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Abstract

Minutes for the REVme (802.11me) Telecons on March 21st and 28th 2022.

R0: March 21st minutes captured.

R1: March 28th minut

Action Item List:

1.6.2.7.1 ACTION ITEM #1: Edward AU to check the proper style to use for use of “Equal to” or “is false or not present”.

1.9.4.5 ACTION ITEM #2: Jon ROSDAHL to send email to WG/TG reflectors to ask about deprecation of DMG Relay.

1.9.7.4 ACTION ITEM #3: Mark RISON to check with Assaf KASHER on the use of Beam Tracking and the ability to disable with setting the time limit to 0.

1.9.9.5 ACTION ITEM #4: Mark RISON to provide specific changes for CID 1447 (PHY).

2.6.3.6 ACTION ITEM #5: Mark HAMILTON: To devise (better?) rejection reason for 1123 and 1122.

2.6.8 ACTION ITEM #6: Graham SMITH – CIDs 1118, 1117, 1115, Check with Laurent and Matt Fischer whether we have normative statements for these (and perhaps NOTEs 3 and 4, just above the NOTE 5 in 1118).

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Monday, March 21, 2022 at 10:00-12:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** 10:02 am 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 – Edward AU (Huawei)
         4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      2. Absent:
         1. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
   2. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Andersdotter, Amelia | Sky UK Group |
| 2 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 3 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| 4 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 5 | Kakani, Naveen | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 6 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 7 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 8 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | Patil, Abhishek | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 10 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 11 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 12 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 13 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 14 | Torab Jahromi, Payam | Facebook |
| 15 | VIGER, Pascal | Canon Research Centre France |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
     1. **See slides 4-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0208-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-march-2022.pptx>
     2. No issues were noted.
  2. **Review agenda**:11-22/511r1:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0511-01-000m-march-may-teleconference-agenda.docx>
     2. Item b is on FILS Discovery
     3. No other issues noted.
     4. Agenda Approved unanimously.
  3. **Editor Report**
     1. No substantial items to note today.
     2. Next two weeks will have the roll in of the approved Resolutions.
     3. Plan to have updated Draft ready for AdHoc in New York City.
  4. **Review Doc 11-22/88r1 - Co-Hosted BSS - Abhi PATIL (Qualcomm)**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0088-01-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-co-hosted-bssid-set.docx>
     2. CID 1007 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review proposed changes
        3. Discussion on the need for some articles that were missing.
        4. Discussion on adding “not Present” to the condition in 9.3.2.249.
        5. CID 1112 (MAC): Seems to cover more/other issues and will not be resolved here today.
        6. Discussion on format of use of “Equal to” or “is false or not present”.
        7. CID 1263, CID 2005 may have similar styles that have been adopted and should be applied to this CID.
           1. ACTION ITEM #1: Edward AU to check the proper style to use for use of “Equal to” or “is false or not present”.
        8. Proposed Resolution: CID 1007, 2203, 1087, 1086, 1009 (MAC): Revised; incorporate the changes in 11-22/88r2.
        9. Discussion on CID 1112 (MAC) direction may be counter to the others, so that is why it in needs to be taken offline.
        10. Straw Poll: Do you agree to mark CIDs 1007, 2203, 1086, 1087, 1009 ready for motion, Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0088r2.
            1. **Results Straw Poll:** 9y-2n-1a – 7 no answer
        11. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 1007, 2203, 1086, 1087, 1009 (all MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-03-21 14:30:22Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0088r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0088-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-co-hosted-bssid-set.docx>).
        12. Mark Ready for Motion
  5. **Review doc 11-22/115r2 – FILS Discovery** - Abhi PATIL (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0115-02-000m-lb258-resolution-for-cids-related-to-fd-frame.docx>
     2. CID 1011 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review proposed changes.
        3. Change of “as” to “in”. in a couple places in 9.6.7.36.
        4. Discussion on Operating Class definition and used.
           1. "specifies the operating bandwidth of the BSS (considered to be equal to the channel spacing)"
           2. Primary Channel is given in the Operating Class
           3. Request to be more explicit on the bandwidth and center frequency that is specified by the Operation Class value.
           4. A possible Change to “…”specifies the transmitting AP’s BSS bandwidth (considered to be equal to the channel spacing)…”
           5. The change was not kept.
        5. More work is going to be needed offline.
  6. **Review doc 11-22/253 – CID 1276** – DavidHALASZ (Morse Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0253-02-000m-cid-1276-protectedaidswitch.docx>
     2. CID 1276 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review changes made to the document from last presentation.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-03-21 14:56:46Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0253r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0253-02-000m-cid-1276-protectedaidswitch.docx>).
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  7. **Review doc 11-22/0353r0 - PHY CIDs** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
     2. Start on Page 27 of the document for those CIDs needing to confirm direction.
     3. CID 1070 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Needs more review –
        3. Assign CID to Youhan KIM
     4. CID 1393 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Asked if there is any objection on deprecation of DMG Relay.
        3. No email has been sent.
        4. Move to GEN AdHoc for grouping with other Deprecate/Obsolete CIDs.
        5. ACTION ITEM #2: Jon ROSDAHL to send email to WG/TG reflectors to ask about deprecation of DMG Relay.
     5. CID 1398 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on global change and having the specific changes should be made in the specific locations in the specific need.
        3. More work to review the specific location.
        4. Need to identify the specific locations and consider. Okay with direction, generally, but there might be an exception that needs other handling.
     6. CID 1406 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Need to review the specific uses of the counters, to ensure proper usage.
        3. Request to see the redline to be able to review them one by one.
     7. CID 1410 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Need to check with the cited individual.
        3. Concern that this is a feature rather than a bug.
        4. ACTION ITEM #3: Mark RISON to check with Assaf KASHER on the use of Beam Tracking and the ability to disable with setting the time limit to 0.
     8. CID 1417 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on if “number of TBTT” is meaningful or not.
        3. Suggestion is to reject the CID.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Reject – <Mark RISON to prepare reject reason>
           1. *The updated Proposed Resolution post telecon:*

