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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bn MAC Ad Hoc Madrid Meeting in July 2025.

**Minutes for the IEEE 802.11bn MAC Ad Hoc May 2025 Warsaw Meeting**

TGbn MAC Ad Hoc Chair chairing: Xiaofei Wang (InterDigital)

TGbn MAC Ad Hoc Chair serving as recording secretary: Srinivas Kandala (Samsung)

# Monday July 28, 2025, AM1

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 09:02 CET.
	1. The chair introduced himself and the secretary
2. Chair’s reminder on meeting and patent policies.
	1. The chair reminded attendees to register for the July 2025 meeting
	2. The chair reminded attendees of the patent polices.
	3. The chair called for essential patents, and none was indicated.
	4. The chair reminded attendees that participation is on an individual basis.
	5. The chair reminded attendees of IEEE meeting and copy right policies.
	6. Chair’s reminder on recording attendance through IMAT
3. The agenda is 11-25/1064r1.
	1. The chair reviews agenda
	2. The author of “SP on QoS”, and documents 25/1101, 25/1027 and 25/1163 have requested to defer the items. The agenda has been adjusted accordingly
	3. The agenda is approved with unanimous consent by all attendees.
4. **Straw Polls**
	1. **SP2: Binita Gupta**
		1. Do you support the following for a multiple BSSID Set in UHR?
		2. A multiple BSSID set in UHR can consist of a UHR BSSID as the transmitted BSSID and one or more non-UHR EHT BSSID as a nontransmitted BSSID. For a non-UHR EHT nontransmitted BSSID, the UHR Operation element, the UHR Capabilities element and/or other UHR defined elements that are carried for the UHR transmitted BSSID, are listed in the non-Inheritance element in the corresponding nontransmitted BSSID profile.
		3. Author walked through the SP
		4. Discussion:
			* C: Right now, the operational element and capability element are inhertible and now we are diverging from it. I am concerned about the complexity. We need better justification
			* A: There appears to be alignment on the approach. This way we can have different way of supporting different UHR features
			* C: Same concern as the previous commenter. This is not necessary. For legacy they don’t understand the new ones and even though there is inheritance they will just skip the unknown elements
			* C: Also agree with the previous commenter. Not sure if we want to introduce more complexity
			* A: As we are updating the BSSIDs have to be the same generation and we think that woud address many field issues
			* C: This is an important issue and operators see issues in upgrading and disconnecting devices would happen which would cause pain
			* A: This issue was observed in .11be timeline and had to fix through manually fixing it
			* C: Clarification on having non-UHR EHT
			* C: The way it is written is that there is one UHR and others are non-UHR
			* A: Will clarify in the next version
	2. **SP3** is deferred
5. **PDTs/CRs SPs –**
	1. [25/1094](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1094-03-00bn-cr-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-37-13.docx) cr cc50 mac cids in clause 37.13 Liwen Chu 16C
		1. Author walked through the changes
		2. Discussion
			* C: What does it mean for a STA to be in the EMLSR link
			* A: That the STA is using EMLSR link. At one point there was a thought of calling it EMLSR STA but the group decided against
			* C: Rephrase as “If a non-AP STA performs frame exchanges as a TXOP responder in EMLSR mode...”. Do not find any instances of EMLSR link in .11be
			* Suggestions in the chat window on how it should be crafted and document saved as r4
			* C: Are you intending to say the delay should be maximum of NPCA Switchback Delay and EMLSR Transition Delay. The text is not clear because it has four items, but at this time it is just an NPCA channel access and if the DPS delay is larger, it will dominate
			* A: The intention is to have a rule when all features are implemented
			* C: I understand, but the text is not clear
			* A: The text is clear
			* Additional editorial change made
			* Modified SP being run
		3. **Modified SP**: Do you support to incorporate the CRs for the following CIDs in 11-25/1094r4 into the next TGbn draft:
			* 2504, 3668, 2684, 1917, 2685, 3104, 3106, 872, 1918, 2164, 3107, 1561, 3108, 1919, 2429, 3109
		4. **No objections**
	2. [25/1097](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1097-04-00bn-cc50-mac-cids-in-clause-37-14.docx) cc50 mac cids in clause 37.14 Liwen Chu 16C
		1. Author walked through the document. Removed CFP as it is not in scope
		2. Discussion
			* Editorial changes suggested and incorporated
			* Modified SP being run
		3. **Modified SP**: Do you support to incorporate the CRs for the following CIDs in 11-25/1097r6 into the next TGbn draft:
			* 874, 1447, 2165, 2505, 2524, 2686, 3110, 1422, 3111, 3112, 3196, 2687
		4. **No objections**

* 1. [25/0764](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0764-05-00bn-peer-to-peer-p2p-pdt.docx) Peer-to-Peer (P2P) PDT Rubayet Shafin 14C
		1. Author walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			+ If duration is set to SIFS+response, then how does the NAV work?
