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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the TGbn MAC ad hoc meeting in July 2025 (in Helsinki).

Revisions:

* Rev0: Added the minutes from the MAC ad hoc meetings held on July 23, 24, and 25.

**July 23, 2025, AM1 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 09:00. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
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 asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-25/1048r2.
5. CR/PDT SPs:
	1. [25/0636](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0636-05-00bn-joint-pdt-cr-trigger-frame-format-part-5.docx) Joint PDT CR Trigger Frame Format Part 5 Alice Chen 15C/2TBD

C: IFCS location field, please delete the second field because of its duplicated.

A:ok

C: page 4, the first paragraph, what if the other user info fields means?

A: I’m not sure whether it’s main field. Just padding and IFCS field.

C: I did not see comments on it. But it’s ok

A: Just feedback from others.

C: they are for HE STAs or EHT STAs.

C: Other user info field, what kind of user info fields? As Alfred said, we can clarify it.

C: We can add other user info field for non-UHR STAs.

C: 37.15, What’s the TBD in the begining?

A: Liwen is resolving the TBD for the CIDs. There is another document for resovling it.

C: TBD is in D0.1?

A: Yes.

C: 37.15, shall it to 0. Is true, both of the conditions.

C: non-UHR STA is not accurate. If UHR STA does not support it. STA does not use the IFCS field. Is correct.

C: User info fields that STA does not require the IFCS field. Is correct.

C: STAs that do not require the ICFCS field.

C: the last sentence, AP always shall include the location indication field regardless of STAs does not support it?

A: Yes, If STA does not support it, STA just ignore it.

A: This is r7.

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/0636r7 into the next version of draft, which resolvs the following CIDs:

22, 1038, 1421, 1564, 1730, 2092, 2510, 2578, 2666, 2667, 2932, 2933, 2934, 3755, 3840 (15 CIDs)

No objection

* 1. [~~25/0907~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0907-02-00bn-cc50-cr-for-clause-9-4-2-aa1.docx) ~~CC50 CR for clause 9.4.2.aa1 Ming Gan 44C/6TBD~~
1. CR/PDT Submissions:
	1. 25/199r1, Xiangxin Gu

C: SP is option 1? Option 2?

A: Yes.

C: PM bit in bitmap in 890 is simpler.

C: That , down link triggering is per link. You can do that perlink basis.

C: SP seems very general. The text in 890 is simple. Look at the text in doc. And then, you can think what you can do on top of the doc.

C: Can we go through 890 and then you can talk again about it?

* 1. [25/0890](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0890-01-00bn-d0-1-cc-subclause-37-9-2.docx) D0.1 CC subclause 37.9.2 Laurent Cariou 29C/2TBD

C: the power management mode..

C: indicate rather than use.

C: note shouldn’t be used?..

A: the PM bit in FC is for STA transmitting the frame. Other bits in the bitmap are for other STAs in MLD.

C: It’s hard to keep track the change of PM bits for multiple links.

C: What if non-AP STA does not receive the acknowlegdement of it?

C: MIB , that uspports rather than is capable of support.

C: What’s the opinion on DL data triggering?

A: It can already support by current operation.

C: This is active and PM. Need to indicate the PS. DPS active.

A: this is just change mode of power managment mode between active and PM. Not related to awake or doze state.

C: We can consider another operation on top of this.

The session was recessed at 10:30.

**July 23, 2025, AM2 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 10:45am. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
* CR/PDT SPs:
	+ [25/1090](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1090-00-00bn-cr-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-9-4-1-85.docx) cr cc50 mac cids in clause 9.4.1.85 Liwen Chu 11C/5TBD

C: greater than or equal to is better than symbols.

C: you can delete unsigned integer, can change to microsecond than us.

Some changes

C: Is this only for non-AP STAs? This is useful for the AP. How does the legacy STA interpret the served value?

C: no minimum in the transmission delay.

* + 25/1101 PDT-CR MAC on Seamless Roaming Part 5 Duncan Ho 5C/1TBD

C: we can just mention what the existing method means with the the details. Are you talking RTS/CTS?

C: for IP address, this can be note. Not requirement.

C: Can you clarify how we dont have the second trnasition code added here?

C: we need to clarify the requirement on the TID usage beside IP address.

A: Do you have any CID on it?

C: what is the meaning of all these reasons? What does AP provide? I’m confusing this one. What AP is doing? We need more discussion. What is the difference? This is adding more confusion.

C: discussion on blockack window size.

C: is it over a window or is ti at a given point in time? How is this max really come? How is the actual number computed?

C: what is the requirement of client? What is the difference? Regarding max number.

C: do you need normative text to indicate what happens or what’s the behavor.

C: do you want to remove those field in the ST request?

A: If fields are mandatory, we don’t need to mention in this. We can mention in case of optional fields. That’s the previous comments.

C: why do you remove note?

A: Ok, it’s still under discussion.

C: if the buffer size of the arget AP MLD is smaller than the current AP MLD, there should be a renegotiation, that’s the point?

C: this rejection code on ST execution, we may need other code.

C: are we closing a blockack renegotiation as part of preparation?

C: I don’t see a reason to make it no ack frame.

C: DL part, the subbullet is not needed for notification

C: if we cross out this, there is not indicatin of this. There is nothing mandatory here. I think it should be shall rather than should for AP operation.

C: what’s the meaning of DL data are ocmpleted?

The session was recessed at 12:30.

**July 23, 2025, PM1 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 13:30. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
* CR/PDT SPs:
	+ 25/1101 PDT-CR MAC on Seamless Roaming Part 5 Duncan Ho 5C/1TBD

C: AP MLD set this field to 0, what about non-AP MLD?

