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Abstract

This document summarizes all the straw polls conducted since the end of the January 2020 interim, and the potential changes to the Specification Framework Document (19/1262r8).

Note to the readers:

* The list of straw polls conducted is shown in section 13.
* The potential changes to the Specification Framework Document are highlighted in yellow.
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* SFD text contributions that do have a request for further discussion will be added as an item for discussion in the subsequent Joint conf call, if the straw poll passes then the respective text will be marked in green.
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# Abbreviations and acronyms

BIGTK beacon integrity group temporal key

BPSK binary phase shift keying

BU bufferable unit

BSS basic service set

BW bandwidth

CCA clear channel assessment

DL downlink

DS distribution system

EHT extremely high throughput

EP emergency preparedness

GTK group temporal key

HE high efficiency

IGTK integrity group temporal key

LLC logical link control

L-LTF Non-HT Long Training field

L-SIG Non-HT SIGNAL field

L-STF Non-HT Short Training field

LTF long training field

MAC medium access protocol

MCS modulation and coding scheme

MLD multi-link device

MU multi-user

MU-MIMO multi-user multiple input, multiple output

NDP null data PPDU

NS national security

OFDM orthogonal frequency division multiplexing

PHY physical layer

PN packet number

PPDU PHY protocol data unit

PSDU PHY service data unit

RA receiver address

RL-SIG Repeated Non-HT SIGNAL field

RU resource unit

RX receive or receiver

SAP service access point

STA station

SU single user

SU-MIMO single user multiple input, multiple output

TA transmitter address

TID traffic identifier

TX transmit or transmitter

TXOP transmission opportunity

UL Uplink

U-SIG Universal SIGNAL field

WM wireless medium

# EHT PHY



## General

This section describes the functional blocks in the EHT PHY.

## Channelization and tone plan

### Wideband and noncontiguous spectrum utilization

802.11be supports 320 MHz and 160+160 MHz PPDU.

[Motion 10, [1] and [2]]

802.11be supports 240 MHz and 160+80 MHz transmission

* Whether 240/160+80 MHz is formed by 80 MHz channel puncturing of 320/160+160 MHz is TBD.

[Motion 16, [3] and [4]]

240/160+80 MHz bandwidth is constructed from three 80 MHz channels which include primary 80 MHz.

[Motion 17, [3] and [5]]

802.11be reuses 802.11ax tone plan for 20/40/80/160/80+80 MHz PPDU.

For 320 MHz and 160+160 MHz PPDU, 802.11be uses duplicated HE160 for OFDMA tone plan.

[Motion 33, [3] and [6]]

802.11be 240/160+80 MHz transmission consists of 3x80 MHz segments while the tone plan of each 80 MHz segment is the same as HE80 in 802.11ax.

[Motion 35, [3] and [6]]

**Straw poll #42**

Do you support the following toneplan for 11be 80 MHz OFDMA?

* 80 MHz OFDMA = 40 MHz DUP, Table 27-8 in 11ax D6 right/left shifted by 256 tones.



* Note
  + The 80MHz OFDMA design applies to any RU<996 for all modes of transmission, SU, DL MU, TB PPDU, with and without puncturing
  + Non-OFDMA full BW 80MHz segment uses 996RU design
  + Any punctured 80MHz segment uses the OFDMA tone plan
  + For each 80MHz segment in 160MHz, 240MHz or 320MHz: if it’s punctured or used for OFDMA the 80MHz OFDMA tone plan is used, if it’s used for non-OFDMA and non-punctured the 996RU tone plan is used

[20/0666r2 (80MHz OFDMA Tone Plan, Ron Porat, Broadcom), SP#1, Y/N/A: 44/1/5] ***[#SP42]***

In 160+80 MHz BSS, should the 160 and 80 MHz be non-adjacent?

[20/0479r0 (240 MHz channelization, Sigurd Schelstraete, Quantenna/ON Semiconductor), SP#1, Y/N/A: 25/5/24]

A 160 MHz tone plan is duplicated for the non-OFDMA tone plan of 320/160+160 MHz PPDU.

* The 160 MHz tone plan is TBD.

[Motion 18, [3] and [7]]

The 802.11be 320/160+160 MHz non-OFDMA tone plan uses duplicated tone plan of HE160.

NOTE – Puncturing design TBD.

[Motion 34, [3] and [6]]

12 and 11 null tones are placed at the left and right edges in each 160 MHz segment for the non-OFDMA tone plan of 320/160+160 MHz PPDU.

[Motion 19, [3] and [7]]

802.11be uses the same subcarrier spacing for the data portion of EHT PPDU as 802.11ax data portion.

[Motion 11, [1] and [2]]

### Aggregated PPDU

**Straw poll #48**

Do you agree to define frequency domain aggregation of aggregated PPDUs for EHT?

* Aggregated PPDU consists of multiple sub-PPDUs.
  + The PPDU format combination limits to EHT and HE.
  + Other combinations are TBD.
  + For the PPDU using HE format, the PPDU BW TBD.
  + The number of PPDUs is TBD.
* A-PPDU will be R2 feature.

[20/0693r1 (Aggregated PPDU for Large BW, Rui Cao, NXP), SP#1, Y/N/A: 31/0/7] ***[#SP48]***

## Resource unit

### Single RU

**Straw poll #13**

Do you agree that, for a single RU less than or equal to 242 tones (i.e. RU26, RU52, RU106, RU242), the BCC can be supported?

* Mandatory or Optional for BCC, TBD
* Only for modulation up to 256QAM (with or without DCM – if defined in 11be)
* Only for NSS <=4

[20/0470r1 (Small Size MRU with Different MCS and BCC, Junghoon Suh, Huawei), SP#1b, Y/N/A: 48/3/12] ***[#SP13]***

### Multiple RU

#### **General**

802.11be shall allow more than one RUs to be assigned to a single STA.

Coding and interleaving schemes for multiple RUs assigned to a single STA are TBD.

Maximum number of RUs (>1) assigned to a single STA is also TBD.

[Motion 6, [1] and [8]]

Small-size RUs can only be combined with small-size RUs and large-size RUs can only be combined with large-size RUs.

RUs with equal to or more than 242 tones are defined as large-size RUs.

RUs with less than 242 tones are defined as small-size RUs.

[Motion 76, [9] and [10]]

In 802.11be, there is only one PSDU per STA for each link.

[Motion 91, [9] and [11]]

In 802.11be, for LDPC encoding each PSDU only uses one encoder.

[Motion 92, [9] and [11]]

**Straw poll #12**

Do you agree that, for the combined multiple RU with the combined RU size less than 242 tones, the BCC can be supported?

* Mandatory or Optional for BCC, TBD
* Only for modulation up to 256QAM (with or without DCM – if defined in 11be)
* Only for NSS <=4

[20/0470r1 (Small Size MRU with Different MCS and BCC, Junghoon Suh, Huawei), SP#2, Y/N/A: 41/12/10] ***[#SP12]***

**Straw poll #14**

In case of small size MRU transmission, do you support to apply a common BCC encoder and joint bit Interleaver for the combined RU?

[20/0470r1 (Small Size MRU with Different MCS and BCC, Junghoon Suh, Huawei), SP#3, Y/N/A: 60/0/3] ***[#SP14]***

#### **Small-size RUs**

Combination of small-size RUs shall not cross 20 MHz channel boundary.

* The combination that includes RU 106 plus center 26-tone RU case is TBD.

[Motion 69, [9] and [10]]

Only allowed small-size RU combinations are RU106+RU26 and RU52+RU26.

[Motion 78, [9] and [10]]

For 20 MHz and 40 MHz PPDU, within 20 MHz boundary, any contiguous RU26 and RU106 can be combined.

[Motion 79, [9] and [10]]

For 20 MHz and 40 MHz PPDU, the blue colored combination of RU52 and RU26 are allowed.



Figure 1 – Allowed combination of RU52+RU26 for 20 MHz and 40 MHz PPDU

[Motion 80, [9] and [10]]

For 80 MHz PPDU, the blue colored combination of RU52 and RU26 are allowed.



Figure 2 – Allowed combination of RU52+RU26 for 80 MHz PPDU

[Motion 81, [9] and [10]]

**Straw poll #21**

Do you support the following 106+26 combinations as shown in orange for each 80MHz segment in 80, 160, 240 and 320MHz BW?

A picture containing screenshot, different, computer, clock

Description automatically generated

[20/0667r1 (Small RU Combinations, Ron Porat, Broadcom), SP#1, Y/N/A: 35/7/10] ***[#SP21]***

For LDPC coding, for combined RUs sent to a user with RU size less than 242-tone, a single tone mapper shall be used.

[Motion 82, [9] and [12]]

#### **Large-size RUs**

For the OFDMA transmission in 320/160+160 MHz, for one STA large size RU aggregation is allowed only within primary 160 MHz or secondary 160 MHz, respectively.

* Note that primary 160 MHz is composed of primary 80 MHz and secondary 80 MHz and secondary 160 MHz is 160 MHz channel other than the primary 160 MHz in 320/160+160 MHz.

Exception: 3×996 is supported.

3×996+484 RU combinations is TBD.

[Motion 87, [9] and [13]]

For the OFDMA transmission in contiguous 240 MHz, for one STA large size RU aggregation is allowed only within 160 MHz which is composed of two adjacent 80 MHz channels.

For the OFDMA transmission in noncontiguous 160+80 MHz, for one STA large size RU aggregation is allowed only within contiguous 160 MHz or the other 80 MHz, respectively.

2×996+484 RU combinations is TBD.

[Motion 86, [9] and [13]]

In 160 MHz OFDMA the following large RU combinations are supported.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RU size** | **Aggregate BW** | **Notes** |
| 484 + 996 | 120 MHz | 4 options |

[Motion 98, [9] and [14]]

In 80 MHz OFDMA the following large RU combinations are supported.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RU size** | **Aggregate BW** | **Notes** |
| 484 + 242 | 60 MHz | 4 options |

[Motion 97, [9] and [14]]

In 80 MHz non-OFDMA the following conditional mandatory (conditional on supporting puncturing) large RU combinations are supported.

* Any one of four 242 RU can be punctured.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RU size** | **Aggregate BW** | **Notes** |
| 484 + 242 | 60 MHz | 4 options |

[Motion 93, [9] and [14]]

In 160 MHz non-OFDMA the following conditional mandatory (conditional on supporting puncturing) large RU combinations are supported.

* Any one of eight 242 RUs can be punctured.
* Any one of four 484 RUs can be punctured.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **80 MHz RU Size** | **80 MHz RU size** | **Aggregate BW** | **Notes** |
| 484 | 996 | 120 MHz | 4 options |
| 484 + 242 | 996 | 140 MHz | 8 options |

[Motion 94, [9] and [14]]

In 240 MHz non-OFDMA the following conditional mandatory (conditional on supporting puncturing) large RU combinations are supported.

* Any one of six 484 RUs can be punctured.
* Any one of three 996 RUs can be punctured.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **80 MHz RU size** | **80 MHz RU size** | **80 MHz RU size** | **Aggregate BW** | **Notes** |
| 484 | 996 | 996 | 200 MHz | 6 options |
| - | 996 | 996 | 160 MHz | 3 options |

[Motion 95, [9] and [14]]

In 320 MHz non-OFDMA the following conditional mandatory (conditional on supporting puncturing) large RU combinations are supported.

* Any one of eight 484 RUs can be punctured.
* Any one of four 996 RUs can be punctured.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **80 MHz**  **RU size** | **80 MHz**  **RU size** | **80 MHz**  **RU size** | **80 MHz**  **RU size** | **Aggregate BW** | **Notes** |
| 484 | 996 | 996 | 996 | 280 MHz | 8 options |
| - | 996 | 996 | 996 | 240 MHz | 4 options |

[Motion 96, [9] and [14]]

**Straw poll #44**

Do you agree that the minimum RU size for EHT to support MU-MIMO shall be 242-tone RU?

[20/0609r3 (Further discussion on RU allocation subfield in EHT-SIG, Ross Jian Yu, Huawei), SP#3 (modified text), Y/N/A: 31/6/13] ***[#SP44]***

### Interleaving for RUs and aggregated RUs

Do you support joint interleaving for BCC and joint tone mapper for LDPC for RU and aggregated RU size <=80 MHz?

[20/0394r1 (Thoughts on RU Aggregation and Interleaving, Bin Tian, Qualcomm), Modified SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 64/6/62/23]

Do you agree the segment parser bit distribution sequence starts from the lowest frequency location to the highest frequency, just like in 11ac/ax?

[20/0394r1 (Thoughts on RU Aggregation and Interleaving, Bin Tian, Qualcomm), SP#4, Y/N/A: 53/0/8]

Do you support the following LDPC tone mapper parameters:

* for RU52+26: D\_TM = 4
* for RU106+26: D\_TM = 6
* Existing RUs: identical to 11ax

[20/0394r1 (Thoughts on RU Aggregation and Interleaving, Bin Tian, Qualcomm), SP#2.1, Y/N/A: 54/0/7]

Do you support the following LDPC tone mapper parameters:

* for RU484+242: D\_TM = 18

[20/0394r1 (Thoughts on RU Aggregation and Interleaving, Bin Tian, Qualcomm), SP#2.2, Y/N/A: 53/9/10]

Do you agree with the following LDPC tone mapper scheme for multi-RU aggregation in 11be?

* For aggregated RUs and PPDU BW larger than 80MHz, separate LDPC tone mapper is applied in each 80MHz segment.

[20/0440r1 (Segment Parser and Tone Interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek), SP#1, Y/N/A: 44/8/9]

Do you agree that 11be uses 80MHz segment parser with proportional round robin scheme?

[20/0440r1 (Segment Parser and Tone Interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek), 20/0495r1 (Discussions on multi-RU aggregation, Tianyu Wu, Apple), Joint SP#2, Y/N/A: 48/0/10]

**Straw poll #2**

Do you agree that 11be uses 80MHz segment parser with the following parameters for the proportional round robin scheme?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RU Aggregation** | **Nsd\_total** | **Proportional Ratio (m1:m2:m3:m4)** | **Leftover bits (per symbol)** |
| 484+996 | 1448 | 1s:2s | 44\*Nbpscs on ru996 |
| 484+2\*996 | 2428 | 1s:2s:2s | 44\*Nbpscs on ru996 |
| 484+3\*996 | 3408 | 1s:2s:2s:2s | 44\*Nbpscs on ru996 |
| 2\*996 | 1960 | 1s:1s | 0 |
| 3\*996 | 2940 | 1s:1s:1s | 0 |
| 4\*996 | 3920 | 1s:1s:1s:1s | 0 |

where

[20/0579r3 (update on segment parser and tone interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek), SP#1, Y/N/A: 43/1/8] ***[#SP2]***

**Straw poll #3**

Do you agree the same proportional round robin is applied to left-over bits?

* The same ratios are used in the entire segment parsing process except the ratios of those already filled segment becomes 0.



Leftover bits

To 1st RU

To 2nd RU

[20/0579r3 (update on segment parser and tone interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek), SP#2, Y/N/A: 44/0/11] ***[#SP3]***

## EHT preamble

### L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, and RL-SIG

For EHT PPDU, L-STF, L-LTF and L-SIG shall be transmitted at the beginning of the EHT PPDU.

For EHT PPDU, the first symbol after L-SIG shall be BPSK modulated.

[Motion 1, [1] and [15]]

The LENGTH field in L-SIG set to a value *N* such that mod(*N*, 3) = 0.

[Motion 29, [3] and [16]]

Phase rotation is applied to the legacy preamble part of EHT PPDU.

Coefficients applied to each 20 MHz channel are TBD.

Application to the other fields is TBD.

[Motion 41, [3] and [17]]

**Straw poll #30**

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* Phase rotation is applied to legacy preamble, RL-SIG, U-SIG and EHT-SIG in EHT PPDU

[20/0699r0 (Phase Rotation Proposal Follow-up, Eunsung Park, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 48/3/9**] *[#SP30]***

**Straw poll #31**

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* 11be reuses the phase rotation sequence defined in 11ax for 20/40/80/160/80+80 MHz PPDU

[20/0699r0 (Phase Rotation Proposal Follow-up, Eunsung Park, LGE), SP#3, Y/N/A: 51/3/5] ***[#SP31]***

EHT PPDU shall have a RL-SIG field, which is a repeat of the L-SIG field, immediately following the L-SIG field.

[Motion 49, [3] and [18]]

The extra 4 subcarriers are applied to L-SIG and RL-SIG.

The indices for extra subcarriers are [-28, -27, 27, 28].

The extra subcarriers are BPSK modulated.

The coefficients [-1 -1 -1 1] as in 802.11ax are mapped to the extra subcarriers.

[Motion 107, [9] and [19]]

Do you agree that one PPDU that is sent to multiple user is configured as following?

* L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, RL-SIG, U-SIG, EHT-SIG, EHT-STF, EHT-LTF, DATA
* Additional fields are TBD



[20/0019r1 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 33/0/1]

Do you agree that EHT TB PPDU format is configured as following?

* EHT TB PPDU consist of L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, RL-SIG, U-SIG, EHT-STF, EHT-LTF, DATA
* Additional fields are TBD



[20/0019r1 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#2, Y/N/A: 19/2/7]

**Straw poll #39**

Do you agree to add the following into the 11be SFD?

* The EHT PPDU sent to a single user has the EHT-SIG field.
  + A subfield that indicates preamble puncturing pattern can be present in the U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG field.

[20/0019r4 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 36/0/11] ***[#SP39]***

### U-SIG

There shall be a 2 OFDM symbol long, jointly encoded U-SIG in the EHT preamble immediately after the RL-SIG.

* The U-SIG will contain version independent fields. The intent of the version independent content is to achieve better coexistence among future 802.11 generations.
* In addition, the U-SIG can have some version dependent fields.
* The size of the U-SIG for the case of an Extended Range Mode (if such a mode were to be adopted) is TBD.
* The U-SIG will be sent using 52 data tones and 4 pilot tones per-20MHz.

[Motion 27, [3] and [20]]

The U-SIG is modulated in the same way as the HE-SIG-A field of 802.11ax.

* Extended range SU mode is TBD.

[Motion 45, [3] and [21]]

The U-SIG includes Version-independent bits followed by Version-dependent bits.



Figure 3 – U-SIG

* Version-independent bits have static location and bit definition across different generations/PHY versions.
* Version-dependent bits may have variable bit definition in each PHY version.

[Motion 47, [3] and [22]]

The U-SIG shall contain the following version independent fields:

* PHY version identifier: 3 bits.
* UL/DL flag: 1 bit.

[Motion 42, [3] and [21]]

PHY version identifier field shall be one of the version independent fields in the U-SIG.

* Purpose is to simplify autodetection for future 802.11 generations, i.e., value of this field is used to identify the exact PHY version starting with 802.11be.
* Exact location of this field is TBD.

[Motion 28, [3] and [23]]

The U-SIG field includes the following bits in Version-independent bits portion:

* BSS color, number of bits TBD.
* TXOP duration, number of bits TBD.

[Motion 48, [3] and [22]]

The U-SIG shall contain Bandwidth Information, carried as a version independent field.

* This field may also convey some puncturing information.
* Number of bits for this field is TBD.

[Motion 88, [9] and [24]]

Do you support that U-SIG in each 80MHz shall carry puncturing channel info for at-least the specific 80MHz where it is transmitted?

* Note: Within each 80MHz segment, U-SIG is duplicated in every non-punctured 20MHz
* Whether BW/Puncturing info can be different for different 80MHz is TBD
* Whether BW and puncturing info in U-SIG are carried as a combined or a separate field is TBD

[20/0285r5 (SU PPDU SIG Contents Considerations, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung), SP#2, Y/N/A: 42/9/6]

**Straw poll #28**

Do you agree that 11be signaling in U-SIG for BW/puncturing information in every non-punctured 20MHz of an 80MHz segment shall allow even an OBSS or unassociated device to decode the puncturing pattern of at least the specific 80MHz that contains the 20MHz?

[20/0606r2 (Further discussion on bandwidth and puncturing information, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung), SP#1, Y/N/A: 34/10/8] ***[#SP28]***

**Straw poll #29**

Do you support BW field which doesn’t include puncturing information?

[20/0606r2 (Further discussion on bandwidth and puncturing information, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung), SP#4, Y/N/A: 44/10/5] ***[#SP29]***

The U-SIG shall contain a PPDU type field, carried as a version dependent field.

* Number of bits for this field is TBD.

[Motion 89, [9] and [24]]

The following subfields exist in U-SIG of an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users:

* EHT-SIG MCS
* Number of EHT-SIG Symbols

[Motion 59, [9] and [25]]

The following subfield exists in U-SIG or EHT-SIG of an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users:

* GI+EHT-LTF Size

[Motion 100, [9] and [25]]

The following subfields exist in U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG of an EHT PPDU sent to single user:

* MCS
* NSTS
* GI+EHT-LTF Size
* Coding

[Motion 99, [9] and [25]]

Do you agree to add the following into the 11be SFD?

* The following subfields exist in U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG of an EHT PPDU sent to single user:
  + LDPC Extra symbol
  + Beamformed
  + Pre-FEC padding factor
  + PE Disambiguity

[20/0019r3 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 41/5/11]

Do you agree that a subfield for preamble puncturing pattern information separate from the BW field is included in U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG for the 11be PPDU transmitted to a single user?

[20/0524r2 (Signaling of preamble puncturing in SU transmission, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#2, Y/N/A: 36/4/14]

Do you support following in 11be?

* Preamble of primary 20MHz channel shall not be punctured in any PPDU (Except TB PPDU)

[20/0285r5 (SU PPDU SIG Contents Considerations, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung), SP#1, Y/N/A: 45/1/10]

Do you agree that the following indication shall be the same considering symbol alignment within each segment from PHY point of view, if the fields are present in U-SIG:

* Number of EHT-SIG symbols
* GI+EHT-LTF Size
* Number of EHT-LTF symbols
* PE related parameters

[20/0545r1 (Multi-segment EHT-SIG design discussion, Ross Yu, Huawei), SP#3, Y/N/A: 40/6/12]

Do you agree that a STA only needs to process up to one 80MHz segment of the pre-EHT preamble (up-to and including EHT-SIG) to get all the assignment information for itself?

* No 80MHz segment change is needed while processing L-SIG, U-SIG and EHT-SIG

[20/0380r0 (U-SIG structure and Preamble Processing, Sameer Vermani. Qualcomm), SP, Y/N/A: 31/8/14]

[Passed with unanimous consent to keep the existing text]

Do you agree with allowing information in U-SIG to vary from one 80MHz to the next in an EHT PPDU of bandwidth >80MHz?

* Notes:
  + - Each STA still needs to decode only one 80MHz segment in U-SIG
    - Within each 80MHz, U-SIG is still duplicated in every non-punctured 20MHz
    - SST operation using TWT is one potential applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD (Needs MAC discussion).

[20/0380r0 (U-SIG structure and Preamble Processing, Sameer Vermani, Qualcomm), SP#1 (modified text) Y/N/A: 34/8/16]

### EHT-SIG

There shall be a variable MCS and variable length EHT-SIG, immediately after the U-SIG, in an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users.

[Motion 43, [3] and [21]]

The EHT-SIG (immediately after the U-SIG) in an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users shall have a common field and user-specific field(s).

* Special case compressed modes (e.g., full BW MU-MIMO) are TBD.

[Motion 44, [3] and [21]]

An RU Allocation subfield is present in the Common field of the EHT-SIG field of an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users.

* Compressed modes are TBD.
* Contents of the RU Allocation subfield are TBD.

[Motion 57, [9] and [25]]

**Straw poll #46**

Do you agree that N RU allocation subfields are present in an EHT-SIG content channel?

* Where, N is the number of RU allocation subfield in common field of EHT-SIG content channel.
* N = 1 if a 20MHz or 40MHz EHT PPDU sent to multiple users is used.
* N = 2 if a 80MHz EHT PPDU sent to multiple users is used.
* N = TBD for other cases.
* The compressed modes are TBD.

[20/0738r2 (Evaluation of signaling overhead for EHT-SIG, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 38/1/10] ***[#SP46]***

**Straw poll #45**

Do you agree that the RU allocation subfield in the EHT-SIG field of an EHT-PPDU sent to multiple users includes the RU allocation for Multiple RUs as well as Single RU?

[20/0652r0 (Signaling of RU allocation in 11be, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 38/0/10] ***[#SP45]***

**Straw poll #43**

Do you agree to add the following to the 11be SFD:

* An RU Allocation subfield that is present in the Common field of the EHT-SIG field of an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users (except EHT TB PPDU), indicates RU assignment, including the size of the RU(s) and their placement in the frequency domain, to be used in the EHT modulated fields of the PPDU in the frequency domain.
  + Compressed modes are TBD.

[20/0609r3 (Further discussion on RU allocation subfield in EHT-SIG, Ross Jian Yu, Huawei), SP#1, Y/N/A: 37/0/8] ***[#SP43]***

There exists at least one compressed mode in which RU Allocation subfield does not exist in the Common field of the EHT-SIG field of an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users.

* Signaling method is TBD.

[Motion 58, [9] and [25]]

For the PPDU transmitted to MU, the User field having TBD bits is contained in the user-specific field of EHT-SIG

* The User field indicates user information assigned to each RU similar to that used in HE MU PPDU.
* Detailed descriptions are TBD.

[Motion 85, [9] and [26]]

Do you agree that in BW ≤ 160MHz, the EHT-SIG content channel for Multiple user transmission is configured as following?

* A EHT-SIG content channel is composed of a 20 MHz frequency segment.
* EHT-SIG content channels carry EHT-SIG common information and the user-specific information.
* The EHT-SIG field consists of the two EHT-SIG content channels in each 80MHz

The content channels (i.e., CC1 and CC2) per each 80MHz may carry different information.

* + Where, SST operation using TWT is one potential applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD

[20/0020r3 (Consideration for EHT-SIG transmission, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 42/3/6]

Do you agree that 11be STA can recognize the preamble puncturing pattern it needs by using the BW field and puncturing information of U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG field in Multiple user transmission?

* Details for how to convey the puncturing information is TBD.

[20/0020r3 (Consideration for EHT-SIG transmission, Dongguk Lim, LGE), SP#3, Y/N/A: 33/2/24]

Do you agree to have STA-ID related information in the EHT PPDU preamble sent to a single user and multiple users? TB PPDU is TBD.

[20/0285r5 (SU PPDU SIG Contents Considerations, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung), SP#3, Y/N/A: 42/2/13]

**Straw poll #1**

Do you agree that EHT-SIG may carry different content in each 80MHz?

* For PPDU BW larger than 80MHz.
* SST operation using TWT is one applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD.

[20/0605r0 (Further Discussions On Efficient EHT Preamble, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek), SP#1, Y/N/A: 51/1/4] ***[#SP1]***

### EHT-STF

**Straw poll #8**

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* EHT PPDU has EHT-STF immediately after EHT-SIG
  + If EHT PPDU doesn’t have EHT-SIG, EHT-STF is positioned immediately after U-SIG

[20/0585r0 (Consideration on EHT-STF, Eunsung Park, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 52/0/6] ***[#SP8]***

**Straw poll #9**

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* 802.11be supports 1x EHT-STF and 2x EHT-STF
  + 1x EHT-STF is used in EHT SU/MU PPDU
    - Whether SU and MU PPDU format is the same is TBD
  + 2x EHT-STF is used in EHT TB PPDU
  + TBD for any new EHT PPDU formats

[20/0585r0 (Consideration on EHT-STF, Eunsung Park, LGE), SP#2, Y/N/A: 51/1/8] ***[#SP9]***

**Straw poll #10**

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* 802.11be reuses 1x HE-STF and 2x HE-STF in 20/40/80/160/80+80 MHz PPDU

[20/0585r0 (Consideration on EHT-STF, Eunsung Park, LGE), SP#3, Y/N/A: 51/0/8] ***[#SP10]***

### EHT-LTF

802.11be shall include 1x EHT-LTF and 2x EHT-LTF.

[Motion 74, [9] and [27]]

802.11be shall include 4x EHT-LTF.

[Motion 75, [9] and [28]]

802.11be supports EHT-LTF for 16 spatial streams.

[Motion 83, [9] and [29]]

**Straw poll #11**

Do you support to reuse 1/2/4x HE-LTF sequences for 1/2/4x EHT-LTF sequences in 20/40/80MHz PPDU transmission?

