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Abstract

2024 July IEEE 802 Mixed-Mode Plenary – 802.11me (REVme) Minutes – Sheraton Le Center Hotel.

5 Slots (meetings)

1. **802.11me (REVme) Meeting Monday PM2 – July 15 4-6pm ET**
   1. **Called to order** 4:03pm ET by Michael MONTEMURRO
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark HAMILTON
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      4. Editor – Emily QI
      5. Editor – Edward AU
      6. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. **Review Patent Slides/Copyright slides and participant slides.**
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda:** -- 11-24-0985-01-000m-revme-agenda-july-2024-session
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0985-01-000m-revme-agenda-july-2024-session.pptx>
      2. Monday July 15, 4pm ET
2. Chair’s Welcome, Policy & patent reminder
3. Approve agenda
4. Motions
5. Minutes (Slide 7)
6. Editor report
7. Comment resolution
8. Ranging Comment Resolution – doc 11-24/1107 – AJAMI (Apple) – Mon PM2 on July 15
9. CID 8037 – HUANG (Intel)
10. CID 8257, 8259 – HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
11. CID 8039 – doc 11-24/1149 – MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
12. Technical/General CIDs – doc 11-24/1149 – MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
13. Recess
    * 1. No objection to the proposed agenda.

* 1. **Motion to approve Previous Minutes**:
     1. Move to Approve the minutes in documents
* **Adhoc:** 11-24/0725r0:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0725-00-000m-minutes-revme-april-2024-adhoc-san-diego.docx>

* **May meeting:** 11-24/0912r0:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0912-00-000m-minutes-for-revme-2024-may-interim-warsaw.docx>

* **Teleconferences:** 11-24/1140r0:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1140-00-000m-minutes-for-revme-telecon-july-8-2024.docx>

* + 1. Moved: Jon Rosdahl
    2. Seconded: Stephen McCann
    3. Results: Unanimous, Motion Passes.
  1. **Editor Report - Emily QI - 11-21/0687r22:**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0687-22-000m-802-11revme-editor-s-report.pptx>
     2. Review Status of comments
     3. 257 Comments total
     4. At the start of this Session, we have 31 Ready for Motion.
  2. **Review Document 11-24/1168r0** POKAI as presented by Emily QI (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1168-00-000m-cr-for-cid-8037.docx>
     2. CID 8038 (SEC)
        1. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2024-07-15 20:19:42Z) The commenter has withdrawn the comment.
        2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8037 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment and discussion in the submission.
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-15 20:28:32Z) - Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1168-01-000m-cr-for-cid-8037.docx>.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  3. **CID 8257, 8259 –** Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
     1. CID 8257 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment – Looking to remove Normative Verbs.
        2. Review Context
        3. Discussion on the use of Optional feature of GAS Extension.
        4. Discussion on if the sentence should be at all in Clause 9.
        5. Word Smything will take place offline and then bring back.
        6. Discussion on if we are paying attention to “shall usage”.
        7. We may not need to worry as much about it.
        8. We have “when present” in some cases and not here, so maybe a clue to resolve this.
        9. Will need to bring back.
     2. CID 8259 (SEC) not ready
        1. Mark More Work Required
        2. Schedule for Tuesday PM2
  4. **CID 8039 (SEC) – doc 11-24/1149r0** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-00-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 8039 (SEC)
        1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Proposes Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-15 20:46:43Z) - Make the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-00-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx> document under “Proposed Resolution: (8039)”
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **ED2 CIDs – 11-24/1281** – Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1281-02-000m-revme-sa-ballot-3-ed2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
        1. Review Submission.
        2. There are 31 CIDs that are included in this submission (excel file).
        3. These are deemed to be Trivial.
        4. All of these will be marked Ready for Motion.
  2. **Review doc 11-24/1289r0** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1289-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-comments-on-recirculation-sa-ballot-on-d6-0.docx>
     2. CID 8034 (ED2)
        1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; As per D6.0, the MIB variable consists of true and false, rather than 1 and 0, respectively. For the preceding paragraphs at 2781.12 and 2781.15, it has "set to 1" because it refers to setting the value of the LOS Assessment TX Capability subfield to 1. Therefore, I do not see there is anything to be fixed.
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 8118 (ED2)
        1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

At 3172.50, 3173.8, 3173.10, and 3174.61, replace “PASN first frame” with “first PASN frame”.

At 3173.14, 3173.15, 3174.22, 3174.25, and 3174.38, replace “PASN second frame” with “second PASN frame”.

At 3165.60, 3173.19, 3174.48, 3174.50, and 3174.62, replace “PASN third frame” with “third PASN frame”.

At 3166.49, 3170.56, 3171.37, 3171.39, and 3175.7, replace “{first/second/third} PASN authentication frame” with “{first/second/third} PASN frame”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8021 (ED2)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Need to reach out to 802.11az experts.
       3. Assign to Edward
       4. Mark More Work Required.
       5. Schedule Tuesday PM2
    2. CID 8161 (ED2)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in Submission.
       2. Discussion if making the change at 3013.24 is correct.
       3. No opinion was strongly expressed, so the change was deleted.
       4. Review contexts.
       5. Discussion on changing "temporal key portion of the PTK" to "TK" at 2977.60, 3073.27
       6. Proposed Resolution: " Revised. At 1029.13, replace “the length of the SAE-KCK and” with “the length of the SAE key confirmation key, SAE-KCK, and”

At 2679.46, replace “The MIC shall be calculated using the TPK-KCK” with “The MIC shall be calculated using the TPK key confirmation key (TPK-KCK)”.

At 2978.14, replace “PTK-TK” with “TK”.

