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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meeting that took place during the IEEE 802 Electronic Plenary Session 8-12 November 2021.

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**

**1st slot. Wednesday 10 November 2021, 11:15 ET.**

Chair calls meeting to order at 11:15 ET.

Agenda slide deck: 11-21-1630r0:

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.
4. **Discussion of agenda 11-21-1630r0 (slide #17)**
	1. Unanimous approval of the agenda.
5. **Administration**
	1. **Motion #6:** Approve previous minutes

Approve the minutes for:

2021 September 802.11 Electronic Interim: 11-21/1551r0,

TGbi Teleconferences: 11-21/1663r1, 11-21/1752r0, 11-21/1788r0

Moved: Dan Harkins

Seconded: Po-Kai Huang

Approved by unanimous consent (63 participants).

* 1. **Teleconferences**
		1. Future teleconferences are scheduled for Dec 2 (Thursday) and Dec 16 (Thursday).
		2. If the 10 AM ET is not occupied by TGbe, they will be at 9 AM ET.
	2. Timeline
		1. Current time-line is to finish use-case document by January 2022.
		2. Identifying features and requirements by July 2022.
1. Discussion
	1. **Timeline (11-21/1630r1 slide #21),** Carol Ansley (Chair)
		1. Current time-line is to finish use-case document by January 2022.
		2. Identifying features and requirements by July 2022.
		3. No comments.

* 1. **Review of 10/93r5: Use-case/requirements,** Carol Ansley (Chair)

Mike Montemurro brought up the use-case and requirements document from .11ae contained in 11-10-0093r5 in the last teleconference. The requirements table could serve as a model for how this group can decide how to shape its work, without getting locked down in a full SFD process.

**Discussion:**

C: We already have a use-case document so I assume we don't need that. But the requirements table looks fine, however it's a bit strange to have these unresolved questions.

A: So we only used this as a basis for our brainstorming back when .11ae was created. It's just an example so I don't think we need to be completely bound by how it looks. I don't remember that we ever went back to cross things off a list or so.

C: To me this is fine. But I also think we should not put in questions, then we just run into problems in the end. It needs to be a process for deciding things. Having notes in the minutes is fine, and we already have that. The table seems entirely fine.

Q: So just for clarification, we will then be having one document for the use cases and another document for the requirements? Should we be already beginning with the requirements?

A: This is my assumption that we'll then be having a document for requirement table that is separate from the use-case document. But we need some formal way to decide how to put stuff in that requirements document.

Q: Is the use-case document and requirements document going to finalized in lock?

A: Yes.

Q: So then the use-case document is not a living document?

A: I think we need to discuss that.

C: I think it should be clarified that requirements can clarify both use-cases and technical issues. Both of them are good but some of the requirements we're going to formulate will almost certainly connect more to the technical issues we've seen than to use-cases.

Chair will complete a template for future requirements discussions for consideration in tomorrow's session.

C: I don't understand how we can deal with new topics if we lock down these documents. I'm concerned that we'll not be able to bring new things to the table then.

A: It's a balance, right? You can't just bring in new issues when we're about to publish the new draft. There's a time for bringing the issue, and a time for completing the draft. We have processes for this. We'll get motions to open things up again if this is an issue.

C: I don't think any of these documents pose any strict constraints on what we put in the draft. The PAR is a different story, but these documents are just to support us in the work to fulfill the PAR. If something critical comes up we'll deal with it.

C: I also don't think we need to track these issues in a requirements document - think also of the publicity side of this. We come from different backgrounds too, AP, client side, enterprise and so forth, and it may be difficult to converge on requirements that speak to everyone's experiences.

Technical editor: I think the important bit is just that we have some references to say minutes where it's known what was agreed to be put in the requirements document or use-cases document. That's all.

C: Isn't it the more salient bit how we in that case fill in requirements doc?

A: Yes, maybe we can sleep on this.

* 1. **TGbi Proposed Issues (11-21-0641r1)**, Po-Kai Huang (Intel)

Discussion:

Q: I was just in a MADINAS call at the IETF and I think a few other people in this meeting were also. Some things we can do something about, like if your device has a name that it communicates to networks - maybe we need to liaise there to ensure it doesn't fall between the cracks. There are also DHCP client options that some vendors put, and they always put them in a specific order which means a device can be tracked. I'll make a presentation on this.

C: I dont' think Soft AP is anything that we should get into.

C: APs in car and Mobile devices that share internet as Mobile AP represent a huge market segment. In general we should focus on AP privacy as well. I understand legacy AP can not be easily protected but newer APs could be protected.

Chair: In use-case 7 on slide 11 in the Proposed Issues document it should be clarified that we are protecting against finger-printing.

C: So the network may know a bunch of stuff about the client due to authentication data and log-in details and so forth. Is protecting clients against the network also within scope?

A: It's up for discussion still. At some point we lost the ability to have a functioning network.

C: In an encrypted system all the information is protected right? But in open networks all bets are off.

C: I disagree that all bets are off in unencrypted networks.

C: On the other hand you have information elements that can be used to fingerprint devices as per 11-16-1492r0.

Chair: So we should all try and reflect on how to begin the requirements document. If you have topics to be discussed on Friday let me know, otherwise we continue discussing tomorrow how to progress with the requirements document.