[20/0608r0 (Consideration on EHT-LTF, Jinyoung Chun, LGE), SP#1, Y/N/A: 51/0/9] ***[#SP11]***

**Straw poll #41**

Do you support to reuse 1/2/4x HE-LTF sequences for 1/2/4x EHT-LTF sequences in 80+80/160MHz?

[20/0608r0 (Consideration on EHT-LTF, Jinyoung Chun, LGE), SP#2, Y/N/A: 41/0/4] ***[#SP41]***

Do you agree to adopt P-matrix based modulation of EHT-LTFs for all spatial multiplexing modes (both UL and DL) defined in EHT?

* All spatial streams are active during EHT-LTFs on every non-zero LTF tone
* Applicable to multi-AP transmission modes as well

[20/0382r0 (P-matrix based LTFs for EHT, Sameer Vermani, Qualcomm, SP#2, Y/N/A: 30/0/11]

### Preamble puncture

CCA minimum BW resolution is 20 MHz.

Preamble puncturing resolution is 20 MHz.

[Motion 90, [9] and [11]]

The 802.11be amendment shall support a preamble puncture mechanism for an EHT PPDU transmitted to multiple STAs.

[Motion 30, [3] and [30]]

The 802.11be amendment shall support a preamble puncture mechanism for an EHT PPDU transmitted to a single STA.

[Motion 31, [3] and [30]]

## Modulation

Do you support adding the following to 11be SFD?

* 11be shall define 4096 QAM as one of the optionally supported modulations

[20/0480r0 (4096 QAM Straw Polls, Sigurd Schelstraete, Quantenna/ON Semiconductor), SP#1, Y/N/A: 54/0/6]

Do you support adding the following to 11be SFD?

* The uniform constellation mapping for 4096 QAM shall be as given in 11-20/0111r0

[20/0480r0 (4096 QAM Straw Polls, Sigurd Schelstraete, Quantenna/ON Semiconductor), SP#2, Y/N/A: 45/0/19]

**Straw poll #20**

Do you support -38 dB as the Tx EVM requirement for 11be 4k QAM?

[20/0456r0 (Tx EVM Requirement for 4k QAM, Qinghua Li, Intel), SP#1, Y/N/A: 32/0/11] ***[#SP20]***

## Data field

**Straw poll #16**

Do you agree to use the following generator polynomial to generate the PPDU synchronous scrambler for EHT PPDU?

• The 11 bits used for the scrambler initialization are randomly assigned by the transmitter.

• The polarity of the pilot subcarrier is derived from the same sequence as 11ax.

[20/0563r1 (EHT PPDU Scrambler, Xiaogang Chen, Intel), SP#1, Y/N/A: 36/12/12] ***[#SP16]***

## Beamforming

Do you support to define a compressed beamforming feedback in 11be for following cases?

* Number of streams: 1-16
* Number of antennas: 2-16
* Note: Compressed beamforming feedback is the same as defined in 11ax except for the new parameter values of Nc and Nr.

[19/1495r2 (Further Discussion on Feedback Overhead Reduction, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung), SP#1, Y/N/A: 51/1/10]

# EHT MAC



## General

This section describes the functional blocks in the EHT MAC.

The 802.11be amendment shall define mechanism(s) for an AP to assist a STA that communicates with another STA.

[Motion 22, [3] and [31]]

Do you agree to add the following to SFD?

* Do you support that 11be defines a procedure for an AP to share time resource obtained in a TXOP for peer to peer (STA-TO-STA) frame exchanges?
  + Whether it is in R1 or R2 is TBD.

[19/1604r1 (EHT Direct Link Transmission, Dibakar Das, Intel), modified SP, Passed with unanimous consent]

The 802.11be amendment shall define mechanism(s) in support of priority access to a non-AP STA for national security (NS)/emergency preparedness (EP) priority service

NOTE – A non-AP STA for NS/EP priority service is a regular non-AP STA authorized to NS/EP service.

[Motion 50, [9] and [32]]

## EHT Operation Element

Do you support to define EHT operation element with the following fields to indicate 320/160+160 MHz BSS bandwidth?

* Channel Width field
* CCFS field

[20/0384r1 (320 MHz BSS Configuration, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 26/3/21/19]

**Straw poll #53**

Do you support that in 6GHz band, an EHT AP may announce different BSS operating bandwidth to non-EHT STAs than the BSS operating bandwidth it announces to EHT STAs when EHT BW covers disallowed 20MHz channels and/or when the announced EHT BW is not supported by non-EHT amendments. The advertised BSS operating bandwidth to EHT STA shall include the advertised BSS operating bandwidth to non-EHT STA?

[20/0398r3 (EHT BSS with wider bandwidth, Liwen Chu, NXP), SP#53, Y/N/A: 31/1/33] ***[#SP53]***

## TXOP

Do you support that 11be defines a MAC mechanism to protect TXOP for PPDUs with >160MHz and/or PPDUs with preamble puncturing?

[20/0062r0 (Protection with more than 160MHz PPDU and puncture operation, Liwen Chu, NXP), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 41/5/17/31]

Do you support to transmit the MU-RTS/RTS and CTS frames in a non-HT duplicate PPDU on 20 MHz subchannels which are not punctured?

[19/2125r2 (EHT RTS and CTS procedure, Yongho Seok, MediaTek), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 35/2/18/26]

# Coexistence and regulatory rules



## General

This section describes the functional blocks that support coexistence. It additionally describes, if needed, adaption to regulatory rules specific to 6 GHz spectrum.

## Coexistence feature #1

Description for coexistence feature #1

# Wideband and noncontiguous spectrum utilization



## General

This section describes features related to the support of wider bandwidth and utilization of noncontiguous spectrum.

## Feature #1

Description for feature #1

# Multi-link operation



## General

This section describes features related to multi-link operation.

Multi-link device (MLD): A device that has more than one affiliated STA and has one MAC SAP to LLC, which includes one MAC data service.

NOTE 1 – The device can be logical.

NOTE 2 – It is TBD for a MLD to have only one STA.

NOTE 3 – Whether the WM MAC address of each STA affiliated with the MLD is the same or different is TBD.

[Motion 23, [3] and [33]]

AP multi-link device (AP MLD): A MLD, where each STA affiliated with the MLD is an AP.

Non-AP multi-link device (non-AP MLD): A MLD, where each STA affiliated with the MLD is a non-AP STA.

[Motion 24, [3] and [33]]

## Multi-link setup

A MLD has a MAC address that identifies the MLD management entity.

For example, the MAC address can be used in multi-link setup between a non-AP MLD and an AP MLD.

[Motion 40, [3] and [33]]

Do you agree to revise the 11be SFD as follows:

A MLD has a MAC address that singly identifies the MLD management entity.

[20/0054r3 (MLD MAC address and WM address, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 42/3/17/19]

**Straw poll #38**

Do you support that if different affiliated APs of an AP MLD have different MAC addresses, then different affiliated non-AP STAs of a non-AP MLD with more than one affiliated STA have different MAC addresses?

[20/0054r3 (MLD MAC address and WM address, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#3, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP38]***

**Straw poll #32**

Do you agree that an EHT MLD shall indicate its MLD MAC address during ML setup?

[20/0119r2 (Follow Up Discussion on Multi-link Operations, Xiaofei Wang, InterDigital), SP#2,Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP32]***

The value of the RA/TA fields sent over-the-air in the MAC header of a frame is the MAC address of the STA affiliated with the MLD corresponding to that link

[Motion 108, [9] and [34]]

The MAC address of each affiliated AP within an AP MLD shall be different from each other unless the affiliated APs cannot perform simultaneous TX/RX operation (e.g., due to near band in-device interference), in which case the MAC address properties are TBD.

NOTE – It is TBD whether we allow the operation of an AP MLD without simultaneous TX/RX operation.

[Motion 109, [9] and [34]]

802.11be defines a multi-link setup signaling exchange executed over one link initiated by a non-AP MLD with an AP MLD as follows:

* Capability for one or more links can be exchanged during the multi-link setup.
* The AP MLD serves as the interface to the DS for the non-AP MLD after successful multi-link setup

NOTE 1 – The link identification is TBD.

NOTE 2 – Details for non-infrastructure mode of operation TBD.

[Motion 25, [3] and [35]]

A MLD can indicate capability to support exchanging frames simultaneously on a set of affiliated STAs to another MLD.

[Motion 26, [3] and [35]]

A new element will be defined as a container to advertise and exchange capability information for multi-link setup.

[Motion 68, [9] and [36]]

802.11be supports a mechanism for multi-link operation:

* An AP affiliated with an AP MLD can indicate the capabilities and operational parameters for one or more STAs of the multi-link device.
* A non-AP STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD can indicate the capabilities for one or more non-AP STAs of the non-AP MLD.
* Specific information of capabilities and operational parameters of multi-link device is TBD.

[Motion 21, [3] and [37]]

**Straw poll #33**

Do you support that each STA of an MLD may independently select and manage its operational parameters unless specified otherwise in the 11be standard?

[20/0314r1 (MLO: BSS Color, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP, Y/N/A/No answer: 51/8/22/15] ***[#SP33]***

**Straw poll #4**

Do you support the addition of the following text to TGbe SFD?

* A non-AP MLD may update its ability to perform simultaneous transmission and reception on a pair of setup links after multi-link setup.
  + This update for any pair of setup links can be announced by non-AP MLD on any enabled link.

NOTE – Specific signaling for update indication is TBD

NOTE - Limitations on dynamic updating is TBD

[20/0226r5 (MLO Constraint Indication and Operating Mode, Sharan Naribole, Samsung), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 43/7/29/19] ***[#SP4]***

A MLD that supports multiple links can announce whether it can support transmission on one link concurrent with reception on the other link for each pair of links.

NOTE 1 – The 2 links are on different channels.

NOTE 2 – Whether to define a capability of announcing the support transmission on one link concurrent with transmission on the other link is TBD.

[Motion 38, [3] and [38]]

802.11be defines mechanism(s) for multi-link operation that enables the following:

* Indication of capabilities and operating parameters for multiple links of an AP MLD.
* Negotiation of capabilities and operating parameters for multiple links during a single setup signaling exchange.

[Motion 32, [3] and [39]]

802.11be shall define a mechanism to teardown an existing multi-link setup agreement.

[Motion 70, [9] and [40]]

After multi-link setup between two MLDs, different GTK/IGTK/BIGTK in different links with different PN spaces are used

* GTK/IGTK/BIGTK in different links can be delivered in one 4-way handshake.

[Motion 71, [9] and [41]]

After multi-link setup between two MLDs, do you support to use same PMK and same PTK across links with same PN space for a PTKSA.

[19/1822r7 (Multi-link security consideration, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#2, Y/N/A/No answer: 35/10/22/15]

**Straw poll #40**

Between two MLDs, do you support to use the MLD MAC addresses to derive PMK under SAE method and PTK in 11be SFD?

[19/1822r9 (Multi-link security consideration, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#3, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP40]***

## TID-to-link mapping

802.11be defines a directional-based TID-to-link mapping mechanism among the setup links of a MLD.

* By default, after the multi-link setup, all TIDs are mapped to all setup links.
* The multi-link setup may include the TID-to-link mapping negotiation.
  + TID-to-link mapping can have the same or different link-set for each TID unless a non-AP MLD indicates that it requires to use the same link-set for all TIDs during the multi-link setup phase.

NOTE – Such indication method by the non-AP MLD is TBD (implicit or explicit).

* The TID-to-link mapping can be updated after multi-link setup through a negotiation, which can be initiated by any MLD.
  + Format TBD.

NOTE – When the responding MLD cannot accept the update, it can reject the TID-to- link mapping update.

[Motion 54, [9] and [42]]

At any point in time, a TID shall always be mapped to at least one link that is set up, unless admission control is used.

[Motion 101, [9] and [43]]

A link, that is setup as part of a multi-link setup, is defined as Enabled if that link can be used for frame exchange and at least one TID is mapped to that link.

NOTE – Frame exchange on a link is subject to the power state of the corresponding non-AP STA.

[Motion 105, [9] and [44]]

Management frames are allowed on all enabled links, following baseline.

[Motion 102, [9] and [43]]

If a TID is mapped in UL to a set of enabled links for a non-AP MLD, then the non-AP MLD can use any link within this set of enabled links to transmit data frames from that TID.

If a TID is mapped in DL to a set of enabled links for a non-AP MLD, then:

* The non-AP MLD can retrieve buffered BUs corresponding to that TID on any links within this set of enabled links
* The AP MLD can use any link within this set of enabled links to transmit data frames from that TID, subject to existing restrictions for transmissions of frames that apply to those enabled links.
* An example of restriction is if the STA is in doze state

[Motion 103, [9] and [43]]

802.11be define mechanism(s) for multi-link operation that enables the following:

* An operational mode for concurrently exchanging frames on more than one link for one or more TID(s).
* An operational mode for restricting exchanging frames of one or more TID(s) to be on one link at a time.

[Motion 9, [1] and [45]]

**Straw poll #51**

Do you support to adjust the setting of More Data subfield to fit MLD scenario?

[20/0472r2 (Discussion of More Data subfield for multi-link, Yunbo Li, Huawei), SP#1, Y/N/A: 45/8/25] ***[#SP51]***

**Straw poll #52**

Do you support below setting of More Data subfield?

* When AP MLD transmit a BU in one link to a non-AP MLD, if there is at least one additional buffered BU of any TID or management frames that is mapped to this link by TID-to-link mapping or default mapping for the same non-AP MLD, the More Data subfield is set to 1, otherwise the More Data subfield is set to 0.

[20/0472r2 (Discussion of More Data subfield for multi-link, Yunbo Li, Huawei), SP#2, Y/N/A: 43/7/28] ***[#SP52]***

## Multi-link block ack

A single block ack agreement is negotiated between two MLDs for a TID that may be transmitted over one or more links.

NOTE – The format of the setup frames is TBD.

[Motion 36, [3] and [46]]

Setup a block ack agreement for multi-link operation by using ADDBA request and ADDBA response frames.

[Motion 67, [9] and [47]]

The established block ack agreement allows the QoS Data frames of the TID, aggregated within the A-MPDUs, to be exchanged between the two MLDs on any available link.

[Motion 61, [9] and [48]]

For each block ack agreement, there exists one receive reordering buffer based on MPDUs in the MLD which is the recipient of the QoS Data frames for that block ack agreement.

The receive reordering buffer operation is based on the Sequence Number space that is shared between the two MLDs.

