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Abstract

Minutes of the EC Privacy Recommendation SG face-to-face meeting during the IEEE 802 March 2015 Plenary meeting in Berlin, Germany.

**Tuesday, March 10th, 2015**

Chair: Juan Carlos Zuniga

Recording secretary: Karen Randall

**Call to order**

* Meeting called to order at 19:36 hrs.
* The chair slides were posted:
* [privecsg-15-0011-00-ecsg-march-plenary-meeting-slides.pptx](https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0011-01-ecsg-march-plenary-meeting-slides.pptx)

**IEEE WG Guidelines**

* The chair read the IEEE guidelines and asked for declaration of Potentially Essential Patents.
	+ No IPR issues were brought up

**Appointment of recording secretary**

* Karen Randall volunteered to take notes

**Agenda**

* Group reports
	+ 802 Privacy PAR/CSD status
	+ 802 EC Closing Report
* 2 Technical Presentations
	+ MAC Address Randomization Trial/Experiment
	+ Privacy Engineered Access Networks
* Next Steps

**Group’s updates**

* **IEEE Privacy PAR/CSD**

The status of the IEEE 802 Privacy PAR/CSD is that the PAR and CSD were pre-circulated to the EC/WGs. Comments were received from Roger Marks, IEEE 802.1, IEEE 802.3, IEEE 802.11, and IEEE 802.22. Paul Nikolich (IEEE 802 Chair) asked about his comments; the email may have been held up. All comments are supposed to be addressed by Wednesday evening.

JC reviewed the PAR and CSD that was pre-circulated and the comments received. JC stated that the concerns/comments were unlikely to be addressed by the deadline (tomorrow) for submitting the PAR/CSD at this Plenary meeting. He recommended that the group take time to revise the PAR/CSD and resubmit/pre-circulate for the next plenary in July 2015.

JC started with a summary of the discussion with and comments from IEEE 802.1. It was clear that there were several concerns about the scope and purpose of the project – and the concern that it was not narrow enough to be successful. For example, for the areas to be considered in the PURPOSE – will all of those be addressed in the final Recommended Practice? It was suggested to include only those topics that are definitely planned to be discussed in the document. Additionally, the PAR seemed to advocate an ongoing “activity”; however it should be written to define a specific deliverable document, not just research activities.

Paul N commented that he felt it was beneficial to produce a Recommended Practice that defines a realistic threat model for link layer technology. It was suggested that the Recommended Practice would continue to be developed, but it may be better to develop the PAR within IEEE 802.1, especially given the comments received from that WG.

Roger Marks stated that he felt that the general comment from IEEE 802.1 is somewhat similar to the comments he submitted. Additionally, he pointed out that there was a weakness in the draft PAR about identifying the audience. It’s important to understand the audience. Nothing in the PAR indicates that standards developers are the intended audience.

A second comment from IEEE 802.1 was confusion in the scope about what is meant by “privacy threat model.” Several interpretations are possible. It was recommended that the text here be clearer.

The PURPOSE could be crisper. Surveillance is agreed to be a privacy issue; however there was concern about opening up the document to try to address the other items (e.g., Stored Data Compromise, Intrusion, Misattribution, Secondary Use, Exclusion); what if they are determined to be not applicable? It is possible to add other threats to be addressed later as appropriate.

The NEED section of the PAR should address why this specific project is needed, not why privacy in general is wanted.

In TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY, the text does not match the proposed scope. Demonstration of the successful use of MAC address randomization does not itself demonstrate that a particular privacy goal has been achieved.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY contains a statement of future intent, not evidence of economic feasibility. It should be easier to make a justifiable statement for a PAR with a narrower scope.

JC reviewed at a high level all of the other comments received (Roger Marks, IEEE 802.3, IEEE 802.11, and IEEE 802.22; Paul Nikolich’s comments will be reviewed later). The comments will be studied in detail and the SG will take time to respond individually. It was felt that it may be preferable to withdraw the PAR for approval this week and resubmit after further discussion/revision before the July Plenary. Paul N reminded the SG that responses to those who submitted comments are due by Wednesday evening.

MOTION: To withdraw the Privacy EC SG PAR proposal from the March 13th EC Agenda by notification to the EC reflector by March 11th, notifying the EC that comment responses will be provided by March 12th.

Moved by Roger Marks; Seconded by Paul Nikolich

 15/0/1 motion passes.

* **WiFi Privacy Experiment**
* Antonio de la Oliva presented on the MAC randomization trial ([doc 07, rev1](https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0007-01-0000-wifi-privacy-experiement-at-802-berlin-plenary.pptx)).
* As part of the Internet Privacy efforts in coordination between IETF (IAB/IESG) and IEEE 802 (Privacy EC SG), the trial randomizes the MAC address of some users’ Wi-Fi devices. Instructions on how to participate in this trial are described at <http://goo.gl/eFUM9h>.
* Antonio reviewed the configuration and set up information.
* Next steps:
* Run similar setup at IETF 92 meeting in Dallas, TX (March 22-27, 2015)
* Compile data and draft a report
* Publish/communicate results at both IEEE 802 and IETF committees

The EC Privacy SG recessed (until Thursday morning) at 21:09 hrs.

**Thursday, March 12th, 2015**

* JC called the meeting to order at 8:10am on Thursday, March 12, 2015.
* **IEEE Privacy PAR/CSD (continuation)**
* attendance: InterDigital, Nokia, Google, IEEE staff, Qualcomm, Aruba, Cicso, Siemens, Rockwell Automation, Ericsson, Broadcom, EthAirNet Association, etc.
* JC reminded those in attendance that the SG had a motion to withdraw the PAR from EC agenda on Friday; however the SG needs to send responses to the commenters on the PAR/CSD today.
* JC offered an (individual) contribution (see [dcn 13](https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0013-00-0000-response-to-par-csd-comments.pptx)) with proposed comment responses for review and discussion by the SG.
* JC stepped through the slides and revised in real time based on the group’s discussion.
* There still needs to be a clear statement about the user/audience of the standard.
	+ The scope can be better defined after the audience is agreed.
	+ There was much debate about privacy versus security and how privacy controls should enhance (not degrade) security and functionality.
* Roger Marks commented that he was uncomfortable with the focus on a threat model. The document needs to clarify why developing a threat model for privacy is a good idea (to provide clear recommendations on how to protect against attacks). [DCN 13 rev1](https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0013-01-0000-response-to-par-csd-comments.pptx) is to be uploaded with the responses to all comments received.
* **Privacy Engineered Access Networks**
* Max Riegel presented on Privacy Engineered Access Network (see [dcn 14](https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0014-00-0000-privacy-engineered-access-network.pptx)).
* This discusses a proposal about what can be done in OmniRAN that could solve some privacy issues.
* Slide 6 showed a diagram about privacy;
	+ Max asked if this is a fair target for the scope and purpose?
	+ Personally Identifiable Information (PII) describes the information and what is to be protected.
	+ Brian Weis commented that it is important to remember that the scope is IEEE 802 networks and technologies.
* JC commented that there has been some good brainstorming.
	+ Use the email list for continued discussion.
* **Next Steps**
* JC proposed three teleconferences (assuming the EC SG is renewed until July 2015) and expected additional participation from members of IEEE 802.1 and IETF:
	+ 15 April 2015, 10:00 AM ET
	+ 3 June 2015, 10:00 AM ET
		- PAR/CSD submission/pre-circulation after this meeting
	+ 1 July 2015, 10:00 AM ET
* There will be no meeting of the EC Privacy SG at either May 2015 interim meetings; the next face to face meeting will be at the 13-17 July 2015 Plenary in Waikoloa, HI, USA.
* **Adjournment**
	+ The EC Privacy SG meeting was adjourned at 9:59am.