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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the TGbe MAC ad hoc teleconferences held in November 2020 and January 2021.

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the minute from the telephone conference held on November 02, 2020.
* Rev1: Added the minute from the telephone conference held on November 05, 2020.
* Rev2: Added the attendance list on the telephone conference held on November 05, 2020.
* Rev3: Added the minute from the telephone conferences held on November 12, 2020 and removed the attendance lists on the telephone conferences held on November 02&05, 2020.

**Monday 02 November 2020, 19:00 –21:00 ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (LG Electronics)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 19:05am EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary, Jeongki Kim (LG)
2. The Chair goes through the 802 and 802.11 IPR policy and procedures and asks if there is anyone that is aware of any potentially essential patents. Nobody speaks up.
3. The Chair recommends using IMAT for recording the attendance.
   * Please record your attendance during the conference call by using the IMAT system:
     1. 1) login to [imat](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance), 2) select “802.11 Telecons (<Month>)” entry, 3) select “C/LM/WG802.11 Attendance” entry, 4) click “TGbe <MAC/PHY/Joint> conference call that you are attending.
   * If you are unable to record the attendance via [IMAT](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance) then please send an e-mail to Liwen Chu ([liwen.chu@nxp.com](mailto:liwen.chu@nxp.com)) and Jeongki Kim ([jeongki.kim@lge.com](mailto:jeongki.kim@lge.com))

The Chair reminds that the agenda can be found in 11-20/1615r5. The agenda is modified

**Submissions**

* 1. [992r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0992-04-00be-mac-pdt-nsep-tbds.docx) **MLO mandatory/optional** Laurent Cariou [7 SPs]

**SP #2:**

* **Do you agree to add the following to the SFD**
  + the MLO basic framework support is mandatory for 11be AP and 11be STA
    - discovery procedure, Setup procedures, Security procedures, default mapping (all TIDs mapped to all links, all setup links enabled), TIM indicating BUs at MLD level, BA at MLD level, Power save per link, Power state change indications per link
    - Note: TSF alignment rules on AP MLD side TBD
    - Note: Single radio single band capable STA and AP TBD
    - Note: TID-mapping and other link operations (enable/disable/add/remove) are TBD

**Discussion:**

C: Several TBD are here.

C: Not sure that some parts should be basic framework. Mandatory is fine.

C: I’m not sure that the TSF alignment rules should be TBD. Maybe it’s motion or SP?

A: I haven’t run the SP.

C: how does the single radio single band capable STA perform the MLO operation?

C: Those should not be note.

SP text is changed as following:

**SP #2:**

* **Do you agree to add the following to the SFD**

the support of the following MLO features is mandatory for 11be AP and 11be STA- discovery procedure, Setup procedures, Security procedures, default mapping (all TIDs mapped to all links, all setup links enabled), TIM indicating BUs at MLD level, BA at MLD level, Power save per link, Power state change indications per link, BSS parameter critical update procedure

Note: the above does not preclude other functionalities being added to the list

68/8/31

* 1. [1722r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1722-00-00be-mac-pdt-nsep-tbds.docx) PDT for TBDs Subir Das

Summary: Proposes the PDT for NS/NE priority access

Discussion:

C: What information is getting for this authorization?

C: How is this authorized?

C: This information is going to be out of the scope.

C: AP can also use other procedures for this authorization information.

A: Yes. It could be. Interaction with SSPN.

A: Basically, If the SSPNInterfaceActivated is set to true, this NSEP service via SSPN could be supported

C: What is the old AP and new AP for?

A: That is related to reassociation.

C: The second last paragraph has still TBD. Is this neogotiation for enabling or disalbing?

A: This is not about enable and disable.

C: After disable, this priority access is not used?

A: Yes

C: Is this diable procedure two way handshake procedure?

C: What happen if the non-AP does not respond this request?

SP is defered

* 1. [1312r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1312-00-00be-triggered-su-ppdu-for-11ber1.pptx) Triggered SU PPDU for 11be R1 Dibakar Das

Summary: Proposing for non-AP to send UL/P2P SU PPDU through the resource allocated by AP

Discussion:

C: This is similar to HCCA mechanism.

A: HCCA triggers the CF-Poll frame.

C: slide 5, after MU-RTS and CTS, STA sends PPDU here, in 11ax, AP sends PPDUs. This is differece between them.

C: Why do you use MU-RTS instead of Trigger frame?

A: MU-RTS is also the type of Trigger frame.

