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Abstract

Minutes for the 2022 August 802.11REVme AdHoc held at the Qualcomm Offices – AZ Building in San Diego, CA. Held Tuesday 9-5:30 Tuesday and Wednesday and 9-3pm Thursday.

R0: Original minutes.

R1: Minor editorial updates made.

Action items:

* + - 1. ACTION ITEM #1: Joseph LEVY to Repost document 11-22/1035r1 to the WG reflector for broader discussion on CID 2346 (GEN).
			2. ACTION ITEM #2: Mike to schedule time for discussion of CID 2346 (GEN) in the September 802W Interim.

3.6.1.5 ACTION ITEM #3: Mark HAMILTON - Will post resolution for CID 1190 to the reflector for broader review.

3.6.5.4 ACTION ITEM #4: Mark HAMILTON to send the resolution of CID 1812 (MAC) to the WG Reflector for a broader review.

3.6.5.5 ACTION ITEM # 5: Michael MONTEMURRO to schedule time for CID 1812 (MAC) discussion in the September 802W Interim.

4.6.2.10 ACTION ITEM #6: Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule time in 802W Interim for CID 1985, 1986, 1535, 1419, 2187, 1536 (MAC)

4.6.2.11 ACTION ITEM #7: Mark RISON – send list of CIDs to the WG Reflector for broader review/discussion. – Proposed solution List Due September 6.

4.6.9.8 ACTION ITEM #8: Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule time for CID 1760 (PHY) during the September 802W Interim session.

4.6.9.9 ACTION ITEM #9: Mark RISON – to complete the proposal for CID 1760 (PHY) prior to September so the TG can review prior to start of September 802W Interim.

5.6.8.4 ACTION ITEM #10: Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule CID 1647 (PHY) for August 29th telecon.

7.7.3.6 ACTION ITEM #11 – Mark HAMILTON to reach out to OCT SME and post to WG reflector the details on CID 2086 (MAC). If No solution is determined, a Rejection reason is to be created.

7.7.3.7 ACTION ITEM #12: – Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule CID 2086 (MAC) during the Sept 802W Interim.

7.7.4.4 ACTION ITEM #13: – Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule CID 1479 (MAC) discussion during the Sept 802W Interim

7.7.4.5 ACTION ITEM #14: – Mark HAMILTON – Craft a Reject reason for CID 1479 (MAC) for consideration.

7.7.4.6 ACTION ITEM #15: – Mark RISON – Post details of CID 1479 (MAC) to the WG Reflector again to see if there is any agreement or an alternative proposal.

7.9.7.8 ACTION ITEM #16: Mark RISON to provide proposal for CID 1554 (ED1) by September 6 for scheduling.

7.9.9.4 ACTION ITEM #17: Mark RISON to provide proposal for CID 1554 (ED1) by September 6 for scheduling. Proposal will include the location for the changes.

8.5.17 ACTION ITEM #18: - Michael MONTEMURRO- Schedule time for 11-22/916 (Clause 6 reorg) in the first meeting of REVme during the September 802W Interim.

|  |
| --- |
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1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Tuesday, August 23, 2022, at 09:00-12:00 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 9:17 am PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of Participants present:**
	3. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2\* | Das, Subir | Peraton Labs |
| 3\* | Fang, Yonggang | MediaTek Inc. |
| 4\* | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 5 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 6\* | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 7\* | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8\* | Nguyen, An | U.S. Department of Homeland Security |
| 9 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 10 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 11\* | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 12 | Thakore, Darshak | Cable Television Laboratories Inc. (CableLabs) |
| 13 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |
| 14 | Wullert, John | Peraton Labs |
| 15\* | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |

* + 1. \* = in person
	1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	2. **Review agenda**:11-22/11186r1:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1186-01-000m-revme-august-2022-adhoc-agenda-san-diego.docx>
		2. Reviewed,
		3. The Webex Link in the file is for Wednesday, so r2 will be updated with the correct day by day links.
		4. No schedule changes.
		5. No objection to approval of agenda for Tuesday in 11-22/1186r1

Tuesday August 23, 2022

3. AM1 – 09:00-12:00 Pacific

a. SEC CIDs – Montemurro (Huawei)

b. MISC CIDs – doc 11-22/353 – Rison (Samsung)

4. PM1 – 13:00-15:00 Pacific

a. CID 2319 – doc 11-22/658 – Das (Peraton Labs)

b. CID 2188 – doc 11-22/627 – McCann (Huawei)

c. MAC CIDs – doc 11-22/1269 – McCann (Huawei)

5. PM2 – 15:30-18:00 Pacific

a. CID 1711 – doc 11-22/1352 – Levy (InterDigital)

b. CID 2346 – doc 11-22/1035 – Levy (InterDigital)

c. CID 1194 – doc 11-22/197 – Levy (InterDigital)

d. CIDs 1125, 1126 – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commmscope)

e. CID 1479 – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope)

f. MAC CIDs – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope)

6. Recess

* 1. **CID SEC** Michael Montemurro (Huawei)
		1. CID 1243 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if nested “Shall” is required.
			3. Determined that while the direction is agreeable, a submission to take care of the form of verbs used is required.
			4. Agree with the direction in the ad hoc notes.
			5. Assign to Joseph LEVY for details, to be brought back this later week.
		2. CID 1241 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1962 (SEC)
			1. Related to CID 1954 (SEC)
				1. These are essentially the same issue.
			2. Review comments
			3. Discuss the proposed changes in the CIDs.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1962 and CID 1954: Accept
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1824 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1721 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes, and an alternative that would not make the second paragraph a note.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1721 (SEC): Revised. At 3226.15, change:

"The Authenticator may initiate the exchange when a Supplicant is disassociated or deauthenticated."

to

"The Authenticator may initiate the exchange at any time including when a Supplicant is disassociated or deauthenticated."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1475 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2043 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context and proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1710 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed context and proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1710 (SEC): Revised. At 3220.58, insert the following note:

"NOTE---The GTK is not required to change when PTK rekeying is performed. However, if it does not change, it is ignored (see 6.3.19.4)." Ready for Motion.

* + - 1. After discussion we will place this note here, and then check if for possible relocation during the recirc.
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2286 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note that we are now working on the PICs CIDs in the SEC AdHoc
			3. Review context of the cited location.
			4. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED (SEC: 2022-08-23 16:56:07Z) - At the cited location, add "11.21" as reference.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2289 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2292 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 2294 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 2296 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1863 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1342 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the default value.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1588 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1344 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 1088 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Offline discussion determined a change was not needed.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED. The only MIB variable in the dot11CDMGOperation TABLE is dot11DCSTimeout. However, CMMG doesn’t have DCS procedure. Therefore, there is no need to define dot11CMMGOperation table to include the MIB variable dot11DCSTimeout.;
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 2370 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 1605 (SEC)
			1. (We're now in Annex E...)
			2. Review comment
			3. Review proposed change
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 1601 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the need for a definition of 6 GHz Band.
			4. Crafted a definition using the sbu1 GHz and Station 6G definitions.
			5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Add the definition in 3.2:
			6. "6 GHz band: Frequency band including any operating class that has a value
			7. of 5.950 for the entry in the “Channel starting frequency” column of Table E-4 (Global operating
			8. classes)."
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		13. CID 1609 (SEC)
			1. (Annex R)
			2. Review Comment
			3. Review adhoc Notes for discussion.
			4. Reiew the context of the cited text. – p5952.58
			5. Discussion on where different variables are defined, and if a reference to RFC 1610 should be cited.
			6. The decision was to add the reference to the end of the

 “l(m) = 00 02 “line.

