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Abstract

Minutes for 802.11 REVme AdHoc (802.11me) at the Huawei office in Toronto, ON.

1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc - Toronto –Tuesday, October 10, 2023, at 9:15-12:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 10:05 am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
		1. There was a delay for technical difficulties.
	2. **Thanks to Huawei and Edward Au for hosting us this week in Toronto.**
	3. **Introductions of other Officers present:**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung) - Remote
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel) – Remote
		4. Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	4. **IMAT Reported attendance:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 3 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 5 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 6 | Li, Xin | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 7 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 10 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 11 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 12 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues noted.
	2. **Review Agenda:** 11-23/1694r0:
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-00-000m-revme-october-2023-AdHoc-agenda.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-00-000m-revme-october-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx)
		2. Proposed Agenda:AM1 – 09:15-12:00 ET
			1. doc 11-23/1701 – Montemurro (Huawei)
			2. doc 11-23/1734 – McCann (Huawei)
			3. doc 11-21/772 – Montemurro (Huawei)
			4. Clause 4 PHY descriptions - Montemurro (Huawei)
		3. Discussion on what documents may be available today.
		4. No objection to the proposed agenda.
	3. **Editor Report - Emily QI (Intel)**
		1. We have rolled in 11az.
		2. Draft 4.1 is ready to post after the SA Ballot closes.
		3. Solutions for updating Clause 6 to new format is in progress.
	4. **Review doc 11-23/1701r0:** Michael Montemurro (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1701-00-000m-power-management-terminology-cleanup.docx>
		2. Abstract: This contribution addresses issues describing power management behavior in the 802.11 baseline.
		3. Review Submission
		4. Discussion on if the changes are a bit wordy, or if it was better to be very clear.
		5. Suggestion to change from “to transition from doze to awake state” to “transition to awake state”.
		6. Another alternative would be rather than change all the “Awake” locations, put a single definition in clause 1 stating that “Awake” means transition to awake state.
		7. Due to other uses of “Awake” by Wakeup Radio for example, we cannot do the global definition.
		8. Change at 1756.43 – delete “and” also needed. And added “transition from doze to awake state”.
		9. Review context. The need for “STAs that wake up”. As this is in Clause 9, it does not need it. Further, you don’t really need to say wake up or receive. Maybe best path to delete the sentence all together.
		10. Michael will make the change from from “to transition from doze to awake state” to “transition to awake state” later so as not making the changes real-time.
		11. Discussion on 2398 – change to plural.
		12. Mark RISON offered to run his PDF tools to ensure we have not missed any. Michael and Mark to get together.
		13. Review Sleep conditions.
		14. Review 2094 location – Transition is indicated, not a stable sleep state.
		15. Rewording was done to make the sentence better, but still not great.
		16. Michael will make an R1.
		17. Aso there is a need to change “doze/awake” to “awake/doze”.
	5. **Review Doc 11-23/1734r0** – Sephen MCCAAN – (Huawwei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1734-00-000m-annex-r-comment-resolution.docx>
		2. Proposed changes to the Annex R. Checked or instances of woman or man and make it “person”.
		3. Review Submission
		4. Question about “Man-in-the-middle”? Need to followup, but not part of this document.
	6. Discussion on what to do next:
		1. Stephen noted that he had two other documents for later – 1735 and 1736.
		2. Stand at ease for 10 minutes.
		3. No objection to adjust agenda to review doc 11-21/773r1:
	7. **Review doc 11-21/773r1** – Michael Montemurro (Huawei)
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0772-01-000m-eapol-key-notation-cid-548.docx>
		2. Review submission.
		3. Suggestion to just use the nominal structure in the draft.
		4. Discussion on which format would be better to adopt.
		5. Review 12.7.2 for context.
		6. Discussion on how to Address the way to explain the element and what it carries.
		7. Discussion on format of the variable descriptions and the formulas.

