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Abstract

This document contains the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bi task group meetings that took place during the IEEE 802.11 Mixed Mode May interim taking place between 12th and 16th May 2025. The on-site location for the meeting was Warsaw (Poland)

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q – proceeds a question

A - proceeds an answer

C - proceeds a comment

Yellow highlight - action point

**Revision:**

R0: initial revision

**1rst slot: Monday May 12th 2025, 13:30 local time.**

**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 13:32 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0625r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0625-02-00bi-tgbi-may-2025-meeting-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

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

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0625r2 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

Documents: 11-25/0891r1, 11-25/0924r2, 11-25/0925r1, 11\_25/0934r0 are added to the presentation queue upon author’s request.

Authors indicated that Document 11-25/0583 is now r2 and Doc 11-25/0708 is r1

Agenda modified accordingly.

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (26 participants online, 16 in the room).
1. **Administrative:**

**Schedule for the week**

 Monday: PM1 –25/583r0 - partially presented, 25/693r2, and 25/692r3

Tuesday: PM1 –25/536, 554, 532, 535, and 25/708r0, 25/708r0

Wednesday: AM1 –25/485r5, 25/625r3, and 25/895r0

Thursday: AM1 – Review timeline, straw polls/motions of accumulated documents, submission queue

Thursday: PM1 – Ad Hoc discussion, closing motions, submission queue

**Approval of the previous minutes.**

**Motion #61 text:**

Approve the prior session minutes:

11-25/0444r1 (March Plenary minutes)

11-25/0543r0 (TGbi Teleconference minutes March-April 2025)

**Motion #61: moved by Jerome Henry and seconded by Po-Kai Huang**

**Discussion on motion #61:**

No discussion

**Motion #61 approved by unanimous consent (27 attendees online and 16 in the room)**

1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0583r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0583-02-00bi-bpe-discovery-comment-resolutions.docx) – BPE Discovery Comment Resolutions -- Jarkko Kneckt

Document presented by the author.

 R1 contains corrections after last presentation and associated comments.

 R2 now includes CID 618 that was related to this document

Author first briefly recap the content of the previously presented document.

* + 1. Discussion

CID 134, 306, 416, 619, 622: no discussion

CID620:

Editorial correction on note#1

Q: Should we mention “non-AP MLD” instead of “STA”?

A: Here this is really on one link so the STA is correct there.

Q: What about “Affiliated STA”, then? To avoid this text applying to non-MLD?

A: Agree

Text modified accordingly.

CID 622, no discussion

CID627:

Q: in the resolution text, you should mention “This text clarifies” instead of” clarified”

A: Agree

New CID resolution resumed from here:

CID628, 629, no discussion

CID631: Editorial modification

CID633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 746, 747, 749, 773,775, 815: No discussion

830:

Q: is it “the key” or “a key”?

A: I think this is “the key”

831:

Q: Can we address in the rejection text that it is fine not to indicate that to the STA? So what is the need for this value?

A: It is to indicate it should be short and add a maximum value for the answer.

Resolution text modified accordingly.

832, 894: no discussion

CID 895:

Q: The resolution sentence is unclear. Can we indicate “a single entity to compute”?

A: Agree.

CID930: no discussion

Q: what is the new public action frame? Is it different from Privacy beacon?

A: Privacy beacon is periodic without payload. This new frame is a request sent by non ap to obtain encrypted content.

CID 994, 1021: No discussion

CID 831 is still under drafting even if a common agreement is found.

CID3:

C: correct element name is MME, not MMC

A: agree.

Author will come back with a new revision.

* 1. [11-25/0692r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0692-03-00bi-cids-9-6-42-5-9-6-42-6.docx) – CIDs 9.6.42.5 9.6.42.6 -- Antonio de la Oliva,

Document presented by the author.

* + 1. Discussion

CID1016,1017, 62, 218 are all resolved by 218 resolution

858,859

Q: Is it possible for the station to answer?

A: Yes, this assignment can be answered with EDP Epoch response.

Q: What is the difference with previous request since the station can answer?

A: This is what was discussed in previous meeting and agreed by the group.

C: I agree with the direction, even if this new frame is a duplicate from the request.

Q: Do we have a place, in the draft, where we indicate that the station can answer?

A: Yes page 7.

Q: Is it same frame to answer the two requests (assignment, and request)?

A: Yes.

CID 909, 922, 1018, 63, 217, 1019 no discussion

Author then create revision 4 according to last comment received, and request a SP

**SP#1:**

Agree with the resolutions in document 25/692r4 for comments: 1016, 1017, 62, 218, 858, 859, 909, 922, 1018, 63, 217, 1019

Chair ask if there is any objection on **SP#1**

No objection received

**SP#1 received no objection** (27 people online and 15 in the room)

* 1. [11-25/0693r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0693-02-00bi-cids-9-6-42-7.docx) – CIDs 9.6.42.7 -- Antonio de la Oliva,

Document presented by the author.

* + 1. Discussion

CID 123, 219, 951, 1020, 211: No discussion

Author request to run a SP.

C: I would like time to review the doc, can we defer the SP to tomorrow

A: OK.

C: Chair schedules the SP to tomorrow’s agenda.

* 1. [11-25/0554r5](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0554-05-00bi-12-16-6-comments.docx) – 12.16.6 comments – Po-kai Huang

Document presented by the author

Cleanup of 2 remaining CIDs (915, and 176) after previous presentation

* + 1. Discussion

CID 915, 176: no discussion

 Author uploads R5 and request a SP for this document.

**SP#2**:

Text : Agree with the resolutions in document 25/554r5 for comments: 167, 165, 966, 166, 139, 140, 678, 680, 681, 849, 850, 945, 4, 266, 978, 683, 684, 685, 915, 176.

Chair ask if there is objection to this **SP#2**

No objection received.

**SP#2 received no objection**

* 1. [11-25/0536r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0536-00-00bi-12-16-5-comments.docx) – 12.16.5 comments– Po-kai Huang

Document presented by the author

* + 1. Discussion

CID 675, 676, 847, 848, 965

CID848:

C: You mention X is a value that is larger than 3. Can we simply say this is a value larger or equal to 3, instead of using an ‘X’ intermediate?

A: I see. OK

CID965:

C: I don’t think the last part of the paragraph is specific enough.

C: I think this is more complex than just receiving fails it also depend on the state upon reception.

C: For failure I would prefer to reuse the status code from 802.1X on AP side.

C: High level direction is OK for me. I would like more text on key derivation.

Commenter will help providing text to the Author on this Cid resolution.

C: You say “extract” and process but say differently in another place “extracts” and “processes”

C: for the mast sentence, I think that we may not need to go for this EAP reason.

C: I think we nned to discuss offline for this CID.

CID 965 is then tabled for now waiting for offline work.

Author created revision r1 accordingly

Author the request a SP on his document for the first 4 comments.

**SP#3:**

Agree with the resolutions in document 25/536r1 for comments: 675, 676, 847, 848.

Chair ask if there is any objection to this **SP#3**

**SP#3 received no objection**

1. **AoB**

No other business

Next TGbi session is tomorrow PM1.

1. Chair Recess at 15:28

**2nd slot: Tuesday May 13th 2025, 13:30 local time.**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado (replacing Stéphane Baron)**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

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

Chair calls meeting to order at 08:02 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0625r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0625-03-00bi-tgbi-may-2025-meeting-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

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

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0625r4 (slide #16)**
	1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (35 participants online, 14 in the room).
2. **Administrative:**

**Schedule for the week**

Wednesday: AM1 –25/485r5, 25/625r3, and 25/895r0

Thursday: AM1 – Review timeline, straw polls/motions of accumulated documents, submission queue

Thursday: PM1 – Ad Hoc discussion, closing motions, submission queue

1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. Document [11-25/0583r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0583-03-00bi-bpe-discovery-comment-resolutions.docx) -- BPE Discovery Comment Resolutions-- Jarkko Kneckt

**SP#1:**

Agree with the comment resolutions in document 25/583r3 for comments: 1, 3, 20, 21, 64, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 134, 306, 312, 325, 335, 364, 365, 366, 415, 416, 417, 418, 505, 506, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 746, 747, 749, 773, 775, 815, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 893, 894, 895, 930, 994, and 1021.

**SP#1 accepted without disagreement** (16 people in the room)

* 1. Document [11-25/0693r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0693-02-00bi-cids-9-6-42-7.docx) -- CIDs 9.6.42.7 -- Antonio de la Oliva

**SP#2 :**
Agree with the comment resolutions in document 25/693r2 for comments: 123, 219, 951, 1020, 211.

**SP#2 accepted without disagreement** (15 people in the room)

* 1. Document [11-25/0535r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0535-01-00bi-12-16-7-comments.docx) -- 12.16.7 comments -- Po-Kai Huang

	**SP#3:**

Agree with the comment resolutions in document 25/535r1 for comments: 178, 919, 917, 270, 687, 918.

