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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meeting that took place on

11 August 2022 at 09:00 ET.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q – proceeds a question

A - proceeds an answer

C - proceeds a comment

Yellow highlight - action point

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Amelia Andersdotter, Sky UK**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henri, Cisco; Stephen McCann, Huawei**

**Technical editor: Po-Kai Huang, Intel**

Chair calls meeting to order at 09:03 ET.

Agenda slide deck: 11-22-1322r0:

1. Reminder to do attendance
2. Review of policies and procedures.
   1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.
3. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
   1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
4. The chair covered the IEEE copyright and participation rules.
   1. No questions
5. **Discussion of agenda 11-22-1322r0 (slide #16)**
   1. Adoption of agenda 11-22-830r2 slide #16 by unanimous consent (15 participants).
6. **Administrative**
   1. Reminder of upcoming teleconference scheduled (three scheduled leading up to interim).
7. **Presentations**
   1. **Additional TGbi requirements for Issue 2 and Issue 7, 11-22-1221r0, Po-Kai Huang (Intel)  
        
      Discussion:  
        
      C:** Both of these requirements seem to be solutions to an existing requirement, rather than actually new requirements that would prompt us to find new solutions. I'm not sure that these really qualify as requirements. They're probably perfectly valid and good solutions but I would like to hold them off until we've completed the requirements document.  **C:** For the first proposal I agree there is a more high-level requirement on top. For the second I don't think so. I also don't think it's a problem to introduce specificity in the requirements document, since it should help us with drafting the spec text.  
      **C:** What if we wanted a different mechanism, like protecting parameters instead of protecting an action frame? I think we should remove that specific wording to avoid pre-empting future discussions on solutions.  
      **C:** Removing action from action frames... I think it's already quite generic.  
      **C:** The other requirements have specified whether they are CPE or BPE, but here I don't see this. Do we need to add it?  
      **C:** It's a CPE requirement in my view, but I don't think we need to specifically mention that.  
      **C:** In the beginning of the header that the MAC control field that contains the information on what the frame type is. Action frames, however, don't really contain that information so I think specifying this to be an Action frame is correct from a privacy perspective.  
      **C:** I agree that there is a problem with specifying the route forward in the requirement. We can leave that for later. Adding more solutions to the requirements is not the path forward - rather we should be discussing solutions at a later time that match the requirements. Otherwise we'll end up discussing endlessly at a later time whether we need to do this or that because of the requirements.  
      **Chair:** I will add these as proposed in the requirements document and we can look at them later.  
      **Q:** What would be the next time we could get back to them?  
      **Chair:** In the next couple of teleconferences.
   2. **BPE Beaconing And Discovery Requirements, 11-22-1306r0, Jarkko Kneckt (Apple)**  
        
      Q: Are 11bi non-AP stations still going to be processing normal beacons? Or do we imagine that everything will be using these new beacons?  
      A: We have two modes of operations. Privacy-enhanced such as CPE that contains no changes in the AP, and then the BSS Privacy Enhanced (BPE) that require changes also in the AP. In the BPE connections we'd be assuming that these privacy enhanced beacons would be the dominant form of beacon.   
      Q: So let's say that the EDCA parameters change or something, would you then broadcast that a bit but just assume that everyone sees it?  
      A: That is correct. Even if you did miss it you would have the sequence number from which you could identify the information.  
      Q: What if we didn't encrypt the CSN?   
      A: We have two separate strategies here: either we encrypt the entire beacon. The other way is to have these encryption on the payload and use some obfuscation. But we're thinking that entire beacon encryption is better because then we don't have to rely on obfuscation for the remainder of the protection.  
      C: I think a unified structure might be more useful here?   
      C: Like in our previous discussion I think we should extend this from BPE to CPE as well.  
      C: One of the requirements just discussed previously I think is very similar to what we're also proposing here.  
      C: So in your checksum slide, I'd just like to pre-warn that we are bringing a similar contribution presently. We have some preliminary concern about the complexity we'd have to introduce to deal with this though. I'd also like to highlight that the AP can still be tracked in the absence of BSSID change.   
      Q: Is this new beacon planned for mostly mobile AP use?  
      A: Yes, that's the primary use-case for us.  
      Q: On redoing the addressing structure, is there a shared-secret structure in the background that I'm not seeing?  
      A: Yes, we would be knowing how to calculate from the random ID whether the checksum ID is correct. There would be a hash to help this.  
      Q: But how do we know the hash?  
      A: It's not to be defined by Tgbi.  
      C: OK, so there is a random shared secret that both the AP and non-AP STA know but that is defined somewhere else.  
      A: That is correct.  
      Chair: We are out of time, speaker list is closed.  
      C: I will send a question to the e-mailing list.
8. **AoB**
   1. No other business.
9. Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:01 ET.

**Attendance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** |
| Ansley, Carol | Cox Communications Inc. |
| Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| Hawkes, Philip | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| Ho, Duncan | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| Huang, Po-Kai | Intel Corporation |
| Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple, Inc. |
| McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| Mutgan, Okan | Nokia |
| Nezou, Patrice | Canon Research Centre France |
| RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| Smith, Luther | Cable Television Laboratories Inc. (CableLabs) |
| Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| Yee, Peter | NSA-CSD |