1. **Recess at 12:45 ET.**

**2nd slot. Thursday 11 November 2021 11:15 ET**

1. **Call to order 11:18 ET.**
2. **Reminder of policies, procedures, attendance (see also point 2-3 above).**
3. **Review of agenda 11-21-1630r1 (slide #17)**
	1. No comments on agenda. Unanimous proposal.
4. **Review of document 11-21-1848r0, Carol Ansley (Chair)**
	1. Document is based on use-case and requirements document from .11ae task group.
	2. No comments.
	3. Requirements could be included in updated versions of use-cases and issues tracking presentations.
	4. Requirements could either be inserted into the document by formal motions or by having a living document. Using formal motions will likely increase people's opportunities to understand what has been decided and discussed.
	5. When or how often we motion is not the important bit, perhaps but it should be at some point formally decided.
	6. Would propose that we keep the document very open and be liberal about what we keep in, keeping track about what we've talked about, and then we can clean up later and motion. We could keep track this way of what we've proposed, and run strawpolls - obviously if the strawpoll results are very negative we may not keep that proposal in the end, but we can at least have it in the document for some time to track that it's been raised.
	7. Agreement with the above. Who maintains the document?
	8. For me the question is what is the difference between this and the minutes?
	9. Minutes are more extensive. This document could help us keep track of where we are at with requirements.
	10. We may want to safe-guard against people running motions that they don't understand and having requirements inserted that there is actually no agreement on.
	11. There is normally not a reason to believe that people would make such motions since we're all professionals.
	12. Strawpolls are not meant to be pre-motion tools. They should be used to indicate which route the group finds more productive to solve some problem. Now they're getting used to check whether a motion would pass before the motion is moved, and I think that's a waste of time.
	13. Agree with that comment on strawpolls.
	14. Normally the chair would lead the living document discussions and in general facilitate the discussions in a brainstorming question on requirements.
	15. If we have the process currently outlined:
		1. Submissions to include proposed requirements with issue/use-case reference
		2. Additional meetings to be held for open discussion on accumulated requirements
		3. Strawpoll on proposed requirements to measure consensus
		4. Add status indicator to requirements table (for isntance containing whether a strawpoll has already been taken)
		5. Motion on proposed requirements at appropriate intervals (plenary?/interim?)
		6. Final document will consist of requirements that passed a motion
	16. There may be a problem with document versioning here. We've been live-editing the agenda during the meeting so we're now at 11-21-1630r2? Or which is the right document to be consulting here?
	17. I would like to have it noted in the minutes that I disagree with the procedure outlined [under point 11.15].
	18. I do not understand the process as presented here, to be honest. i thought we had a rough consensus and I don't really care how we approve the process, and the chair needs to figure that out how to run the task group. But we should at least agree on the process before we try to motion anything.
	19. Agree that we should be making a slide to document this process.
	20. We could adjourn for today and come back to this discussion tomorrow. Do we have any other things to bring up today? Hearing none.
5. **Recess at 12:55 ET.**

**3rd slot. Friday 12 November 2021 11:15 ET**

1. **Call to order 11:17 ET**
2. Reminder of policies (see also point 2-3 above).
3. **Review of agenda (11-21/1630r3 slide #17)**
	1. Agenda approved by unanimous consent
4. **Requirements tracking process (11-21-1630r3 slide #18), Chair**
	1. Proposed process:
		1. **Proposed Requirements from Submissions:**
		2. A submission can propose requirements related to one or more issues or use cases from the Use Case Document (21/641).
		3. A presenter may ask for one or more straw polls on a requirement to determine the level of consensus on that requirement.
		4. A presenter may ask for a requirement that has been presented to the group to be added to the Requirements Table
			1. No specific straw poll results or other indicators are required for a requirement to be added to the Requirements table
			2. A presenter may choose to work further on a requirement instead of asking for it to be added to the Requirements Tracking document.
		5. **Brainstorming for Requirements**
		6. Chair may dedicate one or more meetings to review existing requirements and lead brainstorming for additional requirements, if needed
		7. **Conversion of Proposed Requirements to Approved Requirements**
		8. A presenter may initiate a motion to approve one or more proposed requirements.
		9. The approval metric is the standard Y>.75(Y+N)
		10. With notice, the chair may dedicate one or more meetings to review existing requirements and motion one or more proposed requirements for approval
	2. **Discussion:**
		1. I think this looks good, just a minor thing. Under [16.1.9] I'm also just saying that for motions >= but it's not a big thing.
		2. Maybe we want to add a column for tracking the state of a requirement, if it's appoved, removed, rejected, or pending? But that's it.
		3. Maybe motion fail is the more appropriate categorization of a requirement that's been motioned, since we can always motion it again.
		4. We have rules against motion the same thing over and over. There should be no reason safe-guarding against obnoxious motions. Also the chair has a responsibility to steer the group in a way that the work advances.
		5. Maybe we can also include in the table submission number. This is obvious.
		6. A reminder that strawpolls are not decisions. Motions are decisions.
		7. This table may be getting a bit bloated now, including the cross-reference table. We could keep it in the simple way it was originally proposed. Also rely on the minutes to keep track of what was discussed and when.
		8. Should we motion the requirements tracking document process?
		9. I don't think it's necessary. But we could add it to the top of the requirements tracking document to remind people of it when they check that document.
		10. Chair: I will add it to revision 2.
5. AoB.
	1. No AoB.
6. Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:11 ET.