**SP#3** **accepted without disagreement** (15 people in the room)

* 1. Document [11-25/0532r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0532-01-00bi-12-16-4-comments.docx) -- 12.16.4 comments-- Po-Kai Huang

**SP#4:**

Agree with the comment resolutions in document 25/532r1 for comments: 845, 262, 263, 264, 265, 846.

**SP#4 accepted without disagreement** (15 people in the room)

**3rd slot: Wednesday May 14th 2025, 08:00 local time.**

**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 08:02 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0625r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0625-04-00bi-tgbi-may-2025-meeting-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

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

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0625r4 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

No discussion

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (22 participants online, 9 in the room).
1. **Administrative:**

**Schedule for the week**

Thursday: AM1 – Review timeline, straw polls/motions of accumulated documents, submission queue

Thursday: PM1 – Ad Hoc discussion, closing motions, submission queue

1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0709r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0709-03-00bi-steering-to-bpe-ap-mld-text.docx) – Steering to BPE AP MLD Text-- Jarkko Kneckt

Document presented by the author.

 Resolution for CID760 and 761

* + 1. Discussion

Q: What does "a frame with set BPE Available field…" mean?

A: BPE Available field equal to 1.

Q: All this element is in the RNR in a beacon but here we have no beacon, right?

A: This needs to be configured in the AP. We will not specify how neighbor report element are obtained.

C: I don’t like the way you solve the CID. Now you use 2 mechanisms mixed together with RNR usage. It is not clear how it works today.

A: Privacy beacon is a maintenance of the BPS AP MLD. They are very short.

A: Steering is a new concept to be able to better utilize BPE AP. To allow out of band BPE AP MLD discovery.

C: My problem is that you are mixing 2 use cases. One without steering, and another with steering.

A: I believe this better for implementation to always have identity key.

C: I disagree with your approach.

Q: page 4: we only have “group addressed Management Frames”

A: ok.

Q: I think using the GTK here is not clear.

A: Thus, is just a first try, this needs refinement.

C: If you want to encrypt the frame you should indicate you use the group key from the cypher suite.

A: OK

Q: RNR are sent in clear by neighbor APs, right? How do you guaranty that an AP cannot be tracked if you indicate the newt MAC address?

A: We can clarify that this part of the element shall not be sent by non BPE AP in clear.

Q: 10.71.8: I think this I confusing. Better mentioning the usage of the different keys here. I would prefer to replace the whole paragraph with something like: "A BPE AP MLD does not use beacon protection with a BIGTK or BIP with IGTK." followed by description of Privacy Beacon frame protection and PGTK/Identity Key.

C: Suggest change the text at the end of 10.71.8.3 to "...by matching the transmitter address or the receiver address in the MAC header of a received frame to the BSSID reported in the Neighbor Report."

A: ok, I think this is better.

Q: You add a new capability so you supposed to get a bit and you didn’t this

A: Should be ANA then.

C: My key problem is the delivery of the identity key.

Q: When I store key from different APs how do I know the one to use, and how to manage this key list?

A: identity key maintenance is something that we do not specify in .11

C: I recommend removing all this identity key sharing for now.

C: You let the station decide which key to keep, for how long, this is not specified, and I think we need to describe it.

A: Today station already store a lot of AP’s information. This mechanism is out of scope of .11. I think storing this info is not a bottleneck.

Q: The station will have to check a long list of keys; I think this is an issue to store all those keys and check each of them.

A: Currently the key is per MLD. This type of computation is already used by other technology like Bluetooth. I don’t see this is an issue.

Q: Are you OK to table this, so we can check it carefully.

A: We do not propose problematic technology, this is similar to what can be performed by Bluetooth tech.

C: Bottom of page 5: Add "to 1" at the end so as to read "...that has set the BPE Available field of the Extended Capabilities element on its (Re)Association Response frame to 1."

A: Agree

C: Regarding identity key. The difference here is that identity key describes a life time. The non-AP MLD are left with a potentially life duration key. We should give a mean to determine expiration time.

C: If the AP stops and restart, I don’t think there is a way for the non-AP MLD to determine new value. I don’t know how to do that right now. I think this require more offline discussion.

C: The concept of always adding and never removing is not good.

