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# Abstract

This submission presents a suggested comment resolution for CID(s) 2623 on REVmd D2.0
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# Comment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **LB** | **Draft** | **Page** | **Line** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2623 | 236 | 2 |  |  |  | It is confusing to have something called "FILS Shared Key authentication", as it sounds as if this is a special case of "Shared Key authentication" (a.k.a. WEP) | Delete Subclause 12.3.3.3 |
| 2624 | 236 | 2 |  |  |  | It is confusing to have something called "FILS Shared Key authentication", as it sounds as if this is a special case of "Shared Key authentication" (a.k.a. WEP). This was rejected under CID 1324 on the basis that "The term "FILS Shared Key" is unambiguous." but the problem is that "Shared Key" is ambiguous (as to whether it encompasses "FILS Shared Key") | Change "FILS Shared Key" to "FILS Common Key" throughout the document and change "FILS\_SHARED\_KEY" to "FILS\_COMMON\_KEY" throughout the document |

# Discussion

The comment does not provide technical insights allowing to understand where the “confusion” comes from. “FILS Shared Key” is not to be read as a derivation of “Shared Key”.

The comment resolution committee discussed this issue in detail as part of the resolution of the similar, previously submitted CID 1324 and did not agree on an existing potential for confusion that requires a change to be made.

As such, it is suggested to reject the comment.

In case a technical submission explaining the confusion is available and the group agrees that as a result cls. 12.3.3.3 should be modified, the approved resolution to reject may be revisited.

# Proposed Resolution

Rejected.

The comment resolution committee discussd the comment and did not agree on an existing potential for confusion that requires a change to be made.

The same topic has been discussed as part of the resolution of a previously submitted comment (CID 1324) and the comment resolution committee stands to the outcome of the previous discussion.