At 2977.60 and 3073.27, replace “temporal key portion of the PTK” with “TK”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8209, 8195, 8130, 8111 (ED2)
       1. These four are Rejected for Insufficient Details.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; Insufficient details. -- The comment fails to identify a specific issue to be addressed. It 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.
  1. CID 8235 (ED2)
     1. Need updated Figure.
     2. Proposed Resolution: Accept.
     3. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark HAMILTON to update figure 11-52 and give source to Editor
     4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. CID 8002 (ED2)
     1. Review comment
     2. Discussion on Rejecting the CID.
     3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected: The "so" indicates that the NAV is not updated per the rules specified here, but it might be updated following some other rules.
     4. This CID moved from Trivial Comments and added to Edward’s other CIDs for motion later this week.
     5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  3. **Technical/General CIDs – doc 11-24/1149r1 –** Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-01-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 8192 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8197 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change “FILS AKMP” to AKM” at cited location. Also at 3070.8 change “AKMP” to “AKM”.
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 8198 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on the change proposed.
        3. Review context in table 9-190.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED.   
           Change   
           “In an infrastructure BSS for which an SAE AKM is indicated, the AP shall”  
           To  
           “In an infrastructure BSS advertising an AKM for which the Authentication type cell in Table 9-190 identifies SAE, the AP shall”
        5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 8199 (SEC)
        1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. At 3147.42 and 3147.50, change

“indicating support for a FILS AKM in …”

to

“indicating support for an AKM in Table 9-190 for which the Authentication type cell identifies FILS in …”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 8190 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Change the note as follows:  
          Change  
          “NOTE 2—Because the FTM procedure executes at the PHY/MAC layer, an RSTA accepting a ranging request despite…”  
          to  
          “NOTE 2—An RSTA that accepts a ranging request despite…”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 8228 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on the proposed change.
       3. Need to adjust the proposed change, which is noted in the proposed resolution.
       4. We will not change the Note.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. At 2809.34, change

“in the HeSS and all the BSSs in the HeSS use the same value.” To “in the HeSS. All the BSSs in the HeSS use the same value.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 8146 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on what the wrapping key field is containing.
       3. Discussion on the value of even mentioning padding, the function takes a key and then returns a blob.
       4. The KeyLength field is not the Wrapkey Length field.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. The cited text is consistent with the definition of the GTK and IGTK. At 1093.41. Delete the second sentence.
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. **Recess 6:00pm**

1. **REVme Meeting Tuesday AM2 – July 16 10:30-12:30pm ET**
   1. **Called to order 10:34 am** ET by Michael MONTEMURRO
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark HAMILTON
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      4. Editor – Emily QI
      5. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. **Review Patent Slides/Copyright** slides and participant slides.
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda:11-24/0985r1**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0985-02-000m-revme-agenda-july-2024-session.pptx>
      2. Add Technical General CIDs to agenda
      3. Move Qi WANG to PM2 – Ranging
      4. No objection to the updated Agenda
   5. **Review doc 11-24/1070r4** Ali RAISSINIA (Qualcomm Inc.)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1070-04-000m-comment-resolutions-for-secure-ranging.docx>
      2. CIDs 8012, 8016, 8017 and 8036 (SEC)
         1. Review history of changes since last presentation.
         2. Review proposed changes and discussion in the submission.
         3. Discussion on Ack was not received, but that was baseline text.
         4. Review list of changes.
         5. Proposed Resolution:
         6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 8026 (SEC)
         1. Review CID
         2. Proposed Resolution: Reject; The two paragraphs stated by commenter differs in behavior-

First paragraph describes ISTA requiring the secure LTF operation, which can occur with capable RSTA, hence a normative behavior for RSTA to honor such a request. The second paragraph allows ISTA to indicate support for secure LTF by including Secure (HE)-LTF subelement in IFTMR and based on RSTA’s local policy decides the secure LTF operation proceeds.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 8003, 8004, 8018 and 8030
       1. Review
       2. Need to Add the commas (to match the Table) into the diagrams above the table
       3. Ali will make the change offline.
       4. Will add a comma on the M00, M01, M02 to be M0,0 M0,1 M0,2
       5. Update Resolution: CIDs 8003, 8004, 8018, and 8030: Revised. Incorporate the changes in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1070-05-00m-comment-resolutiona-for-secure-ranging.docx>
       6. No Objection – Still ready for Motion.
  1. **Review CID 8045 (SEC)** Joseph LEVY (Interdigital)
     1. CID 8045 (SEC)
     2. Review Comment
     3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
     4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  2. **Review 11-24/114912** Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-01-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 8008 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment.
        2. The IEEE SA Staff (Katherine Burger) indicated that the Adobe Tools are used. She does a word for word compare with what is balloted to ensure the correct words are in the published document.
        3. Review page 3090.20-37 was an example of the wrong character being used. The left arrow is point incorrectly.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; This standard will be professionally edited prior to publication. The issue will be brought to the attention of the publication Editor.

Note: The referenced text is page 3090, lines 20-35 (left arrow is displayed incorrectly).

* + - 1. One objection to resolution – Mark Ready for Motion.
      2. Will run as a separate motion.
    1. CID 8011 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. The ASAP is the name of a field and does not need to be an acronym.
       3. Proposed Resolution: ASAP is only used as a field name.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8013 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and proposed changes.
       2. Discussion on how to indicate the changes.
       3. Discussion on if FTM vs FTMR should be used.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change the cited paragraph as shown in 11-24/1149r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-01-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>) under “Proposed Resolution: (8013)”
    3. CID 8014 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on where the arrow needs to be shifted.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted: Note to Editor: Shift the HE-LTF field arrow to align with the beginning of Secure HE-LTF U1-A1 and to the end of Secure HE-LTF U2-A2.:
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 8015 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and proposed changes
       2. Proposed Resolution: CID 8015 (SEC): REVISED. Change “null-SAC” to  
          “Null-SAC” in Figure 11-65 (2751.35) and Figure 11-67 (2755.28 and 2755.29)
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    5. CID 8019 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and proposed changes
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted. Note to Editor: The Cited text is in Figure 11-64. At cited location, change “LMR\_1 SEC..” to LMR\_1 (SEC…”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    6. CID 8148 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Make the changes provided by the commenter, fixing the repetitive “regarding”

At cited location, change “with no implication regarding frame addressing or regarding …” to “with no implication regarding….”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8234 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on capitalization rules.
       3. Discussion on how to make the proper changes.
       4. Discussion on what frames could be protected.
       5. After discussion, the decision was made to reject the CID.
       6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The proposed resolution causes more confusion than the existing text.
       7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8183 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. At 2691.42 and 2691.44, change “are canceled” to “shall be canceled by the SME”

