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Abstract

REVme (TGme) Telcon Minutes for November 1st and November 5th, 2021

R0: November 1st Telcon Minutes

R1: November 5th Telecon Minutes added.

Action items:

* + 1. ACTION ITEM #1: Jon ROSDAHL to update the PAR Corrigenda document to explain the proposed project timing, so everyone can understand the plan, and not be surprised by planning less than 6 months.

1.0 **TGme (REVme) Telecon Monday November 1st, 2021, at 10-12:00 ET**

* 1. Called to order 10:02am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
			2. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			3. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	2. **Attendance:**
		1. IMAT Reported attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Andersdotter, Amelia | Sky UK Group |
| 2 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 3 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 4 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 5 | Henry, Jerome | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 6 | Kim, Jeongki | Ofinno |
| 7 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 8 | Lumbatis, Kurt | CommScope, Inc. |
| 9 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 10 | McCann, Stephen | Self |
| 11 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 12 | NANDAGOPALAN, SAI SHANKAR | Synaptics |
| 13 | Patil, Abhishek | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 14 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 15 | Petrick, Albert | Jones-Petrick and Associates, LLC. |
| 16 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 17 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 18 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 19 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 20 | Ward, Lisa | Rohde & Schwarz |
| 21 | Wentink, Menzo | Qualcomm Incorporated |

* + 1. Webex Attendance not in IMAT:
			1. [V] Youhan Kim (Qualcomm)
			2. [V] Nehru Bhandaru (Broadcom)
			3. Dave Halasz [Morse Micro]
	1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy** and Participation Policies.
		1. No issues were noted.
	2. **Review agenda:11-21/1572r7:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1572-07-000m-sep-nov-teleconference-agendas.docx>
		2. Proposed Agenda:

4. (11ay) Corrigendum PAR

5. Comment resolution

a. Document 11-21/1664– Patil (Qualcomm)

