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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the TGbe MAC ad hoc teleconferences held in Sept 2021.

Revisions:

* Rev0:
	+ Adding the minutes for the session on Sept 13, 2021.

**Monday Sept 13th, 2021 19:00 – 21:00 ET (TGbe MAC interim session)**

Chairman: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

Secretary: Liwen Chu (NXP)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Jeongki, Ofinno) calls the meeting to order at 19:02pm EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary, Liwen (NXP)
2. The Chair goes over patent policy and calls for Potentially essential patents.
	1. Nobody reponds.
3. The Chair goes over other guidelines
4. The Chair goes over the IEEE SA Copyright Policy.
5. 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) and Jeongki Kim (jeongki.kim.ieee@gmail.com)
6. Agenda in 11-21/1319R3 after deferring 1261 per the request was approved.

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

**Technical Submissions:**

1. [**1285r1**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1285-01-00be-cc36-security-comment-resolutions.docx) **Security Comment Resolutions Michael Montemurro [46 CIDs 25’]**

Summary: The author goes through the CR for security.

Discussion:

C: CID 6050, 6052, the information of the links that are not accepted during the the association should be carried in EAPOL-Key 2 and be verified.

A: This may create security issue.

C: The links that are not accepted are known to both sides after the Association Response.

Chair asked to do offline discussion since other persons were in the queue.

SP was deferred since the author can’t review all the CIDs in the docuemnt.

1. [**1264r2**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1264-02-00be-cc36-resolution-for-miscellaneous-cids-in-clause-9.docx) **CC36 Resolution for Miscellaneous CIDs in Clause 9 Gaurang Naik [19 CIDs 25’]**

Summary: The author goes through the document.

C: CID 6226, Neighbor report is used for BSS transition. Is there any guidance for MLD operaiton?

A: don’t understand the question.

C: other link’s AP information is not complete.

A: we have that information. Reported AP’s information is just like legacy AP report.

C: we may need to do some offline idscussion.

C: CID 5767, you compare field with element. The text should be updated.

A: change to the corresponding fields.

C: 4026, change ”AP” to ”AP not affiliated with any AP MLD”.

A: ok.

4026 ws deferred since more comments were raised for the other changes of 4026.

C: CID 4813. Is Common Info always present.

A: yes the Length field is always there.

C: 9.4.2.295b.2.1 has six levels. The editor mentioned that the numbering of subclause should not be more than 5 levels.

A: will check with the editor.

C: 7616, why the text is added.

A: some capabilities in HT/VHT/HE/EHT operation/capabilities elements are not applied to TDLS link.

C: this should be general rule.

A: can defer this CID.

1. [**283r1**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0283-01-00be-cc34-cr-emlsr-part1.docx) **CC34-CR-EMLSR-part 1 Minyoung Park [9 CIDs 30’]**

Summary: The author goes through the document.

C: enabling eMLSR should be default mode. The MLSR mode may not work since onl one radio exists among multiple links.

A: if the spec requires that MLSR is default mode, the links other than the association link will be in power save mode.

C: but it is preferrable that the default mode should be eMLSR mode. The full capability should be default.

A: see no other opnion. Will change the text per the comment.

C: the subset of links being in eMLSR mode is explicitly indicated. With default eMLSR mode the subset feature after multi-link setup can’t be supported.

C: the bitmap can be in Association Request.

The related text needs further discussion, so the related CID 6776 was deferred per the request.

C: do you want to mention that AP MLD needs to know the support mode based on the capabilities received?

A: the capability fields are already there.

C: Can we structure the text into multiple clauses. Some clauses for non-AP MLD and some clauses for AP MLD operation? This could improve readability.

C: only eMLSR links can send eMLSR enablement and disablement, right?

A: yes.

C: since the link bitmap exists, do you need such restriction?

A: enabling should be fine. Maybe there are some issues for link disablement. The question is why do you want such operation.

C: you may add the clarification text that any STA can send the Action frame.

A: Let me think about it.

**The chair asked whether there is any other business before recessing the session. Nobody responds.**

**The meeting was recessed at 21:00 ET.**