A: reserved.

C: You can change it.

C: Format for preparation response. Shouldn’t be the non-AP MLD already know the buffer size, why the buffer size is sent to non-AP MLD?

A: Target AP MLD may have different buffer size. We can have more discussion.

C: We have to differentiate the buffer size for uplink or downlin.

C: the SN number is transferred to the target AP or not? And later on in execution response there is also the Aps telling the STA what is?

C: in execution response, you’re sending the uplink SN right? You also need the next SN for downlink? We should also provide downlink SN.

C: using same element carrying different coments for those.

C: non-AP MLD or AP MLD should be able to terminate DL data ddrain.

C: request frame, SMD information is missing in this table.

A: SMD information if from the AP side? AP is advertising ST capabilities.

C: AP and client need to check whether SMD information is correct.

C: ST request should include the first profile in subelement.

* + [25/1097](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1097-00-00bn-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-37-14.docx) cc50 mac cids in clause 37.14 Liwen Chu 13C/1TBD

C: enabled CFP feature. we did not define that feature. Need more discussion. How do we include the rules in 11bn

C: this section is for MLD by multiple features ?

A: This is EMLSR, MLD level. So I clarified UHR STA affilitated with an MLD.

* + [25/0908](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0908-01-00bn-cc50-cr-for-clause-9-4-2-aa2.docx) CC50 CR for clause 9.4.2.aa2 Ming Gan 37C/2TBD

C: CR table, Draft number is 0.2. you have to change to 0.3.

C: the capability , DPS assited support and assiting support. DSO support. There is no assisting for other operation . Some inconsistency for others. Aligned with other operations.

A: DPS, we have assisting part and assisted part. But other operation does not have two different part. Meaning is same.

C: we have to make an align with other documents.

C: You have two TBDs. First 4 and second 5. You can change it in PHY.

C: OM Control related field need to be more clarified for AP.

C: MIB variable can be changed from support to implemented. We can double check it.

C: what’s the mismatch of DUO or PUO for capabilities?

A: AP side.

C: we don’t have DPS assisted in the text.

A: I will not include the related CID.

C: 2953,can we defer the CIDs?

C: we use implement or activated

C: defer CID 2099

C: 1922, 1923 are deferred

C: 2951, 718, 2412, 753

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/908r4 into the next version of TGbn draft, which resolves the following CIDs:
2946 762 2949 2950 2424 1736 2097 1536 2388 2394 3617 3377 2414 3616 476 3378 1503 1504 2415 1924 3379 2098 3380 719 2413 2952 1524 3402 2425

No objection

* + [~~25/0669~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0669-03-00bn-cr-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-37-9-1.docx) ~~cr cc50 mac cids in clause 37.9.1 Liwen Chu 125C/10 TBD~~
* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ [25/0741](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0741-00-00bn-mac-pdt-cr-37-11-4.docx) MAC-PDT-CR-37\_11\_4 Sherief Helwa 13C

C: second note. You’re saying two. Whatever PUOschedule. Can APPUO PA being unavailable, the beacon is also transmitted.

C: How about splitting two part in note?

C: CID 1815, it does not address my issue. Can you defer this?

C: indicates availability, it’s not a bit because this is the description of unavailability mode subfield.

C: if the subfield is set to 1, it can be handled. What if the subfield is set to 0?

The session was recessed at 15:30.

**July 23, 2025, PM2 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 16:00. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
2. Announement (Alfred): We will have joint sessions for CBF/CSR tomorrow. If you’re interested in the joint sessions and have MAC contributions in MAC agenda tomorrow, let me know it and I will reschedule it in the next agenda.
3. CR/PDT Submissions:
	* 25/1027 PDT MAC DBE part 2 Binita Gupta PDT

C: STA does not need to enable/disable every time AP enable/disable.

C: Some discussions on EHT-MCS MAP field.

C: DBE capability parameter field. We have to guarantee the extended bandwdith for future. We can have more bits to indentify future MCS Mapping.

* + [~~25/1025~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1025-01-00bn-pdt-mac-uhr-critical-updates-procedures.docx) ~~PDT MAC UHR Critical Updates Procedures Abhishek Patil 1C~~
	+ 25/1087 PDT - Setting TXVECTOR parameters for UHR PPDU Jeongki Kim PDT

Q: Not planning to run SP

Q: Better to use the format TXOP parameters; SU transmission should be PPDU

A: Text changed

Is 37.11.2 the correct reference? A: text changed

Q: Suggested language for BSS color rules; A: changed

Q: BSS color rules seem to duplicate the text before; A: removed

Q: SU PPDU is not correct, should change to SU transmission; A: removed

Q: Regarding power boost factor, what are the rules? A: Keep the note is better

* CR/PDT SPs:
	+ [25/0882](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0882-04-00bn-pdt-mac-uhr-operating-mode-and-parameter-updates.docx) PDT on generic enablement Gaurang Naik 0C/7TBD

C: is there any chance to change length of mode prameters?

C: If mode ID indicates the fixed length, we don’t have length field. The length field doesn't give any length information.

C: do you have define the timer value, time value is applied for STA of each mode of operation?

* + [~~25/0936~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0936-08-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-npca-cc50.docx) ~~PDT-CR-MAC-CC50-NPCA Matthew Fischer384C/16TBD~~
* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ 25/1091 PDT MAC on modes enablement and parameter updates at the AP Gaurang Naik 10C

C: DUO length part, we can also have a default value of mode length. If there is a default value, then this may not be present.