			+ A: Other STAs in the group have an idea of what is going on and assume that the schedule will be provided and the STAs will follow accordingly and set the NAV progressively to cover the response frame
			+ C: Who is sending the following frames?
			+ A: First is the leader and the other members follow. The schedule is out of scope
			+ C: How does the TXOP Duration work?
			+ A: TXOP is allocated for the group is allocate and the STAs access the allocated time with SIFS separation, but we don’t have protection for the entire time
			+ C: So, there may not be a gurantee that the next STA will get the medium
			+ C: During the allocated time, should the STAs sense the medium
			+ Sequence of comments on how the scheduling is done
		3. Author chooses to discuss offline
1. **Technical Presentations**
	1. [25/0065](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0065-01-00bn-considerations-on-npca-operation.pptx) Considerations on NPCA Operation Zhenpeng Shi
		1. Author walked through the document
		2. Discussion
			* C: Agree with th problem
			* C: There are cases where there are issues, but we should not be making too many protocol changes
			* A: Yes, this may be too complicated, but may be small things can be introduced into the mechanism that we can improve
			* C: Supportive of the direction, but it comes with the technical challenges and it will have to go beyond and we can have more discussion
			* C: Also supportive of the direction, they may be more complicated and we should find simpler solutions
			* C: Similar comment
	2. [25/0377](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0377-00-00bn-multiple-shared-ap-allocation-in-co-tdma.pptx) Multiple Shared AP Allocation in Co-TDMA Serhat Erkucuk
		1. Author walked through the document
		2. Discussion
			* C: For option 1, you are saying using NPCA may be used. If the channel is occupied, best choice to use NPCA and better not to share
			* A: Yes, but we should find a way to use NPCA or use Co-TDMA used
			* C: Similar comment. In your example, you mentioned NPCA, it is decided that in the beginning of the TXOP, you could be making the decision in the middle of the TXOP and the AP and STA may not be in synch
			* A: There can be some way to organize themselves
2. Session recessed at 11:00 AM CET

# Tuesday July 29, 2025, AM2

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 11:31 CET.
	1. The chair introduced himself and the secretary
2. Chair’s reminder on meeting and patent policies.
	1. The chair reminded attendees to register for the July 2025 meeting
	2. The chair reminded attendees of the patent polices.
	3. The chair called for essential patents, and none was indicated.
	4. The chair reminded attendees that participation is on an individual basis.
	5. The chair reminded attendees of IEEE meeting and copy right policies.
	6. Chair’s reminder on recording attendance through IMAT
3. The agenda is 11-25/1064r4.
	1. The chair reviews agenda
	2. The agenda is approved with unanimous consent by all attendees.
4. **Straw Polls –**
	1. **SP1 (Klaus on C-TDMA):** Do you support to include additional information field(s) in the Co-TDMA ICR to what is already present in Draft 0.3 [1].
		1. Author went through the SP
		2. Disussion:
			* C: Expected ICF to be in the SP
			* A: Decided to limit this to ICR
			* C: What is the additional information that needs to be added. SP2 appears to be more appropriate
			* A: Feedback from the group is that this should be the first one to discuss and if it fails, we can stop. Else, we can discuss what needs to be added and have another discussion on converging
		3. SP was run.
		4. **Result:** 83Y, 54N, 43A
	2. **SP2 (Klaus on C-TDMA):** 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.
		1. SP2 deferred
5. **PDTs/CRs –**
	1. [25/1177](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1177-04-00bn-cid-resolution-cc50-for-cortwt.docx) CID Resolution CC50 for CoRTWT Giovanni Chisci [24C SP]
		1. Author walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* Some editorial issues pointed out and fixed
			* C: The changes on the page 28, first paragraph: what is the expected behavior of the AP that responds to the CoRTWT requeting AP in MAPC negotiation?
