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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meetings that took place Thursday January 4th.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q – proceeds a question

A - proceeds an answer

C - proceeds a comment

Yellow highlight - action point

**January 4th:**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Stéphane Baron**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Stephen McCann, Huawei**

**Technical editor: Po-Kai Huang, Intel**

Chair calls meeting to order at 10:02 ET.

Agenda slide deck: [11-23-2162r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2162-03-00bi-agenda-for-dec-telecons.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance
2. Review of policies and procedures.
   1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.
3. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
   1. No one responded to the call for essential patents but there is a comment.
4. The chair covered the IEEE copyright policy and participation rules.
   1. Questions

No Questions

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-23-2162r3 (slide #14)**
   1. Discussion on agenda

No discussion

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (14 participants).

1. **Administrative**
   1. Upcoming teleconference meeting times:
      * Jan. 11th 2024: 10:00 to 12:00 EDT

Chair indicated that current slot do not have conflict with other groups (mainly 11bn), and will discuss with 11bn chair to avoid future conflict after January meeting.

1. **Technical Submissions**
   1. [11-23/2098r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2098-03-00bi-frame-anonymization-fa-normative-text-for-11bi.docx) – Frame Anonymization (FA) normative text for 11bi -- Philip Hawkes

Present document that was amended online during last meeting (r3), and prepare r4 that will contain today’s changes.

The group agreed that the text on 11-23/2098r3 before the tag is agreed and can be added to the spec text.

* + 1. Discussion

C: Author indicated that the part related to the setup of the FAPU requires additional text based on previous straw poll about the

Q: Is it the idea to make a comeback on this signaling?

A: Yes the goal is to see the agreement we can have on, and remove the part we have no agreement to see how mush we can put in the spec.

C: I support the time-based change proposed by other contributor, and I think that single FAPU request is too complex and provide too much overhead. I prefer to have less signaling and use the time base approach instead.

C: This text is not really useful as it is and the timing for the changes needs to be precise.

C: In addition, I think we should not mix retransmission here even if I agree on the concept.

A: The introduction has no normative text; this is just an explanation of how things are supposed to work. This is just informative text.

Q: Doing the wording change online may not be that efficient, maybe we should do it offline?

A: Agree.

According to comments, the author prefers to skip 10.x.2 since there is no consensus, and jump to 10.x.3

C: The title no includes individually addressed instead of \*DATA frame since we can also address control frames for instance.

C: One recommendation is to say AP MLD and non-AP MLD frames instead of Uplink and downlink.

Q: I want to clarify that SN offset will be different per Tid, or per SN space. So, can we rather refer to the SN space table instead in the text of the bullet 5 for the 10.x.3 introduction?

C: Table 10-5—Transmitter sequence number spaces

A: Ok, sounds good to me.

Q: You have separate clause for uplink and downlink. Is there a specific reason for that or can we have only one clause?

A: Well, main difference comes from the address field in the frame that is changed. Another difference is on the A-MPDU aggregation rules. Finally, there are also differences on the address filtering.

C: MLD level stuff is the same but affiliated STA part is changing.

C: Maybe we can have a common part and then just have the AP or STA specific parts to help readers.

A: we can keep it like that to ease our work and modify it after for readers.

C: You indicates that stations have the parameters values before applying them What about the error cases? I assume that you will have a section indicating what happens if you are un-sync.

A: I can add an error case section.

C: I can remove this part if needed.

A: yes, it is better.

C: If the AP keeps it address, I think this is not good for the privacy.

A: I agree but we have no consensus and no proposal on this topic, this is why we have nothing here dealing with that.

C: I think things can be simpler by indicating that a device sending this type of frame goes thru a given process without mentioning the type of device. We are obscuring frames by changing things.

A: I appreciate the feed back but need time to evaluate what to do with this.

C: Regarding previous comment, I think we can have a common part and add detailed things in annex to give details on some case (uplink, downlink).

C: I think this section applies to AP and non-AP and do not provide many explanations. But we need to put something in this section.

C: There is no mentioning on the “CPE” today, but I think we should focus on this is a first step. BPE can be delayed.

A: Agree we should refer to the CPE

Q: Not sure we should keep the address 2 filtering since this is implementation specific.

A: Ok, so I can remove the AP only processes that is checking the address 2.

C: I agree there is a confusion since 10.x.3 Is for individually addressed but latter paragraph (10.x.3.1) is data plane related.

C: I think we can add CPE in the title and have a dedicated part for BPE in a second step.

C: I don’t like the fact we deal with the TXOP rules here, because there is no MAC data plane part dedicated to the TXOP. I think we should move this part in a section we deal with having a TXOP.

C: I think this should be normative.

A: Agree. If a STA change its MAC address during a TXOP, then nobody knows who is the TXOP holder for instance. So rather put it in a retransmission related section.

Author propose to stop at that point before going to 10.x.4

No objection.

Chair reminds that we have a meeting next week and we can then resume the document review, and request for additional contribution.

Discussion on January schedule.

Chair indicated that, for the moment, we have 4 slots scheduled during next interim in January.

So, people planning additional contributions can indicate it to the chair, so that she can request additional slots if needed.

1. **AoB**
   1. No other business.
2. Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:48 EDT.
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