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Abstract

In trying to update our draft to reflect the changes that appear in REVmc, there are a few items that should be brought to group attention.

In clause 8.4.2.171, D2.0 Page 40, Line 5: Here and a couple of other places we differ from the base wihout showing a change. Is this intentional? Editor assumes this is unintentional and plans to change to match REVmc.

ai D2,0: REVmc D3.0

The TBTT Information Length subfield is 1 octet in length and contains the length in octets of the TBTT Information field that is included in the Neighbor AP Information field.

The TBTT Information Length subfield contains the length in octets of each TBTT Information field included in the Neighbor AP Information field.

Clause 10.1.4.3.2 Active scanning procedure: Now two clauses in REVmc but one clause in ai. Editor will change to reflect REVmc with appropriate changes to reflect what is needed for 11ai D2.1.

Clause 10.1.4.3.3 Probe response criteria: Major changes needed to reflect REVmc.

ai D2,0: REVmc D3.0

10.1.4.3 Active Scanning  
10.1.4.3.2 Active scanning procedure for a non-DMG STA  
10.1.4.3.3 Active scanning procedure for a DMG STA

10.1.4.3.4 Criteria for sending a probe response

10.1.4.3.5 Contents of a probe response

10.1.4.3 Active scanning  
10.1.4.3.2 Active scanning procedure

10.1.4.3.3 ~~Sending a probe response~~ Probe response criteria

10.1.4.3.4 Sending a response to probe request

Page82, Line 48: "A STA for which dot11OCBActivated is true but intended to use FILS authentication will transition to State 5: FILS authenticated." This is a meaningless statement as one of the whole points of having dot11OCBActivated true is that authentication does not happen. Can this be deleted without having had a comment submitted?

Clause 10.3.4.1, Page 86, Line 40: "This subclause describes the procedures used for ~~IEEE Std 802.11~~ authentication and deauthentication." "IEEE Std 802.11" was deleted due to CID 2105 from Adrian, which stated: " "The 802.11 Association Request frame" - there is no doubt that an Association Request frame is just that." and proposed deleting 802.11 throughout when used in this manner. The problem is that we did that and then the new REVmc includes 802.11 as an adjective throughout. Since Adrian generated the comment that caused us to make this change but then did not do the same for his own document, should we match the style of REVmc or keep the changes made in response to his comment? Editor suggests matching the style of REVmc and rejecting the changes made in response to CID 2105.

Page 91, Line 59: CID 5133 changed "Reduced" to "Short" here, need to see if all instances of "Reduced" also need to be changed.