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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the 3 TGbe MAC ad hoc teleconferences held in December 2019 and January 2020.

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the telephone conference held the 12th of December 2019.
* Rev1: Slightly updated

**Thursday 12 December 2019, 10:00 – 13:00 ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (LG Electronics)

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen Chu, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 10:03. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary, Jeongki Kim (LG Electronics)
2. The Chair goes through the 802 and 802.11 IPR policy and procedures and asks if there is anyone that is aware of any potentially essential patents. Nobody speaks up.
3. The Chair reminds everyone to report their attendance by sending an e-mail to the Secretary and the Chairman himself. Based on the join.me app, it appears to be around 70 people in the call.

**Recorded attendance through the join.me app and/or reported attendance through e-mail:**
	* Akira Kishida (NTT)
	* AL Petrick
	* Albert Bredewoud
	* Alfred Asterjadhi (Qualcomm)
	* Abhishek Patil (Qualcomm)
	* BARON Stephane (Cannon)
	* Dibakar das
	* Dmitry Akhmetov
	* Gaurav Patwardhan
	* George Calcev
	* Hanseul Hong (Yonsei Univ.)
	* Insun Jang (LG)
	* Jane Erickson
	* Jason Yuchen Guo
	* Jeongki Kim (LG)
	* Jonathan Segev
	* Kazuto Yano (ATR)
	* Liwen Chu (NXP)
	* Matt Brooks
	* Ming GAN
	* Minyoung Park
	* Myeongjin Kim
	* Pascal Viger
	* Rojan Chitrakar
	* Sang Kim (LGE)
	* Sebastian Max (Ericsson)
	* Sharan Naribole
	* Stephane Baron (Canon)
	* Suhwook Kim
	* Sungjin Park (LGE)
	* Taewon Song
	* Younghoon Kwon,
	* Yongho Seok

1. The Chair reminds that the agenda can be found in 11-19/1720r0. Today we will go through submissions related to multi-link.

**Submissions**

1. **11-19/1528r2, Multi-Link Operation - Link Management (Abhishek Patil)**

**Summary:** R2 just updated the terminologies like MLD. Discussing the topic of link enablement. For AP power save, load balancing, co-ex conditions, need a mechanism for AP MLD to indicate the disablement of link(s). Two approaches, explicit signalling and implicit enablement (TID-to-Link maping).

**Discussion:**
**C:** you had only a single association operation? After association, no way need to create or add the link,
**A:** during association, MLD can negotiate the capabilities of multi-link? After association, you can enable or disable link.
**C:** For adding/enabling/disabling a link, do you need new association or re-association?

**A:** enablement/disablement could be possible by multi-link setup procedure. Adding or creating link as well.

**C:** what is the disabled link?
**C: disabled** link doesn’t allow any UL traffic or DL traffic. Beacon?

**A:** It will be in both links.

**C:** TID-to-Link mapping need a new signalling mechanism. In some case, we may define new power saving. Need to clarify that.

**A:** Existing power saving mechanism will be applied. Details will come later.
**C:** link has only one STA. enablement means the operational?

A: If a link is enabled, the baselink power saving is used in the links.

C: For association, need link enablement/disablement?

A: Before association, any link could be used.

C: AP or non-AP can enable/disable the links?

A: It depends on the scenarios (who initiates it, what is the scenario?)

C: Explicit enablement/disablement is much clear to me.

A: TID-to-link mapping provides the clear operation. See both exmaples

1. **11-19/**[**1541r1**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1541-01-00be-performance-aspects-of-multi-link-operations-with-constraints.pptx)**-Performance aspects of multi link op with constraints (Dmitry Akhmetov)**

**Summary:** Multi-link device may need to impose constraints on concurrent TX/RX operations on different bands

Introducing 2 new modes of operation with restrictions

isolated (R)estricted MPC

Non-isolated (R)estricted MPC

AP is considered a “better” device and can operate under “isolated RMPC” while STA operates under “non-isolated RMPC” rules

* + For STAs without Tx/Rx constraints, MPC mode of operation performs very well
	+ For STAs that have Tx/Rx constraints, both isolated and non isolated RMPC mode of operations preform much better than fully synchronized access
	+ Even with Tx/Rx constraints, MLLE still can provide benefits in terms of reduced latency

**Discussion:**

**C: page 6, right figure, OBSS load is zero?** why is the red bar reduced?
**A:**
**C:** In Your simulation, only DL, no OBSS. A single BSS. Then, no block the channel.

**C:** Why happened when one link is occupied, other links are idle?

**A:** links are independent…..
**C: two back-offs on two link? not fair independent channel access.**

**A:** multiple primary channel… Perfomance of synchronous operation depends on the environments
**C:** Slide 4, you list channel access rule. Non-isolated RMPC.

