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Abstract

2021 May 802.11 Interim Telecon Minutes for the 802.11me (REVme) for May 11-13, 2021

1. **802.11me – REVme Telecon – May 11, 2021 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** by Michael Montemurro, Chair TGme at 16:03 ET
   2. Leadership announcements
   3. Policy reminders, Patent reminders, Review Guidelines, etc.
      1. No response to patent call
   4. **Review Agenda: 11-21/583r2**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0583-03-000m-tgme-agenda-may-2021-session.pptx>
      2. Meetings this session: Tues, Wed, Thurs.
      3. Wed focused on Security CIDs.
      4. Reviewed today’s agenda details/contributions plan.

**Tuesday May 11, 4pm ET**

1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
2. Approve agenda
3. Minutes Approval
4. Editor Report
5. Comment Resolution
6. *Announcement: Call for contribution on 11-21/787*
7. 11-21/695–Montemurro (Huawei) – CIDs 51-80
8. 11-21/688 - Ganesh Venkatesan (Intel) – CIDs
9. 11-21/766 – David Goodall (Morse) - 11ah interop issue
10. Mark Rison (Samsung) – CIDs 315, 276, 238, 559
11. Recess
    * 1. No comments on the agenda.
      2. Approved as posted by Unanimous Consent.
    1. **Review Previous Minutes**:
       1. Will approve tomorrow, as they were posted only very recently.
    2. **Editor Report**: Emily QI (Intel)
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-01-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
       2. Draft: P802.11REVme D 0.0 (members’ area)
          1. [Draft P802.11REVme\_D0.0.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/Draft%20P802.11REVme_D0.0.pdf)
       3. D0.0 Word docs and figures are also available (member’s area) for preparing submissions.
          1. [REVme\_D0.0.fm.zip](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/REVme_D0.0.fm.zip)
          2. [REVme-D0.0-Figure Source.zip](https://www.ieee802.org/11/private/Draft_Standards/11me/REVme-D0.0-Figure%20Source.zip)
       4. CC35 Comments
          1. Full set of comments in doc 11-21/0684r1:
          2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0684-01-000m-revme-wg-cc35-comments.xlsx>
       5. Review AdHoc Groups and Status
       6. Review list of Assignees
       7. Thanks for those willing to work on the Comments.
    3. **Liaison from Wi-Fi Alliance** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
       1. 11-21-787r0
       2. Action Item: Mike to see if Stephen McCann is willing to lead effort.
       3. Looking for Volunteers to help prepare response.
       4. This may be a longer effort, so this will not be completed this week, but can plan to work over the next few weeks.
    4. **Review Doc 11-21/695r2** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0695-01-000m-revme-cc35-802-1d-comments.xlsx>
       2. Review the document
       3. Un-Highlighted CIDs are proposed Accept. – Ready for motion
          1. CID 62, 63, 64, 65, 69, 70, 71, (MAC)
          2. CIDs 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80 (GEN)
       4. Note 54 was highlighted, but from the minutes, it needs more discussion.
       5. The Highlighted CIDs need more discussion.
          1. CID 54 (GEN)
             1. Review Comment
             2. Review minutes from April 26th on discussion.
             3. Concern on the priority Issue differences. The GLK priority is not a major concern but need to look at ramifications.
       6. We may need to give more time for review and work on these later.
    5. **Review doc 11-21/0766r1** – David GOODALL (Morse Micro)
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0766-01-000m-a-mpdu-issue-for-802-11ah.pptx>
       2. Abstract:
          1. The 802.11ah-2016 specification made changes to originator processing of MPDUs within an A-MPDU. The changes involve modifying the Fragment Number Field in each MPDU MAC header. It was not specified whether to make the changes before or after encryption and FCS creation, leading to a potential variety of implementations. In addition, there are no instructions for recipient processing.