[Motion 62, [9] and [48]]

The receive status of QoS Data frames of a TID received on a link shall be signaled on the same link and may be signaled on other available link(s)

[Motion 63, [9] and [48]]

Sequence numbers are assigned from a common sequence number space shared across multiple links of a MLD, for a TID that may be transmitted to a peer MLD over one or more links.

[Motion 37, [3] and [46]]

**Straw poll #27**

Do you support that, after the BA agreement of a TID between two MLDs, the common reordering buffer of the TID are applied on all setup links?

[20/0460r3 (Multi-link BA Clarification, Yongho Seok, MediaTek), SP#1, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP27]***

**Straw poll #6**

Do you support that for each block ack agreement between two MLDs, there exists one transmit buffer control to submit MPDUs for transmission across links?

* TBD for separate transmit buffer control

[20/0053r3 (Multi-link BA, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 48/1/41/7] ***[#SP6]***

**Straw poll #7**

Do you support to extend the negotiated Block Ack buffer size to be smaller than or equal to 1024 and define 512-bits and 1024-bits BA bitmap in R1?

[20/0053r3 (Multi-link BA, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#2, Y/N/A/No answer: 45/0/43/9]***[#SP7]***

**Straw poll #25**

Do you support to extend table 26-1 as shown below?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Negotiated buffer size** | **Bitmap in compressed BA** | **Bitmap in multi-STA BA** |
| 1-64 | 64 | 32 or 64 |
| 65-128 | 64 or 256 | 32, 64, 128 |
| 129-256 | 64 or 256 | 32, 64, 128, or 256 |
| 257-512 | 64 or 256 or 512 | 32, 64, 128, 256, 512 |
| 513-1024 | 64 or 256 or 512 or 1024 | 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, or 1024 |

[20/0053r4 (Multi-link BA, Po-Kai Huang, Intel), SP#3, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP25]***

**Straw poll #22**

Do you agree to add to the TGbe SFD:

* For a M-BlockAck frame, add support for 512/1024 bitmap lengths by:
  + Including new BA Bitmap lengths (of 512 and 1024 bits), where the length of the BA Bitmap field is signaled in the Per AID TID Info field addressed to an EHT STA
  + The M-BA frame containing these Per AID TID Info fields is not sent as a response to an HE TB PPDU generated by at least one HE STA.

[20/0441r3 (MLA: BA Format, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm), SP#3, Y/N/A/No answer: 36/1/35/6] ***[#SP22]***

**Straw poll #23**

Do you agree to add to the TGbe SFD:

* For a Compressed BlockAck frame, use some of the reserved values of the Fragment Number field of the BlockAck frame to indicate the added bitmap lengths (512 and 1024).

[20/0441r3 (MLA: BA Format, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm), SP#2, Y/N/A/No answer: 46/0/29/5] ***[#SP23]***

**Straw poll #23**

Do you support to use B3 equal to 1, B2 B1 equal to 0 and B0 equal to 0 in Fragment Number field to indicate 512 BA bitmap length and to use B3 equal to 1, B2 B1 equal to 0 and B0 equal to 1 in Fragment Number field to indicate 1024 BA bitmap length in compressed BA and multi-STA BA?

[20/0397r4 (Sequence number and BA operation with large BA buffer size, Liwen Chu, NXP). SP#1, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP23]***

**Straw poll #5**

Do you support that the 802.11be amendment shall define mechanism for multi-link operation that enables the following:

* A STA of a recipient MLD shall provide receive status for MPDUs received on the link that it is operating on and may provide (if available) information on successful reception of MPDUs received by another STA of that MLD

[20/0024r2 (MLO: Acknowledgement procedure, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 48/5/23/8] ***[#SP5]***

**Straw poll #26**

Do you agree that an originator MLD of an BA agreement:

* shall update the receive status for an MPDU corresponding to the BA agreement if the received status indicates successful reception.
* shall not update the receive status for an MPDU corresponding to the BA agreement that has been already positively acknowledged.

[20/0024r3 (MLO: Acknowledgement procedure, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP#2, Y/N/A/No answer: 34/0/33/13] ***[#SP26]***

## Power save

For each of the enabled links, frame exchanges are possible when the corresponding non-AP STA of the enabled link is in the awake state.

NOTE 1 – A link is enabled when that link can be used to exchange frames subject to STA power states.

NOTE 2 – When a link is disabled (i.e., not enabled) by an MLD the frame exchanges are not possible.

[Motion 51, [9] and [49]]

An AP of an AP MLD may transmit on a link a frame that carries an indication of buffered data for transmission on other enabled link(s).

[Motion 52, [9] and [49]]

An AP MLD can recommend a non-AP MLD to use one or more enabled links.

* The AP’s indication could be carried in a broadcast or a unicast frame.

[Motion 106, [9] and [50]]

For a link setup between an AP MLD and a non-AP MLD, a non-AP STA operating on that link can send to an AP operating on that link an indication that (an)other non-AP STA(s) within the same non-AP MLD that has(have) transition to doze state is(are) in awake state.

[Motion 84, [9] and [51]]

A non-AP MLD monitors and performs basic operations (such as traffic indication, BSS parameter updates, etc.) on one or more link(s).

[Motion 104, [9] and [52]]

Each non-AP STA affiliated with a non-AP MLD that is operating on an enabled link maintains its own power state/mode.

[Motion 110, [9] and [44]]

## Multi-link group addressed data delivery

**Straw poll #37**

Do you agree to add to the TGbe SFD the following:

* For R1, each AP affiliated with an STR AP MLD shall follow the baseline rules for scheduling Beacon frame transmissions

[20/0442r1 (MLA: Group addressed frames delivery, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 44/4/32/15] ***[#SP37]***

## Multi-link channel access

**Straw poll #49**

Do you support that the TGbe SFD shall include that

* An MLD AP may offer differentiated quality of service over different links

[20/408r4 (Prioritized EDCA Channel Access Over Latency Sensitive Links in MLO, Chunyu Hu, Facebook), SP#1, Y/N/A: 61/8/17] ***[#SP49]***

802.11be shall allow the following asynchronous multi-link channel access:

* Each of STAs belonging to a MLD performs a channel access over their links independently in order to transmit frames.
* Downlink and uplink frames can be transmitted simultaneously over the multiple links.

[Motion 20, [3] and [53]]

802.11be shall allow a MLD that has constraints to simultaneously transmit and receive on a pair of links to operate over this pair of links.

* Signaling of these constraints is TBD.

[Motion 46, [3] and [54]]

Do you agree to the following?

* In R1 of the spec, supporting the following cases:
  + STR AP MLD with STR non-AP MLD
  + STR AP MLD with non-STR non-AP MLD
  + Note: All the other cases are TBD.

[20/0026r4 (MLO: Sync PPDUs, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm), SP#1, Y/N/A: 71/3/15]

Do you support the following PPDU transmission restriction for the constrained multi-link operation?

* If an AP MLD intends to align the ending time of DL PPDUs carrying a frame soliciting an immediate response simultaneously sent to the same non-STR non-AP MLD on multiple links, the AP MLD shall ensure that the difference between the ending times of transmitting DL PPDUs is less than TBD (< SIFS).
  + Where the reference of the ending time of the PPDU is TBD.

[19/1305r4 (Synchronous Multi-link Operation, Yongho Seok, MediaTek), SP1, Y/N/A/No answer: 50/4/35/10]

Do you support the following constrained multi-link operation?

* When a STA in a non-STR MLD receives an RTS addressed to itself, if the NAV of the STA indicates idle but another STA in the same MLD is either a TXOP holder or a TXOP responder, the STA may not respond with a CTS frame.

[19/1959r1 (Constrained Multi-Link Operation, Yongho Seok, MediaTek), SP, Y/N/A/No answer: 26/6/35/19]

## Multi-BSSID

**Straw poll #34**

Do you agree that an AP of an AP MLD can correspond to a transmitted BSSID or a nontransmitted BSSID in a multiple BSSID set on a link?

[20/0358r1 (Multi-BSSID Operation with MLO, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP#1, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP34]***

**Straw poll #35**

Do you agree that APs belonging to the same multiple BSSID set cannot be part of the same AP MLD?

* Note: APs within a multiple BSSID set are, by definition, operating on the same channel

[20/0358r1 (Multi-BSSID Operation with MLO, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP#2, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP35]***

**Straw poll #36**

Do you agree that APs belonging to the same co-hosted BSSID set cannot be part of the same AP MLD?

* Note: APs within a co-hosted BSSID set are, by definition, operating on the same channel

[20/0358r1 (Multi-BSSID Operation with MLO, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP#3, Approved with unanimous consent] ***[#SP36]***

**Straw poll #50**

Do you support that each AP of an AP MLD is independently configured to operate as transmitted or nontransmitted BSSID of a multiple BSSID set or as an AP of a co-hosted BSSID set or not part of either a multiple BSSID set or co-hosted BSSID set?

[20/0358r3 (Multi-BSSID Operation with MLO, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm), SP#4, Y/N/A: 52/2/33] ***[#SP50]***

# Multi-band and multichannel aggregation and operation



## General

This section describes features related to multi-band and multichannel aggregation and operation.

## Feature #1

Description for feature #1

# Spatial stream and MIMO protocol enhancement



## General

This section describes features related to 16 spatial stream operation and MIMO protocol enhancement.

## 16 spatial stream operation

802.11be supports a maximum of 16 spatial streams (total across all the scheduled STAs) for MU-MIMO.

[Motion 65, [9] and [55]]

802.11be defines a maximum of 16 spatial streams for SU-MIMO.

[Motion 66, [9] and [55]]

**Straw poll #15**

For an EHT MU-MIMO transmission, do you agree to limit the maximum number of Spatial Streams allocated to each MU-MIMO scheduled non-AP STA to 4?

[20/0067r1 (Restrictions for 16 SS based MU-MIMO Scheduling, Junghoon Suh, Huawei), SP#1, Y/N/A: 56/1/9] ***[#SP15]***

**Straw poll #47**

Do you agree that the max number of users that can be spatially multiplexed in EHT for DL transmissions is 8 per RU/MRU?

* Applicable to all transmission modes in 11be

[20/0767r0 (Number of Users in MU-MIMO, Ron Porat, Broadcom), SP#1, Y/N/A: 45/1/6] ***[#SP47]***

# Multi-AP operation



## General

This section describes features related to multi-AP operation.

## Setup

An EHT AP supporting the Multi-AP coordination can send a frame (e.g., Beacon or other management frame) including capabilities of Multi-AP transmission schemes.

NOTE – Multi-AP transmission schemes are TBD (e.g., Coordinated OFDMA).

[Motion 72, [9] and [56]]

An EHT AP which obtains a TXOP and initiates the Multi-AP coordination is the Sharing AP.

An EHT AP which is coordinated for the Multi-AP transmission by the Sharing AP is the Shared AP.

NOTE – The name of the Sharing AP and the Shared AP can be modified.

[Motion 73, [9] and [56]]

## Channel sounding

802.11be shall provide a joint NDP sounding scheme as optional mode for multiple-AP systems.

* Sequential sounding scheme that each AP transmits NDP independently and sequentially without overlapped sounding period of each AP can also be used in multi-AP systems.

[Motion 14, [3] and [57]]

Joint NDP sounding scheme for multi-AP system with less or equal to total 8 antennas at AP has all antennas active on all LTF tones and uses 802.11ax P matrix across OFDM symbols.

[Motion 15, [3] and [57]]

**Straw poll #18**

Do you support that multiple APs can sequentially use an 11ax-like sounding sequence to collect CSI from the in-BSS STAs and OBSS STAs?

* Each AP’s sounding sequence is similar to the 11ax sounding protocol with multiple STAs (NDPA + NDP + BFRP TF + CSI report).

[20/0123r0 (Channel Sounding for Multi-AP CBF, Feng Jiang, Intel), SP#1, Y/N/A/No answer: 81/4/43/30] ***[#SP18]***

**Straw poll #19**

In sequential channel sounding sequence for multi-AP, do you support that the NDPA frame and BFRP TF frame will include ID info for OBSS STA?

* The details of the NDPA, BFRP TF and the ID info are TBD.

[20/0123r0 (Channel Sounding for Multi-AP CBF, Feng Jiang, Intel), SP#2, Y/N/A/No answer: 75/9/45/26] ***[#SP19]***

## Coordinated transmission

11be shall define a mechanism to determine whether an AP is part of an AP candidate set and can participate as a shared AP in coordinated AP transmission initiated by a sharing AP.

[Motion 55, [9] and [58]]

Define a procedure for an AP to share its frequency/time resources of an obtained TXOP with a set of APs

* Set of APs is TBD.

[Motion 56, [9] and [59]]

An AP that intends to use the resource (i.e., frequency or time) shared by another AP shall be able to indicate its resource needs to the AP that shared the resource.

[Motion 53, [9] and [60]]

In all modes of operation wherein an AP shares its frequency/time resource of an obtained TXOP with a set of APs,

* Define a mechanism for the sharing AP to optionally solicit feedback from one or more APs from the AP candidate set to learn the resource needs and the intend to participate in a coordinated AP transmission.

[19/1582r2 (Coordinated AP Time and Frequency Sharing in a Transmit Opportunity in 11be, George Cherian, Qualcomm), SP (new text), Y/N/A: 76/7/32]

In all modes of operation wherein an AP shares its frequency resource with a set of APs, the AP shall share its frequency resource in multiples of 20MHz channels with a set of APs in an obtained TXOP?

* PPDU format of the transmission on the shared resource is TBD

[19/1582r2 (Coordinated AP Time and Frequency Sharing in a Transmit Opportunity in 11be, George Cherian, Qualcomm), SP#3, Y/N/A: 68/12/37]

Coordinated OFDMA is supported in 11be, and in a coordinated OFDMA, both DL OFDMA and its corresponding UL OFDMA acknowledgement are allowed.

[Motion 60, [9] and [61]]

## Other Multi-AP coordination schemes

Do you support to introduce a coordinated spatial reuse operation in TGBe?

Whether it is in R1 or R2 is TBD.

[20/0033r1 (Coordinated spatial reuse operation, Jason Yuchen Guo, Huawei), SP, Y/N/A: 97/6/25]

Do you support adding to 11be SFD Joint Transmission for single and multi user under the multi-AP topic?

* Note: this feature is for rel. 2

[20/0071r1 (Joint Transmission for 11be, Ron Porat, Broadcom), SP, Y/N/A: 89/10/28]

**Straw poll #17**

Do you support adding “Multi-AP Coordinated BF” to 802.11be SFD as one of the multi-AP coordination schemes?