* 1. No objection to change agenda to review some potential Clause 4 changes.
	2. **Clause 4 discussion** – Michael Montemurro
		1. Review context of the need to make the changes.
		2. The issue is that we may have the same information in the PICS, and so we do need to double specify it.
		3. Discussion of how to summarize the new features included in the new amendments.
		4. Is a list or worded paragraph needed.
		5. Some Clauses (see Clause 19) has included this list of mandatory and optional features.
		6. Suggestion that the summary of Mandatory and optional Features at the start of each PHY Clause should not be touched, but the changes in Clause 4 may be desirable, but not feasible to find consensus on what can reduced.
		7. While it may be hard, it may be possible to clean up Clause 4.
		8. It should be descriptive and not just lists, and avoid any normative language being added.
		9. We should not have multiple descriptions of the same feature.
	3. **Recess at 11:42am.**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc - Toronto –Tuesday, October 10, 2023, at 13:00-17:00 ET PM**
	1. **Called to order** 13:01 ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Attendance Reminder -**
		1. **IMAT Reported attendance:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 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 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 7 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 8 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 9 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 10 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 11 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues noted.
	2. **Review Ballot Status and Agenda for today:**
		1. The SA ballot is still not closed, so we will continue with ad hoc documents/comments, in anticipation of the SA comments.
		2. Proposed Agenda: PM1 – 1:00 -15:00 ET
			1. doc 11-23/1736 – McCann (Huawei)
			2. doc 11-23/1735 – McCann (Huawei)
			3. Recess
		3. No Objection
	3. **Review doc 11-23/1736:** Stephen McCann, Huawei
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1736-00-000m-gas-fragmentation-description.pptx>
		2. This is a proposal for how request messages can be fragmented.
		3. Noted that <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1735-00-000m-gas-query-request-fragmentation.docx> has the detailed changes along the lines presented in the PPT.
		4. Review of GAS, for those that could use a reminder.
		5. Noted that GAS response messages can already be fragmented.
		6. Noted that there is a feature of GAS to allow the AP to wait a short time, to receive multiple (similar) requests, and send a single group-addressed response.
		7. Q: Can any device receive a GAS Response, without regard to whether it is that STA’s request? A: Technically, yes, but the point of the group-addressed response is to explicitly facilitate optimizing the response.
		8. Noted that GAS Comeback is used for fragmenting a GAS Response, currently, putting the fragments into GAS Comeback Response frames.
		9. Proposal is to use GAS Comeback Request message to carry fragments of a GAS Request.
		10. C: On slide 5 (the protocol details of the proposal), suggest adding a Response to Fragment 3 in the Request flow, so that the Requesting STA gets an immediate response that the fragment was received and the request is being forwarded to the Advertisement Server. Otherwise, there could be a long delay before the Requesting STA can realize that the Fragment 3 Request message was not received correctly.
		11. Q: Is this planned for group addressed processing? A: Currently, this is only for individually addressed.
		12. C: Note that fragmentation is not supported for GAS Responses that are group-addressed, either.
		13. Switched to review of the detailed text in the Word doc (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1735-00-000m-gas-query-request-fragmentation.docx>)
		14. C: Query Request Length field needs to be noted as optional. R: Agreed.
		15. C: There is some concern that the GAS Query Fragment ID field should be an IE. Where is the length of this field specified? If we add a length for this field, we are effectively adding an IE, for the Fragment ID. C: With that as an IE, the frame remains being extensible.
		16. Caught some editorial suggestions.
		17. Q: Is there a way for the AP to know how big the overall request will eventually be, early in the exchange, so it can provide the “Request too large” error code (before the non-AP STA has sent a whole bunch of the request)? A: That seems to be missing. But it seems to be missing from the Response fragmentation, also. Need to look into this.
		18. Q: 9.4.1.31 “… Fragment ID field” is “set to the same value” (or some value), do we mean all 8 bits, or just the 7 bits with the number? Suggest using a more specific name to be clear.
		19. Q: Is there an indication from the Requesting STA that the Initial Request is not complete, and that this Comeback interchange will follow? A: In the current (Response) fragmentation, there is a status code in the Initial Response to indicate that the Response will be fragmented, and the Requester should do the Comeback exchange. We need something similar here, for the fragmented Request, to indicate that the Request is known to be incomplete and will be carried in a Comeback exchange.
		20. C: Not sure what “shall not be split” in the clause 12 text is trying to say. C: Suggest instead just say the Initial Request/Response shall not include a fragment.
		21. Discussion about whether to introduce a subclause for the Request fragmentation procedure. General agreement that we do need to split into subclauses. Discussion about what the subclauses should be/how to split the concepts most readily.
		22. Noted that the current MIB includes a lot of “statistical” attributes about GAS, but those don’t seem useful to be expanded to cover this Request fragmentation.
		23. Q: Should the Length Limit say “maximum limit enforced is \_contained\_ or “constrained”?
		24. Q: Does the “…Activated” MIB attribute need to be bi-directional (between non-AP STA and AP, when those are the peers)? R: It seems simpler to leave it that way.
		25. Q: Is an MLME change needed for this? R: In the new clause 6 update, there is nothing for fragmentation of the Response, so don’t think it is needed on the Request.
		26. C: The last MIB attribute needs a DEFVAL.
		27. With that feedback, the author is appreciative, and will work further off-line, and bring this back.
	4. Nothing else ready for today. It appears the SA ballot will close and run through the processing overnight. We’ll pick back up with that information, tomorrow.
	5. **Recess 3:30pm**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc - Toronto –Wednesday, October 11, 2023, at 9:15-12:00 ET**
	1. **Called to order** 9:40 am ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **Thanks to Huawei and Edward Au for hosting us this week in Toronto.**
	3. **Introductions of other Officers present:**
		1. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
		2. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung) - Remote
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel) – Remote
		4. Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	4. **IMAT Reported attendance:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 3 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 5 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 6 | Li, Xin | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 7 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 9 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 10 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 11 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 12 | Qi, Emily | Intel |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues noted.
	2. **Review Agenda:** 11-23/1694r1:
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-01-000m-revme-october-2023-AdHoc-agenda.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-01-000m-revme-october-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx)
		2. Discussion on what documents may be available today.
		3. Discussion on what we can do initially today with the new comments available.
		4. No objection to the proposed agenda
	3. **Editor Report** Emily QI (Intel)
		1. Working on distribution of the Comments to the AdHoc Chairs
		2. Comment file is 11-23/1742r0
			1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1742-00-000m-revme-sa-ballot-comments.xls>
	4. **Ballot Review** Emily QI (Intel)
		1. Received 606 Comments
		2. Want to Complete Comment Processing and Recirc February.
		3. There is an AdHoc in Piscataway Dec 7-8 (Thur-Friday).
	5. **Stand at Ease from 9:50 to 10:03** to allow Emily to parse database parts to AdHoc Chairs.
	6. **Reconvene at 10:03.**
	7. **Comment Processing** - Start with looking at random CIDs –
		1. Primarily MISC CIDs to reassign to other AdHoc Groups.
		2. CID 6420 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on if we want to make the change, and then decide if it is implementable as stated.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required.
		3. CID 6570 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on locating the issue.
			3. Move to GEN AdHoc
			4. Need expert input to ensure proper resolution.
			5. Assign to Mark RISON
			6. Mark Submission Required
		4. CID 6569 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to SEC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		5. CID 6565 (MISC
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		6. CID 6564 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		7. CID 6563 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to SEC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		8. CID 6562 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to SEC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
			5. Note that this is related to CID 6563.
		9. CID 6556 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		10. CID 6552 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. One instance was given, proposed to resolve CID with this one change.
			3. There may be only 10 instances.
			4. Review context of Figures.
			5. The concept is to drop listing the fields, and review to the figure listing the fields.
			6. Discussion on the direction of the proposed change.
			7. Need to allow “comprised of” or “composed of” in general, but maybe only in the PPDU cases.
			8. Need to provide location and specific changes.
			9. Move to PHY AdHoc
			10. Assign to Stephen MCCANN
			11. Mark More Work Required
			12. Schedule for November Plenary
		11. CID 6537 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		12. CID 6532 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		13. CID 6531 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
			5. Note Old Comment resolved previously.
		14. CID 6529 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		15. CID 6522 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Related to CID 6529 (GEN) also related to 6065 (MAC)
			3. Move to MAC AdHoc
			4. Need to move CID 6529 (GEN) to MAC also.
			5. Assign to Mark RISON
			6. Mark Submission Required
		16. CID 6519 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		17. CID 6515 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required

* + 1. CID 6514 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6512 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		3. CID 6499 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Identifies CIDs from 11md (prior to 2020).
			3. Move to MAC AdHoc
			4. Assign to Mark RISON
			5. Mark Submission Required
		4. CID 6487 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		5. CID 6467 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Youhan KIM
			4. Mark Submission Required
		6. CID 6461 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
			5. Suggested to contact Solomon, Payam, or Carlos.
		7. CID 6456 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required

* + 1. CID 6439 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6433 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to SEC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		3. CID 6432 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		4. 6430 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		5. CID 6429 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		6. CID 6428 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		7. CID 6418 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required

* + 1. CID 6403 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6402 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on where the reference is to be included.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Add "(see 12.2.6)" after "The Protected Frame subfield" at 586.60.
			4. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion.
			5. Move to GEN AdHoc for motion.
		3. CID 6401 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark More Work Required
			5. Schedule for Wednesday, Oct 11 PM meeting.
		4. CID 6385 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		5. CID 6374 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		6. CID 6373 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		7. 6358 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		8. CID 6348 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Bryan HART
			4. Mark Submission Required

* + 1. CID 6344 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6337 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MISC: 2023-10-11 15:27:38Z) The changes to satisfy the commenter are not identified.
			3. Move to GEN AdHoc
			4. Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6331 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		4. CID 6327 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to SEC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		5. CID 6320 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required

* + 1. CID 6271 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6270 (MISC):
			1. Move to MAC AdHoc
			2. Assign to Mark RISON
			3. Mark Submission Required

* + 1. CID 6269 (MISC):
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to MAC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6268 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. We would not like to have a global exchange, but rather look at context.
			3. Move to GEN AdHoc
			4. Assign to Mark RISON
			5. Mark More Work Required
			6. Schedule for Wednesday, Oct 11 PM meeting.
		3. CID 6256 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to GEN AdHoc
			3. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
			4. Mark More Work Required
			5. Schedule for Nov 6 Telecon
		4. CID 6171 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the history of this CID.
			3. Discussion on the Proposed Change and discussed the ramifications.
			4. Review Minutes from July 2023

1.11.2. CID 4341 (MAC)

1.11.2.1. Review Comment.

1.11.2.2. Review submission discussion on proposed changes.

1.11.2.3. Discussion on what parameter dependent-ness”

1.11.2.4. Discussion on what happens in a BlockAck reception.

1.11.2.5. What can be modified when you get a BlockAck Agreement.?

1.11.2.6. What can be modified in later d

1.11.2.7. Straw poll

 What can be changed when a BA agreement is modified?

A) Timeout only.

B) Timeout and Buffer Size only.

C) Any parameter?

D) Nothing?

1.11.2.7.1. Results: A1 B2 C4 D4 (No Answer) 13

1.11.2.8. Concern on changes that will affect existing devices and what the impact was.

1.11.2.9. Discussion on what Any parameter can be changed.

1.11.2.10. Discussion on how to find a resolution.

1.11.2.11. If we undid the change CID 3172 which caused the conflict, and this could be a simple resolution to CID 4341.

1.11.2.12. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Revert the changes made by CID 3172.

1.11.2.13. Alternate Proposal: REVISED -- In 9.6.4.1 delete “(#3172)When Block Ack operation is modified, only the timeout can be changed.”

1.11.2.14. No Objection – Mark the Alternate Proposal as Ready for Motion.

* + - 1. Discussion on path forward.
			2. Need an updated submission that provides technical justification for a change to be made.
			3. Move to MAC AdHoc
			4. Assign to Mark RISON
			5. Mark More work required.
			6. Schedule for November 2023 Plenary.
		1. CID 6118 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to PHY AdHoc
			3. Assign to Joseph LEVY
			4. Mark Submission Required
		2. CID 6086 (MISC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Move to SEC AdHoc
			3. Assign to Jouni MAILINEN
			4. Mark Submission Required
		3. That Completes all the MISC Comments.
	1. **Recess at 11:54 am**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc - Toronto –Wednesday, October 11, 2023, at 13:00-15:00 ET – PM1**
	1. **Called to order** 1:03pm ET 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) - Remote
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel) – Remote
		4. Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **IMAT Reported attendance:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 3 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 4 | Li, Xin | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 5 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 7 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 8 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 9 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 10 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 11 | Qi, Emily | Intel |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues noted.
	2. **Review Agenda:** 11-23/1694r1:
		1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-01-000m-revme-october-2023-AdHoc-agenda.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-01-000m-revme-october-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx)