       3. Review document
       4. Discussion of Resolution Options
          1. Concerns expressed on the fields are changed.
          2. Concerns expressed with how to resolve the perceived problem.
          3. Request to get a bit more time to understand the use case in 11ah.
          4. Action item: David GOODALL to make a more formal submission for the resolution.
    6. **CIDs 315, 276, 238, 559** - Mark RISON (Samsung) –
       1. CID 315 (ED1)
          1. Review comment
          2. Discussion on the use of “log\_2”.
          3. Identification of the non-subscripted “log”. Are they log base 10?
          4. Review “ln” = natural log.
          5. The direction for the CID would be to add a definition of ln, log10, log2,
          6. Proper Resolution to be prepared.
       2. CID 276 (ED1)
          1. Review comment
          2. Review different examples of describing fields and elements.
          3. Suggestion to not state element or field in the tables but do that in the text below.
          4. Review more tables for alternate examples.
          5. Naming or Frames and Fields and Elements.
          6. Are all Elements Fields? No are All Elements in Fields? No
          7. Discussion on various ways to look at this.
          8. Action Item: Mark RISON to prepare a Straw poll to get a direction.
       3. CID 559 (ED1)
          1. Review Comment
          2. Discussion of Duration vs Duration/ID field name.
          3. To Be consistent, the field name should be used, however, you have an overlay of different frames that have a duration aligned with the generic Duration/ID field.
          4. More work on this -
       4. CID 238 (ED1)
          1. Review comment
          2. Review script output looking for Acronyms that had not been defined or not expanded for first use.
          3. Discussion on changing the definition of PMK-R0 to not defined as some level.
          4. No support to expand EAPOL or EAPOL PDU.
          5. Discussion on if it is defined in 3.2 or 3.4, then it was expanded in general on first use.
          6. Straw poll –
             1. Do you want to expand “EAPOL” and “PDU”?
             2. YES/NO/Abstain
             3. Results: 4/11/5/ (27 not responding).
       5. CID 329 (ED1)
          1. In 9.6.3.2.2 DMG ADDTS Request frame variant and certainly others: the way the optional parts are described is inconsistent ("The optional X element", "The X element is optional and", "When present, the X element" etc.)
          2. Review comment
          3. Question on how to indicate Optional.
          4. In a table, the “(optional)” is a good way.
          5. In text, having different method may be better.
          6. Discussion on indicating the condition for when it present or not.
          7. More work to determine the possible solution may be.
    7. **MAC Comments:**
       1. CID 263 (MAC)
          1. Review comment
          2. Discussion on what Note 2 means.
          3. The conditions for the alternate language choice may need more thought.
          4. More thought needed.
       2. CID 448 (MAC)
          1. Review the comment (Clause 11.2.6).
          2. Proposed change: Change “can determine” to “determines”
          3. The list of bullets noted does not seem complete.
          4. More work and thought required.
    8. **Recess 6:00pm ET**
12. **802.11me – REVme Telecon – Wednesday, May 12, 2021 16:00-18:00 ET**
    1. Called to order at 4:03pm by Michael Montemurro
    2. Leadership announcements
    3. Policy reminders, Patent reminders, Guidelines, etc.
       1. No response to patent call,
    4. Review Agenda for Today – 11-21/583r3:
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0583-03-000m-tgme-agenda-may-2021-session.pptx>
       2. Wednesday focused on Security CIDs.
       3. Reviewed today’s agenda details/contributions plan.

**Wednesday May 12, 4pm ET**

1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
2. Approve agenda
3. Minutes Approval
4. Editor Report
5. Comment Resolution (Security CIDs)
6. 11-21/716 – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
7. 11-21/735 – Mark Rison (Samsung)
8. [Msg02118](https://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11-tgm/msg02118.html) – Mark Rison (Samsung)
9. 11-21/762 – Montemurro (Huawei)
10. Recess
    * 1. No comments on the agenda.
      2. Approved as posted – No objection – Unanimous Consent.
    1. **Motion May-01** – Approve Minutes:
       1. **Approve the minutes for the March plenary session as**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0643-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-march-9-11-2021.docx>

**and teleconferences for April 19 and April 26:**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0691-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-april-19-and-26.docx>

* + 1. Move Edward AU
    2. 2nd: Dan HARKINS
    3. Results for Motion May-01: No Objection - Unanimous Consent.
  1. **Review doc 11-21/716 -** Dan HARKINS (HPE)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0716-01-000m-resolution-of-some-security-comments.docx>
     2. CID 116 (SEC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Propose to accept
        3. Discussion format “if” something “then” do something format.
        4. Discursion on alternate ways to resolve.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        6. Several options were proposed in the Chat window, and several options suggested and discussed during the call.
           1. Chat Window log:

from Mark HAMILTON Ruckus/CommScope to everyone: 2:17 PM

"If ..., the frame shall be discarded if ..." is too confusing, with the double ifs.

from [V] Mark RISON {Samsung} to everyone: 2:17 PM

"If Sync is not greater than dot11RSNASAESync, the frame shall be discarded if the finite cyclic group differs from that of the previous SAE Commit message. Otherwise [...]"

from Mark HAMILTON Ruckus/CommScope to everyone: 2:18 PM

How does Otherwise relate to the two 'if's? Which one is it the otherwise for?

from [V] Nehru BHANDARU Broadcom to everyone: 2:18 PM

How about this - If Sync is not greater than dot11RSNASAESync, and the finite cyclic group is the same as the previously received SAE Commit message, the protocol instance shall increment Sync, increment Sc, and transmit its SAE Commit message and its SAE Confirm message with the new Sc value. Otherwise, the frame shall be silently discarded.

from [V] Mark RISON {Samsung} to everyone: 2:18 PM

I like that

from [V] Jouni MALINEN Qualcomm to everyone: 2:18 PM

Nehru: that seems to break logic

from Mark HAMILTON Ruckus/CommScope to everyone: 2:19 PM

@Nehru, that has combined the Otherwise with the first 'if', which doesn't seem right, I think?

from [V] Mark RISON {Samsung} to everyone: 2:19 PM

Well, what is the intent when Sync is greater than dot11Sync?

from [V] Joseph LEVY InterDigital to everyone: 2:19 PM

If the finite cyclic groups differ the frame shall be silently discarded, otherwise the protocol instance shall ....

from [V] Mark RISON {Samsung} to everyone: 2:20 PM

q

from [V] Joseph LEVY InterDigital to everyone: 2:20 PM

replace otherwise with If the finite cyclic groups are the same ...

from Mark HAMILTON Ruckus/CommScope to everyone: 2:20 PM

If sync is greater is in the previous sentence

from [V] Mark RISON {Samsung} to everyone: 2:22 PM

I like "If Sync is not greater than dot11RSNASAESync, and the finite cyclic group is the same as the previously received SAE Commit message, the protocol instance shall increment Sync, increment Sc, and transmit its SAE Commit message and its SAE Confirm message with the new Sc value. Otherwise, the frame shall be silently discarded."

from [V] Jouni MALINEN Qualcomm to everyone: 2:25 PM

that seems to break logic for Sync >= dot11..

from [V] Jouni MALINEN Qualcomm to everyone: 2:25 PM

q

from Mark HAMILTON Ruckus/CommScope to everyone: 2:25 PM

Frankly, the current 4 sentences are broken. We should re-write all 4 if we're going to bother re-writing.

from [V] Mark RISON {Samsung} to everyone: 2:26 PM

I only saw 3 sentences...

from [V] Jouni MALINEN Qualcomm to everyone: 2:26 PM

I'm not against re-writing if someone wants to do this correctly, but the current text with this change looks correct to me.