At 2691.47, change “the STA shall” to “the SME shall”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 8185 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8062 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted. Note to Editor: the locations are 4141.2 and 4146.8.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. Revisit 8185 (SEC)
       1. Need to change Resolution.
       2. Discussion on what is current timer mean.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised At 4141.2, change “current TSF timer” to “TSF timer” and at 4146.8, change “current TSF timer” to “current value of the TSF timer”
       4. No objection – leave marked Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 8166 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on if the cited sentence was even needed.
       3. Possible resolution: Delete the cited sentence.
       4. An Alternative addition was proposed: “[the other items in the TPKSA are not needed"?
       5. No agreement to add the alternative addition.
       6. Proposed Resolution: CID 8166 (SEC): REVISED. At 3080.30, change  
          “Only TPK-TK in the TPKSA is required for the supported band/channel.”  
          To  
          “The TPK-TK in the TPKSA is used for cryptographic encapsulation of MPDUs in the other supported band/channel.”
       7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 8172 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    6. CID 8168 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in the submission.
       2. Discussion on the reference that needs to be changed.
       3. Out of Time, will return here when we get back.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/1070r5** Ali RAISSINIA (Qualcomm Inc.)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1070-05-000m-comment-resolutions-for-secure-ranging.docx>
     2. CID 8003, 8004, 8018 and 8030
        1. Review the updated changes that were requested.
        2. Commas were added, but full text made red to make visible.
        3. Updates were approved, and R5 will be posted.
  2. **Recess 12:30pm ET**

1. REV**me Meeting Tuesday PM2** – July 16, 16:00-18:00 ET
   1. **Called to order 4:03pm** ET by Michael Montemurro
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark HAMILTON
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      4. Editor – Emily QI
      5. Editor – Edward AU
      6. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. **Reminder Patent Slides/Copyright slides and participant slides**.
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda**: 11-24-0985-02-000m
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0985-02-000m-revme-agenda-july-2024-session.pptx>
      2. No Objections
      3. Set time for Jonathan SEGEV (Intel) presentation at 5:30pm
      4. No objections to amended agenda.
   5. **Review doc 11-24/1235r1** Emily QI
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1235-01-000m-revme-sb3-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>
      2. 47 CIDs for ED1
      3. Several tabs in file.
      4. Tab for Trivial Comments – 31 comments Ready for Motion.
         1. If question on these 31 CIDs, please let Emily know.
         2. Otherwise, motion on Thursday.
      5. Today presentation on “Review” Tab 9 CIDs.
      6. CID 8213 (ED1)
         1. Propose to reject the comment, because hyphens are not strictly disallowed
         2. No objection to rejecting, as proposed.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 8213 (ED1): REJECTED (ED1: 2024-07-15 18:12:36Z)- According to the Style guide, hyphens are allowed. In the past, we implemented an effort to avoid adding hyphen between a prefix and a word. The compound words "channel-usage-aiding"/"channel-usage-aidable" don’t fall in this category.
      7. CID 8230 (ED1):
         1. Reviewing each location
         2. Only change is at P5870.49, instead, we should delete the second instance of dot11TransmittedFrameCount.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 8230 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2024-07-08 17:17:55Z) Delete the Editor's Note at P193.10.

At P5854.17, change "802.11-2020" to "802.11-2024" and delete the Editor Note. For the note at 5879.49, reverse the changes made from CID 6160; at 5869.62, delete the second instance of dot11TransmittedFrameCount in dot11CountersGroup6, and delete the editor note.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8158 (ED1):
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Proposed Resolution: CID 8158 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2024-07-12 15:08:47Z) - change "BSS Configuration Parameter Set" to "BSS configuration parameter set", x20

Noted that there is one place where the current text is "BSS configuration parameter Set" but should still be changed.

* + - 1. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8150 (ED1):
       1. Looked at some sample locations.
       2. Many are in code, but there are more than just 2 that are in text and we probably do want to change.
       3. Mark CID as More Work Required,
          1. for off-line search to find the appropriate locations.
       4. Assigned to Mark R,
       5. Schedule to bring back Wednesday AM2
    2. CID 8120 (ED1):
       1. Reviewed and slightly revised the wording change to 1.4.
       2. Noted that CID 8229 is on this topic.
       3. Discussion on if we should define “ought” usage vs reword to remove it.
       4. There was discussion on potential change in CID 8120.
       5. Mark 8120 and 8229 as More Work Required.
       6. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
       7. Action item #2: Mark H to work with Mark RISON on solution
       8. Schedule Wednesday AM2.
    3. Mike had to step out, and Mark Hamilton assumed Chair role.
    4. CID 8114 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed resolution: Rejected:
       3. There are 120 instances for this CID.
       4. Discussion on if changes for this CID will collide with the changes, we discussed this morning.
       5. Discussion on the use of IFTMR vs IFTM – 150 instances
       6. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; terms IFTMR and IFTM are defined at 262.58 and 262.57.
       7. One objection (Mark RISON) – Mark Ready for Motion
       8. Prepare separate Motion.
    5. CID 8101 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context
       3. Concern that Bit 12 is not in the ANA database, and having Reserved for non-S1G usage is hard to use this bit that seems to have been reused.
       4. ACTION ITEM #3: Emily to get Bit 12 assignment in the ANA database.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    6. CID 8097 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context
       3. Discussion on removing cited text.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Delete “the (#7224)Redirect URL field is not present” at lines 55 and 56. Move two paragraphs at 1577.1-1577.8 to 1576.44
       5. Discussion on frames, like elements, should only have one name
          1. It's hard enough finding stuff in the standard without having to worry about aliases
       6. Discussion on how the wording should be changed. Change if it is zero, then it is “not there”.
       7. Proposed Resolution: Revise; Delete "the (#7224)Redirect URL Length field is set to 0 and" at lines 55 and 65. Move two paragraphs at (1577.1 - 1577.8) to 1576.44.
       8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    7. CID 8044 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 8044 (ED1): REVISED (ED1: 2024-07-12 21:32:58Z) -at location 299.9 Replace "user priority (UP)" With "UP".