Note: This feature is for rel. 2

[20/0099r1 (Coordinated Beamforming for 802.11be, Roya Doostnejad, Intel), SP, Y/N/A/No answer: 88/1/41/26] ***[#SP17]***

# Link adaptation and retransmission protocols



## General

This section describes features related to enhanced link adaptation and retransmission protocols.

## Feature #1

Description for feature #1

# Low latency



## General

This section describes features related to low latency.

## Feature #1

Description for feature #1
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| [57] | Jianhan Liu (MediaTek), “Joint sounding for multi-AP systems,” *19/1593r3,* November 2019. |
| [58] | Cheng Chen (Intel), “Multi-AP group formation follow-up,” *19/1931r2,* January 2020. |
| [59] | Lochan Verma (Qualcomm), “Coordinated AP time/frequency sharing in a transmit opportunity in 11be,” *19/1582r2,* January 2020. |
| [60] | Yongho Seok (MediaTek), “Coordinated OFDMA operation,” *19/1788r1,* January 2020. |
| [61] | Liwen Chu (NXP), “Coordinated OFDMA,” *19/1919r3,* January 2020. |

# List of straw polls since the end of the January 2020 interim

## January interim (PHY): 2 SPs

**20/0019r1 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree that one PPDU that is sent to multiple user is configured as following?

* L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, RL-SIG, U-SIG, EHT-SIG, EHT-STF, EHT-LTF, DATA
* Additional fields are TBD



Y/N/A: 33/0/1

SP#2

Do you agree that EHT TB PPDU format is configured as following?

* EHT TB PPDU consist of L-STF, L-LTF, L-SIG, RL-SIG, U-SIG, EHT-STF, EHT-LTF, DATA
* Additional fields are TBD

Y/N/A: 19/2/7

## January 30 (PHY): No SP

No straw polls where conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0266-00-00be-11be-phy-ad-hoc-minutes-january-2020

## January 30 (MAC): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0258-00-00be-11be-mac-ad-hoc-teleconference-minutes-jan-2020-to-mar-2020

## February 6 (Joint): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0287-03-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-february-and-march-2020

## February 13 (Joint): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0287-03-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-february-and-march-2020

## February 20 (MAC): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0258-00-00be-11be-mac-ad-hoc-teleconference-minutes-jan-2020-to-mar-2020

## February 27 (Joint): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0287-03-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-february-and-march-2020

## March 5 (MAC): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0258-00-00be-11be-mac-ad-hoc-teleconference-minutes-jan-2020-to-mar-2020

## March 13 (MAC): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0467-01-00be-mac-ad-hoc-teleconference-minutes-march2020-april2020

## March 16 (PHY): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0500-01-00be-minutes-for-802-11be-phy-ad-hoc-telephone-conferences-march-2020

## March 16 (MAC): 2 SPs

**19/1822r7 (Multi-link security consideration, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**

SP#2

After multi-link setup between two MLDs, do you support to use same PMK and same PTK across links with same PN space for a PTKSA?

Y/N/A/No answer: 35/10/22/15

**20/0054r3 (MLD MAC address and WM address, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you agree to revise the 11be SFD as follows:

A MLD has a MAC address that singly identifies the MLD management entity.

Y/N/A/No answer: 42/3/17/19

Reference: 11-20-0511-01-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## March 18 (PHY): 5 SPs

**20/404r0 (Further Proposals for Multiple RU Aggregation, Eunsung Park, LG Electronics)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

For the OFDMA transmission in the bandwidth larger than or equal to 80MHz, combinations of middle 26-tone RU and one of its adjacent 106-tone RUs are allowed within 20MHz boundary

Y/N/A: 26/24/10

SP#2

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

For the OFDMA transmission in the bandwidth larger than or equal to 80MHz, combinations of center 26-tone RU and one of its adjacent 106-tone RUs are allowed

Y/N/A: 20/30/11

SP#3

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

For the 80MHz non-OFDMA transmission, the following RU combinations are allowed

242+242, 4 options



Y/N/A: 12/28/16

SP#4

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

For the 320MHz non-OFDMA transmission, the following RU combinations are allowed

(484)+(484)+(996)+(996), 3 options.

Note that () means the RU used in each 80MHz channel



Y/N/A: 15/33/12

**20/0380r0 (U-SIG structure and Preamble Processing, Sameer Vermani. Qualcomm)**

SP

Do you agree that a STA only needs to process up to one 80MHz segment of the pre-EHT preamble (up-to and including EHT-SIG) to get all the assignment information for itself?

* No 80MHz segment change is needed while processing L-SIG, U-SIG and EHT-SIG

Y/N/A: 31/8/14

Reference: 11-20-0500-01-00be-minutes-for-802-11be-phy-ad-hoc-telephone-conferences-march-2020

## March 18 (MAC): 3 SPs

**19/1604r1 (EHT Direct Link Transmission, Dibakar Das, Intel)**

SP

Do you agree to add the following to SFD?

* Do you support that 11be defines a procedure for an AP to share time resource obtained in a TXOP for peer to peer (STA-TO-STA) frame exchanges?

Y/N/A/No answer: 33/11/18/30

**20/0062r0 (Protection with more than 160MHz PPDU and puncture operation, Liwen Chu, NXP)**

SP#1

Do you support that 11be defines a MAC mechanism to protect TXOP for PPDUs with >160MHz and/or PPDUs with preamble puncturing?

Y/N/A/No answer: 41/5/17/31

**19/2125r2 (EHT RTS and CTS procedure, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you support to transmit the MU-RTS/RTS and CTS frames in a non-HT duplicate PPDU on 20 MHz subchannels which are not punctured?

Y/N/A/No answer: 35/2/18/26

Reference: 11-20-0511-01-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## March 19 (Joint): 4 SPs

**19/1582r2 (Coordinated AP Time and Frequency Sharing in a Transmit Opportunity in 11be, George Cherian, Qualcomm)**

SP (new text)

In all modes of operation wherein an AP shares its frequency/time resource of an obtained TXOP with a set of APs,

* Define a mechanism for the sharing AP to optionally solicit feedback from one or more APs from the AP candidate set to learn the resource needs and the intend to participate in a coordinated AP transmission.

Y/N/A: 76/7/32

SP#3

In all modes of operation wherein an AP shares its frequency resource with a set of APs, the AP shall share its frequency resource in multiples of 20MHz channels with a set of APs in an obtained TXOP?

* PPDU format of the transmission on the shared resource is TBD

Y/N/A: 68/12/37

**19/1961r3 (Multi-AP Group Establishment, Bo Sun, ZTE)**

SP

Do you support that any AP may deliver the information of the AP candidate set for coordinated AP transmission?

* Note: whether or not delivery of AP candidate set information for coordinated OFDMA transmission is FFS.

Y/N/A: 22/29/46

**20/0033r1 (Coordinated spatial reuse operation, Jason Yuchen Guo, Huawei)**

SP

Do you support to introduce a coordinated spatial reuse operation in TGBe?

* Whether it is in R1 or R2 is TBD.

Y/N/A: 97/6/25

Reference: 11-20-0287-03-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-february-and-march-2020

## March 23 (PHY): 3 SPs

**20/0474r0 (Remarks on the content channels, Miguel Lopez, Ericsson)**

SP

Do you agree that TGbe should consider the use of low complexity erasure codes in the design of the content channels?

Y/N/A: 9/14/22

**20/0382r0 (P-matrix based LTFs for EHT, Sameer Vermani, Qualcomm)**

SP#2

Do you agree to adopt P-matrix based modulation of EHT-LTFs for all spatial multiplexing modes (both UL and DL) defined in EHT?

* All spatial streams are active during EHT-LTFs on every non-zero LTF tone
* Applicable to multi-AP transmission modes as well

Y/N/A: 30/0/11

**20/0486r0 (Decoupling Channel Training from NSTS, Abhishek Agrawal, Quantenna/ON Semiconductor)**

SP#3

Do you support to optionally allow flexible NEHT-LTF and include NEHT-LTF in EHT packets sent to a single user?

Y/N/A: 11/12/16

Reference: 11-20-0526-01-00be-minutes-for-802-11be-phy-ad-hoc-conf-call-in-march-2020

## March 23 (MAC): 1 SP

**20/0384r1 (320 MHz BSS Configuration, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you support to define EHT operation element with the following fields to indicate 320/160+160 MHz BSS bandwidth?

* Channel Width field
* CCFS field

Y/N/A/No answer: 26/3/21/19

Reference: 11-20-0511-01-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## March 26 (PHY): No SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0526-01-00be-minutes-for-802-11be-phy-ad-hoc-conf-call-in-march-2020

## March 26 (MAC): 1 SP

**19/1305r2 (Synchronous Multi-link Operation, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**

SP

Do you support the following PPDU transmission restriction for the constrained multi-link operation?

* If an AP MLD intends to align the ending time of the DL PPDUs simultaneously sent on the multiple links, the AP MLD shall ensure that the difference between the ending times of transmitting PPDUs is less than SIFS – margin time.
  + Where the reference of the ending time of the PPDU is TBD and the margin time (< SIFS) is TBD.

Y/N/A/No answer: 29/10/27/20

Reference: 11-20-0511-01-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## March 30 (PHY): 6 SPs

**20/0394r1 (Thoughts on RU Aggregation and Interleaving, Bin Tian, Qualcomm)**

SP#1

Do you support joint interleaving for RU and aggregated RU size <=80 MHz?

Y/N/A: 38/9/11

SP#4

Do you agree the segment parser bit distribution sequence starts from the lowest frequency location to the highest frequency, just like in 11ac/ax?

Y/N/A: 53/0/8

SP#2.1

Do you support the following LDPC tone mapper parameters:

* for RU52+26: D\_TM = 4
* for RU106+26: D\_TM = 6
* Existing RUs: identical to 11ax

Y/N/A: 54/0/7

SP#2.2

Do you support the following LDPC tone mapper parameters:

* for RU484+242: D\_TM = 18

Y/N/A: 53/9/10

**20/0440r1 (Segment Parser and Tone Interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you agree with the following LDPC tone mapper scheme for multi-RU aggregation in 11be?

* For aggregated RUs and PPDU BW larger than 80MHz, separate LDPC tone mapper is applied in each 80MHz segment.

Y/N/A: 44/8/9

**20/0440r1 (Segment Parser and Tone Interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek)**

**20/0495r1 (Discussions on multi-RU aggregation, Tianyu Wu, Apple)**

Joint SP#2

Do you agree that 11be uses 80MHz segment parser with proportional round robin scheme?

Y/N/A: 48/0/10

Reference: 11-20-0526-01-00be-minutes-for-802-11be-phy-ad-hoc-conf-call-in-march-2020

## March 30 (MAC): 1 SP

**19/1959r1 (Constrained Multi-Link Operation, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**

SP

Do you support the following constrained multi-link operation?

* When a STA in a non-STR MLD receives an RTS addressed to itself, if the NAV of the STA indicates idle but another STA in the same MLD is either a TXOP holder or a TXOP responder, the STA may not respond with a CTS frame.

Y/N/A/No answer: 26/6/35/19

Reference: 11-20-0511-02-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 2 (Joint): 2 SPs

**20/0056r2 (Preparations for coordinated OFDMA, Rojan Chitrakar, Panasonic)**

SP

Do you support to add the following to the 11be SFD:

The sharing AP may solicit feedback from one or more APs from the AP candidate set to learn the frequency resources preferred for Coordinated OFDMA transmissions.

Note: AP Candidate set is TBD.

Y/N/A: 38/28/53

**20/0071r1 (Joint Transmission for 11be, Ron Porat, Broadcom)**

SP

Do you support adding to 11be SFD Joint Transmission for single and multi user under the multi-AP topic?

* Note: this feature is for rel. 2

Y/N/A: 89/10/28

Reference: 11-20-0570-00-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-april-2020

## April 6 (PHY): 8 SPs

**20/0380r0 (U-SIG structure and Preamble Processing, Sameer Vermani, Qualcomm)**

SP#1

Do you agree with allowing information in U-SIG to vary from one 80MHz to the next in an EHT PPDU of bandwidth >80MHz?

* Notes:
  + Each STA still needs to decode only one 80MHz segment in U-SIG
  + Within each 80MHz, U-SIG is still duplicated in every non-punctured 20MHz

Y/N/A: 25/15/15

**20/0439r0 (Efficient EHT Preamble Design, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek)**

SP#2

Do you agree that EHT-SIG may carry different content in each 80MHz?

* For PPDU BW larger than 80MHz.
* SST operation using TWT is one applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD.

Y/N/A: 35/15/10

SP2 (modified text)

Do you agree that EHT-SIG may carry different content in each 80MHz?

* For PPDU BW larger than 80MHz.

Y/N/A: 35/15/10

**20/0380r0 (U-SIG structure and Preamble Processing, Sameer Vermani, Qualcomm)**

SP#1 (modified text)

Do you agree with allowing information in U-SIG to vary from one 80MHz to the next in an EHT PPDU of bandwidth >80MHz?

* Notes:
  + Each STA still needs to decode only one 80MHz segment in U-SIG
  + Within each 80MHz, U-SIG is still duplicated in every non-punctured 20MHz
  + SST operation using TWT is one potential applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD (Needs MAC discussion).

Y/N/A: 34/8/16

**20/0545r1 (Multi-segment EHT-SIG design discussion, Ross Yu, Huawei)**

SP#3

Do you agree that the following indication shall be the same considering symbol alignment within each segment from PHY point of view, if the fields are present in U-SIG:

* Number of EHT-SIG symbols
* GI+EHT-LTF Size
* Number of EHT-LTF symbols
* PE related parameters

Y/N/A: 40/6/12

**20/0524r2 (Signaling of preamble puncturing in SU transmission, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP

Do you agree that EHT-SIG field included in EHT-PPDU sent to a single user is duplicated per 20MHz in BW?

Y/N/A: 12/29/17

**20/0285r5 (SU PPDU SIG Contents Considerations, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung)**

SP#1

Do you support following in 11be?

* Preamble of primary 20MHz channel shall not be punctured in any PPDU (Except TB PPDU)

Y/N/A: 45/1/10

SP#3

Do you agree to have STA-ID related information in the EHT PPDU preamble sent to a single user and multiple users? TB PPDU is TBD.

