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Abstract

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

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the minutes from the telephone conferences held on Sept 22, Sept 23.

**Wednesday 22 pet 2021, 10:00am – 12:00pm ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

MAC Ad-Hoc Chair, Jeongki Kim, calls meeting to order.

Alfred Asterjadhi will be secretary for the call today.

Chair goes over the patent policy and calls for potentially essential patents.

Nobody spoke up.

Chair goes over the copyright policy

Chair provides an overview of the agenda and asks if there is any discussion on it.

Chair asks if there is any objection to approve the agenda ([1478r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1478-04-00be-sept-nov-tgbe-teleconference-agenda.docx)) by unanimous consent.

No objections were heard or noted in the chat. Hence agenda is approved with unanimous consent.

* [**1275r5**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1275-05-00be-cc36-cr-for-d1-0-proxy-arp-cids.docx) **(Rojan Chitrakar, CR for 3 CIDs)**
	+ Author provides an overview of the changes made to the document based on received feedback. Changes are highlighted in grey in the doc.
	+ Chair asks if there is any discussion on this document.
	+ Clarification question how STA6 connect to the AP MLD.
	+ STA6 is connected via an ethernet connection.
	+ Do you call it a STA or device then?
	+ Some more clarificatory discussion on this particular topic in terms of terminology.

SP: Do you agree to incorporate the resolution provided in [IEEE 802.11-21/1275r5](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1275-05-00be-cc36-cr-for-d1-0-proxy-arp-cids.docx) to the next revision of 802.11be draft for the following CIDs:

* 6715, 6716, 7890

Discussion: Some clarification on the wording. Amended to say resolution rather than changes.

Result: No objection.

* [**1360r1**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1360-01-00be-cc-36-cr-for-35-3-11-and-35-3-12.docx) **(Po-Kai Huang, CR for 19 CIDs)**
	+ Author starts from where he left last time, namely resolution for CID 6681.
	+ Question on CID the changes related to 6681 batch that the behavior should be w.r.t. the MLD, not the STA affiliated with it.
	+ Answer: The reference to the “STA affiliated to” is so that it is aligned with baseline, which refers to STA.
	+ Question: Why is the column for “Transmitter Requirement” empty? Answer: It is inherited from the baseline, where it is also empty.
	+ Some discussion on CID 6736, ending up agreeing with the proposed resolution.
	+ Suggestion by member to apply the resolution for CID 7512 throughout the draft (i.e., replace “an STA” with “a STA”). Author agrees and incorporates the suggestion.
	+ Some editorial suggestion on whether “Any STA” or “No STA”. Result of that suggestion lead to rejecting CIDs 8200 and 8202.
	+ Another question on the changes w.r.t. “TR1”. Author highlights that CID 6691 is still to be discussed so it is deferred for now.

SP: Do you agree to incorporate the resolution provided in [1360r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1360-02-00be-cc-36-cr-for-35-3-11-and-35-3-12.docx) to the next revision of 802.11be draft for the following CIDs:

* 6029, 6030, 6679, 6680, 6682, 6683, 6710, 7512, 6308, 6736, 8200, 8201, 8202, 8203, 8242, 8243, 8244, 6377

Discussion: None.

Result: No objection.

* [**1249r3**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1249-03-00be-cc36-cr-for-eht-om-part-ii.docx) **(Po-Kai Huang, CR for 6 CIDs)**
* Author goes over the document.
* Some suggestion on the changes for CID 4164 which are incorporated in r4 of the document, which will be posted in the server.

SP: Do you agree to incorporate the resolution provided in [1249r6](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1249-06-00be-cc36-cr-for-eht-om-part-ii.docx) to the next revision of 802.11be draft for the following CIDs:

* 8156, 6606, 5799, 8155, 5800, 4164

Discussion: None.

Result: No objection.

* **1421r0 (Insun Jang, CR for 1 CID)**
	+ Author goes over the document. It resolves one CID, namely 6729.
	+ Question: The status code also indicates the reason for the rejection, not only whether it is accepted or not. Answer: Author provides an overview of the intention of that added sentence.
	+ Some more discussion on the wording of that sentence and also some additional observations.

SP: Do you agree to incorporate the resolution provided in [1421r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1421-01-00be-cc36-cr-for-cid-6729.docx) to the next revision of 802.11be draft for the following CIDs:

* 6729

Discussion: None.