			* A: Just giving a chance to fix it. It is about saying that using MAPC there can be a counter proposal
			* C: The changes on page 28, can you remove this part as we did not have agreement?
			* A: This is for spec completion and there is nothing wrong with it
			* C: Last section, the exceptional cases, is it “and” or “or”
			* A: There is a suggestion in chat “in either of the following caes”
			* Commenter accepeted
			* Documnt updated to r5
		3. SP Question:•Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 11-25/1177r5 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft:
			* 831, 894, 1438, 1714, 1868, 1909, 1911, 2206, 2210, 2695, 2837, 2838, 3152, 3153, 3154, 3155, 3583, 3584, 3711, 3735, 3752, 3754, 3794, 3813,
			* Strawpoll will be run
		4. Result: 131Y 9N 33A
	2. [25/1214](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1214-03-00bn-mac-pdt-changes-to-p-edca-37-5.docx) mac-pdt-changes-to-p-edca-37.5 Dmitry Akhmetov [1C SP]
		1. Author walked through the changes
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Clause 9, page 4, why is the value of 0 reserved?
			* A: Since value 0 does not make much sense
			* Asking for deferral in the last paragraph above Note 2. Response was that these changes were in the previous revision
			* C: Under figure 9-aa2, there is a typo
			* C: Are CWmin and CWmax same?
			* A: Yes, for AC\_VO, the expectation is that they are same but we still have to account for them different and initialize CWmin
			* Describes the mechanism
			* C: Uses 6 Mbps, but in higher density we can have higher MCS and would like to increase it
			* A: Yes, that can be accommodated through a new contribution
			* C: The enablement is different. The enabling should carry the related parameters
			* There are editorial comments in chat window and the contributor will consider them and come back with an updated version
	3. [25/1164](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1164-01-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-for-dso-cc50.docx) PDT CR MAC for DSO CC50 Morteza Mehrnoush [3C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the changes
		2. Discussion:
			* C: procedure is too complex and does not provide much improvement
			* A: What is the complexity here
			* Back and forth discussion on the complexity
			* C: Complexity from the third frame
			* C: This negotiation process that you defined is quite complex and can be simplified and both AP and STAs can indicate what they support and on page 5 says that there is a default 80 MHz subband. But there should be no reason that there should be a default as the end result would be each of the STAs will go to default subband
			* A: The default channel can be updated at any time. IF the AP allocates, the STA may reject
			* C: What would be the point of allocation then?
			* C: Bunch of editorial changes, emailed to reflector
			* C: some more editorial suggestions
			* C: You say a 320 MHz, there are 80 MHz DSO channels. If the 40 MHz is punctured, is it still a DSO channel?
			* A: Yes, but if full 80 MHz channel is punctured, then it can be used
			* C: Need to clarify these things
			* C: there can be multiple 20 MHz DSO bands
			* A: There was discussion on the reflector
			* Chair asks the commenter to take it offline
			* C: On 20 MHz DSO, there is only one otpion on the 20 MHz secondary channel. And we want this to be changed as the current is unacceptable
			* Move the rest of the discussion offline
	4. [25/1165](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1165-02-00bn-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11bn-d0-1-cc50.docx) Resolutions for some comments on 11bn/D0.1 (CC50) Mark RISON [4C]
		1. Contributor walked through the changes
		2. Discussion:
			* C: If there are a large number of BSS in one Home Depot then how does it work for this when another Home Depot with a large number of BSS
			* A; Concern is addressed in clause 37.xxx
			* C: Does Bounded ESS essentially mean all the APs are known?
			* A: Yes
			* C: Why not use the channel report in RNR or NR
			* A: The report will be huge and it is more efficient to go this way
			* C: Need more discussion on Assured BSS in terms of AP requirements, can we have an offline
			* A: yes
			* C: There are so many fields on scanning it is not clear what the procedure is
			* C: This information is available. It would be good to identify the gaps with the current specification
			* A: Refer to document 863, slide 5 which answers your question. It is more efficient
	5. [25/1159](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1159-00-00bn-cc50-cr-for-cids-2820-and-2821-npca-operation.docx) CC50 CR for CIDs 2820 and 2821 - NPCA operation Serhat Erkucuk [2C]
		1. Contributor walked through the changes
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Lack of synch between OBSS AP and the AP is an issue. If you have spatial reuse, why use NPCA at all? If the channel is somehow not be used, why not just move to another channel and ue DSO?
