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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meetings that took place Thursday April 11th.

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: 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: [11-24-0646r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0646-02-00bi-tgbi-telecon-agenda-apr-may.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance
2. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents

No one responded to the call for essential patents but there is a comment.

1. Review of policies and procedures.

IEEE individual process slides were presented.

1. The chair covered the IEEE copyright policy and participation rules.
	1. Questions

No Questions

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-24-0646r2 (slide #14)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

No discussion

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (14 participants).
1. **Administrative**
	1. Upcoming teleconferences planning
* Apr 18th, 25th
* May 2nd, 9th

Call from the chair to indicate if people need a timeslot for presentation for one of the next planned teleconferences.

1. **Technical presentations**
	1. [11-24/0681r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0681-01-00bi-auto-and-group-epochs.pptx) -- Auto and group epochs – Jerome Henry

Document presented by Jerome.

Present an explanation of the spec text proposal in a PPT format to explain and discuss on the concepts.

* + 1. Discussion

Q: On slide 5: Is default group information sent very frequently?

A: unicast protected frame is used, but only sent to new STAs.

Q: What is the reason for this group count field?

A: Efficiency of the hiding in a group depends on the number of STAs in this group. This count helps stations to select the group to be well hidden.

Q: On slide 5: “Number of participating STAs” is changing very often, since percentage field value changes each time a Station associates or dissociates from the BSS. Do you resend the default Group info each time?

A: yes. I don’t think it is so frequent. This field is useful to evaluate the impact of privacy. Large group is better for privacy.

C: For clarification, in slide12, you indicate that in other proposals, stations do not rotate at the same time, but in doc 11-24/0645, STAs rotate at the same time also, the pseudo random variation is the same for all stations this is a “pseudo” random.

A: OK I got it now thank you.

C: On slide 4, I have the same view about managing intervals management.

Q: slide 4: What is the difference between Length and Duration?

A: Those are the same.

Q: I have a concern with very small interval, did you hear some feedbacks from implementers on this challenge?

A: I don’t see a challenge here. Can you provide reasons why you cannot support those interval values?

A: Lot of this will be implementation dependent and makers will not provide details, but may just say they have issues.

C: I have same concerns as previous commenter about “Number of Stas” due to overhead.

A: We need to consider a reduction of the overhead.

A: I think we first need to consider is this field is really needed.

Q: How a STA can be aware of other groups?

A: Exact signaling is not fully defined.

C: As mentioned in previous sessions, there may be different TBTTs for multiple links. I think this is better to use TSF as a reference for the Epoch start time.

A: I don’t see advantages of rotating all links at the same time.

C: regarding the AID offset: Changing the whole block of AID by a simple offset make it easy to determine.

Q: How to find available AID values if it is changed so frequently?

Q: AP is in charge of tracking collision and resolution? If conflict detected, do you change all links?

A: Yes, for the collision resolution, and I have no opinion for all links.

Q: How a sleeping STA can be aware about future collision or change of parameters?

A: MAC collision is a complex problem; the AP will handle it and inform the stations.

Q: Does a station just ignore next transition when there is a collision detection?

A: no, they can use the value planned for next Epoch for instance.

C: Say to a tracker when parameters change is not acceptable. We have to take about that.

C: You can put default group info in an association response, and negotiation can be performed during association step 3.

C: Please don’t modify 4way handshake. Assoc response for default and specific action frames for modification is a better way to go.

A: Yes, we can use dedicated action frames to make station join in.

C: MAC header obfuscation allows to have very short Epoch.

C: I hope we could apply short epoch to CPE and BPE when no legacy is present in the BSS to provide better privacy to BPE.

Q: Can we consider pseudo random AID offset per group instead of a fixed offset for all?

A: I think automatic AID and different groups are very attractive, but we need to work more on this.

Q: Should we consider changing privacy parameters for all links of an MLD at the same time?

A: Jerome no opinion.

Q: Should we run a SP for that now?

A: This is an important decision so please differ SP for the next session.

C: We have to state this sooner, can you start a thread on the reflector to discuss this.

A: yes, I will do it.

C: If privacy parameters change at the same time on all links, we disclose the MLO structure.

A: MLO structure is already send in clear in beacons and probe responses.

Q: Are automatic and group epoch the same?

A: Automatic and group Epoch are now merged in this presentation.

1. **AoB**

No other business.

1. Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:50 EDT.
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