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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 CIDs 106 and 107 – Withdrawn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**

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon – 2021 November 22 Monday 10-12pm ET.**
   1. **Called to order** 10:03am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Introductions of Officers.**
      1. TG Chair - Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
      2. Vice Chair – Mark Hamilton (CommScope/Ruckus)
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON (Samsung)
      4. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
      5. 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 – 11-21/1885r2**:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1885-02-000m-nov-jan-teleconference-agendas.docx>
      2. The draft agenda for the teleconference:
   5. Call to order, attendance (<https://imat.ieee.org/attendance> ), and patent and copyright policy
   6. Editor report – Emily QI/Edward AU
   7. Comment resolution and motions
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. Agenda approved without objection as displayed.
  1. **Editor report** – Emily QI (Intel) - Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. All comment Resolutions have been implemented.
     2. D1.0 is now ready.
     3. Thanks to Emily and Edward to get this draft together so quickly.
     4. Plan to launch Letter ballot on Dec 1 and close on about Jan 10th.
  2. **Motions** (see documents 11-21/1632r6 & 11-21/758r16)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1632-06-000m-revme-agenda-november-2021-session.pptx>
     2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0758-16-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
     3. **Motion: REVme meeting minutes approval**
        1. Approve the minutes in documents

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1168-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-july-electronic-plenary.docx>

[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1590-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-sept-27-2021.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1518-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-sept-electronic-interim.docx)

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1518-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-sept-electronic-interim.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1612-07-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-october-2021.docx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1785-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-november-1-and-5.docx>

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
      2. Second: Mark HAMILTON
      3. Results Minutes Motion: No Objection - Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes.
    1. **Motion 36 – Insufficient Details (2021-11-29)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

“Insufficient Details” tab (22 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0699-15-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-cc35-comments.xls>,

and incorporate the changes into the next version of the REVme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
      2. Seconded: Edward Au
      3. Result of Motion #36: No objection – Unanimous Consent – Motion Approved.
  1. **Review doc 11-21/1821r3** - GEN CIDs – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1821-03-000m-cc35-13-gen-cids.docx>
     2. CID 230 (GEN):
        1. Review the comment
        2. Referenced RFC 2758, section 7.9
        3. C: Is that section of the RFC for attributes that are “create”?
        4. C: The section is a bit confusing, but I think it is broader than just row creation. There are a couple paragraphs on “create” rows, but also broader discussion.
        5. C: We should look at the uses within 802.11, these status variables could be okay with no DEFVALs.
        6. C: We should check the individual attributes, some might be okay, but some – like counters – might be correct to have a DEFVAL
        7. C: Don’t think counters need a DEFVAL; part of their description is that they are “a count of XX”, so of course they are zero before there are any XXs, without a DEFVAL.
        8. No consensus. Agreed the comment is not specific. No objection to Insufficient details.
        9. Proposed Resolution: Resolution: Rejected. 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.
        10. No objection – Mark Ready for motion.
     3. CID 336 (GEN):
        1. Review the comment.
        2. There does not seem to be any reference, including in ARC documents, for the term “device”.
        3. There are 292 instances of this usage.
        4. C: One instance pointed out that says “device” and “STA” in the same attribute definition. It seems clear that intends to be for a STA.
        5. C: There are many MIB attributes that do apply to the “device”, though, as the containing physical entity (entities?) that incorporate the STA. This will get more complicated with TGbe concepts.
        6. C: I believe device is defined in the IEEE dictionary. That basis, and our usage, is probably sufficient. Request a straw poll.
        7. **Straw poll:** The use of Device in D0.0 is sufficient and does not need to be changed.
           1. Straw poll Results: 9-3-0
        8. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. There are 292 instances of “Its value is determined by device capabilities.". The commentor is objecting to the use of “device” instead of “STA”. The TGme (REVme) task group determined that “device” was sufficient and did not need to be changed. (2021-11-29 Straw Poll: 9-3-0 for the question (The use of Device in D0.0 is sufficient and does not need to be changed.) The comment is very broad and does not give the specific changes to be made.
        9. Mark Ready for Motion
        10. Create a separate Comment Group/Motion for this CID.
     4. CID 249 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment
        2. After reflector discussion, there seems to be some agreement for changing to refer to Data frames, explicitly.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change ""The received individually addressed frames at a QoS STA may be as follows:" with "Data frames received by a QoS STA may be of:"
        4. Ready for motion.
     5. CID 181 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment history.
        2. Continue where we left off.
        3. Have started going through these and agreed to the ones marked with green highlight. The blue highlight ones need more discussion, and the rest have not been discussed, yet.
        4. CIDs 563 and 184 are similar.
        5. P1831.10: OK
        6. P1840.39: C: Don’t think “at least” is appropriate here.
           1. C: That is beyond the scope of this comment.
           2. C (Editor): Noted that a quick search indicates there are about 6 more instances of this usage that have been added, as of D1.0.
           3. We’ll need a comment on D1.0 to address new instances.
           4. C: Why not just “shall track”?
           5. R: Because the reservations may not exist, so they are not actually tracked, just capable of being tracked.
           6. No objection to the second option, “shall support the tracking of”.
        7. P1840.40: Same thing, one line down. Agreed to similar change, with editorial changes.
        8. P1889.4: Similar to CID 546. No objection. Same thing on following ones.
        9. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2021-11-29 22:59:51Z) Incorporate the Proposed Resolution Changes for CID 181 in doc 11-21/1821r4 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1821-04-000m-cc35-13-gen-cids.docx>
        10. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion.
     6. CID 164 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2021-11-29 22:54:54Z) The changes requested in the Comment for “shall be capable of” to “shall” have been made regarding changes in CID 546 and the changes in CID 181 cover the “shall be able to” instances (x24) called out by the Proposed Change.

