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Abstract

Minutes for 802.11me (REVme – TGme) during the 2022 September IEEE 802 Wireless Mixed-mode Interim. There were 7 meetings (slot times) from Sept 13-15, 2022. Thanks to Stephen McCann and Mark Hamilton for taking minutes while I was presenting.

R0: Initial set of minutes.

11-22-1277-00-000m-minutes-for-revme-2022 sept interim

1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Tuesday, September 13, 2022, at 08:00-10:00 HT**
	1. **Called to order** 8:07am HT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of** other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2022 September 802W Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. **See slides 3,** 13-22 in 11-22/1281r2
		3. Call for Patents
			1. No response received.
		4. Review Copyright policies
			1. No items noted.
	5. **Review agenda – 11-22/1281r3:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-03-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Tuesday Sep 13, 8 am HST
			1. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
			2. Approve agenda
			3. Motions
				1. Telecon, Adhoc, and July Plenary minutes (Slide 6)
			4. Editor Report
			5. Comment Resolution
				1. Withdrawn CIDs – CID 2214 (MAC), 2216 (SEC), 1047 (MAC), 1220 (PHY), 1290, 1291, 1292 (ED1), 2372 (MAC)
				2. Clause 6 - CID 1114 – doc 11-22/916 – Smith (SR Technology)
				3. Deprecate/Obsolete – note doc 11-18/652
				4. WEP – CID 1266, 1267, 1642, 1083 (GEN), 1079, 1719 (SEC)
				5. TKIP – CID 1643 (GEN)
				6. PBSS – CID 1640 (GEN)
				7. IBSS – CID 1639 (GEN)
				8. DMG Relay – CID 1393 (GEN)
		3. No objection to proposed agenda
		4. Other withdrawal list will be updated later.
	6. **Administrative Motions**
		1. **Approve the minutes in documents**
* **July 802 plenary: 11-22-1155r1:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1155-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-july-plenary.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1155-01-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-2022-july-plenary.docx)
* **July 25th teleconference:11-22/1195r0:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1195-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-july-25.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1195-00-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-july-25.docx)
* **August Adhoc meeting: 11-22/1276r1:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1276-01-000m-minutes-for-revme-2022-august-adhoc-san-diego.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1276-01-000m-minutes-for-revme-2022-august-adhoc-san-diego.docx)
* **August teleconferences: 11-22/1275r2:** [**https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1275-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-august-2022.docx**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1275-02-000m-telecon-minutes-for-revme-august-2022.docx)
	+ 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
		2. 2nd: Mark Hamilton
		3. Results: Unanimous consent – Motion passes.
	1. **Editor Report** – Emily QI (Intel)
		1. D1.4 is pending an announcement, but it may be on the member site already.
		2. See 11-21/687r11
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-11-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
			2. Review submission



* 1. **Process Withdrawn CIDs** –
		1. CID 2214 (MAC), 2216 (SEC), 1047 (MAC), 1220 (PHY),

1290, 1291, 1292 (ED1), 2372 (MAC)

Also 1008, 2207, 2208 (MAC)

* + 1. Emails have been received by the Chair for withdrawing comments.
		2. Resolution to be updated for all: Rejected; commenter has withdrawn the CID.
		3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/916r7** – Clause 6 – Graham SMITH (SR Technology)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0916-07-0arc-clause-6-3-new-text.docx>
		2. CID 1114 (GEN)
			1. Review history of document
			2. Organization of document explained
				1. Review Changes since last revision.
				2. Discussion on other CIDs that may be concerned with Clause 6.
				3. Should CIDs that are related to Clause 6 be rejected/revised.
		3. Move to review doc 11-22/916r9:
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0916-09-0arc-clause-6-3-new-text.docx>
			2. Added two entries to the end of the table and appear in D1.4
		4. Proposed Resolution CID1114 (GEN): REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-13 18:49:04Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-22/916r9:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0916-09-0arc-clause-6-3-new-text.docx>

* + 1. After discussion on how to possibly get other CIDs withdrawn, it was determined that they could only be withdrawn if a Motion was approved.
		2. **MOTION: #80 – CID 1114 (GEN) (2022-09-13)**
			1. Approve the comment resolution for CID 1114 as: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-13 18:49:04Z) Incorporate the changes in 11-22/916r9:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0916-09-0arc-clause-6-3-new-text.docx>

* + - 1. Moved: Graham SMITH
			2. Second: Jon Rosdahl
			3. Results: Unanimous, Motion Passes.
		1. CID 1716 (GEN)
			1. Proposed resolution: Rejected; the commentor has withdrawn the comment.
			2. Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. Reminder that a tutorial in 11-22/1507 will be given during the 802.11 Mid-week plenary.
	1. **Deprecate/Obsolete** CIDs – note doc 11-18/652r20 – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-20-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
		2. WEP – CID 1266, 1267, 1642, 1083 (GEN), 1079, 1719 (SEC)
		3. TKIP – CID 1643 (GEN)
		4. Discussion on path for potential removal of WEP/TKIP
		5. Discussion to change TKIP from Deprecated to Obsolete.
		6. WEP and TKIP ones, first…
		7. CID 1643 (GEN):
			1. Reviewed comment.
			2. Suggest that we can change TKIP from deprecated to obsolete, but it is still used in implementations so we should not remove it, yet.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-13 19:06:10Z) TKIP is currently deprecated; change status from Deprecated to Obsolete; Change to locations TKIP is said to be deprecated: 5.1.2 Security services, 12.2.1 Classes of security algorithm, B.4.4.1 MAC protocol capabilities
			4. No objections.  Ready for motion.
		8. CID 1642 (GEN):
			1. Discussion that TKIP still relies on some WEP text.  Per previous item, we are not removing TKIP (yet), so we can’t just remove WEP (yet).
			2. There is off-line work ongoing that might separate WEP and TKIP enough that we can remove WEP in a future revision.
			3. Doc 11-18/652r1 also has background for how WEP/TKIP could be removed, as reference and background for the off-line work.
			4. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-13 19:11:51Z) - WEP is used by TKIP which is currently deprecated and not subject to removal; However, TKIP will be marked obsolete.  Both will be then subject to possible removal in a future revision.
			5. No objections.  Ready for motion.
		9. CID 1266 (GEN):
			1. This is just a mention, as an example, can we remove it without affecting implementations’ ability to continue to support WEP?
			2. One Suggestion: REVISED: Delete "WEP encryption was defined to provide the data confidentiality aspects of closed wired media." (D1.0 P319 L27)
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-13 19:17:02Z) at p319.26 delete "WEP encryption was defined to provide the data confidentiality aspects of closed wired media."
			4. No objections.  Ready for motion.
		10. CID 1267 (GEN):
			1. Reviewed the footnote, and the sentence that references it.
			2. Agreed we can delete WEP from the sentences, but the footnote still applies because TKIP uses ARC4.  Change the footnote to also reference TKIP instead of WEP.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-13 19:21:33Z) at 321.27 (D1.0) change "IEEE Std 802.11 provides several cryptographic algorithms to protect data traffic, including: WEP, TKIP, CCMP, and GCMP. WEP and TKIP are based on the ARC420 algorithm,"

to

"IEEE Std 802.11 provides several cryptographic algorithms to protect data traffic, including TKIP, CCMP, and GCMP. TKIP is based on the ARC420 algorithm,"

Change the footnote: change "WEP option" to "TKIP option" at p321.64

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1083 (GEN):
			1. Prior discussion was generally agreeing to remove the three rows.  But, need to confirm the rows are not needed to implement WEP or TKIP (which is still included, although deprecated).
			2. WEP-40 and WEP-104 were never used/done.  Those rows can be deleted, but, the TKIP row could possibly still be used.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-13 19:28:48Z) at p3206 in Table 12-8 remove Rows for WEP-40, WEP-104.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. Return to CID 1643 (GEN):
			1. Add to the resolution:
			2. The locations are: 352.48, 3089.27, 4940.12 (D1.0).
		3. CID 1079 (SEC):
			1. Noted that the locations are not provided.
			2. Mark this as insufficient details.  Add to the insufficient details list for Thursday’s motion.
		4. CID 1719 (SEC):
			1. Discussed previously.  Noted that other algorithms (for example CCMP) might be considered a “weak algorithm” in the future.
			2. Suggest reject, that WEP-40, WEP-104 and TKIP are being deprecated, so adding new text that references them is not forward looking.
			3. We should be clear about what algorithms we consider “weak”.  If CCMP is added to that category in the future, then we should add it to the list.  And, when we remove WEP or TKIP, we’ll have to search the spec for all occurrences anyway and dealing with this one more reference is a trivial increase in effort.
			4. Maybe change the “weak algorithm” phrase with a reference to any algorithm that is deprecated or obsolete in this Standard.
			5. This should be a NOTE.
			6. Discussion whether this is (or should be) normative.
			7. Agreed it is normative, as a “may” statement.  So, crafted a rejection along these lines.
			8. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2022-09-13 19:47:57Z) - This cited text allows a STA to reject setting up a TDLS link if the STA's link to the AP is using a weak algorithm. The notion of weak algorithm is not specific to a cipher.
			9. Mark Ready for motion (with one objection).
		5. CID 1640 (GEN):
			1. Comment suggests deprecating PBSS.
			2. But, this ballot got 21 comments on PBSS, so that is evidence that someone still cares and want to maintain this materials.
			3. However, a reflector email was sent, asking if anyone objected to deprecating, and no one responded with any objection.
			4. Two objections to rejecting.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; REVme has had 21 other CIDS (1720,  1486,  1678,  1740,  1752,  1820,  1943,  2135,  1902,  1739,  1303,  1302,  1931,  1514,  1392,  1617,  439,  1464,  1465,  1563,  1591) that have updated clauses pertaining to PBSS operation.

So it is clear that someone cares about PBSS operation.  An Email request for support of deprecating PBSS operation was sent on March 8, 2022, and no response was received.

* + - 1. Ready for motion (with two objections).
		1. CID 1639 (GEN):
			1. There are known implementations of IBSS
			2. Discussions in 6 GHz for Very-low power, indicates peer-to-peer operation is still of interest.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected.  There are use cases that are looking to use IBSS in another band, and so deprecation at this point is not warranted.
			4. No objections.  Mark Ready for motion.
		2. CID 1393 (GEN):
			1. Suggest adding this to the insufficient details category.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-13 20:00:05Z) The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			3. No objections.  Mark Ready for motion.
		3. END Notes from Mark Hamilton -- Thanks!!!
	1. **Recess** at 10:00am HT
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Tuesday, September 13, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 HT**
	1. **Called to order** at 4pm HT by the Chair Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. Introductions of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Editor – Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Registration fee required** slide 3
	4. **Review Patent and Copyright Policies**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda** -11-22/1281r4:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-04-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Update agenda to move CIDs for MAC are moved to where Mark H will be present.
		3. Comment Resolution
			1. CID 2346 (GEN) – doc 11-22/1035 – Levy (InterDigital)
			2. CID 1812 (MAC) – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
			3. CID 1985, 1986, 1535, 1419, 2187 (MAC) – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
			4. CID 1479, 2086 (MAC) – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
			5. CID 1554 (ED1), 1760 (PHY) – Rison (Samsung)
			6. CID 1466 (MAC) - doc 11-22/935 – Hiertz (Ericsson)
		4. Move Guido to tomorrow
		5. Add CID 1301 (GEN)
		6. No Other changes to Agenda.
		7. Approve Agenda as seen in R5.
	6. **CID 1301 (GEN)** Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
		1. Review Comment
		2. This comment is resolved with the same proposed resolution as CID 1114 (GEN)
		3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-14 02:09:32Z) - Incorporate the changes in 11-22/916r9: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0916-09-0arc-clause-6-3-new-text.docx> (Note to Editor this is the same resolution as CID 1114).
		4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	7. **Review Doc 11-22/1035r1** – Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
		1. CID 2346 (GEN)
			1. Review history of the CID discussions.
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Review proposed changes outlined in the document.
			4. Discussion on why the name change.
				1. This is not a name change but calling out when it is generic (WUR-OOK) vs (MC-OOK) where it is a specific case.
			5. Discussion on the definition, but MC-OOK definition should stay, and add a Generic Definition.
				1. Is this a definition or is this a modulation type.
			6. The use of MC-OOK is being used in industry (3GPP and other journals and papers being published). Other SDOs are using our notation that was noted in the 11ba specification.
			7. Discussion on the two issues – 1. Naming and the technical issues.
			8. Technically speaking, you can use “should’ vs “shall”.
			9. Detailed why not changing name.
			10. Discussion on what path for consensus on this CID should be able to be followed.
			11. The Standard should identify clearly what the “over the air” interface is defined.
			12. Implications of if it is “XXX-OOK” changes.
			13. Straw Poll: Is the solution provided in 11-22/1035r1 an acceptable way to resolve CID 2346?
				1. Options: Yes/No/Abstain
				2. Results: 7/10/3
			14. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-14 02:40:25Z) After review of doc 11-22/1035r1, and a straw poll to use as a revised resolution (straw poll results: 7/10/3). Previously a proposal for rejecting failed a motion (#61) 4/6/5. The TG has decided that at this impasse will need more work and no action will be taken at this time.
			15. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	8. CID 1812 (MAC) – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 1812 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review history of the discussion.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	9. **More MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 1678 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review History of the discussion.
			3. Review possible locations to apply change.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1533 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review History of the discussion.
			3. Review possible us of “if Supported”.
			4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1487 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review CID 1992 as it was noted to “go along with CID 1992”.
			3. Review Context see page 3082
			4. Discussion on why no change is warranted.
			5. Discussion on when beacon protection is enabled (on TX =AP or RX=non-AP)
			6. Proposed resolution: Accept
			7. There was one objection noted. – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1479 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Action items from the TGme AdHoc in San Diego.
			3. Review the responses to multiple action items.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The TG rejects the addition of a NOTE similar to that proposed. Concerns were raised that even though this is a NOTE, it implies that for the sake of interoperability, implementations need to (must/shall?) restrict Beacons to 1536 octets. Also, the same concern/restriction seems to apply to Probe Responses. However, restricting Beacons and Probe Responses is becoming problematic with the addition of information, such as Multiple BSSID elements (which is helping with the number of Beacons that need to be received to get all the information, and similar combination signaling that will be heavily leveraged in 11be). A straw poll was held on Aug 15 TGme teleconference: "Are you okay with ACCEPT as the resolution to CID 1479?" with results: 4y, 4n, 1a. Other proposed wording for a similar NOTE has also met with resistance due to the reasons mentioned just above.
			5. No objection -- Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1198 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. The history of the CID was reviewed.
			4. A Reject reason was discussed
			5. An objection to the “group disagreed” is not sufficient to show that the group has made a determination or not.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: The group disagreed with the proposed change, the commenter was asked to provide an updated proposed resolution, but no contribution has been received.
			7. There is a concern that we are being non-responsive to the comment.
			8. More detail on the past discussion needs to be captured.
			9. We need to look at reflector traffic for finding more details on the history of the CID and include in the proposed resolution.
			10. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark HAMILTON – Will propose a new reject reason for CID 1198 (MAC) which includes past discussion to be included in the justification.
	10. CID 1554 (ED1), 1760 (PHY) – Rison (Samsung)
		1. Neither CID has a submission prepared.
		2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; insufficient detail boiler plate.
		3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	11. **Review doc 11-22/353r7** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-07-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CID 2095 (ED2) and 1368 (PHY)
			1. Review comments
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Page should be 3545 in the comment citation.
			4. Review the proposed changes.
			5. Remove the change for 4406.
			6. Proposed Resolution: REVISEDAt 3543.27/37/48 change “ERP-DSSS, ERP-CCK, ERP-OFDM, or OFDM format PPDU” to “ERP-DSSS, ERP-CCK or ERP-OFDM format PPDU, or OFDM PPDU”.At 3543.58 change “ERP-OFDM or OFDM format PPDU” to “ERP-OFDM format PPDU or OFDM PPDU”.At 3545.37 change “Non-HT format PPDUs” to “Non-HT PPDUs”.At 3546.64 change “The non-HT PPDU format” to “The non-HT format”.At 3576.33/36 change “NON\_HT format PPDU” to “non-HT PPDU”.At 3618.51, 3791.38 change “a non-HT PPDU format to “a non-HT PPDU”.At 3791.38 change “non-HT PPDU(#238) format” to “non-HT PPDU(#238)”.At 3874.36 change “S1G\_DUP\_1M indicates S1G 1 MHz Duplicate PPDU format” to “S1G\_DUP\_1M indicates S1G 1 MHz Duplicate format PPDU”.At 3874.38 change “S1G\_DUP\_2M indicates S1G 2 MHz Duplicate PPDU format” to “S1G\_DUP\_2M indicates S1G 2 MHz Duplicate format PPDU”.At 3913.25/55, 3919.48/58 change “S1G format PPDUs” to “S1G PPDUs”.At 5054.46 change “HT-mixed format PPDU format” to “HT-mixed format PPDU”.At 5054.48 change “HT-greenfield PPDU format” to “HT-greenfield format PPDU”.At 3615.20/44/47, change “HT\_GF PPDU” to “HT-greenfield format PPDU”.At 3699.57, 3700.8/16/21 change “The STA transmits an HT-mixed PPDU (when FORMAT is HT\_MF) or HT-greenfield PPDU” to “The STA transmits an HT-mixed format PPDU (when FORMAT is HT\_MF) or HT-greenfield format PPDU”.At 5050.59/61 change “HT-greenfield PPDUs” to “HT-greenfield format PPDUs”.At 3589.17 change “HT\_MF PPDU” to “HT-mixed format PPDU”.At 892.12 change “if the format of the PPDU is NON\_HT” to “if the PPDU is a non-HT PPDU”.At 892.15 change “if the format of the PPDU is HT\_MF or HT\_GF” to “if the PPDU is an HT PPDU”.At 892.20 change “if the format of the PPDU is NON\_HT and the PPDU is received in the primary channel” to “if the PPDU is a non-HT PPDU and received in the primary channel”.At 892.23 change “if the format of the PPDU is HT\_MF or HT\_GF provided that the PPDU iseither a 20 MHz PPDU received in the primary channel or a 40 MHz PPDU” to “if the PPDU is an HT PPDU andeither a 20 MHz PPDU received in the primary channel or a 40 MHz PPDU”.At 944.55, 948.11 change “HT\_MF” to “HT-mixed format”.At 944.55, 948.21 change “HT\_GF” to “HT-greenfield format”.At 3788.53, 3789.7/25 change “NON\_HT, HT\_MF, HT\_GF or VHT PPDU” to “non-HT, HT-mixed format, HT-greenfield format or VHT PPDU”.At 3789.3/21 change “NON\_HT duplicate, HT\_MF, HT\_GF or VHT PPDU” to “non-HT duplicate, HT-mixed format, HT-greenfield format or VHT PPDU”.At 3789.61 change “HT\_MF and HT\_GF formats” to “HT-mixed and HT-greenfield formats”.At 4268.37 change “HT\_GF, or HT\_MF” to “HT-greenfield or HT-mixed”.At 4474.50, 4475.7/33, 4476.6 change “non-HT, HT\_MF, HT\_GF, VHT or HE PPDU” to “non-HT, HT-mixed format, HT-greenfield format, VHT or HE PPDU”.At 4475.3/29, 4476.1 change “non-HT duplicate, HT\_MF, HT\_GF, VHT or HE PPDU” to “non-HT duplicate, HT-mixed format, HT-greenfield format, VHT or HE PPDU”.At 4476.61 change “HT\_GF, HT\_MF” to “HT-greenfield, HT-mixed”.At 4485.40 change “HT-GF” to “HT-greenfield format”.
			7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1414 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Changes to “which” and commas is being used.
			4. Review the final 3 example changes for discussion.
			5. The first of the 3 may be correct with comma which.
			6. The final three are to be removed – no change.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Revised; CID 1414 (ED1): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, for CID 1414.
			8. No objection Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 2010 (ED2) and 1653 (ED1):
			1. Review comments
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the use of either “individual MAC address” vs “individual address”
			4. 802.11 does have a definition for “individual address” and it is based on the 802-2014 “individual MAC address” .
			5. Clause 6.3.59 has been removed in the Clause 6 update.
			6. The Clause 6 changes will need to be applied after the changes for CID 1114.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 2020 and CID 1653 Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, for CID 2010 and 1653.
			8. Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 1838 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution: CID 1838 (SEC): Accepted. Note to Editor, the same change is already made for CID 1571.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	12. **Recess at 6pm HT**.
2. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Wednesday, September 14, 2022, at 08:00-10:00 HT**
	1. **Called to order** 8:03am HT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of** other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		2. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		3. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2022 September 802W Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. **See slides 3,** 13-22 in 11-22/1281r2
		3. Call for Patents
			1. No response received.
		4. Review Copyright policies
			1. No items noted.
	5. **Review agenda – 11-22/1281r5:**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-05-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. No Changes
		3. No Objections to proposed Agenda:

Wednesday Sep 14, 8am HST

3) Comment Resolution

CID 1233 (MAC) – doc 11-22/995 – Wullert (Peraton Labs)

CID 1650 (SEC) – Montemurro (Huawei)

CID 1466 (MAC) – doc 11-22/935 – Hiertz (Ericsson)

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

CID 2079, 2095/1368, 1414, 2010/1653, 1777/1776, 1837/1836, 1838, 1840, 1895, 1486, 1674, 1951, 1984, 1987, 2047, 1926, 2187, 1985/1986/1535/1419/1536 – doc 11-22/353 – Rison (Samsung)

4) Recess

* 1. **Review doc 11-22/995** John Wullert (Peraton Labs)
		1. CID 1233 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Proposed Changes
			3. Discussion on the propose new text – remove hyphen, add “methods”, and clarify wording.
			4. After more clarification and word smithing,
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes in 11-22/995r1 for CID 1233 which adds TUA access methods information.
			6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **Chair passed** to Mark RISON
	3. Review CID 1650 (SEC) – Montemurro (Huawei)
		1. CID 1650 (SEC) – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the proposed changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted – Note to Editor add comma after and space after “t0”
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Chair passed back** to Michael MONTEMURRO
	5. **Review doc doc 11-22/935r1** – Guido HIERTZ (Ericsson)
		1. **CID 1466 (MAC) –**
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0935-01-000m-resolution-for-cid-1466.docx>
			2. Review comment
			3. Review the proposed changes.
			4. Discussion on when “dot11MCCATraceStatesActive is greater than”.
			5. Other changes to be considered, an R2 will be brought back on Thursday PM1.
	6. **Review doc 11-22/353r8** – Mark RISON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CIDs 2079, 2095/1368, 1414, 2010/1653, 1777/1776, 1837/1836, 1838, 1840, 1895, 1486, 1674, 1951, 1984, 1987, 2047, 1926, 2187, 1985/1986/1535/1419/1536
		3. CID 1777 and 1776 (ED1)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review Proposed Changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CIDs 1777 and 1776 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which make the way in which elements are abbreviated consistent.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1837 (ED1) and CID 1836 (SEC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review discussion in submission.
			3. Review proposed changes.
			4. Review CID 1571 proposed resolution – it is good.
			5. Proposed Resolution. Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1837 and 1836 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which address the locations where an EAPOL\* frame is (incorrectly) assumed to hold an entire EAPOL\* PDU, or an SME/Authenticator/Supplicant is (incorrectly) assumed to transmit an EAPOL frame itself.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1840 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Note that the changes for CID 1823 did not account for the renaming of the Key MIC bit in the Key Information field (as opposed to the Key MIC field in the EAPOL-Key frame) to Key MIC Present under CID 1829.
			4. This will be addressed in this CID to fix up.
			5. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1840 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which make the changes requested by the commenter, except that the Key MIC Present bit is not necessarily 0.
		6. CID 1486 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; Make the changes proposed by the commenter, and additionally at the end of the para at 3082.15 add the sentence “Otherwise, beacon protection is not enabled at the non-AP STA.”
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1674 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed resolution.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

Add “, except where the Power Management subfield is reserved (see 9.2.4.1.7 (Power Management subfield))” after “upon successful completion of the entire frame exchange” at the following locations:

2690.26: The Power Management subfield in the Frame Control field of the frame sent by the STA in this exchange indicates the power management mode that the STAs coordinated by the MM-SME and advertised in the MMS element sent by the STA shall adopt upon successful completion of the entire frame exchange.

