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Abbreviation(s) used:

C: Comment

Q: Question

A: Answer

r0: initial version

# Minutes for the IEEE 802.11bn MAC Ad Hoc Mar-May Sessions

TGbn MAC Ad Hoc Chair chairing: Xiaofei Wang (Interdigital)

TGbn MAC Ad Hoc Chair serving as recording secretary: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

### 1st Conf. Call: March 24 (19:00–21:00 ET)–MAC

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM EDT.
   1. The chair, Xiaofei Wang, introduced himself.
   2. The secretary for the session is Srinivas Kandala
2. Chair’s reminder on meeting and patent policies.
   1. The chair reminded attendees of the patent polices.
   2. Chair called for essential patents, and none was indicated.
   3. The chair reminded attendees that participation is on an individual basis.
   4. The chair reminded attendees of IEEE meeting and copy right policies.
   5. Chair’s reminder on recording attendance through IMAT
3. The agenda is [11-25/0504r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0504-00-00bn-mar-may-tgbn-teleconference-agenda.docx).
   1. The chair reviews agenda
      1. The author of [24/2007r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-2007-04-00bn-pdt-mac-p-edca.docx) stated that he has presented in an earlier meeting and has been working on r5, but is not ready to be presented and requested to be removed
      2. Rest of the agenda is approved by unanimous consent by all attendees.
4. Announcements: None
5. CR/PDT Submissions:

* [~~24/2007r4~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-2007-04-00bn-pdt-mac-p-edca.docx) ~~PDT-MAC-P EDCA Akhmetov, Dmitry~~
  + Removed from agenda.
* [25/0448r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0448-02-00bn-pdt-mac-on-low-latency-indication.docx) PDT MAC on low latency indication Mohamed Abouelseoud
  + Submission has been walked through
  + Discussion:
    - C: Any reason for not reserving the Fragment Number field in the Multi-STA BA?
    - A: Fragment number is used for determing the size of the feedback and this is still going to be used.
    - C: What is the intent of Low Latency Indication?
    - A: This is in the motion passed. What is sent is TBD, but there should be enough number of bits.
    - C: Is the feature described somewhere?
    - A: It is already in D0.1.
    - C: But isn’t this confusing when competing STAs put this indication, how would the scheduler react?
    - A: You just give it to the TXOP holder and it would determine how to act on it. This could be scheduled in the same TXOP and is not related to the scheduling based on BSRP etc.
    - C: If it were limited to the current TXOP, it makes sense, but if it is for the subsequent TXOPs, then there is this issue if multiple STAs indicate and may lead for competition.
    - A: For now, the indication is TBD. Currently this is what is in the draft – this is being sent to the AP and AP will take action.
    - C: Same question as above. My initial understanding is the low latency indication would be a single bit, but now it appears to be multiple number of bits.
    - A: No, it could be just one bit, the figure only shows multiple bits but it is for indicating TBD.
    - C: I would like to understand the usecase if there is more than one bit
    - A: Not in disagreement, it is just TBD number of bits, so that we can move forward.
    - C: We need to understand what we are indicating.
    - A: There are missing details as AP may not know how AP should be using this information.
    - C: On signalling, in the starting sequenc control, why do we have “feedback type” in the middle of the reserved bits?
    - A: I wanted to put it in the end, but some commenter asked for a reason. So, I kept it this way.
    - C: Similar comment. The expectation now is to resolve the TBDs and attempt to remove them and if we find comments, can we enter and resolve the related comments as this is targeted towards incorporating into D1.0, better to minimize.
* [25/0479r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0479-00-00bn-cr-for-cid-1378.docx) CR\_for\_CID\_1378 Dibakar Das
  + Submission has been walked through
  + Discussion
    - C: There are couple of TBDs. It is better to resolve them before incorporating into the draft.
    - C: One comment is editorial and will discuss offline. The other one, I see the motion #244 differently. The scope is not limited to C-TDMA, but to time-sharing.
    - A: But there is motion 329 that discusses C-TDMA specifically.
    - C: I agree that there should not be TBDs in the draft, but wiping out the TBDs without placeholder carries some risk.
    - C: In the second subbulet in 37.17, the TXOP limit it advertises, AP is already using the TXOP, so it should be reduced.
    - A: Agree and will try to work it out.
    - C: In the final paragraph, you mention TXOP sharing mode 2, in mode 2, the STA can communicate to the AP for uplink.
    - A: It is not disallowed and still operating within the limit.
    - C: My understanding from the paragraph that the AP should start with its own STA, but in mode 2, the STA can send uplink, and we should not exclude this case.
    - A: Mode 2 is mainly for P2P, but if there is uplink mode it can be used and better to use.
    - C: Perhaps we can take it offline, but it may be better to limit. Mode 2 is different from C-TDMA and C-TDMA could have OBSS traffic.
    - A: Let us take it offline
    - C: To clarify, the suggestion is not to remove TBD, but replace it with a value that is acceptable to the group. The purpose is not to add TBDs without any resolution
    - C: Also, the txop sharing can be used for other purposes and should be added.
    - A: But the motion is limited to C-TDMA.
    - C: I prefer to finalize for C-TDMA and then extend to others.
    - C: The TXOP limit announced is not a restriction to the AP and thus the minus part is not needed (mentioned above).
    - A; I understand.
    - C: I would like to generalize to other mechanisms.
    - C: Everyone should be limited to the same limit
    - A: Let us move it offline
    - C: Include .11bn reflector to all offline discussions