* + 1. Proposed Agenda:

PM1 – 13:00 -15:00 ET

a. CID 6268 – Rison (Samsung)

b. CID 6401 – Rison (Samsung)

c. ED1 CIDs – Qi (Intel)

5. PM2 – 15:15-17:00 ET

a. CID 6401 – Rison (Samsung)

b. ED1 CIDs – Qi (Intel)

6. Recess

* + 1. Add ED1 CIDS to PM2
		2. No Objection to the proposed Agenda:
	1. Review CID 6268 (MAC) – Mark RISON
		1. Review Comment
		2. Start to walk through each of the 16 instances.
		3. At p282.58 – discussion on what the change should be, not clear what change would be correct. – Mark HAMILTON to check on proposed wording.
		4. At p311.59 – This instance just seems wrong and should be changed. Mark HAMILTON said he would supply a proposed change.
			1. Discussion on the flow of information in the system.
			2. Rewriting the sentence is going to be most complete.
		5. At p314.5 – This is in MAC Privacy, and this sentence states that a MAC address is selected.
			1. Change “defines the addressing of its MAC layer” to “selects a MAC Address”.
		6. At p322.23 and p322.29 – Similar to first on, Mark HAMILTON to provide suggested text.
		7. At p693.31 – Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		8. At p2340.44 - Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”. And add “a” to “UNITDTA”
		9. At p2341 – Figure 10-166 – Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		10. At p2459.52 – Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		11. At 2536.51 - Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		12. At 2578.13 – Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		13. At p4450.8 - Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		14. At p5705.8 - Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC”.
		15. At 5757.31 - Should change from “MAC layer” to “MAC sublayer”.
	2. Review CID 6401 (GEN)
		1. Review Comment
		2. From Proposed changes: Make the changes highlighted in red under CIDs 1397/1398/1794 in 22/0353r10
		3. Reviewed document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		4. The Standard should define, not assume something.
		5. There are examples that should not be change see page 329.
		6. Why is “assume” so bad? In some cases, the change is not needed.
		7. Discussion on the proposed change that uses “ensure” which is not to be used.
		8. Rewording the sentence to use “shall” is thought to not be correct either.
		9. 353.25 - Suggested new sentence.: In order for the MAC to operate properly, the DS needs to meet the MSDU (object) …”
		10. 2927.51 – Discussion on whether you can put requirements on the implementation specifics.
			1. Lack of support for a change in this area.
			2. Remove the added “shall” changes the later part to more informative.
			3. Discussion on what value the HESSID should be required to be.
			4. The Deletion of the Note that had “assumes” was in the reason for being in this location, but the expansion of the scope of changes is causing more discussion.
			5. The current draft text in this area is completely different from the submission:

In an infrastructure BSS, the Interworking element contains signaling for HeSSs(M12). The HESSID is a (#2047)MAC address that identifies the HeSS(M12). The HESSID value shall be the universal MAC addressof one of the APs(#1347) in the HeSS(M12). Thus, it is a globally unique identifier that, in conjunction with the SSID, may be used to provide network identification for an SSPN.NOTE 1—This standard assumes that the HESSID field in the Interworking element is administered consistently across all BSSs in an HeSS(M12).

* + - 1. Made changes to the paragraph and restore note
			2. Straw poll: Shall we add " and all BSSs in the HeSS use the same value"?