Therefore, as a combined resolutions would be to incorporate the changes in doc 11-21/829r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>> for CID 546 and 11-21/1821r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1821-03-000m-cc35-13-gen-cids.docx>> for CID 181.

Note to Editor, changes have been made in CID 546 and CID 181.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **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 358 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2021-11-06 16:44:50Z)

There are numerous issues with this area of the specification (possibly due to cutting and pasting from DMG material), including:

- Something like “All rules from 11.1.4.3.2 apply, with the following exceptions ...” is missing

- The weird ref to setting NAV to 0 is also in "Active scanning procedure for a DMG STA". The condition is when nothing has been received and switching channels

* + - 1. It was marked ready for Motion on Nov 16, 2021.
    1. CID 177 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion and proposed changes.
       3. Removed one change that was not needed.
       4. Proposed Resolution: CID 177 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:11:36Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/829r9 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx> , for CID 177, which clarify the concept of CMMG NDP announcements.
       5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 302 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Need to revisit and review more.
    3. CID 451 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion in submission.
       3. Review in context p1817.
       4. Proposed resolution: CID 451 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:15:41Z): Delete “that belongs to a TC” from the cited text.
       5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 485 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion in submission.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 485 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:17:44Z)
       4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 441 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion and proposed changes in the submission.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 441 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:20:29Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/829r8 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx> , for CID 441, which make the changes to the referenced subclause proposed by the commenter, except for a couple of missed “idle timeout limit”s.

Note to commenter: No changes are needed in Clause 6, because this is in terms of “the BSS max idle period parameters”, “as defined in 9.4.2.78”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 307 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion and proposed changes in the submission.
       3. The comment was on D0.0, but D1.0 has changed this paragraph.
       4. We need to review to ensure the comment is implemented properly.
       5. Proposed Resolution: CID 307 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:25:47Z)
       6. ACTION ITEM #2: Mark RISON to coordinate the implementation of CID 207 (MAC) with Editors as the cited paragraph has changed in D1.0.
       7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 445 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Similar to CID 141 (MAC)
          1. CID 141 AdHoc Notes:

MAC: 2021-10-15 14:57:57Z - status set to: Submission Required

Requesting TG direction on this pattern, to develop a submission with specific changes (if any direction can be agreed as desired). Also, see CID 445, 441. (11-21/0829)

* + - 1. Discussion on the changes proposed.
      2. Proposed Resolution: CID 445 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:35:59Z): Delete “BSSMaxIdlePeriod,” at 367.63, 388.5.