			* A: Spatial use can be used as an option, but this is for short duration to the candidate AP to switch. That would also help synchronizing the different view problem. For DSO, the AP would want to have its own channel before using NPCA
			* C: How often is the spatial reuse possible? Do you have any simulations?
			* A: No, we don’t. It would be scenario specific
6. Session adjourned at 01:30 PM CET

# Wednesday July 30, 2025, AM1

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 09:00 CET.
	1. The chair introduced himself and the secretary
2. Chair’s reminder on meeting and patent policies.
	1. The chair reminded attendees to register for the July 2025 meeting
	2. The chair reminded attendees of the patent polices.
	3. The chair called for essential patents, and none was indicated.
	4. The chair reminded attendees that participation is on an individual basis.
	5. The chair reminded attendees of IEEE meeting and copy right policies.
	6. Chair’s reminder on recording attendance through IMAT
3. The agenda is 11-25/1064r6.
	1. The chair reviews agenda
	2. The agenda is approved with unanimous consent
4. **Straw Polls**
	1. **SP1 (Guogang on Roaming) [**11-23/1898，11-24/1746]**:**
		1. Do you support to signal the SMD type (i.e. separate MAC SAP per AP MLD of the SMD, or one MAP SAP for the SMD) within the SMD Information element by using one bit?
		2. SP has been walked through
		3. Discussion:
			* The rationale is for the STA to initiated, but this is not the case
			* A: if the DS changes, the non-AP MLD cannot find the current AP MLD for context transfer
			* C: There are some scenarios that the STA may benefit, but it should be kept transparent to the client and would like to have more discussion
			* A: We cannot make it transparent and would like to run the SP
			* C: Similar question, there are many things that need to be enable/disabe and if we go this way, not sure. If we need something like this, we can generalize it
			* C: It would be good to have an itemized list of the impacts of these bits (which new behaviors are allowed under one or the other architecture) would help evaluating the SP.
			* SP will be run
			* Author suggests the following text: For the seperate MAC SAP per AP MLD of the SMD, the non-AP MLD shall stop the UL data transmission if it initiates the ST execution
		4. **Modified SP text:** Do you support to signal the SMD type (i.e. separate MAC SAP per AP MLD of the SMD, or one MAP SAP for the SMD) within the SMD Information element by using one bit?
			* For the seperate MAC SAP per AP MLD of the SMD, the non-AP MLD shall stop the UL data transmission if it initiates the ST execution
		5. Result: 91Y, 38N, 75A
		6. Recorded vote in the spreadsheet in section 7 below
	2. **SP2 (Guogang on Active Scanning) [**11-23/1898，11-24/1746]**:**
		1. Do you support to define new protected Action frames to retrieve probe response content for neighboring AP MLD(s) of the current AP MLD, through the current AP MLD?
			* The info on the link on which the mentioned frames are exchanged is not included.
			* RNR includes the info on each AP affiliated with the target AP MLD.
		2. SP has been walked through
		3. Discussion:
			* C: C: I don’t undersand why RNR is needed
			* A: We should use the usual inheritance rule
			* C: I also think there should be other ways than probe request. We have neighbor report and there are others that can be solicited
			* A; What would you see as change?
			* C: If you can change RNR to other information elements
			* A: What about the inheritance rules?
			* C: We can discuss them but that is a further optimization
			* C: Similar opinion as the previous commenter. Current ML probe request is the correct way
			* C: We should look at using ML Probe Request frame. There is already a protocol defined which can be used for neighboring AP. There are no compatibility or other concerns. There are also some action frames that are always used and we can use them as well.
			* A: But we can use broadcast frames
			* C: The implication if we have a new protected action frame then the assumption is that they have shared keys already, so why can’t we just use protected probe request and responses?
			* A: Because if this is optional and if probe request is sent in a protected manner, then there may be issues
			* C: For broadcast frames they have integrity protected
			* SP being run
		4. **Result:** 62Y, 52N, 79A
		5. Recorded vote in the spreadsheet in section 7 below
	3. SP3 (Gaius on CRTWT) [24/1457r0, 25/0289r2, 25/0276r0]:
		1. 11bn shall define a mechanism that enables an AP to solicit a peer AP to share the TXOPs in the SPs of an R-TWT schedule of the peer AP.
