IEEE P802.15
Wireless Specialty Networks

|  |
| --- |
| IEEE 802.15.13 May, 2018 Warsaw Meeting Minutes |
| Date: 2018-05-08 |
| Author: |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | Email |
| Nikola Serafimovski | pureLIFI |  |  | nikola.serafimovski@purelifi.com |
| Volker Jungnickel | Fraunhofer HHI |  |  | volker.jungnickel@hhi.fraunhofer.de |

Abstract

# This document contains the TG13 Multi-Gigabit/s Optical Wireless Communications Meeting minutes from the Phone call June 13 12-13 U.K. time.

**IEEE 802.15.13**

**Monday, June 13, 2018, 12-13 U.K. time**

Attendance:

* John Li Qiang (Huawei)
* Nikola Serafimovski (pureLiFi)
* Chong Han (pureLiFi)
* Volker Jungnickel (Fraunhofer HHI)
* Malte Hinrichs (Fraunhofer HHI)
* Kai Lennert Bober (Fraunhofer HHI)
* Xu Wang (VLNComm)
* Sang-Kyu Lim (ETRI)
* Bastien Bechadegue (OLEDCOM)

The phone call was opened by the TG13 Chair, Volker Jungnickel (Fraunhofer HHI).

Chong Han presented doc. 15-18/0270r2.

* + Q: Should the FCS be process first?
	+ A: The packet should have already been checked that it was received appropriately. FCS is only really relevant if the destination intends to decode the payload.
	+ Q: Should the Sequence Control field be moved
	+ A: There is no need to process the Source Address if the Sequence Control indicates that this packet has already been received.
	+ C: It would be good if we can identify the similar standard or literature where this approach is taken.
	+ The discussion would be continued as part of the San Diego meeting.
	+ C: The format is similar to that provided in the IEEE 802.11-2016 version. Please provide some technical explanation for the proposed format.
	+ Q: Asked for clarification on the ACK information field
	+ A: The ACK information should be included in the Header if there is additional information that needs to be sent. A way of combing the ACK and data meant for the destination. If there is no data meant for the destination, then a simple ACK frame can be sent. The use of the ACK information in the Header with no data information in the main field may not exist.
	+ Q: How to allow bridging between different 802 standards. If there are 2 different LANs, then why not use the 802.1 standard to create bridging between the different LANs
	+ A: The proposed distribution system is optional and does not need to be implemented. However, it is likely that there will be multiple coordinators that should be connected.
	+ C: This is similar to an 802.11 Coordinator that sends the information using a Data Plane. In this case, there is no definition for the Master Coordinator to have a data plane.
* The discussion around the coordinated and uncoordinated topologies was discussed.
* In 802.15.7-2011, there are 2 subfields that seem to be similar to the current proposal.

The phone call was recessed until June 18, 12:00 UK time (13:00 CEST).