A:ok

C: DBE, 2 bytes is not enough. We’re missing enablement of AP side.

C: Can it be indicated in the UHR operation element?

C: Each entry refer to the events or specific detect type of feedback structure.

* + [25/1049](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1049-00-00bn-pdt-mac-mapc-pasn-part-1.docx) PDT MAC MAPC PASN part 1 Jay Yang 4C

Some discussion.

The session was recessed at 18:00.

**July 24, 2025, AM1 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 09:00. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
2. The Chair asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-25/1048r4.
3. CR/PDT Submissions:
	1. [25/1049](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1049-01-00bn-pdt-mac-mapc-pasn-part-1.docx) PDT MAC MAPC PASN part 1 Jay Yang – Cont. 4C

C: 12.xx.3.4. should be 12.xx.3.5

C: only method for between the authentication is not a good way to move forward. We need to build it in another way where it can be combined but not as the only way but one of other methods that should be there because it’s mainly concentrated on security without authentication.

C: SAE is not only one.

1. CR/PDT SPs:
	1. [25/0936](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0936-10-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-npca-cc50.docx) PDT-CR-MAC-CC50-NPCA Matthew Fischer384C/16TBD

C: Discussions on NPCA timer, NPCA switch back delay

C: Condition 2, 4) the bandwidth of the first PPDU is determined by the STA. I don’t quite get this condition, why not just use the third PPDU as same as the behavior of the condition when only based on the PPDU.

C: A lot of situation that it might not have the same bandwidth as the first third PPDU.

C: NPCA timer, the largest value. Could you explain it a little bit more?

C: NPCA operation parameters, this is not in the beacon. What’s in the beacon? How do we signal it for UHR operation?

Recorded vote

§ SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/936r10 into the next version of TGbn draft, which resolves the CIDs listed in the document

22Y, 54N, 32A 🡺 22Y, 53N, 32A

1. CR/PDT Submissions:
	1. [25/1025](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1025-01-00bn-pdt-mac-uhr-critical-updates-procedures.docx) PDT MAC UHR Critical Updates Procedures Abhishek Patil 1C

C: When the certain USR mmode enablement disablement is changed ist that kind of accounted as UHR?

A: Yes,

C: We need a better place for the TIM element because currently the way you are trying to understand here is putting my restrictions on the UHR.

* 1. [25/1071](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1071-01-00bn-pdt-cr-for-icf-icr-details-with-multiple-modes.docx) PDT/CR for ICF/ICR details with multiple modes Alfred Asterjadhi PDT

C: In general section, do we need LLI there?

A: It does not require the generation of an ICF if the ICF is generated, it benefits but it does not have it as a requirement to generate an ICF to a STA

C: this procedure (cutting the discussion in queue) is not productive

A: Send the question to reflector.

* 1. [25/1094](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1094-01-00bn-cr-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-37-13.docx) cr cc50 mac cids in clause 37.13 Liwen Chu 16C

C: you say in the link, what does a link mean?

C: if a STA performs the frame exchanges, the gramma is broken.

The session was recessed at 10:30.

**July 24, 2025, AM2 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 10:45am. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
	* [25/1080](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1080-00-00bn-cc50-switching-back-condition-for-npca-operation.docx) CC50: Switching back condition for NPCA operation Dongju Cha 4C
		+ C: In the case the AP is operating on the primary channel while the non-AP Sta is operating on the nNPCA channel, non-AP STA can use that RU without any restriction.
		+ C: I don’t understand why the NPCA time and NPCA switch back timer are different?
		+ A: I tried to intend the same thing.
		+ C: What is the expection from non-AP STA side after ti switches back to the BSS primary channel? What is the STA expectation to do in that case?
		+ C: how about NPCA AP operation? E.g., NPCA AP truncates the TXOP, what if the STA
		+ C: CID indicates NPCA AP and non-AP STAs but this resolution only mentions the non-AP STAs. We can think about other conditions.
		+ C: the last subbulet B, your timer is NPCA duration, should we have other limitation?
		+ C: Another conditions? iRTS is mandatory but AP is not there non-AP STA can make multiple efforts to communicate. Right?
		+ C: in any case if the time left is less than NPCA minimum duration non-AP STA can switch back.
* CR/PDT SPs:
	+ [25/1090](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1090-02-00bn-cr-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-9-4-1-85.docx) cr cc50 mac cids in clause 9.4.1.85 Liwen Chu 11C/5TBD

C: You can delete the value of 63 related texts.

C: can we add staring from 0us?

A: Yes,

C: CID 3612, instruction to editor is not clear. Should be Accept

C: from 0us to 252 us is better

C: why not 256?

A: we have a bunch of comments from the members, also in NPCA and DSO 252 based on the comment,

C: which protocol you’re using 252?

A:NPCA DSO?

§ SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/1090r3 into the next version of TGbn draft, which resolves the CIDs listed in the document

899, 2409, 3612, 2643, 2939, 1040, 771, 2647, 2675, 3614

No objection

* + [25/0508](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0508-03-00bn-d0-1-cc-subclause-37-11-3.docx) D0.1 CC subclause 37.11.3 Laurent Cariou 113C/11TBD

C: You refer the wrong revision number of 437. You have to correct the revision number.

A: 437r18 is ok?

C: This should be r5.

C: Can you defer the 652?

C: Jaheon’s CIDs can be removed. We can doublecheck whether he withdraw them.

§ SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/0508r5 into the next version of TGbn draft, which resolves the following CIDs:

1288 1596 2218 3394 3089 3430 426 726 754 801 1068 1289 1290 1555 2406 2607 3702 660 727 802 2158 3395 2159 3088 427 428 728 729 755 1556 1557 2160 2161 2407 2608 3429 3087 1558 1291 2498 2609 3662 3768 1292 3090 1559 2610 3767 3092 512 3093 1294 2611 2682 2455 2499 2612 3396 3397 1295 1296 1297 1298 1299 1300 1301 1302 1560 3191 730 877 2613 3398 3663 3095 3094 1303 1304 1305 1306 269 2500 3666

No objection

* + [25/1097](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1097-02-00bn-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-37-14.docx) cc50 mac cids in clause 37.14 Liwen Chu 13C/1TBD

C: can you remove the MIC part?

C: TGbn does not have control frame protection.

A: we had a discussion about which standards are baseline. TGmf can be baseline.

C: the last paragraph, you can delete the requirement text.

A: Ok,

* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ [25/1020](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1020-00-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-on-seamless-roaming-part-4.docx) PDT-CR MAC on Seamless Roaming Part 4 Duncan Ho 7C

C: discussion on MAC address part.

C: random MAC address is assigned in MLD level and it’s only used for preparation, its used for preparation or execution via the target AP MLD and that it is not used for any further data communication. Correct?

A: That’s part of thing we can. There are multiple options. What you said is one option to go.

C: In general, there is lots of new ideas and this seems to be pretty complicated scheme. Kind of new proposals, we start from the benfits and I think we need to fetch the contexts.

C: You maye want to think about like how much effort we want to invest and how much can we gent and maybe if you do like five investigation, you may find out that maybe this is not really.

C: I think in baseline we have at least three mechanisms for this rather than device ID, PMK ID, etc.

C: Thoughts that we had were that emergency roaming are likely to exist in the field,

The session was recessed at 12:30.

**July 24, 2025, PM1 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 13:30. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ [25/1131](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1131-00-00bn-cr-for-seamless-roaming.docx) CR for Seamless Roaming Duncan Ho 150C

C: we can say an AP MLD in that same SMD, can delete the have the same SSID and.

C:why do you suggest to remove the text?

C: we need to say is Aps that beling to an SMD are part of the same ESS and that should be sufficient?

C: We don’t need to call that out either in the previous? What about the same DS?Should we call it out in this resolution somewhere or is that some implied?

A: I think the text in black is sufficient.

C: A single DS I think this most of them are conditions. One is all the have the smae. The other one is to the same DS. Maybe we can add rewarding in this sentence.

C: we can remove the condition.

C: we can change an AP MLD to all AP MLDs.

C: a UHR non-AP MLD that uses SMD BSS transition?

C: what’s the meaning of uses SMD BSS trnasitions? What if not transitioning? Supports?

C: is it normal” associated with the SMD-ME?

A: Yes

C: We have the definition of what the state means. Do we need to modify those to define what the concept of association means in this case? Because right now all the baseline text is obiously assuming your associaiton is really ..

C: I’m not clear what state it was in before and I wonder whether we have in the baseline a state transition diagram which shows the trnasitions of Aps and STAs bwtween STAs.

C: we need new states and I believe one of the CIDs suggested that as well. We’re going to go and do that work.

* + ~~25/1134 CR-MAC-cc50-CIDs\_in\_clause-37.1 George Cherian 30C~~
	+ [25/1135](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1135-00-00bn-cc50-cr-for-cid-2833-and-2834.docx) CC50 CR for CID 2833 and 2834 Jungjun Kim 2C

C: Can you update the resolution? Still r1.

C: Co-BF topic are discussing in PHY/Joint session.

A: I can defer it.

C

* CR/PDT SPs:
	+ [25/0931](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0931-06-00bn-pdt-crs-mac-lli.docx) PDT-CRs-MAC-LLI M. Abouelseoud 60C/3TBD

C: I saw UHR start supporting LLI and I got very confused EPS supporting AP or something, You’re trying to sya UHR STA that supports LLI?

C: You can delete the response in Multi-STA BlockAck

C: : BSRP and TB trigger fram can be sent to the STA if the STA enabled either DUO or control frame protection

C: BSRP trigger frame that is already defined. There’s alot of technical reason to enablement another ICF from the same reason,

C: whe we will setup for the urgent traffic, how would you know the traffic strongly related to those SCS with the setup with a set of long term parameters?

C:how did you know a set of long term parameters related to that SCS streams or related to that urgent traffic?

C: when you set up a set of streams when you send the indication through M-BA, do we have to know which SCS related to their urgently traffic you?

C: one bit only indicates I have low LL traffic it not enough, you wnat to like the AP to decid if it is clear you in this TXOP or in a few subsequent TXOP, we need to have more bits to indicate that.

C: LLI feature we should allow the enable disable from the AP side. Aligned with others.

A: I don’t think it’s necessary as long as the AP has the option to reject the SCS response and LLI mode would not be enabled as there is no SCS with LLI requrest equal one has been established.

C: SCS request with LLI =1, max interval can be zero ? AP make the decision to accept or reject we need some information at least delay bound should be part of that request.

C: what’s the purpose of enablement?

C: additional information to LLI is beneficial to the AP to know what to do when LLI feedback is sent from multiple non-AP STA. Expiration time can be used to prioritize in scheduling. And information on the amount of LL traffic gives information on how many resources to allocate.

* + [25/0551](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0551-06-00bn-cr-mac-cc50-cids-in-clause-9.docx) CR-MAC-cc50-CIDs\_in\_clause-9 Abhishek Patil 2C

C: AP MLD ID, if AP MLD ID field is 0, you can change subfield to field.

C: if the report AP is colocated or in the same SMD or is it not in the same SMD?that’s only differenciation.

C: Is it possbile to have the case where the non transmitted BSSID being in the same SMD as the reporting AP

A: No

C: there will never be in the same SMD?

C:

* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ [~~25/0756~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0756-05-00bn-cc50-cr-for-cid-2693.docx) ~~CC50 CR for CID 2693 Eda Genc 1C~~
	+ [25/1149](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1149-00-00bn-cc50-cr-for-some-general-comments.docx) CC50 CR for some general comments Suhwook Kim 10C

C: CID 2926, 3127 should be "Revised"

* + [25/0888](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0888-01-00bn-tgbn-d0-1-cr-for-cid-2848-3026-3071.docx) TGbn D0.1 CR For CID 2848, 3026, 3071 Suhwook Kim 3C

C: CID 3026 should be "Revised

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/0888r2 into the next version of TGbn draft, which resolves the following CID :

2848, 3026, 3071

No objection

* + [~~25/1145~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1145-00-00bn-duo-for-peer-sta.docx) ~~Duo for peer STA Rubayet Shafin 1C~~

The agenda is updated during the session.

25/1145 was replaced with 25/1310.

* + 25/1310, Michail

C: This field is an additional duration from unavailability duration. The duratin shall be before the unavailability start time.

C: if the start time is very soon, does that mean the TXOP request duraiton is going to be very short.

C: we have two functionality for feedback. I think the logic would be to keep that separated to get to your use case, You would want to enable those two modes and provide information because you have two modes.

The session was recessed at 15:30.

**July 24, 2025, PM2 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 16:00. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
2. CR/PDT Submissions:
	1. 25/1310, Michail Q&A

C: Do we need new mechanism? This can be used for STA that is out of this unavailable duration.

C: in device coex interference happen but STA cannot communicate with the AP but STA can do communicate with P2P peer STA?

A: STA needs some time before the coex event starts to tell everyone that it can communicate to that is gonna be unavailable.

* 1. [25/1140](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1140-00-00bn-pdt-mac-cr-for-ap-puo.docx) PDT MAC CR for AP PUO Yongsen Ma 1C

C: do you have any reason to combine APPUO and DPS? I think non-AP STA can be combined with DPS.

C: 508 passed, CID 269 is rejected there? You can check it.

A: he requested to defer?

C: We need to keep things simple.

C: I don’t think you need when DPS on top of TWT. You can achieve it by just enabling two modes independently.

A: If we have APPUO and DPS both enabled the AP will operate in the lower community by default, it will always require ICR/ICR for the translations, but this one inside of WSP you don’t need to do that. I think the change is not very big.

C: It would be this mechanism for the voerride ICF/ICR part of the DPS during the period.

* 1. [25/1130](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1130-00-00bn-pdt-mac-cr-for-puo.docx) PDT MAC CR for PUO Yongsen Ma 1C

C: it looks compoicated more fragmented if we can’t use some other mode, I’m gonna try. I would like more discussions.

C:

1. CR/PDT SPs:
	1. [25/0764](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0764-04-00bn-peer-to-peer-p2p-pdt.docx) Peer-to-Peer (P2P) PDT Rubayet Shafin 14C

C: AID12 field will be the group ID? The STA need to figure out the AID 12 field is group ID. They neeed to be changed.

A: how AP assign the group ID. There are a lot of special AID.

C: do we have anassurance that was also all members of the group will honor that?

C: We need some time for reviewing it carefully.

C: what exactly does a particular grop refer to help? It is a sepcific group formed through?

C: we will review and give you feedback

C: intra-BSS NAV will be ignored. All of these are associated to the same AP?

C: What’s the assumption of duration of TXS?

* 1. [25/0839](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0839-10-00bn-pdt-uhr-mu-operation.docx) PDT UHR MU operation Hongwon Lee 4C

C: was there typo? Why do mention the secondary 160MHz?

A: the texts is from EHT

C:I’m not sure if UHR has agreed to make use of SST which we have HUR because in EHT we already started dilivering for stability because we did not define 320. I belive that’s whyi I remember the first sentece.

C: I don’t really see that the field SST really took place. I’m not sure whether we still want to be carrying around SST. I think this part might require a bit more review.

C: It’s already 38.3.3.3.1 what are the new requirement from in this paragraph?

C:

* 1. [~~25/0915~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0915-02-00bn-pdt-cr-for-elr-mac.docx) ~~PDT/CR for ELR MAC Alfred Asterjadhi 3C/1TBD~~
	2. [25/0880](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0880-03-00bn-pdt-mac-on-l4s.docx) PDT MAC on L4S Binita Gupta [2C]
1. CR/PDT Submissions:
	1. ~~25/1159 CC50 CR for CIDs 2820 and 2821 - NPCA operation Serhat Erkucuk 2C~~
	2. ~~25/1160 CC50 CR for CIDs 2822 and 2823 - NPCA operation Serhat Erkucuk 2C~~
	3. [25/1157](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1157-00-00bn-pdt-clarification-on-mac-operations-for-mapc.docx) PDT - Clarification on MAC operations for MAPC Jeongki Kim PDT

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/1157r2 into the next version of TGbn draft

No objection

The session was recessed at 18:00.

**July 25, 2025, AM1 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 09:00. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
2. The Chair asked whether there is comment about agenda in 11-25/1048r6.
* Straw Polls (C-TDMA) – in support of 25/1163

**SP3 (Tong):**

Do you agree to include other TXOP sharing related information as below in the response polled by Initial Control frame, to help a sharing AP make better Co-TDMA scheduling decisions?

