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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11bh telecom meeting March 29, 2022.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer

C- proceeds a comment

**Meeting March 29, 2022 9.00 to 11.00 ET**

**Chair: Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/CommScope)**

**Vice Chair: Peter Yee (NSA-CSD/AKAYLA)**

**Vice Chair: Stephen Orr (Cisco)**

**Secretary: Graham Smith (SRT Wireless)**

**Editor: Carol Ansley (Cox)**

**The teleconference was called to order by Chair 9.03 hrs. EDT,**

Agenda slide deck 11-22/0539r0

1. **Policies and procedures were presented by the chair. (Slides 4 to 14)**

There were no Patent declarations.

Copyright policy slides were presented (Slides 10 and 11)

1. **Agenda:**

* Attendance, noises/recording, meeting protocol reminders
* Policies, duty to inform, participation rules
* Organization topics (see Backup slides)
* Issues Tracking: [11-21/0332r30](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0332-30-00bh-issues-tracking.docx)
* Contributions:
  + [11-21/0332r33](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0332-33-00bh-issues-tracking.docx): Issues tracking update proposal (Jay Yang)
* Way forward toward Draft / Timeline review
* Review of Issues Tracking uncovered items (margin comments, etc.) [11-22/0435r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0435-00-00bh-open-issues-from-issues-tracking.pptx)
* WBA liaison response
* Next meetings:
  + April 7, 19:00 ET, April 12, 9:00 ET, April 22, 19:00 ET

Any comments? None

Any objections to agenda? - None

Agenda accepted.

Chair drew the groups attention to the backup slides, the PAR Scope (slide 19) and timeline (slide 20)

Chair noted that the timeline is off track

1. **Issues Tracking document**

Now Rev 30 is latest “approved” version posted.

1. **Contribution**

[11-21/0332r33](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0332-33-00bh-issues-tracking.docx): Issues tracking update proposal (presented by Jay Yang).

Changes to 4.2

No comments

Changes to 4.27, Notes added.

No comments

Chair asked for a quick review of all the changes introduced.

4.2 updated and new 4.27 added as new Use Case.

C – What is Note 2 in 4.27 about that says contributions may be introduced. Have no idea what this is talking about. To which document would this contribution be directed to?

Discussion on Note 2 in 4.27

“Note2: Further database set up guidance for legislation concern may be introduced in a contribution”

A – Was inserted at request of a member but not aware of details

C – Would suggest that this is removed.

C – There are no comments on adding a data base so needed to add something about how to add a database. May have privacy issues? Maybe just an annex? Knowing that information is being stored.

C – This added section is attempting to identify existing issues for RCM so need to document what is currently happening. This is not an existing Use Case.

C – The note ambiguity has been pointed out. We have a database in TV White Space, so Note should be deleted. If we need to manage a regulatory database, that would need to be specified but that should be added to TGbi not TGbh.

C – Propose to remove the Note.

C – What is way ahead on this document?

A – Need to settle on sections 5 and 6.

C – Some of this new stuff seems to be outside scope. How something is broken and how we fix it is what I am looking for.

A – The new additions note that some apps use a database looking at devices to check that they have permissions, and these are broken.

C – How is this different from the other cases? All cases have a MAC address stored in some way, so why is 4.27 different?

A – Different control of the APs, saving power and using probe request frames.

C – Then that needs to be clarified.

Presenter made changes on screen. Title changed to “STA Identification based on probe request frames”

C – Use cases seem to be repeating themselves. How is this different from 4.8 and 4.9 and even 4.10?

A – The set-up of the AP. Details and probing is different.

C – Concerned that we have 27 Use Cases with no focus on what we are trying to solve. No real organization

C – Clauses 5 and 6 are trying to do that.

C – Maybe merge 4.27 into 4.10?

C – 4.9 and 4.10 have sentences on “what if?” - “what about?” Etc. Not sure how much effort we should spend on these, or even on the document itself now.

C – There are certainly use cases that have been broken and do not want to add new use case and agree how much time should we spend on this document, which is not our draft. Let’s be done with it.

C – Agree do not want to spend too much time on all this. Could merge new 4.27 into 4.10 but then need to see if it affects the criteria at all.

1. **Way forward**

Chair - What to do with the Issues Tracking document – can we set a deadline? Decide on a date to stop work on it. Is it complete enough for us to move on?

C – Yes it is. Did we ever have any intention to share this document with outside organizations at all?

A – It is open ended, could share is, if cleaned up and attached it or just parts of it to a liaison.

C – Suggest we finish it up and then see after we have draft if we need to use it.

Chair- Will post on reflector a proposed plan

**Way forward to the Draft**. Chair summarized the work at the Plenary where the 75% threshold was not passed on getting a proposal into the Draft.

C – In general we are identifying a MAC ID on layer 2. Do not think this is best, should be at higher layer. Not convinced we need anything on layer 2.

C – Clear use cases for this so do not agree that we should not do anything. We have proposals that can be used and that meet the requirement. If we have 25% voting against anything at layer 2 then that would mean that we stop now. Maybe we need a motion?

