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Abstract

Minutes of the EC Privacy Recommendation SG teleconference on Wednesday, June 3rd, 2015.

Chair: Juan Carlos Zuniga

Recording secretary: Karen Randall

**Call to order**

* Meeting called to order on at 10:05am EDT.
* The chair slides were posted:
* <https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0022>

**IEEE WG Guidelines**

* The chair read the IEEE guidelines and asked for declaration of Potentially Essential Patents.
	+ No IPR issues were brought up
	+ Mick Seaman suggested that there is IEEE patent slide about pre-PAR discussions that should be shown. He will forward to JC. JC thought what he showed was the correct one for pre-PAR meetings.

**Appointment of recording secretary**

* A call for an EC SG Secretary was made, but no one volunteered for the position
* Karen Randall volunteered to take notes
* No one opposed to recording meeting for keeping minutes

**Roll call**

|  |
| --- |
| **Name**  |
| Juan Carlos Zuniga (Chair) |
| Dan Romascanu |
| Lily Chen |
| Carlos Bernardos |
| Soo Bum Lee |
| Mick Seaman |
| Piers O’Hanlon |
| Karen Randall |
| Peter Yee |

**Agenda**

* Group’s updates
	+ Privacy EC SG PAR/CSD
	+ IEEE802/IETF MAC Privacy Trials
* Technical Topics
	+ Threat Model for Privacy at Link Layer
		- IETF IAB Confidentiality Threat Model and Problem Statement
	+ Privacy Issues at Link Layer
	+ Proposals regarding functionalities in IEEE 802 protocols to improve Privacy
	+ Proposals regarding measuring levels of Privacy on Internet protocols
	+ Implications of MAC address changes
	+ Other
* Next Steps

Agenda reviewed and approved no changes.

**Reports**

* **Privacy EC SG PAR/CSD**
	+ The main focus of this meeting will be to finalize the Privacy PAR and CSD since the deadline for pre-circulation prior to the July Plenary meeting is next week. There are some comments submitted by Christine Runnegar (Internet Society) to be reviewed. An updated version of PAR and CSD is available at <https://mentor.ieee.org/privecsg/dcn/15/privecsg-15-0004-03-0000-privacy-recommendation-par-csd-proposal.pptx>.
	+ SCOPE and PURPOSE (see slides 5 and 6)
	+ Most of the comments received were about who the audience would be: should it be protocol developers, standards developers, implementers, or others. It was decided at the meeting in Berlin to restrict audience to standards developers.
	+ Looking at PURPOSE on slide 6:
	+ Mick – prefers the second option; thinks it’s broader and more useful.
	+ Piers – first option is more specific about who it is aimed at; includes concept of protection from surveillance.
	+ Mick – more potential attackers than just government security agencies; other attackers are out there.
	+ there was a comment that it may be important to mention the threat model since that may be one of the first deliverables.
	+ overall preference for option 2.
	+ NEED (see slide 7)
	+ recommend to add “threats to” before “Internet privacy”
	+ current wording makes it sound like work is being initiated because of noise/press/etc about the issues. The fact that there is talk doesn’t necessarily focus the need.
	+ And these threats have been identified by whom/where? Could add reference/note to IETF/IAB threat model.
	+ Mick suggested that the NEED could simply start with:
	+ “IEEE 802 technologies play a major role in internet connectivity yet have the potential to disclose their users’ private information….”
	+ Dan R – should we say anything about consistency here?
	+ “A recommended practice to promote a consistent approach by IEEE protocol developers to mitigate…”
	+ MANAGED OBJECTS (slide 10)
	+ Dan – why does this say that it will not specify a management architecture?
	+ Piers – this is just a threat model right now; not a solution.
	+ overall agreement to say it doesn’t specify any managed objects.
	+ JC will upload the revised version for all to review.
	+ JC asked if anyone on the call objected to pre-circulating the PAR and CSD for consideration at the July Plenary meeting. There were no objections.

* + There was general agreement on the text for the proposed PAR/CSD, so it was decided that there is no need for the conference call on 10 June. We will still have the next conference call on 1 July. The topics for discussion on that call will include
		- updated results from the MAC randomization experiments and
		- the IAB threat model.
* **Next Steps**
	+ Meeting times for Privacy EC SG at the July Plenary in Waikoloa are anticipated to be Tuesday night, Wednesday noon, and Thursday morning.
* **Adjournment**
	+ The meeting adjourned at 11:03amET.