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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meetings that took place during the IEEE 802.11 Mixed Mode March Plenary session 10-15 March 2025. The on-site location for the meeting was Atlanta (USA).

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q – proceeds a question

A - proceeds an answer

C - proceeds a comment

Yellow highlight - action point

**Revision:**

R0: initial revision

**1rst slot: Monday March 10th 2025, 16:00 local time.**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Stéphane Baron**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

**Technical editor: Po-Kai Huang, Intel**

Chair calls meeting to order at 16:02 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0225r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0225-02-00bi-tgbi-march-plenary-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

1. The chair covered the IEEE copyright policy and participation rules.

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0225r2 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

 Document 455r0 is added to the agenda on Wednesday session

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (27 participants online, 15 in the room).
1. **Administrative**

Approval of the previous minutes.

**Motion #59 text:**

Approve the prior session minutes:

11-25/157r0 (January Interim minutes)

**Motion #59: moved by Jerome Henry and seconded by Antonio de la Oliva**

**Discussion on motion #59:** No discussion

**Motion #59 approved by unanimous consent (27 attendees online and 15 in the room)**

Chair indicate that we need to review our timeline on Thursday.

1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0302r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0302-01-00bi-aid-list-distribution-close-to-epoch-end-8203.pptx) – AID-List distribution close to epoch end -- Domenico Ficara

Document presented by the author.

* + 1. Discussion

Q: It looks good, but when a station associates it get an Aid, and now it gets and AID lists. But it could wait since it just arrives.

A: I think it matter because the association may be a reassociation so you need an AID in that case. The AP could compute in advance a short AID list for the next client that will join. Then AP will latter one sends complete list to the stations.

Q: What if an epoch goes just after the association, do you really need to change your AID. You cannot be tracked right?

A: Yes, but the case will occur where you will associate at a bad time.

C: I think what is proposed is OK.

Q: Instead of sending one AID you send the list.

A: Right.

C: I think this I the perfect solution then.

C: I am not sure this will work. If someone joint, it is not part of the current Epoch and will start to the next one.

Q: Do you replace the AID address by a list or add an IE and keep existing AID?

A: I add the list, but I do not remove existing AID value.

Q: Can’t we just use the normal Aid value after association and start using the first AID of the list upon first EDP epoch start time?

A: it will work but need to check

C: I think there are different case where the stations can have issues. For instance, going into sleep mode for a long time.

C: The AID provided by the AP is used after the Epoch Start time. So, if the Start time specified in the association response is after the identified issue, there is no more issue.

A: it creates un synchronization with AID list.

C: I don’t understand why, we just need to specify the AID list usage by the STA. When the AP knows how its list is used there is no synchronization issue.

C: I don’t like the idea of shifting the usage of the AID.

Author then request to run a SP.

**SP #1 :** Do you agree on adding AID-List Element in the Association Response to guarantee AIDs at any moment in the EDP epoch timeline?
-Yes
-No
-Abstain

**SP#1 :** Discussion;

Q: is it having a new element or the same AID

A: I add an IE

C: I think that I would like to have all the AIDs in the list not a separated ones and a list.

A: I do not have strong opinion

 C: I would like to clarify that is a station is not assigned to an epoch it doesn’t receive the Aid list.

**SP#1 Modified text** : proposal for SP wording:
Do you agree on adding an AID list element to the association response, when the association sets up a group epoch.

NOTE : the AID List guarantees AIDs for the coming EDP epochs.

Chair ask unanimous:

Some people ask for a vote.

**SP#1 results** ; 70% yes, 13% no, 17% abstain 23 voters

**SP#1 : Final result** : 16Y, 3N, 4A

* 1. [11-25/452r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0452-00-00bi-9-4-2-349-fixes.docx) – 9.4.2.349\_fixes – Jerome Henry

Document presented by the author.

The solves Editorial CID

* + 1. Discussion

CID469:

Q; I think it should be “to collide a MAC address”, not “the MAC address”

A: Agree but this is will probably be done in the future.

Q: I agree to reject but I don’t understand the answer. Everything sents over the air are OTA MAC address, but over the DS this is not the modified MAC address but the DS MAC, so no collision possible.

A: To answer this question I need to switch to the contribution and presents 25/0449r0

Chair agree to switch to the doc 11-25/0449r0 as support for the answer to the question.

* 1. [11-25/0449r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0449-00-00bi-ota-mac-collisions.pptx) – OTA MAC Collisions – Jerome Henry

Document presented by the author.

The solves Editorial CID

* + 1. Discussion

C: I disagree with doc 0449 assumption.

C: In the DS we never see the OTA MAC, but the DS MAC. The device you are mentioning is not the AP but the bridge in the DS.

C: You are learning based on SA and DA that are DS MACs. No collision possible there.

C: you are splitting in two the collision domains.

Q: do you mean you indicate the DS MAC address in the frame?

A: In the DS yes.

C: 11be AP MLD has to do the translation between link MAC addresses and MLD MAC address

C: Currently we do not say that once we receive the address over the Air, we swap the MAC address over the DS.

A: Here we indicate that if a forwarding device hear a colliding MAC address, what should we do ?

C: But you shouldn’t have a collision over the DS. If it happens, someone select a wrong MAC address for its device.

Q: Which case would have problem

A: The case with Link Mac address.

C: Currently, we do not mention that the MAC address is switched from OTA to DS MAC when the AP receives it.

A: I still think we have a problem created by 11be and we need REVmf to solve it. We inherit this issue; we didn’t create it.

After the last question, the Author switch back to the CID resolution in document 11-25/0452r0

Back to document [11-25/0452r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0452-00-00bi-9-4-2-349-fixes.docx).

Q: Do we want to have relative numbers per station of absolute numbers

A: I don’t have a response for now we should discuss that questions offline.

Q: I don’t like the idea of having a response frame that may disagree. We should have a request response instead.

Presentation stopped after AID 934 discussion. Will be resumed tomorrow PM2.

1. **AoB**

No other business

Next TGbi session is tomorrow PM2.

1. Chair Recess at 17:59

**2nd slot: Tuesday March 11th 2025, 16:00 local time.**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Stéphane Baron**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

**Technical editor: Po-Kai Huang, Intel**

Chair calls meeting to order at 16:00 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0225r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0225-04-00bi-tgbi-march-plenary-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

1. The chair covered the IEEE copyright policy and participation rules.

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0225r4 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

Doc 11-25/0435 cannot be presented on Thursday and is moved to Wednesday.

Doc 11-25/0174 moved to Thursday upon author request.

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (25 participants online, 15 in the room).
1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0452r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0452-01-00bi-9-4-2-349-fixes.docx) – 9.4.2.349\_fixes – Jerome Henry

Document presented by the author.

Resume of last sessions presentation based on new revision r1

R1 contains modification on CID 476 after offline discussion due to clarification of the 11bi design.

* + 1. Discussion

AID 476

Q: There are two pieces in this proposal, have you done both?

A: Yes, both parts are implemented

Editorial modification of the resolution text

CID 211:

Q: I think dialog token is in the action frame, not in the element.

A: So, modification should be in the frame.

CID211 is transferred to the resolver of comments related to the frame and removed form the document. 11-25/0452.

CID753:

Q: Why do you send OMI on link that is not the one suffering from a collision?

A: Because 11be allows it, we have to take that into account.

A: We cannot operate on the link if there is a MAC address collision, so this simplifies the STA operation.

Q: I don’t think collision warning only impact one link but all the links. We have to change Epoch on every links.

A: I have same understanding. But the frame indicates the link with a collision this may be interesting to know which link.

Q: Do we care? Since we will change everything?

A: Link information may not be needed.

A: There may be several actions from the STA to solve the problem like not using the link for the duration of the epoch, so link id may be needed.

Q: If you indicate collision on this link, we need to change resolution of CID 469.

A: Yes

C: If we want to indicate several links, we can have several elements in the same frame.

C: I think this comment is not resolved.

A: With this, we do not know what the station will do. The link is an information the STA may need to put it in the frame.

Then author switch to 449 to explain the modification reflecting our design.

Q: The design doesn’t protect against correlation, but there is no collision, right?

A: yes,

Q: Should we protect both addresses?

Q: You mean A1 and A2?

A: right.

A: The SA problem is solved by encrypted A-MSDU. There are hooks for this in 802.11bi.