			* The solicitation uses the MAPC agreement negotiation procedure
			* The solicitation is included in a response to a request for protection of that R-TWT schedule
			* The peer AP indicates in the request for protection if the solicitation will be accepted
			* Sharing the TXOP is based on the Co-TDMA procedure
			* The request for protection can indicate which type(s) of sharing will be accepted if sent in the solicitation
			* The type of sharing is one or more of:
				1. For the TXOPs of the R-TWT schedule that overlap the start time of any R-TWT SP of the AP that the peer AP protects, the peer AP shall poll the AP and, if requested to, shall share a portion of the TXOP with the AP and may elect not to end its TXOP before the start time of the overlapped R-TWT SP
				2. For the TXOPs of the R-TWT schedule, the peer AP shall poll the AP and, if requested to, shall share a portion of the TXOP with the AP
		2. SP has been walked through
		3. Discussion:
			* C: The direction looks good. One clarification question is if there will be renegotiation to have this
			* A: Yes
			* C: May want to make sure to avoid that soon after the request jumping back and using this
			* A: Yes
			* C: See this proposal in line with the current mechanism
			* C: We need to solve this situation but I think the last two bullets are too detailed and may be removed for now
			* Recorded strawpoll requested
		4. **Result:** 49 Y, 33N, 87A
		5. Recorded vote in the spreadsheet in section 7 below
5. **PDT/CRs**
	1. 25/1049 PDT MAC MAPC PASN part 1 Jay Yang [4C SP]
		1. Contributor walks through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* Pointed out the conventions that need to be followed
			* Suggestion from the floor that editorials can be fixed through comments
			* Author wishes to run the straw poll
			* C: Page 15, what does the security-profile-subelement-format, is it a wrapper?
			* Author points to MAPC Security Info
			* C: This is carried in which frame?
			* A: It is in the MAPC Discovery response frame
			* C: Is this discovery or PASN negotiation? You need three frame exchanges for authentication and here you have ony two exchanges and you say that the frame includes authentication frame. Can we discuss this part offline?
			* A: It is on page 18 indicating three MAPC authentication frame
			* C: You have the authentication frame body in the Security profile
			* A: No
			* C: Need more time to review even though the direction itself is fine
			* C: In 12.xx1, you have “should” instead of “shall”. Is that correct, a requirement or a recommendation
			* A: It is a requirement
			* C: It should be a shall
			* SP will be modified to indicated that the agreement is on principle and subject to edits
		3. **SP:** Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 11-25/1049r6 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft: 151, 1386, 3796, 3797
		4. A member requests for count
		5. **Result:** 97Y, 9N, 61A
		6. Recorded vote in the spreadsheet in section 7 below
	2. Changed agenda to skip 25/0907 as the presenter for 25/0907 is not present at the meeting
	3. 25/0880 PDT MAC on L4S Binita Gupta [PDT SP]
		1. Member walked through the document
		2. Discussion
			* C: There appears to be a TBD – replaced with 1023 octets
			* Other editorial suggestions to be made
			* DCN should be added to the resolution box
		3. **SP:** Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 11-25/880r6 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft: 3949 70
		4. **No objection**
	4. 25/0907 CC50 CR for clause 9.4.2.aa1 Ming Gan [2C SP]
		1. Deferred
	5. 25/1082 PDT-MAC-Co-TDMA-CR-CC50-Part-3 Sanket Kalamkar [116C SP]
		1. Deferred
	6. 25/1160 CC50 CR for CIDs 2822 and 2823 - NPCA operation Serhat Erkucuk [2C]
		1. Member walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: In the first paragraph, do you mean disabling EDCA?
			* A: Yes, for a time period
			* C: Say that instead of the current wording
			* C: Make it clear say that there are two times
			* A: Will do
			* C: What does it mean the channel is being available?
			* A: It means that the sensing is done etc
			* C: Are you suggesting that this is an additional mode of operaetion for NPCA or something else?
			* C: How likely that this situation is going to happen? Will it be a dominant situation?
			* A: This may happen if the AP cannot obtain channel access the AP may alow STA to communicate with AP
			* C: On the second item, when does this happen?
			* A: At some point in time, the AP may decide that it may update the timer so that delivery for some is getting too late
			* C: This proposal may cause the STA to lose medium synchronization of the primary channel and think the proposal needs further improvement
			* A: STA behavior can be updated to make sure it stays synchronized. There could be some options that can be discussed
			* C: The first part falls into the operation mode
			* A: True, but what is done here is you find a time period, have the maximum duration is unannounced
			* C: Is this for specific STAs or all STAs?
