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Abstract

802 Wireless Electronic Interim Minutes for 802.11me (REVme) telecons.

R0 – Tuesday/Wednesday/Thursday/Friday Telecon Minutes.

ACTION ITEMS:

#1: Brian's action to enter a comment to fix the HT figure to address the parity check issue

#2: Michael MONTEMURRO to prepare a motion for consideration for doc 11-21/970r5.

#3: Mark RISON – Identify the missing reference for CID 240 to be included in the Resolution.

#4: Mark HAMILTON will help formulate the actual resolutions, offline for 11-21/1461.

#5 - Xiaogang CHEN – Send email to the 802.11 and 802.11m reflector to solicit feedback on doc 11-21/1448, Ensure Subject is explicit to request.

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim - Tuesday 14, 2021, at 16:00-20:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:03 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
			2. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
			3. Others absent at start of telecon – Joined later:
				1. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
				2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1215r1 slides starting at 11.
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-21/1215r1:
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1215-01-000m-revme-agenda-september-2021-interim-session.pptx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1215-01-000m-revme-agenda-september-2021-interim-session.pptx%20)
		2. Agenda for the week – slide 5
			1. **Tuesday Sep 14, 4pm ET**
			2. Chair’s Welcome,
			3. Policy & patent reminder
			4. Approve agenda
			5. Editor Report
			6. Comment Resolution
				1. Document 11-21/965 – Brian HART (Cisco) – PHY CIDs (60 min)
				2. Document 11-21/1009 – Jerome HENRY (Cisco) – IETF RFC – CID 91
				3. Document 11-21/981 – Jerome HENRY (Cisco) – ANQP CIDs
				4. Document 11-21/734 – Yujin NOH (Senscomm) – S1G CID
			7. Recess
			8. **Wednesday Sep 15, 4pm ET**
			9. Comment Resolution (Security CIDs)
				1. Montemurro (Huawei) – CID 594, 116
				2. Document 11-21/xxx – Bhandaru (Broadcom)
				3. Document 11-21/970r5 – Huang (Intel) – AKMs
			10. Recess
			11. **Thursday Sep 16, 4pm ET**
			12. Comment Resolution
2. Document 11-21/684 – Halasz/Goodhall (Morse Micro)
3. Document 11-21/1448 – Chen (Intel)
4. Document 11-21/1476r0 – Harkins (HPE)
5. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm) – “discuss” comments
	* + 1. Recess
			2. **Friday Sep 17, 1:30pm ET**
			3. Comment Resolution
				1. <>
			4. Recess
			5. **Monday Sep 20, 4pm ET**
			6. Motions
				1. Approve Previous Minutes
				2. Approve Comment Resolutions for Comments ready for Motion
			7. Comment Resolution
				1. <>
			8. Timeline, Teleconferences, Plan for November
			9. AoB
			10. Adjourn
			11. Review agenda
				1. No objection to the agenda plan – approved by unanimous consent.
	1. **Editor Report**
		1. No editor on the call today.
	2. **Comment Resolution:**
		1. CID 50 (ED1) – Withdrawn by commentor
			1. EDITOR1 will mark resolution “Reject – Commentor Withdrew”
			2. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
	3. **Review Doc 11-21/965r**3 – PHY CIDS - Brian HART (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0965-03-000m-cc35-phy-cids-19-18-14-15-527.docx>
		2. CID 18 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Discussion on what occurs when the RATE field is checked or not.
			4. More work to do, to add a MIB attribute controlling the new behavior.
			5. Support for the direction of the proposed changes.
			6. Discussion on deleting changes for HT.
				1. Testing for LSIG Parity bit, but not for RATE.
				2. Need a correction to the Figure may need to be made.
				3. Agreement to delete changes for HT
				4. ACTION ITEM #1: Brian's action to enter a comment to fix the HT figure to address the parity check issue.
			7. Discussion on changes to VHT
				1. There may be a check needed.
				2. What is the field name going to be for the field to check?
				3. CheckRATEField defined? Need to review and ensure.
			8. Discussion on Unsupported value – 17.3.12
				1. Format violation – can still determine some fields.
				2. Once unsupported value, the value may need to be different.
				3. This New procedure and the language will need to be reviewed to ensure proper error values are assigned.
				4. Only the format violation needed to be addressed.
				5. Change to “is an undefined”
			9. CID 18 (PHY): More work to do. Bring back on Monday.
		3. CIDs 14 (GEN), 15 (PHY), 527 (GEN):
			1. Review comments
			2. Review submission discussion justifying the proposed changes.
			3. Review proposed changes
				1. Frame, PPDU, Packet
				2. MAC has frames
				3. PHY has PPDUs
			4. Discussion on if the SIGNAL extension was part of the PPDU or not.
				1. Table 6.5.4 – has a definition of PPDU and signal extension.
				2. Page 692 – See description of Signal extension
				3. Seems to have two alternate definitions of whether it is in the PPDU or Not in the PPDU.
				4. Discussion on Reasons for putting into the PPDU was discussed.
				5. Page 3550 (D0.3) – Figure 19-24
			5. Need Signal clean-up needs to be done.
			6. So, the submission should pull the Signal Extension to a separate section.
			7. Add an indication that the synonym for MAC Frame is MPDU or Frame.
			8. Need to fix definition of “frame” also to mean it is an MPDU.
			9. The direction would be for clean-up of “frame” to always mean MAC frame and not allow PHY frame once this clean-up is done.
			10. Interframe spacing is legitimate use in PHY.
			11. Names in fields or MIB variables were not included in changes.
			12. P2858L12 – discussion on PSDU usage.
			13. Discussion on if RCPI is defined over the data portion of the PPDU or the entire PPDU.
			14. Need more review and discussion
			15. Bring back on Monday for wrap up discussion.
			16. WebEx chat from Mark RISON: "RCPI is a parameter included in the PHY-RXEND.indication primitive that the PHY provides the local

MAC entity. If present, RCPI is a measure of the received RF power averaged over all of the receive chains

in the data portion of a received frame. "

* 1. **Review Document 11-21/1009** –– IETF RFC – CID 91 - Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		1. Document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1009-02-000m-proxy-nd-discovery-text-proposal.docx>
		2. Abstract: 802.11-2016 11.22.14 describes a WNM STA ARP Proxy, and also adds an IPv6 ARP Proxy.

However, there is no such thing as ARP in IPv6. The equivalent function to IPv4 ARP Proxy is IPv6 ND Service.

This function operates differently from what 11.22.14 describes, as assuming equivalence with IPv4 ARP Proxy is an oversimplification.

This submission proposes a correction to the text, aiming at accurately stating the function description.

* + 1. CID 91 (MAC)
			1. Review Submission
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. There are some editorials that will be communicated offline.
			4. Discussion on the behaviour of the STA and AP.
			5. The first paragraph does not have a change.
			6. More offline discussion needs to take place.
			7. AdHoc Notes: CID 91 (MAC): MAC: 2021-09-14 21:28:42Z - Reviewed 11-21/1009r2. Concern about the AP responding after the STA is no longer associated (for IPv6). Other concerns about being clear what is changed in the text (not NOTE) paragraph.
			8. Will bring back, after off-line discussion.
	1. **Review Document 11-21/981r6** – ANQP CIDs – Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0981-06-000m-anqp-augmentation-for-federations.docx>
		2. Abstract: This submission proposes two new elements for ANQP that would be of use for WFA and federations use cases. All the changes are related to Draft P802.11REVme D0.0.
		3. CID 93/94 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on validation subfield - discussion on how to decode the bitmap.
			5. Discussion on the Privacy Indicator usage
			6. The table subfield is a value not a bitmap
			7. Need more discussion – bring back later.
	2. **Review Document 11-21/734** – S1G CID – Yujin NOH (Senscomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0734-00-000m-s1g-phy-resolution.docx>
		2. CID 447 (PHY)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Proposed resolution: CID 447 (PHY): Revised; Incorporate changes as shown in 11-21/0734r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0734-00-000m-s1g-phy-resolution.docx>> .
			5. No discussion or objection - Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Return to review document 11-21/981r6** – ANQP CIDs – Jerome HENRY (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0981-06-000m-anqp-augmentation-for-federations.docx>
		2. CID 95 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Question on “nx8” – notation different.
			3. Service level – Gold/silver/bronze/no SLA – discussion on use.
				1. Something that was provided in the STA.
			4. Credential Types and SLA are in different ANQP-element (Subclause).
				1. The clause number is needed in the table 9-331
			5. Question on nominal nomenclature to use in the submission.
			6. Out of time, more review to work on the submission.
			7. AdHoc Notes: CID 95 (MA)C: MAC: 2021-09-14 21:55:34Z - Reviewed 11-21/0981r6. Mostly format details to work out. Will bring back.
	4. **Recess at 6:03 pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim - Wednesday 15, 2021, at 16:00-20:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:03 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
			2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
			3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			4. Editor – Edward Au (Huawei)
			5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1215r1 slides starting at 11.
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-21/1215r2:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1215-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2021-interim-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda for Wednesday– slide 5
			1. **Wednesday Sep 15, 4pm ET**
2. Chair’s Welcome,
3. Policy & patent reminder
4. Approve agenda
5. Editor Report
6. Comment Resolution (Security CIDs)
	1. SEC CIDs: CID 594, 116 - MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
	2. Document 11-21/809r6 – Nehru BHANDARU (Broadcom)
	3. Document 11-21/970r5 –AKMs - Po-Kai Huang (Intel)
	4. Documents 11-21/816, 11-21/1128, 11-21/829 – Mark RISON (Samsung)
7. Recess
	* + 1. **Thursday Sep 16, 4pm ET**
8. Comment Resolution
9. Document 11-21/684 – Halasz/Goodhall (Morse Micro)
10. Document 11-21/1448 – Chen (Intel)
11. Document 11-21/1476r0 – Harkins (HPE)
12. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm) – “discuss” comments
13. Recess
	* + 1. **Friday Sep 17, 1:30pm ET**
14. Comment Resolution
	* + - 1. <>
15. Recess
	* + 1. **Monday Sep 20, 4pm ET**
16. Motions
	* + - 1. Approve Previous Minutes
				2. Approve Comment Resolutions for Comments ready for Motion
17. Comment Resolution
	* + - 1. <>
18. Timeline, Teleconferences, Plan for November
19. AoB
	* 1. Agenda changes:
			1. Mark RISON – please add 11-21/829 to list of SEC docs.
			2. Dan Harkins- doc 11-21/1476r0 is on Thursday due to time limitations.
		2. No objection to the agenda plan – approved by unanimous consent.
	1. **Editor Report Emily QI (Intel)**
		1. See doc 11-21/687r3
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-03-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
		3. 
		4. Review Reference documents on slide 3.
		5. Review figure shadowing issue in 0.3, in 0.4 the problem will be gone.
		6. CC35 Comments:
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0684-07-000m-revme-wg-cc35-comments.xlsx>
		7. Roll-in Plan:



* + 1. Current Comment Processing status:



* + 1. Unresolved comments assigned:



* + 1. No questions for editor
	1. **Change Chair of Meeting to Mark Hamilton.16:14 ET.**
	2. **SEC CIDs: CID 594, 116** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
		1. CID 116 (SEC) (*See 2.6.3*)
			1. Review Comment
			2. History of the CID reviewed.
			3. The proposed change is similar to the proposed resolution, but the update provides a reordering of the text.
			4. Discussion on silently discarding frame.
			5. There are about 40 instances of “silently discarded”. What is the difference to just “discarded”?
				1. Do not want to give info to attackers, so if you get garbage frames, you do not want to respond these frames. It is better to just drop the frame and not give any external indication of what was done to process the frame.
				2. We may want to ensure that all discarded frames that do not have “silently” are in fact ok to be “noisy”
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-09-15 20:22:41Z) - Update the cited text in the direction proposed by the commenter:

Replace

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

with

"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."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion. *(Changed in 2.6.3)*
		1. CID 594 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed Changes
			3. Discussion on if the implantation can choose which option it uses?
				1. Yes, it can
				2. Change the sentence - "may update the ... but shall otherwise have no effect"?
			4. Discussion on the replay counter and the uses.
			5. Discussion on what the proper value should be and how to determine the next value.
			6. Updates to the Proposed Resolution were made.
			7. Concern on the weightiness of the words. (Overly complex).
			8. The Issue the Comment identified does happen in the real world, but part of the detail being asked may be a bit more of a corner case that may not occur.
			9. Agreement that the complexity is increasing but we need to describe these cases.
			10. Suggestion: "to be increased to the value .. or have no effect" would be simpler
			11. Propose to take offline and bring back with another update.
		2. Return to CID 116 (SEC)
			1. The proposed change seems to have an issue with two “if” and one otherwise, but do not see how it applies. There is an if statement in front of the proposed change.
			2. Need to work on this some more, remove from “Ready for Motion”
			3. Discussion on which proposal is better. More work to be done.
	1. **Return control of meeting to TG Chair**, Michael MONTEMURRO
	2. **Review Document 11-21/809r6** – Nehru BHANDARU (Broadcom)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0809-06-000m-cc35-crs-a.docx>
		2. CID 360 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Assumption – change "masked to" to "set to" and "unmasked" to "not modified" (preserve the case)
			4. Masked = set to zero – forced to zero.
			5. Discussion on if the values are being set to zero, or not.
			6. Muted meaning is not changing to zero.
			7. Suggestion to change “muted by being masked o 0” to
			8. Change “masked to” to “treated as”.
			9. We may want to add a definition of what “masked” means -- this may be another alternative.
			10. RFC 42 – 331 quoted for something similar – they use “set”. But they are using a separate ICV check.
			11. Propose that we just reject at this point.
			12. Suggestion that we should make a change to clarify the text is better.
			13. Straw Poll:
				1. Which Option do you prefer for resolving this comment (CID 360)?

Reject the comment

Change “*masked to”* to “*treated as*” – and unmasked to not modified.

 Define what masked and unmasked means for this context.

Use the set to terminology.