C: This scheme is also for single link. This could be adopt to multi-link?

A: Yes.

C: In this case, TXOP duration is different on each link?

A: It depends on the STA type. STR STA has different TXOP on each link. NSTR could have the same TXOP.

C: P2P STA also has PIFS error recovery procedure?

C: slide 5, NAV resetting rule discussion. If STA receives MU-RTS frame and does not receive CTS , the STA can reset the NAV.

C: Why this STA need to know intra-TXOP SP?

C: I have similar comment on the sequence of MU-RTS/CTS procedure.

C: It seems like RDG.

A: RDG can allow the entire time duration for it. RDG can control only one STA.

C: You may extend this to more than one STA?

A: Yes. Maybe R2

C: If this is for single User, why not use RTS/CTS procedure?

C: New type of Trigger frame is good to me instead of reuse MU-RTS. You don’t need to combine this allocation and channel protection mechanism.

SP is defered

* 1. [1730r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1730-01-00be-ul-sync-channel-access-procedure.pptx) UL Sync Channel Access Procedure Yongho Seok et. al. [1 SP]

Summary: Proposing that when BO becomes zero, the STA does not send a frame and keeps BO , and then the STA MLD can send the frame with other link’s transmission

Discussion:

C: channel is busy, if slot boundary is aligned busy/idle status, what happens?

C: When BO becomes zero and keep BO, if the channel is busy, SP text can not cover that procedure. In this case, STA needs to check the channel status.

* **Do you support an STA that is affiliated with a non-STR MLD shall follow the channel access procedure described below?**
  1. The STA may initiate transmission on a link when the medium is idle and one of the following conditions is met:
     1. The backoff counter of the STA reaches zero on a slot boundary of that link.
     2. The backoff counter of the STA is already zero, and the backoff counter of another STA of the affiliated MLD reaches zero on a slot boundary of the link that the other STA operates.
  2. When the backoff counter of the STA reaches zero, it may choose to not transmit and keep its backoff counter at zero.
  3. If the backoff counter of the STA has already reached zero, it may perform a new backoff procedure. CW[AC] and QSRC[AC] is left unchanged.

SP is deferred

The meeting was recessed at 21:00 ET

**Thursday 05 November 2020, 09:00 –11:00 ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (LG Electronics)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 09:00am EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary, Jeongki Kim (LG)
2. The Chair goes through the 802 and 802.11 IPR policy and procedures and asks if there is anyone that is aware of any potentially essential patents. Nobody speaks up.
3. The Chair recommends using IMAT for recording the attendance.
   * Please record your attendance during the conference call by using the IMAT system:
     1. 1) login to [imat](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance), 2) select “802.11 Telecons (<Month>)” entry, 3) select “C/LM/WG802.11 Attendance” entry, 4) click “TGbe <MAC/PHY/Joint> conference call that you are attending.
   * If you are unable to record the attendance via [IMAT](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance) then please send an e-mail to Liwen Chu ([liwen.chu@nxp.com](mailto:liwen.chu@nxp.com)) and Jeongki Kim ([jeongki.kim@lge.com](mailto:jeongki.kim@lge.com))

The Chair reminds that the agenda can be found in 11-20/1615r5. The agenda is modified

**Submissions**

1. [992r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0992-04-00be-mac-pdt-nsep-tbds.docx) **MLO mandatory/optional** Laurent Cariou [7 SPs]

* **SP #5: Do you agree to add the following to the SFD**
  + An AP MLD shall support operation with single radio non-AP MLD

Discussion:

C: The SP text is not clear to me. What does it mean support here?

A: Ok, I can change it based on the comment.

* **SP #5: Do you agree to add the following to the SFD**

An AP MLD shall be able to serve a single radio non-AP MLD

**Approved with unanimous consent**

* **SP#7: Do you agree to add the following to the SFD:**
  + An STR AP MLD with 2 or more affiliated EHT APs
    - shall be capable to receive a PPDU on one each EHT AP link independently to the transmit/reception status on the other affiliated EHT APs links
    - shall be capable to transmit concurrent PPDUs simultaneously to the same non-AP MLD by at least two affiliated EHT APs on at least one pair of links among all the affiliated EHT APs possible pairs of links
    - shall support asynch channel access across all the affiliated EHT APs links

Discussion:

C: This requirement is AP MLD only?

A: Yes

C: On second bullet, is it for non-STR?

A: It’s for STR. This is just for channel aggregation.

C: Do we need all the affiliated EHT APs there?

A: I can delete it.

