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1. Minutes

Chair: H.B. Li (NICT), Japan.

Secretary: Marco Hernandez (NICT), Japan.

===================================================================

Thursday January 7th, 7:00 AM EDT.

Participants: Marco, HB Li, Billy.

─Chair calls the teleconference meeting to order.

**Chair:** The agenda for this teleconference is to check the progress status. We have 1 presentation.

1st presenter is Marco (NICT) DCN 15-988r0 "Motion for teleconference on December 21st"

Comments:

**Marco:** The idea of this contribution is to harmonized the current text in clause 5.7 "MAC command frames" in the Draft Standard v. 0.16.1, and the contribution presented and approved in the last meeting

DCN 15-901r1 "MAC commands". We have reached the point that there are conflicting contributions across the Draft. In particular clause 5.7 is an old contribution by Qing and there are some issues like no command frame during the CFP, re-peering is not defined in clause 6 (MAC services), we decided to repeat peering. De-peering request/response is not contemplated in clause 6 (MAC services), we decided to use de-peering notification, etc. I corrected that according to clause 6 in the harmonized text.

On the other hand, the current text in clause 5.7 is for one-to-one peering command. However, there is no reason to have different clauses for one-to-many peering command and many-to-many peering command, because the payload fields are the same. That is, we need to define one peering command frame with the description of the payload fields: Command ID field and Content field and some relevant MHR fields, except addressing fields. The cases of one-to-one, one-to-many and many-to-many differ by the addressing fields descriptions. That is why I propose to place those addressing cases in clause 5.1 "MAC functional description" rather than in clause 5.7 "MAC command frame".

Also, I introduce more MAC command cases for discovery. So, I think we need more TG8 members for discussion and final approval. I will postpone the discussion for the Atlanta meeting.

**Chair:** That is fine. Billy, do you have a comment?

**Billy:** It is fine with me. I agree in principle with some of Marco's statements, but we need more discussion.

On the other hand, I have been reading the Draft and I found many holes in the MAC section.

**Marco:** We discussed about it last time. I think it is normal as we have engaged in finishing missing MAC clauses. When we finish that part, we can start revising the whole Draft. That is what I have in mind. What do you think?

**Billy:** We need to work through the Draft as we need consistency in the different clauses. Otherwise, we will have problems in the letter ballot. At this stage, it is premature to think in letter ballot in the Atlanta meeting. We need an extension.

**Marco:** We discussed about that before. Bob Heile suggested applying for an extension after letter ballot submission.

**Billy:** I have read some parts in the Draft that are unclear, like the cyclic superframe. How is it used?

Is it group-based configured?

**Chair:** I understand your concern. You may prepare a document with the different holes you have found for discussion in Atlanta. I can prepare a document for the case of many-to-many peering.

**Chair:** I have a question in page 2, we have re-peering somewhere.

**Marco:** In clause 6, we do not have re-peering. We decided to repeat peering. But I think there is a re-peering somewhere in clause 5. We need to revise clauses 5 and 6 to be coherent and avoid conflicts.

**Chair:** We have had Marco and Qing as sub-editors (champions) for PHY and MAC. As Qing left, I would like to propose Billy to lead the discussions for MAC.

**Billy:** Ok, we need the approval of the other members too.

**Chair:** We can discuss that in the Atlanta meeting.

**Chair:** I think we can stop here. The teleconference is adjourned.