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Abstract

This file has the Telecon Minutes for REVme for November 22 and 29.

R0: Nov 22 Telecon Minutes – Thanks to Stephen McCann for taking minutes on Nov 22, 2021.

R1: Nov 29 Telecon Minutes added. Thanks to Mark Hamilton for taking notes for portions of the telecon.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

1. ACTION ITEM #1 – Graham Smith to update 11-21/1782r1 and post the update to the 802.11 Reflector in preparation for presenting the updates on Dec 6th.
2. ACTION ITEM #2: Mark RISON to coordinate the implementation of CID 207 (MAC) with Editors as the cited paragraph has changed in D1.0.
3. ACTION ITEM #3 – David HALEZ – Review CID 473 for clarity. Any issues to be noted to the Reflector.
4. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 22 Monday 10-12pm ET.**
   1. **Called to order** 10:04am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Introductions of Officers.**
      1. TG Chair - Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
      2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
      3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
      4. Secretary Pro-Tem – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
      5. Absent:
         1. Vice Chair – Mark Hamilton (CommScope/Ruckus)
         2. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
   3. **Review Patent Policy, Copyright Policy and 802 Policies**
      1. Patent, Participation, and policy related slides: See slides 4-19 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1642-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-november-2021.pptx>
      2. No response to call for Patents.
   4. **Review and Approve Agenda – 11-21/1885r1**:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1885-01-000m-nov-jan-teleconference-agendas.docx>
      2. The draft agenda for the teleconferences is below:
5. Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/attendance> ), and patent and copyright policy

2.       Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU

3.       Comment resolution and motions

1. **Monday November 22, 2021 – 10am – noon Eastern**
   1. Comment resolution
      1. CIDs 106 and 107 – Withdrawn
      2. ED2 CIDs – Au (Huawei)
      3. Annex G – Smith (SR Technologies) – CID 81, 565
      4. 11-21/829 – MAC CIDs – Rison (Samsung)
   2. Discussion on 2022 Adhoc meetings
2. **Monday November 29, 2021 – 10am – noon Eastern**
   1. Motions (document 11-21/1632r6 & 11-21/758r16)
      1. September Interim and teleconference minutes
      2. GEN insufficient details
   2. Comment resolution
      1. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
      2. 11-21/829 – MAC CIDs – Rison (Samsung)
3. **Monday December 6, 2021 – 10am – noon Eastern** 
   1. Comment resolution
      1. <>
4. **Monday December 13, 2021 – 10am – noon Eastern** 
   1. Comment resolution
      1. CID 224 – Montemurro (Huawei)
      2. 11-21/829 - SEC CIDs – Rison (Samsung)
5. **Monday December 20, 2021 – 10am – noon Eastern** 
   1. Comment resolution
      1. <>
6. **Monday January 7, 2022 – 10am – noon Eastern** 
   1. Comment resolution
      1. Document 11-21/816 – Rison (Samsung)
7. **Monday January 10, 2022 – 10am – noon Eastern** 
   1. Comment resolution
      1. Document 11-21/1128 – Rison (Samsung)

