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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11bh telecom Interim meeting February 17, 2022.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer

C- proceeds a comment

**Meeting Feb 17, 2022 17.00 to 19.00 ET**

**Chair: Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/CommScope)**

**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 17.03 hrs. EDT,**

Agenda slide deck 11-22/0348r0

1. **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 Backup slides)
* Issues Tracking updates/status: [11-21/0332r29](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0332-29-00bh-issues-tracking.docx)
* Contributions (analysis of proposed solutions):
	+ [11-22/0296r6](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0157-00-00bh-mac-address-designation-maad.pptx): TGbh proposals
	+ [11-22/0343r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0157-00-00bh-mac-address-designation-maad.pptx): TGbh solutions analysis
* Way forward on solutions
* Review of Issues Tracking uncovered items (margin comments, etc.)
* Next meetings: Feb 22 9:00 ET, Mar 3 19:00 ET

Any comments? Any objections to agenda? - None

Agenda accepted.

Chair noted that the timeline is still off track but hopefully D0.1 for March 2022.

1. **Issues Tracking document**

Now Rev 30 now posted. Any comments?

C – Issues other than those the STA has?

A – Some indirect effects, not aware of anything else.

C – There are some STA impacts, else why talk about unique ID such that user is not impacted? So there are some STA issues.

C – Was referring to fact that infrastructure was using the MAC address. All issues due to network imparting some special issues related to the MAC address.

1. **Contributions**

Two contributions to look at the proposals and analyze where we are in looking at them.

22/0296r6 and 22/0343r0

**22/0296r6 presented by Chair**

Slide 3 Use cases. Table completed by the proposal authors.

Slide 4 Property Comparisons.

C – Difficult to compare properties as means different things to different schemes. Selection often needs clarification. Not sure if good or bad, really need to make sure everyone understands the different proposals.

C – Slide 3 pre-associated clients will use

C – A good part of this is to look at the outlines of each proposal (elevator pitches)

**22/0343r0 presented by Chair**

Chair explained that he originally prepared this and then invited authors to go through and edit.

C – Another criterion may be “is the signature unique on an ESS basis?” For example, if using public key? Must be unique, otherwise can still be tracked. If using same public key across multiple ESSs then could be tracked.

C – Requirement is that 3rd party cannot tracked.

C – Yes, need to establish. Also, if we use digital signatures, then need to generate unique random numbers. May need a column for unique questions per scheme.

C – One has 9 proposals, the other has but 5. Can we assume that only 5 need be considered?

C – Yes, need to get that established.

A – All of this is just to provide background information. Do suggest we straw poll all 9 however.

1. **Proposed Way forward**

**Chair presented Slide 18**

Run straw polls (anyone can vote), both today and next week Tues (AM call):

* For each proposal (9 main proposals, on previous slide):
	+ “How much priority do you put on continuing work on this proposal?”
	+ Answer choices: High/Medium/Low
* Hope is that we’ll see some clear pattern/trends that will help select 2 or 3 proposals that seem to have broad support to continue at a High priority and did not receive a lot of Low priority votes.
* No option for Abstain (or “more information needed”). If you don’t know, either just don’t vote in the poll, or maybe vote “Medium” as a placeholder for “not a high priority, but don’t drop it either”.

C – On running poll twice, is restriction only vote once?

A – Hoping answers we get are clear. Open

C – Bring up the 1 page descriptions when voting

C – we need as big an audience as possible, why not use email?

A – Not sure what we have for procedure for e vote. If just email on Reflector?

C – Run a doodle poll?

C – Interesting thought. Now not sure what to do.

C – seem that we have a small subset on the call.

C – Casting a wider net is that doodle poll only goes to who you send it to, but visually can see how it is going on.

C – If URL for Doodle poll on Reflector that may work. But everyone sees everything

C – 17 on this call, that is normal for this meeting.

C – Could also send out email to say polls at next meeting, and say attend the next meeting.

C – Only worry is that some may vote without really understanding the proposals.

C – Do not see problem with original problem but not sure about running polls twice. Also 802.1 group have some formats. On whether voters follow employers etc. that is against the rules.

C – Running one week is always a problem as a time slot is never ideal.

C – email all authors to make sure they fill in the one-page description if they wish.

C - If authors do not fill in their proposals then assumed the proposal is withdrawn.

C – Only possible problem is if author is out of office.

**Chair – Proposal is to do polls next week on call. Ask authors to submit description slide, if they wish. This to be made clear on Refelctor.**

**There appeared to be Consensus on this.**

Any more business? None

C – What about existence of text?

C – Yes if text exists, that is a question for the group.

C – Not voting on acceptance of text.

A – Yes, would work on proposal if voted high but no text, but will need real text quickly.

C – Looking at one or more proposals? What way forward? One way or multiple ways?

Chair – Happy to have discussion, but no definitive answer. Bottom line is to have specifics.

C – Criteria used - how much algorithm is needed.

C – People may have different opinions on what is new. Will be personal opinions.

C – How extensible could a proposal be, looking forward?

C – Was in original list but many did not understand exactly what it meant.

C - hence need to read and hopefully understand the one-page elevator pitches. If not, then ask the question directly to the proponent

1. **AOB**

Chair, still need to clean up Issues Document per the margin comments

Anything else?

Note next meeting.

**Out of agenda**

**Meeting adjoined at 18.19 ET.**