			* A; Proposal can be for a specific STA or all STAs
6. Session recesed at 11:00 PM
7. Recorded votes for the SPs are in 

# Wednesday July 30, 2025, AM2

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 09:00 CET.
	1. The chair introduced himself and the secretary
2. Chair’s reminder on meeting and patent policies.
	1. The chair reminded attendees to register for the July 2025 meeting
	2. The chair reminded attendees of the patent polices.
	3. The chair called for essential patents, and none was indicated.
	4. The chair reminded attendees that participation is on an individual basis.
	5. The chair reminded attendees of IEEE meeting and copy right policies.
	6. Chair’s reminder on recording attendance through IMAT
3. The agenda is 11-25/1064r8
	1. The chair reviews agenda
	2. The agenda is approved with unanimous consent
4. **PDTs/CRs**
	1. [25/0936](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0936-15-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-npca-cc50.docx) PDT CR MAC NPCA CC50 Matthew Fischer [117C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: If MU EDCA Timer is set to 0, then STAs will not be able to initiate on their own?
			* A: Yes
			* SP has been run
		3. SP: Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 25/936r15 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft:
* 171 176 421 422 453 454 455 543 544 545 546 547 548 786 787 833 836 837 885 903 1052 1053 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1063 1210 1211 1214 1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1227 1236 1505 1509 1510 1511 1512 1513 1514 1515 1554 1580 1722 1741 1795 1808 1809 1820 1825 1855 1877 1878 1882 1890 1891 2076 2138 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2358 2359 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2401 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2649 2678 2679 2680 2688 3037 3038 3039 3040 3043 3044 3045 3046 3047 3048 3049 3050 3051 3052 3053 3054 3055 3056 3139 3142 3188 3389 3390 3409 3411 3412 3413 3414 3415 3416 3417 3421 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 3593 3594 3596 3597 3712 3714
	+ 1. No objection
	1. [25/1082](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1082-02-00bn-pdt-mac-co-tdma-cr-cc50-part-3.docx) PDT-MAC-Co-TDMA-CR-CC50-Part-3 Sanket Kalamkar [116C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			+ C: Suggest putting BSS color information
			+ C: Suggest deferring this part when ICF is at higher bandwidth and ICR at lower banwidth
			+ Some discussion on different bandwidths between sharing and shared AP
			+ C: The note on page 59 is not needed
			+ C: The behavior of CTS is baseline and does not need to be mentioned
			+ A: It is there to bring clarity but open to remove it
			+ C: Max TXOP Allocation Under Consideration, the units have better granularity and better to indicate as unsigned
			+ C: Deletion of traffic info control field doesn’t appeartro be in the right direction and likely regressing
			+ A: The advice from others to reconsider it
			+ C: Page 53, TXOP Return Support – is it first time else give a forward return?
			+ C: Editorial suggestions
			+ C: Why is it called UHR bandwidth, different from BSS bandwidth?
			+ A: Deleted UHR
			+ Page 56, change “is” to “may”
			+ Rest of the comments be sent over the reflector
	2. Change the agenda to skip 25/1140 and 25/1130 as the presenter is not responding
	3. [25/1164](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1164-03-00bn-pdt-cr-mac-for-dso-cc50.docx) PDT CR MAC for DSO CC50 Morteza Mehrnoush [PDT SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			+ C: Suggest changing “offered” to “one or more offered” to reduce rejection from the non-AP STA
			+ A: The non-AP STA should evaluate the downside of rejecting and make a choice. Most of the time it may not be an issue. Members feedback is that it would be complex
			+ C: Editorial changes suggested
			+ C: Why is there one option for 20 MHz STA when you have multiple options for 80 MHz?
			+ A: Based on member’s opinion, this appears to be most feasible
			+ C: Is non-AP MLD going to change its DSO subband using OM when it has already enabled DSO with a first DSO subband and what is the behavior?
			+ A: Not discussed here and we can have further discussion in the future
			+ C: Speaks in favor
			+ Straw poll is being run
		3. **Result:** 135Y, 51N, 59A
		4. Recorded vote in the spreadsheet in section 7 below
	4. [25/1009](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1009-03-00bn-d0-1-cid1751-cr.docx) D0.1 CID1751 CR Michail Koundourakis [1C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			+ C: Does one bit or more matter since either action needs to be taken or not. So, I am not sure why we need this the extra indication?
