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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11 bh telecom Interim meeting 31 Aug 2021.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer

C- proceeds a comment

**Meeting October 26, 2021 9.00 to 11.00 am ET**

**Chair: Mark Hamilton**

**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 09.03 hrs. EDT,**

Agenda slide deck 11-21/1723r2

**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 also Backup slides):
  + PAR/CSD: [https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject-web/public/view.html#pardetail/8770](https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject-web/public/view.html); [11-20/1117r5](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-1117-05-0rcm-rcm-sg-proposed-rcm-csd-draft.docx)
  + Timeline estimate
* Issues Tracking/Contributions
* Next meetings: Nov 4th

The Chair reviewed the agenda.

No more comments

The proposed agenda was adopted without objection.

Attendance is listed at end of the Minutes.

1. **Timeline**

* PAR approved Feb 2021
* First TG meeting Mar 2021
* D0.1 Nov 2021
* Initial Letter Ballot (D1.0) Mar 2022
* Recirculation LB (D2.0) Jul 2022
* Initial SA Ballot (D3.0) Nov 2022
* Final 802.11 WG approval Mar 2023
* 802 EC approval May 2023
* RevCom and SASB approval May 2023

1. **Response to WBA liaison request** – contribution needed

Chair asked for contributions – none submitted and no volunteers

1. **TGbh Issues Tracking document: 11-21/0332r18**

Chair discussed the Tracking Document/Contributions 11-21/0332r13 **Section 5 Issues and analyses**.

* Created summary table of the use cases defined in section 4
  + No comments
* Chair went through use cases

Q – Once we get through the list are we going to try to combine them into 1 or 2 use cases or compare different proposals

A – will be addressed in next topic

Q – Uses case 4.8 probe response does not depend on any state (in current spec)

C – Don’t think there is anything in the spec that the network can’t use state – might it use state and is it broken?

C – can you point out what is defined in the current spec

A – Test changed to “Current text requires the AP to send Probe Response (based on listed criteria).

C – With respect to text, while spec says AP responds to Probe request – implementations throttle probe requests.

C – If you want to with RCM to maintain privacy – you should use passive scanning which doesn’t transmit STA MAC addresses OTA.

C – Would like to see more focus on guidelines versus additional requirements. Guidelines on how to implement certain features of the standard.

C – Infrastructure that tries to maintain state on probe request – we should consider adding guidelines/recommendations.

Q – 4.9 Rogue Client Detection. Critical facilities require physical security – they would not do wireless intrusion detection.

C – this is a bigger problem that should be solved by other mechanisms

C – should we close this?

Q – what problem is MAC randomization solving here? Its not a rogue phone – it’s the persons device. What’s the problem we are trying to fix – authorized clients that may mistakenly be considered rogue, or the network is unable to determine how many rogue clients because of RCM.

Q – What about people that pass the physical controls but have unauthorized devices?

Q – What is the definition of Rogue?

A – don’t want to get in the rathole of defining Rogue. Focus on unauthorized device.

C – Change 4.9 from Rogue to be Authorized/Unauthorized client detection.

A – Changed in text

Q – For the first case. Unath client sniffing around probing – what is broken here? Not sure there is anything broken here. Second – if a person has a device that they are authorized to use and not told to turn off RCM to use – this falls back to other use cases. Want to recognize device even if it uses RCM.

Q - need to be consistent with changing Rogue to Unauthorized in all sections

Q – there appear to be four use cases in 4.9 – do we need a better nomenclature to define section 4.9. Need to name the use cases.

A – Document editorial change.

C – there are a lot of use cases now

Q – what about a previously authorized device before it associates?

C – if the network has seen the device before it may want to track it. If it’s the first time its seen the device, it may need to enter it into a database to track it.

Q – what is the purpose and why would you want to detect devices not detected to your network?

A – they want to detect devices that should and shouldn’t be there and enforce policies.

Q – Use “Approved” vs “Authorized”?

A – Editorial change offline – no objections/concerns

C – Authorized is already a used term – approved is something that is done out of band that you are allowed to bring the device into an environment. These environments should use higher levels of security like WPA3 Enteprise-192.

C – is it ok for the network to use the Security Identity as the device identity. Chair believes the discussion was documented will find the reference.

C – 4.11 Soft AP use case. Only consider Enterprise not home use case. For home/personal Soft AP – recommendation such as opt-in mechanism when RCM is turned on.

C – Spec does not address an AP changing its MAC Address. First define RCM for AP.

C - Devices associate based on SSID not BSSID.

C – AP Changing MAC addresses while devices are connected should not happen.

C – Soft AP is a different use case than an AP. Soft AP is taken with you. Similar to unplugging one AP and inserting another in its place with the same SSID.

Q – Starting to define “Mobile AP” (11be) – Soft AP could we rename to Mobile AP

A – Timelines for 11be and 11bh do not coincide to use 11be terms.

Q – From Chair – does Mobile AP mean the same to everyone?

A – No comments, Chair will make editorial change to 4.11

C – this AP (Mobile) has a very short lifetime should be noted in use case.

C – Possibly add Mobile AP guidelines in annex but not requirements.

**Out of time to start further discussion.**

Chair – please look at the rest of the use cases. Next step is to look at proposed solutions and how do we analyze them.

**Next calls Nov 4th, Nov Plenary**

**Meeting Adjoined at 10.59 ET.**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Ansley, Carol | Cox Communications Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | baron, stephane | Canon Research Centre France |
| TGbh | 10/26 | DeLaOlivaDelgado, Antonio | InterDigital, Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Fernandez, Olivia | SR Technologies |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Henry, Jerome | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Hervieu, Lili | Cable Television Laboratories Inc. (CableLabs) |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Huang, Po-Kai | Intel Corporation |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Kain, Carl | USDoT; Noblis Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple, Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Lu, Liuming | Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecommunications Corp.,Ltd |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Lumbatis, Kurt | CommScope, Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Max, Sebastian | Ericsson AB |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Orr, Stephen | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Riegel, Maximilian | Nokia |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Shalom, Hai | Google |
| TGbh | 10/26 | Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
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