* + - 1. More discussion is needed.
      2. Straw poll: Accept proposed change of CID 116?
         1. Yes/No/Abstain
         2. Results: 8/5/4
      3. More Discussion required.
    1. CID 156 (SEC) 331 (SEC)
       1. Review comments
       2. Discussion on how to resolve the two comments.
       3. Proposed Resolution: 156: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 20:31:08Z) - Change “hash-to-curve” to “hash-to-element” in the following:
* the title of 12.4.4.2.3
* the 4 references in the body of 12.4.4.2.3
  + - 1. Proposed Resolution: CID 331: Accept
      2. Mark Both Ready for Motion
    1. CID 165 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 175 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion on the meaning of ‘{ }’ vs “ “
       3. Assign the CID to Mark HAMILTON as it is part of the MIB.
       4. Determine what the DEFVAL should be represented as.
    3. CID 224 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion in submission.
          1. There is nothing inherently wrong with using a smaller key. It depends on what the TDLS conversation is going to be consisting of. In fact, one might argue the other way around—a longer key protected by an exchange using a smaller key—but that’s if one wants to argue the point which it does not seem useful to do. If we wanted to start making recommendations on ciphers it should involve how the key was generated—i.e. don’t use EAP-TLS with a TLS version less than 1.2 and do (EC)DHE for key generation, make sure you use the appropriate hash algorithms, etc—but for people that get hung up on that we have the Suite B ciphers.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Reject, aside from Suite B ciphersuites and AKMs, 802.11 does not restrict what ciphers can be used and we shouldn’t start with TDLS.
       4. Discussion on which cipher should be used and when it should be used.
       5. Support for reject due to not clear what change should be made.
       6. Discussion on a recommendation for which ciphersuites should be used.
       7. Possibly a note could be added to help clarify this.
       8. Assign CID to Mark RISON – More work needed.
    4. CID 355 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion: Other parts of the standard discuss “the SAE hash-to-element method” and we wouldn’t want to introduce any *inconsistencies* in wording so “technique” is not appropriate.
       3. During the discussion, the addition of “method” to “SAE hash-to-element” was not thought to be sufficient for the proposed resolution:
       4. The proposed resolution was crafted and one objected to referring to a document for two words.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 20:49:06Z) - REVISED. Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0716-01-000m-resolution-of-some-security-comments.docx> under "Resolution:" for CID 355.
       6. Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 369 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. *Discussion*: It implies no such thing. In a protocol when a message is “silently dropped” it means it is discarded without an externally visible notification of dropping. This is well known to people who work on standards and develop standards and implement standards.
       3. More discussion on proposed changes.
       4. With only 2 locations with “silently dropped” why not change to “silently discarded”.
       5. “In a protocol when a message is “silently dropped” it means it is discarded without an externally visible notification of dropping.”
       6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; In a protocol when a message is “silently dropped” it means it is discarded without an externally visible notification of dropping. This is well known to people who work on standards and develop standards and implement standards.
       7. Alternate Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 20:55:51Z) - In a protocol when a message is “silently dropped” it means it is discarded without an externally visible notification of dropping. At two locations: P2582.32, P2582.37, change "dropped" to "discard".
       8. Mark Ready for Motion
    6. CID 588 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. *Discussion*: This is not an SAE or FILS issue, it affects 802.1X as well. The PMKSA database on a STA (including an AP) is governed solely by the STA. It can delete a PMKSA any time it wants for any reason, including no reason whatsoever. A STA is attempting to use a cached PMK is opportunistically hoping. There are no guarantees and if an AP communicated a PMK lifetime to the STA somehow it would still be under no obligation to retain that PMK in its PMKSA database for the entire duration.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Reject, (SEC: 2021-05-12 21:02:03Z) while it may be possible to provide a uniform method of PMK lifetime notification, it would be optional, and there would be no guarantee the PMK will not be deleted beforehand anyway so the utility of this seems to not be worth the effort
       4. No objection to rejecting the comment – Mark Ready for Motion.
    7. CID 589 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed changes
       3. Discussion on the proposed text changes.
       4. Discussion on which messages may have encryption or not.
       5. Note, location is P2634.15
       6. This is more complicated when also considering re-keying, and FILS.
       7. Agree on M1 - there is no state, so not encrypted. But, in M2, why do we restrict the sender from encrypting it?
       8. This is duplicated text with 12.7.6.3.
       9. While some agree it could be encrypted, we can't invalidate existing implementations. So, we need to stay with it being not encrypted in M2 (and M1).
       10. Agree about removing the duplication. Just delete these two sentences in 12.7.2. (First one is a sentence, second one is a phrase at the end of the sentence.)
       11. Result of discussion make changes as shown in 11-21/716r2 for CID 589.
       12. Request to change the "Discussion" in the document, to delete that "these fields aren't encrypted”, because that are for AEAD.
       13. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 21:15:16Z) - These fields are not encrypted unless AEAD is used. Incorporate the changes in: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0716-02-000m-resolution-of-some-security-comments.docx under "Resolution:" for CID 589.
       14. Mark Ready for Motion
    8. CID 590 (SEC)
       1. Reviewed Comment
       2. Discussion: Yes, the intent is obviously for PMK\_bits to be 384. The existing text is very fragile because there are so many places that need updating when new AKMs are added. Obviously 20 was added without dotting all the Is and crossing all the Ts.
       3. This has gotten complicated and fragile as we've added AKMs.
       4. Suggest adding AKM 20 in 12.7.1.2 and 12.7.1.3.
       5. Discussion on what is required for .1X.
       6. Checked 12.7.1.6.5 reference (in the comment). Agreed that text is okay as is.
       7. Proposed Resolution: CID 590 (SEC): REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 21:15:16Z) - The PTK length did not require a change because there are no 384-bit ciphers. Incorporate the changes in: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0716-02-000m-resolution-of-some-security-comments.docx under "Resolution:" for CID 590.
       8. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    9. CID 595 (SEC) and 117 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. *Discussion*: There is a discrepancy between the text and the graphic in figure 12-4. The intent is that the first Confirm message have a Sc of 1, state machine resynchronization that results in a new Confirm message being generated will increment Sc. Since SAE is defined not as a client-server protocol, there is no notion of AP and non-AP STA, everyone’s a peer so the behavior of a peer is identical no matter whether you initiated or responded (or both initiated simultaneously).

