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1. Minutes

Chair: Prof. Myung Lee (CUNY), USA.

Secretary: Marco Hernandez (NICT), Japan.

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

Wednesday February 17th, 7:00 AM EST.

Participants: Prof. Lee, Marco, HB Li, Igor, BJ, SS Joo.

─Chair calls the teleconference meeting to order.

**Chair:** The agenda for this teleconference is to check the progress status. We have 2 contributions by Marco.

**Marco:** The 1st one is a PDF screenshot of the text in the Operations Manual regarding the use of shall, should, may, can, suggested by Prof. Lee. It is a very simple sentence, I think BJ can copy and paste easily.

**Chair:** That is ok for me.

**BJ:** I agree. I will take this sentence for the new Draft update. Question: the words shall, should, etc. shall be in quotation marks?

**Marco:** The Operations Manual does not place them with quotation marks.

**Chair:** Yes, I think without quotation marks are fine.

**Marco:** The 2nd is the document circulated by email for discussion of IFS.

Basically, we have 2 different definitions of IFS:

Clause 5.1.1.3 "Interframe spacing" p. 15 (based on 802.15.4)

Clause 5.6.1.3 "IFS for CAP" pp.63-64 (based on 802.11)

Clauses with specific reference and notation to IFS are:

5.6.1.4 "Basic access" p. 64 (based on 802.11)

5.6.1.6 "Access with RTS/CTS" p. 66 (based on 802.11)

7.2 Minimum LIFS and SIFS periods p. 125 (based on 802.15.4)

Even IFS is a general concept, the way 802.11 and 802.15.4 described it is different, because of the differences in the protocols. We need to choose one of them. I propose:

1) Merge 5.1.1.3 and 5.6.1.3 into one clause under the name "IFS" (attached document)

Because the contention access scheme in the TG8 Draft is based on physical/virtual carrier sense of 802.11,

I suggest sticking to the description/notation of 802.11 rather than 802.15.4.

2) Delete 7.2. The different timings of IFS would be described in the merged clause.

In the Word document, I included the changes of Prof. Lee suggested.

**Chair:** I agree with your proposal.

**BJ:** Also, I agree with you.

**Marco:** Let's check the text. In page 2, I indicated the need to define a couple of PHY service primitives for the definitions of IFSs. I can present those next time.

**Chair:** Ok.

**Marco:** For the name of MIFS, I thought of minimum of mean, as it will be used for both CAP and CFP.

**Chair:** I think minimum is more correct.

**BJ:** What happened with t\_ack?

**Marco:** I did not delete it. I put it in Equation 1. The MACProcessingDelay depends on the channel access. If the channel access is in CFP and there is an immediate ACK, the MACProcessingDelay is t\_ack. This is how I figured out the merging of IFS based on 802.11 and 802.15.4. In 802.11, its SIFS does not depend on the packet size. SIFS is a fixed value, and it was designed to cope with the largest packet size. In contrast, in 802.15.4, its SIFS depends on the packet size. If the packet size is less or equal to aMaxSIFSFrameSize, the IFS is called SIFS; otherwise LIFS. Additionally, if the packet is an immediate ACK frame, the IFS is t\_ack. In this way, we have merged both ideas based on the channel access.

**Marco:** As for the values of Table 2, I took the values suggested in 802.11-2012. BJ, is that fine with you?

**BJ:** I fully agree.

**Marco:** FYI, in the latest revision of 802.11-2016 now in sponsor ballot, the values are implementation dependent. However, I am fine with the values of 802.11-2012. I think that is all.

**Chair:** Is the value of t\_ack same as MIFS? If they are same, can you replace t\_ack with MIFS?

**Marco:** Yes, they are the same and I will replace t\_ack with MIFS.

**Chair:** Ok, let's vote.

Marco moves a motion to approve the document with the clause for IFS.

Second: BJ.

**Chair:** objection? Then, the approval is unanimous.

**Chair:** I think, next time we can revise the TBDs progress.

**Chair:** Any other comment? Hearing none, the teleconference is adjourned.