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Abstract

This submission proposes potentially invalid comment resolutions from TGah Draft 2.0.

* CIDs:

4079, 4099, 4081, 4082, 4083, 4084, 4085, 4075, 4076, 4073, 4050, 4039, 4096, 4097, 4098, 4074, 4067, 4066, 4048, 4091, 4095, 4068, 4089, 4077, 4088, 4051, 4072, 4052, 4086, 4053, 4069, 4058, 4057, 4054, 4056, 4087, 4060, 4070, 4071, 4059, 4055, 4093, 4040, 4041, 4062, 4063, 4094, 4042, 4043, 4044, 4045, 4047, 4046, 4090, 4078, 4064, 4065, 4092 (58 CIDs)

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGah Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGah Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGah Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGah Editor” are instructions to the TGah editor to modify existing material in the TGah draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGah editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGah Draft.***

| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4079 | Ronald Murias |  | 9.47 | I object to the resolution of CID 2528. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4099 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2976. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4081 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2613. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4082 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2614. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4083 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2696. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4084 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2697. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4085 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2698. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4075 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2364. CID 1021 has no clear resolution. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4076 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2366. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4073 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2329. CID 1021 was accepted. How can this one be rejected? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4050 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 1366. CID 1021 was revised, but the revision is not described in this database. Now this comment is rejected and refers to a revised comment for explanation. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4039 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 1021. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4096 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2973. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4097 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2974. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4098 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2975. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4074 | Ronald Murias | 5.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2363. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4067 | Ronald Murias | 27.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 2082. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4066 | Ronald Murias | 27.00 | 4.16 | I object to the resolution of CID 1823. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4048 | Ronald Murias | 64.00 | 8.4.1.47.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 1087. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4091 | Ronald Murias | 64.00 | 8.4.1.47.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2793. I object to the resolution of CID 2793. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4095 | Ronald Murias | 67.00 | 8.4.2.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2953. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4068 | Ronald Murias | 67.00 | 8.4.2.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2162. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4089 | Ronald Murias | 68.00 | 8.4.2.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2789. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4077 | Ronald Murias | 68.00 | 8.4.2.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2474. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4088 | Ronald Murias | 68.00 | 8.4.2.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2788. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4051 | Ronald Murias | 68.00 | 8.4.2.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 1382. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4072 | Ronald Murias | 94.00 | 8.4.2.170f | I object to the resolution of CID 2326. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4052 | Ronald Murias | 111.00 | 8.4.2.170m | I object to the resolution of CID 1429. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4086 | Ronald Murias | 174.00 | 9.20.5.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 2750. The resolution to CID 2267 claims it is a duplicate of CID 2750, CID 27512750 says its resolved by CID 1492, but has a contribution associated with it, 14/0234r2. In 14/0234r2, the resolution refers to CID 1492 as in the database.1492 is agreed: remove paragraph or move it to 9.20.5.6. Which was done?2751 is revised according to "11-13/XXXXr0" under the heading CID 2751, invalid document number In the database, 14/0019r0 is mentioned. The text in 14/0019 appears to resolve CID 2751.If 2750 and 2751 are duplicates of 2267, why do they have different resolutions? What exactly is the resolution to CID 1492 (referenced by CID 2750? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4053 | Ronald Murias | 175.00 | 9.20.5.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1492. The resolution to CID 2267 claims it is a duplicate of CID 2750, CID 27512750 says its resolved by CID 1492, but has a contribution associated with it, 14/0234r2. In 14/0234r2, the resolution refers to CID 1492 as in the database.1492 is agreed: remove paragraph or move it to 9.20.5.6. Which was done?2751 is revised according to "11-13/XXXXr0" under the heading CID 2751, invalid document number In the database, 14/0019r0 is mentioned. The text in 14/0019 appears to resolve CID 2751.If 2750 and 2751 are duplicates of 2267, why do they have different resolutions? What exactly is the resolution to CID 1492 (referenced by CID 2750? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4069 | Ronald Murias | 175.00 | 9.20.5.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 2260. If the current description were clear, the commenter would not have submitted the comment. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4058 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1499. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4057 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1498. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4054 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1495. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4056 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1497. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4087 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 2751. The resolution to CID 2267 claims it is a duplicate of CID 2750, CID 27512750 says its resolved by CID 1492, but has a contribution associated with it, 14/0234r2. In 14/0234r2, the resolution refers to CID 1492 as in the database.1492 is agreed: remove paragraph or move it to 9.20.5.6. Which was done?2751 is revised according to "11-13/XXXXr0" under the heading CID 2751, invalid document number In the database, 14/0019r0 is mentioned. The text in 14/0019 appears to resolve CID 2751.If 2750 and 2751 are duplicates of 2267, why do they have different resolutions? What exactly is the resolution to CID 1492 (referenced by CID 2750? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4060 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1501. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4070 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 2267. The resolution to CID 2267 claims it is a duplicate of CID 2750, CID 27512750 says its resolved by CID 1492, but has a contribution associated with it, 14/0234r2. In 14/0234r2, the resolution refers to CID 1492 as in the database.1492 is agreed: remove paragraph or move it to 9.20.5.6. Which was done?2751 is revised according to "11-13/XXXXr0" under the heading CID 2751, invalid document number In the database, 14/0019r0 is mentioned. The text in 14/0019 appears to resolve CID 2751.If 2750 and 2751 are duplicates of 2267, why do they have different resolutions? What exactly is the resolution to CID 1492 (referenced by CID 2750? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4071 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 2268. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4059 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1500. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4055 | Ronald Murias | 176.00 | 9.20.5.6 | I object to the resolution of CID 1496. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4093 | Ronald Murias | 196.00 | 9.47.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2920. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4040 | Ronald Murias | 196.00 | 9.47.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 1056. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4041 | Ronald Murias | 196.00 | 9.47.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 1057. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4062 | Ronald Murias | 197.00 | 9.47.3 | I object to the resolution of CID 1539. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4063 | Ronald Murias | 197.00 | 9.47.3 | I object to the resolution of CID 1540. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4094 | Ronald Murias | 198.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 2921. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4042 | Ronald Murias | 198.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1059. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4043 | Ronald Murias | 198.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1060. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4044 | Ronald Murias | 198.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1061. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4045 | Ronald Murias | 199.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1065. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4047 | Ronald Murias | 199.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1068. What exactly was the reason for rejection? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4046 | Ronald Murias | 199.00 | 9.47.4 | I object to the resolution of CID 1066. What exactly was the revision? | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4090 | Ronald Murias | 206.00 | 9.48.2 | I object to the resolution of CID 2791. It is not clear how this is not a "real issue". The rejection should address the concerns of the commenter or resolove the issue. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4078 | Ronald Murias | 223.00 | 10.3.8 | I object to the resolution of CID 2520. Rejection is not clear. There is no discussion section or justification. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4064 | Ronald Murias | 278.00 | 24.3.7 | I object to the resolution of CID 1605. Resolution agrees revision may be required to clear up the confusion yet the comment is rejected. Comment resolutions should not promise or propose action sometime in the future. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4065 | Ronald Murias | 279.00 | 24.3.7 | I object to the resolution of CID 1606. Resolution to CID 1605 agrees revision may be required to clear up the confusion yet the comment is rejected. Comment resolutions should not promise or propose action sometime in the future. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |
| 4092 | Ronald Murias | 325.00 | 24.3.10.1 | I object to the resolution of CID 2794. While the spec is not responsible for explanations, I find this resolution unhelpful and it would be more appropriate to address the commenter's concerns or at least refer the commenter to contributions which may have address the concerns in the comment. | See comment. | Rejected-  A comment is that several comment resolutions of the previous WG LB didn’t follow the guideline of comment resolution process.  But, this comment is not in scope because the comment is not in the first ballot (approved letter ballot #203).  However, in order to improve the draft quality, the task group members listened to the comment resolution tutorial presented by the WG chair.  The comment resolution committee will carefully check whether the comment resolution guideline is followed. |