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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 July 6th, at 10:00 hrs EDT.

# Monday July 6th 2020, 10:00 hrs EDT:

**Chair: Carol Ansley, CommScope**

**1. The teleconference was called to order by Chair 10:00 hrs. EDT,**

Rob Sun volunteered to be acting secretary.

Agenda slide deck (11-20/995r0):

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0995-00-0rcm-rcm-sg-agenda.pptx>

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

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

See attendance list at the bottom of this document.

**4. Minutes review and approval:**

The minutes from the last teleconference (June 22nd 2020) contained in 11-20/941 were approved with no comments or amendments.

**5. Approval of the Agenda:**

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

## 6. Status Update:

The Chair announced one new presentation for this meeting.

## 7. Presentations/discussion:

**7.1 Security and Privacy maintenance task group PAR ideas (Amelia Andersdottert (self)) (11-20-0990r1)**

(<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0990-01-0rcm-security-and-privacy-maintenance-task-group-par-ideas.pptx>)

The submission identified the obstacles of obtaining consistent work flow for security and privacy issues within current IEEE 802.11structure, and proposed a few improvement ideas, including a standalone and long living Security and Privacy TG.

Q&A

1. Comment: Thank you for trying to think out of box. However in IEEE, such kinds of work may need to go through lots of steps, and may have to involve the indemnification from IEEE SA. Another issues with an ongoing TG has to be authorized. Some of the suggestions look a bit utopian. The database had failed on previous experiences.

To start mandating security and privacy work, and getting the support for what you are suggesting, are not particularly easy for external people, who may not be able to access the letter ballot, and sponsor ballot in timely fashion, and usually they would access to IEEE web site to gain information. I do believe some of the suggestions can be applied to working groups for security and privacy. The security committee might be a better solution. Some are my own thoughts, don’t want to be negative

1. Comment: I think the initial motivation having a new work item focused on privacy. It will be good to be very specific in the PAR. My recommendation that narrowing down the scope, rather than working on broad scope of work, are more successful, and can be finished on time.
2. Comment: I am in favor of such recommendation, not sure about the database example mentioned. So as to avoid to be misguided, perhaps the database failed for particular reasons, perhaps I wonder what reasons had caused the database failed.
3. Comment: The effort was done at the SA level, the issues were overlapping at the period of time: when you were doing one thing, another thing coming up, the database and dictionary fall apart. For RCM, you cannot envision the success of such effort. TGm is the reason why the security things taking place. and everything is up for debate, and in the timely manner
4. Comment: I agree that, the success is up for the focused work. Each TG may have different timeline, and their scope of work, and security and privacy usually fell under the TG’s objectives. Need some clarification on the provision of the TGs.

1. Comment: The indemnification means we are doing the best of we can, if someone wants sue us, for whatever reasons, IEEE following the procedures, with the indemnification, we can get protection. We go out with policy, that's one of the reasons we are strict with it. My standard role as secretary in IEEE is to protect the procedures.
2. Comment: Thanks for the presentation. I think it’s still able to address the issues in quick manner, IEEE recently introduced the Open source route, rolling out at SA, I am wondering if this work fall into the open source model, that would enable the work rollout quickly, I am suggesting possible introducing .11 open source to follow the open source guidelines, to obtain what you are shooting for, just a thought.

1. Comment: I would disagree, it's not a viable path. The source code people use on device, not generally public, open source would be putting source code in public repository, which had numerous issues, I would personally opposed to it.

1. Comment: I am little confused, privacy and security are different things, security is a huge things, I am wondering why this being considered here, if the group is going to do security or random mac address, I just like clarification. I think to obtain privacy, just start with RCM, then moving into security,

1. Comment: Practically speaking, the security involving encryption, authentication and other crypto modules., I don’t think this scope of work in RCM is to increase the security significantly, I would trust the individual engineering’s decision, on security and privacy,

1. Comment: Going back to subject of open source, I agree with Jon, there are always issues with publishing source code on open source repository. However open source I mentioned is tool based, it’s for engineers to share their work, there are variations of things, I would propose some of standardization work to open source model, with specification document, a lot for security protocols we had worked, already been open sourced. If we move some of the specification into open source, would provide us with flexibility of specification.
2. Comment: I appreciate your sentiment and you points, IEEE SA’s policy and standards pointed out that the specification have to take place from descriptive work. While having the code, for example, some keys derived, will have to cite the IETF, or IEEE 802.1X. Some different standards also need to be referred further. Completely describing the work within the open source would be hard. Apologizing my discussion derailing the discussion of the PAR proposals. In RCM TIG/SG, RCM is one, Privacy is another one, and other PAR might be, I disagree with open source, I agree the narrowed PAR.

1. Chair: Our priority is to make sure to make RCM PAR/CSD go. I worry about having the privacy PAR going too general.

1. Comment: Going back the formation of SG, originally two projects proposal defined: 1) Randomized MAC address, 2) to improve privacy of IEEE 802.11 users'. If indeed we have privacy issues, or concerns, not currently addressed by current specifications, let's focus on these issues. If otherwise, I would like to focus on new items. TGmd is the first place, as Amelia had pointed out, it's hard to predict the work. Forming this TG would be a forum, for people to come to talk, and form new ideas.
2. Comment: Privacy issues were discussed in TGm, that's why I thought having a permanent TG would be better idea. Privacy issues can be addressed in TGm, however some of the features are not privacy issues, but added inadvertently. That kind of things happens over and over

A TG that tightly focusing on the privacy issues to be addressed, having a long lived group, I thought it's a way to go.

1. Comment:: It would need for long work, I acknowledge that. I guess we are debating the structure of current formation, the duration of the TG normally with 4 years of work. I imagined the privacy group formation. Other TGs, i.e. the AX, BE etc., would also look for privacy improvements, privacy group look at the specific new items, if new items, coming in, the PAR would be modified to accommodate. If 4 years later, come back and work on new TG. You can always write new PAR,.
2. Chair: Continue with the identified goals of our group, the 1st priority is related to RCM identity issues, then have 2nd PAR give us a bit of leeway, to accommodate the privacy project/concerns.

1. The chair asked the group to move ready for the motions of the updated PARs, and encourage attendees to volunteers to work on the CSDs.

## 8. Review upcoming Telecon Schedule

1. The Chair reminded the group that:
2. the next meeting will be Monday 20 July, 10:00 am EDT
3. The chair asked the group to move ready for the motions of the updated PARs, and encourage attendees to volunteer to work on the CSDs.

## 9. AOB:

No other business was raised.

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