			+ A: 1-bit is not enough. But more feedback would allow the AP make a better decision
			+ C: How does that happen?
			+ A: If you look at the figures the AP cannot distinguish between channel and oexistence errors where as with more information, it allows the AP to see the channel and in-device errors and it doesn’t have to make binary decisions
			+ C: But a STA may look at both of them and can make its own decision and don’t see the need
			+ C: We can have all sorts of optimizations at some point we need to come up with answers. Adding to it may also bring more support. We can go with 1-bit support for this week and if we find if adding more information helps
			+ A: We did run SPs for both back-to-back and neither of them got enough support. The group has not gone one way or another
			+ C: This proposal does not preclude anything. You can still use partial feedback or full feedback
			+ C: 1-bit is good enough
		3. **Result: 51Y, 78N, 86A**
		4. Recorded vote in the spreadsheet in section 7 below
	5. [25/1214](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1214-04-00bn-mac-pdt-changes-to-p-edca-37-5.docx) mac-pdt-changes-to-p-edca-37.5 Dmitry Akhmetov [PDT SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			+ C: Only one change
			+ A: yes
			+ C: Comments on 0 is reserved. The AP must make decision and it should not be reserved
			+ A: Why is this required?
			+ C: If the STA sends DS as RTS, if the CTS-timeout happes then the duration will reduce to DIFS and not fair to other high priority traffic
			+ Good amount of back and forth discussion
			+ Straw poll being run
			+ **SP Text:** Do you support to incorporate both the CR in 11-25/1214r5 for CID 214 and the text changes in 11-25/1214r5 into the next TGbn draft?
		3. **Result: 121Y, 21N, 70A**
1. **Recessed at 1:30 PM CET**
2. Recorded votes for the SPs are in 

# Thursday July 31, 2025, AM1

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 09:00 CET.
	1. The chair introduced himself and the secretary
2. Chair’s reminder on meeting and patent policies.
	1. The chair reminded attendees to register for the July 2025 meeting
	2. The chair reminded attendees of the patent polices.
	3. The chair called for essential patents, and none was indicated.
	4. The chair reminded attendees that participation is on an individual basis.
	5. The chair reminded attendees of IEEE meeting and copy right policies.
	6. Chair’s reminder on recording attendance through IMAT
3. The agenda is 11-25/1064r11.
	1. The chair reviews agenda
	2. Document 25/1165r3 added to the agenda
	3. Document 25/753r5 has been deferred
	4. Document 25/639 will be deferred for an hour in the session
	5. The agenda is approved with unanimous consent
4. **PDTs/CRs –**
	1. [25/0639](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0639-04-00bn-cc50-cr-for-cids-related-to-ap-id-assignment.docx) CC50 CR for CIDs related to AP ID assignment Chun Huang [8C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Is there a normative behavior or text?
			* A: We do not want any normative behavior text
			* C: But this is behavior, so we have to think about it
			* C: it does make sense
			* A: Talk it offline
			* Editorial comments suggested and incorporated
			* Straw Poll will be run
		3. SP text: Do you support to incorporate the resolutions in 11-25/639r5 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft: 481, 818, 2452, 1862, 1423, 1424, 3255, 3844.
		4. Result: No objection
	2. [25/0993](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0993-01-00bn-cc50-cr-for-cids-1437-1906-1907-1908-overlapping-quiet-interval-for-co-rtwt.docx) CC50 CR for CIDs 1437, 1906, 1907, 1908 - Overlapping Quiet Interval for Co-RTWT Sung Hyeonjun [4C SP]
		1. Only editorial changes
		2. Discussion:
		3. C: There is not much ues for these Quiet elements and would not be able to support
		4. SP being run
		5. **SP Text:** Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 11-25/993r2 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft: 1437, 1906, 1907, 1908
		6. **Result:** 24Y, 63N, 60A
	3. [25/1082](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1082-06-00bn-pdt-mac-co-tdma-cr-cc50-part-3.docx) PDT-MAC-Co-TDMA-CR-CC50-Part Sanket Kalamkar [116C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Any change in the TXS part?
			* A: No
			* C: Change the document number in the resolutions
			* A: Accepted and upload a revision to the document
			* SP being run
		3. **SP Text Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 11-25/1082r7 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft: 70, 93, 158, 201, 220, 417, 418, 438, 667, 673, 675, 677, 686, 689, 690, 693, 694, 695, 700, 715, 737, 764, 765, 779, 820, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 867, 986, 987, 988, 990, 1028, 1030, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1380, 1390, 1391, 1432, 1433, 1434, 1487, 1528, 1529, 1539, 1540, 1543, 1699, 1701, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1711, 1712, 1713, 1731, 1864, 1866, 1892, 1987, 1988, 2208, 2209, 2447, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2465, 2516, 2517, 2640, 2673, 2698, 2791, 2792, 2818, 2819, 3156, 3158, 3171, 3172, 3173, 3174, 3333, 3335, 3337, 3385, 3431, 3441, 3442, 3601, 3602, 3603, 3605, 3749, 3785, 3786, 3787, 3791, 3792, 3793, 3816, 3841, 3842, 3876, 3881, 3883.**
		4. **Result: No objection**
	4. 25/1165r3 Resolutions for some comments on 11bn/D0.1 (CC50) Mark Rison [4C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Editorial suggestions in the chat window
			* C: In the BTM section, the text doesn’t accommodate clients that do not follow the BSS Termination Included field
			* Changes made to accommodate the comment
			* C: We don’t have requirements for STAs to show that and it may not work without it
			* A: The AP will give a gentle request and if not accommodated the STA will terminate
			* C: Add requirement that if the STA does not follow the BTM request?
			* A: Contributor will work on the replacement of the text
			* C: a member wanted to know if updates were made based on his comments, posts them in the chat window
			* C: good direction and few more clarifications are required for AP. Suggest deferral
			* C; The new note reads like what it is above
			* A: The note is a warning to the STAs on the repurcussions if they do not take the action
			* C: Would like to keep the Note
			* Two members recommended keeping the note and two recommended deleting the note
			* Whether the note should be kept is being polled with the members. SP is only limited to the note
		3. SP Text: Do you want a "NOTE—If a non-AP MLD does not follow the BTM request, the AP MLD might send a BSS Transition Management Request frame with the Disassociation Imminent field set to 1 to that non-AP MLD. “ in document 11-25/1165?
		4. Result: 20% Yes, 34% No
		5. Need clarification
		6. Requests strawpoll to understand the level of support. A recorded poll is requested
		7. Proposed SP Text: Are you happy with 25/1165 subject to further discussions on the BTM Assurance part?
		8. **Result: 70Y, 33N, 77A**
	5. 25/1163r2 CR for 2446 Klaus Doppler [1C SP]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Speaks against this parameter. It is not necessary as it will not be helpful to the sharing APs, adds complexity without clear benefits
			* C; It may be complicated to add, but with a new generation there will be new things and this one is easier than most. The main concern is that this does not go far enough and having BSR is better.
			* C: The timing information may not be available in time and it may not be relevant anymore and the information is redundant and there is no guarantee that this would result in what is expected
			* A: There is space for this information and if it is 0, it may be undefined if only one AP is to be shared with
			* C: The requested information is not enough. If there is a request from multiple APs, this feedback can be used to prioritize. In general, this is necessary
			* C: Can you clarify the requirement on the bandwidth? There are several requests for information and would be good to study
			* A Wwill add a note with clarification that bandwidth will be same as ICF
	6. [25/1080](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1080-02-00bn-cc50-switching-back-condition-for-npca-operation.docx) CC50: Switching back condition for NPCA operation (Dongju Cha, LGE)
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* None
		3. **SP Text:** Do you support to incorporate the CRs in 11-25/1080r3 for the following CIDs into the next TGbn draft: 251, 1516, 3956
		4. **No objection**
	7. [25/1134](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1134-00-00bn-cr-mac-cc50-cids-in-clause-37-1.docx) CR-MAC-cc50-CIDs\_in\_clause-37.1 George Cherian [1C]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* An editorial suggestion followed up
			* C: Not all features are reflected in this. Perhaps add and come back??
		3. Contributor agreed and will bring back a revision to the contribution
	8. [25/1326](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-1326-00-00bn-cc50-npca-cr-for-cids-1817-1818-1819-1821-1830-1822-1823-1824-1831.docx) CC50 NPCA CR for CIDs 1817, 1818, 1819, 1821, 1830, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1831 Juseong Moon [9C]
		1. Contributor walked through the document
		2. Discussion:
			* C: Several comments; on NAV it should be moved to normative text and not note. Generally needs work before it can be voted in
5. **Recessed at 11:00 AM CET**
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