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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the TGbe MAC ad hoc teleconferences in March 2022 Plenary.

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the minute from the telephone conference held on March 07.
* Rev1: Added the minute from the telephone conference held on March 09.

**Monday 7 March 2022, 19:00 – 21:00pm ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 19:02 ET. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary.
2. The Chair reminded the members that they need to register for the plenary in order to attend the call
3. 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.
4. The Chair goes through the IEEE 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) 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. The Chair asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-22/0271r2. The agenda was approved.

 **Submissions**

1. 1681r14 SP

Discussion:

C: There are still TBDs. We should not have TBDs.

C: use CFSTAofsoftAP instead of CFEHTSTAofsoftAP

C: 9.8, what M for MLD AP? You can add it in 9.8.1 instead of 9.8.

C: FR5 9.6 is missing M.

C: 9.7.3 WNM is optional

**SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-21/1681r15 for the following CIDs?**

* **4281, 5533, 6672, 6748, 7287**

No objection

1. [0239r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0239-01-00be-cc36-cr-for-remaining-cids-on-aar.docx) CC36 CR for Remaining CIDs on AAR Ming Gan [10C]

Discussion: None

**SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-21/0239r1 for the following CIDs?**

* **4136 8153 4140 4141 4805 4142 7341 7554 7680 8065**

No objection

1. [1877r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-1877-01-00be-cr-for-mld-individually-addressed-management-frame-delivery.docx) CR for MLD individually addressed MGMT frame delivery Po-Kai Huang [14C]

Discussion:

C: Name of Figure is wrong. Multi-link Link Information.

C: Link info can be included in TWT element.

C: Option 1, all link level managements should include link information? Perlink management or MLD level management? Not cross link shall include?

C: Option 2, last note, is that common for everything?

SP1: which way do you support to indicate the link where a link level management frame is applied

Option 1: link ID in frame payload

Option2: Address 3 in frame header

Abstain

58 option 1, 21 option 2, 21 abstain

1. 442r1

Discussion:

C: There is a huge harm of this for AAD or protection.

C: Last paragraph, bullet, what does it mean? Is this frame body? Is it element?

A: Link ID is ESPC or TWT setup frame? Option 1 provide only 1 ID.

C: Only TWT setup frame.

C: we haven’t discussed for group addressed frame. Suggesting taking out all group frames stuffs.

A: The first is general. But I can remove it. Are you ok with A3?

C: I’m fine with IG bit. But third bullet needs to be discussed.

A: Got it.

1. [0075r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0075-01-00be-cr-for-cids-on-sta-id.docx) CR for CIDs on STA ID Yongho Seok [10C]

C: No Beam change and no STBC in EHT MU PPDU

C: We have other rules for inactive-subchannels in subclause 35.

A: Let me check them

C: 5344, the comment is not for EMLSR?

A: I added the new text regarding that. This is natural way.

C: Why adding single radio there?

The chair asked whether there are any other businesses before recessing the meeting. No response was received.

The teleconference was recessed at 21:00 ET

**Wednesday 9 March 2022, 19:00 – 21:00pm ET (TGbe MAC ad hoc conference call)**

Chairman: Liwen Chu (NXP)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex session.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Liwen, NXP) calls the meeting to order at 19:02 ET. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary.
2. The Chair reminded the members that they need to register for the plenary in order to attend the call
3. 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.
4. The Chair goes through the IEEE 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) 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. The Chair asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-22/0271r4. A discussion on a rule of adding documents. Quarantined documents could be added on the fly if no objection. The agenda was approved after some modifications.

 **Submissions**

1. [0075r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0075-03-00be-cr-for-cids-on-sta-id.docx) CR for CIDs on STA ID Yongho Seok [10C Q&A+SP]

Discussion:

C: Some discussion on 5344. Want separate SP. This CID is totally different topic from the remaining CIDs

A: I want one SP with all CIDs. Only one objection.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-22/75r3 for the following CIDs?

* + 7860, 7938, 7088, 4166, 6339, 7939, 7089, 7889, 4165, 5110, 5343, 5344

47Y/ 23N/ 38A

1. 1210r7, Kaiying

Discussion:

C: Can we have 30us instead 20us for a margin? Too restricted.

A: Adjustment rule of a single AP will use the baseline rule.

C: Same. We already have 100ppm. Why do we need to have such a restriction?

C: what will be included for NSTR Mobile AP MLD? What will NSTR Mobile AP MLD do when the subfiled is set to 1?

A: Beacon Interval Present subfield and DTIM Info Present subfield will be set to 1.

C: How about the regular AP MLD if the NSTR mobile AP MLD has the same TSF timer?

A: This is not for regular AP MLD.

C: Still want to have 30us.

A: Ok.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-21/1210r8 for the following CIDs?

* 6177, 7826, 4078, 4079, 5065, 5066, 5107, 5701, 5702, 5703, 4247, 6965, 7622, 6971, 6972, 6967

61Y /26N /20A

1. [0184r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0184-00-00be-cr-for-group-addressed-bus-by-tim.docx) Group addressed BUs by TIM Ming Gan [14C]

Discussion:

C: If there are 16 virtual BSSs, then do we have 32 bits?

A: Is it common scenario? 2 or 4 can be common.

C: Pls separate the element.

C: N is 4, N is fixed value or could be changed.

A: Fixed number is preferable. But, if anyone want to change, I’m ok with it.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-22/0184r1 for the following CIDs?

* 4279 6306 6307 8043 4074 4075 5943 5992 6609 6610 6611 6612 6635 7885

39Y /35N /27A

1. [0214r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0214-01-00be-cc36-cr-emlsr.docx) CR EMLSR Minyoung Park [21C]

C: One or more spatial streams is reduantant, you can remove it.

A: I’m fine.

C: I want to have more time to review this carefully.

A: which parts?

C: Definition part and third part.

C: What is the multiple receive chains? Does the spec have such a text? The spec does not restrict anything. Single receive chain is possible?

A: What is the benefit?

C: Do we have such a text like multiple receive chains?

C: In the subclause, the non-HT PPDU and OFDMA PPDU are mentioned. But you only mention the non-HT PPDU here.

A: Other CID already resolved it. It was accepted.

C: 4422 is covered at one of notes in EMLMR section. Looks this is same.

A: This is normative texts.

C: MU-RTS can be used for MU for this procedure? How can the AP know which STA responds?

A: Same as the normal procedure. Anyway, AP can receive the Ack to data. It’s same.

C: I think BSRP is better than MU-RTS for MU.

A: That is AP’s implementation choice.

C: Why not mentioning multiple users at MU-RTS figure like BSRP figure? Some people can misunderstand that MU-RTS can only be used for single user.

A: There is no such restriction in the spec.

C: on that link is weired. Clarify.

A: I can change to on the link on which the initial Control frame was received.

SP: Do you support to accept the resolution in 11-22/0214r2 for the following CIDs?

* 4697, 6776,7336,5933, 4241, 6960,7831,7832,7334,6325, 4698,6963,7063, 7337, 8357,44Y /12N /29A

The chair asked whether there is any objection to extended the meeting. No response.

The chair asked whether there are any other businesses before recessing the meeting. No response was received.

The teleconference was recessed at 21:04 ET