Note to commenter: at 282.18, "UP" is expanded already, see "user priorities (UPs)".

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8180 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on having only one term for specification of a certain action.
       3. Depending on the clause may change the desire to make the change or not.
       4. Proposed resolution: Rejected – Insufficient details text.
       5. One objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8152 (ED1)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Context
       3. Discussion on the need to remove “MAC” from the name of frames that did not have “MAC” 3 expression types that need to have “MAC” removed.
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (ED1: 2024-07-16 21:12:05Z)

Delete "MAC" in the following locations:

MAC Management frame at 324.24/33; 1566.6

MAC Extension frame at 324.33

MAC Control frame at 324.37

MAC Data frame at 324.25

* + - 1. Mark RISON to provided locations for changes.
      2. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8138 (ED1)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion on difference in “NonTXBSS ID” vs “NonTXBSSID” profiles.
       3. Assign This to Mark RISON
       4. Mark More Work Required
       5. Schedule for Wednesday AM2
    2. **Review Trivial Comments**
       1. CID 8167 (ED1)
          1. Request to have TDLS expanded on first use.
          2. Change Resolution to expand the acronym.
       2. CID 8227 (ED1) –
          1. Review proposed resolution.
          2. Concern on how reference get out of sync, but this is not in order for this meeting.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/1303r0** – Jonathan SEGEV (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1303-00-000m-resolution-to-cid-8031-figure-11-45.docx>
     2. CID 8031 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion and diagrams in submission.
        3. Proposed Resolution: Accept; VISIO version of diagram is included in 11-24/1303r0: (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1303-00-000m-resolution-to-cid-8031-figure-11-45.docx>)
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc 11-24/942 – CID 8046-8058** – –Joseph LEVY (InterDigital)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0943-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cids-7124-7125-7126-7127-7128-7129-7130-7131-7132-7133-7134-7135-time-of-departure-accuracy-requirements.docx>
     2. CID 8046-8058 (SEC)
        1. Review Submission discussion
        2. Discussion on how we test the accuracy of time of departure.
        3. This change is for each PHY, but it is the same exact text for each PHY Clause.
        4. These changes were not accepted last recirc, but would like to have them done this time.
        5. Then all 12 CIDs will be Marked Accepted
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  3. **Review doc 11-24/1289r3** – Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1289-03-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-comments-on-recirculation-sa-ballot-on-d6-0.docx>
     2. CID 8021 (ED2)
        1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Discussion on wording in the Notes.
        3. Assign to Edward
        4. Mark More Work Required.
        5. Schedule 12:00pm ET
     3. CID 8160 (ED2)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution:

Proposed resolution for CID 8160:

Revised.

Replace “OFDM mode” with “EDMG OFDM mode” at the following locations:

4495.48, 4495.50, 4519.50, 4550.32, 4662.47, 4677.54,

Replace “OFDM EDMG A-PPDU” with “EDMG OFDM A-PPDU”:

4536.44

Replace “SC mode” with “EDMG SC mode” at the following locations:

4495.32, 4495.34, 4495.40, 4495.42, 4496.4, 4496.6, 4496.9, 4496.12, 4519.50, 4550.27, 4598.24, 4677.53, 4813.60

Replace “SC mode” with “DMG SC mode” at the following locations:

4521.54, 4692.8

Replace “SC and OFDM mode” with “EDMG SC and OFDM modes” at the following locations:

4495.56, 4495.59, 4495.61, 4496.1, 4692.35, 4693.60

Replace “control, SC, and OFDM mode” with “EDMG control, SC, and OFDM modes” at the following location:

4807.34

Replace “control mode” with “DMG control mode” at the following locations:

4521.50, 4692.8

Replace “control mode” with “EDMG control mode” at the following location:

4693.32

* + 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 8096 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution:

Proposed resolution for CID 8096:

Revised

Change “HE-LTF User Block” to “HE-LTF user block” at the following locations:

4396.47 (two appearances), 4396.50, 4396.55, 4396.56, 4396.57, 4396.58, 4396.59, 4397.16, 4397.44, 4397.56, 4397.65, 4398.7 (two appearances), 4398.15, 4398.26, 4398.44, 4398.56, 4398.57, 4398.58, 4398.59, 4399.30, 4399.33, 4399.55, 4399.57.

Change “HE-LTF Repetition Block” to “HE-LTF Repetition Block” at the following locations:

4396.48 (two appearances), 4396.50, 4397.42 (two appearances), 4397.59, 4397.64, 4397.65, 4398.7 (four appearances), 4398.25, 4398.26, 4398.27, 4398.44, 4399.32, 4399.33 (two appearances), 4399.53, 4399.55, 4399.57, 4399.62, 4400.2, 4400.5, 4400.6.

Change “User Block” to “HE-LTF user block” at the following location:

4398.51

Change “Repetition Block” to “HE-LTF repetition block” at the following location:

4410.37

* 1. **Recess 6:00pm**

1. **REVme Meeting Wednesday AM2 – July 17 10:30-12:30pm ET**
   1. **Called to order 10:34 am** ET by Michael Montemurro
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark HAMILTON
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      4. Editor – Emily QI
      5. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. **Review Patent Slides/Copyright** slides and participant slides.
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda:11-24/0985r3**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0985-03-000m-revme-agenda-july-2024-session.pptx>
      2. No objection to presented Agenda.
   5. CID 8150 – Rison (Samsung)
      1. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED: Change "byte" (case-insensitively) to "octet" at:

658 (5x)

1519.24

1993.34

4044.26 (2x -- second should be lowercased)

4872.27

* + 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. Review doc 11-24/1308 - CID 8257, 8259, 8229, 8120 and 8231–– Mark HAMILTON Ruckus/CommScope)
     + 1. CID 8257 (SEC)
       2. Review comment
       3. Proposed resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-15 20:37:12Z)  
          Change the cited sentence to:  
          "The GAS Extension element indicates parameters that the STA transmitting the request is requesting the responder to use while processing this request."
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     1. CID 8259 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on why the sentence was written as it was written.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 14:45:02Z) - Change:

"When the Trigger field is set to 3, an EDMG ISTA indicates that the following FTM burst shall contain a LOS assessment measurement. If the FTM burst is performed over the first path AWV and shall contain a LOS assessment measurement, the Trigger field is set to 4."

to:

"When the Trigger field is set to 3, an EDMG ISTA indicates that the following FTM burst is requested to contain LOS assessment measurements. If the FTM burst is performed over the first path AWV and is requested to contain LOS assessment measurements, the Trigger field is set to 4."

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8229 and CID 8120 (SEC)
       1. Review both CIDs and looking for a compromise on how to resolve the issue with “ought”.
       2. Proposed Resolution: CID 8229: Accepted
       3. No objection – Mark ready for Motion.
       4. Discussion – Changes to 1.4 cannot be changed by us. Word usage is controlled by IEEE SA. The use of Ought was suggested to remove it.
       5. Discussion on word usage and redefining new terms should be avoided.
       6. Why define “ought to”? It is an English language idiom.
       7. CID 82209 removes “ought” from the Frame format descriptor definition.
       8. Discussion on if we need to define “ought and might”.
       9. One suggestion to reject because they are just English words.
       10. One suggestion to add a new paragraph that is not making a change to the first paragraph of 1.4. (IEEE STAFF said we cannot change first paragraph.
       11. Straw Poll:   
           **Do you support resolving 8120 with "REJECTED. The words ought and might are used only in informative contexts, have their English language meaning, and do not need further definition. "**
       12. Yes: 78%, No 22%, 0 Abstains – 9 Votes
       13. Proposed Resolution CID 8120: Rejected; The words ought and might are used only in informative contexts, have their English language meaning, and do not need further definition.
       14. Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. **CID 8231 (SEC)**
       1. Review comment and diagram in submission.
       2. Discussion on removing the “AAA interface” words on the figure.
       3. Concern on the Tunnel wording may cause confusion. Suggest removing “VLAN Tunnel x”
       4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:09:05Z) - Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1308-02-000m-misc-hamilton-revme-cids.docx>
       5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review doc 11-24/1293 – TWT CIDs** - Rubayet SHAFIN (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-00-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
     2. CID 8070 (SEC)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Discuss proposed change to be done.
        3. Discussion on reducing Note 4 and remove the first phrase, and start at “The total number…”
        4. The changes are related to peer to peer TWT and is based on individual TWT definition.
        5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8070  in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
        6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8071 (SEC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on how to put the resolution into the database.
        3. It was noted that there are 13 CIDs in this submission and all will be of the form incorporate the changes, and while they may be shown inline, the change bars are not easily shown in the excel files/database.
        4. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8071  in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
        5. One objection (Mark RISON – wanted text changes moved directly into resolution.) Mark Ready for Motion.

* + 1. CID 8072 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8072  in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
       3. One objection (Mark RISON – wanted text changes moved directly into resolution.) Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 8073 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Delete the word “last”.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8073  in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
       4. One objection (Mark RISON – wanted text changes moved directly into resolution.) Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 8074 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8074  in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
       3. One objection (Mark RISON – wanted text changes moved directly into resolution.) Mark Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 8075 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: The nomenclature for peer-to-peer TWT is not mandated to exactly follow the nomenclature of individual and broadcast TWT. From the context of the descriptions in this subclause, there is no confusion in the usage of “peer-to-peer TWT agreement” and “peer-to-peer TWT schedule”.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8076 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. The name of the element is “TIE” so no change is needed.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:37:41Z) - The name of the element is TIE.
       4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 8077 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 8078 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution Rejected; Although a Channel Usage element contains only one Channel Entry field, the Channel Usage Elements field may contain one or more Channel Usage elements. Therefore, the Channel Usage Elements field may contain multiple Channel Entry fields, each corresponding to a different Channel Usage element.
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 8079 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8079 in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
       3. One objection (Mark RISON – wanted text changes moved directly into resolution.) Mark Ready for Motion.
    5. CID 8080 (SEC) and CID 8081 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:22:19Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8080/8081 in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
       3. One objection (Mark RISON – wanted text changes moved directly into resolution.) Mark Ready for Motion.
    6. CID 8082 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment.
       2. Review Context.
       3. Discussion on use of infrastructure AP to use Aidable.
       4. Review the definition of channel-usage-aidable-BSS.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; (EMILY TO PROVIDE REJECT REASON)
       6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/1149r2** – Michael Montemurro (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-02-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 8168 (SEC)
        1. We ran out of time before, so return to finish this CID.
        2. Review context page 3030 Line 212-38.
        3. Page 3028.22
        4. Suggest move text to 3032.
        5. Also discussion on page 3046.
        6. Discussion on reducing the duplicate description text.
        7. Proposed Resolution: REVISED  
             
           At cited location, change  
           “Construct the (#209)CCM nonce as defined in 12.5.2.3.4 (Construct CCM nonce) from the PN,  
           A2, and the priority value of the MPDU where A2 is MPDU Address 2”  
           To  
           “Construct the (#209)CCM nonce as defined in 12.5.2.3.4 (Construct CCM nonce)   
           where MPDU Address 2 is used as A2.”  
             
           At 3046.63, change  
           “Construct the (#209)GCM nonce as defined in (#357)12.5.4.3.4 (Construct GCM nonce) from the PN and A2, where A2 is MPDU Address 2.”  
           To  
           “Construct the (#209)GCM nonce as defined in (#357)12.5.4.3.4 (Construct GCM nonce).”
        8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8236 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8238 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Update the EAPOL-KEY notation to use OCI only. At 3108.42, 3120.56, 3120.57, change “OCI KDE” to “OCI”
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
       4. Discussion that the Editor could just add a space after the comma in the messages. The editor said she would add the spaces if this was only location, but there was a potential that there was another message set that also needed to have a space after the comma.
       5. Need to include statement in resolution: "Add a space after each comma that is not already followed by a space in 12.7.6.1 P3109 L13-L24."
       6. Proposed resolution: REVISED.