Y/N/A: 42/2/13

Reference: 11-20-0587-00-00be-minutes-april-phy-cc

## April 6 (MAC): 0 SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0511-03-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 9 (PHY): 6 SPs

**20/0483r2 (Preamble Puncturing for PPDUs Transmitted to Multiple STAs, Oded Redlich, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you agree to allow puncturing structure 1001 in a given 80MHz segment for OFDMA PPDUs transmitted to STAs operating at BW>=80MHz?

* Assuming 2 content channels are used
* Puncturing signaling may be different for different 80MHz channels
* In 802.11ax in such cases the BW drops to 20MHz

Y/N/A: 31/13/16

SP#2

Do you agree to allow puncturing structure 1010 in a given 80MHz segment for OFDMA PPDUs transmitted to STAs operating at BW>=80MHz?

* Assuming 2 content channels are used (Signaling TBD)
* Puncturing signaling may be different for different 80MHz channels
* In 802.11ax in such cases the BW drops to 20MHz

Y/N/A: 17/34/9

SP#3

Do you agree that U-SIG may include puncturing signaling/info about both 80MHz channels within each 160MHz channel?

* Will be used only by devices that can decode pre-EHT on 160MHz
* Will NOT affect the operation of STAs that decode pre-EHT on 80MHz
* Applicable for BW=160,320MHz. For BW=240MHz applicable for P160 only
* Signaling content is TBD

Y/N/A: 16/30/10

**20/285r5 (SU PPDU SIG Contents Considerations, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung)**

SP#2

Do you support that U-SIG in each 80MHz shall carry puncturing channel info for at-least the specific 80MHz where it is transmitted?

* Note: Within each 80MHz segment, U-SIG is duplicated in every non-punctured 20MHz
* Whether BW/Puncturing info can be different for different 80MHz is TBD
* Whether BW and puncturing info in U-SIG are carried as a combined or a separate field is TBD

Y/N/A: 42/9/6

**20/0524r2 (Signaling of preamble puncturing in SU transmission, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#2

Do you agree that a subfield for preamble puncturing pattern information separate from the BW field is included in U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG for the 11be PPDU transmitted to a single user?

Y/N/A: 36/4/14

SP#3

Which option do you prefer to configure the preamble puncturing information for transmission to a single user?

* Approach. 1: BW field includes some puncturing information
* Approach. 2: BW field doesn’t include puncturing information. Puncturing information is a separate field.
* Abs

Y/N/A: 17/30/10

Reference: 11-20-0587-01-00be-minutes-april-phy-cc

## April 9 (MAC): 0 SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0511-04-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 13 (PHY): 8 SPs

**19/1495r2 (Further Discussion on Feedback Overhead Reduction, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung)**

SP#1

Do you support to define a compressed beamforming feedback in 11be for following cases?

* Number of streams: 1-16
* Number of antennas: 2-16
* Note: Compressed beamforming feedback is the same as defined in 11ax except for the new parameter values of Nc and Nr.

Y/N/A: 51/1/10

SP#2

Do you support to define a mechanism to reduce the explicit beamforming feedback overhead for 9-16 antennas in 11be compared to the compressed beamforming feedback defined in 19.3.12.3.6 of 802.11-2016?

* Focusing on MU-MIMO feedback with maximum 4 streams
* SU case TBD

Y/N/A: 22/23/18

**20/0065r3 (Implicit Sounding Scheme, Lily Yunping Lyu, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you support to investigate implicit sounding as an optional mode in TGbe (for R2)?

Y/N/A: 47/8/10

**20/0019r3 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add the following into the 11be SFD?

* The following subfields exist in U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG of an EHT PPDU sent to single user:
  + LDPC Extra symbol
  + Beamformed
  + Pre-FEC padding factor
  + PE Disambiguity

Y/N/A: 41/5/11

**20/0020r3 (Consideration for EHT-SIG transmission, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree that in BW ≤ 160MHz, the EHT-SIG content channel for Multiple user transmission is configured as following?

* A EHT-SIG content channel is composed of a 20 MHz frequency segment.
* EHT-SIG content channels carry EHT-SIG common information and the user-specific information.
* The EHT-SIG field consists of the two EHT-SIG content channels in each 80MHz

The content channels (i.e., CC1 and CC2) per each 80MHz may carry different information.

* + Where, SST operation using TWT is one potential applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD

Y/N/A: 42/3/6

SP#3

Do you agree that 11be STA can recognize the preamble puncturing pattern it needs by using the BW field and puncturing information of U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG field in Multiple user transmission?

* Details for how to convey the puncturing information is TBD.

Y/N/A: 33/2/24

**20/0479r0 (240 MHz channelization, Sigurd Schelstraete, Quantenna/ON Semiconductor)**

SP#1

In 160+80 MHz BSS, should the 160 and 80 MHz be non-adjacent?

Y/N/A: 25/5/24

**20/0456r0 (Tx EVM Requirement for 4k QAM, Qinghua Li, Intel)**

SP#2

Do you support -38 dB as the Tx EVM requirement for 11be 4k QAM?

Y/N/A: 27/12/18

Reference: 11-20-0587-03-00be-minutes-april-phy-cc

## April 13 (MAC): 0 SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0511-05-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 16 (Joint): 0 SP

No straw polls were conducted.

Reference: 11-20-0570-01-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-april-2020

## April 17 (MAC): 9 SPs

**19/1305r4 (Synchronous Multi-link Operation, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you support the following PPDU transmission restriction for the constrained multi-link operation?

* If an AP MLD intends to align the ending time of DL PPDUs carrying a frame soliciting an immediate response simultaneously sent to the same non-STR non-AP MLD on multiple links, the AP MLD shall ensure that the difference between the ending times of transmitting DL PPDUs is less than TBD (< SIFS).
  + Where the reference of the ending time of the PPDU is TBD.

Y/N/A/No answer: 50/4/35/10

**20/0026r4 (MLO: Sync PPDUs, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm)**

SP#1

Do you agree to the following?

* In R1 of the spec, supporting the following cases:
  + STR AP MLD with STR non-AP MLD
  + STR AP MLD with non-STR non-AP MLD
  + Note: All the other cases are TBD.

Y/N/A: 71/3/15

SP#2

Do you agree to the following?

* An STR AP MLD shall align the end of DL PPDUs that are sent simultaneously on multiple links to the same non-STR non-AP MLD, in such a way that the response to any of the PPDUs will not overlap with any of the DL PPDUs?

Y/N/A: 41/35/17

**20/0081r3 (MLO-Synch-Transmission, Matthew Fischer, Broadcom)**

SP#2

Do you support the inclusion of the following in the SFD:

* 802.11be shall define a trigger message that may be transmitted by an AP or a non-AP STA and elicits an SU PPDU, for example, as a means to assist in creating an alignment of PPDU start and or end times on different links

Y/N/A/No answer: 32/36/24/11

**20/0082r2 (Synchronous-Transmitter-Medium-State-Information, Matthew Fischer, Broadcom)**

SP#0

Do you support the inclusion of the following in the SFD:

* 802.11be shall include a mechanism for the exchange of Medium State Information and rules for the use of that information by an NSTR STA

Y/N/A/No answer: 28/38/29/10

**20/0291r1 (MLO Async. and Sync. Operation Discussion, Zhou Lan, Broadcom)**

SP#2

Do you agree a mode of MLO operation that supports NON STR NON AP MLD to initiate transmit and receive frames to a NON STR AP MLD concurrently (PPDUs on multiple links overlapping in time domain) on multiple available links and solicit response is not in the scope of R1. Note-whether to define NON STR AP MLD is TBD

Y/N/A/No answer: 39/29/22/14

**20/0329r3 (Group addressed frame transmission in constrained multi-link operation, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**

SP

Do you support the following group addressed frames delivery mechanism?

* The non-STR STA MLD may configure one link with the AP MLD to receive group addressed frames, then during the group addressed delivery in the configured link, then the AP MLD may not schedule frames soliciting an immediate response to this non-STR STA MLD on other links that overlap with group address frame. NOTE- The condition to signal the configured link is TBD.

Y/N/A: 36/21/35

**20/0414r4 (Method for Handling Constrained MLD, Insun Jang, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree that 11be shall define mechanism(s) for enabling a non-AP MLD with constraints to transmit PPDUs overlapping on multiple links?

NOTE: whether it is for R1 or R2 is TBD.

Y/N/A: 37/27/24

**20/0415r4 (Multi-link Aggregation: Synchronized PPDUs on Multiple Links, Insun Jang, LGE)**

Do you agree that 11be shall allow the following multi-link operation?

* When at least one STA of non-AP MLD with constraints transmits a PPDU, the other STA(s) in the non-AP MLD defers (defer) the channel access without performing CCA during the transmission of PPDU

Y/N/A: 12/52/22

Reference: 11-20-0511-06-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 20 (PHY): 3 SPs

**20/0480r0 (4096 QAM Straw Polls, Sigurd Schelstraete, Quantenna/ON Semiconductor)**

SP#1

Do you support adding the following to 11be SFD?

* 11be shall define 4096 QAM as one of the optionally supported modulations

Y/N/A: 54/0/6

SP#2

Do you support adding the following to 11be SFD?

* The uniform constellation mapping for 4096 QAM shall be as given in 11-20/0111r0

Y/N/A: 45/0/19

**20/0565r0 (Smoothing Indication in 11be, Shimi Shilo, Huawei)**

SP#3

Do you support indicating within the PHY preamble of 11be if smoothing is recommended to be applied at the receiver for MU-MIMO allocation?

Y/N/A/Need further study: 21/15/6/19

Reference: 11-20-0587-04-00be-minutes-april-phy-cc

## April 20 (MAC): 5 SPs

**19/1547r5 (Multi-link operation and channel access discussion, Kaiying Lu, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you support that an AP MLD may transmit Beacon only on a subset of multiple links?

* eg. Transmit Beacon on one link of a pair of links
* How to choose the link to transmit Beacon is TBD.

Note: when the AP MLD has TX/RX constraints.

Y/N/A/No answer: 26/34/13/8

SP#2

Do you support that an AP MLD is capable to enable or disable a contention based channel access for each STA within a non-AP MLD?

Y/N/A/No answer: 28/37/12/5

**20/0026r6 (MLO: Sync PPDUs, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm)**

SP#3

Do you agree to the make the following an optional or mandatory feature?

* An AP MLD aligns the end of DL PPDUs that are sent simultaneously on multiple links to the same non-STR non-AP MLD, in such a way that the response to any of the PPDUs will not overlap with any of the DL PPDUs

Mandatory/Optional/Neither/Abstain/No Answer: 29/6/26/15/8

**20/0188r3 (Multi-link Triggered Uplink Access, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you support the following PPDU transmission restriction in the MLO?

* When an AP MLD aligns the ending time of DL PPDUs, the alignment requirement (i.e., the difference restriction between the ending times of transmitting DL PPDUs) is determined independent of the frame contained in the DL PPDUs.

Y/N/A/No answer: 24/22/29/14

**20/0433r4 (PPDU alignment in STR constrained multi-link, Yunbo Li, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you support below synchronization requirement?

* When a MLD1 transmit PPDU1 and PPDU2 in link 1 and link 2 respectively to a MLD2 which is STR constrained, if PPDU1 and PPDU2 has time domain overlapping, then the offset of ending time of PPDU2 compare with ending time of PPDU1 should follows below table
  + T1 = SIFS – TBD value;
  + T2 < T1, and the value of T2 is TBD.



Y/N/A/No Answer: 31/11/28/13

Reference: 11-20-0511-07-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 23 (PHY): 5 SPs

**20/0605r0 (Further Discussions On Efficient EHT Preamble, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you agree that EHT-SIG may carry different content in each 80MHz?

* For PPDU BW larger than 80MHz.
* SST operation using TWT is one applicable scenario, other scenarios are TBD.

Y/N/A: 51/1/4

**Straw poll #1 *[#SP1]***

**20/0604r2 (New Parser Discussion in 11be, Dandan Liang, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you agree that 11be uses RU Parser with the following proportional round robin scheme for RU242+484+996?

* (242+484)+996: 1s:2s:4s

Y/N/A: 11/29/14

**20/0579r3 (update on segment parser and tone interleaver for 11be, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Do you agree that 11be uses 80MHz segment parser with the following parameters for the proportional round robin scheme?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RU Aggregation** | **Nsd\_total** | **Proportional Ratio (m1:m2:m3:m4)** | **Leftover bits (per symbol)** |
| 484+996 | 1448 | 1s:2s | 44\*Nbpscs on ru996 |
| 484+2\*996 | 2428 | 1s:2s:2s | 44\*Nbpscs on ru996 |
| 484+3\*996 | 3408 | 1s:2s:2s:2s | 44\*Nbpscs on ru996 |
| 2\*996 | 1960 | 1s:1s | 0 |
| 3\*996 | 2940 | 1s:1s:1s | 0 |
| 4\*996 | 3920 | 1s:1s:1s:1s | 0 |

where

Y/N/A: 43/1/8

**Straw poll #2 *[#SP2]***

SP#2

Do you agree the same proportional round robin is applied to left-over bits?

* The same ratios are used in the entire segment parsing process except the ratios of those already filled segment becomes 0.



Leftover bits

To 1st RU

To 2nd RU

Y/N/A: 44/0/11

**Straw poll #3 *[#SP3]***

**20/0603r0 (EHT-SIG Contents for SU transmission, Ross Yu, Huawei)**

SP#1

Which option do you prefer regarding EHT-SIG contents for SU transmission when BW>20MHz.?

* Opt a: 1111 (CC1 and CC2 have the same contents)
* Opt b: 1212 (CC1 and CC2 have different contents)
* Neither
* Abstain

Opt a/Opt b/Neither/Abstain: 18/12/0/21

Reference: 11-20-0587-05-00be-minutes-april-phy-cc

## April 23 (MAC): 5 SPs

**20/0487r5 (Multiple Link Operation Follow Up, Liwen Chu, NXP)**

SP#1

Do you support that in non-STR STA MLD, the simultaneous transmission in two links through backoff in one link (link 1) and enhanced PIFS idle/busy check in another link (link 2) is allowed:

* NAV checking in primary 20MHz channel of link2 besides PIFS checking in other secondary channels of link2,
* The further method to guarantee fairness is TBD.

Y/N/A/No answer: 19/26/27/14

SP#2

Do you support to define a mode that when doing simultaneous frame exchanges with STA MLD without STR capability, the inter-frame space between the ending time of the short responding PPDU and the starting time of the following soliciting PPDU may be more than SIFS and no more than TBD time?