Q: MLME scan primitive can be extended (see picture)

Q: Here, you indicate this is like a fast transition but people argue this is not.

A: I need to discuss with people to get the problem and the difference between the CPE and the BPE situation.

C (chat): regarding FT MD: "It is assumed by this standard that the reassociation deadline is administered consistently across the mobility domain. The mechanism for such consistent administration is outside the scope of this standard."; so, there is not really a rule on \_all\_ RSN parameters (as I might have said earlier), so I'm open to not having such constraint for a single MD between none/CPE/BPE

No more question.

* 1. [11-25/485r6](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0485-06-00bi-comment-resolution-for-multiple-comments-in-10-71-7.docx) – Comment resolution for multiple comments in 10.71.7-- Domenico Ficara Document presented by the author.

 Follow up presentation after previous presentation and reception of comments.

CID597 and 762, 828

* + 1. Discussion

Q: In the EDP element has an EDP epoch setting fields. Do we have the AID list here?

A: no, it is in another element.

C: You should indicate that the AID list is encrypted.

A: Maybe we don’t need to indicate it there. I think we have general sentence saying that everything is encrypted.

C: I am strongly against indicating “encrypted” here, otherwise it means that all other places are not encrypted.

Editorial friendly amendments.

Author upload r7 taking into received comments, and request an SP

SP#1:

Agree with the comment resolutions in 25/485r7 for comments: 96, 97, 132, 133, 358, 359, 360, 483, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 762, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 875.

Chair ask if anybody disagree with those comment resolutions.

C: I object to pre\_motion

SP1# received 1 objection (33 people online 16 people in the room).

* 1. [11-25/626r3](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0626-03-00bi-tgbi-4-5-4-10a-comment-resolution.docx) – TGbi\_4.5.4.10a\_Comment\_resolution – Carol Ansley

Document presented by the author.

 Follow up presentation after previous presentation and reception of comments.

* + 1. Discussion

CID389

Q: What does it mean “previously shared identity key”? Does it mean “previously configured”?

A: Yes.

C: (tech editor): This is already solved in another document, so just indicate change from preconfigure to configure.

C: An easy way may be to transfer this comment to the other resolution.

A: There is no need to do that, this part of the text is already corrected in doc 583r3 already straw polled.

Q: What is the definition of the identity key here. Do we need to indicate preconfigured here if this is in the definition?

A: You need that key to match the Hash. You need that key before you can do it.

C: We could say CID#389 could be addressed with this, to be consistent: “REVISED. Agree in principle with the comment. TGBI Editor, please make the changes as shown in the submission 25/583r1 and 25/583r3 and identified with CID #631”.

C: Just remove the 10.78 part from your document so there is no conflict anymore.

A: Ok

Document modified accordingly.

Author uploaded r4 then request a SP.

**SP#2:**

Agree with the comment resolutions in doc 25/626r4 for comments: 11, 104, 297, 303, 304, 382, 383, 384, 385, 387, 388, 389, 390, 771, 787, 788, 789, 880,881, 882, 904, 937, 993

**No discussion on the SP#2**

Chair ask any disagreement to accept this straw poll as a comment resolution document

No disagreement received.

**SP#2** received no disagreement.

* 1. [11-25/895r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0895-01-00bi-ebcs-ul-privacy-enhancement.pptx) EBCS UL Privacy Enhancement -- Hitoshi Morioka

Document presented by the author.

EBCS also have privacy issue and associated document proposes a change to solve this issue, potentially in the 11bi amendment.

* + 1. Discussion

 C: I don’t think this is a SP for 11bi but rather on REVmf

C: I am little worry about the fact that this certificate is shared among different stations.

C: EBCS usually don’t know the AP they will send the frame. So this is a different scenario here.

C: I support addressing the issue, but rather in REVmf.

Q: This frame is usually broadcasted but now you propose individually addressed right?

A: This is an option in EBCS to be broadcast or individual.

Due to lack of time, discussion stopped there

More discussion will continue offline

1. **AoB**

No other business

Next TGbi session is tomorrow AM1.

1. Chair Recess at 10:00

**4th slot: Thursday May 15th 2025, 08:00 local time.**

**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 08:02 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0625r6](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0625-06-00bi-tgbi-may-2025-meeting-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

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

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0625r6 (slide #16)**
	1. Discussion on agenda

Doc 11-25/0442, 11-25/0443 are requested to enter the agenda.

