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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meeting that took place on 5 November 2021 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 09:02 ET.

Agenda slide deck: 11-21-1638r4:

1. Reminder to do attendance
2. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
   1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
3. The chair covered the IEEE copyright and participation rules.
   1. No questions
4. **Discussion of agenda 11-21-1638r4 (slide 16)**
   1. Adoption of agenda 11-21-1638r4 slide 16 by unanimous consent.
5. **Administrative:** 
   1. Three two-hour sessions scheduled for IEEE 802 Plenary 8-12 November.
   2. Thursdays at 9AM ET teleconference slots, except 25 November and 20-31 December 2021.
6. **Discussion:** 
   1. **Process for evaluating use-cases**

Open questions: do we have enough use-cases? How do we continue to look at each submitted use-case or subdivide them into more appropriate tasks? How do we deal with people bringing proposals later to the table?

**Discussion**

C: Our already planned time-line seems to indicate that we would move on to a requirements documents, and that this is a natural next step. If you allow continuous updates to the use-case document we'll never get down to discussion actual features.

C: Would like to propose that we don't motion or strawpoll further the use-cases since it's formalistic and takes a lot of time.

C: I agree with the above.

C: Putting down requirements based on the use-cases seems like it may be a very main-line procedure for 802.11 task groups, like TGbe for example, but for this particular group I think we could also move straight on to solutions - put stuff on the table and see whether it catches on. Requirements may lock us in needlessly given the type of solutions we're typically looking for to be addressing the privacy issues.

C: I also agree we don't need to straw-poll each issue again. We can follow up on the use-cases and issues we've already identified, we can modify them as we go along. On having a requirements document, we already agreed on having such a document along the way. It's step 2 after defining the use-cases. I think it would be good for us to stay with the process we had already agreed in the beginning.

C: The original threshold for the strawpolls was Y >= 0.5(Y+N) so this is now a much higher threshold proposed. Does that influence us?

C: there is no threshold for a strawpoll. It serves as an indication.

C: The use-cases just somehow clarify the scope in rough sentiment so I don't think we need to narrow that down, given what a use-case actually is. On the step 2, I know that the use-case document is a well-known concept from other task groups. If we move on to the Requirements document I'd like to know what kind of submission I should be making to get accepted there.

C: We have various use-cases now, we could look at them closer, make a list of the privacy aspects that we see there and perhaps which criteria need to be fulfilled to protect against those privacy threats. Going through an SFD phase will formalize things, but here I think we could try to re-absorb some older working methods of the group which allow greater flexibility in how we suggest and adopt features and fixes.

C: If we define a requirement document that will be innovative. Members are more familiar with SFD.

Chair: I think we need another level of detail before we can move on specify requirements. Right now we also don't have so many use-cases to consider separately.

C: I understand the Spec Framework Document might be a bit to heavy for this task group, but we also have use-cases here that to me look a lot like a SFD. For me it would help if we could have clarity in what sort of process we want here. This sort of requirement document that is being proposed here is new to me so I would really like to know what it could contain.

Chair: I understand this comment and I need to go back and look at this.

C: Here is a simpler requirements document that was used for P802.11ae: [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/10/11-10-0093-05-00ae-tgae-requirements-and-use-cases.doc](https://ieeesa.webex.com/ieeesa-en/url.php?frompanel=false&gourl=https%3A%2F%2Fmentor.ieee.org%2F802.11%2Fdcn%2F10%2F11-10-0093-05-00ae-tgae-requirements-and-use-cases.doc)

C: I think we should continue to look at this from the perspectives of proposals and relative performance or advantage point of view in the proposals that we consider. If we restrict ourselves to looking at this from only a feature perspective we'll be running into problems. Privacy is a system-wide thing so any potential solution that we consider also needs this system-wide perspective.

Chair: We may have to continue discussing this during the sessions next week? We have few submissions so we can set aside time for this next week.

C: I think the points on system-wide approach are good, but there is also a procedural conundrum here, so I was just wondering if we could hear more on that.

C: If we have criteria then we would have a number of proposals and evaluate the proposals based on how they fulfill the criteria. So this would be the requirements approach that we normally adopt in other working groups. However, this approach couldn't work with privacy as far as I understand and so we need to find a different way of doing that. In a use-case/requirement approach that we are already having we could have a more wholesome consideration of the proposed solutions with respect to their full impact.

Chair: So I will close the queue now seeing as we have only four minutes left. But I will look at the .11ae doc and see if we can have that as a basis for our future work as well.

1. AoB
   1. Reminder that there is an open call for presentations ahead of the plenary session.
2. Chair adjourned the meeting at 09:59 ET.
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