* Note: it may be required to do ED sensing when the IFS is longer than SIFS according to EU regulation.

Y/N/A/No answer: 12/36/33/16

**20/0226r5 (MLO Constraint Indication and Operating Mode, Sharan Naribole, Samsung)**

SP#1

Do you support the addition of the following text to TGbe SFD?

* A non-AP MLD may update its ability to perform simultaneous transmission and reception on a pair of setup links after multi-link setup.
  + This update for any pair of setup links can be announced by non-AP MLD on any enabled link.

NOTE – Specific signaling for update indication is TBD

NOTE - Limitations on dynamic updating is TBD

Y/N/A/No answer: 43/7/29/19

**Straw poll #4 *[#SP4]***

**20/0433r5 (PPDU alignment in STR constrained multi-link, Yunbo Li, Huawei)**

SP

Do you support below synchronization requirement?

* When a MLD1 transmit PPDU1 and PPDU2 in link 1 and link 2 respectively to a MLD2 which is STR constrained, if PPDU1 and PPDU2 has time domain overlapping, then the offset of ending time of PPDU2 compare with ending time of PPDU1 should follow below table
  + T1 = SIFS – non-negative TBD value;
  + 0< T2 < T1, and the value of T2 is TBD.



Y/N/A/No answer: 37/16/28/15

**20/0329r6 (Group addressed frame transmission in constrained multi-link operation, Yongho Seok, Mediatek)**

SP#2

Do you support the following group addressed frames delivery mechanism?

* The non-STR non-AP MLD may configure one link with the AP MLD to receive non-GCR group addressed frames, then during the non-GCR group addressed delivery in the configured link, then the AP MLD and non-STR non-AP MLD may not schedule frames soliciting an immediate response to each other on other links that overlap with the non-GCR group address frames.

Y/N/A/No answer: 26/15/37/20

Reference: 11-20-0511-08-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 24 (MAC): 3 SPs

**20/0024r2 (MLO: Acknowledgement procedure, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm)**

SP#1

Do you support that the 802.11be amendment shall define mechanism for multi-link operation that enables the following:

* A STA of a recipient MLD shall provide receive status for MPDUs received on the link that it is operating on and may provide (if available) information on successful reception of MPDUs received by another STA of that MLD

Y/N/A/No answer: 48/5/23/8

**Straw poll #5 *[#SP5]***

**20/0053r3 (Multi-link BA, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you support that for each block ack agreement between two MLDs, there exists one transmit buffer control to submit MPDUs for transmission across links?

* TBD for separate transmit buffer control

Y/N/A/No answer: 48/1/41/7

**Straw poll #6 *[#SP6]***

SP#2

Do you support to extend the negotiated Block Ack buffer size to be smaller than or equal to 1024 and define 512-bits and 1024-bits BA bitmap in R1?

Y/N/A/No answer: 45/0/43/9

**Straw poll #7 *[#SP7]***

Reference: 11-20-0511-09-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 27 (PHY): 12 SPs

**20/0578r0 (On RU Allocation Singling in EHT-SIG, Jianhan Liu, MediaTek)**

SP#1

Which option do you prefer to EHT-SIG RU allocation signaling (not for 11be SFD)?

* Option 1: 11ax HE-SIGB Common Field-based schemes
* Option 2: New Self-contained schemes based on RU allocation being sent in per-user field.

Note: for information only – Not for SFD.

Option 1/Option 2/Absent: 38/22/2

**20/0585r0 (Consideration on EHT-STF, Eunsung Park, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* EHT PPDU has EHT-STF immediately after EHT-SIG
  + If EHT PPDU doesn’t have EHT-SIG, EHT-STF is positioned immediately after U-SIG

Y/N/A: 52/0/6

**Straw poll #8 *[#SP8]***

SP#2

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* 802.11be supports 1x EHT-STF and 2x EHT-STF
  + 1x EHT-STF is used in EHT SU/MU PPDU
    - Whether SU and MU PPDU format is the same is TBD
  + 2x EHT-STF is used in EHT TB PPDU
  + TBD for any new EHT PPDU formats

Y/N/A: 51/1/8

**Straw poll #9 *[#SP9]***

SP#3

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* 802.11be reuses 1x HE-STF and 2x HE-STF in 20/40/80/160/80+80 MHz PPDU

Y/N/A: 51/0/8

**Straw poll #10 *[#SP10]***

**20/0608r0 (Consideration on EHT-LTF, Jinyoung Chun, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you support to reuse 1/2/4x HE-LTF sequences for 1/2/4x EHT-LTF sequences in 20/40/80MHz PPDU transmission?

Y/N/A: 51/0/9

**Straw poll #11 *[#SP11]***

**20/0470r1 (Small Size MRU with Different MCS and BCC, Junghoon Suh, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you agree that, for a single RU less than or equal to 242 tones (i.e. RU26, RU52, RU106, RU242), the BCC can be supported?

* Mandatory or Optional for BCC, TBD
* Only for MCS0 to 9.
* Only for NSS <=4

Y/N/A: 49/2/13

SP#1a

Do you agree that, for a single RU less than or equal to 242 tones (i.e. RU26, RU52, RU106, RU242), the BCC can be supported?

* Mandatory or Optional for BCC, TBD
* Only for MCS0 to 9 (with or without DCM – if defined in 11be)
* Only for NSS <=4

Y/N/A: 37/6/14

SP#2

Do you agree that, for the combined multiple RU with the combined RU size less than 242 tones, the BCC can be supported?

* Mandatory or Optional for BCC, TBD
* Only for modulation up to 256QAM (with or without DCM – if defined in 11be)
* Only for NSS <=4

Y/N/A: 41/12/10

**Straw poll #12 *[#SP12]***

SP#1b

Do you agree that, for a single RU less than or equal to 242 tones (i.e. RU26, RU52, RU106, RU242), the BCC can be supported?

* Mandatory or Optional for BCC, TBD
* Only for modulation up to 256QAM (with or without DCM – if defined in 11be)
* Only for NSS <=4

Y/N/A: 48/3/12

**Straw poll #13 *[#SP13]***

SP#3

In case of small size MRU transmission, do you support to apply a common BCC encoder and joint bit Interleaver for the combined RU?

Y/N/A: 60/0/3

**Straw poll #14 *[#SP14]***

**20/0067r1 (Restrictions for 16 SS based MU-MIMO Scheduling, Junghoon Suh, Huawei)**

SP#1

For an EHT MU-MIMO transmission, do you agree to limit the maximum number of Spatial Streams allocated to each MU-MIMO scheduled non-AP STA to 4?

Y/N/A: 56/1/9

**Straw poll #15 *[#SP15]***

**20/0563r1 (EHT PPDU Scrambler, Xiaogang Chen, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you agree to use the following generator polynomial to generate the PPDU synchronous scrambler for EHT PPDU?

• The 11 bits used for the scrambler initialization are randomly assigned by the transmitter.

• The polarity of the pilot subcarrier is derived from the same sequence as 11ax.

Y/N/A: 36/12/12

**Straw poll #16 *[#SP16]***

Reference: 11-20-0587-06-00be-minutes-april-phy-cc

## April 27 (MAC): 2 SPs

**20/0055r2 (Multi-link block ack architecture, Rojan Chitrakar, Panasonic)**

SP#1

Do you support to add the following to the 11be SFD:

Different scoreboard sizes may be negotiated for different links of an MLD during negotiation of a block ack agreement for a TID that may be transmitted over one or more links.

Y/N/A/No Answer: 14/22/34/17

SP#2

Do you support to add the following to the 11be SFD:

An MLD may maintain a common scoreboard to record the receipt status of MPDUs of a TID received via different links?

Y/N/A/No Answer: 16/15/43/21

Reference: 11-20-0511-10-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## April 30 (Joint): 3 SPs on requests for candidate SFD texts

**20/0394r1 (Thoughts on RU Aggregation and Interleaving, Bin Tian, Qualcomm)**

Modified SP#1

Do you support joint interleaving for BCC and joint tone mapper for LDPC for RU and aggregated RU size <=80 MHz?

Y/N/A/No answer: 64/6/62/23

**19/1604r1 (EHT Direct Link Transmission, Dibakar Das, Intel)**

Modified SP

Do you agree to add the following to SFD?

* Do you support that 11be defines a procedure for an AP to share time resource obtained in a TXOP for peer to peer (STA-TO-STA) frame exchanges?
  + Whether it is in R1 or R2 is TBD.

Passed with unanimous consent

**20/0380r0 (U-SIG structure and Preamble Processing, Sameer Vermani. Qualcomm)**

SP to keep existing text in the SFD

Do you agree that a STA only needs to process up to one 80MHz segment of the pre-EHT preamble (up-to and including EHT-SIG) to get all the assignment information for itself?

* No 80MHz segment change is needed while processing L-SIG, U-SIG and EHT-SIG

Passed with unanimous consent to keep the existing text

Reference: 11-20-0570-02-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-april-2020

## April 30 (Joint): 3 SPs

**20/0099r1 (Coordinated Beamforming for 802.11be, Roya Doostnejad, Intel)**

SP

Do you support adding “Multi-AP Coordinated BF” to 802.11be SFD as one of the multi-AP coordination schemes?

Note: This feature is for rel. 2

Y/N/A/No answer: 88/1/41/26

**Straw poll #17 *[#SP17]***

**20/0123r0 (Channel Sounding for Multi-AP CBF, Feng Jiang, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you support that multiple APs can sequentially use an 11ax-like sounding sequence to collect CSI from the in-BSS STAs and OBSS STAs?

* Each AP’s sounding sequence is similar to the 11ax sounding protocol with multiple STAs (NDPA + NDP + BFRP TF + CSI report).

Y/N/A/No answer: 81/4/43/30

**Straw poll #18 *[#SP18]***

SP#2

In sequential channel sounding sequence for multi-AP, do you support that the NDPA frame and BFRP TF frame will include ID info for OBSS STA?

* The details of the NDPA, BFRP TF and the ID info are TBD.

Y/N/A/No answer: 75/9/45/26

**Straw poll #19 *[#SP19]***

Reference: 11-20-0570-02-00be-telephone-conference-meeting-minutes-april-2020

## May 4 (PHY): 3 SPs

**20/0456r0 (Tx EVM Requirement for 4k QAM, Qinghua Li, Intel)**SP#1

Do you support -38 dB as the Tx EVM requirement for 11be 4k QAM?

Y/N/A: 32/0/11

**Straw poll #20 *[#SP20]***

**20/0667r1 (Small RU Combinations, Ron Porat, Broadcom)**

SP#1

Do you support the following 106+26 combinations as shown in orange for each 80MHz segment in 80, 160, 240 and 320MHz BW?

A picture containing screenshot, different, computer, clock

Description automatically generated

Y/N/A: 35/7/10

**Straw poll #21 *[#SP21]***

**20/0686r0 (Considerations on the Scrambler design for 11be, Chenchen Liu, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you agree to use higher degree scrambler only for user with large RU size and high MCS in EHT PPDU?

* The exact high degree scrambler is TBD
* The condition when the high degree scrambler should be used is TBD

Y/N/A: 11/31/7

Reference: 11-20-0708-00-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-phy-ad-hoc-cc-march-to-may-2020

## May 4 (MAC): 8 SPs

**20/0441r3 (MLA: BA Format, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm)**

SP#3

Do you agree to add to the TGbe SFD:

* For a M-BlockAck frame, add support for 512/1024 bitmap lengths by:
  + Including new BA Bitmap lengths (of 512 and 1024 bits), where the length of the BA Bitmap field is signaled in the Per AID TID Info field addressed to an EHT STA
  + The M-BA frame containing these Per AID TID Info fields is not sent as a response to an HE TB PPDU generated by at least one HE STA.

Y/N/A/No answer: 36/1/35/6

**Straw poll #22 *[#SP22]***

SP#2

Do you agree to add to the TGbe SFD:

* For a Compressed BlockAck frame, use some of the reserved values of the Fragment Number field of the BlockAck frame to indicate the added bitmap lengths (512 and 1024).

Y/N/A/No answer: 46/0/29/5

**Straw poll #23 *[#SP23]***

**20/0122r4 (A BAR Variant For Multi-Link Operation, Chunyu Hu, Facebook)**

SP#1

Do you agree to define a new type of BAR used in the multi-link operation that can be used to notify the A-MPDU responder that it has skipped a range of sequence numbers and/or a subset of sequence numbers, and that the responder shall not move its BA window as result?

Y/N/A/No answer: 5/44/26/13

**20/0397r4 (Sequence number and BA operation with large BA buffer size, Liwen Chu, NXP)**

SP#1

Do you support to use B3 equal to 1, B2 B1 equal to 0 and B0 equal to 0 in Fragment Number field to indicate 512 BA bitmap length and to use B3 equal to 1, B2 B1 equal to 0 and B0 equal to 1 in Fragment Number field to indicate 1024 BA bitmap length in compressed BA and multi-STA BA?

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #24 *[#SP24]***

**20/0053r4, (Multi-link BA, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**

SP#3

Do you support to extend table 26-1 as shown below?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Negotiated buffer size** | **Bitmap in compressed BA** | **Bitmap in multi-STA BA** |
| 1-64 | 64 | 32 or 64 |
| 65-128 | 64 or 256 | 32, 64, 128 |
| 129-256 | 64 or 256 | 32, 64, 128, or 256 |
| 257-512 | 64 or 256 or 512 | 32, 64, 128, 256, 512 |
| 513-1024 | 64 or 256 or 512 or 1024 | 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, or 1024 |

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #25 *[#SP25]***

**20/0024r3 (MLO: Acknowledgement procedure, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm)**

SP#2

Do you agree that an originator MLD of an BA agreement:

* shall update the receive status for an MPDU corresponding to the BA agreement if the received status indicates successful reception.
* shall not update the receive status for an MPDU corresponding to the BA agreement that has been already positively acknowledged.

Y/N/A/No answer: 34/0/33/13

**Straw poll #26 *[#SP26]***

**20/0432r1 (Bug fix for Acknowledgement rule in multi-link, Yunbo Li, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you agree to modify acknowledgement rule in multi-link as below:

* The receive status of a MSDU or A-MSDU in a QoS Data frames of a TID received on a link shall be signaled on the same link unless at least one of following conditions is true:
  + The receive status of the MSDU or A-MSDU has already be signaled in other available link(s) with corresponding bit in the BA be set to 1;
  + The corresponding Ack Policy of the MSDU or A-MSDU is set to No Ack.