REJECTED 11.1.3.2 Beacon generation in non-DMG infrastructure networks indicates that TBTTs are entities that can be counted: "... a series of TBTTs exactly dot11BeaconPeriod TUs apart". The comment does not identify any instances where a STA would know the beacon interval but not know the TBTTs and hence would be unable to count TBTTs.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 1447 (PHY)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review proposed change
       3. Discussion on the value of making the changes. In some cases, the change would not be desired, but some may be ok. Question on the use of time to do the changes where it is clear already.
       4. Needs case-by-case review. Not all may be clear/clearer if they are merged.
       5. ACTION ITEM #4: Mark RISON to provide specific changes for CID 1447 (PHY).
    2. CID 1521 (PHY)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on Transient vs temporal keys.
       3. More work offline to identify the differences.
       4. CID 1567 (SEC) is similar and should be grouped.
       5. As this is a security issue, move CID 1521 to SEC AdHoc
    3. CID 1570 (PHY)
       1. Review comment
       2. Disagreement on making the change.
       3. Discussion on aAirProgationTime usage.
       4. More discussion will be needed offline.
       5. CID 1570 (PHY): More work needed. Suggest working with Brian HART and Mark HAMILTON, in particular
  1. **Review PHY CIDs** Mark RISON
     1. Presented directly from the comment database – PHY Review.
     2. CID 1200 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 2366 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 2332 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on the proposed change.
        3. No Objection on the change, but there is not enough detail on where the change is to be made.
        4. Discussion on if Tsym is defined in a global way or can it be left as defined in its individual usage.
        5. In general, the usage is in one place, but there is an extra instance that is otherwise removed, so an extra definition is ok.
        6. Proposed resolution: CID 2332 (PHY): Revised. Add the cited sentence at 4495.7 1/2.
     5. CID 2349 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on if the example should be contiguous or single bit.
        3. Assign to Yan XIN and Submission required.
     6. CID 1133 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. There are 3 instances of WUR PSDU.
        3. There was an objection to Accept.
        4. Assign to Mark RISON
        5. CID 1133 (PHY): Assign to Mark RISON. Sort out what a "WUR PSDU" is (3 existing uses, plus this would be a new one).
     7. CID 1129 (PHY)
        1. Review comment
        2. Correct location is page 4879
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1129 (PHY): Accepted. Ready for motion. Note to editor: the correct location is on page 4879.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     8. Change to Discuss CIDS.
     9. CID 2022 (PHY)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the meaning of “only” in this context.
        3. Suggestion of changing “valid only” to “used”
        4. We are missing the otherwise case in the first bullet case.
        5. We can change from “valid only” but would need the otherwise added.
        6. Assign to Graham SMITH – mark Submission required.
  2. **Adjourned 12:00pm**