Y/N/A

Results: 11A1000 = 3y-3n-1a

* + - * 1. Discussion on what a HESSID is.
				2. Not enough consensus for the changes for this part.
			1. Mark RISON will come back to it in the afternoon.
	1. Trivial Editorial Comment review – Emily QI
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1743-00-000m-revme-sb1-ed1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
		2. CID 6323 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		3. CID 6315 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6314 (ED1)
			1. Review commen.t
			2. Review Context.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2023-10-11 18:18:47Z)- change cited text to "as if it had TID 15" at 203.55 and 203.64.:
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6310 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on the proposed change – it was not competed for where the changes that are needed to be done.
			3. Assign to Emily QI
			4. Mark Submission Required
		6. CID 6306 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. There was a discussion on how many instances that are to be included.
			3. There are 5 locations:
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2023-10-11 18:26:11Z) - change "Element id" to "Element ID" at 973.45/56, 974.3/13/28.;
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6305 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2023-10-11 18:31:52Z) - Change the cited text to "the variables".
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		8. CID 6304 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2023-10-11 18:35:16Z) - change the format of "WinStartB" and "WinStartR" as shown at 1981.5. (Italicize and subscript missing).
			3. Locations for WinSizeO that is not italic and subscript O: 1958.23/25, 1959.26/27, 1965.29, 1991.7Also WinStartO at 1965.29, 1991.10.Also \*B/\*R versions at 1965.28/28/32/32, 1991.47, 3853.15, 3854.26
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		9. CID 6303 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		10. CID 6299 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. There was a discussion on how many instances that are to be included.
			3. There are 9 locations:
			4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2023-10-11 18:40:38Z) change “in RSNE" to "in the RSNE" at the following 9 locations:
			5. (Editor to add the exact locations offline).
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		11. CID 6298 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		12. CID 6161 (ED1)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		13. CID 6141 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED; This comment will be referred to the publication editor for consideration.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		14. CID 6140 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion for the use of upper-case vs lower-case of hex digits.
			3. Page 1085 gives an exception to need to make it all one case.
	2. **Recess at 3pm ET**.
1. **REVme AdHoc - Oct 11, 2023, PM2 – 15:30 -17:00 ET**
	1. Called to order: 15:15 ET.
	2. Patent policy call – no response
	3. Reviewed proposed agenda, no changes.
		1. Without objection – unanimous consent.
	4. **Continued review of** 11-22/0353r11 (Mark RISON, Samsung):
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0353-11-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d1-0-lb258.docx>
		2. In D4.0, we’re looking at the NOTE at P2663.22.
		3. Change this to be “need to” language, and keep as a NOTE
		4. In D4.0, at P2884.11:
			1. OK with the proposed change.
		5. In D4.0, at P2900.44:
			1. Change to remove the shall. During 11r, the scope of this behavior was debated. Just say “are delivered by the R0KH to the R1KHs”.
		6. In D4.0, at P2900.50:
			1. Just delete “It is assumed by this standard”
		7. P2901.39:
			1. Delete “It is assumed that”
		8. P2975.48:
			1. Delete “assumed to be”
		9. P2976.24:
			1. Delete “are assumed to” at the first change location. Replace “is assumed” with “needs” at the second location. The third change is agreed as proposed.
		10. P2976.33:
			1. Just delete “assumptions”
		11. P2976.45:
			1. Delete “are entities that are assumed to physically”
		12. P2977.23:
		13. Delete “It is assumed by this standard that”. Replace “are administered consistently” with “need to be the same.”
		14. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark RISON will upload these changes as an r12.
		15. The group will do a quick review of the r12 tomorrow, and this should be ready for motion.
	5. **Review Document: 11-23/1743r0 (Emily QI, Intel)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1743-00-000m-revme-sb1-ed1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
			1. Return to CID 6310 (ED1):
			2. Reviewed the locations found for these changes, off-line.
			3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2023-10-11 18:58:13Z) change the format of &quot;WinSizeO&quot; to italic and subscript O at 1958.23/25, 1959.26/27, 1965.29, 1991.7.change the format of &quot;WinStartO&quot; to italic and subscript O at 1965.29, 1991.10.change the format of &quot;WinStartB&quot; or &quot;WinStartR to italic and subscript &quot;B&quot; or &quot;R&quot; at 1965.28/28/32/32, 1991.47, 3853.15, 3854.2, respectively..
			4. Mark Ready for motion.
	6. **Review Document 11-23/1747r0 (Emily QI, Intel):**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1747-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-revme-sb1-ed1-comments.docx>
		2. CID 6587 (ED1):
			1. Proposed resolution: Revised. Change “after SIFS” to ““after a SIFS”, thoughout the draft, 38 instances. Change “after PIFS” to ““after a PIFS”, thoughout the draft, 3 instances. Change “PIFS” to “A PIFS” at 1798.38. Change “SIFS” to “A SIFS” at 1708.46.
			2. No objection. Mark Ready for motion.
		3. CID 6568 (ED1):
			1. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The cited text in D4.0 is shown as the comment suggested. No change is required.
			2. No objection. Ready for motion.
		4. CID 6364 (ED1):
			1. Commenter requests to review for other places in clause 3 that have frame names with upper-case.
			2. Assign to Mark RISON
			3. Mark Submission Required
		5. CID 6018 (ED1):
			1. Looked at 11.21.15. That uses “peer-to-peer”, but not “peer-to-peer link indication”.
			2. C: Concern that “Unavailability indication” is broadening this concept too much.
			3. Move to MAC AdHoc.
			4. Assign to Emily QI.
			5. More work required.
			6. Schedule for November Plenary session.
		6. CID 6029 (ED2):
			1. Move to MAC AdHoc.
			2. Assign to Emily QI.
			3. More work required.
			4. Schedule for November Plenary session.
		7. CID 6322 (ED1):
			1. Found the “earlier text” at . But, the change here is not as easy, because of the additional information about “set to the corresponding value” at P2683.33.
			2. Think we can still say all three concepts are defined in 9.3.1.8 in one sentence.
			3. The additional information is behavior, not format, and shouldn’t be here anyway.
			4. Investigated if the behavior text needs to be moved to clause 10, or can be deleted, and then provide the detailed changes for combining the three fields into one sentence.
			5. Decided to leave the behavioral text in, as moving it (or deleting it if not needed) is beyond the scope of this comment.
			6. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change paragraphs at 1684.22 to 1684.28 to:“The BA Control, Block Ack Starting Sequence Control and BlockAck Bitmap fields are defined in 9.3.1.8 (BlockAck frame format). The Block Ack Starting Sequence Control field is set to the corresponding value within the immediately previously received Relay Ack Request frame.”
			7. No objection. Mark Ready for motion.
		8. CID 6317 (ED1):
			1. These seem to be just referring to the concepts of these filtering, and so should be lower case.
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No objection. Mark Ready for motion.
		9. CID 6316 (ED1):
			1. Agree with the comment suggested changes.
			2. Discussed the other two instances, no change is needed at those locations.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			4. No objection. Mark Ready for motion.
		10. CID 6295 (ED1):
			1. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			2. No objection. Mark Ready for motion.
		11. CID 6292 (ED1):
			1. Investigated what PV1 Action frames use for the Action field. It seems that PV1 Action frames are defined by referencing PV0 Action frame details.
			2. Decided reference to 9.6 looks like it matches what the published 802.11ah had.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Revised. At 1753.24 and 1753.28, change “9.5.7 (EDMG BRP field(11ay))” to “9.6 (Action frame format details)”.
			4. No objection. Mark Ready for motion.
		12. CID 6412 (ED1):
			1. Need to review CIDs 1472, 2144, 3548.
			2. Will bring back.
		13. CID 6026 (ED1):
			1. This needs discussion; a presentation will be provided to help with that discussion.
	7. **Recess at 16:57 ET.**
2. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc - Toronto –Wednesday, October 12, 2023, at 9:00-12:00 ET – AM**
	1. **Called to order** 9:10pm ET 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) - Remote
		3. Editor - Emily QI (Intel) – Remote
		4. Edward AU (Huawei)
		5. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
	3. **IMAT Reported attendance:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 3 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 4 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 5 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 6 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 7 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 8 | Li, Xin | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 10 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 11 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues noted.
	2. **Review Agenda:** 11-23/1694r1:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-02-000m-revme-october-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx>
		2. Thursday October 12, 2022