A: SA and DA are protected using A-MSDU.

Back to 452.

Resolution of the CID 469 is then modified mentioning the collision occurs on the same link.

Q: What “on the same link” means?

A: The MAC address of the STA will collide with the MAC address of another STA on the same link. But since the warning frame maybe sent on another link, we have to indicate the Link ID.

C: indicate on a link in the introduction part. And precise after.

C: I will go on the signaling of the OTA MAC address since we may have an issue on MLD. And again, this is clause 9. We do not need to give more explanation.

C: The AP may know that an OBSS on the same channel is using a MAC address and you don’t want to collide with it, so just don’t say what it is colliding with. Keep it generic.

A: OK, I will keep it general in clause 9

Author will revise the document and come back later.

* 1. [11-25/0451r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0451-02-00bi-10-71-2-5-fixes.docx) – 10.71.2.5\_fixes– Jerome Henry

Document presented by the author.

 Deals with CID of the MAC collision warning in clause 10.

* + 1. Discussion

CID91:

Q: What is a CPE STA?

A: When we are talking on a link this is a station.

A: CPE STA may not support MLD, or a CPE may not support FA.

Q: Are we supporting on the same BSS stations having CPE, and some that are not?

A: This is not explicitly mentioned anywhere.

C: The difficult part is if stations say they don’t want to change.

C: I don’t like the fact that the AP is controlling the MAC address the Stations are using. So, I would like to keep this as a recommendation. A station may apply different solution for instance not using this link for that epoch.

A: An AP shall have a way to deal with issues that may deeply break the BSS operations. There may be also Ack collision for instance.

C: If we really go to the serious issue case, then we need to define what those issues are. In that case we need a strong language. In other case we may ignore the collision.

C: I think we cannot indicate the AP will refrain traffic. I prefer the AP disassociate both.

C: We do not need to indicate options where the AP can discard frame. The AP can do it anyway.

C: The AP will protect the BSS and may dissociated.

A: Then we can say that if the station refuse the AP may dissociates

C: We are talking about things that will occur in the future. So, we need to be more precise when the collision will occur and how severe it will be.

C: Please remember that we are talking about very rare event, so we should have simple solution. AP informs a station that it has to solve the issue by changing its MAC address or silent if it will.

C: I think we need to have a solution at the time of the collision will happens. If the STA does nothing at

that time it will be dissociated.

Q: What if there is legacy in the two colliding stations?

A: in that case kill the other one.

Q: Why just not focusing on the next epoch?

A: Epoch may be short. An epoch may not be enough.

C: The AP can keep track on the time before the collision and inform the STA in time. Then if the AP do not want to change just keep silent just dissociate.

C: I agree this is quite rare event we should not make it to complex.

Since this discussion may have an impact of a lot of CID resolution author stopped now to have offline discussion and then address the CIDs.

* 1. [11-25/0295r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0295-00-00bi-editorial-comments.docx) – Editorial comments -- Po-Kai Huang

Document presented by the author.

The solves Editorial CID

* + 1. Discussion

CID 571

C: There is no page indicated here. Are you supposed to guess? I would reject it.

A: OK, but I recognize we need space.

C: I don’t see where you need space before a closing paren.

A: OK Iwill reject this one.

CID 508.

C: Same issue, if the commenter does not indicate the page we just reject it.

A: The comment resolution indicates the locations. So, it is ok for this one.

CID 963

C: For me changing “May” to “are” is changing to a shall statement.

A: the baseline is “are” so I revert to the original wording.

C: So, this is a technical modification.

A: No in this case.

Document presentation is stopped and will resume tomorrow AM2.

1. **AoB**

No other business

Next TGbi session is tomorrow AM2.

1. Chair Recess at 18:00

**3rd slot: Wednesday March 12th 2025, 10:30 local time.**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Stéphane Baron**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

**Technical editor: Po-Kai Huang, Intel**

Chair calls meeting to order at 10:31 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0225r5](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0225-05-00bi-tgbi-march-plenary-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

1. The chair covered the IEEE copyright policy and participation rules.

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0225r5 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda
	2. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (35 participants online, 18 in the room).
2. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0295r5](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0295-05-00bi-editorial-comments.docx) – Editorial comments -- Po-Kai Huang

Document presented by the author.