* LL related information (for example, LL indication, data priority level)
* Deferred

**SP4 (Tong):**

Do you agree that the LL related information to be included in the Initial Control Response (ICR) comprises either one or both of the following:

* Buffered LL data indication: using 1 reserved bit
* Data priority level: using ACI Bitmap (4 bits)
* Deferred
* CR/PDT SPs:
	+ [25/0915](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0915-06-00bn-pdt-cr-for-elr-mac.docx) PDT/CR for ELR MAC Alfred Asterjadhi 3C

C: Can we move the text for BSS color to TXVECTOR parameter BSS Color subclause?

A: Ok, I will remove the related to text.

C: we said the RTS as an ICF? If the AP is operating in DPS mode you can still send an RTS in LC mode.

C: I need to use some clarification the RTS in some case, it can be also considered the ICF for TPS sections. We are calling is the RTS to one of the ICF.

§ SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/915r7 into the next version of TGbn draft resolving the following CIDs:

1252 3645 1127 1202

No objection

* + [25/0551](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0551-08-00bn-cr-mac-cc50-cids-in-clause-9.docx) CR-MAC-cc50-CIDs\_in\_clause-9 Abhishek Patil 2C

C: change to is equal to

C: RNR of this Aps will have RNR.

C: what is the motivation to complex the non-AP MLD side? Why not to take it out and say we cannot supply the entire indication for SMD within the Beacon because of the blood ?

C: why not taling all the SMD stuff out of RNR and put it in anthter element will will not be carried in the beacon?

C: We keep sticking to have any information or partial information about SMD in beacon.

C: Can we defer this?

A: Ok

* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ [25/1164](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1164-00-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-for-dso-cc50.docx) PDT CR MAC for DSO CC50 Morteza Mehrnoush 3C

C: why DSO subchannel selection is complex?

A: Based on the past discussion I think people were preferring to have multple subband when DSO band is 320MHz

C: What’s the main reason that for AP and non-AP side ..?

A: from the AP side if you think of the support the AP slide annouce for all associated STAs.

* + [25/1082](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1082-00-00bn-pdt-mac-co-tdma-cr-cc50-part-3.docx) PDT-MAC-Co-TDMA-CR-CC50-Part-3 Sanket Kalamkar 70C

C: If the sharing Pas bandwidth is lareger than the shared AP it will force the sharing AP to shrink its bandwidth per the subsequent MBSS transmission which is not quite.

**SP1 (Klaus):**

Do you support to include additional information field(s) in the Co-TDMA ICR to what is already present in Draft 0.3 [1]

Result:

C: SP is very weak. What’s the information you wanted?

A: SP 1, we want to add additional fields, SP 2 says what I want to add.

C: You can run the SP 2 rather than SP 1. You can achieve the SP2.

C: adding something in ICR to enhance QoS for Co-TDMA, SP1 does not say anything. It’s hard to decide.

C: ICF also may carry additional information. You just explicitly add ICR.

A: When we do that negotiation, we don’t know who has the most urgent traffic at the time when ICF is sent

C: I object you at ICF that has been announced because we already have a parameter in ICF a maximum duration under consideration.

C: I think additional information in ICR can help polling the coordinated AP.

SP is deferred to next session.

**SP2 (Klaus):**

Do you support to add an information field to the Co-TDMA ICR that the coordinated AP can use to indicate the time duration it would like to be allocated by the sharing AP as part of the Co-TDMA TXOP sharing procedure. The sharing AP can use this information to allocate time to the coordinated AP(s). Note: The indicated time duration to be allocated is a recommendation to the sharing AP. The PDT already includes the primary AC as a parameter in the ICF to help the polled AP to decide if it has wants to receive part of the TXOP from the sharing AP.

Result:

SP is deferred

The session was recessed at 10:30.

**July 24, 2025, AM2 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 10:45am. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).

**SP1 (Klaus):**

Do you support to include additional information field(s) in the Co-TDMA ICR to what is already present in Draft 0.3 [1]

Result:

SP is deferred to next week.

**SP2 (Klaus):**

Do you support to add an information field to the Co-TDMA ICR that the coordinated AP can use to indicate the time duration it would like to be allocated by the sharing AP as part of the Co-TDMA TXOP sharing procedure. The sharing AP can use this information to allocate time to the coordinated AP(s). Note: The indicated time duration to be allocated is a recommendation to the sharing AP. The PDT already includes the primary AC as a parameter in the ICF to help the polled AP to decide if it has wants to receive part of the TXOP from the sharing AP.

Result:

SP is deferred to next week.

**SP3 (Tong):**

Do you agree to include TXOP sharing related information as below in the response polled by Initial Control frame, to help a sharing AP make better Co-TDMA scheduling decisions?
· Required time duration
· LL related information (for example, LL indication, data priority level)

C: overall very supportive, if this fails, the concept that we want to do can be failed. At this time, defer. Next week is easier to get the consensus.

SP is deferred to next week.

**SP4 (Tong):**

Do you agree that the LL related information to be included in the Initial Control Response (ICR) comprises either one or both of the following:

* Buffered LL data indication: using 1 reserved bit
* Data priority level: using ACI Bitmap (4 bits)
* SP is deferred to next week.
	+ [25/1165](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1165-00-00bn-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11bn-d0-1-cc50.docx) Resolutions for some comments on 11bn/D0.1 (CC50) Mark RISON 4C

C: I’m not sure this assurance stuff because there’s no asusrance in the client.