3. AM1 – 09:00-12:00 ET

a. CID 6268 – Hamilton (Ruckus-Commscope)

b. CID 6401 – Rison (Samsung)

* + 1. Discussion on the schedule for today.
		2. Plan to end at 3pm ET today.
		3. No Objection to the Agenda.
	1. **Review doc 11-23/1749r0 - CID 6268 (GEN)** - Mark HAMILTON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1749-00-000m-proposed-partial-resolution-for-revme-cid-6268.docx>
		2. Review Submission which only identifies 3 locations that we discussed yesterday.
		3. These will be included in the submission from Mark RISON (11-23/1750).
		4. CID 6268 (GEN)
			1. P282.58 – Review proposed change. –
				1. The use of “appears” while not great, was not objected to.
			2. P311.59 – Review the proposed change.
				1. Wording matches other wording in the specification.
				2. There is parallel wording that explains the authentication.
				3. Question on use of 802.1X with and without “IEEE” prefix. The use here matches the other usage in this clause.
				4. Discussion on what information should be notified? Delete “of the deauthentication” .
				5. Check that this change matches (does no conflict with) p2931 and figure 12-50.
				6. Discussion on what the notification should be.
			3. P322.23/322.29
				1. Review the proposed changes.
				2. Addition punctuation was needed.
			4. An R1 will be created.
			5. Then Mark RISON will incorporate these changes to 11-23/1750.
			6. Mark CID 6268 – More Work Required.
			7. Schedule for Nov 6
	2. Review doc 11-23/1750 Mark RISON
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1750-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d4-0-initial-sa-ballot.docx>
		2. CID 6401 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Review submission proposed changes
			3. Discussion on why assumes is not desirable.
			4. For p2900.44, we need to define a portion in our standard, and use assumptions.
				1. Discussion on direction and how to resolve.
				2. Suggest break up the paragraph at 2900.41.
				3. Then adjust the “are assumed to be” to “are”
				4. The updated change will be in 11-23/1750r1.
			5. For p2900.50 we will just delete the sentence.
			6. p2884.10 the change is no quite accurate.
				1. The statement needed “called an MSK and used to generate a PMK”.
			7. p2975.48 – Change to “needs to be a “.
			8. Continue reviewing the proposed changes, and no other comments were made.
			9. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
	3. **Stand at ease until 10:10 am ET**.
	4. **Review PHY Comment Database** – Mark RISON
		1. CID 6585 (PHY)
			1. Review the comment.
			2. The references from TGaf seem to have not been updated.
			3. Assign the CID to Edward AU
			4. Mark More Work Required.
			5. Schedule for Nov 6 Telecon.
			6. Note to Editor: There are more, further down. Mark HAMILTON is willing to help review the final changes.
		2. CID 6578 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on how the MIB variable is made.
			3. Consider assigning to Brian HART or Stephen MCCANN.
			4. Discussion on why the use of Table was chosen.
			5. Assign to Stephen MCCANN
			6. Mark More Work Required
			7. Schedule for November Plenary
		3. CID 6577 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
			3. Submission Required
		4. CID 6576 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED; Change O.8 to CFHE:O.8 at 4649.44/50/57.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		5. CID 6607 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Assign comment to Youhan KIM
			3. Mark Submission required.
		6. CID 6591 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Assign comment to Mark HAMILTON
			3. Mark Submission required.
		7. CID 6530 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on if the proposed change is clear.
			3. Discussion in the rule can be applied globally.
			4. There are less than 10 of this case of having both “Implemented” and “Activated”. So why not just fix these outliers.
			5. Is there a clean ASCII MIB file to use?
			6. There is an RTF file in the 802.11 members area.
			7. Mark as Submission Required
			8. Assign to Mark RISON
		8. CID 6528 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON

* + 1. CID 6504 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON

* + 1. CID 6399 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON

* + 1. CID 6375 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON

* + 1. CID 6366 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. This was covered in the WG LB.
			3. This may have been fixed.
			4. Mark as Submission Required
			5. Assign to Mark RISON
		2. `CID 6340 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. p4606.6 - Possibly Missing “For”, is the “should” incorrect, or is there a rational reason.
			3. Discussion on desire to remove the word “test”.
			4. Assign to Joseph LEVY
			5. Mark More work required.
			6. Schedule for November Plenary.
		3. CID 6251 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (PHY: 2023-10-12 14:43:57Z) The comment is out of scope, as 11az has not been incorporated yet
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		4. CID 6244 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The Process to make this change will need to deprecate and then add the new tables.
			3. This will be Submission required.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON
		5. CID 6243 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
		6. CID 6231 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. There are several “read-create” MIB entries.
			3. Mark as Submission Required
			4. Assign to Mark RISON
		7. CID 6230 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 6243 (PHY).
			3. Mark as Submission Required
			4. Assign to Mark RISON
		8. CID 6229 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
		9. CID 6225 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
		10. CID 6221 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Mark as Submission Required
			3. Assign to Mark RISON
			4. Need to start discussion on the reflector.
		11. CID 6189 (PHY)
			1. Review comment.
			2. Similar to CID 6591
			3. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
			4. Mark Submission Required.
			5. Discussion on the history of the NOTE 2.
			6. The Tag in the draft #3504, indicates it was not completely corrected.
			7. This Round we will now try to finally correct it.
		12. CID 6182 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 6158 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Review the proposed changes.
			3. There is a definition somewhere that address this, and we should locate that word and definition to be used here.
				1. P232.6 – successful transmission.
			4. The Group Address successfully transmitted, gives details of which bits are required to be set and the MPDU was sent.
			5. One of the changes is on p5280.28.
			6. Discussion on how to reword the description.
			7. Should we use “UP” or “integer priority”?
			8. Consistent usage was determined.
			9. Proposed Resolution: was truncated

CID 6158 (PHY): Revised. Change the DEFINITION of dot11GroupTransmittedFrameCount from

“This is a status variable. It is written by the MAC when a group addressed frame is transmitted. This counter is incremented only when the group bit is set in the destination MAC address of a successfully transmitted MSDU. When operating as a STA in an infrastructure BSS, where these frames are directed to the AP, this implies having received an acknowledgment to all associated MPDUs." to

"This is a status variable. This counter is incremented when an MSDU with a destination address that is a group address is successfully transmitted (not necessarily in a single frame)."

Change the DEFINITION of dot11TransmittedFrameCount (5280.28) from

"This is a status variable. It is written by the MAC when a frame is successfully transmitted. This counter increments for each successfully transmitted MSDU." to

"This is a status variable. This counter is incremented when an MSDU is successfully transmitted (not necessa (TRUNCATED)

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready Motion
	1. **Review Document 11-23/1751r 0 Edward AU (Huawei)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1751-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-comments-on-initial-sa-ballot-on-d4-0.docx>
		2. CID 6287 (ED2):
			1. Review Comment
			2. - This overlaps with changes in Mike MONTEMURRO's document, that we were reviewing yesterday (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1701-00-000m-power-management-terminology-cleanup.docx>). Which covers CID 6038.
			3. Mark More work Required.
			4. Assign to Michael MONTEMURRO
			5. Schedule for November
			6. Move CID to GEN AdHoc.
		3. CID 6274 (ED1)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		4. CID 6321 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6321 (ED2): Accepted. Note to Editors:
			Replace “PLME\_SAP” with “PMLE SAP” at 3708.3, 4207.3, 4559.56.
			Replace “PMLE” with “PLME” at 3708.1.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		5. CID 6589 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Replace “1080HMz” with “1080 MHz” at 3780.56 and 3793.10 in D4.0.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		6. CID 6324 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted. Note to Editor: The locations are 4070.45 and 4070.51 in D4.0
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		7. CID 6309 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Discussion on the lower case measurement mode request which is not a field vs calling out the field.
			3. So instead of calling out field these all should be lower case generic useage.
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6309 (ED2): Revised. Replace “Measurement Mode” with “measurement mode” at 2514.46, 2514.60, 2515.1, 2515.30, 2516.24, 2516.40 in D4.0.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		8. CID 6307 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion of the sentence order. Reorder will make it ready better.
			3. i.e., bits of the “FILS USER Priority field” …
			4. Proposed Resolution: CID 6307 (ED2): Revised. Replace “the FILS User Priority B0, B1, and B2” with “B0, B1, and B2 of the FILS User Priority field” at 2770.34 in D4.0.
			Replace “the FILS User Priority B0” with “B0 of the FILS User Priority field” at 2770.62 in D4.0.
			Replace “the FILS User Priority B1” with “B1 of the FILS User Priority field” at 2770.63 in D4.0.
			Replace “the FILS User Priority B2” with “B2 of the FILS User Priority field” at 2770.64 in D4.0.
			5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		9. CID 6302 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed change says “As it says in the comment”, but the comment uses shorthanded notation that is not clear.
			3. Proposed Resolution: CID 6302 (ED2): Revised. Replace “in the TDLS Setup Request, TDLS Setup Response, and TDLS Setup Confirm” with “in the TDLS Setup Request, TDLS Setup Response, and TDLS Setup Confirm frames” at 2397.27 in D4.0.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		10. CID 6297 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.

* + 1. CID 6294 (ED2)
			1. Review comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
		2. CID 6319 (ED2)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: CID 6319 (ED2): Revised. Replace “A non-AP STA shall use a transmit power less than or equal to the minimum or the local maximum and regulatory client maximum transmit power for the channel” with “A non-AP STA shall use a transmit power less than or equal to the minimum of the local maximum and regulatory client maximum transmit power for the channel” at 2489.40 in D4.0.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
			4. CID 6162 (ED2)
				1. Review Comment
				2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
				3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
	1. **Recess at 12:00pm ET.**
1. **TGme (REVme) AdHoc - Toronto –Thursday, October 12, 2023, at 13:00-15:00 ET – PM1**
	1. **Called to order** 1:03pm ET by the TG Chair, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
	2. **IMAT Reported attendance:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 2 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 3 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 4 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 5 | Li, Xin | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 6 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 7 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 8 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 10 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy and Copyright policy and Participation Policies.**
		1. No issues noted.
	2. **Review Agenda:** 11-23/1694r3:
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1694-03-000m-revme-october-2023-adhoc-agenda.docx>
		2. Thursday October 12, 2022

