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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the TGbe MAC ad hoc sessions in March 2024 Plenary.

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the minutes from the MAC ad hoc sessions held on March 11 AM1, March 13 PM3, and March 14 AM1.

**March 11, 2024, AM1 (TGbe MAC ad hoc session)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Denver (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 08:00. 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 meeting.
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 Wireless Interim/Plenary Session” 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 11-24/237r3. The agenda was approved.

**Submissions**

1. [296r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0296-04-00be-cr-for-miscellaneous-cids.docx) CR for Miscellaneous CIDs Po-Kai Huang [5C SP]

C: This makes AID is unique per each BSS?

C: You don’t need exising because AP can assign the new one.

A: I’m ok with removing existing.

C: AID is unique in a BSS in the baseline.

C: You can change like the AP MLD shall not assign the AID ....

C: Why do you need two conditions?

A: This is for the link configuration case.

C: Can you defer this?

A: Ok

22027 is deferred

C: 22250, what is the baseline operation?

A: We don’t have any in the baseline. This is generalization.

C: Is this for 11be specific or general operation?

A: Then, we can add EHT STA for 11be.

C: That’s the passive sentence. Other member may submit the comment for changing it. You can change it like An EHT STA shall not use a status code unless the condition ....

A: Ok.

C: 22250, 22343, can you defer them?

A: Ok, this is the first new one.

22250, 22343 were deferred.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/296r7 for the following CIDs?

22034, 22174, 22250

No objection

1. [319r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0319-00-00be-cr-for-miscellaneous-cids-part-ii.docx) CR for Miscellaneous CIDs Part II Po-Kai Huang [3C]

22171

C: Do we have to add VHT?

A: We employed new format 26, VHT can be covered in the previous clauses 10, 11.

C: How about 12 too?

A: I’m ok with adding 12.

C: Clause 13?

A: I don’t think adding FT per link stuff.

C: Ok

22292

C: there is also a response frame in the last sentence.

A: Ok. I can move it.

A: there is duplication.

C: I think we can remove at least one other requested link exists.

A: I agree. Ok with removing it.

C: On the fourth line, there is a text regarding requested link that exisits.

C: We can do offline discussion.

A: I think this is correct one. Like can change to request in the second paragraph?

C: Let’s review it one more time.

A: Ok

22413 is deferred.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/319r2 for the following CIDs?

22171, 22292,

No objection

1. [291r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0291-00-00be-resolution-of-epcs-related-cids-sa-ballot.docx) Resolution of EPCS-related CIDs (SA Ballot) John Wullert [6C]

C: You can put the document number instead of XXXX. It is going to be R1

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/291r1 for the following CIDs?

22181, 22182, 22183, 22184, 22185, 22197

No objection.

C: Header should be also 291r1 rather than 921.

1. [292r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0292-00-00be-resolution-of-definition-related-cids-sa-ballot.docx) Resolution of Definition-Related CIDs (SA Ballot) John Wullert [3C]

C: you can change MLO to non-MLO.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/292r1 for the following CIDs?

22234, 22235, 22326

No objection

1. [322r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0322-00-00be-isb-cr-for-35-3-7-2-4.docx) ISB CR for 35.3.7.2.4 Jason Y. Guo [6C]

C; Why do we need that note?

A: the Expected Duration field indicates just duration.

C: we have two meanings for the Expected duration field. It may be ambiguous. Can you defer it?

A: Ok with deferring it.

C: you can add comman in front of units of TUs.

C: how many Tus do you need? 1 TU?

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/322r1 for the following CIDs?

22065 22196 22064 22035

No objection

1. [323r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0323-00-00be-isb-cr-for-cid-22390.docx) ISB CR for CID 22390 Jason Y. Guo [1C]

C: Do you check where the text comes from?

A: Maybe it’s from D3.0.

C: Or you can also mention like the B0 of RU allocation.

A: I’m fine with either way. I can change it. It should be R1.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/323r1 for the following CIDs?