C: I don’t want to define roaming scans. What do you mean here?

C: Language should be soft.

C: I don’t understand what inexensible means.

C: How would you provide this information?

C: AP Channel Report element

C: If we allow that they all have the same SMID ID and if we happen to decide that they’re on the same ESS but you will never get around to them.

* + [25/1167](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1167-00-00bn-cr-for-cid-2548-shortening-the-duration-of-p-edca-periods.docx) CR for CID 2548: Shortening the Duration of P-EDCA Periods Behnam Dezfouli 1C

C: This comment is already resolved on May meeting. You can suggest this one without CID.

C: why this reduced value is good for PEDCA and not good for regular EDCA? What’s the rationale for shortening during PEDCA and rather than using legacy way for the regular channel access?

C: Note 3, there is some conditions based on the retry count.

A: there is clarification here.

C: Do we have a problem that we’re trying to solve or just trying to save several microseconds?

C: If we apply this service has to differentiate between the rues for PEDCA or EDCA and I’m trying to see if the potimization of twenty microseconds or not.

C: CTS timout is legacy procedure. What part of these legacy procedure goals? Did you consider all these dynamic with hidden nodes?

* + [25/1177](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1177-01-00bn-cid-resolution-cc50-for-cortwt.docx) CID Resolution CC50 for CoRTWT Giovanni Chisci 30C

Presented and discussions

* + 25/1179 PDT Clarifications on R-TWT in UHR Giovanni Chisci PDT
	+ defer
	+ 25/1196 PDT CR for some remaining CID Laurent Cariou ??C
	+ defer
	+ [25/1214](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1214-00-00bn-mac-pdt-changes-to-p-edca-37-5.docx) mac-pdt-changes-tp-p-edca-37.5                  Dmitry Akhmetov       [1C] Q& A pending

C: 214 is resolved in D0.3, no action required,

The session was recessed at 12:30.

**July 24, 2025, PM1 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 13:30. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
* CR/PDT Submissions:
	+ [25/1214](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1214-00-00bn-mac-pdt-changes-to-p-edca-37-5.docx) mac-pdt-changes-tp-p-edca-37.5                  Dmitry Akhmetov       [1C] Q& A pending

C: Need to change the header,

C: CW rule changed, you can just mention GW[AC\_VO] is CWmin[AC-VO].

A: ok

C: two retry count, PSRC QSRC, you want to keep this or it merged on retry count?

C: I wanted to ask the failed case, you pickup value which is the smallest between one based on current QSRC and the Cwmax?

A: Yes

C: Do you ned to keep the set by ANA or you want to remove that?

C: This is successful one or failure one? You’re suggesting the conention window. We did not discuss this.

C: Duration is 97, it’s fixed.

C: If durion is fixed, only I havce is one specific value for Cwmin max?

C: Why should AP advertise the other parameters than default?

C: Page 4, typo, QSCR to QSRC

* + [25/1163](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1163-00-00bn-cr-for-cid-2446-icr-parameters-in-co-tdma.docx) CC50 CR for CID 2446 Klaus Doppler [1C]

Deferred

* + [25/1255](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1255-00-00bn-cc-50-cr-for-dynamic-power-save-mode-update.docx) CC 50 CR for DPS Mode Update Vishnu Ratnam [5C]
	+ [25/1238](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1238-00-00bn-cr-for-seamless-roaming-clause-4.docx) CR for seamless roaming clause 4 Binita Gupta [1C]

C: Can you go to the reference model for the centralized mode?

C: Why do we need the SMD upper MAC sublayer?

C: I think we have to justify it, even one functionality that you see, but i don’t see it

C: I don’t think this aligned with the text. If you look at the distributed mode, we hav a text saying the control is on each AP. Each AP already have their component in SMD.

C: single MAC sap does not have MAC address that is used as SMD identifier.

* + 25/0669 cr cc50 mac cids in clause 37.9.1 Liwen Chu

C: txop duration non-zero padding, what could be the value for TXOP duration RTS threshold> it could be any non zero value.

C: Do we have offline discussion?

C: it seems that there is the disablement procedure of non-AP STA. How about the AP side?

C: I can see the text of disablement of non-AP STA.

A: That part will be handled in another document. I only lists the conditions.

Deferred:

25/1163 CC50 CR for CID 2446 Klaus Doppler [1C]

25/1255 CC 50 CR for DPS Mode Update Vishnu Ratnam [5C]

25/1255 CC 50 CR for Dynamic Power Save Mode Update Vishnu Ratnam

Withdrawn:25/0756 CC50 CR for CID 2693 Eda Genc [1C]

* Technical Submissions (last 1hr):
	+ [25/0121](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0121-00-00bn-further-considerations-on-client-power-save.pptx) Further Considerations on Client Power Save Liuming Lu

Presented. No discussion.

* + [25/0124](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0124-00-00bn-discussion-on-in-device-coexistence.pptx) Discussion on In-device Coexistence Liuming Lu

C: how does it solve the problem? Which DUO frames can be sent.

A: If AP encounter this scenarios, AP can turn off . Fairness issue needed to be considered.

C: Extra information you are suggesting., For future unvailability, I don’t think there is any disagreement of this. RSSI SNR information can be included using a single bit.

C: I’m cosidering you feedback later.

* + [25/0022](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0022-00-00bn-dps-sounding-procedure.pptx) DPS Sounding Procedure Jiayi Zhang

C: Group agreed which frame can be the ICF. NDPA is not in the list of ICF

A: Yes, we want to add this frame as ICF.