* + - 1. Proposed Change: REVISED (SEC: 2022-08-23 17:39:11Z) - Add (see IETF RFC 3610) at the end of the cited line.
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1606 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed resolution.
			3. Review context on page 1806.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. CID 1375 and 1376 (SEC)
			1. (Annex AA)
			2. Review comments
			3. Proposed Resolutions:

CID 1376 (SEC): Accepted.

CID 1375 (SEC): Revised. After bullet a) add "NOTE---The mechanism by which the RSSI is obtained is outside the scope of this standard." EDITOR: Note this is the same resolution as for CID 1376.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1217 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the use of “may not” vs “might not”
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark ready for Motion.
		2. Return to CID 1243 (SEC)
			1. See doc 11-22/1378r0
			2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1378-00-000m-cid-1243-lb258-802-11revme.docx>
			3. Review submission
			4. Provides the changes that were discussed this morning now in instructional text.
			5. Discussion on if an extra “shall” is needed in second and third sentences in each group.
			6. Needed an “shall” in “a)” and “b)” in the last sentence. Respectfully.
			7. Fixed tense of deathentcate as well.
			8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-08-23 16:32:40Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-22/1378r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1378-01-000m-cid-1243-lb258-802-11revme.docx> >.
			9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. All the SEC Discuss/Review have been covered.
	1. **Add to agenda Doc 11-22/22/353.**
	2. **Review doc 11-22/353r4** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-04-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CID 1521 (SEC)
			1. We had looked at this CID in July, and more work was required.
			2. Review the discussion in the submission.
			3. Discussion on the definitions.
			4. Discussion on use of “temporal” vs “group”.
			5. Discussion of the question “Is there a group key that is not temporal?”
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-08-23 18:27:55Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0335r5 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-05-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>.
			7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1989 (PHY) and 1669 (MAC)
			1. Review comments
			2. Discuss if a change in the first round CID 177 was incorporated or not, but no definitive conclusion was made. It was incorporated in the D1.1.
			3. Review proposed changes to resolve the current CIDs.
			4. Need to see if the proposed changes may have already been made.
			5. Check a few of the specific changes being proposed that may have already been made.
			6. Check on “CMMG NDP announcement indication” and its use.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 1989 (PHY) Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1989 in <this document>, which reapply the changes agreed for CID 177 on D0.0. (These changes were made in D1.1 under CID 177.)
			8. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1669 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-08-23 18:42:00Z) Note to Editor, this is already done in D1.3.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1996 (GEN) and 1997 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1996 (GEN) and CID 1997 (GEN) REVISED

Change “A-MSDU frame” to “frame that contains an A-MSDU” at 1009.21/25, 2924.4, 5561.41/42, 5562.54/55.

Change “A-MSDU frame” to “MPDU that contains an A-MSDU” at 2913.54.

Change “(A-MSDU) frame format” to “(A-MSDU) format” at 216.46.

Change “A-MSDU frame format” to “A-MSDU format” at 2179.20.

At 5562.30 and 5563.4 change “the number of octets in the frame body of an A-MSDU frame when an A-MSDU frame is” to “the number of octets in the frame body of a frame that contains an A-MSDU when it is”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1385 and 1386 (SEC)
			1. See doc 11-22/1326 (pending – not posted yet)
			2. Continue review in 11-22/353r4
			3. Review discussion in submission.
			4. Review proposed changes.
			5. Proposed Resolution:

Revised:

At 3142.49 change:

“The ExtIV subfield (bit 5) of the Key ID octet signals that the CCMP Header field extends the MPDU header by a total of 8 octets, compared to the 4 octets added to the MPDU header when WEP is used. The ExtIV bit (bit 5) is always set to 1 for CCMP.

Bits 6–7 of the Key ID octet are for the Key ID subfield”.

to:

“The third octet of the CCMP Header field is reserved.

The ExtIV subfield (bit 5) of the Key ID octet signals that the CCMP Header field extends the MPDU header by a total of 8 octets, compared to the 4 octets added to the MPDU header when WEP is used. The ExtIV subfield is always set to 1 for CCMP.

Bits 6–7 of the Key ID octet are for the Key ID subfield. The remaining bits of the Key ID octet are reserved.”

[Mark RISON to send the figure to the Editors.]

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1663 (MAC):
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1663 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-23 18:53:01Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0353r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-05-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>), for CID 1663.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2005 (GEN):
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution:

CID 2005 (GEN) REVISED (GEN: 2022-08-23 18:57:39Z)

Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0353r5 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-05-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>), for CID 2005.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Recess for Lunch at 11:58 PT**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Tuesday, August 23, 2022, at 13:00 – 15:00 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 13:02 PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review doc 11-22/0658r1** Subir DAS (Peraton Labs)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0658-01-000m-lb258-cid-2319.pptx>
		2. CID 2319 (GEN)
			1. Review Submission.
			2. Background
* Emergency Telecommunications Service (ETS) is specified in [ITU-T E.107]: A national service, providing priority telecommunications to the ETS authorized users in times of disaster and emergencies (e.g., floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, terrorist attacks)
* In the United States, the DHS/CISA/ECD Priority Telecommunications Services⁺ programs provide National Security and Emergency Preparedness (NS/EP) and public safety users the ability to communicate using existing telecommunications networks during times of congestion
	+ Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS)
	+ Wireless Priority Service (WPS)
	+ Next Generation Network Priority Services (NGN Priority Services)
	+ Telecommunications Service Priority (TSP)
* Priority Service in other countries
	+ Blue Light Mobile service in Belgium,
	+ Mobile Crisis Communications service in the Czech Republic,
	+ Mobile Telecommunications Privileged Access Scheme in Great Britain,
	+ Disaster Priority Telephone (優先電話) in Japan, and
	+ Wireless Priority Service (WPS) in Australia, and Canada.
		- 1. Discussion on submission.
			2. Plan to continue the discussion in September during the 802W Interim.
			3. Question on how much detail is going to be beneficial for progress.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/627r3** Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0627-03-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-gen-cids.docx>
		2. CID 2188 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Review context 2211.24
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-08-23 21:12:47Z); Incorporate the changes in 11-22/627r4 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0627-04-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-gen-cids.docx>> under CID 2188. Note to Editor see CID 1478 which updated the reference number already.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Review doc 11-22/1269r3** Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1269-03-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-mac-cids.docx>
		2. CID 2183 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on editorial improvements.
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2183 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:24:33Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/1269r4 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1269-04-000m-comment-resolution-for-some-mac-cids.docx) for CID 2183.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1865 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 2128 – in 11/21/1128r6.
				1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1128-06-000m-on-frattacks-and-related-matters.docx>
			3. Reviewed the common material.
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1865 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:27:38Z): Incorporate the changes indicated in 11-21-1128r6.

(<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1128-06-000m-on-frattacks-and-related-matters.docx>), for CID 2128.

Note to editor: See the text change to “Change 26.3.3.1 General” at the top of page 3 of 11-21-1128r6, as a resolution to this CID.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1631 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The proposal is close to the proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1631 (MAC): Revised. REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:30:44Z):

Change the cited text at P1924L38 (D1.3) to “The Action fields of Protected Dual of Public Action frames have the same format as those of the corresponding nonprotected Public Action frames.”

At P3195L4 (D1.3), add at the end of 12.6.20’s first paragraph:

“An individually addressed Protected Dual of Public Action frame shall be protected using the pairwise cipher suite. A group addressed Protected Dual of Public Action frame shall be protected using BIP."

Note to commenter: This is the proposed change with some minor editorial updates.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1612 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the use of tuple subfields.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1612 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:33:21Z).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1621 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the use of “only”.
			3. Discuss an alternative would be the xxx is present if yyy and not present otherwise.
			4. More discussion on “The RSNE is present only when dot11meshsecurity activated….” The assertion was that only one place is “The RSNE is present only”.
			5. Straw Poll: With regard to CID 1621, do you wish to remove the word "only" and add "otherwise not present" at the end of the sentence?
				1. Straw poll results: 4y,2n, 2a
			6. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1621 (MA)C: REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:51:17Z): Change the cited sentence as follows: remove the word "only" and add "; otherwise not present" at the end of the sentence.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1651 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1651 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:53:05Z):

A non-mesh STA can associate with an AP that has a different RSNE, the requirement is that there is a non-null intersection of ciphers and AKM.

Change the cited text to:

“h) Both mesh STAs have dot11MeshSecurityActivated equal to false or both mesh STAs have dot11MeshSecurityActivated equal to true and the neighbor mesh STA advertises an RSNE that is compatible with that of the scanning mesh STA”

*Note to editor.* This is at P3330L34 in D1.3

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion – One objection to the proposed resolution.
		1. CID 2067 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed rejection reason.
			3. From the AdHoc notes: MAC: 2022-01-21 20:22:40Z - Group direction: Reject. Craft a reason. In effect, this creates new issues, not clear it fixes more than it creates.
			4. Proposed resolution:

ID 2067 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-23 21:54:56Z):

If there is a problem with the specification of Beacons, S1G Beacons and DMG Beacons, then specific changes should be specified at the relevant locations in the draft.

There is no reason to include text about S1G Beacon frames in locations where S1G is not supported. It is more appropriate to address specific locations where different rules apply to Beacon and S1G Beacon frames.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion – Make a separate motion.
		1. CID 1896 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1896 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2022-08-23 22:01:03Z)
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Recess at 18:00 ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Tuesday, August 23, 2022, at 18:30 – 21:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 10:17 am PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review agenda.**
		1. Updated Agenda for today:

a. CID 1711 – doc 11-22/1352 – Levy (InterDigital)

b. CID 2346 – doc 11-22/1035 – Levy (InterDigital)

c. CID 1194 – doc 11-22/197 – Levy (InterDigital)

d. CIDs 1125, 1126 – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commmscope)

e. CID 1479 – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope)

f. MAC CIDs – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope)

* + 1. No objection to plan.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/1352** - Joe LEVY (InterDigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1352-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1711-beacon-report.docx>
		2. CID 1711 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review history of discussion.
			3. Review Discussion in submission.
			4. Discussion on where beacon information is conveyed.
			5. More time will need to be taken.
			6. Will schedule for Thursday afternoon.
			7. Discussion on fragmentation frame body in Beacon reports.
			8. See page 1244 for context (D1.0).
			9. Use of Field or Subfield is inconsistent in the draft, and will need to be careful to apply the proposed changes consistent with this proposal.
			10. An updated document will be prepared.
			11. The way Beacon report is used, was discussed.
			12. There are two different definitions for the same words, and we are trying to create a clear description of the data with a consistent set of terms.
			13. Refer back to p1235 for possible direction.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/1035** Joe LEVY (InterDigital)
		1. Document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1035-00-000m-proposed-tgme-comment-resolution-cid-2346.docx>
		2. CID 2346 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review history of discussions.
			3. Review discussion in submission.
			4. Note done error of WRU that should be WUR.
			5. Point that the change of MC-OOK to WUR-OOK Is not a good direction.
			6. There have been discussions on this topic in the past.
			7. During the May Meeting direction is reflected in this submission.
			8. ACTION ITEM #1: Joseph LEVY to Repost document 11-22/1035r1 to the WG reflector for broader discussion on CID 2346 (GEN).
			9. ACTION ITEM #2: Mike to schedule time for discussion of CID 2346 (GEN) in the September 802W Interim.
			10. Discussion on the use of MC vs WUR -ook.
	3. **Review doc 11-22/197r0** Joe LEVY (InterDigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0197-00-000m-cid-1194-lb258-802-11revme-on-deenabled.docx>
		2. CID 1194 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected

While the commentor is correct that DEENABLE is not a “real word”, DEENABLE is a term used in the TV White Space community, where it has a defined known meaning. Changing it to another term would likely cause confusion in the TV White Space community.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMITON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 1190 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion – delay motion until Sept 802W Interim.
			5. ACTION ITEM #3: Mark HAMILTON - Will post resolution for CID 1190 to the reflector for broader review.
		2. CID 2086 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on why a rejection may be the right direction.
			3. The assertion is that the types are not consistent with each other.
			4. A Commenter wanted to discuss the rationale for “No Consensus” and the Chair indicated that we would move on.
			5. The Commenter was then told we would move on.
			6. Not wanting to stop his point, the commenter continued until the Chair Muted him..
			7. A formal complaint was voice, but formal complaint for process items is to be taken up with the TG Chair. And can be then taken to the WG. chair.
		3. CID 1913 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 1904 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context in Table 9-187 and the paragraphs above.
			3. Discussion on if WEP should be marked in more locations than the initial definition as Obsolete.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 1812 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the Channel Switch Count Field is used.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. ACTION ITEM #4: Mark HAMILTON to send the resolution of CID 1812 (MAC) to the WG Reflector for a broader review.
			5. ACTION ITEM # 5: Michael MONTEMURRO to schedule time for CID 1812 (MAC) discussion in the September 802W Interim.
		6. CID 1479 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review history of discussion.
			3. No consensus has been found either to reject or accept the proposed changes. There was a straw poll on Aug 15 with 4y4n1a result for accepting the proposed changes.
			4. There were many emails on the reflector, but no consensus was found.
			5. Leave this in the No Consensus category.
		7. CID 2125 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the context p2126.
			3. Discussion on the use of SSRC, SLRC, and other counters still in standard.
			4. The reference to AX that added QSRC, may need comments in the next recirculation to remove QSRC.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 2125 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-24 00:06:46Z): The SSRC, SLRC, SRC and LRC facilities are still in the spec, deleting this one sentence would disrupt the operation of those facilities.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		8. CID 1230 (MAC)
			1. Sean Coffey is working on this one.
		9. CID 2325 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. The proposed Change gives a set of instructions for handling a specific case in 6 Ghz. – Alternative scanning is being proposed.
			3. Discussion on how an active Beacon report scan is done.
			4. We can propose to accept or to propose an alternate to prohibit the sending of this type of beacon request.
			5. A Request of passive scanning to STA vendor may take a long time.
			6. The Current standard is enough for RNR to be used for gaining the information that an AP or STA would need.
			7. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2325 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-24 00:12:08Z): The non-AP STA can respond with behavior similar to the same request in 5 GHz that includes DFS channel(s), which might involve waiting to hear a Beacon before sending a Probe Request (or timeout), or using RNRs to determine AP presence.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Recess at 20:23 ET**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Wednesday, August 24, 2022, at 9-12 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 9:03 am PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. Introductions of attendees
		1. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2\* | Fang, Yonggang | MediaTek Inc. |
| 3\* | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4\* | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 5 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6\* | Nguyen, An | U.S. Department of Homeland Security |
| 7 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 8\* | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 9\* | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 10\* | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |

* + 1. \* = in person
	1. Review agenda 11-22/1186r2
		1. Move CID 1190 to Thursday.
		2. No other objections or changes.
	2. CID 1555 (MAC) – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. Review email exchange history.
			1. (Mark RISON will post as a document later).
		2. Review proposed changes for resolving CID.
		3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1555 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-24 16:12:58Z): In D1.3: At 2186.20, after "A-MSDUs shall be transmitted as SPP A-MSDUS", add " and shall not be transmitted in PV1 MPDUs".