2727.7: The Power Management subfield(s) in the Frame Control field of the frame(s) sent by the STA in this exchange (#172)that are acknowledged by the AP indicate the power state that the STA shall adopt upon successful completion of the entire frame exchange.

2730.42: The Power Management subfield(s) in the Frame Control field of the frame(s) sent by the PCP in this exchange (#172)that are acknowledged by the AP indicate the power state that the PCP shall adopt upon successful completion of the entire frame exchange.

3408.9: The Power Management subfield in the Frame Control field and the Mesh Power Save Level subfield in the QoS Control field of the frame sent by the mesh STA in this exchange indicates the peer-specific mesh power management mode that the STA shall adopt upon successful completion of the entire frame exchange.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 1951 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Proposed changes.
			3. Review change from “may” to “might” to match other location with similar context.
			4. Proposed resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1951 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which make the changes requested by the commenter.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1984 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED

In 10.38.3.1, 10.38.4.1, 10.38.5.2, 10.38.5.3 change "incremented by 1 for each new MSDU or A-MSDU transmitted" to "incremented by 1 for each new MSDU (not in an A-MSDU) or A-MSDU transmitted".

Note to the Editor: this was done by D1.3 under CID 1597. No further changes required.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2047 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 2047 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which address the issues with duplicative “n-octet”s and related matters.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1987 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At 2221.10 in D1.3 change “the TXOP holder may commence transmission of that frame exchange sequence (#109)” to “the TXOP holder may initiate that frame exchange sequence(#109)”.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1926 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review cases for the resolution to address.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 1926 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which avoid the term “CTS frame response”.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 2079 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 2079 in 11-22/353r8 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-08-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>>, which effect the changes requested by the commenter.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. That should be the last CID in 11-22/353 at this time.
			1. Mark R will check to ensure.
	1. **Add to Agenda**: Doc 11-22/1594
		1. No objections.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/1594r0** - Kazuyuki SAKODA (Sony)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1594-00-000m-revme-mesh-profile-vs-mesh-sta-configuration.docx>
		2. Presented by Mark RISON
		3. CID 1289 (ED2) and 1771 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review the proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; incorporate the changes for CID 1289 and 1771 in doc 11-22/1594r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1594-00-000m-revme-mesh-profile-vs-mesh-sta-configuration.docx>>
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Add to Agenda:** add three more documents
		1. CID 1888 – doc 11-22/1449 – Halasz (Morse Micro)
		2. CID 1632 – doc 11-22/1432 – Halasz (Morse Micro)
		3. CID 1718 – doc 11-22/1431 – Halasz (Morse Micro)
		4. No objection
	4. **Review– doc 11-22/1449** – CID 1888 - Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1449-00-000m-cid-1888.docx>
		2. CID 1888 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the condition “A PPDU that contains a single frame”
				1. “or that contains an A-MPDU” this phrase seems to be causing confusion.
				2. If it is a “single frame” then A-MPDU is not relevant.
				3. The Condition to have a single frame may be enough of a limitation.
			4. Review the context of Table 10-16.
			5. More Work will need to be done this CID.
	5. **Review– doc 11-22/1432** – CID 1632 - Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1432-00-000m-cid-1632.docx>
		2. CID 1632 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes for CID 1632 in doc 11-22/1432r0 < <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1432-00-000m-cid-1632.docx>>
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. **Review doc 11-22/1431** – CID 1718 – Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		+ 1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1431-00-000m-cid-1718.docx>
			2. CID 1718 (MAC)
				1. Review Comment
				2. Previous discussion with 3GPP, we said that RCPI was not used 8 years ago.
				3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Incorporate the changes for CID1718 in doc 11-22/1431r0 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1431-00-000m-cid-1718.docx>>
				4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	7. **Recess at 10:00 am HT**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Wednesday, September 14, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 HT**
	1. **Called to order** at 4:07pm HT by the Chair Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. Introductions of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		2. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		3. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Review Registration fee required** slide 3
	4. **Review Patent and Copyright Policies**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review Agenda** 11-22/1281r6
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-06-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Comment Resolution
2. CID 2319 (GEN) – doc 11-22/658 – Das (Peraton Labs)
3. PHY/MAC CIDs – doc 11-22/576 – Hart (Cisco)
4. CIDs 1034, 2202, 1031, 1310, 1199 (MAC) – Asterjadhi (Qualcomm)
5. CID 1678, 1533, 1487, 1198 – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
6. “MAC – Quick Review” CIDs – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)

