IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Minutes for TGbe MAC Ad-Hoc teleconferences in July 2021 Plenary | | | | |
| Date: 2021-07-12 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Jeongki Kim | Self |  |  | [jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com](mailto:jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com) |
| Liwen Chu | NXP |  |  | [liwen.chu@nxp.com](mailto:liwen.chu@nxp.com) |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the TGbe MAC ad hoc teleconferences in July 2021 Plenary.

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the minute from the telephone conference held on July 12.
* Rev1: Added the minute from the telephone conference held on July 15.

**Monday 12 July 2021, 19:00 – 21:00pm ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Self)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 10:02am EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary.
2. The Chair reminded the members that they need to register for the plenary in order to attend the call
3. 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.
   1. Nobody responds.
4. The Chair goes through the IEEE copyright policy.
5. The Chair recommends using IMAT for recording the attendance.
   * Please record your attendance during the conference call by using the IMAT system:
     + 1) login to [imat](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance), 2) select “802.11 Telecons (<Month>)” entry, 3) select “C/LM/WG802.11 Attendance” entry, 4) click “TGbe <MAC/PHY/Joint> conference call that you are attending.
   * If you are unable to record the attendance via [IMAT](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance) then please send an e-mail to Liwen Chu ([liwen.chu@nxp.com](mailto:liwen.chu@nxp.com)) and Jeongki Kim ([jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com](mailto:jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com))
6. The Chair asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-21/924r1(r3). Several changes are made per the comment. The modified agenda was approved.

**Recorded attendance through Imat and e-mail:**

**Submissions**

1. [467r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0467-01-00be-cr-for-35-3-4-3-multi-link-element-usage.docx) CR for 35.3.4.3 Multi-link element usage Ming Gan [SP-10’]

The author goes through the changes of the version. 2329 is defered. Several questions are raised.

Discussion:

C: Is it Only update from r0?

A: Yes.

C: 2329 is defered? There is the related text.

A: Yes

C: 11.1.4.3.4 texts belonging to your defered texts. Not clear.

The author added 2329 in all text in the subclause.

C: The last comment (2977) resolution should be clarified. Wrong number of document.

The author updated it.

**SP: do you support the changes in 11-21/467r2 identified by the following CIDs?**

* + - 1191 1192 2096 2323 2422 2423 2977

No objection

1. [282r8](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0282-08-00be-resolutions-for-cc34-cids-for-mlo-tid-to-link-mapping-subclause.docx) Res. for CC34 CIDs for MLO TID to link mapping subclause Laurent Cariou [SP-5’]

The author goes through the changes of the version.. Several questions are raised.

Discussion:

C: Page 11, MMPDU is manament? You need to add control frame. E.g., NDPA. In your previous paragraph, there is contorl frame but it’s not here.

A: This is just for the power save state. Is this enable or disable?

A: Regarding the NDPA, we don’t need to adjust the same rule as MMPDU.

C: Ok,

C: Go to non-AP MLD, the first condition, no TIDtoMapping. Fine. The next part (retrieved buffered...), you need to add the MMDPU?

A: The first part already covers it.

C: However, if the condition meets, what about MMPDU?

C: I’m fine with the clarified text.

The text is modified with the clarification.

C: the last paragraph, you can remove the “not measurement” in it.

A: Ok,

C: You can remove “ follow the rules..”

A: The first and second text follow the subclause.

C: Ok

C: P 11, after 49, AP may use any enabled links…

C: one thing, MSDUs or A-MSDUs corresponding to TID 🡺 with TID

C: The last sentence, An MLD may use any enabled links.. should be AP MLD?

A: Ok, now I can limit the AP.

C: In case of disabling, you can add the control frame for consistency with previous paragraph.

The text is changed with the suggestion.

**SP: Do you agree with the changes proposed as resolution of CID 1927 and 2128 in document 282r9?**

43Y/18N/43A

1. [792r](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0792-04-00be-pdt-for-cc34-resolution-for-cid3222.docx)4 PDT for CC34 Resolution for CID3222 Arik Klein [25’]

The author goes through all texts of the document regarding the details of link disablement. There are two options of it.

Discussion

C: This is for latency-sensitive traffic.

A: This is the tool that AP MLD use.

C: Need some condition when it is used.

A: AP MLD know which links are used. In some cases, AP can disable one of the links.

The chair recommend that the author check the chat and there are 10 people in the queue.

1. [971r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0971-00-00be-pdt-for-fast-ml-transition.docx) PDT for fast ML transition Po-Kai Huang [30’]

The author goes through all texts of the document regarding flast ML tranition.

Discussion:

C: I like the direction. Need to discuss this in architecture group.

A: This is based on the Duncun’s document.

C: ..

A: non-AP STA is in one BSS.

A: This is already in Duncun’s document. The other is already passed.

C: I have comment for this in CC36.

A: Are you aligned with this?

C: No, but fine.

A: We can address it later with this document when we resolve it.

C: ML and BSS transition is better.

C: MLD has multiple MAC address in the definition

A: I will update it.

C: Abhi defines the similar thing in WMN sleep mode.

The chair asked whether there are any other businesses before recessing the meeting. No response was received.

The teleconference was recessed at 21:00pm

**Thursday 15 July 2021, 09:00 – 11:00pm ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Self)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 09:02am EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary.
2. The Chair reminded the members that they need to register for the plenary in order to attend the call
3. 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.
   1. Nobody responds.
4. The Chair goes through the IEEE copyright policy.
5. The Chair recommends using IMAT for recording the attendance.
   * Please record your attendance during the conference call by using the IMAT system:
     + 1) login to [imat](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance), 2) select “802.11 Telecons (<Month>)” entry, 3) select “C/LM/WG802.11 Attendance” entry, 4) click “TGbe <MAC/PHY/Joint> conference call that you are attending.
   * If you are unable to record the attendance via [IMAT](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance) then please send an e-mail to Liwen Chu ([liwen.chu@nxp.com](mailto:liwen.chu@nxp.com)) and Jeongki Kim ([jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com](mailto:jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com))
6. The Chair asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-21/924r7. Several changes are made per the comment. The modified agenda was approved.

**Recorded attendance through Imat and e-mail:**

**Submissions**

1. [**650r9**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0650-09-00be-cc34-resolution-for-cids-related-to-mlo-discovery.docx) **CC34 resolution for CIDs related to MLO Discovery Abhishek Patil [SP-10’]**

Summary: R9 is updated based on Payam and Ming’s comments.

Discussion:

C: There is a rule of MLD addressing. Comments on the probe request for non-transmitted BSSID and transmitted BSSID. MLD behavior is different from legacy behavior.

C: Echo to previous commenter. Conflict with the existing texts. Need more discussion.

A: This is based on legacy multiple-BSSID operation. If there is conflict, we can fix later.

**SP: Do you support the changes in 11-21/650r9 identified by the following CIDs?**

* + - 1037, 2962

47Y/25N/32A

1. [**672r2**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0672-02-00be-cr-for-restricted-twt-sp.docx) **CR for Restricted TWT SP Sunhee Baek [SP-10’]**

Summary: The author goes through update of the revisions.

Discussion:

C: Are you trying to extend the SP of individual member or all members?

A: I assume all members

C: What is the behavior of other members of the SP?

A: If AP announce the extension, they know it.

C: When the SP is extended, the quiet interval covers only the original SP. What can you handle it?

A: Not true. Quiet Interval is 1 TU. Not cover all part of SP.

C: New text that you updatd is conflicted with the next text. Overlapping TXOP should be clarified more.

**SP: Do you support the changes in 11-21/672r2 identified by the following CID?**

* + - **2922**

17Y/63N/33A

1. [**285r**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0285-02-00be-cc34-resolution-for-cids-related-to-mlo-ba-procedure.docx)**3 CC34 resolution for CIDs related to MLO BA Procedure Abhishek Patil [SP-20’]**

Summary: The author went through the remaining CIDs that he did not finish during the last call.

Discussion:

There are several discussions on the text” An originator MLD shall maintain a single common transmit buffer for each <peer MLD, TID> tuple under a block ack agreement, independent of the number of links that are setup”. E.g., how can it be test? Finally, the text was removed in the document and will be handled in CC36 CR.

Discussions on discaring duplicate frame with the same sequence number. In Revmd, the retry bit is used for it.

Local scoreboard context control, how to specify in receiver side?

Scoreboard maintained in originator MLD or recipient? It’s confusing. The text is changed from scoreboard to the reception status.

This is the local scoreboard. How about handling it later?

**SP: Do you support the changes in 11-21/285r4 identified by the following CIDs?**

* 1751 1684 2445 3029 2871 2870 1930 1931 1199 1932 1686 1446 1427 1065 3339 2353 3340 2837 3341 2485 1689 2713 1752 2756 2838 3383

55Y/4N/40A

1. [**971r**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0971-01-00be-pdt-for-fast-ml-transition.docx)**2 PDT for fast ML transition Po-Kai Huang [SP-20’]**

Summary: The author went through changes from previous revision regarding ML transition in BSS transition text, annex xx for examples, etc.

Discussion:

C: MDE is link address?

A: This is not ML element, this is just policy, KDE. EAPOL-Key is data frame.

C: MDE contains mobility domain id.

C: 13.4.1., there is MLD ME, you mentioned the SME of MLD.

A: After discussing in ARC, we decided to remove MLD ME.

C: Definition, should be IEEE 802.11 supplicant’s MLD instead of authenticator’s MLD.

A: My mistake

**SP: Do you support accept the changes in Part I of 11-21-0971r3?**

**No objection**

1. [**282r**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0282-09-00be-resolutions-for-cc34-cids-for-mlo-tid-to-link-mapping-subclause.docx)**10 Res. for CC34 CIDs for MLO TID to link mapping Laurent Cariou [SP-5’]**

Summary: The author went through changes from previous revision (based on Guoagang and Payam’s comments, CID1927)

Discussion:

C: bring up the complete solution

A: it doesn’t make sense of your email.

C: There is a lot of issues here for 2128. The texts are related to 2128. Please take out them of 2128.

C: You added the texts of non-AP MLD. What is the behaviour if AP want an MMPDU?

**SP: Do you agree with the changes for CID1927, 2128 in doc 282r10?**

**39Y/19N/45**

1. [**826r5**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0826-04-00be-pdt-for-error-recovery-of-nstr-mld.docx) **PDT for error recovery of NSTR MLD Yunbo Li [SP-10’]**

Summary: The author went through changes from previous revision (based on yongho and chunyu’s comments)

Discussion:

C: Is the strike-out text from the previous revision or from previous draft?

A: the previous version.

C: You need to remove the strikeout text.

The chair asked the group if there is objection to extend 5min. Nobody spoke.

**SP: Do you support the changes in 11-21/826r6 identified by the following CID?**

* **3325**

**40Y/18N/41A**

**The chair asked whether there is any other business before adjourning the call. Nobody spoke.**

**The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 ET.**