C: In that case, AP does not know that STA receives ICF

C: Another option, if you look this, ICF and NDPA combining make more complicated. C: EMLSR is similiar to this way. After ICF/ICR NDPA can be sent in EMLSR. We can follow the rule.

C: if you combined the ICF and NDPA it will make complicated.

* + [25/0040](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0040-01-00bn-thoughts-on-context-transfer-in-seamless-roaming.pptx) Thoughts on Context Transfer in Seamless Roaming Zhenpeng Shi

C: slide 6, why do you think that non-AP MLD need to send some requests to extend the timeout?

C: how does the non-AP MLD know all of this ahead of time to be able to update timeout?

Why is the secario like how frequently will we have a scenario where suppose the preparation is completed

The session was recessed at 15:30.

**July 24, 2025, PM2 (TGbn MAC Ad Hoc meeting)**

Chairman: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

Secretary: Jeongki Kim (Ofinno)

This meeting took place using a webex and in Helsinki (in-person).

**Introduction**

1. The Chair (Srinivas Kandala, Samsung) calls the meeting to order at 16:00. The Chair introduces himself and the Secretary (Jeongki Kim, Ofinno).
2. CR/PDT Submissions:
	1. [~~25/0839~~](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0839-13-00bn-pdt-uhr-mu-operation.docx) ~~PDT UHR MU operation Hongwon Lee 4C~~
	2. [25/0882](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0882-10-00bn-pdt-mac-uhr-operating-mode-and-parameter-updates.docx) PDT on generic enablement Gaurang Naik 0C/7TBD

C: If we leave out the EMLSR are enablment from this document I will be ok, work on the email saying enablement it needs more time. If you think you know we want to have all this EMLSR are enablement parts in this document. Are you knowing correct paraemters why certain parameter>

C: I want to defer this.

C: Table 9-xyz, why there is no DSO?

C: the mode length will only appear when you need to include the paraemters of this mode. I don’t think the current desing is good design we want to implement, how about we defer this session?

* 1. [25/0890](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0890-02-00bn-d0-1-cc-subclause-37-9-2.docx) D0.1 CC subclause 37.9.2 Laurent Cariou 29C/2TBD

Defer.

* 1. [25/0907](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0907-02-00bn-cc50-cr-for-clause-9-4-2-aa1.docx) CC50 CR for clause 9.4.2.aa1 Ming Gan 44C/6TBD

C: adding NPCA Operation parameters, I did not add the address to names of this. There is offline discussion about including parameters in separameter element and HR operation inclues enabled or disabled.

C: we want to carry the paraemters we carry the parameters.

C: MBSSID , UHR operation element may not be inherited always.

C: UHR capa and UHR operation be overriden in nontransmitted BSSID. Not sure about his change here.

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/0907r4 into the next version of TGbn draft, which resolves the following CID :

855 3847 1498 2941 473 1466 1230 3278 911 1534 2942 132 910 3615 2944 794 2620 3375 2411 3400 3376 2945 2451 1041 2395 2947 1042 1501 1500 2948 1535 3857 3858 3860 3140

No objection

* 1. [25/0931](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0931-08-00bn-pdt-crs-mac-lli.docx) PDT-CRs-MAC-LLI Mohamed Abouelseoud 60C/3TBD

C: there was a direction field is needed. This is indepenent.

C: we had better have a harmonizd together rather than og through independetly later on having trouble.

Recorded voting requested

o SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/931r9 into the next version of TGbn draft resolving the following CIDs:

§ 189, 190, 191, 270, 433, 434, 1397, 1448, 1450, 1485, 1493, 1496, 1725, 1726, 1727, 1728, 1893, 2387, 2390, 2404, 2506, 2518, 2544, 2623,2624, 2626, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2825, 3114, 3115, 3148, 3344, 3345, 3347, 3348, 3349, 3350, 3351, 3622, 3899, 3908

§ With the specification of the DCN# and rev# in the resolution

48Y, 36N, 23A

* 1. [25/0744](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0744-05-00bn-mac-pdt-cr-37-12-5-parameter-update.docx) MAC-PDT-CR-37\_12\_5-parameter-update Sherief Helwa 69C/14TBD

C: we need to mention preamble puncture for SU transmisison. You text is MU case is fine.

A: it’s hard to recognize . you mean adding Txector paramet.

C: maximum duration.

A: do you have disagreement with the values that were indicated?

* 1. [25/0936](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0936-11-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-npca-cc50.docx) PDT-CR-MAC-CC50-NPCA Matthew Fischer 384C/16TBD

C: MU EDCA AIFSN shall be set to 0 for all Acs. We can have a clear method.

C: condition e) PPDUbased NPCA, you’re checking the third PPDU the minium duration, eg. If you have a TXOP with ten PPDUs,

C: e)-i,

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/936r11 into the next version of TGbn draft resolving the CIDs listed in the document

40Y, 24N, 26A

* 1. [25/1071](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1071-03-00bn-pdt-cr-for-icf-icr-details-with-multiple-modes.docx) PDT/CR 4 ICF/ICR details with multiple modes Alfred Asterjadhi PDT

o SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/1071r8 into the next version of TGbn draft resolving the following CIDs:

· 101

3252

3645

3868

3869

No objection

* 1. [25/1087](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1087-00-00bn-pdt-setting-txvector-parameters-for-uhr-ppdu.docx) PDT - Setting TXVECTOR parameters for UHR PPDU Jeongki Kim

SP: Instruct the editor to incorporate the changes in document 25/1087r2 into the next version of TGbn draft

§ No objections

The session was adjourned at 18:00.