1. Technical Submissions – Roaming Part 3:

* [24/1890](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1890-00-00bn-seamless-roaming-follow-up-2.pptx) Seamless roaming follow up 2 Liwen Chu
  + Submission has been walked through
  + Discussion
    - C: For the example in slide 7, the SN for AP1 is until 31 and for AP2, it starts at 32. Will it be continuous?
    - A: Yes, in seamless roaming it needs to be continuous.
    - C: Slide 3, for first association ML set up will be first but should not need to have the SMD.
    - A: If seamless roaming is supported, the ML set up should have the required information
    - C: During association, isn’t it sufficient with basic procedure?
    - A: Modifications need to be made.
    - The author chooses to defer running the SP and asks people to contact him offline.
* [24/1898](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1898-00-00bn-low-latency-roaming-flow.pptx) Low Latency Roaming Flow Pooya Monajemi
  + Submission has been walked through
  + Discussion
    - C: Did you think of the signaling that you want to use?
    - A: Havent thought about signaling yet.
    - C: One caution is not to use management frames and perhaps use some other ways.
    - A: Your idea is to have management frames should be sent by only one AP.
    - C: Yes, that is correct.
    - C: Slide 11, you mentioned that this is an optimization issue. I want to check with you. Is this optimization issue or an implementation issue?
    - A: Not sure if it is implementation, but if you have to ignore one TID, but then you would have loss in transmission.
    - C: Would you be using the BAR to indicate per TID?
    - A: Yes, something like that.
* [24/0656](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0656-01-00bn-seamless-roaming-signaling-details.pptx) Seamless roaming signalling details Binita Gupta
  + Submission has been walked through
  + Discussion
    - C: link reconfiguring req/resp are link-level and not MLD level and AIDs may not match.
    - A: AID scope is with MLD.
    - C: But the same AID could be used by target MLD.
    - A: Let us move to offline discussion.
    - C: You mentioned the SMD ID being one byte. Earlier the domain ID was two bytes. Do you plan to keep it that way or will you have to versions?
    - A: We already have an agreement that SMD 1D would be 6 octets. This is a shortened version to only identify the SMDs locally.
    - C: On AID, receiving that AID at the last minute may not be good and should be done earlier. Why not just run multiple preparations and if there is concern on running out AID space, then there can be the risk of running out the SCS? The prep phase should not be too light and should be like association.
    - A: We split into phases for a reason. With the link set up, there is not a lot of processing involved. Let us discuss more offline.
* [24/0658](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0658-00-00bn-optimizing-roaming-scan.pptx) Optimizing Roaming Scan Binita Gupta
  + Submission has been walked through partially
  + Discussion:
    - C: Do you plan to define a new element?
    - A: You can use one bit.
    - Ran out of time

1. AoB: None
2. Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at 9:01 PM EDT

**References:**