22390

No objection

1. [305r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0305-00-00be-cr-for-rcm-relevant-cids.docx) SA-CR-for-RCM-relevant-CIDs Jay Yang [3C]

C: Page 4, there is a typo in the table. The meaning of value 1 is same as that of value 0.

A: This is the baseline. I agree.

C: We don’t have link MAC address. We have non-AP STA MAC address. Or non-AP MLD MAC address.

C: You have two addresses. You can use link address for authentication for all the cases.

A: I will update the text based on the Po-kai’s comment if there is no objection.

C: What’s the plan for the document? You have a big change.

A: I will come back on Thursday.

No SP.

1. [321r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0321-00-00be-initial-sa-ballot-cr-for-cid-22159.docx) Initial SA Ballot CR for CID 22159 Juseong Moon [1C]

Not present due to lack of time.

The session was recessed at 10:00.

**March 12, 2024, PM3 (TGbe MAC ad hoc session)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Denver (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 19:30. 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 meeting.
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 Wireless Interim/Plenary Session” 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 11-24/237r6. The agenda was approved with modifications.

**Submissions**

1. [321r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0321-02-00be-initial-sa-ballot-cr-for-cid-22159.docx) Initial SA Ballot CR for CID 22159 Juseong Moon [1C SP]

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/321r2 for the following CIDs?

22159

No objection

1. [368r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0368-02-00be-resolutions-for-cid-22177.docx) Resolutions for CID 22177 Kaiying Lu [1C SP]

C: Data field is capital D. OM control cannot be sent on cross link. You can use received rather than indicated.

C: MCS 15 subfield can be used in both EHT MU PPDU and EHT TB PPDU?

A: STA can indicate to not use MCS 15.

C: EHT TB PPDU does not carry EHT-SIG.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/368r3 for the following CIDs?

22177

No objection

1. [291r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0291-02-00be-resolution-of-epcs-related-cids-sa-ballot.docx) Resolution of EPCS-related CIDs (SA Ballot) John Wullert [1C SP]

C: Is the capability for AP MLD or both ?

A: Both side.

C: You don’t need to advertise by AP side.

A: STA need to indicate that I support the capability. Then AP can indicate I support the capability. So, both sides can indicate.

C: If the STA does not support the capability, the AP does not send it.

A: We can have AP shouldn’t send if STA does not support the capability.

C: Why not in the MLD?

SP is deferred.

1. [357r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0357-00-00be-initial-sa-ballot-cr-for-35-3-21-2.docx) Initial SA Ballot CR for 35.3.21.2 Guogang Huang 5

C: we can keep “AP affiliated with the AP MLD” that is operating on the link which the non-AP MLD attempts to establish a TDLS link.

C: the BSSID is the link is weird. But the modification is good.

C: how this change is related to the comment? We can have offline discussion.

A: Ok.

C: Non-AP would not know.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/368r3 for the following CIDs?

22106 22107 22108

No objection

1. [359r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0359-00-00be-d5-0-cr-for-p2p-buffer-report.docx) D5.0 CR for P2P buffer report Yunbo Li 1

C: P2P for P2P peer STA in the second line is not defined in 11be.

A: its peer STA is ok.

C: 35.2.1.3 can be changed to 35.2.1.2

C: Intention, TXS procedure, client can return the TXOP. AP can regain the TXOP and can transmit its PPDU.

A: returning is optional. Buffer may be zero. Without knowing this, AP cannot know.

C: A-Control field is MAC header.

A: This is optional feature.

C: I have a lot of suggestions.

C: you can add link id here. I agree with the direction.

C: Page 4, how about BSRP trigger? How does the STA know it?

A: Same BSRP. STA can choose it.

SP is deferred.

1. [324r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0324-01-00be-cr-for-802-11be-isb.docx) CR for 802.11be ISB Laurent Cariou

C: Can you show the text? You’d better add the bullet instead of note.

A: The second bullet can cover that case. This is just clarification.

C: third bullet is better.

A: It’s redundant. Did not occur.

C: I agree with Laurent. So, I want to add the note.

C: If one of them is met, what happens?

C: this is not removing mode 3.

A: Just optional.

C: there is error for negotiation. You can change Duration to Direction.

