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Abstract

This document contains the TGax-mac-ad-hoc meeting minutes from the IEEE 802.11 Vienna.

Rev 0: 16 July 2019

**IEEE 802.11 Task Group ax, MAC Ad hoc**

**July 2019 Meeting, Vienna, Austria.**

**July 14 – 19, 2019**

**Tuesday, July 16, 2019, AM2 TGax MAC Ad Hoc Session (10:30 - 12:30)**

1. **The meeting called to order at 10:30 AM by Osama (Huawei), the chair of 802.11 TGax.**
   1. 58 people are in the room.
2. **Agenda Setting (11-19/1279r2)**
   1. Proposed agenda for Tuesday, July 16 AM2:
      1. Call meeting to order
      2. IEEE-SA IPR policy and Procedure
      3. Submissions and comment resolution
      4. Recess
   2. Chair asked if there is any item to add to the agenda. 🡪 No response.
   3. Chair asked if there is any objection to proceed with this agenda. 🡪 No objection.
      1. The agenda was accepted.
3. **Reminder and Announcement**
   1. Chair reminded that we are still operating under the IEEE-SA P&P.
      1. No body spoke up.
   2. Chair asked people to state name and affiliation when addressing the group for the first time in a session.
   3. Attendance: <https://imat.ieee.org/attendance>
4. **Comment Resolution**
   1. **Kaiying Lu (Mediatek) presented 11-19/** **1163r0-Comment resolution for QTP.**

Mark: CID 20642: It is sufficient to say “An HE STA may ignore the request,” no need to mention the part about accessing the channel…

Kaiying updated the text and the resolution based on Mark’s suggestion.

Mark: CID 21056: What is the difference between QTP non-AP STA and QTP requesting STA, or a QTP AP and a QTP responding AP? The terms should be used consistently.

Kaiying added a definition of a QTP requesting STA at the start of sub-clause 26.17.5.2 (Requesting STA procedure) and changed “QTP non-AP STA” to “QTP requesting STA” in subsequent texts.

Tomoko: Why is NOTE 1 on page 7 deleted, which CID is this based on? How is service specific identifier selected?

Kaiying: Text change for CID 20085 specifies this.

Mark: The text “the service specific identifier is randomly selected …” in NOTE-1 should not be deleted.

Matt: The method to select the service specific identifier is out of the scope of the standard.

Kaiying added the text regarding selection of service specific identifier to the resolution of CID 20085.

Mark: CID 20571: The comment is saying that Vendor Specific element should be allowed in QTP.

Kaiying deferred CID 20571 for offline discussions.

Mark: CID 20963: What is QTR? In addition, the resolution is different from the proposed change to delete duplicate text.

Kaiying changed the resolution for CID 20963 to accepted.

Mark: Is the resolution for CID 20964 revised or accepted?

Kaiying: Kaiying deferred CID 20964 for offline discussions.

Mark: Is the resolution for CID 20967 revised or accepted?

Kaiying changed resolution for CID 20967 to accepted.

Mark: The proposed text in CID 20968 seems to be better.

Kaiying: Kaiying deferred CID 20968 for offline discussions.

Kaiying changed resolution for CID 20483, CID 20484 to accepted.

Mark: Page 7, bullet a, why is the condition of QTP capable deleted?

Kaiying added condition “If responding AP is…”

Mark asked why the AP’s response to QTP request is may and not shall?

Kaiying changed the first sentence in 26.17.5.3 (Responding AP procedure) to “…QTP responding AP ~~may~~shall operate..”

**Strawpoll:** 19/963r1 (except 20571, 20964, 20968) approved with unanimous consent.

**Note:** editorial changes are pending

* 1. **Jarkko Kneckt (Apple) presented 11-19/696r6-OMI Comment Resolutions.**

Jarkko changed text for CID 20716 based on Mark’s suggestion.

Yongho: CID 20716: Do we need the text “Response to other Trigger frame variants are not suspended”, the previous two sentence already seem to cover this. Are management frames also suspended?

Ran out of time.