Chair indicated they are already included in the presentation queue that will be used if time permits after today’s agenda.

Q: Did we discussed ad-hoc date already?

A: No, this is schedule for this afternoon PM1

No more discussion

* 1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (17 participants online, 8 in the room).
1. **Administrative:**

**Schedule for the week**

Thursday: PM1 – Ad Hoc discussion, closing motions, submission queue

* 1. Review timeline

Chair propose to move the recirculation to September.

C: At this point we have around 300 motions and we have around 100 CID in different documents. If we add an ad hoc. I think we can make them.

Q: Here we assume we will have an ad hoc but this decision will be taken this afternoon. So, can we take final decision after this afternoon ad hoc discussion?

A: Ok let’s indicate we maintain the schedule assuming ad hoc.

C: I think we can nail our work in July if we have an ad hoc. Knowing that we already discussed main technical subjects that was remining on the road.

C: I think there is a good spirit in this group and people are eager to progress

Q(chair): Do you consider we can have Ballot pool in September? It seems difficult.

A: Agree knowing that the July meeting is very late this year, so the time difference between July and September meetings will be short.

C: Since July meeting ends in August, we could indicate LB recirc to August.

Proposal is to change the ballot pool to November 2025.

No objection received.

Q: Since we move the ballot by two months, shouldn’t we move the other dates by 2 months?

A: Not necessarily, we need to check with 802.11 chair.

Q: Can we check the shortest time we need between the Ballot pool and the SA ballot?

A: Will do it.

* 1. Motions of accumulated documents

Q: Can we have CID#709 discussed now and then add it to the motion list.

A: I think, here, we just want to clean our accumulated documents, and we will try to resume discussion and run associated motions this afternoon.

To let the chair, assemble the long list of CIDs ready for motion, presentations are resumed and we will come back to motion after

1. **Technical Submissions**
	1. [11-25/0891r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0891-02-00bi-editorial-comments-part-ii.docx) – editorial comments part II -- Po-Kai Huang

Document presented by the author

Editorial comments from various paragraphs.

* + 1. Discussion

Q: Do we have to review all editorial CIDs?

A: In next round we may have a more efficient mechanism exchanging in advance on the document but for this one, let me go thru the document.

CIDs: 27, 80, 81, 90, 115, 116, 117, 118, 285, 316, 330, 346, 347, 348, 353, 355, 535, 536, 538, 543,

544, 546, 547, 549: No discussion

CID 550;

C: Comment resolution should be : “delete (Privacy GTK)” not “delete (PGTK)”

A: agree

CID 550, 551, 552, 553, 764, 807, 871, 905, 969, 1061, 1064, 1065, 995: No discussion

CID 378,

C; I think this should be accepted event if there is no modification

A: agree

CID 381,

C: Please better indicate the change in the note to editor here

A: agree

CID395, 722, 723, 724, 726, 728, 898, 899, 900, 901, 992: No discussion

Author uploaded r3 and then request SP for revision 3

SP#1:

Agree with the comment resolutions in 25/891r3 for comments: 27, 80, 81, 90, 115, 116, 117, 118, 285, 316, 330, 346, 347, 348, 353, 355, 535, 536, 538, 543, 544, 546, 547, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 764, 807, 871, 905, 969, 1061, 1064, 1065, 995, 378, 381, 395, 722, 723, 724, 726, 728, 898, 899, 900, 901, 992.

Chair ask if anybody have an objection to indicate this document as approved.

Nobody objects

SP#1 receive no objection

Back to motions

* 1. Motions of accumulated documents

**First, chair push a motion for all the CIDs resolution that received no objections:**

**Motion 62#**

Approve the texts and CID resolutions listed below and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGbi draft.

Doc11-25/0692r4 : 12 comments: 1016, 1017, 62, 218, 858, 859, 909, 922, 1018, 63, 217, 1019

Doc 11-25/0554r5 : 20 comments: 167, 165, 966, 166, 139, 140, 678, 680, 681, 849, 850, 945, 4, 266, 978, 683, 684, 685, 915, 176.

Doc 11-25/0536r1 : 4 comments: 675, 676, 847, 848

Doc 11-25/0583r3 68 comments: 1, 3, 20, 21, 64, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 134, 306, 312, 325, 335, 364, 365, 366, 415, 416, 417, 418, 505, 506, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 746, 747, 749, 773, 775, 815, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 893, 894, 895, 930, 994, and 1021.

Doc 11-25/0693r2 5 comments: 123, 219, 951, 1020, 211.
Doc 11-25/0535r1 6 comments: 178, 919, 917, 270, 687, 918.
Doc 11-25/0532r1 6 comments: 845, 262, 263, 264, 265, 846.
Doc 11-25/0626r4 23 comments: 11, 104, 297, 303, 304, 382, 383, 384, 385, 387, 388, 389, 390, 771, 787, 788, 789, 880,881, 882, 904, 937, 993

Doc 11-25/295r8 : 43 comments :305, 271, 272, 278, 279, 282, 688, 689, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 162, 702, 704, 705, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 718, 719, 852, 298, 743, 768, 6, 8, 421, 455, 460, 734, 737, 591, 424, 748, 458, 143

Doc 11-25/435r5 : 39 Comments: 394, 399, 403, 405, 409, 410, 160, 459, 47, 491, 495, 311, 496, 497, 857, 744, 261, 644, 393, 379, 979, 944, 927, 962, 392, 147, 169, 648, 655, 650, 667, 840, 173, 841, 842, 843, 975, 457, 742

Doc 11-25/435r5 2 separated CIDs resolutions: 465 and 407

Doc 11-25/542r1 4 comments: 49, 22, 192, 931

Doc 11-25/544r4 13 comments: 493, 950, 315, 499, 500, 501, 502, 504, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015

Doc 11-25/555r1 22 Comments: 273, 274, 275, 280, 281, 283, 284, 690, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 851, 971, 972, 701, 703, 706, 707, 708, 717

Doc 11-25/891r3 Comments: 27, 80, 81, 90, 115, 116, 117, 118, 285, 316, 330, 346, 347, 348, 353, 355, 535, 536, 538, 543, 544, 546, 547, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 764, 807, 871, 905, 969, 1061, 1064, 1065, 995, 378, 381, 395, 722, 723, 724, 726, 728, 898, 899, 900, 901, 992.

These CID resolutions were agreed to without objection.

**Motion#62 moved by** Jouni Malinen **and seconded** by Stéphane Baron

**Motion #62** **Passed unanimously**

**Chair then proposes a motion for the two documents that received one objection each**

**Motion #63**

Approve the texts and CID resolutions listed below and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGbi draft.

Doc 11-25/0485r7 34 comments: 96, 97, 132, 133, 358, 359, 360, 483, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 762, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 875

Doc 11-25/137r2: 209

These documents each had one objection.

**Motion #63 moved by** Jarkko Kneckt **and seconded** by Po-kai Huang.

**Motion#63 passes unanimously**. (23 attendees on-line, 11 in the room)

* 1. [11-25/0924r2](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0709-03-00bi-steering-to-bpe-ap-mld-text.docx) – Editorial comments for 9.4.1.83-- Antonio de la Oliva

Document presented by the author

* + 1. Discussion

CID : 23,

C: Please indicate revised and the changed done.

A: agree.

CID 24,

C: Typo :”fugur”

A: (tech editor) I will take care of that

CID 25, 32, 106, 161, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 202, 327, 328, 423, 425, 427, 428, 430, 433, 434: No discussion.

CID 439,

C: Should be revised

A: Agree

CID 440, No discussion

CID 442,

C: Should it be “revised”?

A: There is only one change so, I thought we can set accept.

C: If the comment change proposal is not 100% clear you should not accept, but revise.

CID 443,

C: I think this is fine to reject, but indicate in the comment resolution text that this is consistent because you are considering any of those two fields to set the control bit.

A: Agree

CID 447, 750, 792, No discussion

CID 995,

C: Maybe it is better to remove 995 from the list since it is already resolved in another document handled by the tech editor.

A: ok

CIDs 997, 999, 1001 no discussion

No more discussion

Author created r4 and request a SP on this.

**SP#2**

Agree with the comment resolutions in 25/924r3 for comments: 23, 24, 25, 32, 106, 161, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 202, 327, 328, 423, 425, 427, 428, 430, 433, 434, 439, 440, 442, 443, 447, 750, 792, 997, 999, 1001.

Chair ask if anybody has any comment on this SP#2

No discussion on **SP#2**

Chair ask if anybody disagree with this SP or we can say it is unanimous supported?

No objection received.

SP#2 received no objection.

Chair then ask if doc 11-25/0709 can be quickly reviewed?

No objection received.