b. Document 11-21/981 – Henry (Cisco) – CID 93,94

c. Document 11-21/1637 – McCann (Huawei) – MAC Comments

d. Document 11-21/1753 – Wentink (Qualcomm) – TDLS CIDs

* + 1. No objection to agenda as published
	1. **Editor Report Emily QI**
		1. Nothing to report.
	2. **Review doc 11-21/1750r0: 11ay Corrigendum PAR** Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. Document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1750-00-000m-par-corrigendum-1-correct-802-11ay-assignment-of-protected-announce-support-bit.docx>,
		2. Reviewed the proposed PAR text.
		3. Purpose is to correct the TGay use of the Protected Announce Support bit, which re-used a bit assigned to the Wi-Fi Alliance, in error.
		4. Officially, this is a corrigendum to 802.11, as 802.11 was amended by TGay. It is not an IEEE SA procedure to correct an approved amendment, as it is the (effective) base document (as amended) that is being corrected.
		5. Assumption is that this will sequence very quickly, as it is very simple. WG can vote to make this change at the November plenary, without a WG LB.
		6. We need to open the pool for the SA ballot, after the PAR is approved. We need enough time to form that pool, and then hold at least one SA ballot. Also a concern about having enough members join the SA pool.
		7. Who would be the ballot resolution committee for this? 802.11 Chair could empanel a small group, or we could use REVme members or WG members.
		8. From looking at ANA, believe the correct bit will be bit 11. Discussion about noting that in the PAR, at this point. We don’t want to have to do a PAR amendment if that changes for some reason. Will put that in the Notes section as an “expectation”.
		9. Also made some editorial changes, produced 11-21/1750r1.
		10. Plan to bring this to the Working Group for approval during the closing plenary in November.
		11. ACTION ITEM #1: Jon ROSDAHL to update the PAR Corrigenda document to explain the proposed project timing, so everyone can understand the plan, and not be surprised by planning less than 6 months.
		12. REVme will take a motion on the updated (r1) early in the November session.
	3. **Review Document 11-21/1664– PATIL (Qualcomm)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1664-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-4.docx>,
		2. CID 4 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Identified one typo (capitalization), started an r1 for the call.
			3. Comment is about element inheritance when there are multiple elements with the same ID.
			4. This was discussed on last Friday’s call. Continued where we left off (last xxx paragraphs).
			5. Suggested some clarification changes, to make “this BSS” more clear in the first paragraph, and to point out that VSE “Content(1)” was replicated in the non-transmitted BSSID.
			6. CID 4: REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-01 14:54:06Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-21/1664r01 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1664-01-000m-resolution-for-cid-4.docx>> .
			7. Ready for Motion.
	4. **Review Document 11-21/981– CID 93, 94 – Jerome HENRY (Cisco)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0981-09-000m-anqp-augmentation-for-federations.docx>
		2. Adds facilities to better support Wi-Fi Alliance and federations use cases.
		3. Updates are for clarifications, per off-line discussion, and to align the format with our normal style.
		4. CIDs 93, 94 (MAC):
			1. Reviewed the proposed new material.
		5. Also considered CID 95 (MAC):
			1. Really all three CIDs are covered by the document, in a merged way. Will update to indicate that this overall document covers all three CIDs and fixed up the flow to be more clear.
			2. Corrected some bullet numbering.
			3. We could simplify the Excluded NAI Realm Tuple, to just be a list of NAI Realms.
			4. Question about the “Cloud or Social Media Provider” category. It might be better to list these are separate types, they could be very different types of entities. This concept is currently being used today (in a different, non-802 Std structure), without separating these, so it is easier to migrate to our Standard if we keep it the same. It also avoids duplicating structure when both categories could apply Also, note that some things like “Doctor or Dentist” are already clubbed together, which is sort of similar. Some disagreement that those are similar cases. This seems to be a personal opinion about how detailed to be in split categories.
			5. A suggest is made to clarify how a non-AP STA uses this information, more as behavior description. But, it is largely out of scope. So, will add a NOTE that discusses the concept, but notes that it is out of scope.
			6. Will update to r10, and post.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 93, 94, and 95: REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-01 14:58:17Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/0981r10 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0981-10-000m-anqp-augmentation-for-federations.docx>).
			8. Ready for motion as a separate Motion.
	5. **Review Document 11-21/1637 – MAC Comments – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-03-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>
		2. Move to Friday Call
	6. **Review Document 11-21/1753 – TDLS CIDs – Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1753-00-000m-tdls-related-comment-resolutions-on-revme-draft-0-0.docx>
		2. CID 250 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed changes
			3. Discussion on adding specifics to the sentence being added.
			4. There is another document that is discussing the addressing fields, may be a better option for CID 250, CID 195 may need to include “TDLS or other” in the sentence.
			5. Discussion on RA usage and TDLS methods.
			6. Discussion on using positive rather than negative statements.
			7. Discussion on potential security concern with non-individual address TDLS going over the TDLS link.
			8. Discussion on if the statement should be positive or not, and if “shall only” could be used or not.
			9. One suggestion: "An A-MSDU transmitted over the direct path shall only contain a A-MSDU subframe headers with a DA field that are individually address."
			10. Another Suggestion: “"Each A-MSDU subframe transmitted over the direct path shall be individually addressed."
			11. MAC AdHoc Notes: CID 250 (MAC): MAC: 2021-11-01 15:49:48Z - Reviewed CID 250, and related CID 195, in 11-21/1753. Discussion to limit the DA to individually addressed, also. Suggested something like, "Each A-MSDU subframe transmitted over the direct path shall have an individually addressed DA." Needs off-line polishing.
			12. Ran out of time.
	7. **Adjourn at 12:00pm ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon Friday November 5st, 2021, at 10-12:00 ET**
	1. Called to order 10:02am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. Introductions of Officers.
			1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
			2. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
			3. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
			4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		2. Will join later
			1. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
	2. **Attendance:**
		1. IMAT Reported attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | baron, stephane | Canon Research Centre France |
| 3 | Bhandaru, Nehru | Broadcom Corporation |
| 4 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 5 | Derham, Thomas | Broadcom Corporation |
| 6 | Guo, Jing | NXP Semiconductors |
| 7 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| 8 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 9 | Kancherla, Sundeep | Infineon Technologies |
| 10 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11 | Lee, Wookbong | SAMSUNG |
| 12 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 13 | Lumbatis, Kurt | CommScope, Inc. |
| 14 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 15 | McCann, Stephen | Self |
| 16 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 17 | Nezou, Patrice | Canon Research Centre France |
| 18 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 19 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 20 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 21 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 22 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 23 | Stacey, Robert | Intel Corporation |
| 24 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 25 | Ward, Lisa | Rohde & Schwarz |
| 26 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |

* + 1. WebEx Attendance not in IMAT:
	1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy** and Participation Policies.
		1. No issues were noted.
	2. **Review agenda:11-21/1572r8:**
		1. [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1572-08-000m-sep-nov-teleconference-agendas.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1572-08-000m-sep-nov-teleconference-agendas.docx)
		2. Proposed Agenda:

4. Comment Resolution

a. Withdrawn CIDs 91, 99

b. Document 11-21/1637 – McCann (Huawei) – MAC Comments

c. Document 11-21/1617, 11-21/1678, 11-21/1780 – Au (Huawei)– ED2 CIDs

d. Document 11-21/1570, 11-21/1668r3 – Hart (Cisco) – CID 13, 455

* + 1. No objection to agenda as updated and shown on the screen (see R9)
	1. **Editor Report Emily QI**
		1. Rolling in approved resolutions complete.
		2. For the 11ay bit correction has been assigned to bit 11.
			1. A Motion will be run next week to make it official.
		3. Corrigendum PAR posted yesterday and will discuss next week.
	2. **Announcement**
		1. We are still planning on going to D1.0 WG LB next week if possible.
	3. **Withdrawn CIDS 91, 99**
		1. Each CID to have a Resolution prepared: Rejected, Comment was withdrawn by commentor.
		2. Proposed Resolution: CID 91 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:08:46Z): The commenter has withdrawn this comment.
	4. **Review Document 11-21/1637r2 – MAC Comments – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-02-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>
		2. CID 290 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 290 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:12:31Z): Change the cited text to "A MAC header, which comprises frame control, optional duration (not in PS-Poll frames), address, optional sequence control information, optional QoS Control information (only in QoS Data frames), and optional HT Control fields (only in +HTC frames);"
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 545 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 545 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:13:21Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 289 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on what the change may do to deployed devices.
			3. We should not call it “Element” for the subfield, but that will be for a a different comment in a later time.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 289 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:13:52Z)
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			6. Discussion on if the field contains the element or the values from the element. No objection to change, further comments would be later.
		5. CID 392 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 392 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:17:54Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 318 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 318 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:18:24Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 251 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if this is Editorial vs Technical – while technical comment, it is a simple change for the editor to make.
			3. Discussion on the dot11OCBActivated requirements – is it “and” or “or”.
			4. From the table 9-157 and table 156, we can see that “and” is the right answer.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 251 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:19:02Z)
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 564 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 564 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:24:00Z):

Revised: Change the sentence at P844L15, starting “In an MMPDU…” to "The maximum size of an MMPDU that is not carried in a VHT or S1G PPDU is defined in Table 9-25."

Change the sentence at P844L19 starting “in an MMPDU…” to "The maximum size of an MMPDU that is carried in one or more VHT or S1G PPDUs (in whole or in part) is the maximum MPDU size supported by the recipient or, if there is more than one recipient, the smallest of the maximum MPDU sizes supported by the recipients less the shortest Management frame MAC header and FCS."

Note to commenter, this adds “one or more VHT or S1G PPDUs” to the 2nd change.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 11 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The change from 802.1Qc is because it is not ready to be a reference.
			3. Need to have a revised resolution to be explicit on the change to be made.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 11 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:28:34Z): Change "IEEE Std 802.1CQ" to "IEEE Std 802c-2017"
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 566 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 566 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:32:03Z): The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 82 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 82 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:32:51Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 227 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 227 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:33:56Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 234 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 234 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:35:07Z) Note to Editor: Add at P1075.32
			3. Review context for location check.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 241 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 241 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:36:58Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 446 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. An article is not necessary in a long list of items.
			3. Discussion on how item #2 should be parsed. If you have a long list with an or at the end, then they are all “or”ed.
			4. Can item #2 be worded in a better way? Sure, but this is a resolution to the specific comment.
			5. Recrafted the sentence to change from SU PPDU or MU PPDU to SU or MU PPDU…
			6. Proposed Resolution:

CID 446 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:38:51Z): Change to:

“2) An SU or MU PPDU, where the PPDU carries a single MSDU, single MMPDU, single A-MSDU, or single A-MPDU

3) An MU PPDU carrying A-MPDUs to different users (a single A-MPDU to each user)"

Note to commenter: This has minor editorial style correction.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 449 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 449 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:44:00Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 343 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 343 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-05 14:44:30Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. Out of time for this submission – about 20 CIDs left in the submission.
		4. An updated revision will be posted, and we will revisit later.
	1. **Review Document 11-21/1617r5 -** ED2 CIDs **–** EdwardAU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1617-05-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-3.docx>
		2. CID 419 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Need to add an article and a plural needs be added.
				1. 985.15 -> for a mesh Data frame
				2. 986.27 -> frame\*s\*
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 419 (ED2): Revised. Incorporate the changes shown in 11-21/1617r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1617-06-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-3.docx>> for CID 419.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review** **Document 11-21/1780r0 -** ED2 CIDs **–** EdwardAU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1780-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-5.docx>
		2. CID 581 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Add “of zero length” to end of the sentence.
			3. The RFC number that is the reference is not remembered instantly.
			4. ACTION ITME #1: Edward AU to send the Reference for DEFVAL { ' 'H } process to Mark HAMILTON (and reflector).
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 581 (ED2): Rejected

DEFVAL { ' 'H } is not a typo. It means that the Hex value option is used to indicate that the default value is a hexadecimal value of zero length.

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 352 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review** **Document 11-21/1678r2 -** ED2 CIDs **–** EdwardAU (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>
		2. CID 257 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review changes in context
			3. 11 types of changes reviewed
			4. Discussion on how addresses should be referenced.
			5. Need to follow the style/terminology of IEEE Std 802-2014.
			6. More Work will need to be done for this CID.
			7. Question on how AID addressing may need to be done.
			8. If we do not make the change as suggested by Commentor, there was feedback that there are uses of individually or group address without “MAC”, so we may need to look if changes on them need to be done.
		3. CID 221 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 402 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

: Revised

Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 402 in 11-21/1678r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>>.

* + - 1. Discussion on the use of “subfield” vs “bit” for single bit subfield.
			2. Should this be added to the Style guide? Not yet, will be discussed in Editor meeting.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 465 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Discussion on use of “B” vs “Bits” and how to be consistent.
			4. Editorial Guideline will need to be updated.
			5. Proposed Resolution:

CID 465 (ED2): Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 465 in 11-21/1678r3 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>>.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 135 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes (5 instances)
			3. There is a “set” without the value it is being set to. Will be subject to another future comment.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 135 (ED2): Accepted. Note to the Editors: The locations in D0.4 are 2645.36, 2735.45, 2835.34, 3038.16, and 3044.55.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 185 (ED2)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Review submission discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 185 (ED2): Accepted

Note to the Editors: The locations in D0.4 are 3215.24, 3335.10, 3869.44, and 3911.33.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. There are about 8 CIDs left.
	1. **Review** **Document 11-21/1668r4 - CID 455 – Brian HART (Cisco)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1668-04-000m-cc35-phy-cids-285-455.docx>
		2. CID 455 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review submission discussion and proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on some possible changes, but that should be a separate comment to resolve.
			4. Discussion on the Class of Reserved fields in PHY and we have a couple, so a single global statement may not be clear in the context of where the field is defined.
			5. Discussion on if the “shall be” is meant for both the TX and RX. Specifically for having the RX ignore the bit on receive.
			6. Discussion on the use of Reserved bits in deployments and historically used.
			7. These changes are based on D0.3 Need to notate that in the doc and revise the document. (11-21/1668r5).
			8. Discussion on how references to figures was made.
			9. Need for Page number and line number needed for some proposed changes.
			10. Updates made to changes.
			11. Proposed Resolution:

CID 455 (PHY): Revised.

Note to Commenter:

See changes in 11-21/1668r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1668-05-000m-cc35-phy-cids-285-455.docx>> , which substantially aligns with the commenter’s comment, and includes clarity on setting of TX fields, behavior at the RX and cross references to receive behavior.

Instruction to Editor:

Implement the "Proposed Text Updates: CID 455" in 11-21/1668r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1668-05-000m-cc35-phy-cids-285-455.docx>> .

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review Document 11-21/1570r2 CID 13** – Brian HART (Cisco)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1570-02-000m-cid13.docx>
		2. CID 13 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review options presented in PowerPoint doc: 11-21/1569r1
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1569-01-000m-evm-issues.pptx>
				2. Option 2 has the preference for use.
			3. Review discussion and changes in the 11-21/1570r2 submission
			4. Request for more time to review before we proceed.
			5. Discussion on products being sold with older generations of the standard, and we should be cautious in or changes to not obsolete deployed products that are still in the marketplace.
			6. There are different types of changes: Clarifying, Fixing
			7. Discussion on if existing clauses may need to be left as is rather than looking to make changes that may have unintended consequences.
			8. Discussion on if the EVM Test is really being valid in the way it is described now.
			9. Need more offline discussion.
			10. Ran out of time.
	2. **Adjourned 12:00pm**

**References:**
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1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1572-07-000m-sep-nov-teleconference-agendas.docx>
2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1750-00-000m-par-corrigendum-1-correct-802-11ay-assignment-of-protected-announce-support-bit.docx>
3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1664-00-000m-resolution-for-cid-4.docx>
4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1664-01-000m-resolution-for-cid-4.docx>
5. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0981-09-000m-anqp-augmentation-for-federations.docx>
6. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0981-10-000m-anqp-augmentation-for-federations.docx>
7. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-03-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>
8. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1753-00-000m-tdls-related-comment-resolutions-on-revme-draft-0-0.docx>

**5 November**

[**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1572-08-000m-sep-nov-teleconference-agendas.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1572-08-000m-sep-nov-teleconference-agendas.docx)

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1637-02-000m-proposed-comment-resolutions-for-mac-cids.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1617-05-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-3.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1617-06-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-3.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1780-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-5.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1668-04-000m-cc35-phy-cids-285-455.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1668-05-000m-cc35-phy-cids-285-455.docx>