Resumed at CID 897 from yesterday’s presentation

The solves Editorial CID

* + 1. Discussion

CID 305:

C: I found this way to write the sentence quite unclear. You can group the first frames of A,B,C and then second frame of A,B,C.

A: But in the baseline this is how it is written.

A: In addition, it's not "first" for reassoc

CID305 is marked deferred

 -CID 10 :

Friendly editorial modification applied on CID10

CID302:

C: Those 2 paragraphs are repeating a lot of information.

A: I believe this is more a REVmf comment rather than a 11bi one.

C: I agree rejecting the comment to avoid maintenance here, but clarify the reject reason.

C: Finally, I think this is the scope of this group and we can revise this text. We can delete the second paragraph completely.

A: The point is that there is RSNA in the second paragraph.

C: I think the sentence should not be deleted completely and need revision, but this needs to be transferred to the REVmf.

CID302 rejected as a maintenance comment.

A corresponding comment will be sent to the REVmf

CID404:

C: The number of octets in the field is different to the number of octets of the field.

A: OK: I revise it and indicate number of octets in the field.

CID 408:

Q: Can we also change 9b to “this field”?

A: Agree

CID412:

Resolution changed to “accept”

CID155:

Q: This non-AP STA is an MLD ort Not?

A: this is not a MLD.

Q: So why using DS MAC if you are not an MLD.

A: For legacy, for roaming.

No change to the resolution

CID1004:

C: I think this is clearer to indicated that this is used by EDP.

A: This is used by some feature of the EDP not all EDP features.

C: Indicate this is used by .. an EDP non-AP MLD or an EDP non-AP STA"

A: Agree

Text modified accordingly, and CID 1004 is now “revised”

CID 557

C: This modification should be done thru the whole document, other instances exist.

A: Agree.

CID 679

C: This modification should be done thru the whole document, other instances exist.

A: Agree.

CID664:

C: correct term is “except that”

A: I don’t have strong preference, I just follow the baseline, but I can accept the comment.

CID 664 is then accepted.

CID665:

C: I think this is not a editorial change to to from “when” to “that”

A; AI will clarify that.

CID666:

C: I think we need to reword that not to mislead people thinking that the multi-link probe request preserves the privacy.

A: OK, I see the point.

CID666 is then revised accordingly.

CID159:

Q: What is the name of the frame?

A: Here in the title, we are talking about the procedure. We can remove EDP

CID 159 is revised accordingly and same resolution is applied for CID 668

CI670:

C: There are two locations indicated in the comment, but you changed only in one place.

A: Agree.

CID resolution is still “accept”, but the editor notice there will be two changes.

Cid674:

C: Use a semicolon instead of the “and”.

A: Agree

C: You are considering two frames there, so it should be plural in the title.

A: Agree.

Text modified accordingly.

CID652 resolution changed to accept.

CID653:

C: There is need for revision there.

A: OK, I can fix it now

Text modified by remove the spurious “the” and adding the missing ones.

CID 271:

C: The subclause is wrong but the page and line are ok.

A: Fine.

CID 271 and 272 are tabled. Resolution on chapter 16.8.1 will be applied on 16.8.2 to solve those two CIDs.

Autor stop there to run a Straw poll on the accepted CIDs.

**SP#2 intial text** :

Do you support addressing the comments listed below as shown in document 25/295r6: 778, 144, 163, 145, 370, 571, 508, 574, 503, 371, 984, 963, 889, 391, 897, 12, 377, 380, 324, 10, 302, 928, 13, 14, 15, 16, 402, 191, 404, 406, 408, 411,
412, 400, 422, 419, 456, 461, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 453, 155, 1003, 468,1004, 977, 61, 935,1009, 494, 754, 314, 498, 334,1010, 557, 679, 664, 665,
666, 668, 159, 669, 670, 776, 138, 844, 671, 672, 673, 674, 765, 677, 682, 647, 651, 652, 653, 175, 686, 766, 276, 277

**SP#2 : Discussion:**

C: Usually we use “resolving” not “addressing”

A: OK.