Update the EAPOL-KEY notation to use OCI only.

At 3108.42 (left most occurrence), 3120.56, change “OCI KDE” to “OCI”.

At 3120.57, change “OCI KDE” to “The OCI KDE”

Add a space after each comma that is not already followed by a space in 12.7.6.1 P3109 L13-L24 and at P3120 L27-30."

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8240 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. Recess at 12:25pm

1. REV**me Meeting Wednesday PM2** – July 17 4-6pm ET
   1. **Called to order 4:05 pm** ET by Michael Montemurro
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark HAMILTON
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      4. Editor – Emily QI
      5. Editor – Edward AU
      6. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. Reminder Patent Slides/Copyright slides and participant slides.
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda**:
      1. 11-24/985r3
      2. No objections
   5. **Review doc 11-24/1289r6 Edward AU (Huawei)**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1289-06-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-comments-on-recirculation-sa-ballot-on-d6-0.docx>
      2. CID 8021:
         1. Review Comment
         2. Add a couple articles in the first Note.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.  
            Change from  
              
            “NOTE 1—If the ISTA successfully transmits a non-IFTMR  
            frame late in a burst instance, fewer than FTMs per burst might be successfully  
            transmitted by the RSTA in the burst instance. If a FTM frame, except for the  
            IFTM frame in the ASAP=0 case, is sent outside a burst instance, it might not  
            be acknowledged.”  
              
            To  
            “NOTE 1—If the ISTA successfully transmits an FTM  
            Request frame with the Trigger field set to 1 late in the burst duration, fewer  
            than the negotiated per burst TOF measurements (i.e., the value of the FTM Per  
            Burst field) might be completed within this burst duration instance.  
              
            NOTE 2—If an FTM frame, except for the IFTM frame in the  
            ASAP=0 case, is sent outside a burst instance, it might not be acknowledged.”
         4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **Review 11-24/1149r3 –** Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-03-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 8241 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Make the changes proposed by the commenter with the exception of 775.55, 776.19, and 776.209. (Fragment element). At those locations, change “may be” to “is”.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8201 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion about whether PMKID[0..1] means there are up to two PMKIDs
        3. (index 0 and index 1), or does it mean there are either zero PMKIDs, or one PMKIDs?
        4. Agreed that the first one (in the first PASN frame) means PMKID[0], PMKID[1] .. PMKID[n]]. (That is, up to n PMKIDs)
        5. The second one (second PASN frame) is only zero or one PMKIDs
        6. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. At 3165.18, change “PMKID[0..n]” to “[PMKID[0], PMKID[1] .. PMKID[n]]”  
           At 3165.24, change “PMKID[0..1]” to “[PMKID]”
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 8145 (SEC)
        1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
        2. Discussion on the actual editorial changes to be made.
        3. There is an other change close there that may need review in future.
        4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At cited location, change “Key Field” to “GTK”.
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8203 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; REVISED.  
          Change "The No-Fragmentation subfield is reserved when transmitted by an HE STA to another HE STA.(11ax) " to   
          "The No-Fragmentation subfield is reserved when transmitted by a non-DMG STA "
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.

* + 1. CID 8206 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8207 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Replace  
          the cited sentence with “TK\_Length\_Bits is the TK\_bits in Table 12-8.”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 8208 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 8088 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    5. CID 8089 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. The Editor can put a star next to the number and note at the bottom of the table
       3. During the discussion on where to note it, we found that it had already delt with this
       4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The AKM has already been deprecated. See NOTE-2 following the table (1029.4)..
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    6. CID 8090 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    7. CID 8091 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; The AKM provides an FT AKM that uses SHA-384 with restrictions on cipher suite selectors. The Commenter provides no justification for marking the AKM Deprecated.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    8. CID 8147 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8135 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Review context.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Rejected, while duplicative, the cited text is necessary because there are four mechanisms for how the PTK is derived.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8094 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Prepend the cited sentence   
            
          Change “The Max Channel Switch Time element is defined"  
          To  
          “The Max Channel Switch Time Element field, if present, contains a Max Channel Switch Time element as defined". Also make the same change at 1654.38.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 8127 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 8121 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. 4 Instances to do apply proposed change.
       3. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED. Change Full SSID to SSID when not referring to the field name.

At 1373.51, change “Full SSID” to “SSID” in third column.

At 1863.27, change “a Full SSID” to “an SSID” in the second occurrence.

At 3896.7 and 3896.50, change “Full SSID” to “SSID”.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8137 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At end of cited sentence, delete “(see 9.4.2.2 (SSID element))”.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8103 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on what the proposed change really is.
       3. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED. Make the changes provided by the commenter.

At cited location, change “If any field is absent, other than fields whose length is zero because the count indicated in the preceding field is zero, then none of the subsequent fields are included."

To

“If the Group Data Cipher Suite, Pairwise Cipher Suite Count, AKM Suite Count, RSN Capabilities or PMKID Count field is absent, then all of the subsequent fields are also absent.”

At 887.23, change the Extensible column value for the RSN row from “Yes” to “No” in Table 9-130.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8106 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on if we accept or reject the comment.
       3. Straw Poll:
       4. Would you resolve CID 8106 as Accept, Reject, Abstain.
       5. Results: 2, 4, 3
       6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED. It is important to highlight the importance of binary comparison of SSID for security purposes.
       7. One Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8115 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED. The description is informative so the use of “can” is appropriate.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 8116 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: . REVISED. At cited location, change “can be deleted” to “should be deleted”.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 8224 and 8223 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: 8224 – ACCEPTED
       3. Proposed Resolution 8223 -- (8223) REVISED. Make changes in line with those provided by the commenter. At 5719.21, change “64000000” to “255”
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 8221 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED. At 5717.26, change “non-AP STA” to “non-AP STA for a transmit sector sweep”.