1. **TGme (REVme) Telecon –Monday, March 28, 2022 at 10:00-12:00 ET**
   1. **Called to order** 10:02 am 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. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Andersdotter, Amelia | Sky UK Group |
| 2 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 3 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| 4 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 5 | Henry, Jerome | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 6 | Kakani, Naveen | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 7 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 8 | Lumbatis, Kurt | CommScope, Inc. |
| 9 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 10 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 11 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 12 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 13 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 14 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 15 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 16 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 17 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
     1. **See slides 4-19 in** <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0208-00-0000-2nd-vice-chair-report-march-2022.pptx>
     2. No issues were noted.
  2. **Review agenda**:11-22/511r2:
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0511-02-000m-march-may-teleconference-agenda.docx>
     2. Comment resolution

1. CIDs 1208 & 1209 – Proxy IPv6 ND – document 11-22/510 – Henry (Cisco)
2. CIDs 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1122, 1123 – document 11-22/373 – Smith (SRT)
3. CIDs 2377, 2379, 2374 – document 11-22/480 – Noh (Senscomm)
4. GEN CIDs – Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
   * 1. Yujin NOH was not on the call at the start but will adjust if she does not come.
     2. No objection to proceed with the agenda as posted.
   1. **Review document 11-22/510** – CIDs 1208 & 1209 – Proxy IPv6 ND – Jerome Henry (Cisco)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0510-00-000m-proxy-nd-discovery-text-proposal.docx>
      2. Presented by Pascal THUBERT (Cisco)
      3. CID 1208 (GEN) and CID 1209 (MAC)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review proposed changes
         3. Proxy ARP vs Proxy IPv6 ND differences explained.
         4. There are some editorial changes that will be taken offline.
         5. Discussion on differences in IPv6 vs IPv4 and how to describe.
         6. More discussion will be needed on the document. Determining if the material should be separated in separate subclauses for IPv4 vs IPv6 ect.
         7. Will post to reflector and bring back later.
   2. **Review document 11-22/373** – CIDs 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1122, 1123 – Graham Smith (SRT)
      1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0373-01-000m-resolutions-to-cids-on-notes.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0373-01-000m-resolutions-to-cids-on-notes.docx )
      2. CID 1123 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Discussion on removal of “Note that” from the proposal.
         3. Discussion on why this “NOTE 3” should be made normative.
         4. Could we change “can” to “could” or “might”.
         5. Discussion on if the Note should just be normative text.
         6. Straw Poll: I prefer the direction for resolution:
5. Reject
6. Revise
   * + - 1. Straw Poll Results: 12 option A -3 Option b – 4 No answer
       1. Proposed resolution: CID 1123 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-03-28 14:44:54Z): Note is OK as written.
       2. Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 1122 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the difference in this case, which this is pointing to the reference and as such a Note is correct.
        3. Discussion on why we use “NOTE” or “Note that”
        4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; Note is OK as written.
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
        6. ACTION ITEM #5: Mark HAMILTON: To devise (better?) rejection reason for 1123 and 1122.
     2. The remaining CIDs that are similar should be rejected with similar rejection.
     3. Discussion on need to review them individually to ensure the proper NOTES are NOTES.
     4. CID 1118 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the need to have a normative statement that the NOTE is restating what already stated in the draft.
     5. The remaining CIDs need to be reviewed.
     6. ACTION ITEM #6: Graham SMITH – CIDs 1118, 1117, 1115, Check with Laurent and Matt Fischer whether we have normative statements for these (and perhaps NOTEs 3 and 4, just above the NOTE 5 in 1118).
   1. **GEN CIDS** – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      1. Review “Review” status CIDs directly from database
      2. See document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-04-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
      3. Thanks to Mark HAMILTON for taking notes the rest of the telcon.
      4. CID 1948 (GEN):
         1. Email discussion that we have non-HT PPDU but not non-HE PPDU.
         2. This has a proposal also in document 11-22/353
         3. Is the proposed definition sufficient?
         4. Defer to the 11-22/353 document, and assign to Mark RISON
      5. CID 1562 (GEN):
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:06:17Z).
         3. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion.
      6. CID 1641 (GEN):
         1. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. REJECTED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:07:11Z) MBSS has been extended to support VHT and HE both in the standard and in a deployed implementation.
         2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      7. CID 1649 (GEN):
         1. Discussion on if this completely clean up use of “directed”
            1. Think so, yes.
         2. “unicast” is still used in some MIB attributes, particularly for ciphers. We should leave the “unicast: See individually addressed” one.
         3. The MIB uses seem broken, anyway. Could fix to the description of dot11NonAPStationUnicastCipherSuite, to change “AKM cipher suite” to “pairwise cipher suite” to clarify what this attribute is referencing.
         4. Also, for the next one (the matching group one), change “AKM suite” to “group cipher suite”. Also, at the end of that sentence, replace “for broadcast and group addressed frame transmissions” with “that is currently in use by the non-AP STA”. (And, editorially fix the missing open paren in the last sentence.)
         5. With the above additions, support for deleting all the references in the Proposed Change.
         6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:20:15Z) Delete:

"directed frame: See: individually addressed." at 193.54,

"Syn: directed

address, unicast address." at 196.21,

"Syn: directed, unicast." at 196.27,

"unicast: See: individually addressed.

unicast address: See: individual address." at 205.1

Change "directed frames" to "individually addressed frames" at 2677.24

Also, at 5677.22 change "The selector of the AKM cipher suite" to "The selector of the pairwise cipher suite"

At 5677.36 change "The selector of an AKM suite for broadcast and group addressed frame transmissions." to "The selector of the group cipher suite that is currently in use by the non-AP STA."

* + - 1. Ready for motion.
    1. CID 1701 (GEN):
       1. The 4-way handshake does not distribute a PTK (it derives one). So, change the Proposed Change to mention deriving a PTK (instead of distributing it).
       2. Other keys are also distributed. Maybe we need to work off-line to make this correct/complete.
       3. Concern with saying the 4-way handshake derives the PTK, when it is the procedure the STAs are doing during the 4-way handshake that includes this derivation, but not the 4-way handshake itself.
       4. Reworded to reference distributing “one or more keys, including…”
       5. REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:31:41Z) change the cited definition to "4-way handshake: A pairwise key management protocol defined by this standard. This handshake confirms mutual possession of a pairwise master key (PMK) by two parties, derives a pairwise transient key (PTK) and distributes one or more keys including a group temporal key (GTK).”
       6. Mark Ready for motion.
    2. CID 2178 (GEN):
       1. Reviewed Draft text. Agreed, the “0” should “0-255”
       2. Revised to clarify the specific changes.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised:

p702.40 change Valid Range for Dialog Token from "0" to "0-255”; p703.26 change Valid Range for Dialog Token from "0" to "0-255"

* + - 1. Ready for motion.
    1. CID 1770 (GEN):
       1. These are defined terms elsewhere in 802. We should not be defining them ourselves but should be referencing the existing ones.
       2. Looked at the Draft, page 910, 9.2.4.3.3. There are several definitions here that are duplicating external terms.
       3. More work required.
       4. Mark Submission Required and Assign to Mark HAMILTON
    2. Revisit CID 2178 (GEN):
       1. Actually, the Dialog token is a fixed value (0) in this case.
       2. Delete the row for Dialog Token in the MLME-SCS-TERM primitives.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:34:45Z)

p702.27 Delete "DialogToken"

P702. 40 Delete row for "DialogToken"

p703.14 Delete "DialogToken"

p703.27 Delete row for "DialogToken"

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 1785 (GEN):
       1. Proposed rejected.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:46:39Z) Comment is not specific about a change to the draft. The formatting of the draft will be addressed by professional editors prior to publications. The requested change is not aligned with the style guide used by the IEEE.
       3. Objection to this rejection. It would be very helpful to us while doing reviews/ballots. Run as a separate motion. Move to Comment Group: “Gen Motion EDITOR Change Header”
       4. Note that if we format differently for internal drafts, we’ll have to re-format to deliver to the publication editor.
       5. Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 1997 (GEN):
       1. Related to CID 1996 (PHY). (Proposes a different resolution)
       2. Could just handle CID 1997 and reject CID 1996.
       3. Why is this a problem – we don’t define a “xxx frame” unless it is non-obvious.
       4. But, A-MDSU frame is not obvious, in particular what is the length of the A-MSDU (which is a used concept).
       5. Suggest accepted for CID 1997.
       6. There was some objection to the resolution.
       7. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:58:27Z)
       8. Mark Ready for motion. Run as separate motion. Move to Comment Group: ” GEN Motion- New Definition A-MSDU”
       9. Will make CID 1996 (PHY), the same resolution.
       10. CID 1996 (PHY), move to GEN, make ready for motion (with Revised, and the same effective resolution as 1997) and put in the same Comment Group.
    3. CID 2056 (GEN):
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-03-28 15:59:29Z).
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. **Adjourn 12:00pm**
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