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Chair: Yoshihiro Ohba

Editor: Antonio de la Oliva

Date & Time: Tuesday, October 10, 2014, 10am-noon, Eastern Time

Agenda: Sponsor Ballot Comment Resolution i-37, i-115, i-12

Attendees: Yoshikazu Hanatani (Toshiba), Subir Das (ACS), Karen Randall (Randall Consulting), Lily Chen (NIST), Yoshihiro Ohba (Toshiba, Lead)

Minutes taken by Yoshi.

Agenda agreed.

IEEE IPR policy was explained. No IPR declaration in the call.

Comment resolution.

- i-37: DCN 152r2 was presented by Hana.

It was agreed to revise Figures 44 to 47 to show MIH message once. Hana will revise the contribution.

- i-115 (re-opened): DCN 154r0 was presented by Hana.

The framework remedy was agreed. A new contribution for complete remedy will be submitted by Hana.

- i-12: DCN 151r1 (the same document discussed in the Oct-7 call) was presented by Yoshi.

It was agreed to add support for PKIX CRL. The contribution will be revised.

AOB:

There will be no additional SBRC call before November meeting. We continue comment resolution in November meeting.

In November meeting, it was suggested to avoid PM1 slot and prefer AM1 slot.

The call ended at noon.

Date & Time: Friday, October 7, 2014, 8am-10am, Eastern Time

Agenda: Sponsor Ballot Comment Resolution

Attendees: Subir Das (ACS), Karen Randall (Randall Consulting), Hanatani Yoshikazu (Toshiba), Antonio de la Oliva (UC3M), Yoshihiro Ohba (Toshiba, Lead)

Yoshi took the minutes.

IEEE IPR policy was explained by Yoshi.

Comments i108, i110, i111 : DCN 153r0 presented by Subir.

- i108: ACK-Req duplicate handling. Suggested changes are (1) messages with same transaction-ID to messages with the same Message ID and same transaction-ID,

(2) Change "In all cases" to "All other cases".

- i110: Subir will revise the remedy after checking the current definition of MIH network entity.

- i111: Proposed remedy was accepted.

- i112: Proposed remedy was accepted by changing “capability discover message” to “capability discover request message”.

Comment i37: Yoshi presented DCN 152r1.

- Karen is ok for making Signature TLV optional.

- Hana will further work on how to generate Signature TLV by revising Figure 44-47 of 9.6.4 and adding explanatory text.

Comment i12: Karen is ok with the proposed remedy.

Comment i115 requires a new contribution to add clarified text about applying signature per MIH fragment (similar to applying AES-CCM encryption per MIH fragment).

Next call: October 10 (Fri) 10am-noon Eastern Time

The call ended at 9:10am.

Date & Time: Friday, October 3, 2014, 8am-10am, Eastern Time

Agenda: Sponsor Ballot Comment Resolution

Comments: i-7, i-12, i-37, i-108

Contributions: DCN 150r0 (i-7), 151r0 (i-12), 152r0 (i-37, i-15)

Latest commentary file: DCN 142r2

Attendees: Subir Das (ACS), Antonio de la Oliva (UC3M), Hanatani Yoshikazu (Toshiba), Yoshihiro Ohba (Toshiba, Lead)

Yoshi took the minutes.

Antonio is almost done with editorial comments.

IEEE IPR policy was explained by Yoshi.

- Comment i-7:  Accepted with DCN 150r1 (presented by Yoshi)

- Comment i-12: DCN 141r1was presented (presented by Yoshi)

MIH\_Revoke\_Certificate.request is generated by MIH user of PoS.

Then MIHF of PoS generates MIH\_Revoke\_Certificate request message which is multicast or unicast.

What is the use case of revoking a large number of nodes which leads to bloom filter?

When there are 10000 nodes in an area, and 10% of nodes are revoked,

the revocation list can contain 1000 nodes.  But in many cases, list of certificates should be sufficient to use.  That is why bloom filter is described as optional.

We wait for Lily's opinion about bloom filter use.

- comment i-37 (and i-15): DCN 152r0 (presented by Yoshi)

Mentioning comment i-35 in DCN 152r0 is wrong, it should be i-15. Next revision of DCN 152 will fix this.

Revised text for 9.6.2 line 24 and line 34 is needed.  Hana will work with Yoshi to revise DCN 152 accordingly.

There is discussion on making signature optional.

If we make signature optional in cases where more than two members exist, we need to put some wording so that implementers can choose what they need understanding a  potential risk.

Let's discuss this including Lily and Karen on this.

Yoshi will update DCN 152.

Subir will submit his contribution on Cmt i-108 in the next call.

The call ended at 9:05am.