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Abstract

These are recommended changes to our draft that were not covered by ballot comments but would be beneficial improvements before going to ballot again. The proposed/recommended changes are provided.

1. In Clause 3, there is a definition for "TLV" that conflicts with 11af which also has a TLV definition.

From P802.11ai:

**type length value (TLV)**: The TLV identity is used to encode optional information of fixed and variable length. The first field is the assigned identifier of data being processed, the second field specifies the number of octets of the value, and the third field contains that number of octets of data representing the value for the “type”.

From P802.11af:

type/length/value (TLV): A formatting scheme that adds a tag to each transmitted parameter containing the parameter type (and implicitly its encoding rules) and the length of the encoded parameter.

**Propose deleting of the definition in P802.11ai.**

1. Clause 6.3.3.2.2:

The primitive parameters are as follows:

MLME-SCAN.request(

......,

FILSRequestParameters ,

ReportingOption,

APConfigurationChangeCount,

VendorSpecificInfo

)

Delete "Parameters"? See REVmc for examples of not using this word in the name (hint - there are none). The term itself is a parameter so it is confusing to say that the parameter is a set of parameters. One option would be to replace "Parameters" with "Information" as that would be more descriptive of the contents of the element. Also any change should also be made in the table that follows and other places throughout the document (such as in Clause 8).

**Propose changing "FILSRequestParameters" to "FILSRequest" in the parameter list and wherever else is appropriate throughout the document (deleting "parameter" in each instance of "FILS Request").**

1. Page 10, line 7 (P802.11ai D1.3): The Type entry for FILSRequestParameters does not define a type.

**Propose to follow the REVmc example for such parameters and replace " FILS Request Parameter element " with "Octet string".**

1. Page 10, line 27 (P802.11ai D1.3): The Type entry for APConfigurationChangeCount does not define a type.

**Propose to follow the REVmc example for such parameters and replace "APConfigurationChangeCount element" with "Octet string".**

1. Page 11, line 36 (P802.11ai D1.3): The "Type" for Differentiated Initial Link Setup seems more like a description than a type (such as "integer" or "octet string")

**Propose to follow the REVmc example for such parameters and replace the current type definition with "Octet string".**

1. Page 11, line 36 (P802.11ai D1.3): The "Type" for Differentiated Initial Link Setup seems more like a description than a type (such as "integer" or "octet string")   
   The same issue with "FD Capability", "Access Network Options", "Reduced Neighbor AP Report", "RSNE", "FILS Indication", "FILSWrappedData" (multiple places), "FILSIPAddressRequestData", " FILSIPAddressAssignmentData", and "FILSDNSInformationData".

**Propose to follow the REVmc example for such parameters and replace the current type definitions with "Octet string".**

1. Table 8-29: In the "Presence of fields 4-20" column, REVmc uses the word "element" as part of the name for each element being referred to. We do not.

**Propose to add the word "element" to each element referenced in this column of this table.**

1. Clause 8.4.2.171: In P802.11af, Figure 8-401cl—Neighbor AP Information field format, the right-most column octet sizes are "0 or n" but we have "variable". In Figure 8-401cm—TBTT Information Header subfield the columns in our table do not match those in P802.11af. In Figure 8-401cn—TBTT Information field the first column is missing "in TUs" that appears in 11af. Were these intentional changes? If so they need to be underlined. Also, the umarked (which should indicate unchanged) text in this clause does not match that of P802.11af. There is also a whole paragraph in P802.11af that is missing in our draft. It is assumed that none of these diferences from 11af were intentional.

**Propose to modify the figures and text in clause 8.4.2.171 to match 11af execpt where already explicitly identified as a change.**

**Move to**

- approve these 8 proposed issue resolutions and instruct the editor to implement them in our draft.

Moved:   
Seconded:

Yes: ;  
No: ;

Abstain: ;