Delete the row with BSSMaxIdlePeriod in the first cell at 369.37, 389.49.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 444 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion and Proposed changes in submission.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 444 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:38:49Z): incorporate the changes in 11-21/829r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>> , for CID 444, which debride the (potential) spec rot in the locations identified by the commenter.
       4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 310 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion and proposed changes.
       3. Discussion on if to Change “under the AC” to by the EDCAF.
       4. Add page and line number location for the changes in 10.23.2.6.
       5. 10.23.2.5 change reviewed.
       6. 5 Changes total that needed page and line numbers.
       7. Proposed Resolution: CID 310 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:42:22Z):

In 10.23.2.5 EDCA channel access in a VHT or TVHT BSS change (1807.24):

If a STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.4 (Obtaining an EDCA TXOP)) and the STA has at least one MSDU pending for transmission for the AC of the permitted TXOP

to:

If a STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.4 (Obtaining an EDCA TXOP)) and the STA has at least one MPDU to be transmitted under the AC of the permitted TXOP

In 10.23.2.6 EDCA channel access in an S1G BSS change (2x, 1808.40, 1808.61):

and the S1G STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.4 (Obtaining an EDCA TXOP)) and the S1G STA has at least one MSDU pending for transmission for the AC of the permitted TXOP, the S1G STA

to:

, the STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.4 (Obtaining an EDCA TXOP)) and the STA has at least one MPDU to be transmitted under the AC of the permitted TXOP, the STA

and change (1809.12):

if the S1G STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.4 (Obtaining an EDCA TXOP)) and the S1G STA has at least one MSDU pending for transmission for the AC of the permitted TXOP. In this case the S1G STA

to:

if the STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.4 (Obtaining an EDCA TXOP)) and the STA has at least one MPDU to be transmitted under the AC of the permitted TXOP. In this case the STA

In 10.23.2.13 EDCA channel access in a CMMG BSS change (1819.54):

If a STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.3 (EDCA TXOPs)) and the STA has at least one MSDU pending for transmission for the AC of the permitted TXOP

to:

If a STA is permitted to begin a TXOP (as defined in 10.23.2.3 (EDCA TXOPs)) and the STA has at least one MPDU to be transmitted under the AC of the permitted TXOP

* + - 1. More discussion on whether “under the AC” was proper.
      2. Potential change to the phrasing.
      3. More offline discussion will be done resolve the wording specifics.
      4. Updated Proposed Resolution: CID 310 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 16:42:22Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-21/829r9 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-09-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>>, for CID 310.
      5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON (CommScope/Ruckus)
     1. CID 473 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. A choice of options needs to be chosen.

Add a NOTE, e.g.

1. NOTE---If the STA receives a PV1 Probe Response frame, it might transmit an Association Request frame, or it might transmit a Probe Request frame or wait for a Beacon frame to obtain more information. If it receives a Probe Response frame, it might transmit an Association Request frame.(#4269)

or even just

1. NOTE---If the STA receives a PV1 Probe Response frame, it might transmit a Probe Request frame or wait for a Beacon frame to obtain more information.
   * + - 1. No opposition to just going with the second option.
         2. ACTION ITEM #3 – David HALEZ – Review CID 473 for clarity. Any issues to be noted to the Reflector.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 473 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2021-11-29 17:01:18Z) - Add a NOTE: "

NOTE---If the STA receives a PV1 Probe Response frame, it might transmit a Probe Request frame or wait for a Beacon frame to obtain more information."

* 1. **Adjourn 12:00pm ET**
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