4. PM – 13:00-15:00 ET

a. CID 6020 – doc 11-23/1745 – HUANG (Intel)

b. PHY comment review – RISON (Samsung)

c. GEN comment review – ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)

6. AOB

7. Adjourn

* + 1. No Comments or changes asked for the agenda.
		2. No Objection to the Agenda
	1. **Review doc 11-23/1745 – Po-Kai HUANG (Intel)**
		1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1745-00-000m-cr-for-cid-6020.docx>
		2. Review submission.
		3. CID 6020 (SEC)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Long discussion on the proposed changes.
			3. Review all the changes and the side notes will be removed.
			4. R1 will be uploaded.
			5. Proposed resolution: CID 6020 (SEC): Revised. Incorporate the changes in 11-23/1745r1 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1745-01-000m-cr-for-cid-6020.docx>>.
			6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
	2. **PHY AdHoc Comments.** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
		1. **From Database.**
		2. CID 6157 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Similar to CID 6178 (PHY)
			3. Why do we count frame vs fragments?
			4. Discussion on if a single frame is also a fragment or not.
			5. MPDU cannot be fragmented.
			6. Discussion on what the counter should be counting.
			7. A simpler sentence was created and will be in the resolution.
			8. Proposed Resolution:

CID 6157 (PHY): Revised. Change the definition of dot11TransmittedFragmentCount (5278.10) from

"This is a status variable. It is written by the MAC when a fragment is successfully transmitted. This counter is incremented for an acknowledged MPDU with an individual address in the Address 1 field or an MPDU with a group address in the Address 1 field with the Type subfield equal to Data or Management." to

"This is a status variable. This counter is incremented when a Data or Management frame (which may or may not be a fragment) is successfully transmitted."

Change the definition of dot11QoSTransmittedFragmentCount (5297.17) from

"This is a status variable. It is written by the MAC when a QoS fragment is transmitted. This counter is incremented for an acknowledged MPDU, for a particular UP, with an individual address in the Address 1 field or an MPDU with a group address in the Address 1 field, either belonging to a particular TID. This counter has relevance only for TIDs between 0 and 7." to **...<TRUNCATED – see PHY Comment file to be posted after the AdHoc>**

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		1. CID 6123 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Assign to Joseph LEVY
			3. Mark More Work Required
			4. Schedule for November Plenary

* + 1. CID 6117 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Discussion on where to measure the start, and what the RX\_START\_OF\_FRAME\_OFFSET really means.
			3. Assign to Joseph LEVY
			4. Mark More Work Required
			5. Schedule for November Plenary
		2. CID 6116 (PHY)
			1. Review comment
			2. Same text area, but different issue.
			3. Discussion on what bits of information are sent to the MAC to determine the processing time and the delay that is known.
			4. More discussion offline is needed.
			5. Assign to Joseph LEVY
			6. Mark More Work Required
			7. Schedule for November Plenary
		3. CID 6061 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The Existing text is not in error.
			3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.

* + 1. CID 6057 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Assign to David Goodall
			3. Submission required.

* + 1. CID 6056 (PHY)
			1. Review Comment
			2. Assign to David Goodall
			3. Submission required.
	1. **GEN CIDS** – Jon Rosdahl (Qualcomm)
		1. Review GEN AdHoc Database. – A Comment file will be posted after the AdHoc Meeting.
		2. CID 6350 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. C: D2.0 is rather old, and these locations should be corrected to D4.0
			3. C: Some of these locations are in the old clause 6
			4. Submission required.
			5. Assign to Mark RISON.
		3. CID 6355 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		4. CID 6360 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		5. CID 6383 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		6. CID 6397 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		7. CID 6419 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. C: The comment is to add the reference to clause 2.
			3. C: I think it should go in the bibliography, as it is not a normative reference.
			4. C: If this paper made a change to IEEE 802.11, there should be a corresponding 802.11 submission. Therefore, I don’t think this reference is required.
			5. C: I think the information in section 5.3 of this paper should be converted into an 802.11 submission and then presented.
			6. Submission required.
			7. Assign to Jouni MALINEN
		8. CID 6468 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		9. CID 6354 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON. Moved to SEC.
		10. CID 6526 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. C: Moving these vectors has some issues.
			3. Submission required.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON.
		11. CID 6540 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. The comment location is P352L48.
			3. Submission required.
			4. Assign to Mark HAMILTON.
		12. CID 6550 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		13. CID 6553 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. The figure has now been removed from D4.0.
			3. Rejected: Rejected. The cited figure does not exist in the current draft 4.0. Ready for motion.
			4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
		14. CID 6558 (GEN)
			1. Review Comment
			2. The reference has been changed in D4.0 to 6.7.4.2.
			3. Submission required.
			4. Assign to Mark RISON.
		15. CID 6560 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		16. CID 6573 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		17. CID 6574 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		18. CID 6448 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark RISON.
		19. CID 6254 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. C: I think the answer is probably yes. This is regarding confirms and responses in the MLME primitives. Therefore, the comment does need to be investigated.
			3. C: Need to look at old version to see if they used the protected version and if the new text is accurate.
			4. Submission required.
			5. Assign to Mark RISON.
		20. CID 6204 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
		21. CID 6122 (GEN)
			1. Review comment
			2. Submission required.
			3. Assign to Joseph LEVY
	2. Thank you for all those that participated either in person or virtually with the REVme Mixed-mode AdHoc in Toronto, ON, CA
	3. **Thanks to Huawei and Edward AU for hosting.**
	4. **Adjourned 15:00 ET**
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