C: at least one pair of links…? Do you mean that there are two APs?

A: Yes, I can change it like that.

C: AP MLD only contains EHT APs?

A: Currently it’s right. At the future, it can mean other than EHT AP.

C: Add the note.

C: concurrent PPDU means the alignment of start time?

A: No, it means overlapped.

SP texts are changed.

**SP#7: Do you agree to add the following to the SFD:**

An STR AP MLD with 2 or more affiliated EHT APs

* shall be capable to receive a PPDU on each affiliated EHT AP independently to the transmit/reception status on the other affiliated EHT APs
* shall be capable to transmit concurrent PPDUs simultaneously to the same non-AP MLD by at least two affiliated EHT APs on at least 2 affiliated EHT APs of the AP MLD
* shall support asynch channel access across all the affiliated EHT APs linksNote: all APs affiliated with an AP MLD are EHT APs

96/6/42

1. [1730r](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1730-03-00be-ul-sync-channel-access-procedure.pptx)3 UL Sync Channel Access Procedure Yongho Seok et. al. [1 SP]

Summary: Added slide 8 compared to previous version which is relate to busy channel status. In busy cases, STA may not perform a new backoff procedure or may perform a new backoff procedure.

Discussion:

C: In slide 8, if the STA3 checks the CCA before sending the frame, how long the STA need to wait? SIFS or PIFS? Do we need anything?

C: may not or may? What does it mean? Does it mean STA’s decision?

A: Yes

A: This is general direction. We will have more discussion on the details.

* **Do you support an STA that is affiliated with a non-STR MLD shall follow the channel access procedure described below?**
  1. The STA may initiate transmission on a link when the medium is idle and one of the following conditions is met:
     1. The backoff counter of the STA reaches zero on a slot boundary of that link.
     2. The backoff counter of the STA is already zero, and the backoff counter of another STA of the affiliated MLD reaches zero on a slot boundary of the link that the other STA operates.
  2. When the backoff counter of the STA reaches zero, it may choose to not transmit and keep its backoff counter at zero.
  3. If the backoff counter of the STA has already reached zero, it may perform a new backoff procedure. CW[AC] and QSRC[AC] is left unchanged.

82/23/52

1. [968r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0968-02-00be-multi-link-rts-cts-operations-with-non-str-sta-mld.pptx) Multi-link RTS-CTS operations with non-STR STA MLD Ronny Y. Kim

Summary: Proposes **several cases for a semi-synchronized ML RTS-CTS procedure**

* + Case1: Second link’s backoff success < First link’s CTS TX start time
  + Case2: Second link’s backoff success < First link’s PPDU TX start time
  + Case3: Second link’s backoff success > First link’s PPDU TX start time

**it is recommended not to transmit RTS frame on the second link when using a semi-synchronized ML transmission**

Discussion:

C: slide 7, you’re suggesting that AP2 sends CTS-to-self. STA2 sets the NAV based on it. In case of multiple frame exchanges, STA2 may not change any frame.

A: I’ll think about it more.

C: slide 7, if AP is non-STR AP, it’s not possible.

A: Here, I don’t consider non-STR AP. Just STR AP.

C: AP2 sends CTS-to-self. Here if the channel is busy, how does the AP send it?

A: We can reuse the UL sync tx mechanism.

C: Is it yongho’s suggestion?

A: Yes.

A: CTS to self is just to protect the TXOP.

C: Do you consider only CTS frame?

A: Yes, here STA just sends on link 1. The lengths are same on both links.

C: RTS is mandatory in 11ax based on the frame length.

C: Similar to old Zhou’s contributions. Please check it.

A: I haven’t checked it.

C: Why do you prevent to send RTS? AP can send RTS.

C: We already discussed these issues several months ago. I don’t like them. RTS and CTS are short frames. I don’t think it’s critical issue.

Not running SP

1. [1062r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1062-00-00be-error-recovery-for-non-str-mld.pptx) Error recovery for non-STR MLD Yunbo Li

Summary:

* **Potential error recovery scenarios for response non-STR MLD are listed, and possible solutions are introduced;**
* **Several factors are considered during the design**
  + Avoid simultaneous transmit and receive for non-STR non-AP MLD
  + Initiating AP MLD may also be non-STR MLD (soft AP)
  + Delay of cross link information exchange

Discussion:

C: slide 5, Regarding the STR AP, the start time of PPDU is not critical. Just end time is critical.

A: This is just non-STR AP.

