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Abstract

This document includes minutes of all IEEE 802.11bd teleconference between the November and January face to face meetings.

*Versioning:*

R0: Uploaded after Dec 3 teleconference

# Tuesday, December 3, 2020

## Opening

* 1. Call to order 9:10 AM EST
  2. Chair introduced the patent policy and meeting rules.
  3. No response to the call for patents.

## Agenda

* 1. Chair presented the agenda as sent on email list: <http://www.ieee802.org/11/email/stds-802-11-tgbd/msg00152.html>.
  2. Chair is verifying that presenters are on the call and order of presentations
  3. Agenda for this session has been adopted without objection

### Technical Submission ([802.11-19/2115r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-2115-00-00bd-broadcast-ack-operation.pptx))

* 1. Presentation by Onn Haran
  2. Discussion
     1. Question about slide 5 option 2,what is the MAC header
     2. Response: there is a 24 bits available to indicate this in the MAC header
     3. Question: on slide 11 vs slide 7 are two different approaches. Which one do you prefer.
     4. Response: they don’t conflict each other. Could use either or both. If to reduce the amount of work, we just want to define one, the most efficient should be used and that is slide 11 scheme.
     5. Comment: this was discussed in 802.11aa and it was found that multi-recipient doesn’t do error recovery well and is difficult to implement.
     6. Response: doesn’t agree with complexity argument
     7. Comment: Even if we decide to include a mechanism for reliable multicast, this isn’t a good solution. (still discussing slide 11). The issue is with PIFS recovery if the first BroadcastAck is wrong.
     8. Comment on slide 10, is this the only change required for the new BlockAck procedure. There are additional cases that rely on the BlockAck agreement and maintaining the scoreboard context and buffer.
     9. Question: How does the originator know the group to which it is sending? Are their additional messages for this?
     10. Response: There is a safety protocol running on top of 802.11. This safety protocol will have an understanding of the other vehicles around it, and which of them it wants to communicate with in this manner.
     11. So the upper layer will have the information about which other stations are around.
     12. Exactly
     13. Question: on slide 7, does it only allow for one retry?
     14. Comment: this is only an example. The unacknowledged broadcast is used for the safety messages and they are repeated every 100ms. For other types of signaling you want it to be reliable and retry.
     15. Question: In your scenario you are considering BlockAck as a BroadcastAck.
     16. Comment: Yes, considering to use BlockAck as the mechanism to transmit Broadcast Ack
     17. Question: Have you considered just sending simple Ack, it may save time.
     18. Comment: If not using A-MPDU, might want to consider shorter simple Ack for these cases.
     19. Comment: need to check which fields are needed. (Ack vs BlockAck)
     20. Question to the other commenter on why PIFS recovery cant be done on slide 11.
     21. Comment that the OCB environment changes more quickly than other 802.11 environments so finishing transmission sequences more quickly is important.
     22. The use case is platooning which has low relative speed, but possibly a number of hidden nodes. Suggestion that RTS/CTS or CTS-to-self protection before transmitting might be helpful.
     23. Discussion about whether RTS/CTS helps or not.
     24. Would you use basic rate, or higher data rate? 11bd has a larger range of rates.
     25. Straw polls will be added for the January meeting to discuss moving forward with reliable broadcast protocols.

### Technical Submission ([802.11-19/1946r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1946-00-00bd-detection-of-adpative-repetitions.pptx))

* 1. Presentation by Alessio Filippi
  2. Discussion:
     1. Comment about doing repetition with a deterministic gap. If the cause of the original packet failure is a collision, then assuming both transmitters use the same gap, won’t both collide? Suggest to look at the real-world testing outdoors to see what the cause of packet loss are, and if 32us gap is enough to solve it.
     2. Agree that system testing with different channel busy ratio is needed. Discussion about interferer vs low SNR situations.
     3. Comment maybe this is good for NLOS channel.
     4. Comment on adding randomness to the gap between repetitions.
     5. Comment that interference is a big factor and if there is interference the EVM isn’t helpful
     6. Question about the channel model for simulation on slide 16. It appears the channel estimation may not be accurate.
     7. Comment from co-author Vincent Martinez that they have also simulated in more challenging channels and larger number of OFDM symbols, 5, 7, 8.
     8. Comment that there is a way to get both repetition gain, but also get some diversity gain. This may require additional signaling.
     9. Discussion about extra tones on the side of the subcarrier for the data portion to add extra signaling proposal from November.
     10. There are Strawpolls in this presentation and they will be run in January to collect the groups opinion on this topic.

### Regulatory discussion

* 1. James had sent the following two links to the email reflector to inform members of an upcoming regulatory procedure regarding the 5.9GHz spectrum our 802.11bd amendment targets.
     1. <https://www.fcc.gov/news-events/events/2019/12/december-2019-open-commission-meeting>
     2. <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/filings?limit=50&offset=0&proceedings_name=19-138>
  2. Discussion about the FCC process timeline for draft NPRM (available today), FCC Open meeting (Dec 12), the date the NPRM is published (a date after Dec 13), then it’s a 30 day comment period. This comment period will overlap with our January face to face meeting.
  3. IEEE 802.18 TAG is the group within IEEE 802 that can file comments at the FCC on radio regulatory matters related to our standards.
  4. In the past there was an 802.11 Regulatory Standing Committee. They have historical documents to provide background [11-13/1449](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-1449-02-0reg-proposal-for-dsrc-band-coexistence.pptx) [11-15/0402](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0402-02-0reg-dsrc-band-sharing-tt-status-and-report-finalization.pptx) [11-14/1596](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1596-04-0reg-final-report-of-dsrc-coexistence-tiger-team.docx) on this topic that goes back several years.
  5. Suggestion to devote some time to discuss this topic during January face to face.
  6. Suggestion that “802.11bd TG” will want to provide our position to “802.11 WG”.
     1. 802.11bd position may differ or conflict with the position of other parts of 802.11 promoting Wi-Fi operation in the lower 45MHz.
     2. There are other parts of the NPRM where 802.11 may have unified view such as details about channel 180 and 183.
  7. Comments in support to have this as an agenda item in the January meeting
  8. There was a request that Bo ask for some time on this topic at the Wednesday plenary.
  9. Question about the out of band emissions and the loss of the guardband between unlicensed channels and ITS safety channels.
  10. Comment that this is part of the NPRM. The details about power levels and emissions masks are things we can comment on.
  11. Chair asks Joe Levy (Vice Chair) to kick off an on-line discussion on the 802.11bd reflector to start building a position before the January face to face meeting.

### Closing

* 1. Chair asks members to send any agenda items for the next teleconference via email.
  2. Chair adjourns at 10:47am
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# Tuesday, December 17, 2020

TBD

# Next Meetings

Face to face:

Hotel Irvine, Irvine, California, USA, January 13, 2019

Teleconferences:

December 17, 9-11am EST