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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the IEEE 802.11bh telecon meeting of May 2, 2023.

Note: Highlighted text are action items.

Q- proceeds a question asked at the meeting

A- proceeds an answer

C- proceeds a comment

**Meeting May 2, 2023 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. ET**

**Chair: Mark Hamilton (Ruckus/CommScope)**

**Vice Chair: Peter Yee (NSA-CSD/AKAYLA)**

**Vice Chair: Stephen Orr (Cisco)**

**Secretary: Peter Yee**

**Editor: Carol Ansley (Cox)**

**The teleconference was called to order by the Chair at 9:33 a.m. EST.**

Agenda slide deck [11-23/0707r00](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0707-00-00bh-agenda-tgbh-2023-may-2.pptx)

1. **Policies and procedures were presented by the chair. (Slides 4 to 14)**

There were no Patent declarations.

Copyright policy slides were presented (Slides 10 and 11)

1. **Agenda:**
* **Attendance, noises/recording, meeting protocol reminders**
* **Policies, duty to inform, participation rules**
* **Organization topics (see Backup slides)**
	+ Timeline reminder (slide 20)
* **Issues Tracking:** [**11-21/0332r37**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/21/11-21-0332-37-00bh-issues-tracking.docx)
* **Results of Comment Collection on D0.2:** [**11-22/0973r26**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0973-26-00bh-cc41-comments-against-d0-2.xlsx)
* **Motions record:** [**11-22/0651r17**](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-0651-17-00bh-tgbh-motions-list.pptx)
* **Editor’s report on status, D0.3**
* **Discussion / Contributions on remaining CIDs (next slide)**
* **WBA liaison response**
* **Review status and motions for May session; Plan for between now and May session (May 9 teleconference)**

Any comments? [None]

Any objections to agenda? [None]

1. **Editor’s report on status, D0.3**

Carol Ansley has incorporated the agreed upon changes into Draft 0.3 (work in progress). A few small improvements will be made based on feedback. The document will be further discussed during the May interim meeting in order to be ready for a D1.0 and attendant WG Letter Ballot.

1. **CR for PASN**

Okan Mutgan (Nokia) presented the updated [11-22/1806r05](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/22/11-22-1806-05-00bh-cr-for-pasn.docx), which resolves comment IDs (CIDs) 19 and 20 on PASN (Pre-Association Security Negotiation). The updates fix typos, add a clarifying picture and matching explanatory text, and incorporate input from Kurt Lumbatis (self). The STA recognition text has now been split between non-PASN and PASN cases.

C- I’d like to see the first paragraph 12.2.11.1 reworded so that the first PASN frame phrasing is used when referring to the second PASN frame(s). I’ll defer to the editor on the exact wording that’s best.

Q- Are all subsequent PASN frames second frames?

A- We only use the first two of the three possible PASN frames.

Q- Why “associate” with two APs with PASN at the same time?

A- For ranging purposes. The “associations” [but these aren’t Associations in the true IEEE 802.11 sense] have to be done close together in time to establish a location.

C- Yes, for location. I do find that labeling these things differently in the text and the figure is confusing. You use Auth Msg 1 in the figure, for example, and talk about PASN frames in the text.

C- The numbering comes from the underlying 802.11 authentication. Example naming would be “802.11 authentication message 1 for PASN”.

C- Let’s defer this one and look at IEEE 802.11az. We can then discuss it during the face-to-face meeting or take a comment during the ballot. Let’s assume that we know what we are doing despite the wording.

C- I can live with that, but it is very confusing. You shouldn’t have to be a PASN expert to read our specification.

C- I would rearrange the ordering of the three options that the non-AP STA has to put PASN as number 2.

Q- Can we treat this as editorial?

A- Yes.

C- We aren’t saying anything about the assigned device ID value. If you read this in a nasty way, it would be possible to have the Device ID IE present, but it contains the same value as previously used. Change the text to “a new device ID value” or something like that.

C- That works.

C- We need to clarify the new figure so that the first AP’s auth messages (1 and 2) are transmitted prior to trying to range with the second AP. Otherwise, the STA will send the same device ID to both.

C- It’s not explicit in the paragraph above, but it is implied that the ordering is sequential and not simultaneous. It could be made more explicit. The question is do we wordsmith it now or wait for the next round? We could use a dotted line between the messages on each side of the diagram to show the linkage between the uses of DevID1. We can do that now or wait until the ballot.

C- The way the figure is drawn, the AP-2 communications are supposed to be later because they are lower in the diagram. Maybe that’s not clear enough.

C- More vertical spacing might make it clearer. That’s what angled, dotted lines in other diagrams in the specification mean.

Q- Can we approve the document and deal with editorial issues in the next round?

A- I’m fine with that if the group is. The editorial stuff can be cleaned up before we go out for ballot or not.

Q- Any objection to marking the next version of this document as the agreed upon resolutions for CIDs 19 and 20, to be confirmed at the face-to-face session?

A- [None]

1. **CID 35 text – open discussion**

Mark Hamilton re-presented [11-23/0623r02](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0623-02-00bh-discussion-on-cid-35.pptx). It doesn’t seem like the group has come to any consensus on this resolution, so it hasn’t been updated from the last version. We are in general agreement that we are adding a paragraph to the end of 12.2.11.1, but the wording isn’t wholly satisfactory to everyone. I’m looking for comments, feedback, or suggestions that lead to consensus on the wording, especially the wording highlighted in yellow.

C- The current 11bh draft does not quantify how to make comparable procedures to Annex Z, so I don’t know how to interpret “comparable security and privacy”. The criteria should be quantified. They aren’t defined, so I suggest removing the highlighted part.

C- I seem to recall it was noted on a previous call that Annex Z was supposed to say something about the properties, but I don’t see an obvious list. Maybe it’s implied.

Q- Any objection to just deleting the text?

A- [None]

Q- Are people comfortable accepting the proposed text with the yellow highlighted text removed, to be confirmed at the face-to-face meeting?

A- [None]

C- I’ll update the comment tracking document for both of the presentations. That’s huge progress. That gets us ready for finalizing things at the face-to-face meeting to produce our final draft.

1. **WBA liaison response**

Stephen Orr suggested we wait until the draft is squared away prior to creating a response to the WBA.

C- A reminder, the draft is not a public document until the WG agrees it is sufficiently mature. Thus, if we get to a Draft 1.0 that makes us happy, it’s still not public, at least until we go through a first ballot round.

C- I don’t see a real need to wait until the document is final before responding to the WBA. The general concepts are there, and we can respond with those and a timeline. It’s been a long time since we got back to them.

C- My intent wasn’t to wait for a shareable document. It’s just to make sure that things won’t change in the draft after we tell the WBA about it. This is only until the face-to-face meeting in two weeks.

C- That’s all right then.

1. **Review of status**

I believe we have covered all comments and the editor has everything in general. With the approval of the last set of resolutions during the May meeting, we should be able to go to Draft 1.0 and presumably everyone will agree that we are ready to pass motions for the WG letter ballot.

The May 9th meeting will be cancelled seeing as there’s nothing left we need to do.

**Meeting adjoined at 10:32 a.m. ET.**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Breakout | Timestamp | Name | Affiliation |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Ansley, Carol | Cox Communications |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Bredewoud, Albert | Broadcom |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Halasz, Dave | Morse Micro |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Henry, Jerome | Cisco |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Lumbatis, Kurt | ARRIS/CommScope |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Luo, Yuanqiu | Futurewei |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Montemurro, Mike | Huawei |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Mutgan, Okan | Nokia |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Nezou, Patrice | Canon |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Orr, Stephen | Cisco |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Petrick, Al | InterDigital |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Riegel, Max | Nokia |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Sam, Harvey | Broadcom Corporation |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Smith, Luther | CableLabs |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Yang, Jay | Nokia |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Yang, Jimmy CM | Moxa |
| TGbh | 05/02 | Yee, Peter | NSA-CSD |