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Abstract

Some of the comments assigned to the editor need to be either reassigned or need group approval that they are editorial rather than technical.

The following comments need to be brought to the attention of TGai for additional input or approval.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID  | Page | Line | Clause | Comment | Proposed Resolution | Issue or recommendation | Action |
| 4862 |  |  |  | I'm not clear on what the difference is between "(conditional)" and "(optional)" | Always say "optional" | There is no page/line/clause number so it is not clear which usage of the term is of concern. The word "conditional" appears multiple places. The two terms are not synonymous: "Conditional" means that the decision is based on certain pre-established and agreed upon criteria whereas "optional" is open and left for the implementor to decide by whatever criteria they may wish to use.Suggest that Ping review all instances of "conditional" to ensure that it is used properly. There are currently no instances of "optional" in the document. | Reassign to Ping |
| 4767 |  |  |  | A lot of articles (a/an/the) are missing | Add missing articles | The problem here is that it takes a massive amount of effort to do this and one can never say with certainty that the document is 100% right. Editor will make a best effort to fix all such things in the next draft, but cannot say that the comment is "accepted" and a "revised" response represents only a best effort to resolve. | Notice to TG, no action required |
| 4102 | 4 | 3 | 3.3 | "CSN" is used by itself in the text, but not defined here. | Insert " CSN configuration sequence number " | REJECTED (EDITOR: 2014-05-12 22:10:23Z)AP-CSN is defined here and "CSN" is thus defined as part of that. The only time that CSN is used by itself is as part of the AP-CSN description so it is felt that it is not necessary to add this. | Approve of this resolution? |
| 4109 | 10 | 45 | 6.3.3.3.1 | "when the MLME-SCAN.request has ReportingOption parameter set to CHANNEL\_SPECIFIC or to AT\_END.": confusing description. | Replace with "when the value of the ReportingOption parameter in the MLME-SCAN.request is CHANNEL\_SPECIFIC or AT\_END." Also replace "may" with "can". | Did not change the "may" with "can" as they have different meanings: MAY = equivalent to "is allowed to", "is permitted to"" and "CAN = equivalent to "is able to" or "is allowed to, as defined elsewhere in this standard" ". Thus such a change would be considered technical. | Is this technical? |
| 4820 |  |  |  | "HLP frame" does not make sense, since a frame is an MPDU | Change to "HLP packet" or something | First, there is no page/line/clause number. Did manage to find the term in Clause 8, but also in Clause 10 where it is fully defined. To change it in Clause 8 would make it conflict with Clause 10, to change it in Clause 10 would be a technical change. | Make change? If so it is technical. |
| 4323 |  |  |  | FILS PTKSA definition is missing in the draft | FILS PTKSA should be define at 11.5.1.1.13 | PTKSA is defined in the base standard and used frequently in Clause 11. This one instance which has "FILS" in front of it needs to be reviewed by the group to determine if it is anything different than any other instance of PTKSA. Perhaps the "FILS" should be removed here. | Make change? |
| 4861 |  |  |  | (Sub)field names should have leading caps | (Sub)field names should have leading caps |  | Reassign to Ping |
| 4789 |  |  |  | Things like "The Element ID field is equal to the Key Delivery element value in Table 8-61 (Element IDs).The value of the Length field is 8 plus the total number of octets of all the KDEs." | "The Element ID and Length fields are defined in 8.4.2.1 (General)." | Should this be technical? We could do as proposed and simply refer to 8.4.2.1, but then after looking at these terms as they are defined there it looks like it would alter what we currently have in our 8.4.2.182. For instance, we say "Length field is 8 plus… of all the KDEs." whereas in 8.4.2.1 it says "The Length field specifies the number of octets in the Information field." | Technical? |
| 4759 |  |  |  | What is the difference between "If the STA is a FILS STA" and "If dot11FILSActivated is true in the STA"? (First spotted in 10.1.4.3.2 but seems to be widespread.) | Require a FILS STA to have dot11FILSActivated be true, and then just talk of FILS STAs everywhere else | There is a difference between a "FILS STA" (it supports FILS) and a STA for which dot11FILSActivated is true. It would seem that a FILS STA could change dot11FILSActivated from true to false and back again. Thus it is appropriate to identify if a FILS STA does have dot11FILSActivated equal to true. That said, in review of the draft, it does seem to imply that there is no case where dot11FILSActivated is false, all instances seem to imply that it is always true if it is a FILS STA. | What is the correct relationship between FILS STA and a STA for which dot11FILSActivated is true? With either interpretation some changes will be required. |
| 4871 |  |  |  | AEAD seems to be, from the description, a mode where everything is authenticated but only some stuff is encrypted, so the naming is poor | Rename to "All-Authenticated Part-Encrypted Data (AAPED)" |  | Technical? |
| 4861 |  |  |  | (Sub)field names should have leading caps | Change e.g. "FILS public key" in 8.4.2.177 and "Subnet-ID Token present" and "Public KeyInformation type" in 8.4.2.179 (I expect there are many others) |  | Assign to Ping to find all instances |
| 4801 |  |  |  | "is indicated", "is set", etc. in clause 10 | Change to "shall be..." | This is not as simple as just changing each instance. "Shall be" has a totally different meaning than "is indicated". There may be one or more instances where such a change may be appropriate, but will require carefull analysis/consdieration of each place.  | Assign to Ping for analysis and recommendation. |
| 4630 |  |  | 10.1.4.3.2 | This procedure description is a mess and a logical conundrum. Very difficult to ascertain the conditions and meaning in the convoluted set of changes upon changes. The 11mc version, by contrast, is readable and understandable. | Joe Kwak volunteers to try to rewrite this paragraph so the gist of the meaning may be understood in only one or two readings. Rewritten procedure will be submitted in 11-14-0563-00-00ai\_LB201\_Revised\_Active\_Scanning\_Procedure. |  | Does TG approve of this submittal (ensure that it is editorial and not technical)? |
| 4816 |  |  | 11.11.2.2.1 | I don't really understand what all these steps are about | Somehow introduce the steps (they are just mentioned on Figure 11.47a) |  | Reassign to Ping |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |