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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meetings that took place Wednesday August 07th.

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; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

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

Chair calls meeting to order at 10:03 ET.

Agenda slide deck: [11-24-1354r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1354-02-00bi-tgbi-telecon-july-august-agenda.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 11-24-1354r2 (slide #14)**
   1. Discussion on agenda

11-24/1304r0 will not be presented due to author unavailability.

11-24/1371r0, and 11-24/1359r0 asked to be presented.

Both documents are added to the agenda since there is no other document ready. Those documents will be presented after 11-24/1121r2.

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (12 participants).

1. **Administrative**
   1. Upcoming Teleconference dates:

August 14, 21, 28, September 4

Chair ask people having contributions ready to inform the chair to prepare next agendas.

1. **Technical contributions**
   1. [11-24/1121r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1121-02-00bi-cr-for-12-14-4.docx) : CR for 12.14.4: **P**o-Kai Huang

New presentation, resuming last meeting presentation about CID identified as requiring discussion (1427, 1440, 1210, 1194).

* + 1. Discussion

Q: On CID 1427: those general terms are currently not used for 802.1x. The 2 new subclauses are related to 802.1x so we should use the terminology from 802.1x (authenticator/ supplicant).

A: OK, let’s differ it for today and have an off line discussion on the reasoning.

Friendly editorial modification on 1440.

Only CID1427 is differed and author request a SP for the rest of the CIDs.

Author prepared online revision 3 including latest modification occurred during the presentation

**StrawPoll#1 Initial text**:

Support adding the resolutions for the following CIDs in 1121r3 to the current TGbi Draft:

1155, 1426, 1428, 1429, 1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434,   
1435, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1181, 1390, 1393,   
1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1183, 1129, 1179, 1182,   
1193, 1195, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1207, 1208, 1209,   
1130, 1047, 1196, 1197, 1220, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1403, 1213,   
1214, 1215, 1216, 1219, 1221, 1226, 1194, 1149, 1228

**Discussion on SP#1 text:**

No discussion

**SP#1 result:** unanimous consent.

* 1. [11-24/1359r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1359-00-00bi-clause-10-71-2-2-fixes.docx) : Clause 10.71.2.2 fixes: Jerome Henry

Document presented by Jerome, resolving CIDs for 10.71.2.2 EDP epoch request part.

* + 1. Discussion

Q: CID1020: the “otherwise” is confusing.

A: The intend is define what happens if the station as less stringent requirements than the AP default groups.

C: make the same sentence with a “less than” and then avoid using the otherwise.

A: OK.

CID1332:

C: Remove the “Action frame” part since the frame is a protected action frame, no need to mention it there.

A: OK.

Q: Do we need EDP in front of the frame name?

A: OK, we may redefine the name in newt step.

Author will prepare an r1 and come back for the SP later on.

* 1. [11-24/1371r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1371-00-00bi-fixes-to-clause-10-71-2-3.docx) : Clause 10.71.2.3 fixes: Jerome Henry

Document presented by Jerome, resolving CIDs for 10.71.2.3 Group EDP epoch part.

* + 1. Discussion

Editorial online modification of the CID 1333 resolution.

CID #1336, 1019, 1074:

Q: Editorial comment: When you change the same sentence several times, can you provide the final result?

A: At the end, we have the final text, but it is difficult to see where the changes come from. This is why we have the resolution CID per CID and then the final cumulated results.

Q: Do we use unicast? Supposed to be “individually addressed”

A: Agree

Modification adopted in live to be in next release.

Q: Do we need the “Enhanced” in the name “Enhanced EDP Group Parameters”?

A: The element carried is called Enhanced Group Privacy this is why the frame is named like that, but I agree since EDP already include Enhanced, we do not need it. We can remove it.

C: Individually sending this frame is inefficient.

A: We had discussion for this. You can send it with high MCS with unicast. If broadcast, we need to send with low MCS.

CID1082:

Q: What if there are several predefined groups?

A: Agree, there may be typically 3 EDP epoch groups: default (mid frequency), privacy sensitive (high frequency), IoT (low frequency). There is another document in preparation by another contributor on this subject.

CID1076:

Editorial modification of the content of the added note.

CID1113:

C: We are assigning a CPE non-AP MLD to a Group and not to an Epoch, and a Group has an associated Epoch structure. This is why “Group EDP epoch” has been changed to “EDP Groups”.

C: We have two ways to express this. We advertise Epoch parameters more than Group parameters. Is a Group one param associated to Epoch or is an Epoch one param associated to a Group? We need to clarify this.

C: I Prefer the proposed modification. Group is the key concept which gathers all params.

C: We have one group vs one epoch. Better to add “Epoch” to clarify EDP groups and their “Epoch” parameters.

C: Anyway, Epoch should be still there. We should discuss how to coexist these two terms.

C: EDP Group seems to be the common concept and agrees on Jerome’s direction.

Author indicates he will ask for more inputs on this last subject thru the reflector.

No more questions.

1. **AoB**

No other business.

1. Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:00 EDT.
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