After that para add "NOTE—A PV1 MPDU cannot contain an SPP A-MSDU because the signalling of whether an A-MSDU is being carried is not part of the AAD (see Figure 12-20—AAD construction for PV1 MPDUs) and so is not protected."

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/353r5** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-05-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CID 1985 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Multiple CIDs in this discussion.
				1. CID 1985, 1986, 1535, 1419, 2187, 1536 (MAC)
			3. CID 1536 was already motioned (#66) as an Accept.
				1. Concern that there may be some different change made for this CID.
				2. Note that CID 1536 is already done and motioned. But, I agree we need to align all these, in one discussion. So, we'll see how the CID 1536 changes relate to the final changes.
			4. Review the proposed Changes for the CIDs in total.
			5. Discussion on the reason for the “Note” from CID 1536 was changed to normative text.
			6. 4 cases are explicitly included in the normative text.
			7. Other 5 locations will need similar changes to be made.
			8. Discussion on why deletion of item “e)” in 10.23.2.5.
			9. Discussion on when EDCAF goes idle. – How can a new frame be sent?
			10. ACTION ITEM #6: Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule time in 802W Interim for CID 1985, 1986, 1535, 1419, 2187, 1536 (MAC)
			11. ACTION ITEM #7: Mark RISON – send list of CIDs to the WG Reflector for broader review/discussion. – Proposed solution List Due September 6.
		3. CID 1512 (SEC), 1513 (SEC) 1505 (GEN), 1506 (SEC), 1507 (SEC), 2166 (SEC)
			1. Review the context for the CIDs.
			2. Review the proposed changes for this set of CIDs.
			3. Review context at 3149.8 – Discussion on why changing to 0.
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1512 (SEC), 1513 (SEC) 1505 (GEN), 1506 (SEC), 1507 (SEC) REVISED

Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CIDs 1512, 1513, 1505, 1506, 1507 in 11-22/0353r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-06-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx> >, which make changes in the direction suggested, though they do not change the initialisation value for BIP.

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2166 (SEC) REJECTED; It’s true that there is no receiver PN etc. but saying “transmitter” and “receiver” is helpful to distinguish the behaviour on each side.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion (All 6 CIDs).
		1. CID 1570 and 1714 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on will arrive vs start to arrive.
			4. What primitive could be referred to instead of the vague language?
			5. Changed the “start of arrival” with “beginning of the preamble”
			6. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1570 and 1714 (PHY) REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1570 and CID 1714 in 11-22/0353r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-06-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which clarify that the IFS is SIFS locally but up to SIFS+APT at any other STA.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion (Both CIDs).
		1. CID 1761 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on use of implemented and activated variable usage.
			4. Discussion on clause 9 changes.
			5. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1761 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-24 17:20:44Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0353r6 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-06-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx) for CID 1761.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1938 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on use of “replay counters”.
			4. Discussion - 356.31 change – does this affect the FST figure. Change to add “same sequence numbers etc..
			5. Mark RISON to provide an updated 5-2 figure to the Editors.
			6. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1938 (GEN) REVISED (GEN: 2022-08-24 17:29:39Z)

Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1938 in 11-22/0353r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-06-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which replace the term “sequence counter” (other than receive/TKIP) with a more precise term.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. That is all the CIDs that were ready for review in this submission. Start on Confirm direction set of CIDs.
		2. CID 1673 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Use D1.3 to ensure we are looking at the updated draft with Graham’s doc included.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1673 (PHY) Revised -In D1.3,

Remove the word “entire” at the following locations 2697.6/29, 2733.43, 2737.55, 3417.12 (and also append "sequence" at this last location).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1760 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion on use of “might” vs “may”
			4. Discussion on the “If, for example, a STA” …. Might be better worded as “For example, if a STA”…
			5. Review other potential changes of “may” to “might”.
			6. Suggested change” the alternate destination might be, for example,”.
			7. Remove the last two proposed changes as no change were needed.
			8. ACTION ITEM #8: Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule time for CID 1760 (PHY) during the September 802W Interim session.
			9. ACTION ITEM #9: Mark RISON – to complete the proposal for CID 1760 (PHY) prior to September so the TG can review prior to start of September 802W Interim.
		2. CID 1893 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review potential changes.
			3. Capture Locations for changes – 911.18, (802 as well) 911.8, (delete IEEE MAC) 911.39/46, "individual or group MAC" 54, 911.60, 1288.11 to "MAC address", 2666.19, 2846.59, 2847.1, 2847.16, 2884.41, 3225.29 and at 1409.1"delete "6 octet IEEE 802",
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1893 (PHY) Revised. in D1.0

Delete “IEEE” at the following locations: 911.18, (802 as well) 911.8, (delete IEEE MAC) 911.39/46, "individual or group MAC" 54, 911.60, 1288.11 to "MAC address", 2666.19, 2846.59, 2847.1, 2847.16, 2884.41, 3225.29 and at 1409.1"delete "6 octet IEEE 802",

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2004 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Look for locations for technical correctness. D1.3
			3. At 915.31 change to “corresponding A-MSDUs (re)transmitted using individually addressed delivery via DMS.”
			4. At 2186.1 – change to “within an A-MSDU in an individually addressed MPDU.”
			5. At 2921.46 and 2921.51 change to “as A-MSDUs in individually addressed MPDUs”.
			6. At 2924.38 change to “as A-MSDUs in individually addressed MPDUs”.
			7. Complete set of changes:

915.31 Change to "corresponding A-MSDUs (re)transmitted using individually

addressed delivery via DMS"

2186.1 change to "within an A-MSDU in an individually addressed MPDU"

2921.46 and 2921.51 change to "as A-MSDUs in individually addressed MPDUs"

2924.38 change to "as A-MSDUs in individually addressed MPDUs"

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2004 (PHY) REVISED; in D1.3, make the following changes:

915.31 Change from “corresponding individually addressed A-MSDUs delivered via DMS”:

 to "corresponding A-MSDUs (re)transmitted using individually

addressed delivery via DMS"

2186.1 change from” within an individually addressed A-MSDU” to "within an A-MSDU in an individually addressed MPDU"

2921.46 and 2921.51 change from ” individually addressed A-MSDU” to " A-MSDUs in individually addressed MPDUs"