Recess

* + 1. No objection
	1. **Review doc 11-22/658r2** – CID 2319 (GEN) –Subir DAS (Peraton Labs)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0658-02-000m-lb258-cid-2319.docx>
		2. CID 2319 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review history of the CID.
			3. Review history of the submission.
			4. Question is if there is support for this topic, which group should it be done in (TGbe or TGme).
			5. Support for feature but may be that TGbe is correct place.
			6. The path forward could be to withdraw the CID and then consider in the future.
			7. Support for EPCS and would like to see this extended in the near future, specifically would like to see it supported in Wi-Fi 6.
			8. Commenter is willing to withdraw the comment and come back with a new comment in the D2.0 timeframe
			9. Proposed Resolution: Rejected – Comment has been withdrawn by the commentor.
			10. Subir DAS requested the following to be added in the minutes: "Members expressed the market need for this feature. Support for this feature was also expressed. It was mentioned that members will work together and bring a proposal during next Letter Ballot. "
	2. **Review doc 11-22/576r10** PHY/MAC CIDs –– Brian HART (Cisco)
		1. CID 1052 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Update Mbps to Mb/S
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1052 (PHY): Revised; Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/576r10 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-10-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>>, for CID 1052, with a change from "Mbps" to "Mb/s"
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1056 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1056 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-15 02:24:37Z): Rejected.Vendor specific functionality is typically supported via SW yet Trigger frames require hard real time operation that makes such SW functionality more challenging.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1058 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1058 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 02:27:03Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/576r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-11-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>>, for CID 1058.;
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1059 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed resolution:
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1059 (MAC) and 2109 (MAC)
			1. Review Comments
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on if some of the changes could be held back for now and considered in the future.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1059 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-15 02:37:38Z): The commenter provides insufficient detail to determine changes would satisfy the comment.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 2109 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-15 02:35:43Z): The commenter provides insufficient detail to determine changes would satisfy the comment.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1062 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 1062 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/576r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-11-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>> for CID 1062
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1067 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed Changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1067 (PHY): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/576r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-11-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>> for CID 1067.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1072 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if this is relevant in all the PHYs.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised: Incorporate the changes in 11-22/576r11 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0576-11-000m-misc-phy-and-lower-level-cids.docx>> for CID 1072.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
			5. We will revisit to ensure that the final change is agreeable (At the conclusion of today’s meeting, the change was reviewed and no objection to the updates in the document. If anything needs further review, it will be part of D2.0 LB).
	3. **Review doc 11-22/936r0** - CIDs 1034, 2202, 1031, 1310, 1199 (MAC) - Alfred ASTERJADHI (Qualcomm)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0936-00-000m-miscellaneous-crs-part-2.docx>
		2. CID 2202 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Discussion in submission.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 2202 (MAC): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0936r0, (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0936-00-000m-miscellaneous-crs-part-2.docx> ) under all headings that include CID 2202.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1034 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review discussion in the submission.
			3. Update to some sentences to clarify the text.
			4. Discussion on details of TWT.
			5. Proposed Resolution: CID 1034 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 02:53:57Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0936r1, (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0936-01-000m-miscellaneous-crs-part-2.docx) under all headings that include CID 1034.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1031 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review Proposed changes.
			3. Discussion on the rational for removing the “physical layer (PHY)”
			4. Discussion on what the adjective should be for the operation elements.
			5. Change from operation elements to element(s) corresponding.
			6. This change had a lot of discussion to identify that the element(s) have both PHY and MAC components.
			7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-15 03:16:34Z) Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0936r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0936-01-000m-miscellaneous-crs-part-2.docx>) under all headings that include CID 1031.
			8. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 1310 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1310 (GEN): Revised. Insert "nontransmitter" before "identifier (ID)" in the clause 3.1 definition.
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		6. CID 1199 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1199 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 03:20:35Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0936r1 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0936-01-000m-miscellaneous-crs-part-2.docx) under all headings that include CID 1199.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **MAC Quick Review** CIDS: Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. CID 1198 (MAC)
			1. We looked at this one on Tuesday but need to have a new resolution prepared. Will be discussed tomorrow.
		2. CID 1178 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The TG could not agree that an unrecognized channel number is necessarily a correctly formed Neighbor AP Information field (and hence would not be conforming), or if that is possible, that this is a special case that needs specific description of normative behavior. There was discussion whether a zero Channel Number should be mentioned as another special case, but that discussion did not reach agreement, either.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 1195 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if Non-HT in 6Ghz was allowed or not.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The TG did not reach agreement to enable use of Non-HT Duplicate group addressed PPDUs in 6 GHz.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1197 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The group could not come to consensus on a set of changes to the draft that would satisfy the commenter. Concerns were raised about clarifying the wording and the polarity of any reuse of the Reserved bit in the BSS Parameters subfield.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1324 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 03:35:41Z) - "For the Short A-MSDU case, an A-MSDU contains only MSDUs whose SAs are all the same, and whose DAs are all the same.": .
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1556 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; the cited table has been deleted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1600 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on change of roaming to BSS transition.
			3. Discussion of the case of the word transition.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-08 22:31:31Z). At (D1.3) P279.24, P610.34… change "roaming" to "BSS transition". At P1312.24 change "roaming" to "performing BSS transition". At P1312.59 change "roaming" to "BSS transitioning". At P3176.41 change "Roaming" to "BSS transition".
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 1690 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-08 22:48:07Z) - Append to the paragraph starting at P1209.6, "When included in a Beacon request with the Data field set to other than 1, it indicates that the requesting STA asks the responding STA not to include such an indication."
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		9. CID 1754 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on where to put the suggested new text.
			3. Should it be in 14.2.3 or 14.2.2?
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-09 19:29:39Z): At 3319.23 add the following paragraph:"An MBSS does not have a BSSID. Any field containing a BSSID contains the MAC address of a particular (originating or target) mesh STA, or the wildcard BSSID where permitted."
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		10. CID 1771 (MAC)
			1. Done this morning.
		11. CID 1797 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 02:12:01Z): At 1179.26, add to the end of the sentence: "that was the source of the Supported Rates andBSS Membership Selectors element or Extended Supported Rates and BSSMembership Selectors element containing this value". Note to commenter: this is the requested change.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		12. CID 1819 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): These bullets are needed to limit the transmission window, in case the ADDBA Response provides a Buffer Size that exceeds the capabilities of a legacy (pre-11ax) peer. There appears to be no normative limitation that the ADDBA Response's Buffer Size is limited per these capabilities, so the limit is needed on the transmission window adaptation, itself.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		13. CID 1659 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): This was discussed in Jan '22 and continued on the reflector. A number of issues were raised that how the classifier is used depends on the usage, for example in the TSPEC of an ADDTS, or in a TFS setup. How an all-zero Classifier Mask is treated needs to be considered in all the possible cases, and make sure the specification is appropriate for all. Likely, Figure 9-364 should be updated as well. And, perhaps some/all of this discussion doesn't belong in clause 9 at all, but should be in a behavior clause.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **Recess 6:00pm HT**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Thursday, September 15, 2022, at 10:30-12:30 HT**
	1. **Called to order** 10:35am HT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions of** other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		2. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		3. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2022 September 802W Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. **See slides 3,** 13-22 in 11-22/1281r2
		3. Call for Patents
			1. No response received.
		4. Review Copyright policies
			1. No items noted.
	5. **Review Agenda** 11-22/1281r7
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-07-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Thursday Sep 15, 10:30am HST

3) Comment Resolution:

1. MAC CID 1198 – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
2. “MAC – Quick Review” CIDs – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)
3. CID 1711 (MAC) – doc 11-22/1352 – Levy (InterDigital)

4) Recess

* + 1. No objection to the proposed agenda
	1. **MAC CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
		1. MAC spreadsheet
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-26-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>
		2. CID 1198 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. No solution for this – Reject rational reviewed.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1198 (MAC) REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-14 03:09:36Z): The group disagreed with the proposed change, the commenter was asked to provide an updated proposed resolution, but no contribution has been received. Some concerns raised were that limiting the size of transmitted PPDUs has the effect of lowering possible throughput. While frame delivery reliability could be increased in 6 GHz, that comes at the expense of preserving the band for high-through and low-latency operations. Use cases that need higher reliability/range/etc. can be moved to 2.4/5 GHz, and leave the 6 GHz band for high-throughput and low latency.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1600 (MAC)
			1. The previous proposed resolution had an extra “…”
			2. Updated Proposed resolution: CID 1600 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-08 22:31:31Z). At (D1.3) P279.24, P610.34 change "roaming" to "BSS transition". At P1312.24 change "roaming" to "performing BSS transition". At P1312.59, P1352.62, P3177.41, P3186.47 change "roaming" to "BSS transitioning". At P2911.64, P2912.15, P3176.41, P3187.2 change "Roaming" to "BSS transition".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 2116 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 2116 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-09 21:13:35Z): Subclause 10.6 contains over 30 pages of normative text that is present in, and relied upon by, implementations. Perhaps this text can be improved, but simply deleting it is not forward progress.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 2086 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review proposed change.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-09 22:12:28Z):

Note to commenter: The exact quotes in the Comment cannot be found. Assuming the issues are at: P3011.35, P3011.56 and P3012.28, respectively (without the extra “Multi-band” before “OCT source parameter”).

Editor: Change these occurrences as (inserting text between '\_'s):

Multi-band peer parameter shall be set to \_a Multi-band element where the value of the Band ID, Channel Number and BSSID fields are set to\_ the value of the \_corresponding fields in the\_ OCT source parameter of the MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive

Multi-band peer parameter shall be set to \_a Multi-band element where the value of the Band ID, Channel Number and BSSID fields are set to\_ the value of the corresponding fields in the\_ OCT source parameter received in the \_corresponding MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive

Multi-band peer parameter set to \_a Multi-band element where the value of the Band ID, Channel Number and BSSID fields are set to\_ the value of the \_corresponding fields in the\_ OCT source parameter of the MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive.

In the Figure "Return path of OCT messages based on OCT parameters", add a footnote on "MBPp (=OSp)", that says, "n - this equivalence is actually a mapping from OCT source parameters to a Multi-band peer parameter, as described in 11.31.5."

Editor: note this is the same resolution as for CID 2085.

* + - 1. Discussion on what the instructions mean. Reviewing the context of the changes.
			2. Review with the Editor the instructions for this CID
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2085 (MAC)
			1. Same comment effectively in CID 2086, so same resolution.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-09 22:12:28Z):

Note to commenter: The exact quotes in the Comment cannot be found. Assuming the issues are at: P3011.35, P3011.56 and P3012.28, respectively (without the extra “Multi-band” before “OCT source parameter”).

