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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11bh telecon meeting of November 29, 2022.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer

C- proceeds a comment

**Meeting November 29, 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. EST.**

Agenda slide deck [11-22/2070r00](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-2070-00-00bh-agenda-tgbh-2022-nov-29.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:**

* **Attendance, noises/recording, meeting protocol reminders**
* **Policies, duty to inform, participation rules**
* **Organization topics (see Backup slides)**
  + **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:** [**11-22/0973r13**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0973-13-00bh-cc41-comments-against-d0-2.xlsx)
* **Motions record:** [**11-22/0651r9**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0651-09-00bh-tgbh-motions-list.pptx)
* **Contributions (slide 16)**
* **WBA liaison response**

Any comments? [None]

Any objections to agenda? [None]

1. **CID resolutions for 12.2.11**

Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/CommScope) led a discussion of [11-22/1329r10](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1329-10-00bh-cid-resolutoins-for-12-2-11.docx), which has been updated based on feedback given during the November plenary meeting.

CID 2 is currently marked as “accepted”, but then it is not really accepted as-is. As the resolution has instructions to the editor, the resolution is really “revised”. This is a recurring theme in this presentation.

C- I’m not sure that an “if” is required in the bullet item on page 7 that starts “If the AP requires a recognized Identifier”. The AP can fail an association for other reasons.

C- Agreed. The AP can fail the association for a variety of other reasons.

Q- Should the overall choice on the section be that the AP “may” do something as opposed to “shall”?

A- I think the AP can choose to do other things or nothing at all. Thus, “may” covers that case.

C- We covered this during the face-to-face meeting and didn’t reach agreement.

Q- Do we have to the complete list of things the AP can do?

A- I think if we are using “shall” we have to have the complete list.

C- We talked about sending back the old identifier or the new identifier. I think we agreed on refusing to use an unrecognized identifier.

C- Thanks for reminding me. I’m fine with changing it to “shall”.

C- I’ll add a reminder that we still need to discuss this point.

Q- Looking at the baseline text, has it accomplished everything that CID 2 raised?

A- Not seeing any comments, I’ll assume that the group is satisfied with the resolution now. [To be recorded in [11-22/1329r11](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1329-11-00bh-cid-resolutoins-for-12-2-11.docx).]

Q- Looking at CID 3, this one is “revised” as well. Any concerns? [None]

CID 4 asks for a verification step. Do we need more text to make the verification explicit? [No one suggested anything.]

Going on to CID 6, any comments? [None]

CID 10. [Changed to “revised”.]

CID 11. The stipulation of the Device ID being new each time has been received. Any comments? [None]

CID 25. This asks for one use of “opaque identifier” being changed to “identifier” to match the rest of the paragraph. The resolution is still waiting on Antonio de la Oliva’s proposal for the what the correct term is.

C- The revised resolution there can’t just say “given below”.

C- After the call, I’ll clarify those in the resolution. We also need to check Clause 9.

C- Annex Z also needs to be checked.

C- Agreed. This CID is not ready, but we are heading in a direction, so that’s a good start.

CID 26. This is marked as a duplicate of CID 6. Any objections to that? Procedurally, we could just put the resolution from CID 6 here as well rather than pointing back to CID 6.

C- This is the same thing as the verification procedure. We haven’t determined that yet.

Q- Right. Do we still think we need a verification procedure?

A- A verification procedure covers what happens when the ID is not recognized. Until we finalize that paragraph, I think this CIDs are still pending.

C- That’s up to the group. Do we feel clarification or some verification process is needed?

C- I would say that if the AP receives an identifier that is not recognized, I would define a feedback mechanism. I’m not sure if the group wants that. This paragraph is “what should the AP do” rather than a feedback mechanism. I’ve asked for one before, but I think the group is not concerned about that.

C- I agree with your summary. I believe the group has not felt the need for such formality.

C- I think we have a feedback mechanism implied, but it is not very much of a mechanism.

C- I guess the “AP may fail the association” means that the AP will not send 4-way handshake message 3 or will send a Deauthentication frame. It’s ambiguous. An explicit feedback mechanism would be more appropriate. We generally are explicit about these sorts of things. Maybe we can live with it. I’m kind of in the middle.

Q- Anyone else?

C- I understand we want to keep it as simple as possible.

Q- You can bring a presentation, or we can see if anyone else wants to pursue the matter. If not, we can leave it the way it is. [Nobody spoke up.] Do you want to pursue this further with a presentation or give up?

A- I’m in the middle, so it would be better to discuss this during another call.

C- Understood. [And so marked in the document.] If you feel strongly, please bring a presentation.

CID 30 is changed from “accept” to “revised”. We need to check that clause 9 has all the changes indicated. [No comments]

CID 31. I think this has been cleared up by the resolution. Is everyone okay with change from “may” to “shall”? [No responses.]

CID 33. Some wordsmithing suggestions. This is a “revised”, not an “accepted”. Any comments? [None]

CID 49. We have revised text here that seems to resolve the comment.

CID 50. I believe we have addressed this one satisfactorily.

CID 51. The resolution on this one needs to be changed so that it has an “(including FT)”. Any comments? [None]

CID 52. I think we’ve responded to that one.

CID 53. “Identifier” is now used throughout but will be subject to de la Oliva’s proposal when it is ready.

CID 55. Covered.

CID 63. I’m not sure why Kurt Lumbatis does not believe this CID is completely resolved as he indicated in the resolution. Anyone know why he would think that? I think we can remove that note in the resolution. [No objection.]

CID 65. This is implied in both directions. That seems to address the comment.

If anyone has other thoughts, please be ready to discuss those during the next call or even on the reflector.

A reminder that our next call is on a Thursday evening to see if that works out better for folks in Asia.

**Meeting adjoined at 10:34 a.m. EST.**
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