2924.38 change from ” individually addressed A-MSDU” to " A-MSDUs in individually addressed MPDUs"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2073 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Look at p1965 for context.
			3. More thought on this one needed.
	1. Recess 12:00 PT
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Wednesday, August 24, 2022, at 1-3 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 1:03 pm PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Attendance reminder**
		1. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2\* | Fang, Yonggang | MediaTek Inc. |
| 3\* | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4\* | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 5\* | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6\* | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8\* | Nguyen, An | U.S. Department of Homeland Security |
| 9 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 10 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 11\* | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 12 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |

* + 1. \* = in person
	1. **Review Agenda – 11-22/1186r2**
		1. GEN CID 1938 is done already (see minutes line 4.6.6)
		2. No other changes to agenda.
	2. CID 1341 (ED1) Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus-Commscope).
		1. Review comment
		2. Review proposed changes.
		3. More work to be done by September 802W Interim.
	3. **Review doc 11-22/990r5** Youhan Kim (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>
		2. CID 1048 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed resolution.
			3. Discussion if “data” should proceed subcarriers.
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1048 (PHY) REVISED

*Note to commenter:*

The instruction to editor below implements the changes suggested by the comment with some editorial updates.

*Instruction to TGme Editor:*

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1048 in 11-22/990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + 1. CID 1049 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1297 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed Resolution:
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1297 (PHY) REVISED;

*Note to commenter:*

Agree with the commenter that b\_phi is missing. Note that Table 9-90 already specifies that b\_psi and b\_phi are “the number of bits used to quantize” the angles, hence it seems redundant to add that information here again.

*Instruction to TGme Editor:*

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1297 in 11-22/990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1064 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes
			3. Proposed resolution:

CID 1064 (PHY) REJECTED;

REVme D1.3 P4490L1 states that Figure 27-63 is a “\*typical\* state machine implementation”. The actual receive state machine is implementation specific. For example, if an implementation has sufficiently low RL-SIG false detection performance, then a too-small-length 11a PPDU will not be mistaken to be an HE PPDU.

If we now add additional requirement that receivers has to check for the minimum length in L-SIG Length field, then for example, some future 802.11 revision could exploit that to define very short PPDUs which need to be ‘spoofed’ to be 11a for HE STAs. However, implementations which followed the current typical state machine in Figure 27-63 will not be spoofed to think such PPDUs to be 11a. Hence, it is better not to change Figure 27-63.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1186 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on editorial change of “or” to “OR”.
			4. Discussion on PICs setting for CFHE20.
			5. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1186 (PHY) REVISED

Note to commenter:

A STA which is not capable of 40 MHz operation in the 2.4 GHz is also a 20 MHz-only non-AP STA. Hence, changing the CFHE20 to be conditioned on CFHE5G and CFHE6G only is not appropriate.

As for CFHE80, the commenter’s suggestion to include “NOT CFHE20” as a condition to make CFH80 mandatory is a good idea for the non-AP STA side. However, an AP is required to support CFHE80 when in 5/6 GHz as CFHE20 is not applicable to APs.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1186 in 11-22/990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1768 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes in the resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

 CID 1768 (PHY): Revised. Note to commenter:

The underlying text has changed between REVme D1.0 and D1.3. Instruction to editor below implements the suggestion by the commenter on top of D1.3, with an editorial update (“device receiving STA” to “receiving STA”).

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1768 in 11-22/0990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1647 (PHY)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Review proposed changes in the resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1647 (PHY) REJECTED;

Unlike MAC which has a common MAC clause (Clause 9), there is no common PHY clause. Hence, we need to review one by one.

In Clause 15, SIGNAL, SERVICE and LENGTH fields clearly specifies that LSB is transmitted first. The CRC field has a clear example stating that “leftmost bit” is transmitted first. Hence, there is no need for further change.

Situation is similar for Clause 16.

Clause 17 has two numeric fields. Rate field has a clear definition for each bit. Length field already states that LSB is transmitted first.

In Clause 19 (HT), HT-GF has a statement that numeric field is transmitted LSB first as the commenter has said. As for HT-GF, the HT-SIG format is the same as that for HT-MF. And since HT-GF already clarified that numeric fields have LSB transmitted first, there is no need to repeat the statement form HT-GF.

In Clause 20 (DMG, D1.3 P3656L15), Clause 21 (VHT, P3743L55), 23 (S1G, P3916L56), 24 (CDMG, P4024L47), 25 (CMMG, P4067L59), 27 (HE, P4374L37, P4390L9) already states that numeric fields are transmitted LSB first.

Clause 30 (WUR) L-SIG has two numeric fields. Rate field refers back to Clause 17 (see above), and LENGTH field is specified to be transmitted LSB first.

The only remaining PHY clause is 28 (EDMG) for the which the preamble definition is written with many tables, and it is not clear if there is a need to explicitly specify that LSB is transmitted first. If needed, commenter should submit a comment with more specific changes to be made at specific locations.

* + - 1. ACTION ITEM #10: Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule CID 1647 (PHY) for August 29th telecon.
		1. CID 1927 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context – see Figure 17-7.
			3. Concern with the value of making the change.
			4. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1927 (PHY) REJECTED

SCRAMBLER\_INITIAL\_VALUE is the initial 7 bits of the scrambler sequence. Hence, the name is appropriate.

Furthermore, the name SCRAMBER\_INITIAL\_VALUE has been used over multiple PHY generations and changing the name now would cause confusion to readers and does not seem worth it.

* + - 1. Objection was voiced about rejecting CID 1927 (PHY)
			2. Request for separata motion.
			3. Mark Ready for Motion – Make a separate Motion
		1. CID 2017 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed text changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2017 (PHY): Revised.

*Note to commenter:*

As the commenter has noted, Clause 16 and 18 already has the TXSTATUS parameter TIME\_OF\_DEPARTURE defined in Table 16-5 and 18-2, respectively. Furthermore, clauses 16 and 18 do not have separate subclause for TXSTATUS, but deliberately uses the Table 16-5 and 18-2 to specify them. Hence, there is no more work needed for clauses 16 and 18.

The instruction to editor below adds the TXSTATUS parameter TIME\_OF\_DEPARTURE to clause 23.

*Instruction to TGme Editor:*

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2017 in 11-22/990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2044 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on some definition to put into Clause 9, but it was discussed and determined that if that is the path, that could be done during a future comment in a recirculation comment.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2044 (PHY) REVISED

*Note to commenter:*

Normative statement cannot be put in Clause 9. Hence, the requirement that Nr need to be at least two is put in Clause 10 instead.

Note that REVme D1.3 P2360L61 (10.36.5) states that “For an S1G STA, the S1G sounding protocol is specified in 10.36.5 (VHT sounding protocol) with “VHT” replaced by “S1G”, except in this sentence”. Hence, there is no need to add an explicit normative statement for S1G – the normative statement for VHT we are putting in 10.36.5 covers S1G as well.

*Instruction to TGme Editor:*

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2044 in 11-22/0990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2115 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2115 (PHY) REVISED

Note to commenter:

DMG PHY has PHYCONFIG\_VECTOR description in 20.2.3 (PHYCONFIG\_VECTOR parameters).