**SP#2: final text:**

Do you support resolving the comments listed below as shown in document 25/295r6: 778, 144, 163, 145, 370, 571, 508, 574, 503, 371, 984, 963, 889, 391, 897, 12, 377, 380, 324, 10, 302, 928, 13, 14, 15, 16, 402, 191, 404, 406, 408, 411, 412, 400, 422, 419, 456, 461, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 453, 155, 1003, 468,1004, 977, 61, 935,1009, 494, 754, 314, 498, 334,1010, 557, 679, 664, 665, 666, 668, 159, 669, 670, 776, 138, 844, 671, 672, 673, 674, 765, 677, 682, 647, 651, 652, 653, 175, 686, 766, 276, 277

Chair ask if anyone has an objection to declaring unanimous support for this SP

No response.

SP#2 received unanimous support.

Doc 137 is added to the agenda since there is few remaining minutes and author indicates it will fit into the remaining time.

* 1. [11-25/0137r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0137-00-00bi-capability-of-robust-beamforming.docx): Capability of Robust Beamforming – Jarkko Knecht

Document presented by Author.

Propose to split the robust beamforming capability into 2 capabilities for TB and non-TB Robust beamforming.

Resolving CID209.

* + 1. Discussion

C: I support this, and it make sense.

C: I also agree, but first bullet need a little more work.

A: I see we can make it more explicit.

Author will improve the language and come back for a SP.

1. **AoB**

Doc 11-25/0455r1 is put first tomorrow AM1

No other business

Next TGbi session is tomorrow AM1.

1. Chair Recess at 18:00

**4th slot: thursday March 13th 2025, 08:00 local time.**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Stéphane Baron**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

**Technical editor: Po-Kai Huang, Intel**

Chair calls meeting to order at 08:01 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0225r6](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0225-06-00bi-tgbi-march-plenary-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

1. The chair covered the IEEE copyright policy and participation rules.

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0225r6 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

Doc 137r2 is now uploaded and is scheduled for today.

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (17 participants online, 14 in the room).
1. Admin
	1. Teleconference schedule

Wednesday 10 to 12 AM ET. proposed by chair.

March 23, April 2, 9, 23, 30

Chair indicates that depending on our progress, we may need an ad-hoc meeting. This will be discussed during next F2F in MAy

1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0455r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0455-01-00bi-comment-resolution-9-4-2-348-9-4-1-9-9-6-42-1-9-6-42-4-9-6-42-5-9-6-42-6-9-6-42-7-9-4-1-84-9-4-1-83.docx) – Comment resolution 9.4.2.348, 9.4.1.9, 9.6.42.1, 9.6.42.4, 9.6.42.5, 9.6.42.6, 9.6.42.7, 9.4.1.84, 9.4.1.83 -- Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado

Document presented by the author solving a set of CIDs

* + 1. Discussion

CID 146:

Q: Status code indicate failure but the operation succeeds, I would suggest to change the Status code to success.

A: Agree

C: I think now we should not indicate that the creation fails, but rather that no grope creation is need since it already exists.

Q: Is ANA already assigned yet?

A: No

Q: Do we define this in clause 9?

A: There is a section 10.31 giving more details.

Status code name changed, and explanation text accordingly

Regarding the 1011:

Q: The heading is groups and inside it is group. Which one it is?

A: I changed with groups for all in the chapter.

CID 503 and 504 resolutions are changed to “accepted” despite wrong clause number since page and line are OK.

CID1012:

C: This comment requests the editor to search thru the whole document. I would reject it and request redline.

A: I will ask to the tech editor if he agrees in accepting this comment.

CID1015:

C: just copy the resolution of CID501 here.

C: If the proposed resolution is not exactly the same, just copy the resolution applied.

Cid858:

C: I think this is not a good idea to allow a non-AP STA to modify the group. The AP will just reject it all the time.

A: So, if everybody agreed I will reject it

No complaints received.

CID859:

Q: Is there a way for an AP to change a Station to one group to another?

A: No.

C: So, this can be a hole.

C: I think we already have it a 10.71.2.2 so we should revise the text to allow it.

Q: Is there any reason indication by the AP?

A: No.

Text will be revised accordingly.

Q: I though the request from the STA was to create a new group? The AP is handling t he EDP Epoch right.

A: But a STA is not mandated to accept.

C: AP doesn’t ask for authorization and moves the STA.

Q: So, we have a need that is not satisfied, and we need to redesign some frames to support our needs?

A: right, I think so.

C: We need to handle all the management needs with 3 frames.

Q: We already have request response?

A: Yes, we may need an assignment or a recommendation.

C: I think this is too big for a comment resolution. We need a separated document.

A: Agree.

CID909 same as previous one

Both CIDs 859 and 909 are deferred and requires a dedicated contribution.

CID 123:

C: Looks strange to me to name this frame a request. A would prefer notification.

A: the station can answer

C: right but you can answer to a notification

Name of the frame is modified to collision notification

Q: What will be the name of the response then?

A: no change this will be a response.

CID 936.

C: You cannot accept with a complex note to the editor.

CID is transferred to another document that already handle same kind of modification; in wich the identification of every occurrence is done.

CID1012

C: Same issue here, we have to change Group to EDP group.

A: Tech editor: Please just indicate clear instruction so that there is no ambiguity.

C: There are so many types of groups, so you cannot simply replace every occurrence of group.

A: I will do a red line for this.

Cid 208:

C: Today we have only one section for notification frame, but it seems you are adding a subclause so the instruction to editor becomes tricky to follow.

A: How can we add a new section then

A: Just indicate to the tech editor to add a new section after 9.6.2.7

Presenter stops after CID 802 resolution to allow timeline discussion and motion.

1. **Administrative**
	1. Timeline discussion

C: It seems difficult to be ready for recirc in July should we extend to September or November?

C: I think this is not the time to discuss that, we should let it to may meeting and see how we progress.

A: I would like to put something because we know this is not possible

C: I encourage people to keep 11bi as fast as possible. People are already saying 11bi is slow.

C: I would recommend to finish CID resolution rather than creating new things.

C: I tend to agree that we may not need to update the timeline now.

A: We didn’t change anything after the first LB and we slipped.

Q: Does the group want to keep the timeline as it is today?

No answers.

Chair keep the timeline as it is for today.

* 1. Motions

Chair then ask for a motion related to the approved CID resolutions.

**Motion #60 text :**

Approve the texts and CID resolutions listed below and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGbi draft.

Document 25/295r6 to resolve CIDs : **778, 144, 163, 145, 370, 571, 508, 574, 503, 371, 984, 963, 889, 391, 897, 12, 377, 380, 324, 10, 302, 928, 13, 14, 15, 16, 402, 191, 404, 406, 408, 411, 412, 400, 422, 419, 456, 461, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 453, 155, 1003, 468,1004, 977, 61, 935,1009, 494, 754, 314, 498, 334,1010, 557, 679, 664, 665, 666, 668, 159, 669, 670**

**Motion #60 moved by Po-Kai Huang, and seconded by Jouni Malinen**

**Motion #60** results: Approved by unanimous consent. (28 people on line and 17 people in the room)

* 1. Draft D1.1 creation

Q: Does the Tech editor plans to create a D1.1 based on motion #60?

A: tech editor: Yes

After discussion, the group agrees to allow the technical editor to create a draft D1.1 based on the motion 60.

Since some time remains, chair ask if someone is ready to present something.

Doc 11-25/0137r2 is then presented.

1. **Technical Submissions (continuation)**
	1. [11-25/0137r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0137-02-00bi-capability-of-robust-beamforming.docx): Capability of Robust Beamforming – Jarkko Knecht

Document presented by Author.

Modification of text in clause 12.14.2 after previous presentation and comments taken into account.

* + 1. Discussion

Q: I don’t see the logic where one of them would be “1”?

A: If one of them is 0 we do not protect the beamforming.

Q: So, we have a binary decision using two bits?

A: We have many conditions here including using those 2 bits and their configurations.

A: OK, I will read the document more carefully.

C: We are inheriting such behavior from 11be.

Author then request a SP

SP#3

Do you support resolving comment 209 as specified in document 25/137r2?

Y/N/A

Chair ask if we can say this SP received no objection

1 people objected and the SP is run

22 voted. 73% yes, 5% no, 23% abstain

SP# 3result 16 Y / 1N/ 5A

1. **AoB**

No other business

1. Chair Adjourn at 10:00