At 5717.25, change “maximum TXSS duration” to “maximum duration”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. Recess at 6:00pm ET

1. REV**me Meeting Thursday PM1** – July 16 13:30-15:30 ET
   1. **Called to order 1:33 pm** ET by Michael Montemurro
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      3. Editor – Emily QI
      4. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. **Reminder Patent Slides/Copyright slides and participant slides.**
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda**:
      1. 11-24/985r4
      2. No objections to today’s agenda
   5. **Review 11-24/1149r4 –** Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1149-04-000m-sa3-comment-resolutions.docx>
      2. CID 8092 and 8093 (SEC)
         1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
         2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; there are no AKMs using SHA-1 defined for FT due to concerns with security vulnerabilities associated with SHA-1. There is an AKM for FT with PSK and SHA-256 which is 4.
         3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 8233 (SEC)
         1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
         2. Proposed Resolution: EJECTED. PMKSA is  
            not reset under these conditions. The PTKSA (and possibly the PMKSA) would be  
            established in the transition from State 3 to State 4.
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
      4. CID 8184 (SEC)
         1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
         2. Discussion on the proposed resolution changes.
         3. Proposed Resolution:

Change the sentence at P825L34 to “The format of the GAS Query Fragment ID field is shown in Figure 9-173”   
Change the “GAS Query Fragment ID” in Figure 9-173 to “GAS Fragment ID”.   
Change “Fragment ID” to “GAS Fragment ID” at P1662L1 and P1663L8.   
Insert the following text as a second paragraph in Clause 9.4.1.31 (P825L31) “The GAS Fragment ID field contains the GAS fragment number.”  
At 825.28, delete “The maximum value permitted in the GAS Query Fragment ID is 127.”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 8125 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Discussion on proposed resolution.
       3. Proposed Resolution:

REJECTED. The setting of the  
Encrypted Key Data field is defined in the EAPOL-Key request and as with other  
EAPOL-Key frames, it is dependent on the presence of Key Data and whether the AEAD cipher is negotiated as part of the AKM.

* + - 1. One Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8139 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion.
       2. Discussion on what specific text is being restored from D1.0.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Restore the MLME Primitives for WUR Discovery.

REVISED. Restore the MLME primitives for WUR Discovery.

Restore the clause and subclauses from REVme D1.0 clause 6.3.125 (page 843) into the current draft as a clause and subclauses following 6.5.24.

In Table 6-1 at 403.48 for WUR Discovery, change the text in the References column to include the new WUR Discovery clause 6.5.25.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 8174, 8175 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed resolution was sent by Mark RISON.
       3. Proposed resolution:

REVISED. Change  
“(#6149)If the (#3488)Information field of the RSNE, with the exception of the pairwise cipher suite count and pairwise cipher suite list, is not the same as that sent by the TDLS initiator STA in message 1 of this sequence, then the TDLS initiator STA shall reject the response with status code INVALID\_RSNE.”  
to  
“(#6149)If the (#3488)Information field of the RSNE is not the same as that sent by the TDLS initiator STA in message 1 of this sequence, except that the version may be lower as long as it is nonzero, then the TDLS initiator STA shall reject the response with status code INVALID\_RSNE.”

Note to Editor: CID 8174 and 8175 have the same resolution.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/1314r1** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1314-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d6-0-sa3.docx>
     2. CID 8149 (SEC)
        1. Review comment and discussion in document.
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:09:35Z) Change “FTM subfield of the CCMP Header (Figure 12-15 (Expanded CCMP MPDU(#3525)(11az)))” to “FTM subfield of the CCMP or GCMP header (Figure 12-15 (Expanded CCMP MPDU(#3525)(11az)) or Figure 12-28 (Expanded GCMP MPDU(11az)))”.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8214 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:12:45Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8214 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1314-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d6-0-sa3.docx>, which restrict inclusion of the RSNXE in the third and fourth messages to Reassociation Request/Response frames.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CI CID 8200 (SEC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:15:12Z) - Add a second note at the end of Table 12-11:  
            
          NOTE 2—AES-SIV-256 and AES-SIV-512 are AEAD ciphers.  
            
          And number the existing NOTE as NOTE 1 (2 locations).
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 8219 (SEC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution:

REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:18:17Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8219 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1314-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d6-0-sa3.docx>, which refer to things as short SSIDs when they are the 32-bit CRC of the SSID.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 8218 and 8220 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:22:54Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8218 and 8220 in https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1314-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d6-0-sa3.docx, which clarify the composition of the 2 octets for a Compressed SSID field.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8132 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Review the proposed changes.
       3. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8132 in <this document URL>, which refer to BSSID indices rather than “NonTXBSS ID”s. Note to Editor same Resolution for CID 8132 and CID 8138.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 8138 (ED1)
       1. Return to 8138, this is moot due to 8132.
       2. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8132 in <this document URL>, which refer to BSSID indices rather than “NonTXBSS ID”s. Note to Editor same Resolution for CID 8132 and CID 8138.
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 8179 (SEC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:38:53Z) - As the body of 23.3.12.2.8 insert “An NDP Paging frame is an NDP\_1M Paging frame or an NDP\_2M Paging frame, as defined in this subclause.”
       3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    5. CID 8164 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Review proposed changes in resolution.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 18:41:28Z) - Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8164 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1314-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d6-0-sa3.docx>, which address the vague “DTIM”s.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    6. CID 8181 (SEC)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. Proposed Resolution:

Change "when dot11VHTOptionImplemented is true and the STA is not a STA 6G" to "in the 5 GHz band when dot11VHTOptionImplemented is true" at 737.5, 741.29, 745.37, 750.26, 756.14, 760.33, 765.42.

Change “The VHT Capabilities element is present if dot11VHTOptionImplemented is true.” to “The VHT Capabilities element is present in the 5 GHz band if dot11VHTOptionImplemented is true.” at 1664.57, 1726.41, 1728.48, 1763.30, 1764.6.

