCC action before the end of the year is “certain”.
        3. Given this high-probability of access to the band, request is to add it’s global operating class support, now.
        4. Some feeling that we should not add to our tables until the frequencies are actually granted. On the hand, there is no harm to doing so, earlier. Also noted that 802.11ax added 6 GHz channelization before those regulatory rules were final. Noted that for S1G changes in Europe, we quoted the ETSI decision documents in the proposed resolution presentation document. No consensus on direction on this point.
        5. We need a method to update these tables, that is easier and quicker than under a revision PAR. Asked, if the Channel set in the OpClass table(s) in Annex E are not a list of channels that are/must be supported, then why do we need them in these tables?
        6. How does a peer know if OpClass 125, for example, includes these new channels or not, when indicated by a peer? In most (all?) cases, it is not an issue, because the actual channel is communicated along with the OpClass in signalling.
        7. Noted that Table D-1 has a list of approved regulatory Documents. We would need to add a reference to the NPRM to the United States’ list.
        8. Noted that Table E-1 has the United States OpClasses. Why not add these channels, there, also? And, Footnote (a) would also need to be updated/clarified.
        9. There has been some direction recently to only use Table E-4 going forward.
        10. Will come back to this in 1 week, on Aug 26.
  2. **Review document 11-20/0150r17** – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0150-17-000m-assorted-crs-revmd-draft-3-0.docx>
     2. CID 4725 (EDITOR)
        1. Last time we reviewed, there was general agreement on the changes, except the one about changing the upper limit of the retry limit attributes from 255 to 65535.
        2. 255 turns out to be about 10 milliseconds. Believe we should increase the maximum, as that amount of time can happen for retries.
        3. No objection
        4. Menzo WENTINK will take responsibility to submit this on the next SA ballot.
     3. CID 4761 (EDITOR):
        1. This is on the “dec(A[b:c])” syntax.
        2. Off-line discussion has continued; might not be final yet, but have a proposed update to the resolution. Still confirming details, against the Draft, in particular looking for any cases where ‘b’ is larger than ‘c’.
        3. Split the definitions of the “bit slicing” operation, apart from the dec() function, in clause 1.5.
        4. Need (off-line) help with the references to IEEE Std 802 dates.
        5. Concern about the concept that a MAC address can be represented using hyphens. There are colon-separated examples, as well.
        6. Re-wrote, and believe it is a simplification, the rules for how Multiple-BSSID MAC addresses.
        7. Will come back to this on Aug 21.
  3. Adjourned 6:01pm
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