**A:**

**C:** For isolated RMPC, how do you differentiate isolated RMPC from MPC, for interference level, etc.?

1. **11-19/**[**1544r0**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1544-00-00be-multi-link-power-save-operation.pptx)**-Multi-link power save operation (Minyoung Park)**
**Summary:**

**Per-link power save operation**

**propose to use the power states of a STA per-link to indicate whether the enabled link isavailable for frame exchange**

When a STA is in the awake state, the link is available for frame exchange

When a STA is in the doze state, the link is not available for frame exchange

There may be other conditions that need to be met for frame exchange

**Concurrent multi-link case: non-AP MLLE signals in a frame the awake/doze states of multiple STAs to the AP MLLE**

**Discussion:**
**C:** Agree that we need to define the power efficiency mechanism, simplifying, co-existence etc. TIM element can not be used for all power saving mechanisms.
**A:** It’s hard to explain because I didn’t prepare the diagrams about that. Some of details can be shared offline.

**C:** one link can indicate the power states of other links.

**A:** I agree with it. We need more discussion.
**C:** do you have any performance for TID-to-link mapping? I’m not sure it improves WLAN.

**A:** Not yet. How useful TID mapping will be handled by other people. We just consider that assumption.
**C:** slide 7, do you consider the dedicated link? Control channel?

**A:** Singaling should be dedicated link or any link? Now any link. We don’t consider it yet. We need more details

1. **11-19/**[**1546r0**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1546-00-00be-legacy-performance-impact-on-multi-link-operation.pptx)**-Legacy Performance Impact on Multi-link Operation (Yongho Seok)**

**Summary:** **Performance evaluation per each MLO types**

**The MLO-MPC does not have any impact on the performance of legacy STA.**

**But, when the MLLE has a constraint on simultaneous Tx and Rx, both the CMLO-SPC and CMLO-MPC have some throughput loss and instead the legacy STA is taking more throughput gain.**

But, it seems that allowing the multiple primary channels shows the best operation mode for both the legacy STA and the EHT STA. That is, no performance degradation of legacy STAs

**Discussion:**

**C:** slide 15, for single primary channel, BSS2, the performance of legacy STAs is increased. (STA 6, 7, 8, perSTA throughput). What is reason? In this case, single primary channel? Throughput is much higher.
**A:** STA4 and 5 are reference simulation model. In link 1, STA a is access the channel based on ED. In link2, 7 STAs accesses the channel based on EDCA. So, STA6, 7, 8 have higher throughput.
**C:** in simultation, each STA has 80+80. Each link is 80MHz. in slide 14 (MPC+), multi-link device (80+80) is same as legacy STAs (80 +80) do you have consideration like this?

**A:** almost same. Link 1 is 80+80. Link 2 is 80+80. Different consideration? Legacy performance issues. I didn’t attach. Results are almost same.
**C:**slide 9, this is not actual frame exchange?

**A:** STA performs the EDCA channel access. Start time can be different. TX/RX time is different time. If you look at the result, MLO-MPC and CMLO-MPC is different

1. **11-19/** [**1548r1**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-1548-00-00be-channel-access-design-for-synchronized-multi-links.pptx)**-Channel access design for synchronized multi-links (Yunbo Li)
Summary:**.
**Channel Access Design for Synchronized Multi-Links** (using single primary channel for synchronized ML, Intra-BSS Solution 1, 2, Inter-BSS Solution)

**Discussion:**

**C:** what happen if link 2 is transmitted from legacy STA
**A:** It’s bigger issue. I don’t have solution for it.
**C:** slide 8**,** in link2, how can MLD 2 know the duration of BA of link 1(e.g., ba, ack, M-ba,)?

**A:** the STA doesn’t need to know the length exact duration. It’s organized by AP. AP can handle it.
**C:** Block Ack is longer than normal ack

**A:** we need think more. I prefer the single primary channel mechanism to avoid complex issue.
**C:** slide 8. Wasting the spectrum airtime in link 2. Depending on traffic pattern. obviously How can it expect the spectrum size based on traffic pattern?

**A:** I agree. I don’t prefer this solution.

**C:** Same comment as younghoon. Conern on supporting the single link legacy STA. Not easy to control the STAs. Solution for Synchronous AP/non-AP MLD are fine

**A:** I agree

**C:** non-AP MLD2. How legacy STA detects the preambles?

A: If MLD2 missed the preamble of PPDU1, it may happen. And if it may happen, there is some issue in AP side.

C: slide 8, duration of Ack is different from duration of BA.

A: AP side is also synchronous ML.

C: If STAs are hidden, synchronous ML AP could not receive frames.

C: slide 5. How can the STA maintain NAVs for both primary channels?

A: STA need to keep NAV for both links.

**Adjourned at 12:57 ET.**