Instruction to editor below adds description of the PHYCONFIG\_VECTOR for DSSS, HR/DSSS, ERP and TVHT PHYs.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2115 in 11-22/990r6

<<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2123 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed text changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2123 (PHY) REVISED

*Note to commenter:*

The clarification suggested by the commenter on the meaning of ‘static’ introduces yet another undefined terminology – “PHY instantiation”. There are no occurrences of “PHY instantiation” in REVme D1.3, so what does “PHY instantiation” mean? Rather than to try to define “PHY instantiation” to define “static”, proposal is to simply delete “static” from “static XYZ PHY characteristics”. This is because there are no “dynamic” PHY characteristics, so there is no ambiguity being introduced by deleting the word “static”.

*Instruction to TGme Editor:*

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2123 in 11-22/990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-05-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>.

* + - 1. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2154 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed Text changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2154 (PHY) REVISED

*Note to commenter:*

Instruction to editor below addresses the comment raised by the commenter.

*Instruction to TGme Editor:*

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2154 in 11-22/0990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. This CID affects text that was also resolved by CID 1761.
			2. Concern that the Editor will need assistance in incorporating the two CIDs.
			3. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion
			4. Any Inconsistencies will be dealt with offline.
		1. CID 1471 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed resolution changes.
			3. Discussion on the units used.
			4. Change to “higher of”
			5. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1471 (PHY) REVISED;

Note to commenter:

Instruction to editor below clarifies how the interim transmit spectral mask is used to construct the overall transmit spectral mask.

Instruction to TGme Editor:

Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1471 in 11-22/990r6 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>>

* + - 1. No Objections – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1864 (PHY)
			1. Already done –
			2. Marked as Accepted.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/669r2 – CIDs 2355, 2356** – Yonggang FANG (MediaTek)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0669-02-000m-cr-for-cid-2355-2356.docx>
		2. CID 2355 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution:

 CID 2355 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-24 21:13:51Z):

Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0669r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0669-02-000m-cr-for-cid-2355-2356.docx>) for CID 2355.

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2356 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Some discussion about Beacons and group addressed frames.
			3. Discussion on the use of beacon vs Beacon – use lower case.
			4. Change “A Group addressed frame” to “A HE beacon or other group addressed frame”
			5. Change title to …HE beacon and Other Group …
			6. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2356 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-24 21:15:15Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0669r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0669-03-000m-cr-for-cid-2355-2356.docx>) for CID 2356.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **doc 11-22/691 – CIDs 2362, 2363** – Yonggang FANG (MediaTek)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0691-01-000m-resolution-for-2353-2362-2363.docx>
		2. CID 2362 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on editorial changes.
			3. Proposed resolution REVISED (GEN: 2022-08-24 21:38:47Z) Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0691r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0691-02-000m-resolution-for-2353-2362-2363.docx>> for CID 2362
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 2363 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the use of Color
			3. Improvement on the effect of receipt in 6.3.yyy.3.4
			4. Change bars in the document are for differences in revisions.
			5. Proposed resolution REVISED (GEN: 2022-08-24 21:38:47Z) Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0691r2 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0691-02-000m-resolution-for-2353-2362-2363.docx>> for CID 2363
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Recess at 2:48pm PT**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Wednesday, August 24, 2022, at 3:30 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 3:32 pm PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Attendance reminder**
		1. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2\* | Fang, Yonggang | MediaTek Inc. |
| 3\* | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4\* | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 5\* | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6\* | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8\* | Nguyen, An | U.S. Department of Homeland Security |
| 9 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 10 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 11\* | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 12 | Wei, Dong | NXP Semiconductors |

* + 1. \* = in person
	1. **Review Agenda**:
1. CIDs 1120, 1121, 1215, 1216, 1230 – doc 11-22/981 – Coffey (Realtek)
2. Direction CIDs – doc 11-22/353 – Rison (Samsung
	* 1. No Objection to Agenda plan
	1. **Review doc 11-22/981** - CIDs 1120, 1121, 1215, 1216, 1230 – Sean COFFEY (Realtek)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0981-02-000m-revme-lb258-cr-for-1120-1121-1215-1216-spatial-reuse.docx>
		2. CID 1120 and 1215 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Discussion of minor editorial issues.
			4. Discussion of resolution formatting.
			5. Proposed Resolution:

CIDs 1120, 1215 (MAC): Revised.

1. At D1.0/4232.24, add “may” after “the STA’s MAC sublayer”.

2. At D1.0/4232.25 (in (a)), delete “May”.

3. At D1.0/4232.28 (in (b)), change “May not update its basic NAV timer based on the PPDU” to “treat the PPDU as not having been received for purposes of its basic NAV timer (i.e., not update its basic NAV timer)”.

4. At D1.0/4232.28 (in (b)), add a comma and new line (not in the list) after “PPDU”. After “if”, add “(for either (a) or (b))”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1121 and 1216 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution:

CIDs 1121, 1216 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-24 22:49:40Z)

1. At D1.0/4232.53, add “may” after “the STA’s MAC sublayer”.

2. At D1.0/4232.54 (in (a)), delete “May”.

3. At D1.0/4232.57 (in (b)), change “May not update its basic NAV timer based on the PPDU” to “treat the PPDU as not having been received for purposes of its basic NAV timer (i.e., not update its basic NAV timer)”.

4. At D1.0/4232.57 (in (b)), add a comma and new line (not in the list) after “PPDU”. After “if”, add “(for either (a) or (b))”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1230 (MAC)
			1. This has already been resolved in July.
			2. It will be subject to motion on August 29, 2022.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/353r5** - Direction CIDs- Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-05-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. Working on R6 with the changes for the last couple days.
		3. CID 2079 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The Probe Delay was affected by CID 322.
			3. Review context for proposed changes.
			4. Straw Poll: Should the NAV be synched after a channel switch?
				1. Results: 3y, 1n, 3 a
			5. More Work will need to be done.
			6. Suggest sending proposed changes to the reflector for more discussion.
		4. CID 2141 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. No comments on this one.
		5. CID 2247 (EDITOR)
			1. Review Comment
			2. CID 2247 is already done see motion #59
		6. CID 1430 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Look at context of Header Field.
			3. Noted that in 20.5.2 (PPDU format), it shows the format with a single field, named "Header".
			4. The discussion was in general agreement but will need to have the specific locations and in some cases the modifications to the sentence made.
			5. Noted that in 20.5.2 (PPDU format), it shows the format with a single field, named "Header".
			6. General direction: Yes, use "Header field". Fix up ordering of phrases like "SC mode header" to something like "Header field of PPDU in SC mode"
		7. CID 1914 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review several context locations.
			3. CID 1914 (ED2): Agreed on the general direction.
			4. Need more time – will need to bring submission for Inteirm Session.
		8. CID 1964 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Table 12-11 for context.
			3. Reviewed clause 9 for AKM Table.
			4. Direction to say (in 12.11.2.7) that AES-SIV-256 and AES-SIV-512 are the AEAD ciphers.
		9. CID 2010 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Similar to discussion earlier today.
			3. The Context of the change will need to be checked before a general global change can be made.
			4. Generally agreed, but each context has to be considered. Also, Clause 6 clean-up will fix most of these.
		10. CID 2095 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review context locations.
			3. Discussion on when “format” is necessary and what location relative to the name.
			4. May want to remove the” format” from “OFDM format PPDU”
			5. Other places where BLAH “format PPDU” may be correct.
		11. CID 2142 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on SMNP Spec has a description that is not Variable.
			3. More thought needed.
		12. CID 2144 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Discussion on difference on "conformant" vs "compliant".
			3. Discussion on use of comply -
			4. They are considered synonyms by some.
		13. CID 2172 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Order is by when amendment added it to the table.
			3. Concern on identifying
			4. Straw Poll: Do you want to
1. Keep the Table as it is
2. Order the Table Alphabetically
3. Move the BIP-CMAC-128 to the other BIPs
4. Abstain.
	* + - 1. Straw poll results: 6a, 1b, 0c, 1a
			1. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The Group was polled, and no problem was identified, and no change to the table was made.
			Straw Poll run on 2022-08-24: Do you want to
5. Keep the Table as it is
6. Order the Table Alphabetically
7. Move the BIP-CMAC-128 to the other BIPs
8. Abstain.
	* + - 1. Straw poll results: 6a, 1b, 0c, 1a
			1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2179 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Consider making this change if time is available.
		2. CID 1387 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on just removing “always” and “never”.
			3. The group did not reason to keep “always” or “never”.
	1. **Recess at 5:29 pm PT**
9. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Thursday, August 25, 2022, at 9:00-12:00 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 10:03 am PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Introductions of attendees**
		1. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2\* | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 3 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 4\* | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 5\* | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6\* | Nguyen, An | U.S. Department of Homeland Security |
| 8\* | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 9\* | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 10 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 11 | Wentink, Menzo | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 12\* | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |

* + 1. \* = in person
	1. **Review agenda 11-22/1186r3**
		1. Add to AM1: CID 1555 – Doc 11-22/1388 – MCCANN (Huawei)
		2. Reorder AM1 “Direction CIDs” to after other group of CIDs.
		3. Add to AM1 Doc 11-22/990r7 CID 1647 Youhan KIM
		4. No objection to Agenda plan.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/1388r0** – Stephen MCCANN (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1388-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1555.docx>
		2. CID 1555 (MAC)
			1. Document was created to capture what was presented yesterday from a set of email extracts.
			2. The Signature and headers were removed from the document.
			3. Already Marked Ready for Motion
	3. **GEN CIDs** – Jon ROSDAHL
		1. CID 2019 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion as to whether a submission is required for this CID. Decided that one is not required.
			3. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2019 (GEN) ACCEPTED (GEN: 2022-08-25 16:20:59Z)

Note to Editor: location is p2076.29 (D1.0).

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1706 (GEN)
			1. Mentioned that a submission is required for this CID.
			2. In GEN Insufficient Detail Comment Group
			3. Assigned to Mark RISON
		2. CID 1310 (GEN)
			1. Mentioned that a submission is required for this CID.
			2. Assigned to Alfred ASTERJADHI
		3. CID 2159 (GEN)
			1. Mentioned that a submission is required for this CID.
			2. In GEN Insufficient Detail Comment Group
			3. Assigned to Mark RISON
	1. **MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. 3 Discuss CIDS
		2. CID 2008 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution:

 CID 2008 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-25 16:15:04Z): This was discussed by the task group during the January 2022 session. It was concluded that the resolution preferred by some members would be to deprecate DCF and/or merge it with EDCA (which is the subject of other comments). However, that is a bigger task than this comment, and will require more time and review. In the meantime, it was felt that the current title is sufficient for a reader to find material that is being searched and is not confusing if/when the content is read, so no change is necessary.

* + - 1. Discussion on the Rejected resolution text.
			2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2086 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. This was discussed earlier this week, but no consensus was found.
			3. Currently grouped in the “No Consensus” group.
			4. Discussion on deleting subclause 11.31.5 – no consensus to remove.
			5. Question to find OCT expert.
			6. ACTION ITEM #11 – Mark HAMILTON to reach out to OCT SME and post to WG reflector the details on CID 2086 (MAC). If No solution is determined, a Rejection reason is to be created.
			7. ACTION ITEM #12– Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule CID 2086 (MAC) during the Sept 802W Interim.
		2. CID 1479 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We discussed on Tuesday.
			3. There was a Straw poll on Aug 15, and there was no consensus to accept the proposed change.
			4. ACTION ITEM #13: – Michael MONTEMURRO – Schedule CID 1479 (MAC) discussion during the Sept 802W Interim
			5. ACTION ITEM #14: – Mark HAMILTON – Craft a Reject reason for CID 1479 (MAC) for consideration.
			6. ACTION ITEM #15: – Mark RISON – Post details of CID 1479 (MAC) to the WG Reflector again to see if there is any agreement or an alternative proposal.
	1. **Return to doc 11-22/990r8** Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-08-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>
		2. Minor Errors to fix.
		3. CID 1471 (PHY)
			1. There were some minor errors find.
			2. Update resolution to R8
			3. Updated Proposed Resolution:

CID 1471 (PHY) REVISED;*Note to commenter:*Instruction to editor below clarifies how the interim transmit spectral mask is used to construct the overall transmit spectral mask.*Instruction to TGme Editor:*Implement the proposed text updates for CID 1471 in 11-22/990r8 <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-08-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx>

* + 1. CID 1647 (PHY)
			1. Review status from earlier this week.
			2. While schedule for Monday, we can take today.
			3. Updated Proposed Resolution:

CID 1647 (PHY) REVISED:

*Note to Commenter:*

Unlike MAC which has a common MAC clause (Clause 9), there is no common PHY clause. Hence, we need to review one by one.

In Clause 15, SIGNAL, SERVICE and LENGTH fields clearly specifies that LSB is transmitted first. The CRC field has a clear example stating that “leftmost bit” is transmitted first. Hence, there is no need for further change.

Situation is similar for Clause 16.

Clause 17 has two numeric fields. Rate field has a clear definition for each bit. Length field already states that LSB is transmitted first.

In Clause 19 (HT), HT-MF has a statement that numeric field is transmitted LSB first as the commenter has said. As for HT-GF, the HT-SIG format is the same as that for HT-MF. And since HT-MF already clarified that numeric fields have LSB transmitted first, there is no need to repeat the statement for HT-GF.

In Clause 20 (DMG, D1.3 P3656L15), Clause 21 (VHT, P3743L55), 23 (S1G, P3916L56), 24 (CDMG, P4024L47), 25 (CMMG, P4067L59), 27 (HE, P4374L37, P4390L9) already states that numeric fields are transmitted LSB first.

Clause 30 (WUR) L-SIG has two numeric fields. Rate field refers back to Clause 17 (see above), and LENGTH field is specified to be transmitted LSB first.

The only remaining PHY clause is 28 (EDMG) for the which the preamble definition is written with many tables, and it is not clear if there is a need to explicitly specify that LSB is transmitted first. If needed, commenter should submit a comment with more specific changes to be made at specific locations.

*Instruction to Editor:*

Add the following at D1.3 P4028L35 and P4031L42:

“All numeric fields are transmitted in unsigned format, LSB first.”