The text needs to specify that Sc is incremented in the case where a peer is a responder so that it matches the graphic in 12-4. This will have no impact on interoperability because handling just says that the initial value is just stored and during resynchronization of the state machine the received value has to be greater than the previous received value, which will still be true.

* + - 1. Propose change updates the text to match the graphic.
      2. Concern with some implementations that may have an expected value.
      3. Some testing cases may need to be updated with this change.
      4. Alternate location has values that this will now be unambiguous.
      5. Proposed Resolution: CID 595 and 117: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 21:28:48Z) - There is a discrepancy between the text and the graphic. The intent is that the first confirm message have an SC of 1, state machine resynchronization that result in a new confirm message being generate. Incorporate the changes in: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0716-02-000m-resolution-of-some-security-comments.docx> under "Resolution:" for CID 594 and CID 117.
      6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Doc 11-21/735** – Dan HARKINS (HPE).
     1. Previously reviewed and CID 587 assigned to Mark RISON.
  2. **Review doc 11-21-0829r0** - Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
     2. Agenda item: [Msg02118](https://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11-tgm/msg02118.html) – Mark Rison (Samsung)
     3. CID 587 (SEC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review table context
        3. Review Proposed changes.
        4. Discussion on page 5 about one sentence to be deleted.
        5. The RSNE must match, so the sentence is not necessary.
        6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 21:44:52Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 587 in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx, which clarify the negotiation of MFP in an infrastructure BSS, including interoperation with pre-11w devices. Note to the commenter: yes, given the valid combinations of settings at the AP and the non-AP STA, the setting of the MFPR bit at the non-AP STA does not affect the AP behaviour. The changes make this clearer.
        7. Discussion on the resolution “note” – request to delete it.
        8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 21:44:52Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 587 in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx, which clarify the negotiation of MFP in an infrastructure BSS, including interoperation with pre-11w devices.
        9. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 213 (SEC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review proposed change
        3. Discussion on the need for “(Length-4) x 8” vs “variable”.
        4. Ok to make ready for motion, and if there is an issue will bring up prior to motion later.
           1. (After we moved on), comment in Chat” fine to remove those 3 instances of Length-<stuff>.. it matched the KDE Length field use with 4 octets of other stuff in all cases”
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 22:00:18Z) -

