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Abstract

The document is structured in two parts. Part 1 summarizes the CIDs with outstanding approved comment resolutions. Part 2 summarizes procedurual issues with existing, approved comment resolutons that require a further review by TGai.

Volunteers that have the “token to present a resolution or lead the discussion of the open issue” in Athens are listed where applicable.

# CIDs with outstanding comment resolutions

1. CID **4079, 4195 , and 4078 (dup of 4079)**: (**Dan Harkins**)
	1. Status: waiting for submission to resolve the comment. Comment did not specify detailed changes.
	2. Actions for Athens:
		1. Discuss (and approve) submission to resolve the comment or
		2. Reject the comment (The comment does not specify a suggested change detailed enough to be adopted in order to satisfy the comment)
2. CID **4274, 4234, 4253, 5090, 4007**: (**George Cherian**)
	1. Status: Docuemnt <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1074-00-00ai-updated-comment-resolution-status-for-tgai-d2-09.xlsx> presents resolutions for the CID
	2. Notes on submission for CID 4274, 4253, 5090, 4007
		1. The suggested resolution for CIDs 4274, 4253, 5090, 4007 is:
		Revise per approved submission 11-14-0840-01-00ai
		2. Submission 14/840-0 was discussed in San Diego. George uploaded a revised version (14/840-1) after the discussion.
		3. Motion 109 was passed to “Accept the comment resolutions as shown in the “George Cherian” tab of 11-14/973r1”
		4. 11-14/973r1 lists 14/840-01 in the submission column; but the corresponding resolution field for the CIDs is left blanc.
		5. That means that we formally do *not* have a motion to approve 14/840-1 and we do *not* have a motion in place that approves a resolution for CIDs 4274, 4253, 5090, 4007.
		6. Note – apologies to the group if it was the group’s intend to approve 14/840-1 and neither the Chair nor the submitter of the comment resolution file did catch this.
		7. Suggested remedy:

Move to

* approve 11-14/840r1 and instruct the editor to incorporate the changes shown in the document into the TGai draft
* and set the comment resolution status for CIDs 4274, 4253, 5090, 4007 to “Revised” with the following resolution text “Revised per submission 11-14/840r1”
	1. Notes on submission for CID 4234:
	2. Status: Docuemnt <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1074-00-00ai-updated-comment-resolution-status-for-tgai-d2-09.xlsx> presents resolutions for the CID
		1. Suggested remedy for CID 4234 is:
		Revise per submission 11-14-0836-02-00ai
		2. The proposed resolution was discussed in San Diego but did not get approval (motion 118)
		3. Action items for Athens:
			1. **Chair** to contact supporters and members on the prevailing side to ask for alignment or alternative discussions (done)
			2. Discuss submission and, if required, revise to get approvel
			3. Discuss alternative resolutions, if suggested remedy does not get 75% (reasons to reject comment given technical reasons based on the discussion of 14/1074r0)
1. CID 4288, 4311, 4344, 4933, 4712, 4802, 4029, 4313, 4314, 4346, 4368, 4595, 4800, 5137, 4809, 4812, 5127, 5126, 5016, 4808, 5015, 4999, 4032, 5111, 5000, 4586, 4614, 4910, 4911, 4024, 4025, 4724, 4895. (Joe Kwak 🡪 taken over by **Joseph Levy**)
	1. All CIDs have outstanding suggested resolutions.
	2. Staus: Joe Levy is working on resolutons and will present the first bucket of resolutions in the Sept. 9th TGai telco.

Resolutions for all comments are expected to be available at the beginning of the Athens meeting.

Related docuement: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/documents?is_dcn=1107&is_group=00ai&is_options=2&is_year=2014>

1. CID 4930, 4929: (**Santosh Abraham**)
	1. Status: Submission with proposed resolution required.
	2. Related document: xxxx
2. CID 5139: (**Santosh Pandey**)
	1. Status: we have an *unapproved* resolution, i.e.:

"Revise. Include timestamp and beacon interval in FD frame.