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8182 (ED1)
       1. Review comment and discussion in submission.
       2. There was a “frame” that needed to be removed.
       3. Proposed resolution: Revised; Make the changes shown under “Proposed changes” for CID 8182 in 11-24/1314r2 ( <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1314-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d6-0-sa3.docx>) which lowercase “paging request/response/requester/responder/setup” after “NDP”.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8105 (SEC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review Context.
       3. There are only 2 locations: 214.42 and 2145.49
       4. Proposed Resolution.: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 19:04:16Z) - At the cited location, change "the NDP Sounding Announcement field" to "the HT NDP Announcement field"

At 2145.49, change "the NDP Sounding Announcement field" to "the CMMG NDP Announcement field"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8128 (SEC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review content.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-18 19:11:57Z) - Delete the sentence at 743.34, 748.24, 752.29, 758.57, 761.54, 769.26, 778.22, 782.16.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. Review Doc 11-24/1293 (Rubayet Shafin)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-01-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>
     2. CID 8072 and 8074 (SEC)
        1. Review each comment and the proposed resolution.
        2. Proposed Resolution: 8074: REVISED (SEC: 2024-07-17 15:32:42Z) - Incorporate the changes tagged with #8074  in document <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1293-02-000m-sa-ballot-cr.docx>

CID 8072: REJECTED (SEC: 2024-07-18 19:16:00Z) - The comment is not specific enough to identify the issue with the sentence.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. Recess 3:21pm

1. REV**me Meeting Thursday PM1** – July 16 13:30-15:30 ET
   1. **Called to order 1:33 pm** ET by Michael Montemurro
   2. **Introduction of Officers:**
      1. 802.11me Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO
      2. Vice Chair – Mark HAMILTON
      3. Vice Chair – Mark RISON
      4. Editor – Emily QI
      5. Secretary – Jon ROSDAHL
   3. **Reminder Patent Slides/Copyright slides and participant slides.**
      1. No Issues noted.
   4. **Review Agenda** -- 11-24/985r4:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0985-04-000m-revme-agenda-july-2024-session.pptx>
      2. No objection to agenda
   5. MOTIONS
      1. **Motion #168 – EDITOR1, EDITOR2, SEC CIDs (2024-07-18)**
         1. Approve the comment resolutions in the

"Trivial Comments “ (31 CIDs) tab, “Motion-ED1-SA3A” (11 CIDs) tab, and “Motion-ED1-SA3B” (2 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1235-03-000m-revme-sb3-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>,

“ED2 - SA3 - Motion 1” tab (2 CIDs), “ED2 - SA3 - Motion 2” tab (31 CIDs), “ED2 - SA3 - Motion 3” tab (4 CIDs), “ED2 - SA3 - Motion 4” tab (5 CIDs), and “ED2 - SA3 - Motion 5” tab (3 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1281-05-000m-revme-sa-ballot-3-ed2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>,

“SEC Motion A” tab (31 CIDs), and “SEC Motion B” (109 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1142-01-000m-revme-sa3-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>,

and incorporate the text changes into the TGme draft.

* + - 1. Moved: Emily QI
      2. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
      3. Result: No Objection – Unanimous consent – Motion Passes.
    1. **Motion #169 – Submission Required CIDs (2024-07-18)**
       1. Resolve the following CIDs in the
       2. ED1: “Submission Required” tab ( 3 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1235-03-000m-revme-sb3-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>,
       3. SEC: “Submission Required” tab ( 23 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1142-01-000m-revme-sa3-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>,
       4. 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.”
       5. Moved: Emily QI
       6. Seconded: Stephen MCCANN
       7. Result: No Objection – Unanimous consent – Motion Passes.
       8. **Motion #170 – PDF rendering (2024-07-18)**
          1. Approve the comment resolutions in the
          2. “SEC Motion CID 8008” tab (1 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1142-01-000m-revme-sa3-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>,
          3. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
          4. Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
          5. Discussion: Concern with getting the identified problem actually fixed by publication editor
          6. Result: Approved with the exception of one no vote (Mark RISON)
    2. **Motion #171 – Encrypted Data (2024-07-18)**
       1. Approve the comment resolutions in the
       2. “SEC Motion CID 8125” tab (1 CIDs) in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1142-01-000m-revme-sa3-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>,
          1. Moved: Stephen MCCANN
          2. Seconded: Jouni MALINEN
          3. Discussion: concern with resolution.
          4. Result: Approved with the exception of one no vote (Mark RISON)
  1. That concludes the comment processing for this recirculation.
  2. **MOTION: SA Ballot Recirculation:**
     1. Having approved comment resolutions for all of the comments received from the recirculation SA Ballot on REVme D5.0 as contained in documents

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1235-03-000m-revme-sb3-editor1-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1281-05-000m-revme-sa-ballot-3-ed2-ad-hoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1142-01-000m-revme-sa3-sec-adhoc-comments.xlsx>

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0033-11-000m-revme-motions.pptx>

Instruct the editor to prepare Draft 7.0 incorporating these resolutions

and approve a 10-day SA Ballot Recirculation asking the question “Should REVme D6.0 be forwarded to RevCom?”

* + 1. Moved: Emily Qi
    2. Seconded: Jouni MALINEN
    3. Results: Unanimous, No Objection – Motion passes.
  1. **Review 11-24/1141r0** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1141-00-000m-p802-11revme-report-to-ec-on-conditional-approval-to-forward-draft-to-revcom.pptx>
     2. Review Report to 802 LMSC
     3. Long discussion on the dates and requirements to post to RevCom.
     4. Slide 8 has the proposed Timeline.
     5. There is an issue for posting to IEEE SA RevCom needs 5-day review by IEEE Staff.
     6. **Motion:** **EC Conditional Approval for REVCOM**
     7. Approve document 11-24/1141r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1141-00-000m-p802-11revme-report-to-ec-on-conditional-approval-to-forward-draft-to-revcom.pptx> ) as the report to the IEEE 802 Executive Committee on the requirements for conditional approval to forward P802.11REVme to RevCom and

Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to conditionally approve forwarding P802.11REVme to RevCom.

* + 1. Moved: Mark Hamilton
    2. Second: Stephen MCCANN
    3. Result: 9-0-0 Motion Passes.
  1. **Teleconference/Future Meeting Plan**
     1. Aug 12, 2024, 10AM ET
     2. No Ad Hoc planned
     3. September Plenary: None
  2. **Adjourned 17:12 ET**

**References:**