Editor: Change these occurrences as (inserting text between '\_'s):

Multi-band peer parameter shall be set to \_a Multi-band element where the value of the Band ID, Channel Number and BSSID fields are set to\_ the value of the \_corresponding fields in the\_ OCT source parameter of the MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive

Multi-band peer parameter shall be set to \_a Multi-band element where the value of the Band ID, Channel Number and BSSID fields are set to\_ the value of the corresponding fields in the\_ OCT source parameter received in the \_corresponding MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive

Multi-band peer parameter set to \_a Multi-band element where the value of the Band ID, Channel Number and BSSID fields are set to\_ the value of the \_corresponding fields in the\_ OCT source parameter of the MLME-OCTunnel.indication primitive.

In the Figure "Return path of OCT messages based on OCT parameters", add a footnote on "MBPp (=OSp)", that says, "n - this equivalence is actually a mapping from OCT source parameters to a Multi-band peer parameter, as described in 11.31.5."

Editor: note this is the same resolution as for CID 2086.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 2321 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the change was concerned on the adding of “shall not” case. Will reschedule for PM1 today to revisit.
			3. ACTION ITEM: Youhan KIM to check with SME and commenter on CID 2321.
			4. Proposed resolution: CID 2321 (MAC): Proposed (can we live with?): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-08 23:33:32Z) - Modify the sentence starting on p2791 line 55 to say "If an AP, IBSS STA, or mesh STA is operating in the 6 GHz band as an indoor AP, standard power AP or indoor standard power AP (see Table E-12), it shall include Transmit Power Envelope element(s) in Beacon and Probe Response frames as follows:".In addition, a new paragraph (without inset) after Note 8 on p2792 as follows: "If an AP, IBSS STA, or mesh STA is operating in the 6 GHz band as a "very low power AP" or "indoor enabled AP" (per the regulatory definitions) (see Table E-12), it shall not set the Maximum Transmit Power Interpretation subfield to regulatory client EIRP or regulatory client EIRP PSD in any Transmit Power Envelope elements that it transmits."
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 2084 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): To make these NOTEs into normative text, they (perhaps) should be moved out of the table, and re-worded as normative text (with specific editing instructions where to put them). Also, there are cross-references within the NOTEs that would need to be repaired.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1991 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The TG concluded (Jan '22) that it would be better to use different phrases, as appropriate in each case, for the different things, rather than a global statement that a single term can mean different things.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 2003 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The TG considered this change (Jan '22) and concluded that the proposed change is insufficient without further investigation to when the standard uses "Ack frame" to (potentially) mean both Ack and Block Ack frames.
			3. Discussion on if we use “Ack frame” where it means both Ack and Block Ack.
			4. With one objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 2336 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. A Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-08 22:40:38Z) - Replace “Nc subfield” in P985L1, P985L4, P985L9, P4197L12, P4199L2, and P4199L6 (6 cases) with “Nc Index subfield”.
			3. Discussion on the context of the proposed changes.
			4. Look at the context of where the field is used.
			5. Concern on changing field name expressed.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 2336 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-15 21:20:39Z): As a convention, we don't change existing field names, especially if the standard is not actually broken.
			7. With One Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 1992 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Determination that more investigation may be warranted.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): The TG reviewed 11-21/0448 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0448-00-000m-miscellaneous-11me-d0-0-issues.pptx) and concluded that more details need to be investigated (including checking ~ 800 instances of "beacon interval" in the standard), and perhaps "beacon period" as well. The proposed change as given is insufficient to result in a consistent resolution.
		7. CID 1718 (MAC)
			1. Already done on Wednesday AM1.
		8. CID 1979 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. The Proposed Change indicates a change in 11-21/829 under CID 340.
			3. Review the proposed change in 11-21/829r10
			4. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0829-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx>
				1. Check for example listed in CID 340.
				2. Request to have another review done.
				3. Add an agenda item in PM1 to review this CID again.
			5. There are significant changes and when compared to D1.4, this would be a technical change potential to be made. Some of the numbering was not aligned with the existing example.
			6. There is another CID 1850 and CID 1849 are related and has mad changes in this area.
			7. Proposed Resolution: CID 1979 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 21:28:58Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0829r10 under "Subsequent alternative proposal, to better match what might actually happen in the field:"
			8. Will discuss later.
		9. CID 2323 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-08-29 23:23:28Z): Document 11-22/0350r2 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0350-02-000m-discussion-of-cid2323.pptx) gives a discussion of why the problem is not really as stated, but rather that due to recent regulatory actions, Table E-12 needs further (and different) generalization.

However, the following points were raised for the proposal in 11-22/0350: Need to ask ANA for the Value assignments in Table-12, but the proposed values are probably good suggestions and will be assigned. Need a definition of C2C. This will use all options in this table, which we should consider very carefully. This information is not protected over-the-air, so what do the "shall" and "shall not" phrases really mean, if the information can be spoofed/modified? Why do we need the AP to signal this information, rather than assume the clients could determine this regulatory information for themselves?

Thus more work is needed in the direction of a more up-to-date resolution.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Review doc 11-22/1352** - CID 1711 (MAC) – Joseph Levy (InterDigital)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1352-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-1711-beacon-report.docx>
		2. Review the CID history.
		3. The document is not complete and so it is preferred to just accept the comment and make the proposed changes.
		4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
		5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	2. **At the end of the approved Agenda** for AM2
		1. Add Doc 11-22/1456 – Dave HALASZ
		2. Add Doc 11-935 – Hiertz
		3. No objection to add these submissions to the agenda for this slot, which are just moving up from the PM1 slot.
	3. **Review doc 11-22/1456r0** Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1456-00-000m-cid-1444.docx>
		2. CID 1444 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission notes and proposed changes.
			3. Changes to the submission was made to bring in line with editor guidelines (ANA changed to XXX for example).
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 1444 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 21:47:52Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/1456r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1456-01-000m-cid-1444.docx>), which makes change in the direction proposed by the commenter.;
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	4. **Review Doc 11-935r2** – Guido HIERTZ (Ericsson)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0935-02-000m-resolution-for-cid-1466.docx>
		2. CID 1466 (MAC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Note an error was noted in presentation, so an R3 will be posted.
				1. Missing “the STA” was added.
			3. Proposed resolution: CID 1466 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 22:02:38Z): Incorporate the changes shown in 11-22/0935r3 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0935-03-000m-resolution-for-cid-1466.docx).
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	5. **Return to visit CID 1979 (MAC)**
		1. CID 1979 (MAC)
			1. We have received feedback that the proposed change in the document is good. So, the resolution is good.
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 1979 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 21:28:58Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0829r10 under "Subsequent alternative proposal, to better match what might actually happen in the field:"
			3. An Update to the proposed resolution has been prepared in an updated document put into 11-22/353r10.
			4. ACTION ITEM: Mark RISON to post R10 for review by Jouni and others.
			5. Discussion on what the new changes to the last two examples.
			6. It may be better to wait for D2.0 to update the examples.
			7. An update to the document will need to be posted and Jouni will review, and we can discuss in PM1 today.
	6. **SEC CIDS:**
		1. CID 1679 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. This was discussed in March Plenary.
			3. Discussion on updating the grammar.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-09-15 22:23:49Z) - Change "receipt of this primitive shall have no effect" to "receipt of this primitive shall have no effect except updating the RSC(s) when they are greater than those currently stored"
			5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		2. CID 1898 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. This comment has been discussed before, the proposed change was not accepted as presented, and a rejection has been created.
			3. Dissuasion on what detail needed to be included in the resolution to describe what the TG was opposed to.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2022-09-15 22:32:15Z) - The TG reviewed the Comment and Proposed Change and concluded that the Proposed Change could not be accepted, as the issue raised is of broader scope than the resolution. The TG consensus was that a submission was required. However, no submission was provided.
			5. With one Objection – Mark Ready for Motion. – Request to be a separate motion.
	7. **Recess at 12:31 pm HT**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Thursday, September 15, 2022, at 13:30-15:30 HT**
	1. **Called to order** 1:30pm HT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions** of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2022 September 802W Interim.
	4. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-02-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. **See slides 3,** 13-22 in 11-22/1281r2
		3. Call for Patents
			1. No response received.
		4. Review Copyright policies
			1. No items noted.
	5. **Review Agenda** 11-22/1281r8
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1281-08-000m-revme-agenda-september-2022-session.pptx>
		2. Add CID 2018 (similar to 2017)
		3. Add CID 1646 (Similar 1647)
		4. No objection to the updated agenda.
	6. **Withdrawn CIDs:**
		1. Withdrawn CIDs

