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Abstract

Some of the comments assigned to the editor may not be editorial and some that are editorial would benefit from having group input for resolution.

CID 6557, and several other comments, relates to entries for "Function of the field" column in multiple tables. An exampole is table 8-257j in D3.1 in which "TTL IPv4 included" was replaced with "Lifetime of the Assigned IPv4 Address included" in accordance with CIDs 6094 and 4436. Now I am dealing with comments wanting to capitalize the "Included" in "TTL IPv4 included". I started to reply by saying that the recommended change was no longer relevant because of the rewording, but now having second thoughts about it. The issue is determining if the column is a description of the field or if it is a proper name.

Multiple comments relating to figures in Clause 8 (example is Figure 8-604a in D3.1) that have the first field identified as "Info ID" with the description pointing to Table 8-258 (ANQP-element definitions). The comments generally say to simply follow the normal field description of "The Element ID and Length fields are defined in 8.4.2.1 (General).". What I am not sure of is if there really was supposed to be a difference here between "Info ID"  and "Element ID". Was the different name used intentionally, and if so, is this OK for an element definition?

CID 6594 asks for either using either abbreviations or full names but not both (Clause 8.6.8.38). Is there any preference? And if the full name is to be used one place and an abbreviation in another, that begs additional questions and issues.

CID 6160 asks for consistency in the use of "FD RSN Information" versus simply "RSN Information" which is used in Figure 8-662a and in text. I wonder if there should truly be a general change versus specific to a few instances. For instance, in D3.0, P73 L23, "The FD RSN Information field contains the RSN information, ... " should there be a difference between using "FD" as part of the field name extend to the information described as "RSN information". I made the changes to every instance of "RSN information" but am now second guessing that decision.

CID 6225 asks to rename Table 8-405a from "FILS Action frame fields" to "FILS Action frame values". Easily done, but then in reading the paragraph before it, it seems that some things are missing, such as the definition of the FILS Action frame. The table seems to define the values for one field in the frame and not the frame itself. It looks like Clause 8.6.24 should be removed as a clause and inserted as a description of the following Clause in D3.1 "FILS Container Action frame"  as it seems to describe the second field there.