Y/N/A/No answer: 15/21/27/18

**20/0460r3 (Multi-link BA Clarification, Yongho Seok, MediaTek)**  
SP#1

Do you support that, after the BA agreement of a TID between two MLDs, the common reordering buffer of the TID are applied on all setup links?

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #27 *[#SP27]***

Reference: 11-20-0511-11-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## May 7 (PHY): 6 SPs

**20/0606r2 (Further discussion on bandwidth and puncturing information, Wook Bong Lee, Samsung)**

SP#1

Do you agree that 11be signaling in U-SIG for BW/puncturing information in every non-punctured 20MHz of an 80MHz segment shall allow even an OBSS or unassociated device to decode the puncturing pattern of at least the specific 80MHz that contains the 20MHz?

Y/N/A: 34/10/8

**Straw poll #28 *[#SP28]***

SP#4

Do you support BW field which doesn’t include puncturing information?

Y/N/A: 44/10/5

**Straw poll #29 *[#SP29]***

**20/0699r0 (Phase Rotation Proposal Follow-up, Eunsung Park, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* Phase rotation is applied to legacy preamble, RL-SIG, U-SIG and EHT-SIG in EHT PPDU

Y/N/A: 48/3/9

**Straw poll #30 *[#SP30]***

SP#2

Do you agree to define a new phase rotation sequence which is different from the 11ax one for 40/80/160/80+80 MHz PPDU?

* It is not intended for SFD

Y/N/A: 7/27/23

SP#3

Do you agree to add the following text to the TGbe SFD?

* 11be reuses the phase rotation sequence defined in 11ax for 20/40/80/160/80+80 MHz PPDU

Y/N/A: 51/3/5

**Straw poll #31 *[#SP31]***

**20/0373r1 (RU Allocation Subfield Design for Multi-RU Support, Myeongjin Kim, Samsung)**

SP#1

Do you agree to the RU allocation signaling in EHT-SIG is based on RU allocation signaling as defined in HE-SIGB of 11ax?

Y/N/A: 35/13/8

Reference: 11-20-0708-00-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-phy-ad-hoc-cc-march-to-may-2020

## May 7 (MAC): 7 SPs

**20/0136r2 (Virtual Carrier Sense in Multi-Link, Thomas Handte, Sony)**  
SP

Do you support that an AP entity which is part of a AP MLD may transmit network state information of the other AP entities which are part of the same AP MLD?

* Note 1: Definition of network state information is TBD
* Note 2: R1 or R2 is TBD

Y/N/A/No Answer: 32/23/25/19

**19/1930r3 (AP assisted Multi-link operation, Dibakar Das, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you agree that an AP that is part of an AP MLD can transmit the BSS load information of other APs that are part of the same MLD?

* whether we use existing or new mechanism is TBD

Y/N/A/No answer: 38/15/27/17

**20/0119r2 (Follow Up Discussion on Multi-link Operations, Xiaofei Wang, InterDigital)**

SP#2

Do you agree that an EHT MLD shall indicate its MLD MAC address during ML setup?

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #32 *[#SP32]***

**20/0314r1 (MLO: BSS Color, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm)**

SP

Do you support that each STA of an MLD may independently select and manage its operational parameters unless specified otherwise in the 11be standard?

Y/N/A/No answer: 51/8/22/15

**Straw poll #33 *[#SP33]***

**20/0358r1 (Multi-BSSID Operation with MLO, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm)**

SP#1

Do you agree that an AP of an AP MLD can correspond to a transmitted BSSID or a nontransmitted BSSID in a multiple BSSID set on a link?

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #34 *[#SP34]***

SP#2

Do you agree that APs belonging to the same multiple BSSID set cannot be part of the same AP MLD?

* Note: APs within a multiple BSSID set are, by definition, operating on the same channel

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #35 *[#SP35]***

SP#3

Do you agree that APs belonging to the same co-hosted BSSID set cannot be part of the same AP MLD?

* Note: APs within a co-hosted BSSID set are, by definition, operating on the same channel

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #36 *[#SP36]***

Reference: 11-20-0511-12-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## May 8 (MAC): 4 SPs

**20/0430r3 (RTS/CTS for multi-link, Taewon Song, LGE)**

SP#1

A STA may indicate whether each recipient STA commences the transmission of a CTS frame response or not via MU-RTS frame.

* A detailed method is TBD.

Y/N/A/No answer: 14/23/37/7

**20/0442r1 (MLA: Group addressed frames delivery, Duncan Ho, Qualcomm)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add to the TGbe SFD the following:

* For R1, each AP affiliated with an STR AP MLD shall follow the baseline rules for scheduling Beacon frame transmissions

Y/N/A/No answer: 44/4/32/15

**Straw poll #37 *[#SP37]***

**20/0488r1 (Multi-link group addressed data delivery, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**

SP#1

Do you support that different SN space for group addressed data frame are used in different links?

Y/N/A: 21/28/29

**20/0054r3 (MLD MAC address and WM address, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**  
SP#3

Do you support that if different affiliated APs of an AP MLD have different MAC addresses, then different affiliated non-AP STAs of a non-AP MLD with more than one affiliated STA have different MAC addresses?

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #38 *[#SP38]***

Reference: 11-20-0511-13-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-march-and-may-2020

## May 11 (PHY): 1 SP

**20/0019r4 (11be PPDU format, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add the following into the 11be SFD?

* The EHT PPDU sent to a single user has the EHT-SIG field.
  + A subfield that indicates preamble puncturing pattern can be present in the U-SIG and/or EHT-SIG field.

Y/N/A: 36/0/11

**Straw poll #39 *[#SP39]***

Reference: 11-20-0708-02-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-phy-ad-hoc-cc-march-to-may-2020

## May 11 (MAC): 2 SPs

**19/1822r9 (Multi-link security consideration, Po-Kai Huang, Intel)**  
SP#3

Between two MLDs, do you support to use the MLD MAC addresses to derive PMK under SAE method and PTK in 11be SFD?

Approved with unanimous consent

**Straw poll #40 *[#SP40]***

**20/0069r5 (multi-link communication mode definition, Yonggang Fang, ZTE TX)**

SP#1 (modified text)

Do you support to define the following in SFD?

* STR: simultaneous transmission and reception
* STR Operation: is the operation of which a transmission on one link is independent to (i.e. non-interruptible on) the operation on another link of MLD.
* STR-constraint Operation: is the operation on a link may depend on the operation of another link of MLD.
  + i.e. a transmission on a link may be constrained if it causes the reception interruption on another link, or a reception on a link may be constrained if a transmission is on anther link of MLD.
* STR-constraint links: A pair or group of links are in the STR-constraint Operation.

Y/N/A: 16/25/29

Reference: 11-20-0748-00-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-in-march-and-may-2020

## May 14 (Joint): 1 SP

**20/0416r0 (MRU signaling in trigger frame, Ross Jian Yu, Huawei)**

SP#2

Which option do you prefer to be used for RU combination indication in the trigger frame+ Non-ofdma mode TBD

A: Option 1, Repeat AID in the User Info field allocated to the same STA

B: Option 2, combination indication in each user info field

C: Abstain

D: Need more discussion

E: Option 3: Change in the RU Allocation subfield

A/B/C/D/E: 14/21/22/41/30/40

Reference: 11-20-0775-00-00be-may-july-tgbe-teleconference-minutes

## May 18 (PHY): 8 SPs

**20/0608r0 (Consideration on EHT-LTF, Jinyoung Chun, LGE)**

SP#2

Do you support to reuse 1/2/4x HE-LTF sequences for 1/2/4x EHT-LTF sequences in 80+80/160MHz?

Y/N/A: 41/0/4

**Straw poll #41 *[#SP41]***

**20/0666r2 (80MHz OFDMA Tone Plan, Ron Porat, Broadcom)**

SP#1

Do you support the following toneplan for 11be 80 MHz OFDMA?

* 80 MHz OFDMA = 40 MHz DUP, Table 27-8 in 11ax D6 right/left shifted by 256 tones.



* Note
  + The 80MHz OFDMA design applies to any RU<996 for all modes of transmission, SU, DL MU, TB PPDU, with and without puncturing
  + Non-OFDMA full BW 80MHz segment uses 996RU design
  + Any punctured 80MHz segment uses the OFDMA tone plan
  + For each 80MHz segment in 160MHz, 240MHz or 320MHz: if it’s punctured or used for OFDMA the 80MHz OFDMA tone plan is used, if it’s used for non-OFDMA and non-punctured the 996RU tone plan is used

Y/N/A: 44/1/5

**Straw poll #42 *[#SP42]***

**20/0609r3 (Further discussion on RU allocation subfield in EHT-SIG, Ross Jian Yu, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you agree to add the following to the 11be SFD:

* An RU Allocation subfield that is present in the Common field of the EHT-SIG field of an EHT PPDU sent to multiple users (except EHT TB PPDU), indicates RU assignment, including the size of the RU(s) and their placement in the frequency domain, to be used in the EHT modulated fields of the PPDU in the frequency domain.
  + Compressed modes are TBD.

Y/N/A: 37/0/8

**Straw poll #43 *[#SP43]***

SP#3 (modified text)

Do you agree that the minimum RU size for EHT to support MU-MIMO shall be 242-tone RU?

Y/N/A: 31/6/13

**Straw poll #44 *[#SP44]***

**20/0652r0 (Signaling of RU allocation in 11be, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree that the RU allocation subfield in the EHT-SIG field of an EHT-PPDU sent to multiple users includes the RU allocation for Multiple RUs as well as Single RU?

Y/N/A: 38/0/10

**Straw poll #45 *[#SP45]***

**20/0738r2 (Evaluation of signaling overhead for EHT-SIG, Dongguk Lim, LGE)**

SP#1

Do you agree that N RU allocation subfields are present in an EHT-SIG content channel?

* Where, N is the number of RU allocation subfield in common field of EHT-SIG content channel.
* N = 1 if a 20MHz or 40MHz EHT PPDU sent to multiple users is used.
* N = 2 if a 80MHz EHT PPDU sent to multiple users is used.
* N = TBD for other cases.
* The compressed modes are TBD.

Y/N/A: 38/1/10

**Straw poll #46 *[#SP46]***

**20/0767r0 (Number of Users in MU-MIMO, Ron Porat, Broadcom)**

SP#1

Do you agree that the max number of users that can be spatially multiplexed in EHT for DL transmissions is 8 per RU/MRU?

* Applicable to all transmission modes in 11be

Y/N/A: 45/1/6

**Straw poll #47 *[#SP47]***

**20/0693r1 (Aggregated PPDU for Large BW, Rui Cao, NXP)**  
SP#1

Do you agree to define frequency domain aggregation of aggregated PPDUs for EHT?

* Aggregated PPDU consists of multiple sub-PPDUs.
  + The PPDU format combination limits to EHT and HE.
  + Other combinations are TBD.
  + For the PPDU using HE format, the PPDU BW TBD.
  + The number of PPDUs is TBD.
* A-PPDU will be R2 feature.

Y/N/A: 31/0/7

**Straw poll #48 *[#SP48]***

Reference: 11-20-0787-00-00be-minutes-802-11-be-phy-ad-hoc-telephone-conferences-may-july-2020

## May 18 (MAC): 9 SPs

**20/408r4 (Prioritized EDCA Channel Access Over Latency Sensitive Links in MLO, Chunyu Hu, Facebook)**

SP#1

Do you support that the TGbe SFD shall include that

* An MLD AP may offer differentiated quality of service over different links

Y/N/A: 61/8/17

**Straw poll #49 *[#SP49]***

SP#2

Do you support that the TGbe SFD shall include:

* An optional mechanism of dividing medium time into slots of duration TBD during which prioritized EDCA access operates for specifically allowed STAs

Y/N/A: 15/30/39

**20/0358r3 (Multi-BSSID Operation with MLO, Abhishek Patil, Qualcomm)**

SP#4

Do you support that each AP of an AP MLD is independently configured to operate as transmitted or nontransmitted BSSID of a multiple BSSID set or as an AP of a co-hosted BSSID set or not part of either a multiple BSSID set or co-hosted BSSID set?

Y/N/A: 52/2/33

**Straw poll #50 *[#SP50]***

**20/0105r4 (Link Latency Statistics of Multi-band Operations in EHT, Frank Hsu, MediaTek)**  
SP#1

Do you support that EHT AP should provide BSS transmit delay statistics carried in an information element?

* Transmit delay statistics details are TBD?

Y/N/A: 30/25/27

SP#2

Do you support that EHT AP MLD should provide transmit delay statistics of each link carried in an information element?

* Transmit delay statistics details are TBD

Y/N/A: 38/24/22

**20/0472r2 (Discussion of More Data subfield for multi-link, Yunbo Li, Huawei)**

SP#1

Do you support to adjust the setting of More Data subfield to fit MLD scenario?

Y/N/A: 45/8/25

**Straw poll #51 *[#SP51]***

SP#2

Do you support below setting of More Data subfield?

* When AP MLD transmit a BU in one link to a non-AP MLD, if there is at least one additional buffered BU of any TID or management frames that is mapped to this link by TID-to-link mapping or default mapping for the same non-AP MLD, the More Data subfield is set to 1, otherwise the More Data subfield is set to 0.

Y/N/A: 43/7/28

**Straw poll #52 *[#SP52]***

SP#3

Do you support below setting of More Data subfield?

* A QoS Null frame with More Data subfield sets to 0 may be transmitted in one link to indicate no more additional buffered BU of any TID or management frames that mapping to this link present?

Y/N/A: 29/16/37

**20/0398r3 (EHT BSS with wider bandwidth, Liwen Chu, NXP)  
  
SP#1**

Do you support that in 6GHz band, an EHT AP may announce different BSS operating bandwidth to non-EHT STAs than the BSS operating bandwidth it announces to EHT STAs when EHT BW covers disallowed 20MHz channels and/or when the announced EHT BW is not supported by non-EHT amendments. The advertised BSS operating bandwidth to EHT STA shall include the advertised BSS operating bandwidth to non-EHT STA?

Y/N/A: 31/1/33

**Straw poll #53 *[#SP53]***

Reference: 11-20-0777-01-00be-minutes-for-tgbe-mac-ad-hoc-teleconferences-may-and-july-2020