Result: No objection.

* [**1401r0**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1401-00-00be-resolution-for-cids-related-to-status-code-field.docx) **(Namyeong Kim, CR for 2 CIDs)**
	+ Author goes over the document. It resolves two CIDs.
	+ No discussion on the document.

SP: Do you agree to incorporate the resolution provided in [1401r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1421-01-00be-cc36-cr-for-cid-6729.docx) to the next revision of 802.11be draft for the following CIDs:

* 4006, 4290

Discussion: None.

Result: No objection.

* [**1425r2**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1425-02-00be-cc-36-cr-for-4-5-3.docx) **(Po-Kai Huang, CR for 37 CIDs)**
	+ Author goes over the document. Resolves 37 CIDs.
	+ Time is running out so author finished presenting up to CID 6161. Will resume next conference call to discuss the other CIDs.
* Chair asks if there is any other business.
* None was heard
* Call is adjourned.

**Thursday 23 Sept 2021, 10:00am – 12:00pm ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

Secretary: Liwen Chu (NXP)

This meeting takes place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Jeongki, Ofinno) calls the meeting to order at 10:02am EDT. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary, Liwen (NXP)
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.
	1. Nobody responds.
3. The Chair goes through the IEEE copyright policy.
4. 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)
5. The Chair asks whether there is comment about agenda in 11-21/1478r6. Several changes are made per the comment(1330 deferred, 1360 added, 1327 deferred). The modified agenda was approved.

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

 **Submissions**

1. 1360r2

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-21/1360r2 for the following CIDs?

6681

No Onjection

.

1. [1425r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1425-02-00be-cc-36-cr-for-4-5-3.docx) CC 36 CR for 4.5.3 Po-Kai Huang [37 CIDs 45’]

The author went through the document.

C: CID 8256, why is multi-link transittion under mobility scenario?

A: will use the resolution used before (ML transition is under BSS transition) and change the rejected to revised.

C: CID 4302, at least explains the difference between MLO and legacy. What the comment asked should be considered later.

C: Ok with the rejection as long as the group knows the issue.

C: for the CIDs from tomo (e.g. 7509), it may be possible for a MLD to associate with a legacy AP.

A: it is clarified that it is not allowed.

C: one-link association will fall back to legacy association.

A: this is separate discussion whether an EHT STA always belongs to MLD.

C: put in another way, do we allow single link association with ML element without Per link profile.

A: this should be separate discussion. Will derfer the CID.

**SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-21/1425r3 for the following CIDs?**

* 4094, 4130, 4131, 4302, 4804, 5069, 5229, 5575, 5576, 5577, 5891, 5892, 6115, 6116, 6160, 6161, 6180, 6749, 7020, 7400, 7401, 7403, 7404, 7502, 7503, 7504, 7505, 7506, 7507, 7508, 7510, 7562, 7877, 8254, 8255, 8256, 6111, 6113

No Objection

1. [1222r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1222-00-00be-cc36-cr-for-ml-ie-usage-for-ml-setup-part-2.docx) CR for ML IE Usage for ML Setup - Part 2 Insun Jang [3 CIDs 20’]

The author went through the document.

C: why is the MLD address removed?

A: it alreayd mandatory.

C: the dissussion assumes that adding links after association is allowed. This is not allowed in 11be.

A: you are right. But I think single link association under MLD is useful.

C: Do we allow single link association without MLD is allowed?

A: yes.

C: if one link setup is done, ML element is not needed.

Several similar comments that 11be doesn’t allow the addition of links after association.

C: what does it break if single link association under MLD is allowed?

C: after MLD association, link informaiton varification under authentiation is required. However there is no link information in this case.

SP deferred

1. [1426r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1426-00-00be-cc-36-cr-for-35-3-5-1-and-35-3-5-3.docx) CR for 35.3.5.1 and 35.3.5.3 Po-Kai Huang [43 CID 45’]

The author went through the document.

C: CID 4257, the resolution doesn’t address the CID. Make it clear about either it is allowed or not allowed.

A: what is in the request is what you discoverred. Will defer the CID.

C: CID 4379, use a new name or define a new Management frame.

A: the commenter asks for to define a new management frame.

C: CID 5288, in the feedback to the commenter, how about public action frame?

A: will defer the CID.

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

The meeting is adjourned at 11:59am ET.