**No Strawpoll.**

1. **Recess**
   1. The meeting recessed at 12:30 pm.

**Tuesday, July 16, 2019, PM1 TGax MAC Ad Hoc Session (13:30 - 15:30)**

1. **The meeting called to order at 1:30 PM by Osama (Huawei), the chair of 802.11 TGax.**
   1. 28 people are in the room.
2. **Agenda Setting (11-19/1279r2)**
   1. Proposed agenda for Tuesday, July 16 PM1:
      1. Call meeting to order
      2. IEEE-SA IPR policy and Procedure
      3. Submissions and comment resolution
      4. Recess
   2. Chair asked if there is any item to add to the agenda. 🡪 No response.
   3. Chair asked if there is any objection to proceed with this agenda. 🡪 No objection.
      1. The agenda was accepted.
3. **Reminder and Announcement**
   1. Chair reminded that we are still operating under the IEEE-SA P&P.
      1. No body spoke up.
   2. Chair asked people to state name and affiliation when addressing the group for the first time in a session.
   3. Attendance: <https://imat.ieee.org/attendance>
4. **Comment Resolution**
   1. **Jarkko Kneckt (Apple) presented 11-19/696r7-OMI Comment Resolutions.**

This is continuation from AM2.

Alfred: status should also be added to a table. For CID 21618, suggestion: “ … AP ~~should~~shall not transmit trigger frame…”

Laurent prefers it to be left as should.

No changes made to the text.

Liwen had some comment on the new text in 9.2.4.6a (OM Control): response should not be limited to Basic Trigger frame.

Jarkko also added “or frame with TRC Control subfield” based on Alfred’s suggestion.

Jarkko modified text for CID 21618 and removed the conditions in sub-bullets based on Alfred’s suggestion.

CID 21618 is deferred for offline discussion.

**Strawpoll:** 19/696r8 (except CIDs 20788, 21618)approved with unanimous consent.

* 1. **Liwen Chu (Marvell) presented 11-19/748r0-11ax D4.0 Comment Resolution 26.2.8.**

Yongho: The new text is not clear; does this cover the case when the TXOP is protected by RTS/CTS transmitted in non-HT PPDU?

Liwen: No. That case is covered by baseline.

Alfred, Hui Zhao also suggested to change the wording to make the text clearer.

Liwen modified the text based on suggestions from Alfred and Yongho and added exception for the case when non-HT PPDU is included in the TXOP.

Liwen will work offline with Alfred to further improve the text.

**No Strawpoll.**

* 1. **Liwen Chu (Marvell) presented 11-19/734r2-D4.0 Comment Resolution 9.7.3.**

CID 21610: Zhou Lan: Baseline is different from 11ax behavior, so the rejection reason is not correct.

Liwen: Several alternative mechanisms exist.

Liwen updated the rejection reason.

**Strawpoll:** 19/734r3 approved with unanimous consent.

* 1. **Liwen Chu (Marvell) presented 11-19/737r2-11ax D4.0 comment-resolution 9.2.4.6, 9.4.2.242.2.**

**No Strawpoll.**

* 1. **Liwen Chu (Marvell) presented 11-19/735r6-11ax D4.0 Comment Resolution 10.24.**

Liwen revised the text for CID 20654 based on Yongho and Alfred’s suggestion: deleted “…any AC..”

**Strawpoll:** 19/735r7 approved with unanimous consent.

* 1. **Yongho Seok (MediaTek) presented 11-19/1138r0-lb238-cr-subclause-26-13.**

Alfred: the RU in the text “..within an RU..” should be bandwidth?

Yongho will update the text based on Alfred’s suggestion.

**Strawpoll:** 19/1138r1 approved with unanimous consent.

* 1. **Yongho Seok (MediaTek) presented 11-19/1139r0-lb238-cr-subclause-26-17-4.**

**Strawpoll:** 19/1139r1 (3 CIDs) approved with unanimous consent.

1. **Adjourned**
   1. The MAC ad-hoc is adjourned at 3:26 pm.