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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meetings that took place Wednesday October 02nd.

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 10:05 ET.

Agenda slide deck: [11-24-1681r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1681-00-00bi-october-telecon-agenda.pptx):

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

No answers.

1. Review of policies and procedures.

IEEE individual process slides were presented.

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

No Questions

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-24-1681r0 (slide #14)**
   1. Discussion on agenda

No discussion

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (11 participants).

1. **Administrative**
   1. Upcoming ATL Ad Hoc Meeting: Oct. 28-30, attendance poll

Chair propose to use a Doodle poll to gather people intending to attend in person or remotely to the 11bi ad-hoc meeting.

C: Doodle is ok to me.

Q: What will be the meeting hours, and is it hybrid?

A (Chair) : My proposal is 08:00 to 17:00 in hybrid mode.

C: Just a comment for European people attending remotely: This week will be special since Europe goes to winter time one week before US, and then, there will be one hour less difference between US time and Europe time during this ad-hoc.

1. **Technical contributions**
   1. [11-24/1679r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1679-00-00bi-cr-for-miscellaneous-cids.docx) – CR for Miscellaneous CIDs: Po-Kai Huang

Document presented by Po-Kai solving 4 CIDs: 1227, 1229, 1287, 1427

The resolution of those CIDs requires no text modification.

* + 1. Discussion:

CID1227:

Q: Can you ask ANA before draft being motioned?

A: Yes, there are several ANA operations you can perform (request, modify, …), and for a request of new ANA I think it is now good time to request and then modify later if needed.

CID 1229:

Q: I am a little concerned to generalizing the name by changing name from “FILS nonce” to “nonce”. I think this becomes more difficult to differentiate between the nonce itself and the element.

A: Depending on the usage, talking about the nonce or the element, becomes obvious. In addition, we will use the nonce not only for FILS, so I think it is better to generalize the name.

Q: Why do we use the FILS nonce?

A: Historical reason. This nonce has been introduced in FILS, but can be reused to avoid creating a new element. Same mechanism happened in other cases already. 11az made the choice of using the FILS nonce without changing the name but I think this is time to clean things.

Q: Now, we need to change the name everywhere, why making this difficult task?

A: I made a global search and replace but, in this case, there are limited number of instances and I made all the changes.

C: This name is used in different amendment, so I wonder if this name change will create issues on different places.

A: I think it is better reusing rather than creating a new element.

C: I agree that the field name is a bad name, but changing to “nonce” only may not properly solve the issue, and creates additional issue on existing implementation.

A: Implementation is based on element ID, not on the name of the field, so it should not create implementation issue.

Chair suggest to keep going, since this is not author’s intention to straw poll the document today, and then gather offline feedbacks.

CID1287:

C: I think there is a typo in the resolution text: this should be “protected Action Frame”

A: OK, I agree.

Resolution text is changed accordingly.

CID1427:

C: I think introducing this new terminology (originator/responder) make it more confusing. I prefer to keep authenticator/supplicant terminology to keep coherence in clause 12.

A: In FT I duplicate the sentences for MLD and non MLD, and received comments that this is strictly the same. So, I had to introduce the FT originator and responder that can be AP MLD or not. Again, those terms are not new in FT.

C: This is part of the discussion if an MLD is a STA. I think this is better to separate MLD and non MLD in a separate paragraph, but I will not block the process if other people agree with your approach.

A: I think this is safe if we maintain the modification to the FT stuff. But I am also OK to split in between MLD and non-MLD.

C: I second separating into MLD and non-MLD paragraphs.

A: OK, if this is the preference I can duplicate and see other feedbacks.

Q: About FT, there are “originator” and “responder”, but they are “authentication originator” and “authentication responder”.

A: Of course, this is not exactly the same thing. In our case we want something similar and I created a general name without using FT complete names.

Author request no SP today on this document to allow offline feedbacks.

* 1. [11-24/1678r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-1678-00-00bi-cr-for-1148.docx) : – CR for 1148: Po-Kai Huang

Document presented by Po-Kai.

Document related to the issue of adding a PMKSA caching procedure.

Proposal is to put PMKID in first 802.1X authentication frame, and reuse the PKKSA caching procedure with the addition of the 802.1X case.

Document then update several clauses to insert 802.1X case

* + 1. Discussion:

Q: When PMKID is not recognize then the procedure should continue after reception of an error code right?

A: in fact, this is not the case. If you do not go thru, the 802.1x continue. You do not have to stop.

C: In this paragraph you indicate “refuse”. I wonder what it means here?

A: If the client decides to put the PMKID only, the AP do not have the SAE material and refuses. It depends if the client save time by providing everything at once.

Q: This document covers both EDP Keying by basically copying SAE and 802.1x. Should we add more text for EDP key here?

A: I think we dont need to add anything more, but we can check.

Q: So, I assume PASN doesn’t touch those sections?

A: Yes. Maybe REVmf can do it.

Autor do not request to SP it today to let people think if it makes sense.

1. **AoB**

No other business.

1. Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:20 EDT
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