In Figures 12-36, 12-42 and 12-47 change the size shown below the rightmost field to “variable”.

In Figures 9-76, 9-216, 9-218, 9-219, 9-277, 9-278 (2x), 9-280 (2x), 9-568, 9-570, 9-589, 9-600, 9-963, 23-44, 23-45, 23-46, 25-35, 25-36 change “Variable” to “variable”.

In 9.4.2.50 RIC Descriptor element change “Variable parameters” to “Variable Parameters” in the figure and in the body change “Variable parameters contain” to “The Variable Parameters field contains”.

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 223 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on the need for change –
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-05-12 22:02:58Z) - Change "b) The AP's RSNE indicates that WEP-40 (OUI 00-0F-AC:1) or WEP-104 (OUI 00-0F-AC:5) are enabled as either pairwise or group cipher suites;"

to "b) The AP's RSNE indicates that WEP-40 (00-0F-AC:1), WEP-104 (00-0F-AC:5) or TKIP (00-0F-AC:2) are enabled as either pairwise or group cipher suites;".

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Recess at 6:00pm**

1. **802.11me – REVme Telecon – Thursday, May 13, 2021 16:00-18:00 ET**
   1. Called to order at 4:03pm by Michael Montemurro
   2. Leadership announcements
   3. Policy reminders, Patent reminders, Guidelines, etc.
      1. No response to patent call,
   4. **Review Agenda** – 11-21-583r5
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0583-05-000m-tgme-agenda-may-2021-session.pptx>
      2. Reviewed today’s agenda details/contributions plan.

**Thursday May 13, 4pm ET**

1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
2. Approve agenda
3. Minutes Approval
4. Editor Report
5. Comment Resolution
6. 11-21/769 – Emily (Intel) – Editor CIDs (1hr)
7. 11-21/790 – Youhan Kim – 6 GHz CIDs
8. 11-21/730, 11-21/803 – Edward (Huawei) – Editor2 CIDs
9. 11-21/688 - Ganesh Venkatesan (Intel) – CIDs
10. Timeline, Teleconferences, Plan for July
11. AoB
12. Adjourn
    * 1. Swapped Youhan and Edward presentation order. (shown in minutes after swap)
      2. No objection to approval of Agenda by Unanimous Consent.
    1. **MOTIONS – 11-21/758r0**
       1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0758-00-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
       2. **Motion #1 Trivial Editor1 CIDS**
          1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

“Motion-EDITOR1-A” tab in doc 11-21/738r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0738-02-000m-revme-wg-cc35-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>>