* + - 1. Discussion on Clause 24 change that may need to be done changing from Reject to Revised.
			2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/353r5** Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-05-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. Continuing the "Need Direction" CIDs assigned to Mark RISON.
		3. CID 1414 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on use of which vs that.
			3. After discussion, Mark R will proceed with proposal.
		4. CID 1421 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the clause 1.5 that may address things enough.
		5. CID 1459 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on whether or not to change OCVC to OCV capability, or OCVC capability to OCVC.
			3. Straw Poll Do you prefer?
1. Make no change
2. Change “OCVC Capability’ to “OCVC”
3. Abstain
	* + - 1. Results: 5a 1b 2c
			1. Proposed Resolution:
			CID 1459 (ED1) REJECTED; after review of the CID, the group determined that a change was not wanted.
			See Straw Poll Results from Aug 25,
			Straw Poll Do you prefer?
4. Make no change
5. Change “OCVC Capability’ to “OCVC”
6. Abstain

Results: 5a 1b 2c

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1492 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the new name “slice”
			3. Could use a name from Excel functions.
			4. Name “L” could be used in other SDOs or organizations and ensure consistency.
			5. Clause 1.5 has “L” defined clearly. But when reading in the draft, seeing “L” is not clear which operator it is.
			6. It is proposed that it may be used in RFC, but not validated.
			7. Straw Poll: Do you Prefer:
1. Rename the operator
2. Keep the operator name
3. Abstain
	* + - 1. Results: 3a 5b 2c
			1. Proposed Resolution:

CID 1492 (ED1) REJECTED; after review of the CID, the group determined that a change was not wanted.
See Straw Poll Results from Aug 25, 2022:

a) Rename the operator

b) Keep the operator name

c) Abstain

Results: 3a 5b 2c

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1554 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion of changing “Frequency index” to “frequency number”
			3. Discussion on where it is used as is.
			4. Discussion on difference in Channel number and channel Center Frequency Index.
			5. The Initial Channel number were 20 MHz width and then the Channel Center Frequency Index was used to find the center of the wider channel (40 MHz and 80Mhz etc).
			6. Discussion on how the index is tied to the channel number.
			7. Keep “Channel Center Frequency Index”, and add the missing “Channel” or “Center” in some locations.
			8. ACTION ITEM #16: Mark RISON to provide proposal for CID 1554 (ED1) by September 6 for scheduling.
		2. CID 1653 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion led to a direction.
		3. CID 1776 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on using the abbreviation consistently.
			3. Suggestion to keep “MSS element” as the usage.
			4. ACTION ITEM #17: Mark RISON to provide proposal for CID 1554 (ED1) by September 6 for scheduling. Proposal will include the location for the changes.
		4. CID1777 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to RSNE, we should consider using MME in all locations.
			3. Discussion on using the abbreviation consistently.
		5. CID 1837 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the definition of 802.1 using EAPOL PDU.
			3. In the 3.2 definition, we have defined a Frame that carries the 802.1 PDU.
			4. Mark R is to look for consistency in the use of “Frame”.
		6. CID 2002 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the use of frame field names.
			3. In PV1 and PV0 do not use same field names.
			4. Concern in a reference is using the wrong name, but no locations identified.
			5. Proposed Resolution:

CID 2002 (ED1) Rejected – at the top level names are given Address 1 to Address 4 for PV0, and some specific frame types give the fields specific names for that frame, but it is believed that the field names are always addressed either as the generic Address 1-4 or to the specific field name for that frame type.

* 1. **ED1 AdHoc Review** – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. For those CIDs that do not have a submission for “Submission Required” which had insufficient details, will be rejected in Sept 802W Interim.
		2. Comment Groups:
			1. Submission Required - Insufficient Detail
			2. Submission Required – submission pending
			3. Submission Required – Discussed – pending
	2. **Recess 11:33pm**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc – San Diego –Thursday, August 25, 2022, at 13:00-15:00 PT**
	1. **Called to order** 13:02 am PT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues were noted.
	3. **Reminder to mark Attendance:**
		1. **IMAT Reported attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 2\* | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 3\* | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 4\* | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 5\* | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6\* | Nguyen, An | DHS/CISA |
| 8 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 9\* | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 10\* | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 11 | Smith, Graham | SRT Wireless |
| 12 | Wentink, Menzo | Qualcomm |

* + 1. \* = in person
	1. **Review agenda 11-22/1186r3**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1186-03-000m-revme-august-2022-adhoc-agenda-san-diego.docx>
		2. No changes to agenda.
		3. No objection to Agenda
	2. **Review doc 11-22/916** Graham SMITH (SR Technology).
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0916-05-0arc-clause-6-3-new-text.docx>
		2. There is an introduction doc 11-22/1137r1:
		3. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1137-01-0arc-clause-6-3-re-write-presentation.pptx>
		4. Presentation of 11-22/1137r1.
		5. Topic: Replacement/restructuring of Clause 6.
		6. Abstract:

ID 1114

“What purpose is Clause 6 performing in particular 6.3? 434 pages? As big as Clause 11. I suggest that Clause 6 be investigated as to usefulness and necessity. Too much of it is purely boilerplate and never gets used.

A presentation 21/1822 was originally made in ARC prior to the comment. ARC members indicated strong support to do something hence the comment was subsequently submitted.

* + 1. Plan to understand the Text changes described in 11-22/916:

Estimated reduction in pages – 300

Let’s look at the proposal details.

Suggested strategy is that “experts” should look at the primitives in their area(s) and confirm that they are content that the new format works.

* + 1. Change to reviewing doc 11-22/0916r5
		2. Review submission
		3. Discussion on the difference between reference column and comment column.
		4. Review the editing instructions, noted that the introduction paragraph needs a number, and then renumber the table and new subclause.
		5. Update the editor instructions to be clear to the changes.
		6. Discussion on the order of the full table vs the full descriptions.
		7. This proposal was generated in ARC and has been advertised and have included many people. We will put on the WG Reflector and presentations to Editor, WG and TG will need to be made.
		8. Discussion on which TG will need to prepare their clause 6 in this new format. Only those TG that will not be rolled into REVme. If they are based on the 802.11-2020, they will use the old format.
		9. Note that 6.3.2 was not used in the proposal.
		10. ACTION ITEM #18: - Michael MONTEMURRO- Schedule time for 11-22/916 (Clause 6 reorg) in the first meeting of REVme during the September 802W Interim.
	1. **Review doc 11-22/522r2** Alfred ASTERJADHI (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0522-02-000m-miscellaneous-crs.docx>
		2. CID 1032 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on history of the document.
			4. Update a “use frames” to “uses frames”
			5. Proposed Resolution:

 CID 1032 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-08-25 21:07:51Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/522r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0522-02-000m-miscellaneous-crs.docx>), for CID 1032.

* + - 1. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Return to 11-22/916** Graham SMITH (SRT Wireless)
		1. Review the changes in the main text that references a primitive.
		2. Corrected some Editor instruction labels and added missing underlines.
		3. When TG complete with the old Clause 6 format, are ready to be rolled into the new REVme a mapping of the old to the new will have to be created.
		4. An AdHoc committee will be created to handle the logistics of rolling in the new amendments.
		5. A Presentation to Editor’s Meeting will be done by Emily QI with Joseph LEVY, Mark HAMILTON and Graham SMITH to support the presentation details.
	2. **Other Business:**
		1. The Chair issued a Thank You to Qualcomm, and Jon ROSDAHL for hosting this week.
		2. The Chair wanted to also Thank the TG members as this week was very productive.
		3. Look forward to Interim meeting: 2022 September 802W Interim Session at the Hilton Waikoloa Hotel in Hawaii.
		4. Remember to do attendance.
	3. **Adjourned at 3:45pm**
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