In Table 8-273a—FILS Discovery frame format, add two rows in beginning of the table as follows (columns are "","" separated):

1, Timestamp,

2, Beacon interval,

Increment the order field by 2 of the rest of the rows"

* 1. Action items:
		1. **Ping**, please check based on D2.1 if this resolution is specific enough and implementable or if you need more editorial information.
		2. **Santosh**: present resolution in Athens and put to motion.
1. CID 4146: (**Lee Armstrong**)
	1. Status: we have an *unapproved* resolution, i.e.:

REVISED (EDITOR: 2014-07-17 21:31:50Z)In D2.1. Added at the end of clause 2 the following item "ISO/IEC 9594-1:2008,Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Overview of concepts, models and services". Then added reference to this after the use of X.500 in Clause 8 (leaving in the X.500 to help clarify what/where in the ISO std was applicable).

* 1. Action for Athens: approve the comment resolution
1. CID 4005, 4488, 4632, 4506: (Lee Armstrong 🡪 **Ping Fang**)
	1. Status: submission required to address the comments. They are not purely editorial even though the editor could provide a submission with a suggested change.
	2. Action:
		1. Transfer CIDs from Lee to Ping (as Lee is busy cleaning up the draft), (done).
		2. Ping to provide a submission to address the comments. Submission to be discussed in Athens. (Ping will contact – if necessary – other members of the group to assist him in drafting a submssion).

# Procedural issues and questions to be reviewed by TGai in Athens.

1. CID **4634**: (Ping Fang)
	1. Current resolution, approved per Motion #105:
	REVISED (TGai General: 2014-07-17 19:00:55Z) - -- if dot11FILSActivated is true, the STA is doing FILS which implies that the field is present
	2. Comment is:
	In Table 8-27, "Key Delivery" field is claimed to be present when dot11FILSActivated is true. This does not sound correct. Surely this field is not included if FILS was not used for this specific association. Should add "Present if FILS authentication is used and status code is 0." Similarly, some of the other fields in this table may need additional constraint to remove elements in cases they are not really used in the Association Response frame.
	3. Proposed change by commenter:
	Fix the conditions for including FILS elements in (re)association response frames in cases where dot11FILSActivated is true, but the non-AP STA did not request FILS to be used. This includes at least addition of "Present if FILS authentication is used and status code is 0" for the "Key Delivery" field, but probably also other similar changes in these frames.
	Same comment applies for Table 8-29 (Reassociation Response frame).
	4. Issue: Resolution says “revised” but does not providing a revision
	5. Discussion: The comment is similar to CID 5183. The ad-hoc notes indicate, that both CIDs (4634 and 5183) should be resolved by the same resolution. The resolution for CID 5183 (approved per Motion 105) is the same as for CID 4634 except that it indicates the comment as rejected. Note that Motion 105 explicitly stated to change the resolution status for CID 4634 to revised; but the motion left the existing resolution text as is.
	6. Suggested remedy: Move to
	Change the resolution for CID 4634 to:
	REJECT -- if dot11FILSActivated is true, the STA is doing FILS which implies that the field is present
2. CID 4696, 4743, 4770, 4835, 4772, : (**Ping Fang**):
	1. Issue: accepted resolution states “revised” but no details were provided on how to revise the text.
	2. Action items:
		1. **Ping** will analyze the issue and will present a resolution in Athens.
			1. Note: The goal here is to reflect *strictly* what has been approved already, i.e. what is in the draft.
			2. Any further changes, e.g. based on the commenter’s feedback, shall require a separate submission in order to clearly identify the changes on top of what we have discussed and approved already.
			3. Ping to review the San-Diego-24-editorial tab to identify similar issues.
		2. Related submission from Ping: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/14/11-14-1073-00-00ai-cleanup-of-some-editorial-comments-resolutions-for-lb201.docx>
3. CID 4829, 4887, 4719, 4734: (**Ping Fang**)
	1. Issue: accepted resolution states “accepted” but the change proposed by the commenter did not provide editorial changes specific enough to be immediately adapted to the draft (or has provided several alternative changes but the approved resolution did not specify which one was adopted).
	2. Action items:
		1. **Ping** will analyze the issue and will present a resolution in Athens.
			1. Note: The goal here is to reflect *strictly* what has been approved already, i.e. what is in the draft.
			2. Any further changes, e.g. based on the commenter’s feedback, shall require a separate submission in order to clearly identify the changes on top of what we have discussed and approved already.
			3. Ping to review the San-Diego-24-editorial tab to identify similar issues.

# Additional items (e.g. feedback from commenters, etc.)
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