C: Ok, slide 10,

A: Here, the start time can not be aligned.

C: There are several cases, one is that BA only on one link is not received, the other case is that Bas on two links are not received.

A: Additionally, delayed cross link exchanged delay can be considered.

C: slide 11 seems like be covered by Younghoon’s contribution.

A: it does not consider cross link delay.

C: slide 5, are you proposing that the gap between BA and next PPDU is PIFS?

A: if you consider delayed cross link

C: slide 7, the gap between BA10 and PPDU11 should be PIFS?

A: Yes right. It should be changed.

C: BA size could be different on each link corresponding to MCS and several factors. But you’re assuming the size is same.

C: If the exchanged delay is larger, how can the AP or non-AP sychronize?

A: If the delay happens, how can the PPDU be synchronized? We can have more offline discussion

* SP 1: **Do you agree to allow PIFS time interval between the ending of successful response frame and following PPDU for non-STR AP MLD in R1?**

C: Are you allowing only PIFS here or PIFS and SIFS?

A: Basically, STA chooses SIFS after successful reception.

C: Is it within TXOP?

A: Yes.

C: Is this only for non-STR AP?

A: non-STR non-AP MLD can be used

C: how about STR AP?

A: No issue for STR AP.

SP is defered

The meeting is adjourned at 11am ET.

**Thursday 11 November 2020, 10:00 –12:00 ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (LG Electronics)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 10:02am EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary, Jeongki Kim (LG)
2. The Chair goes through the 802 and 802.11 IPR policy and procedures and asks if there is anyone that is aware of any potentially essential patents. Nobody speaks up.
3. The Chair recommends using IMAT for recording the attendance.
   * Please record your attendance during the conference call by using the IMAT system:
     1. 1) login to [imat](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance), 2) select “802.11 Telecons (<Month>)” entry, 3) select “C/LM/WG802.11 Attendance” entry, 4) click “TGbe <MAC/PHY/Joint> conference call that you are attending.
   * If you are unable to record the attendance via [IMAT](https://imat.ieee.org/attendance) then please send an e-mail to Liwen Chu ([liwen.chu@nxp.com](mailto:liwen.chu@nxp.com)) and Jeongki Kim ([jeongki.kim@lge.com](mailto:jeongki.kim@lge.com))