* + - * 1. Only the first two options were put into the Straw Poll.
				2. Which option do you prefer for resolving this comment (CID 360)
				3. 1. Reject the comment
				4. 2. Change masked to treated as – and unmasked to not modified
				5. Results: 9-6-7 (51% no answer). (46 on the call)
				6. Majority wanted to reject.
		1. Out of time – move to next document.
	1. **Review Document 11-21/970r5** –AKMs - Po-Kai Huang (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0970-06-000m-akm-for-sha-384.docx>
		2. Review submission
		3. Table 9-151 – Note N/A = not applicable. It may be better to say “None”
		4. Change values in the new column of Table 9-151 to be “None”
		5. First row should be “reserved”.
		6. Propose that a Separate motion will be created to incorporate into the draft.
		7. No objection to prepare the motion.
		8. ACTION ITEM #2: Michael MONTEMURRO to prepare a motion for consideration for doc 11-21/970r5.
	2. **Review Document 11-21/829r3** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 387 and 406 (SEC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Review the submission discussion.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2021-09-15 21:21:41Z) At 1088.20 change “If any cipher suite other than TKIP, WEP-104, or WEP-40 is enabled, then the AP supports pairwise keys, and thus the suite selector 00-0F-AC:0 (Use group cipher suite) is not a valid option.” to “If an AP advertises a group cipher suite other than TKIP, WEP-104, or WEP-40, then the AP supports pairwise keys, and thus the pairwise suite selector 00-0F-AC:0 (Use group cipher suite) is not a valid option.”
		3. CID 432 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the submission discussion.
			3. Discussion on changing to “RSNA” being potential for lost information.
			4. There is a bit of circular definition if we make the changes.
			5. More support for Reject, and we do not need a definition.
			6. “Such as” indicates a set of examples, and we do not need to be more specific.
			7. Return for more thought.
		4. CID 507 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Discussion on what PMKID KDE contains, and the Key Data may have that and other info, so not sure the change is necessary.
			4. Concern that the proposed resolution does not address the comment in a meaningful way. Need to simplify a bit if possible.
			5. Discussion on keeping the “=” instead of containing.
			6. Move the format of the “Key Data =” then add a new line to keep the format the same for all of them even if it is “non”
			7. More work needed
		5. CID 240 (SEC)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Change needs page and line number.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accept -- Note to editor needs page and line number references.
			5. Discussion cut off and Action for Mark RISON to add missing references.
			6. ACTION ITEM #3: Mark RISON – Identify the missing reference for CID 240 to be included in the Resolution.
		6. CID 462 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Submission Discussion.
			3. There is a point/counter point argument in the discussion.
			4. During presentation – counter-argument was presented a best option.
			5. Why did the CID not just be included in 21/0816?
			6. This could be done but has not as 21/0816 is not tied to a specific CID.
			7. CID 462 (SEC): Support the counter proposal. Resolve along with approval of 11-21/0816.
			8. Need to bring back again.
		7. CID 239 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Submission Discussion.
			3. Confusion on if there are separate counters.
			4. There is one set (in S1G) for each type of PTKSA, GTKSA etc.
			5. Need line number and page number for the resolution.
			6. Look at the context and get the page/line numbers.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 239 (SEC): In 12.5.3.4.4 PN and replay detection change “PTKSA, GTKSA, and protocol version value” to “PTKSA, GTKSA, protocol version value, mesh PTKSA and mesh GTKSA” in a) and b) (at 2579.15 and 2579.19 respectively).

In 12.5.5.4.4 PN and replay detection change “PTKSA and GTKSA” to “PTKSA, GTKSA, mesh PTKSA and mesh GTKSA” in a) and b) (at 2588.33 and 2588.37 respectively).

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. Out of time.
	1. **Recess at 6:01 pm ET**.
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim - Thursday 16, 2021, at 16:00-20:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 4:04 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
			2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
			3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		2. Absent:
			1. Editor - Edward AU (Huawei)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1215r2 slides starting at 11.
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-21/1215r3:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1215-03-000m-revme-agenda-september-2021-interim-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda for Thursday slide 5
			1. **Thursday Sep 16, 4pm ET**
2. Comment Resolution
3. Doc 11-21/0803r3 – Edward AU (Huawei)
4. Document 11-21/684 – Dave HALASZ/David GOODHALL (Morse Micro)
5. Document 11-21/1448 – Xiaogang CHEN (Intel)
6. Document 11-21/1476r0 – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
7. GEN CIDs – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm) – “discuss” comments
8. Recess
	* 1. No objection to today’s agenda
	1. **Comment Resolution:**
		1. Doc 11-21/0803r3 has proposed resolutions for 40 ED2 CIDs: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0803-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-2.docx>
		2. Chair sent an email to indicate:
			1. Given that these 40 comments are editorial, I will announce during today's meeting that we will mark them ready for motion with a targeted motion date for Monday.
			2. Everyone is encouraged to review the resolutions and identify comments from the document that we need to pull from the motion for further discussion.
			3. The document is: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0803-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-2.docx>
			4. The 40 CIDs are:
			279, 467, 464, 375, 337, 317, 274, 560, 561, 472, 424, 222, 151, 558, 481, 262, 382, 552, 553, 210, 482, 40, 426, 255, 332, 174, 218, 555, 570, 433, 194, 197, 440, 578, 134, 252, 324, 314, 203, 453
	2. **Review Document 11-21/684** – CIDs 14-35 – Dave HALASZ/David GOODHALL (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1461-00-000m-cids-for-supported-rates.docx>
		2. CID 24 and 25 (MAC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Concern that the changes break the existing standard if more BSS Membership selectors are added.
			4. If we add more, it could be an issue, but for now it seems ok.
			5. Not full support for the changes as it is stated.
			6. Concern that the ambiguous for the “optionally” being added.
			7. Need to be clear if element is present for DMG and NonDMG i.e. S1G.
			8. The Comment Resolution was not explicitly noted, and in R1 it can be addressed.
			9. Supported Rate support in S1G is causing issues in implementation, so getting this clarified is important to take place to remove the implied need to express all the rates.
			10. CIDs 24 and 25 (MAC): More work needed – then bring back.
			11. ACTION ITEM #4: Mark HAMILTON will help formulate the actual resolutions, offline for 11-21/1461.
		3. The rest of the CIDs in this submission are all sort of similar, so he'll rework them all off-line.
	3. **Review Document 11-21/1448** – PSD Floor of Tx Mask -Xiaogang CHEN (Intel)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1448-01-000m-psd-floor-of-tx-mask.docx>
		2. Abstract: This document proposes to change the PSD floor in Tx mask of 11ax/ac/n/a in 5/6GHz such that the PSD floor of 11be is aligned with the legacy Wifi generations.
		3. Review submission
		4. Discussion:
			1. Significant change will need more offline thought.
			2. There are some editorial changes that would like to be suggested.
			3. There needs some justification for the deletion.
			4. Need space when listing number followed by units.
			5. More suggestions in the chat window:
				1. add space between number and unit throughout
				2. in the 5 GHz and 6 GHz band\*s\*
				3. in the 2.4 GHz is missing "band"
			6. An Additional deletion for 11a needs to be included (with the justification as well). Text to delete = “at 30 MHz frequency offset”
		5. New revision will be brought back.
		6. ACTION ITEM #5 - Xiaogang CHEN – Send email to the 802.11 and 802.11m reflector to solicit feedback on doc 11-21/1448, Ensure Subject is explicit to request.
	4. **Review Document 11-21/1476r0** – MAC Comments – Dan HARKINS (HPE)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1476-00-000m-resolution-of-some-mac-comments.docx>
		2. Abstract: This submission addresses the CIDs under the “Dan Harkins” tab of 11-21/0793r4 with the exception of CID 205 which has been reassigned to Mark Rison and CID 591 which has been reassigned to Stephen McCann.
		3. CID 154 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Upper case “Robust Action” and lower case “group addressed”.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 154 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-09-16 20:56:05Z): Incorporate changes as shown for CID 154 in 11-21/1476r1: <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1476-01-000m-resolution-of-some-mac-comments.docx>>. Note to Editor: correct case on "Robust Action frame" and "group addressed privacy".
			4. No Objection Mark Ready for motion.
		4. CID 461 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Submission Discussion
			3. Proposed resolution: Reject, there is no change proposed that could satisfy the comment.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON for submission.
			5. Mark Submission Required.
			6. If no submission, then we will reject the CID later.
		5. CID 344 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Submission Discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject, there is no problem identified, no justification for the change, and the change would not be correct.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON for submission.
			5. Mark Submission Required – will be addressed in 11-21/829.
			6. If no submission, then we will reject the CID later.
		6. CID 340 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Submission Discussion
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject, inappropriate and unprofessional comment.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON for submission.
			5. Mark Submission Required.
			6. If no submission, then we will reject the CID later.
			7. Mark RISON made a claim of an ethics violation and requested that Formal Complaint about the characterization of this comment be captured in the minutes.
			8. The 802.11 2nd Vice Chair gave a reminder that during the 802.11WG Opening Plenary, his presentation has a pointer to how to report an ethics formal complaint.
		7. CID 204 (MAC)
			1. Assign to Mark RISON for submission.
			2. Mark Submission Required.
			3. If no submission, then we will reject the CID later.
		8. CID 167 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Submission Discussion
			3. CID 167 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-09-16 21:10:58Z)
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		9. CID 162 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. The proposed change is to add “in an MBSS” to the sentence.
			4. Discussion on alternative additional changes of including “(MBSS only)” in some other locations.
			5. If CIDs are being worked on by different people, then we need to communicate this to the AdHoc chair.
			6. There is an alternate solution in 11-21/829 that will be reviewed tomorrow.
		10. CID 119 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Change: Add a new item to the "none of the following are true" list (P2302 L5):

-- The SA Query Request frame was sent to a group address.

Add the following new paragraph at P2302 L24:

"If a STA receives a group addressed SA Query Response frame, it shall deem the response as invalid and discard it."

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
			2. The comment provides a proposed change that is acceptable.
			3. For the first part of the change, the line number 5 does not seem correct. Suggest change to any where in the list by the editor.
			4. Discussion on use case on use of IGTK in group addressed.
			5. After discussion, we decided not to make a change to the resolution, and the Editor indicated that the resolution was clear on where the bullet would be added.
			6. Mark the Comment ready for motion
	1. **GEN CIDs – Jon ROSDAHL** (Qualcomm)
		1. Thanks to Mark HAMILTON for taking notes for the remainder of the telecon.
		2. Sept 16, 2021, REVme telecon, GEN comments section (GEN ad hoc, Ad Hoc Status of “Discuss”):
		3. CID 534 (GEN):
			1. Mark as Submission Required.
			2. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail, unless a submission is provided.
		4. CID 236 (GEN):
			1. Discussion with the task group requested for direction. Will schedule on a future agenda.
			2. Mark as Submission Required. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail unless a submission is provided.
		5. CID 336 (GEN):
			1. Should MIB attributes apply to a “device” or a “STA”?
			2. This came from the ARC document with recommendations on MIB wording.
			3. ARC Chair commented that he thinks there was discussion of this in ARC, and because some attributes apply to more than one STA (for example, apply to the relationship to co-located STAs), the decision was to leave it open as “device”.
			4. But, “device” is vague, in those cases where it is a specific capability of the specific STA. Should we make specific changes?
			5. Agree, we should not make a global change. Either leave as “device” or make only specific changes that are accurate.
			6. Currently assigned to Jon ROSDAHL. He will do some more investigation and bring it back.
		6. CID 510 (GEN):
			1. Agreed to set to Submission Required, leave it assigned to Mark RISON. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail, unless a submission is provided.
		7. CID 539 (GEN):
			1. Agreed to set to Submission Required, leave it assigned to Mark RISON. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail, unless a submission is provided.
			2. May try to coordinate with Brian HART, if possible.
		8. CID 423 (GEN):
			1. Do we agree on the direction suggested?
			2. Note the clause reference should be B.4, not D.4.
			3. Suggestion is to add “AND NOT CFDMG:M" to SM20.\* and DSE9.\*. About 20 instances.
			4. Assign to Jon ROSDAHL.
		9. CID 430 (GEN):
			1. It may be similar to CID 510? No.
			2. Agreed to set to Submission Required, leave it assigned to Mark RISON. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail unless a submission is provided.
		10. CID 490 (GEN):
			1. Agreed to set to Submission Required, leave it assigned to Mark RISON. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail unless a submission is provided.
		11. CID 497 (GEN):
			1. Assign to Jon ROSDAHL.
			2. Direction from the group is that we agree there is no value in a Capability attribute having a DEFAULT value.
			3. Agreed to set to Submission Required, leave it assigned to Mark RISON. This will be marked as Rejected for insufficient detail unless a submission is provided.
		12. CID 508 (GEN):
			1. It was recalled that “if and only if” has been removed in a previous revision (REVmb?).
			2. Some felt “if and only if” is much more clear. Several others do not support changing to “if and only if”.
			3. Seems to be more consensus to not make the change.
			4. Suggest a Reject resolution. Bring back as a separate motion. (Separate Comment Group = “GEN Motion - If only”)
			5. CID 508 - Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2021-09-16 22:01:15Z) The statement of "if xyz then set to 1; otherwise set to 0" format is used throughout the standard. The statement is correct and unambiguous, so a change is not warranted. An early effort was made to remove all the "If and only if" statements, and there was not support in the task group to undo all that work.
	2. **Recess 8:02 pm ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 802 Wireless Interim – Fri. 17 September 2021, at 13:30-15:30 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 1:34 pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
			2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
			3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			4. Editor - Edward AU
			5. Absent at beginning:
				1. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. See 11-21/1215r4 slides starting at 11.
		2. No issues were noted.
	3. **Review agenda**:11-21/1215r4:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1215-04-000m-revme-agenda-september-2021-interim-session.pptx>
		2. Agenda for Friday slide 5
			1. Friday Sep 17, 1:30pm ET
2. Comment Resolution
	1. MAC CIDs – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
	2. ED2 CIDs - Document 11-21.803 – Edward AU (Huawei) –
	3. Assigned CIDs - Documents 11-21/816, 11-21/1130 – Mark RISON (Samsung)
3. Recess
	* 1. No objection to today’s agenda
	1. **Comment Resolution:**
	2. **MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 326 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed resolution
			3. Discuss on the EDCA Parameter usage.
			4. The Next sentence after the cited sentence has same issue to make the change.
				1. “If the EDCA Parameter Set update count value in the QoS Capability element is different from the value that has been stored, the QoS STA shall query the updated EDCA parameter values by sending a Probe Request frame to the AP.”
			5. Other places with EDCA Parameter Set are out of scope for this comment.
			6. From AdHoc Notes:

MAC: 2021-09-17 17:44:59Z - status set to: Ready for Motion

Note considerably more use of "EDCA parameters" than "EDCA parameter values"; should we change that, too? Also, is "Beacon frames that contain that element" too awkward? Maybe "Beacon frames, when present, " structure is better?

* + - 1. Proposed resolution: CID 326 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-09-17 20:23:48Z) -

Change

"A QoS STA shall use the EDCA Parameter Set Update Count Value subfield in the QoS Capability element of all Beacon frames to determine whether the STA is using the current EDCA Parameter Values. If the EDCA Parameter Set update count value in the QoS Capability element is different from the value that has been stored, the QoS STA shall query the updated EDCA parameter values by sending a Probe Request frame to the AP."

to

"A QoS STA shall use the EDCA Parameter Set Update Count Value subfield in the QoS Capability element of Beacon frames, when present, to determine whether the STA is using the current EDCA parameters. If the EDCA Parameter Set Update Count Value in the QoS Capability element is different from the value that has been stored, the QoS STA shall query the updated EDCA parameters by sending a Probe Request frame to the AP."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 325 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed Resolution.
			3. Changes are referenced to d0.0
			4. Update to make citation complete.
			5. Discussion on why setting to 0 is incorrect.
			6. Discussion on why we don’t delete a larger portion as it is in Clause 10 and is not needed here.
				1. Suggested change: “The QoS Info field contains theEDCA Parameter Set Update Count subfield, which is used by non-AP STAs to determine whether the EDCA parameter set has changed and requires updating the appropriate MIB attributes.”
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised:

At 1695.19, delete "is initially set by the AP to 0 and".

At P1103.37 replace "The QoS Info field contains the EDCA Parameter Set Update Count subfield, which is initially set to 0 and is incremented each time any of the announced EDCA parameters change. This subfield is used by non-AP STAs to determine whether the EDCA parameter set has changed and requires updating the appropriate MIB attributes"

with

"The QoS Info field contains the EDCA Parameter Set Update Count subfield, which is used by non-AP STAs to determine whether the EDCA parameter set has changed."

At P1694.47 and P1694.55 change "update count" to "Update Count".

At P1694.53 delete "Value".

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 311 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review AdHoc Notes for proposed changes.
				1. Minor correction from 12 to 10 in one of the references.
			3. There is another bug for another day/CID on page 2070 with a reference to 10.23.2.3.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At P1806.57, and P1808.29, add "(see 10.23.2.4)" after "an EDCA TXOP is obtained based solely on activity of the primary channel".

At P1819.55 and P1820.10, change reference to 10.23.2.3 to be reference to 10.23.2.4.

At P1819.5, change reference to 10.23.3.3 to be reference to 10.23.2.3.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 132 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proceeding to Step J should be Step K.
			3. Note to Editor, Change “step j: to step k”
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accept Note to Editor: just Change “step j: to step k”
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 556 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed Resolution
			3. Review p238 for context of another potential change.
			4. Discussion on the value of “and network load balancing” in the title.
			5. The comment asked for “Change the section title to "BSS transition management"
			6. The subject of another comment is related to "network load balancing" on page 2353, it may need to be deleted in a future CID.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Accept the Proposed Change, and

At P2353.41, change "clause" to "subclause".

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 370 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. There was a discussion in the past, and we had decided to keep “drop”.
			3. What is the difference in “drop”, “discard” or “ignore”?
			4. We have used “drop” and “discard” primarily. We typically ignore things that are not frames, but in Clause 12, it is for things that are not frames. We drop/discard frames.
			5. Support for using a consistent terminology whether it is drop or discard. Use the same verb in all contexts.
			6. Using a single verb would help in avoiding trying to determine which context for different verbs.
			7. Need a submission to make these changes to list page and line numbers.
			8. Mark the CID as Submission Required and Assign to Mark RISON.
			9. Check with the Editor – Proposed Change is actionable by Editor.
			10. Discussion on use of “discard frames” and “ignore fields”.
			11. The submission will change “ignore to discard” for frames.
		2. CID 175 (SEC)
			1. Review comment and Proposed Change.
			2. Discussion on the use of the syntax of DEFVAL of “{}”.
			3. Discussion on if you have a non-zero length or not.
			4. Discussion on “non-Null” string – general understanding of what it is.
			5. Discussion on if the definition of Octet string can have zero length or not.
			6. Discussion the concept of “Null String”.
			7. No clear direction seemed to be supported. Request to work offline on a proposed resolution.
	1. **Review Doc 11-21/0803r4** - Editorial Changes – Edward AU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0803-04-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-2.docx>
		2. CID 324 (ED2)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Review proposed change.
			3. Editor suggested adding reference is fine for one equation.
			4. After discussion, request to reject the CID and not make any change.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Reject; It does no harm to remind the readers that the definition of L can be found in subclause 1.5. It also makes the equation easier to understand by the readers when all parameters are defined/mentioned immediately afterwards.
			6. Some support Accept.
			7. Straw poll:
				1. Do you support resolving CID 324 in doc 11-21/0803r4 as documented (rejected)?
				2. Results: 5/6/1/14 (yes/no/abstain/no answer)
			8. Revision 5 of 803 will have the comment assigned to Mark RISON.
		3. CID 453 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. The proposed resolution: Revised

At 313.8 and 313.10 in P802.11REVme D0.3, replace “Group Addressed Privacy” with “Group addressed privacy”.

