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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11bh telecon meeting of September 6, 2022.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer

C- proceeds a comment

**Meeting September 6, 2022 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. ET**

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

**Vice Chair: Peter Yee (NSA-CSD/AKAYLA)**

**Vice Chair: Stephen Orr (Cisco)**

**Secretary: Peter Yee**

**Editor: Carol Ansley (Cox)**

**The teleconference was called to order by the Chair at 9:33 a.m. EDT.**

Agenda slide deck [11-22/1485r00](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1485-00-00bh-agenda-tgbh-2022-sep-06.pptx)

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:**

* **Organization topics (see Backup slides)**
  + **July to Sept teleconferences: Tuesdays, 9:30-11:30 am ET (this time slot)**
  + **Timeline reminder (slide 20)**
* **Issues Tracking:** [**11-21/0332r37**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0332-37-00bh-issues-tracking.docx)
* **Results of Comment Collection on D0.2:** [**11-22/0973r8**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0973-08-00bh-cc41-comments-against-d0-2.xlsx)
  + **Continue discussion on resolutions of ones that are not on topics:**
    - * **Opt-in, Pre/un-assoc, Non-AP STA-generated ID**
  + [**11-22/1078r0**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1078-00-00bh-device-id-indication.docx) **– Device ID indication (Jouni Malinen)**
  + [**11-22/1218r4**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1218-04-00bh-device-id-synchronizatoin-and-control.pptx) **– Device ID synchronization and control (Kurt Lumbatis)**
  + [**11-22/1329r2**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1329-02-00bh-cid-resolutoins-for-12-2-11.docx) **– CID resolutions for 12.2.11 (Kurt Lumbatis)**
  + **Walk-through CIDs**
  + **~1 hour**
* **Contributions (slide 16)**
  + **~1 hour**
* **WBA liaison response**

Any comments? [None]

Any objections to agenda? [None]

1. **CID Resolutions for 12.2.11**

Kurt Lumbatis (ARRIS/CommScope) presented updated comment resolutions in [11-22/1329r02](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1329-02-00bh-cid-resolutoins-for-12-2-11.docx). Based on substantive offline input from Mark Rison (Samsung), the text has been updated. The changes are too numerous to list here but are shown in the markup of the document.

Q- When you say in Association Request/Response frame, why do you not put “non-AP STA” there? I don’t think we need to overemphasize that.

A- I can change that.

Q- In the sentence “A STA shall not send an identifier to any STA that does indicate Device ID active.”, there appears to be a missing “not”.

C- I also noted that in the mark up.

A- You are correct.

Q- In the following paragraph, why do we indicate something in the RSN Capabilities instead of in the KDE?

A- I can take a look at that, but that’s the Extended RSN Capabilities, not the regular RSN Capabilities.

C- Let me take a look at that.

C- The RSNXE is sent in message 2. The STA asserts the security policy it wants in the RSNE and RSNXE in the Association Request. The AP can then validate that in message 2 of the 4-way handshake.

Q- Do we have a problem if we are not using FILS if we advertise it in both fields?

Q- What is the benefit of the AP knowing a STA supports device ID prior to the 4-way handshake?

A- I didn’t specify this protocol, so the person who did would best answer that.

C- The RSNE and RSNXE in message 2 must match the Association Request.

C- There seems to be a scenario where it needs to be signaled. We may not need the RSNXE.

C- I’ll take some notes to see how this should be addressed.

Q- If the AP needs to determine what credential the STA is going to use, doesn’t it need to know this in the Association?

A- This is just a bit that says I support device ID. It doesn’t give any more information than that.

C- I’m trying to understand the rationale for having it there.

A- I think it allows the AP to prepare that a device ID can be expected if the STA has indicated it can do it.

C- There’s nothing the AP needs to do to prepare. If the device ID comes along, it handles it.

Q- How do we want to indicate support for this? On an ESS or BSS basis? It can be set on a per-ESS or per-BSS basis.

A- I think we agreed that it’s not per BSS. We keep using the vague phrase that it’s per network.

Q- Are you saying that not all BSSs in the same ESS are not using the same SSID?

A- No, but the converse is not true.

Q- We are talking about an ESS in which the same SSID is used.

A- That’s true.

Q- Is the “same network” the same as the “ESS”?

A- Yes.

C- Then let’s use “ESS” everywhere.

C- It gets tricky because the AP has to pass the identifier up to a high level or deal with it itself.

C- I think we should change “network” to “ESS”.

C- The changes in 11-22/1079 you note have not been approved.

C- I can remove that.

C- Note, I’m using “identifier” and “device ID” interchangeably as we haven’t yet agreed on the term.

[Reduced volume of notes from this point forward as it was difficult to follow the discussion that was jumping around on a cluttered screen. Important decisions will be documented.]

C- [Regarding the sentence “When a non-AP STA associates to a BSS or ESS for the first time …”] Most of the language in the base specification talks about associating to an AP, which is in an ESS. But it’s not completely consistent in the baseline.

C- There’s a difference between the first time associating to this ESS as opposed to this AP.

C- The insertion of “any AP in an” before “ESS” (and deletion of “a BSS”) fixes that.

C- If we agree on the concept, let’s wordsmith it offline.

C- [Regarding the sentence “For subsequent associations or re-associations to the same…”], I believe we agreed that this did not apply to re-association. And the identifier will then be needed every time.

Q- What happens if the AP assigns a new identifier?

C- To be clear, that’s at an association not a re-association.

C- We take out the re-association.

C- Interestingly, the last paragraph opens the door to STA-assigned identifiers, which we have not yet agreed upon.

C- Add a note to the last paragraph that says, “The AP might use an identifier from the non-AP STA when the STA has an identifier from the ESS but the ESS no longer has a record of this identifier.”

C- I think “does not recognize” means a controversial topic. It could be an attacker. You wouldn’t send the new ID to an attacker.

C- This only happens under security. Nothing is going in the clear, so the attacker needed to have keying material in order to join the network.

C- The identifier is assigned in message 2, so you don’t have to have the password.

Q- So, if the PTK doesn’t match, the STA shouldn’t accept the new ID?

C- [Regarding the sentence “When an AP receives a zero-length…” (see the next version of the text)] I can’t remember if KDEs have an embedded length, but let’s have someone bring a presentation on that.

C- I’ll post an r03 of the text incorporating today’s discussion.

**Meeting adjoined at 11:19 a.m. EDT.**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Ansley, Carol | Cox |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Bajko, Gabor | Mediatek |
| TGbh | 9/6 | De la Oliva, Antonio | InterDigital |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Halasz, Dave | Morse Micro |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Harkins, Dan | HPE |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Henry, Jerome | Cisco |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Kain, Carl | USDOT, Noblis |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Lumbatis, Kurt | ARRIS/CommScope, Inc. |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Montemurro, Mike | Huawei |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Mutgan, Okan | Nokia |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Nezou, Patrice | Canon |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Orr, Stephen | Cisco |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Rison, Mark | Samsung |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Sam, Harvey | Broadcom Corporation |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Sevin, Julien | Canon |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Stanley, Dorothy | HPE |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Thakore, Darshak | CableLabs |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Thakur, Sidharth | Apple |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Yang, Jay | Nokia |
| TGbh | 9/6 | Yee, Pete | NSA-CSD |