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Abstract

This document points out problems with various resolutions for comments made on 11ai/D3.0 (LB204).

 6317: What does the Edit Note "Changed many other places, but question the use of these terms in 10.3.1." mean?

6294: What does the Edit Note "In D3.1 multiple places" mean? The multiple places are given in the comment.

6047: What does the Edit Note "In D3.1. Note that this includes a new change to REVmc." mean? Every change TGai makes is a new change to the baseline!

6364, 6367, 6366, 6020, 6011, 6003, 6136, 6885, 6719, 6527, 6944, 6934, 6497, 6274 (and that’s just in the 09-editorial tab; there might be others on other tabs): If the resolution is REVISED or REJECTED then it has to say how it's been revised/why it’s been rejected. The only status which can say nothing more is ACCEPTED.

6284: "Editor was aware of these but too late to fix before balloting. Believe that all are now fixed. In D3.1" -- next time we should wait until the document is ready!

6041: The commenter probably meant "RCPI", not "RPCI".

6124: "a set of BSS(s)" is wrong, because even if the set only has one member you use the plural. For example, in other words, a “set of numbers” includes the set { 42 }.

6087: Can't ACCEPT because "Make a table" does not specify exactly what the change is. This is just an example; there are other such CIDs.

6722: I did not claim that a specific change was given in CID 4732. I claimed that a specific change was proffered when the proposed resolution to CID 4732 was to reject because no specific change had been identified. This was sent to the TGai officers on 2014-08-01.

6455: Claims "Table 8-35, no change required. Table 8-37, no change required. Table 8-38, no change required. Table 8-39, no change required. Table 8-40, no change required. Table 8-41, no change required. Table 8-42, no change required. Table 8-43, one place where some clarification was needed but not really in conflict with base style." Table 8-35 is missing definite articles. Here's another one in Table 8-39:

 The FILS Public Key element is present if a

 TTP is not used for FILS authentication.

 Included if dot11FILSActivated is true.

This should be:

 The FILS Public Key element is present

 if dot11FILSActivated is true and a

 TTP is not used for FILS authentication.

6059, 6060, 6061, 6145, 6171, 6339, 6498, 6519, 6520, 6698, 6892: The resolution is “Revised - agree with the commenter.” If the comment and proposed change were clear, then the resolution should be “Accepted”.

6359: 1) If it's not exactly as proposed by the commenter, it's not ACCEPTED. 2) Spelling out "mod" is not acceptable. It is "mod" because that's what appears in subclause 1.5.

6630, 6827, 6680: The ad hominem attacks in the resolution are not acceptable.

6107: This resolution makes no sense. An attempt was made by email exchanges last week to get it clarified by its author, but this failed because the answers given were based on (a) concepts which are not described in the amendment (b) frames which don't exist in the amendment and (c) subclauses which don't exist in the amendment.

[(a) = "filtering rules for the accelarated FILS authentication schemes"

and "the FILS specific key materials being managed in the safe state";

(b) = "the FILS authentication/association frames";

(c) = "11.11.2.6-8"]

We should not add a new State to 10.3 without being clear on why it is necessary.

6273: "When the value of TBTT Information Length is greater than or equal to 1". So it can be 0? What does that mean? And how is that compatible with "Other values [than 1, 5, 7, 11] are reserved."?

6272: No, "variable" is the 802.11 style. (If you want the added sentence, then fine, just delete the "n" in it.)

6009: No, 8.2.4.8 (FCS Field) does not define CRC-32 ("CRC-32" appears nowhere there).

6827: I need more time to look at this and request that it not be motioned for now.

6802: This is not a responsive resolution per the 802.11 comment resolution rules.

6796: "reject: this does not describe encryption or decryption". See line 123.27: "Each successive invocation of the encryption operation of GCM shall [...]".

6637: I need more time to look at this and request that it not be motioned for now.

6073: I need more time to look at this and request that it not be motioned for now.

6039: The proposed change is not specific enough to be simply accepted.

6033: It may be that key confirmation stuff should not be done here, but simply deleting it (assuming that's what's meant by "get rid of") will lose it entirely, which doesn't seem like a good idea. Or is the claim that the stuff here is duplicated elsewhere?**References:**
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