IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Minutes for Task Group (TG) 802.11 be Extremely High Throughput Telephone conferences in August and September 2019 | | | | |
| Date: 2019-08-05 | | | | |
| Author(s): | | | | |
| Name | Affiliation | Address | Phone | email |
| Dennis Sundman | Ericsson |  |  | dennis.sundman@ericsson.com |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the 7 Telephone conferences held in August and September 2019.

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Added the telephone conference held the 1st of August.

**Thursday 1 August 2019, 19:30 – 22:00 ET  
  
Introduction**

1. The Chair (Alfred Asterjadhi) calls the meeting to order at 19:31.
2. The Chair goes through the IPR policy and procedure. He asks the members for any potentially essential patents. Nobody speaks up.
3. The Chair reminds members to report their attendance to Dennis Sundman (Ericsson). Around 80 (up to 120 during the call) people appear to be in the call.  
   **Attendence (In no particular order):**  
   Alfred Asterjadhi (Qualcomm)  
   Dennis Sundman (Ericsson)  
   Steve Shellhammer (Qualcomm)  
   Suhwook Kim (LG Electronics)  
   Akira Kishida (NTT)  
   Al Petrick  
   Carl Kain  
   Dandan Liang  
   Dorothy Stanley (HPE)  
   Edward Au (Huawei)  
   Frank Hsu  
   George Cherian  
   Insung Jang  
   Jeongki Kim (LG Electronics)  
   Jinsoo Choi  
   Joseph Levy (InterDigital)  
   Junghoon Suh (Huawei)  
   Kazuto Yano (ATR)  
   Ming Gan (Huawei)  
   Osama Aboul-Magd (Huawei)  
   Payam Torab  
   Rojan Chitrakar  
   Rui Yang (InterDigital)  
   Sang Kim  
   Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)  
   Xin Zuo (Tencent)  
   Yan Zhang (Marvell)  
   Yusuke Tanaka (Sony)  
   Yongho Seok (MediaTek)  
   Lei Huang (Panasonic)  
   Woojin Ahn (WILUS)
4. The chair asks if there is any objection to proceed with the presentations. Nobody objects.

**Submissions**

1. 11-19/0762r1, “Latency analysis for EHT” – Suhwook Kim (LG Electronics)  
     
   **Summary:** They have provided simulation results comparing different RU tone plans for 80 MHz using OFDMA.  
     
   **C (Comment/Question):** I have a question on slide 15. Why does the persistent scheduler improve the results?  
   **A (Answer):** The latency improves for the persistent STAs but not for the others.  
   **C:** I have a question about the setup. Have you considered the 4 types of access categorizes?  
   **A:** I have generally used the AC\_BE and AC\_VI.  
   **C:** Can you justify a bit why you have chosen this percentage of category users in terms of traffic load?  
   **C:** Are you using single BSS? It would be more interesting with the OBSS case.  
   **A:** We will think about the OBSS case.  
   **C:** What type of traffic are you using, UDP or TCP?  
   **A:** UDP.  
   **C:** Probably you want to run also with TCP because this is used in reality.  
   **A:** Yes  
   **C:** On slide 6, why are you not considering the full stack in the latency analysis?  
   **C:** How do you define latency? Maximum, average, or?  
   **A:** It’s the average.
2. 11-19/1175r0, “ Considerations of new queue mechanisms for real-time applications” – Xin Zuo (Tencent)  
     
   **Summary:** They believe we need to target the worst case latency through some new mechanisms. The current EDCA mechansims cannot handle it. For this mechanism they believe we need to focus on certain types of data, namely frequent and small data. The critical data needs to bypass the internal queues.  
     
   **C:** What is the difference between what you propose and .11aa?  
   **A:** I was not aware of .11aa, but would like to look at it.  
   **C:** Do you think the trigger based functionality from .11ax is insufficient?  
   **A:** I believe trigger based transmission still may not be sufficient for this kind of traffic.  
   **C:** The EDCA scheduler should be capable to do sufficient categorization.  
   **A:** I don’t think that is enough.  
   **C:** In slide 6, once the new queue is activated does the access categories change?  
   **A:** No.  
   **C:** You mention “if a STA gets a large backoff size” it’s not good. Are you worried about collision? Are you considering one or multiple RTA queues?  
   **A:** Regarding the collision, I cannot say 100% but we believe that since we limit the frames for this particular queue, it should not be fatal. For the queues we would like to have it dynamically, so potentially one queue per service or something like this.  
   **C:** If there is only RTA data in the buffert. Will this improvement work well?  
   **A:** In that case it depends on how many STAs, interference, etc.
3. 11-19/1207r4, “Views on Latency and Jitter Features in TGbe” – Akira Kishida (NTT)  
     
   **Summary:** They believe we need to consider mechanisms that can coexist with legacy systems as well as controlled systems.
4. 11-19/0806r2, “Enabling persistent allocation for EHT” – Lei Huang (Panasonic)  
     
   **Summary:** They want to consider reduction of control signalling for EHT UL MU transmissions.
5. 11-19/1242r0, “Wider Bandwidth Channel Access in EHT” – Woojin Ahn (WILUS)  
     
   **Summary:** They propose a new channel access mechanism for wider bandwidths. To this end they introduce an extended channel set. The extended channel set may not be the same as the primary channel set. EDCA in the primary 20 of the primary channel set.   
     
   **C:** Can you go to slide 8, when the primary channel set is busy, then AP switches to extended channel set. How does the STA know this?  
   **A:** So in this case, the extended channel set will only be used if the primary is busy, so such STAs have to wait.  
   **C:** On slide 7, it seems you are proposing to duplicate the same behaviour on the second band. Is the secondary band contiguous or non-contiguous?  
   **A:** It can be both.

**Outroduction**

1. The Chair informs that the next telco will focus on Multi-AP.
2. The Chair mentions that if we want to run straw-polls on the telco, we need some e-poll system.

**Ajourn.**