* 1. [11-25/0709r4](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0709-04-00bi-steering-to-bpe-ap-mld-text.docx) – Steering to BPE AP MLD Text—Jarkko Kneckt

Document presented by the author

R4 removes the controversial key handling that was in the doc.

* + 1. Discussion

Q: I agree with the resolution but in the NR request, we do not actually do the measurement.

A: We do this request quite systematically, so we put in the same way as 11k having measurement present. Those are optional

C: I believe you just indicate BSSID, not all the location and measurement stuff.

A: All the fields are there already. In addition, EDP element contains intervals and such, in neighbor report for instance

C: Just indicate then are not present then.

Q: Do we need an additional reason code?

A: There are already 20 reason codes but that do not match the reason here.

C: If we ask anything specific, the station has to clarify it

A: I just say I don’t know why we need to use measurement request?

C: We have 3 mechanisms to request RNR. Our intention here is to provide solution covering those 3 mechanisms.

C: I believe this is pure discovery

A: Correct but we just reuse existing mechanism

C: Can we get it offline to clarify this

A: Ok.

Q: Why do we say that we specify the location to remote?

A: My understanding that this field is mandatory.

Q: So LCI request shall be present in this frame?

A: No, this is not the intend.

C: So, you don’t need to specify this field. You should rather remove it.

A: I will check that

C: Maybe you can define a new value then

Q: What if we remove the part of text related to the setting of the Location Subject field? Will it solve your comment?

A: The question is to know what you intend to do first and then check if we can reuse the field. May you let time to review that in PM1.

C: I just don’t see why you are using measurement request there.

A: This came from 11k

C: This frame has many usages, so please discuss offline.

C: I think existing use cases or using this frame looks like what we are needing. So, you need to specify what the measurement mode is.

A: Yes.

C: Any case I recommend not running the SP now and have a little offline check.

C: Now there is an issue for the poll mode.

Commenter indicate there is an email sent to the author on the subject.

No more discussion

1. **AoB**

Next TGbi session is this afternoon PM1.

We will discuss ad hoc and come back to previous document if consensus is found and then go to the rest of the queue.

1. Chair Recess at 09:58

**5th slot: Thursday May 15th 2025, 13:30 local time.**

**Chair: Carol Ansley, Cox Communications**

**Secretary: Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado (replacing Stéphane Baron)**

**Vice-chairs: Jerome Henry, Cisco; Antonio DeLaOlivaDelgado, InterDigital, Inc**

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

Chair calls meeting to order at 13:30 Local time.

Agenda slide deck: [11-25-0625r7](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/25/11-25-0625-07-00bi-tgbi-may-2025-meeting-agenda.pptx):

1. Reminder to do attendance

Reminder to register for the session and to not attend the virtual meeting without paying appropriate meeting fees.

1. The chair mentioned the call for essential patents
	1. No one responded to the call for essential patents
2. Review of policies and procedures.
	1. IEEE individual process slides were presented.

No questions

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

No questions

1. Quick review of the hybrid meeting protocols

1. **Discussion of agenda 11-25-0625r7 (slide #16)**
	1. Adoption of agenda by unanimous consent (39 participants online, 11 in the room).
2. **Administrative:**
	1. Teleconferences

Teleconferences: May 28, June 4, 18, 25, July 16, 23 agreed to schedule calls.

* 1. Ad Hoc discussion

Agreed to request for an Adhoc, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of July, 4 hours meeting (2h+15min break+2h), starting at 8:00 AM EST

**motion #64**,

Approve a TGbi ad-hoc meeting on July 7, 8, 9, and 10, held in a virtual format for the purpose of TGbi comment resolutions and consideration of document submissions.

* + - Length 4 days, structured 2 two-hour blocks (8am-10amEDT, 10:15am-12:15pmEDT)

**Motion #64** **moved by** Jerome Henry and **seconded by** Po-Kai Huang

**Motion #64 approved by unanimous consent** (11 in room, 39 online)

A Motion will then be passed by to the 802.11WG for approval in the closing plenary.

* 1. Closing motion

**Motion #65** :

Approve the texts and CID resolutions listed below and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGbi draft.

Doc 11-25/924r3: 23, 24, 25, 32, 106, 161, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 202, 327, 328, 423, 425, 427, 428, 430, 433, 434, 439, 440, 442, 443, 447, 750, 792, 997, 999, 1001

**Motion #65** approved by unanimous consent (11 in room, 41 online)

1. **AoB**

No other business

1. Chair adjourn at 15:30