1326, 1339 (GEN),

1265, 1262, 1257, 1253, 1252, 1251, 1250, 1711 (MAC)

* + - 1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; Commenter Withdrew comment.
			2. Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. CID 1888 (MAC)
		1. See doc 11-22/1449
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1449-00-000m-cid-1888.docx>
		3. The Assignee is Dave H.
		4. The removal of the table was not reasonable.
		5. Discussion for what a reasonable rejection would be.
		6. Proposed Resolution: CID 1888 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-15 23:41:28Z): The proposed resolution would leave existing implementations with no ability to be compliant. A more specific set of changes was not reached in off-line discussion.
		7. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	2. **Review doc 11-22/1492** – CID 2215 – Pascal VIGER (Canon)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1492-02-000m-resolution-for-lb258-cid2215.docx>
		2. CID 2215 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review context in the draft.
			3. Review discussion in submission.
			4. Discussion on not wanting to have Note 3 deleted or to add new text that would make existing devices non-compliant, provided a reason for not proceeding.
			5. The commenter agreed to take the comment topic to TGbe for further discussion.
			6. Proposed Resolution: CID 2215: REJECTED (MAC: 2022-09-15 23:53:18Z): The commenter has withdrawn the comment.
			7. Mark Ready for Motion
	3. Review CID 1979 (MAC)
		1. Review 11-22/353r10
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		3. R9 was posted, r10 was not on Mentor
		4. Objection raised for presentation of document that was not posted as the ACTION ITEM from the earlier Meeting slot requested that R10 be posted.
		5. Discussion on the example that was emailed to Jouni for review, some additional changes to the example were identified.
		6. Discussion on if requiring posting of material before presenting was being applied equitably.
		7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2022-09-15 21:28:58Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-22/0353r10 (https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0353-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d0-0-cc35.docx) under CID 1979.
		8. With Three objections - -Mark Ready for Motion.
	4. **Change of Chair** to Mark HAMILTON
	5. **Review SEC CIDs** – Michael MONTEMURRO
		1. See excel file 11-22/105r17:
		2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0105-17-000m-revme-lb258-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
		3. CID 1809 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review the history of the comment.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2022-09-16 00:10:28Z) - Relative to D1.3 at 3141.47, change"the group that was rejected shall be appended, after the rejected groups from previous attempts if any, to the Rejected Groups field of the Rejected Groups element, if not already present there"to"the group that was rejected shall be appended, after the rejected groups from previous attempts if any, to the ordered list of rejected groups, if not already present there, and a Rejected Groups element (see 9.4.2.246 (Rejected Groups element)) shall be included, containing the ordered list of rejected groups";
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 1684 (SEC)
			1. Review comment history.
			2. No change has been identified for now that would work.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2022-09-16 00:12:26Z) - The TG reviewed the Comment and Proposed Change and concluded that the Proposed Change could not be accepted. The TG consensus was that a submission was required. However, no submission was provided. The concern was that more changes were needed.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 1953 (SEC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Move to Comment group Submission Required in SEC.
			3. This will be rejected for Insufficient details with similar CIDs.
		6. CID 1952 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review Comment history
			3. Discussion on what the rejection rational should be.
			4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2022-09-16 00:20:49Z) - The TG reviewed the Comment and Proposed Change and concluded that the Proposed Change could not be accepted. The concern was that CID 1952 and 1953 were related and required a harmonized set of changes. The TG consensus was that a submission was required, however no submission was provided.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 1843 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the proposed Changes
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. **Change of Chair** to Michael MONTEMURRO
	7. CID 2321 (MAC)
		1. Review Comment and history
		2. Discussion on the need to address this CID now. The Commenter has agreed to the rejection reason being proposed.
		3. Proposed resolution: REJECTEDThere have been more updates to the regulatory situation since the submission of the comment. More review is required on the relevant regulatory rules before making updates to the IEEE 802.11 standard (if any).
		4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	8. **GEN CIDS** – Notes taken by Stephen MCCANN – THANKS
	9. **Review doc 11-22/0067r21** – Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm) [11-22-0067r21]
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-21-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>
		2. CID 2167 (GEN Quick Review)
			1. It was discussed that a reject is the appropriate response.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-16 00:34:56Z) The Proposed Change does not leave complete sentences
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 2038 (GEN Quick Review)
			1. The discussion mentioned that the locations were not mentioned for this comment.
			2. Chair: I will investigate how to handle invalid comments from the IEEE-SA rules.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2022-09-16 00:47:00Z) - In REVme D1.4: P865L21, add “aCMMGPPMinListeningTime”.

P867L28, add a row with “aCMMGPPMinListeningTime | Integer | The minimum time (in microseconds) CMMG STA moves to and stays in listening mode”.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		1. CID 1858 (GEN No Consensus)
			1. The discussion mentioned that a broad statement as mentioned in the comment, is not a good thing.
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-16 00:52:50Z) Specific changes to specific locations would be a more appropriate path forward. A broad statement might lend itself to future conflicts in the standard. Another example for not accepting the CID is that you cannot activate frame exchange sequences in the hybrid coordinator, for example.
			3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. CID 1770 (GEN No Consensus)
			1. The location is P1008
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-16 01:08:05Z) The TG reviewed the locations of "multicast group" in the standard as noted in the comment. There was disagreement on if the multicast address vs multicast group address being either synonymous or distinct. References to 802.1Q may be a better place to reference.
			3. 1 objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		3. CID 1891 (GEN No Consensus)
			1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-16 01:16:29Z) The condition of "not present otherwise" is not always a condition just because a statement is indicating "when is present". This change could also make existing implementations non-compliant.
			2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. The following CIDs were briefly checked for insufficient detail:
			1. CID 2114 (GEN insufficient detail)
			2. CID 1472 (GEN insufficient detail)
			3. CID 1706 (GEN insufficient detail)
			4. CID 1805 (GEN insufficient detail)
			5. CID 1882 (GEN insufficient detail)
			6. CID 1999 (GEN insufficient detail)
			7. CID 2061 (GEN insufficient detail)
			8. CID 2126 (GEN insufficient detail)
			9. CID 2127 (GEN insufficient detail)
			10. CID 1269 (GEN insufficient detail)
			11. CID 2039 (GEN insufficient detail)
			12. CID 1303 (GEN insufficient detail)
			13. CID 1302 (GEN insufficient detail)
			14. CID 1300 (GEN insufficient detail)
			15. CID 1316 (GEN insufficient detail)
			16. CID 2221 (GEN insufficient detail)
			17. CID 1148 (GEN insufficient detail)
			18. The resolution to all of these is: The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
			19. Mark All - Ready for motion
		5. CID 1149 (GEN insufficient detail)
			1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2022-09-16 01:27:44Z) There is a reference to EN 301 893 in Clause 2.
			2. Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 2035 (GEN insufficient detail) moved to GEN Review
	1. **Recess 3:30pm HT**
1. **TGme (REVme) Mixed-mode –Thursday, September 15, 2022, at 16:00-18:00 HT**
	1. **Called to order** 16:01 pm HT by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Introductions** of other Officers present:
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel)
		4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **Remember that Registration** is required for this meeting and all the meetings this week as part of the 2022 September 802W Interim.
	4. **Participation Guidelines, Patent Policy, and Copyright Policies reminders**
		1. No Issues noted.
	5. **Review 11-22/353r10** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-10-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. CID 2187 (MAC)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review history and rational for rejection.
			3. Proposed resolution:
			4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CIDs 1985, 1986, 1535, 1419 (MAC), and 1536 (EDITOR):
			1. Review comments
			2. Review proposed changes.
			3. Straw poll: Shall we:
				1. Resolve the comments as in 11-22/353r10
				2. Reject the comment (for reason)
			4. Results: 4/9/0/3
			5. Discussion on if the reject resolution addresses the individual comments.
			6. Proposed Resolution 1: REJECTEDThe group is not confident that the proposed text change is not causing any behavior changes to the backoff procedure.
			7. Proposed Resolution 2: TGme could not agree the proposed resolution and desired to have additional discussion on this comment.
			8. This will be the resolution for only CIDs: CIDs 1985, 1986, 1535, 1419. (CID 1536 is already resolved, and there's no reason to "undo" that.)
			9. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The group is not confident that the proposed text change is not causing any behavior changes to the backoff procedure. TGme could not agree the proposed resolution and desired to have additional discussion on this comment.
			10. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	6. CID 1362 (MAC)
		1. Review comment history
		2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.
		3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	7. CID 2018 and 1646 (MAC)
		1. Review document 11-22/996
		2. Proposed Resolution: CID 2018 - REVISEDNote to commenter:Resolution below defines TXSTATUS for Clause 23.Instruction to TGme Editor:Implement the proposed text updates for CID 2017 in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-06-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx(NOTE – This is the same text change as for CID 2017.)
		3. Proposed Resolution: CID 1646 REVISEDNote to Commenter:Please see discussion on this topic in under CID 1647 https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0990-10-000m-lb258-misc-cids.docx .Instruction to TGme Editor:Add the following at D1.3 P4028L35 and P4031L42 (NOTE – This is the same text change as for CID 1647):“All numeric fields are transmitted in unsigned format, LSB first.”
		4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	8. CID 1654/1655 (MAC)
		1. From the June Minutes:

6.8.3 CID 1655 (MAC)

6.8.3.1 Review comment

6.8.3.2 Discuss the proposed change.

6.8.3.3 Look to get some more input from a DMG expert.

6.8.3.4 Assign to Mark RISON – Submission required.

6.8.3.5 Not same comment similar proposed change to CID 1654.

6.8.3.6 ACTION ITEM #7: Dave HALASZ to talk with Dave GOODALL and report back to Mark RISON on the details of CID 1655 and CID 1654

6.8.4 CID 1654 (MAC)

6.8.4.1 Review Comment

6.8.4.2 Submission Required – See CID 1655

* + 1. Proposed Resolution: Rejection reason for CID 1654 & 1655.S1G uses System information update procedure (section 10.46.2) to minimize the size of the S1G Beacon. The proposed change "A QoS STA shall use the EDCA Parameter Set Update Count subfield(11ax) in the QoS Capability element of Beacon, S1G Beacon ..." defeats the purpose of the System information update procedure and unnecessarily grows the size of the S1G Beacon. For this reason, CID 1654 and CID 1655 are rejected.
		2. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	1. **Stand at Ease for 20 minutes (until 5:10)**
		1. Reconvene – 5:17pm
	2. **Motions:** 11-22/56r22:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0056-22-000m-revme-motions.pptx>
		2. **Motion #81– ED1, ED2, GEN, MAC, PHY, SEC CIDs (2022-09-15)**
			1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

“Motion-EDITOR1-1L" (10 CIDs) in 11-22/0073r15 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-15-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>),

“Motion ED2-258-14" (3 CIDs) in 11-22/0064r16 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0064-16-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments-on-working-group-letter-ballots.xlsx>),

“GEN Motion Sept A" (22 CIDs) and “GEN Withdrawn” (1 CIDs) in 11-22/0067r23 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-23-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>),

“Motion MAC-AW” (27 CIDs), “Motion MAC-AX” (17), “Motion MAC Withdrawn” (15), and “Motion MAC-AY” (7) in 11-21/0793r29 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-29-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>),

“PHY Motion M” tab (15 CIDs) in 11-21/0727r17 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-17-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>),

“Security Motion M” tab (10 CIDs) in 11-21/0105r18 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0105-18-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>),

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.
 Moved: Stephen MCCANN

* + - 1. Seconded: Mark HAMILTON
			2. **Results Motion #81**: Unanimous – Motion passes.
		1. **Motion #82 – GEN, MAC, SEC CIDs insufficient details (2022-09-15)**
			1. Resolve the following CIDs in the

“GEN Insufficient detail" (18 CIDs) in 11-22/0067r23 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-23-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>),

“Motion MAC Insufficient detail” (53 CIDs) in 11-21/0793r29 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-29-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>) ,

“Insufficient details” tab (76 CIDs) in 11-21/0105r16 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0105-16-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>),

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Mark RISON
			2. Second: Jon ROSDAHL
			3. **Results Motion #82:** Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #83 – GEN, MAC, SEC CIDs insufficient details (2022-09-15)**
			1. Resolve the following CIDs in the

“ED1 Submission Required" (29 CIDs) in 11-22/0073r15 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-15-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>),

“ED2 Submission Required" (47 CIDs) in 11-22/0064r16 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0064-16-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments-on-working-group-letter-ballots.xlsx>),

“PHY Motion M3” tab (39 CIDs) in 11-21/0727r17 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-17-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>),

With the resolution: “REJECTED - The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.”

* + - 1. Moved: Emily Qi
			2. Seconded: Edward Au
			3. **Results Motion #83:** Unanimous Consent – Motion Passes
		1. **Motion #84 - Motion 84 – No Submission (2022-09-15)**
			1. Resolve the following CIDs in the

“PHY Motion M2” tab (6 CIDs) in 11-21/0727r17 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-17-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls>),

“No Consensus” tab (2 CIDs) in 11-21/0105r16 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0105-16-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>).

* + - 1. Moved: Daniel Borges
			2. Seconded: Stephen McCann
			3. Discussion: Objection was made to CID 1981, 2240, and 1133 resolutions.
				1. A Request for Abstain was made.
			4. Run the WebEx Straw poll to collect the count:
				1. Results: 5 y, 1 n, 3 a
				2. Motion Passes.
			5. **Result Motion #84: 5 – Yes; 1 – No; 3 - Abstain. Motion passes.**
		1. **Motion #85 SEC CID 1989 (2022-09-15)**
			1. Resolve the following CIDs in the “SEC – CID 1898” tab (1 CIDs) in 11-21/0105r16 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0105-16-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>).
			2. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
			3. Second: Jon ROSDAHL
			4. **Results Motion #85**: Approved with 1 No Vote.
		2. **Motion** – **Recirculation**
			1. Having approved comment resolutions for all the comments received from LB 258 on REVme D1.0 as contained in documents<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0065-11-000m-revme-wg-ballot-comments.xls>,<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0073-15-000m-revme-wg-lb258-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>,

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0064-16-000m-revme-editor2-ad-hoc-comments-on-working-group-letter-ballots.xlsx>,<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0067-23-000m-gen-adhoc-revme-wg-lb258-comments.xlsx>,<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0793-29-000m-revme-mac-comments.xls>,[https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-17-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls,](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0727-17-000m-revme-phy-comments.xls%2C)<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0105-18-000m-revme-cc35-sec-comments.xlsx>,<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0056-23-000m-revme-motions.pptx>, Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 2.0 incorporating these resolutions and,Approve a 20 day Working Group Recirculation Ballot asking the question “Should REVme D2.0 be forwarded to Sponsor Ballot?

* + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL
			2. Second: Stephen MCCANN
			3. Discussion on the length of the ballot.
			4. Many would like more than 15, many would like less than 25, some wanted 20, some felt that the difference would not be that impactful.
			5. **Recirculation Motion Result**: 10 – Yes; 0 – No; 0 – Abstain
	1. **Motion:** **December AdHoc**
		1. Approve a TGme ad-hoc meeting on December 5-7, 2022, in Piscataway, NJ or New York area location for the purpose of REVme comment resolution and consideration of document submissions.
		2. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
		3. 2nd: Emily QI
		4. No objection - Unanimous – Motion Passes.
	2. **Adjourn 6pm HT**

**References:**