C – I think we need to explore further in feature selection. Less than 50% voted for any feature. Need more polls. Do we need to do something at WG level about the layer 2 question? Do we only need one solution? We had a new suggestion just before the votes, so some confusion. Also need to know if we stop working on new solutions? Do we allow any new proposals?

C – PAR was not controversial.

C – On what basis should we have voted for the proposals? No specific matrix?

C – Support multiple solutions. Benefits different for different use cases.

C – Disagree wholeheartedly with the comment that no basis for the voting. We have the Issues document and so many discussions and matrices on how solutions met the Use Cases. That comment worries me.

C – List of specific agreements we could use to narrow down on proposals. For example, do we require preassociation steering to be a requirement? Specific points like that. We have a list of solutions, and we could cut it down if we require specifics. Could get down to 2 or 3. At Plenary or Interim we have many more attendees who are not familiar with background or proposals.

C – Unfortunate we see lack of knowledge on motions and criteria. We have tracking document, minutes are available, lots of background. Comments that motions do not have criteria for people to select is worrying. Obviously welcome new members but they do need to be familiar with what the group has done. Not sure of way out of this. We have already done selection comments against criteria.

C – We should be clear that we have horses for courses and each solution may be better for each network requirement. If a network wants preassociation then it uses a solution that provides that. If not, then maybe another solution is better. That is a strength.

C – We need to get started with the Draft and can start with simple solution that covers most important use case(s). Could then add solutions to cover specific use cases.

Chair – Need a way forward so looking for contributions on way forward. Do we focus on new issues? Have we done enough analysis? Do we have consensus on any path? Is there a stumbling block at layer 2?

C – Cannot ignore the elephant in the room. Suggest we have ask if anyone wants to make a motion to “not have a layer 2 solution”, get it out of the way. Then in 10 days have the debate.

C – There was no real objection to the PAR so if anyone does want to object to that then they do need to have justifications. We could have a motion to rescind the PAR I guess, but agree that as long as we have elephant in the room we need to get it out of the way.

Chair – Can I put people on the spot for those who do not think layer 2 is appropriate, will you bring a proposal forward?

C – Changing PAR is difficult. Do not have good answer, in my opinion captive portal is most important, there is group (IETF) working on this and alternative solutions at higher layers. Do not have a ready-made contribution but will think about how to go forward.

C – We did have a simple solution for that very use case. Not sure how I can convince others that we continue work here, and are people OK with IETF doing the work at higher levels?

C – Observation that we have 2 TGs tasked with similar but distinct needs. We keep having same arguments about which group does what. Past experience has shown that if we do not do the work and put it out to another group, then we end up having to solve it anyway. We had clear direction by the WG. We need the initial draft.

Chair – Based on that discussion, I propose I take time to put together a review to cover the background work and where we are, relate that back to PAR. Looking to those who do not think the work is in layer 2 to come forward so that we can have the debate.

C – Given all the work, the task is very clear, there seems to be some misunderstanding at last meeting about additional proposals. That has been cleared up by discussion today. With respect to the discussion on layer 2, the burden is on those who do not want layer 2 solution to make their case - understanding that the PAR did pass easily. Support getting a motion and debate prepared.

Chair - A motion around the layer 2 solution or modification/rescind of the PAR i.e. let work continue on IETF etc. Motions to move text into Draft with understanding that more text/solutions can be added. Two meetings away before a motion can be made.

C – Having a straw poll on the next call may be useful. Also need a motion on the draft text in order to get us anywhere.

C – Agree clear way to proceed is to move text into draft. Need off-line discussions with the proponent(s) of the other view, pointing out the background and the vast input of views on the need.

C – Oppose having a motion on layer 2 or not, it is a disservice to the majority. Need to get a Draft started.

Chair - Will make a call for contributions on counter view. Will connect proposals to use cases to help understanding - with intention for motions in two weeks.

1. **AOB**

Still some items in the Tracking Document, 22/435 captures some of these issues. If group could look at this. Need to complete the tracking document.

Will get to WBA response once we have some solution. We could include excerpts from the tracking document, not the document itself.

Anything else? Note next meeting.

**Out of agenda**

**Meeting adjoined at 10.42 ET.**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Andersdotter, Amelia | Sky UK group |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Ansley, Carol | Cox Communications Inc. |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Bajko, Gabor | MediaTek Inc. |
| TGbh | 3/29 | baron, stephane | Canon Research Centre France |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Chng, Shi Baw | BAWMAN LLC |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Gao, Ning | Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecommunications Corp.,Ltd |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple, Inc. |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Mutgan, Okan | Nokia |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Orr, Stephen | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Sevin, Julien | Canon Research Centre France |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Smith, Graham | SRT Wireless |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Smith, Luther | Cable Television Laboratories Inc. (CableLabs) |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Torab Jahromi, Payam | Facebook |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Yang, Jay | Nokia |
| TGbh | 3/29 | Yee, Peter | NSA-CSD |