**Recorded attendance through Imat and e-mail:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| 11/12 | AbidRabbu, Shaima' | Istanbul Medipol University; Vestel |
| 11/12 | Abushattal, Abdelrahman | Istanbul Medipol university ;Vestel |
| 11/12 | Adhikari, Shubhodeep | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Akhmetov, Dmitry | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Alexander, Danny | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Asterjadhi, Alfred | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Baek, SunHee | LG ELECTRONICS |
| 11/12 | Baik, Eugene | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Bankov, Dmitry | IITP RAS |
| 11/12 | baron, stephane | Canon Research Centre France |
| 11/12 | Bhandaru, Nehru | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Bluschke, Andreas | Signify |
| 11/12 | Boldy, David | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Bravo, Daniel | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Carney, William | Sony Corporation |
| 11/12 | CHAN, YEE | Facebook |
| 11/12 | Chen, Cheng | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Chen, Na | MaxLinear Corp |
| 11/12 | Chitrakar, Rojan | Panasonic Asia Pacific Pte Ltd. |
| 11/12 | Chu, Liwen | NXP Semiconductors |
| 11/12 | Coffey, John | Realtek Semiconductor Corp. |
| 11/12 | Das, Dibakar | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | da Silva, Claudio | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | de Vegt, Rolf | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Ding, Baokun | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| 11/12 | Dong, Xiandong | Xiaomi Inc. |
| 11/12 | Fang, Juan | Intel |
| 11/12 | Fischer, Matthew | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Ghosh, Chittabrata | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | GUIGNARD, Romain | Canon Research Centre France |
| 11/12 | Haider, Muhammad Kumail | Facebook |
| 11/12 | Han, Jonghun | SAMSUNG |
| 11/12 | Han, Zhiqiang | ZTE Corporation |
| 11/12 | Ho, Duncan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Hong, Hanseul | WILUS Inc. |
| 11/12 | Hu, Chunyu | Facebook |
| 11/12 | Huang, Guogang | Huawei |
| 11/12 | Huang, Po-Kai | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Kakani, Naveen | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | kamath, Manoj | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Kandala, Srinivas | SAMSUNG |
| 11/12 | Kasher, Assaf | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Kedem, Oren | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| 11/12 | kim, namyeong | LG ELECTRONICS |
| 11/12 | Kim, Jeongki | LG ELECTRONICS |
| 11/12 | Kim, Sang Gook | LG ELECTRONICS |
| 11/12 | Kim, Sanghyun | WILUS Inc |
| 11/12 | Klein, Arik | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| 11/12 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Ko, Geonjung | WILUS Inc. |
| 11/12 | Kwon, Young Hoon | NXP Semiconductors |
| 11/12 | Lansford, James | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Levitsky, Ilya | IITP RAS |
| 11/12 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Li, Yiqing | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| 11/12 | Li, Yunbo | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 11/12 | Liu, Jianfei | HUAWEI |
| 11/12 | Liu, Yong | Apple, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Lorgeoux, Mikael | Canon Research Centre France |
| 11/12 | Lou, Hanqing | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Lu, kaiying | MediaTek Inc. |
| 11/12 | Lu, Liuming | ZTE Corporation |
| 11/12 | Ma, Mengyao | HUAWEI |
| 11/12 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Max, Sebastian | Ericsson AB |
| 11/12 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co.,  Ltd |
| 11/12 | Monajemi, Pooya | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| 11/12 | NANDAGOPALAN, SAI SHANKAR | Cypress Semiconductor Corporation |
| 11/12 | Ouchi, Masatomo | Canon |
| 11/12 | Palm, Stephen | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Patil, Abhishek | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 11/12 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Petry, Brian | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Pettersson, Charlie | Ericsson AB |
| 11/12 | Pushkarna, Rajat | Panasonic Asia Pacific Pte Ltd. |
| 11/12 | Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Rege, Kiran | Perspecta Labs |
| 11/12 | Reshef, Ehud | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Sadeghi, Bahareh | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Sedin, Jonas | Ericsson AB |
| 11/12 | Shor, Gadi | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Stacey, Robert | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Strauch, Paul | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Sun, Yanjun | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 11/12 | Tadahal, Shivkumar | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Tanaka, Yusuke | Sony Corporation |
| 11/12 | Tolpin, Alexander | Intel Corporation |
| 11/12 | Torab Jahromi, Payam | Facebook |
| 11/12 | Ustunbas, Seda | ITU,Vestel |
| 11/12 | Venkatesan, Ganesh | intel corporation |
| 11/12 | Verma, Sindhu | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | VIGER, Pascal | Canon Research Centre France |
| 11/12 | Vituri, Shlomi | Intel |
| 11/12 | Wang, Chao Chun | MediaTek Inc. |
| 11/12 | Wang, Huizhao | Quantenna Communications, Inc. |
| 11/12 | Wang, Lei | Futurewei Technologies |
| 11/12 | Wilhelmsson, Leif | Ericsson AB |
| 11/12 | Wullert, John | Perspecta Labs |
| 11/12 | Yano, Kazuto | Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International (ATR) |
| 11/12 | Young, Christopher | Broadcom Corporation |
| 11/12 | Zein, Nader | NEC Laboratories Europe |
| 11/12 | Zhou, Yifan | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 11/12 | Zuo, Xin | Tencent |

The Chair reminds that the agenda can be found in 11-20/1615r11. The agenda was slight modified.

**Submissions**

1. [992r6](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0992-06-00be-mac-pdt-nsep-tbds.docx) **MLO mandatory/optional** Laurent Cariou [1 SP]

C: For the last bullet, regular AP MLD will not support NSTR link pairs?

A: I means regular AP MLD will be STR AP MLD.

C: Then need to change it like that.

C: Is this only for R1 or it could not be in the future?

A: I don’t think this would be in R2 as well. I don’t like it.

C: I think in the future we can have it. It’s not reasonable. We can decide it in R2. We don’t need to prevent it at this time.

A: I’d like to restrict this.

C: Could you remove “if defined” in the second bullet because it is already in R1?

A: Yes

C: we don’t have the definition of soft-AP yet. So, I think the “if defined” is important.

A: Fine with it.

**SP8: Do you agree to add the following to the SFD:**A multi-radio non-AP MLD that is operating on a pair of links on which it is STR capable shall be capable of operating with channel aggregation on that pair of links?A regular AP MLD (that corresponds to an AP MLD that is not a soft-AP MLD, if defined) shall be an STR AP MLD

70/32/18

1. [1140r5](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1140-05-00be-ecsa-for-multi-link-operation.pptx) eCSA for multi link operation Laurent Cariou [6 SP]
   * SP1bits: Do you support this?
   * If an AP (AP1) of an AP MLD includes a (extended) Channel Switch Announcement element and a Max Channel Switch Time element (if present) or includes a Quiet element and optionally a Quiet Channel element in a beacon frame or probe response frame it transmits, then another AP (AP2) of the AP MLD shall include in the beacon and probe response frames it transmits (or if another AP (AP2) of the AP MLD corresponds to a nontransmitted BSSID, then the transmitted BSSID in the same multiple BSSID set as AP2 shall include in the beacon and probe response frame it transmits) the (extended) Channel Switch Announcement element and Max Channel Switch Time element or the Quiet element and Quiet Channel element in the per-STA profile corresponding to AP1 in a Multi-link element
     + The timing fields in the Quiet element, Quiet Channel element, (extended) Channel Switch Announcement element shall be applied in reference to the most recent TBTT and BI indicated in the corresponding element(s) of AP1 and not to the TBTT and BI of the other AP (AP2) of the AP MLD
     + Note: the CSA/eCSA/Max Channel Switch Time elements will be included in every beacon and probe response frames on all links of the AP MLD from right after the time AP1 includes the elements in its beacons until the intended channel switch time

C: Beacon frame will be quite long. We already have critical update procedure. I don’t think this should be mandatory. SP text is also complicated.

A: For overhead, this extended channel switching will not happen often. It will be included only when it happens.

C: It’s very nice.

59/22/34

1. 1358r5,

* **SP2: Do you support to amend the TGbe SFD as the following?**

In R1, 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.
  + The support of the TID-to-link mapping negotiation is optional.

[Motion 54, [29] and [169]]

C: What is new information for R1?

A: TID-link-mapping is negotiation procedure.

C: We already defined this is for R2.

A: No we didn’t decide this for R2.

C: What is new thing for this?

A: This is for QoS and lower latency support.

C: I support this can support the lower latency. This should be critical for R1.

C: I support this direction for lower latency traffic. We already simulated. Our contribution is in the queue. I can show it later.

84/13/29

1. 1835r1 ML Element Common Format and Types Rojan Chitrakar

C: Option 1 has several restrictions on NDP Probe Request. During the NDP Probe Request, some common information can be included. We haven’t decided which information should be included in NDP Probe Request. And partial request information could be included in Per-STA Profile.

C: I prefer the option 2. ….

Many people mentioned that they prefer the option 2 rather than option 1.

C: Link ID has different meaning for some cases. For example, in association request, it can indicate the targeting AP instead of its non-AP STA. I’m preparing the PDT. We can discuss it there.

C: For format of two control fields, TBD is in Multi-link Control field and reserved is in Per-STA control field. Any reason?

A: I didn’t modify that part. It’s already in D0.1. I don’t have strong opinion. Abhi, what do you think?

C: Basically, we need more discussion on Complete Profile field in Per-STA Profile. However, I’m fine with aligning both them each other.

A: Ok, I change TBD to Reserved in Multi-link control field.

A: Option 2 has the majority. I can remove the option 1 at this time.

C: Size of Type field can be TBD? We didn’t have much discussion on that. At the future, we may have other types. So, not sure that we have fixed 4 bits for types at this time.

A: What size do you have in your mind?

A: I can defer this SP

1. [1651r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1651-01-00be-pdt-tbds-mac-mlo-discovery-discovery-procedures-including-probing-and-rnr.docx) MLO–Discovery Laurent Cariou

C: For partial information request, we need more discussion. We can discuss it in my document.

A: Fine. I will remove this part in this SP.

C: For issue 4, is there any difference from baseline?

C: Regarding the size of change sequence, in the baseline, the size is 1 octect. 4 bits is risky.

A: If group wants it, I can make it TBD at this time.

C: For addressing part in MLD Probe request, do you think there is no other case?

A: I’m fine that you bring other cases if you have any. At this time we can remove TBD.

C: Regarding the Type field, there are two types. Among them, the basic ML element will contain the Per-STA profile.

A: I’ll not touch that part at this SP. Rojan will cover this. You can talk to Rojan.

A: Can we run SP except issue 4?

C: I have a concern on issue 3 also.

A: Issue 3 is basic one.

C: What about the change sequence?

A: I already changed the size of the change sequence to TBD.

1651r4:

SP: Do you support to incorporate the proposed draft text in 11-20/1651r4 except the text related to issue 4 into TGbe Draft 0.2?

43/18/26

The meeting is adjourned at 11:53 ET