C: what’s the cited text?

The session was recessed at 21:30.

**March 14, 2024, AM1 (TGbe MAC ad hoc session)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Denver (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 08:00. 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 meeting.
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 Wireless Interim/Plenary Session” 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 11-24/237r7. The agenda was approved.

**Submissions**

1. [305r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0305-01-00be-cr-for-rcm-relevant-cids.docx) SA-CR-for-RCM-relevant-CIDs Jay Yang [3C SP]

C: frame work format is baseline.

C: Is this feature mandatory or optional?

A: Optional?

C: This text is new text. If it’s a magnet of new comments of it, i’m worried about.

A: BH people already reviewed it. No concern and no comment.

C: We still need to review them. I want to defer this. Did you get feedback from them?

C: there are a lot of new text and changes. We don’t need to rush through this. BH expert firstly reviews it.

SP is deferred.

1. [304r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0304-03-00be-d5-0-cr-for-ml-reconfiguration-part-1.docx) D5.0 CR for ML Reconfiguration part 1 Binita Gupta [2C SP]

C: NSTR indication bitmap is big. The bit corresponding to the link that is removed shall be set to 0 in any NSTR indication bitmap fields.

C: Why do you add one or more?

A: each one is for different link ID. The commenter is it’s not clear.

C: Do we say with each one?

This r5.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/304r5 for the following CIDs?

22081 22333

No objection

1. [293r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0293-01-00be-sa-ballot-cr-for-35-3-7-5-2.docx) SA ballot: CR for 35.3.7.5.2 Arik Klein [9C SP]

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/293r3 for the following CIDs?

22030, 22036, 22059, 22060, 22061, 22095, 22096, 22279, 22327

No objection

1. [294r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0294-00-00be-sa-ballot-cr-for-35-3-7-5.docx) SA ballot: CR for 35.3.7.5 Arik Klein [7C SP]

C: 22283, is there any consensus on deleting Disassociation MLDSTAs?

A: There was consensus on this.

C: why did you change this for affiliated AP link enablement?

A:If you are using the default, so you don’t need to advertise TTLM. It’s already mentioned in the chapter. It’s clearly defined.

22056 is deferred.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/294r1 for the following CIDs?

22057, 22058, 22278, 22282, 22283, 22414

No objection

1. [343r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0343-00-00be-initial-sa-cr-emlsr-misc.docx) TGbe Initial SA CR EMLSR misc Minyoung Park [12C]

C: 22271 can be revised because the commenter suggested two.

A: True.

C: STA can report I’m not going to listen operation.

A: I can defer this.

C: which is item i)? do we have item i) in the draft?

A: Yes, we have it in Draft 5.1 not 5.0

C: Not allowing non-AP STA to switch back to the listening operation need to be discussed.

A: I can defer this. 22158.

22158 is deferred.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/343r1 for the following CIDs?

22364 22356 22255 22261 22271 22258 22260 22256 22254 22163 22162

No objection.

1. [339r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0339-00-00be-sa-ballot-cr-for-35-1.docx) SA ballot CR for 35.1 Ming Gan [8C]

C: MLD reconfiguration capability is missing. It makes sense. You can add it.

A: If you add that, other capabilities may be required to be added. It can be included in the 35.3 already.

C: new added note is not clear. Can we defer it 22385?

A: ok

C: What is the purpose of the change?

A: I already mentioned not limited to.

C: 22354, shall not be used for what?

C: You can mention there is no other STAs affiliated with the same non-AP MLD.

A: non-AP MLD doesn’t exist??

C: You can integrate it with original sentence.

A: I think the separate one is clear.

C: in this case, the non-AP MLD and other affiliated STAs do not exist.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/339r1 for the following CIDs?

22161 22315 22316 22317 22318 22341 22354

No objection.

1. [341r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0341-00-00be-sa-ballot-cr-for-miscellaneous-cids.docx) SA Ballot CR for Miscellaneous CIDs Ming Gan [5C]

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-24/341r0 for the following CIDs?

22103 22209 22214 22322

SP is deferred.

The session was adjourned at 10:00.