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
      2. Seconded: Jon Rosdahl
      3. **Results of Motion #1**: No objection – Unanimous Approval – (35 on the call).
  1. **Review 11-21/769r1** – Editor CIDs - Emily QI (Intel) – (1hr)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0769-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.docx>
     2. CID 258 (ED1)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. We have the definition for bufferable unit (BU), but not for "individually addressed" or "group addressed". Therefore, we still need these definitions.
        4. Question on when the definitions were added?
           1. They were added in 802.11-2012
        5. The definitions for group vs individual is just a bit different.
        6. Some support for the rejection.
        7. Discussion on why we have the different definitions and why we should combine them and let the distinction be the differentiator.
        8. Reviewed P161.19 for Individual Addressed and on p160 has a definition for Group Addressed.
        9. Some support for Accepting the comment expressed.
        10. Updated Proposed Resolution: Accept
        11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 312 (ED1)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept – Note to the Editor, Location is at 874.6.
        3. Discussion on if this is in one place or multiple places.
        4. No other location associated with this CID
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     4. CID 313 (ED1)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted. Note to Editor: Locations are 878.9 and 878.40
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 571 (ED1)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion: According to the Editorial Style Guide, proper names of entities outside 802.11 may use capital letters. Generally, follow whatever appears to be the prevailing custom.

The “advertisement server” is an entity name outside 802.11. It is used as “Advertisement Server”, also shown in other 44 instances in D0.0.

Here are additional locations: 175.30; 181.50, 181.52, 4558.27.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change "advertisement server" to "Advertisement Server" at 900.62, P901L13, P2381L11, P2388L11, P2396L5, P2396L6, P2396L32, 175.30; 181.50, 181.52, 4558.27.
      2. Suggest adding to Style guide to avoid comment.
      3. 11u added “advertisement server”.
      4. The Mixed cases is being used – 44 upper case and 10-12 use the lower case. Discussion on why it should be upper case.
      5. Counter argument on why it should be lower case was given.
      6. Advertisement server is not really a proper noun, but rather just a descriptive name.
      7. As there are different servers, we seemed to define all these from the 11u, and we should make it consistent with lower case.
      8. It may be better to make it lower case, but there did not seem to have any obvious consensus, desire to wait until the commentor was on the call.
      9. More discussion needed.
    1. CID 294 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 1044.18, change “Reported TIM elements might be truncated” to “Truncation of Reported TIM elements”.

At 1044.25, change “Reported RSNEs might be truncated” to “Truncation of RSNEs”.

At 1044.25, change “Reported IBSS DFS elements might be truncated” to “Truncation of IBSS DFS elements”

* + - 1. Concern that the loss of “might” may not be the correct path.
      2. Try to look at the resultant text.
      3. Discussion on if the existing text or the new text would be better.
      4. Clause 9 should not have the details.
      5. Concern with the Resultant sentences being readable.
      6. The Behavior should be moved from Clause 9 to another Clause.
      7. This is not behavior, but it is a description of frame format. This information needs to be kept here in the current form.
      8. There are other clauses where fragmentation and defragmentation are described.
      9. Assign to Mark RISON for an alternate proposal.
  1. **Review doc 11-21/790r2** - Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0790-02-000m-revme-cc35-6ghz-comments.docx>
     2. CID 596 (MAC), 598 (GEN), 599 (GEN), 600 (GEN)
        1. Review comments
        2. Review proposed changes as described in the submission.
        3. Discussion on the timing of adding 11ax and if this submission would be affected.
        4. Rational for adding this submission now rather than later was given.
        5. Once we have 11ax rolled in, we can look to schedule a motion to approve the comment resolutions to be included.
        6. The changes applied are based on the 11ax draft, so putting all these changes in should help the editors in the roll-in process.
        7. The timing of the draft for the industry to see the intention of the changes would be helps the argument for the changes.
        8. The Motion telecon could be scheduled for later in May.
        9. Comments on the text were then reviewed.
        10. Discussion on the interpretation of the Description values in Table E-12.
        11. Should the case of the terms be upper or lower would be a discussion.
        12. Concern with making the overall changes generic such that they will work globally.
        13. Question on the value 0 = Indoor Access Point, can it be Low Power Indoor Access Point. – There is a country String that helps designate the proper meaning to the value.
        14. Suggestions for different name for Value 4 “Standard power Access Point operating indoors” Also Value 0 may need to change to LPI (Low Power Indoor)
        15. More review of the names to be done.
        16. Current devices are shipped with 0 and in some cases 1, what will the existing devices do with the value 4? Concern with the compatibility concern.
        17. The Transmit Power Envelope Element has enough information to help set the correct values for operation.
        18. The believe is that the existing devices are developed with this information implied.
        19. Concern that the names being suggested should be proper names and map correctly to all the countries or have a generic set of terms and then the countries can have a separate section for the specific regulatory domains.
        20. Operating indoor vs AP operating indoor have different meanings, and we need to be careful to the definition.
        21. LPI vs indoor AP is not synonymous, so we need to be careful there too.
        22. We do not want a list of countries, as there are new countries being added all the time, and we will have trouble keeping up and they should be using the generic terms in the specific cases without having different tables or clauses per country.
        23. Other suggestions: Maybe make the "Description" column truly be descriptive (rather than a clever name). We can describe that in the FCC domain, it means "indoor AP" per Part 15xxx, and in EU it means "lower-power indoor" (or whatever), etc. And, further, we can describe what to do in places like somewhere where there is no difference between some of these and tell devices which choice to use/expect.
        24. ACTION ITEM: Youhan to send an updated doc to the reflector to work on the feedback.
        25. We will schedule Telecon for a motion with 10-day notice.
        26. So Youhan will post the document to the .11 reflector to review and depending on how that goes vs the roll-in of 11ax, we can schedule a motion if needed.
  2. **Review doc 11-21/688r7** - Ganesh VENKATESAN (Intel) – CIDs
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0688-07-000m-resolutions-to-a-set-of-comments-related-to-stream-classification-service-scs.docx>
     2. CID 49 (MAC)
        1. Nothing received on the reflector, yet.
        2. Skipping for today.
     3. CID 585 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review the proposed changes in the submission.
        3. No comments
        4. Proposed Resolution: CID 585 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-05-13 21:49:54Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0688-07-000m-resolutions-to-a-set-of-comments-related-to-stream-classification-service-scs.docx for CID 585.
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. Misunderstanding on where we are. Review CID 49 again.
     5. CID 49 (MAC)
        1. Proposed Resolution: CID 49 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-05-13 21:49:01Z)
        2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 583 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review status of the previous discussion.
        3. Running out of Time continue discussion offline.
        4. Least number of parameters being wildcarded is what is being proposed.
        5. General case you would have a different type of TCLASS or different TCLASS.
        6. More time to be reviewed.
        7. Will be on agenda for next call.
  3. **Review Timeline:**
     1. Feb 2021 – PAR Approval
     2. March 2021– Initial meeting, issue comment collection on IEEE Std 802.11-2020 (if published)
     3. March 2021 – Draft 0.00 available
     4. May 2021 – Process CC input, 11ax, 11ay, 11ba integration begins
     5. Nov 2021 – Initial D1.0 WG Letter ballot
     6. May 2022 –D2.0 Recirculation LB
     7. Jan 2023 – D3.0 Recirculation LB (11az + other amendments <11bc, 11bd, 11bb>)
     8. May 2023 – D4.0 Recirculation (other amendment integration)
     9. Jul 2023 – D5.0 Initial SA Ballot (pending integration)
     10. Jan 2024 – D6.0 Recirculation SA Ballot
     11. May 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot
     12. Jun 2024 – D7.0 Recirculation SA Ballot (clean recirculation)
     13. Sep 2024 – RevCom/SASB Approval
  4. **Next TGme Telecons**
     1. May 24 (previously scheduled), June 7, 14, 21, July 26 – Monday 10am ET, 2hrs
     2. Note that the Virtual Plenary is July 12-20)
     3. Will request 3 session for 2021 July 802 Electronic Plenary.
  5. **Agenda Document** updated and posted to Mentor:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0583-06-000m-tgme-agenda-may-2021-session.pptx>
  6. **Adjourned at 5:59pm**
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