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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11 Random and Changing MAC Addresses (RCM) Study Group (SG) teleconference held on August 4th, at 10:00 hrs EDT.

# Tuesday August 4th 2020, 10:00 hrs EDT:

**Chair:** Carol Ansley, Self

**1. The teleconference was called to order by Chair 10:16 hrs. EDT**

Amelia Andersdotter (Self) volunteered to be acting secretary.

Agenda slide deck (11-20/995r2):

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0995-02-0rcm-rcm-sg-agenda.pptx>

**2. The Chair reminded everyone to sign attendance.**

See attendance list at the bottom of this document.

**3. Policies and procedures were presented by the Chair.**

**4. Minutes review and approval:**

The minutes from the last teleconference (July 20th 2020) were mentioned by the chair. They will approved at a future RCM SG call when motions are appropriate.

**5. Approval of the Agenda:**

The Chair reviewed the agenda. The proposed agenda was approved without objection.

## 6. Presentations/discussion:

Yellow highlighting indicates actions

Green highlighting indicates straw poll particulars that clarify outcome of meeting

**6.1 RCM SG PAR (11-20-742r2)**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0742-02-0rcm-proposed-par-draft.docx>

(Note that r3 was created during the meeting)

Revisiting the PAR proposal which was discussed in 11 May 2020 teleconference, with changes incorporated as per discussions in that meeting (see meeting minutes in 11-20/766r0 here: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0766-00-0rcm-telecon-minutes-rcm-sg-11-may-2020.docx>)

Question (Q)

Answer (A)

Comment (C)

C: Not only Apple but also Android will be introducing MAC randomization features, at least for developers, so we should not be too quick to jump to conclusions about what MAC randomization will mean in situations like session continuity until we know more about the specific implementations in August and September.

Q: In the last line of section 5.2.b Scope first paragraph it says “without decreasing user privacy”, but maybe this can be given further qualification by introducing language on confidentiality and integrity of the substitutive mechanisms?

A: We already discussed this in the May meeting and it was agreed then that such a high level of specificity could create confusion. For instance, confidentiality would bring in questions relating to encryption and how would that work with associations and signing, and similar. We could not agree on wording.

A: We also cannot guarantee any particular level of confidentiality.

A: Current ambiguous wording gives more options for us in the future work of the task group when considering how these mechanisms may specifically work. Also, it’s not clear to me now if we are in fact discussing whether to expand beyond the scope of randomized and changing MAC addresses into the broader privacy work that is discussed in the other PAR proposal under consideration by this group. It would be helpful to have clear distinctions between the different PARs and their aims.

Q: Can we have a clarification on how this relates to the other PAR? It seems reasonable with crisp distinctions.

A: The original question was not meant to broaden the scope of this work, but merely to qualify the already existent ambition to incorporate privacy-preserving features of the mechanisms under consideration in section 5.2.b of the PAR draft. Maybe inspiration can be sought in document 11-20/1442r9 section 4.2 on alternative identifiers?

A: In addition to the locational privacy concerns in 1442r9 section 4.2 should we not also add the behavioural tracking concerns from P802E?

C: Discussion on word-smithing around addition to section 5.2.b with results:

Appended into 742r3 section 5.2.b first paragraph: “User privacy concerns include exposure of trackable information to third parties or exposure of an individual's presence or behavior.”

Q: In section 5.2.b there is mentioning of customer support, but it’s not clear that it’s within the remit of IEEE 802 to define mechanisms for customer support only because some network operators have previously been using some 802 features for this purpose.

C: We may not be able to resolve that issue in this study group, but it will have to wait for the task group phase. Currently the PAR tries to follow the outlines of the conclusions of the topic interest group phase that is recorded in 1442r9.

Chair: In this meeting we should at least have a straw-poll to ascertain whether this draft PAR is now moving in the right direction.

[[Two participants had to drop of the call at 11 EDT but declared their intention to vote in favour of 742r3 as amended by highlighted yellow text above]]

Q: Another question is 5.2.b second paragraph first sentence – it is confusing since there is always a unique MAC-to-STA mapping?

A: We discussed before, but unfortunately Mark already left the call. He is capable of explaining the rationale of this wording.

C: I would currently reject this PAR draft in a strawpoll because of this ambiguity. I am sure the intention is to highlight that the mapping may be changing over time, or selected from a pool of mappings, including as described by 802C SLAP. So it is not in fact disruption of the uniqueness of the mapping that is the issue to be designed against here.

C: 802C is not mandatory to implement, and so relying on network operators to use one or the other quadrant will not work. We need more general solutions which are not restricted to a SLAP quadrant.

C: Agreed.

6.1.2 Straw poll: Is the text of 11-20-742r3 acceptable as PAR text for RCM SG?

Results:

Y/N/A/No answer

5/1/3/1

Chair notes that straw poll passes. See above for reference to two participants that declared intention to participate in straw poll as affirmative (Y) voters but that dropped off the call before the actual poll was carried out.

Chair: We have only ten minutes left of the allocated calling time. I propose that we hold off discussions on the CSD document until our next call. Our target then will be a strawpoll on the CSD.

C: It is not likely that ten minutes will be enough for a substantive revisit to the CSD, so agreed.

## 8. Review upcoming Telecon Schedule

The next teleconference will be Monday August 17th 10:00 EDT

## 9. AOB:

No other business was raised.

## 10. Adjourned: 11:30 hrs. EDT

# Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | AKHTAR, NADEEM | Arista Networks, Inc. |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Andersdotter, Amelia | None - Self-funded |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Harkins, Daniel | Aruba Networks, Inc. |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Henry, Jerome | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Huang, Po-Kai | Intel Corporation |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Ji, Chenhe | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Riegel, Maximilian | Nokia |
| (not from mentor) |  | Carol Ansley | Self |
| (not from mentor) |  | Mark Hamilton | Commscope/Ruckus |
| RCM SG | 8/4 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |