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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11 Random and Changing MAC Addresses (RCM) Study Group (SG) teleconference held on 22 June 2020 at 10:00 hrs EDT.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer given by the presenter

C- proceeds a comment

# Monday 22 June 2020, 10:00 hrs EDT:

**Chair: Carol Ansley, CommScope**

**Acting Secretary: Amelia Andersdotter, self**

**1. The teleconference was called to order by Chair 10:00 hrs. EDT,**

Amelia Andersdotter (self) volunteered to be acting secretary.

Agenda slide deck (11-20/733r4):

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0733-04-0rcm-rcm-sg-telecon-agenda-may.pptx>

**2. Policies and procedures were presented by the Chair.**

**3. The Chair reminded everyone to sign attendance.**

See attendance list at the bottom of this document.

**4. Minutes review and approval:**

The minutes from the last teleconference (8 June 2020) contained in 11-20/873 were approved with no comments or amendments.

**5. Approval of the Agenda:**

The Chair reviewed the agenda. The proposed agenda was approved without objection.

## 6. Status Update:

The Chair announced two new presentations for this meeting.

## 7. **Presentations/discussion**:

**7.1 Presentation of P802E Privacy Recommendations Jerome Henry, Cisco (11-20/940r0)**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0940-00-0rcm-introduction-to-p802e.pptx>

The P802E project was presented as agreed in the last meeting (see 11-20/873) with additional contributions from Amelia Andersdotter (self).

Q - Since privacy is voluntary and conditional upon the preferences of the user, is the consequence not that we should (also) be thinking of a Recommended Practice because an amendment PAR could not do a wholesome take on privacy issues?

A – The whole standard is 4600 pages long so doing a complete privacy review would be a huge undertaking. Starting on something like a framework could be a way of advancing this line of discussion.

**7.2 Proposed Privacy PAR draft - Rob Sun, Huawei (11-20/854r2)**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0854-02-0rcm-par-proposal-for-privacy.docx>

The highlighted (yellow) text below is proposed to be merged or worked into 11-20/854r3.

Following the presentation of P802E, will add in addition to PII also a PCI (personal correlated information) reference to capture inferred information as well as explicit.

C – We should spend more time reflecting on this new version of the PAR and think carefully about what actually constitutes a privacy threat - eavesdropping and the use of devices or technical features as such.

Q – Was it correctly understood that mention of PCI will be added to the text?

A - Yes.

Q - In the previous presentation there was a question on a recommended practice for the whole standard. How would that procedurally work?

A – This PAR would stay at the level of deployment of specific data privacy services, but PAR could go into multiple layers and also contain best practices. Or we could recommend to look closer at that in other future work.

C - As a group we should consider this carefully, for instance if we wanted additional changes in the standard. P802E can be a basis for work on recommended practices for IEEE 802.11 Std.

Q – In 5.2.b, could you repeat the specificity of "data privacy services" again in the second paragraph, instead of using the term "such services" in the second paragraph?

A – Yes.

Q - This PAR specifies an amendment to the standard, correct? Not a recommended practice?

A - Correct.

C - I want to reiterate that it should be clarified too in 5.5 that it is eavesdroppers and uses of devices that create concerns for privacy, and not the IEEE 802.11 Std as such.

A - Okay.

C - There is no clear statement here about what kind of eavesdropping we are trying to prevent. We are introducing specific mechanisms to protect PII, but it is not clear what harms these mechanisms pre-empt. I have some text to contribute, but perhaps offline to save time in the meeting.

Q - Is this about making "data privacy service" more specific?

A - The PAR needs to explain what work we'll be doing. Those things we see that we need to do - some of those things can be enumerated as data privacy services, but I was going here for the effects we are hoping for with these services.

Q - We need to be clear in our PAR if we change the MAC, the PHY or both. Can we have a clear statement about this?

A - It is sort of present in the first paragraph, this limitation to the MAC. But we may on the other hand also issue recommendations for scramblers, and the selection of parameters. Then we have to be careful if we still hope for the PAR to be easily approved. We don't have to decide right in this meeting, but recommendations for parameter selections that are more conducive to privacy may be a way of not directly introducing PHY changes but highlighting when the PHY makes a difference.

More reflection is needed on this.

Q - Do we have any references on the privacy compliance obligations that are current that we could add?

C - Propose to change "privacy compliance" to something that references P802E instead. Keep it inside the IEEE 802 framework.

Agreement from a number of participants.

C - A few comments. If we do an amendment, we do an amendment. If we do a recommended practice, it's a recommended practice. "Large", "small", "current" and other such words are problems in PARs. "Could" is also a problem since the scope of a PAR *is what it is*, it is not what it *could* be. I did not see any ambiguity on the PHY/MAC scope - to me it seems clear that this is limited to MAC. Also what causes the privacy concerns may not be that relevant in the end, but what the scope of the PAR is.

Q - I understand that an amendment would have a SHALL, and that a Recommended Practice would have a MAY or SHOULD. But I can also see this project having both aspects - we may end up producing a new appendix for instance. Do you think we need two PAR agreements? Or is it enough with one?

A - My point was that when you focus on an amendment, it has a different tack from if it is a Recommended Practice. We'll revisit this.

Rob Sun agreed to update the PAR draft.

## 8. Review upcoming Telecon Schedule

The Chair reminded the group that:

1. the next meeting will be Monday 6 July, 10:00 am EDT
2. additional telecon is scheduled for Monday 20 July, 10:00 am EDT

The Chair agreed to revisit the time-line and set up milestones (when PAR target finish date, etc). August teleconferences will be announced based on the timeline review and potential August vacation week.

## 9. AOB:

No other business was raised.

## 10. Adjourned: 11:32 hrs. EDT

# Attendance:

The following recorded their attendance in the 802.11 imat attendance tool:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** |
| Aboulmagd, Osama | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| Agrawal, Sandeep | C-DOT/Centre for Development of Telematics |
| Andersdotter, Amelia | None - Self-funded |
| Ansley, Carol | CommScope |
| Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co.,  Ltd |
| Das, Dibakar | Intel |
| Fang, Yonggang | ZTE TX Inc |
| Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| Henry, Jerome | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| Hervieu, Lili | Cable Television Laboratories Inc. (CableLabs) |
| Kain, Carl | Noblis, Inc. |
| Lepp, James | BlackBerry |
| Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| McCann, Stephen | BlackBerry |
| Palm, Stephen | Broadcom Corporation |
| Qi, Emily | Intel Corporation |
| Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| Stanley, Dorothy | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| Sun, Bo | ZTE Corporation |
| Sun, Sheng | Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd |
| Yee, Peter | NSA-CSD |

\*did not indicate attendance via IMAT – though did attend/contribute to the teleconference.