5.       AOB

6. Adjourn

* 1. Approve Agenda - 11-21/1885r1
     1. Agenda approved without objection as displayed.
  2. **Editor report** – Emily QI (Intel) - Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. There are now 6,100 pages in the current draft update
     2. Chair: I would like to thank Emily and Edward for all their help with the draft.
     3. The current version of the comment spreadsheet was presented 11-21-0684r12.
     4. No questions
  3. **CIDs 106 and 107** – Withdrawn
     1. GEN AdHoc Database has updated the resolution.
     2. Proposed Resolution CID 106 and 107: REJECTED (GEN: 2021-11-18 22:30:04Z) The commenter has withdrawn the comments.
     3. These comments have been marked “ready for motion”.
  4. **ED2 CIDs** – Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-04-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>
     2. CID 211 (ED2)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Some of the items within the comment resolution have already been implemented. However, the resolution of “Accepted” is still ok.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        4. Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 551 (ED2)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Question (Q): Is this also true for DMG?
        3. Answer (A): Yes
        4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        5. Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 220 (ED2)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 410 and 328 (ED2)
        1. Q: In the figure, would it be clearer to identify the mode within each box?
        2. A: If you can think of any update for the figure, that would help.
        3. The editors find that .emf figures are the easiest one to work with.
        4. Proposed resolution: Revised;  
           Incorporate the changes as shown in “Proposed resolution for CIDs 410 and 328” in 11-21/1678r4 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1678-04-000m-proposed-resolution-for-revme-cc35-comments-part-4.docx>>.  
           Note to the Editors:  Please make sure the figure is searchable by inserting the figure as emf.  
           Note to the Editors:  The updated figure is shown in the next page for reference.
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  5. **Review doc 11-21/1782r1 - Annex G** – CID 81, 109 – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1782-01-000m-annex-g-cids-resolution.docx>
     2. CID 81 and CID 109 (GEN) - also related to CID 565 (GEN)
        1. These CIDs are regarding Annex G and the submission is a result of many discussions within the Architecture (ARC) Standing Committee (SC).
        2. Annex G can be deleted, as it contains no unique features.
        3. It does not need to be set to deprecated in the next baseline edition.
        4. Q: Has BSS been added, per the definition on page 4?
           1. A: I’m not sure. I’ve forgotten about the 11-21-1782r1, whereas I’ve been presenting 11-21-1782r0.
        5. Comment (C): I think they apply to IBSS as well, so that’s what BSS was removed from that sentence.
        6. Q: I appreciate that this submission is against REVme D0.3. However, in REVme D0.4, clause 29 (the 802.11ba amendment roll-in) now includes some more material that also needs to be clarified.
           1. A: Ok, sure. I will try and do that.
        7. Q: I think that BSS should not be mentioned in the sentence.
        8. C: There are quite a few typos, that I can help with.
        9. Q: Regarding the GAS exchange sequence, it seems that your proposal is suggesting that exchanging GAS requests between STAs, whereas it should be a GAS request/response.
        10. Q: Can we change the “GAS Query Request exchange sequence” to “GAS Query exchange sequence”?
        11. Chair: Perhaps the presenter can work with some people offline to sort this out.
        12. Q: The term “transmitting frame exchange sequences” seems a little strange. The exchange itself is not transmitted.
            1. A: Yes, sure.
        13. Q: Will the next version of this submission be 1782r2?
            1. A: Yes.
        14. Chair: Are people happy with this resolution to Annex G?
        15. No response
        16. Chair: Can we mark this document “ready for motion”, assuming that editorial changes will be made, or does it need to be presented again.
        17. C: I would like to see an updated version please? I would also like this to be mentioned on the main 802.11 reflector.
        18. Q: Do people prefer to change the status of Annex G to “(informative)” or just delete it?
        19. C: I would like to see an updated document first and then ask the 802.11 membership for feedback.
        20. C: This concept was discussed in the ARC SC for quite some time, so it has been thoroughly debated.
        21. Chair: If this goes ahead, the change will appear after D1.0 has been published, possibly in a D1.x. Could this revised submission be available for the REVme call on December 6th?
        22. C: The main differences between D0.3 and D0.4 will be the page and line numbers for the changes suggested in this submission.
        23. C: Dealing with the new clause 29 (regarding 802.11ba) should be done as a separate step.
        24. Chair: Is there any objection to adding a presentation of a revised submission to the December 6th agenda?
        25. No objection.
        26. ACTION ITEM #1 – Graham Smith to update 11-21/1782r1 and post the update to the 802.11 Reflector in preparation for presenting the updates on Dec 6th.
  6. **Review Doc 11-21/829r8** – MAC CIDs – Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
     2. CID 280 (MAC)
        1. Review the Comment
        2. There was a Proposed resolution of “Revised”.
        3. <Can't find CID 280 or the resolution in -r8 or notes for the telecon or CID.>
        4. We will need to revisit the proposal for a resolution.
        5. This remembered to have been discussed, but notes are not available.
     3. CID 316 (MAC)
        1. Review the comment
        2. Q: I can’t see these resolutions on mentor?
           1. A: Oh, I may need to upload a revised version of this submission.
           2. Proposed resolution: REVISED  
              Change the rightmost cell for row 22 in Table 9-45—DMG Beacon frame body to “The EDCA Parameter Set element is optionally present if the QoS Capability element is not present.”  
              Change the rightmost cell for row 26 in Table 9-45—DMG Beacon frame body to “The QoS Capability element is optionally present if the EDCA Parameter Set element is not present.”
        3. Mark Ready for Motion.
     4. CID 480 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Change the cited text to “A responder may ignore a request for beam tracking within an allocation if it transmits no PPDUs other than PPDUs using MCS 0 (control mode PPDUs) to the initiator within the allocation.”
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 438 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed resolution: REVISED After the referenced para add:  
           “NOTE—A VHT STA that receives a CTS frame in response to an RTS frame the STA has transmitted with the TXVECTOR parameter DYN\_BANDWIDTH\_IN\_NON\_HT set to Static might ignore the RXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH\_IN\_NON\_HT as it will be the same as the TXVECTOR parameter CH\_BANDWIDTH\_IN\_NON\_HT in the RTS frame.”
        3. Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 405 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Q: Is this change already part of CID 97?
           1. A: No, this is an additional change.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED  
           Add the following definitions in Subclause 3.2:

operational modulation and coding scheme (MCS): An MCS that belongs to the operational MCS set.  
operational rate: A rate that belongs to the operational rate set.

Note to the commenter: there are already definitions for the operational MCS and rate sets.  The basic ones are dealt with in 11-21/1717 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1717-00-000m-revme-cc35-cid-97-basic-rate-set-definition.docx>> under CID 97.  The relationship between basic/operational and mandatory rates is already captured in 10.3.1.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 456 (MAC)
       1. C: My preference is the alternative.
       2. Q: Does this change the byte order preference?
          1. A: No.
       3. **Straw Poll - Do you prefer the top or bottom alternative?**
          1. Top: 1
          2. Bottom: 2
          3. Abstain: 7
          4. No answer: 7
       4. C: So, let’s use the alternative solution.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED  
          Change the rightmost cell at the referenced location to:  
          — Set to 0: control mode.  
          — Set to 1: robust PHY mode 1.  
          — Set to 2: robust PHY mode 0.  
          The value 3 is reserved.
       6. Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 412 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change the cited text to “a Probe Response frame with its current AP-CSN.”
       3. Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 351 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Q: Do we need to replace this reference with something else?
          1. A: Ideally, we should, but I’ve been unable to find one.
       3. Chair: RFC 8820 describes acceptable URI schemes. It might be worth looking at it.
       4. C: I found the document for you. See: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-geopriv-dhcp-lbyr-uri-option-12>, section 3.3.
       5. C: We need to determine if this ever became an RFC, but we can check offline.
       6. C: I would now to be happy to change this to a note.
       7. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change the para at the referenced location to:  
          NOTE—Due to security concerns, there are some URI schemes that ought to be cautiously processed when received by a STA. For example, URIs using the scheme names “data:” and “http:” might direct applications (e.g., a browser) on the STA to Internet pages that contain active scripts. Therefore, URIs received via this ANQP procedure ought not be processed in a general manner, as these scripts might be inadvertently activated.
       8. Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Discussion on 2022 Adhoc meetings**
     1. C: I think the group should start to consider ad-hoc face-to-face meetings. Having such a meeting would not only help REVme to progress its work, but also to encourage some IEEE 802.11 members to consider other face to face meetings.
     2. C: I would find it difficult to travel at the moment and so I hope that there will be remote support.
     3. C: At the moment, I cannot host meetings or travel.
     4. C: I would like to encourage these face-to-face meetings. I think this is the time to move forward.
     5. C: The questions is when and whether a location can be found or not. Perhaps around March 2022 this may be easier.
     6. C: Perhaps this discussion should be postponed until the new year, when conditions may be easier for several companies, especially about making decisions about holding such meetings.
     7. Chair: There would be no meetings before January, so let’s wait until then.
     8. 802.11 chair: The IEEE offices in Piscataway, New Jersey would work well. Their policies are also good for attendees.
     9. C: I acknowledge that the situation is changing rapidly and understand that at least 30 days’ notice is required. I also suggest that this would be in the new year.
     10. Chair: I’ve noted that comments are resolved more efficiently in a face to face meeting as opposed to a teleconference.
  2. **Adjourn – at 12:00 ET**
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