* + - 1. Comment on if we fix this one, we should fix on other locations.
			2. Question of “scare quotes” usage.
				1. quotation marks used around a word or phrase when they are not required, thereby eliciting attention or doubts.
			3. Assign to Mark Rison and an update will be prepared.
		1. The rest of the Editorial Comments in 11-21/0803r4 will be marked Ready for Motion. (All of the CIDs except 324 and 453)
		2. Mark Ready for Motion the following list of CIDs: 279, 467, 464, 375, 337, 317, 274, 560, 561, 472, 424, 222, 151, 558, 481, 262, 382, 552, 553, 210, 482, 40, 426, 255, 332, 174, 218, 555, 570, 433, 194, 197, 440, 578, 134, 252, 314, 203
	1. **Review doc 11-21/829r3** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
		2. CID 315 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. The example of “Log2(100) =2” should be “Log10(100) = 2”.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised: After the line with the definition of log2 (x) in 1.5 add the following lines, with x being italicized (4x):

log10 (*x*) is the logarithm of x to the base 10. For example, log10 (100) is 2.

ln (*x*) is the logarithm of x to the base of natural logarithms. For example, ln (10) is approximately 2.3.

In Equations (9-2), (19-75), (25-26), (25-35) (2x), (25-67) and in 20.4.4.1.2 Transmit EVM, 20.5.4.1.1 Transmit EVM, 23.3.17.4.2 Transmitter center frequency leakage, 24.5.4.1.1 Transmit EVM change the log\_10 (subscript) to log10 (no subscript).

In D.2.4 Transmit Mask M change the log to log10 (5x).

In K.4.2 Surplus Bandwidth Allocation change the Ln to ln.

In Equation (R-4) and in 9.4.2.5.5 ADE mode change the log\_2 (subscript) to log2 (no subscript).

* + - 1. No objection Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 238 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. See 2170L19 and 2170L29 for context, not also lines 19 and 21 need different specific change.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 238 in 11-21/0829r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>>, which address the issue raised by the commenter.
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 294 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed resolution: Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 294 in 11-21/0829r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx> which separate the format from the behaviour, and address various technical and editorial issues..
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 296 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Proposed resolution: Proposed resolution: REVISED:

Change “the United States” to “the United States and its territories” in 4.3.12.3 Contention based protocol (CBP) in nonexclusively licensed bands, 5.1.4 MSDU format, 18.4.3 Operating channel frequencies, 22.3.14 Channelization, B.4.3 IUT configuration, Table D-1—Regulatory requirement list, Table D-3—Maximum STA transmit power classification for the 5.85–5.925 GHz band in the United States (caption itself), Table D-4—Maximum STA transmit power and maximum BW allowed for the S1G band, E.1 Country information and operating classes (just before Table E-1), Table E-1—Operating classes in the United States (caption itself), Table E-5—S1G operating classes, E.2.2 3650–3700 MHz band in the United States (heading itself), E.2.3 5.9 GHz band in the United States (5.850–5.925 GHz) (heading itself), E.2.5 TVWS band in the United States and Canada (54–698 MHz) (heading itself), Table E-9—Device Identification Information Value fields, E.2.5 TVWS band in the United States and Canada (54–698 MHz) (final NOTE).

Change “the China, United States and Europe” to “China, the United States and its territories, and Europe” in 15.4.4.2 Operating frequency range, 16.3.6.2 Operating frequency range.

Change “USA” to “USA and its territories” at 4167.62, 4168.50, 4297.19 (also prepend “the”), 4324.33 (also prepend “the”).

In 3.3 Definitions specific to IEEE 802.11 operation in some regulatory domains and 3.5 Acronyms and abbreviations in some regulatory domains, at the end of the first para add: “US is to be understood as also including the United States’ territories, and EU is to be understood as including all CEPT member states”. At the end of 4353.2 and 4354.2 add “US is to be understood as also including the United States’ territories.”.

Change “U.S.” to “United States and its territories” in the “emergency alert system (EAS)” definition in 3.1, at 231.62 (NOTE), 11.11 DSE procedures (2x), 22.3.14 Channelization (2x), D.2.2 Transmit power levels. At 4354.35 change “NOTE 3—In the United States, an example of full Map 1 for a U.S. GDD non-AP STA” to “NOTE 3—In the United States and its territories, an example of full Map 1 for a GDD non-AP STA”.

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 550 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; Put "10.28.4 (Response to an invalid Action and Action No Ack frame)" in the "See subclause" cell for that row.

In 10.28.4 change the first two “Action and Action No Ack frame “s to “Action or Action No Ack frame” and the last to “frame”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess at 3:29 pm ET**
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3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0965-03-000m-cc35-phy-cids-19-18-14-15-527.docx>
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11. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0684-07-000m-revme-wg-cc35-comments.xlsx>
12. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0809-06-000m-cc35-crs-a.docx>
13. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0970-06-000m-akm-for-sha-384.docx>
14. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-03-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
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17. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0803-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-2.docx>
18. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1461-00-000m-cids-for-supported-rates.docx>
19. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1448-01-000m-psd-floor-of-tx-mask.docx>
20. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1476-00-000m-resolution-of-some-mac-comments.docx>
21. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1476-01-000m-resolution-of-some-mac-comments.docx>
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