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##### This submission present proposed resolutions for the following 23 ED2 CIDs:

4056, 4057, 4058, 4059, 4060, 4061, 4062, 4063, 4264, 4295,

4298, 4173, 4183, 4258, 4308, 4346, 4354, 4110, 4120, 4121,

4394, 4041, 4135

##### The proposed changes are based on REVme/D3.0.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – Initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4056 | 12.4.5.5 | 2822 | 21 | The separate KCK in SAE was renamed to SAE-KCK in REVme/D3.0, but not all places were renamed consistently. 12.4.5.5 passes "the KCK" to the CN function while 12.4.5.6 passed "the SAE-KCK" to that same function., | Replace "passing the KCK" with "passing the SAE-KCK". |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KCK” with “SAE-KCK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4056:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4057 | 12.7.1.3 | 2887 | 20 | REVme/D3.0 renamed "KCK" to "PTK-KCK" when talking about the KCK that is a part of the PTK. And similarly for KEK. However, not all edits were done consistently. Figure 12-29 misses the changes for KCK and KEK (but the instances with the \_bits postfix are correct without the change). | Replace "(KCK)" with "(PTK-KCK)" and "(KEK)" with "(PTK-KEK)" in Figure 12-29. |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KCK” with “PTK-KCK” and “KEK” with “PTK-KEK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4057:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4058 | 12.7.1.3 | 2888 | 48 | REVme/D3.0 renamed "KCK" to "PTK-KCK" when talking about the KCK that is a part of the PTK. However, not all edits were done consistently. PMKID derivation using KCK did not get updated. | Replace "KCK" with "PTK-KCK" at P2888 L48 and L53. |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KCK” with “PTK-KCK” at both locations for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4058:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4059 | 13.8.4 | 2994 | 36 | REVme/D3.0 renamed "KCK" to "PTK-KCK" when talking about the KCK that is a part of the PTK. However, not all edits were done consistently. One of the FT AKM cases was missed. | Replace "KCK" with "PTK-KCK". |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KCK” with “PTK-KCK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4059:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4060 | 12.7.1.6.5 | 2896 | 55 | REVme/D3.0 renamed "KEK" to "PTK-KEK" when talking about the KEK that is a part of the PTK. However, not all edits were done consistently. Description of KEK use did not get modified. | Replace "The KEK is used" with "The PTK-KEK is used". |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KEK” with “PTK-KEK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4060:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4061 | 12.11.2.5.3 | 2956 | 61 | REVme/D3.0 renamed "KEK" to "PTK-KEK" when talking about the KEK that is a part of the PTK. However, not all edits were done consistently. A FILS case was missed. | Replace "is the length of KEK in bits" with "is the length of PTK-KEK in bits". |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KEK” with “PTK-KEK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4061:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4062 | 12.11.2.6.3 | 2962 | 18 | REVme/D3.0 renamed "KEK" to "PTK-KEK" when talking about the KEK that is a part of the PTK. However, not all edits were done consistently. A FILS case was missed. | Replace "The KEK and" with "The PTK-KEK and". |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “KEK” with “PTK-KEK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4062:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4063 | J.7.3 | 5666 | 4 | KCK/KEK renaming was not done correctly in D3.0 for one of the test vectors. Table J-12 shows components of a PTK; not something from SAE. | Replace "SAE-KCK" with "PTK-KCK" at P5660 L4 and "KEK" with "PTK-KEK" at P5660 L6. |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “SAE-KCK” with “PTK-KCK” and “KEK” with “PTK-KEK” for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4063:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4264 | 12.4.4 |  |  | "password element of xxx (PWE)" has italic bold style for PWE in one location and plain roman in another | Be consistent. Probably just stop using bold italic throughout 12.4.4.3.2 since there doesn't seem to be a specific reason to use this |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that the rephrase “PWE” no longer follows the style of italic and bold.

***Proposed resolution for CID 4264:***

Revised

At 2817.6, 2817.20 (two instances), 2817.21 (two instances), 2817.37, 2817.38, 2831.37, and 2832.10, change the style of “PWE” from italic and bold to plain.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4295 | 12.5.3.6 | 2847 |  | "this MME IPN" v "this MME IPN/BIPN" inconsistency (2x just "MME IPN" under b)) | Change "IPN" to "IPN/BIPN" at lines 40 and 49 |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commente to replace “IPN” with “IPN/BIPN” at both locations for the sake of consistency.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4295:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4298 | 12.5.3.6 | 2847 | 28 | "reception.If the frame is a protected" missing space after full stop | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that there is a missing space after the full stop at 2847.28.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4298:***

At 2847.28:

a) Insert a missing space after the full stop;

b) Remove an extra space prior to “terminate”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4173 | 11 |  |  | "Request/Response exchange" should be "Request/Response frame exchange or lowercased" | As it says in the comment [I can provide locations if needed; confirm direction] |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter.

***Proposed resolution for CID 4173:***

Revised

At 1951.51, replace “GCR Request/Response exchanges” with “GCR request/response frame exchanges”.

At 2143.58, replace “a request/response exchange” with “a request/response frame exchange”.

At 2394.11, replace “a TDLS Peer PSM Request/Response exchange” with “a TDLS peer PSM request/response frame exchange”.

At 2439.43, replace “a separate association request/response exchange” with “a separate association request/response frame exchange”.

At 2444.25, replace “a separate reassociation request/response exchange” with “a separate reassociation request/response frame exchange”.

At 2632.41, replace “GAS request/response exchange” with “GAS request/response frame exchange”.

At 2840.51, replace “a header compression request/response exchange” with “a header compression request/response frame exchange”.

At 4581.41, replace “a secure WUR mode setup request/response exchange” with “a secure WUR mode setup request/response frame exchange”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4183 | 12 |  |  | "FC--MPDU Frame Control field, with the following modifications:" for BIP should be just "FC--MPDU Frame Control field, with:" and then for all cases (CCMP, BIP, GCMP) the last subbullet should be "No modifications to other subfields" | Fix the lists at 2837.45, 2838.52, 2845.31 |

***Discussion:***

CCMP from 2837.45 to 2837.60:



CCMP from 2838.50 to 2838.64:



BIP from 2845.31 to 2845.37:



***Proposed resolution for CID 4183:***

Accepted

Note to the Editors:

a) At 2837.45, add “:” at the end of the sentence

b) At 2837.59, replace “Other subfields are not modified” with “No modifications to other subfields”

c) At 2838.52, add “:” at the end of the sentence

d) At 2838.63, replace “Other subfields are not modified” with “No modifications to other subfields”

e) At 2845.31, delete “the following modifications”

b) At 2845.37, replace “Other subfields are not modified” with “No modifications to other subfields”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4258 | 26.4.2 |  |  | "PS Poll" should be "PS-Poll" | Make the change suggested at 1776.22, 2299.27, 3849.42 |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that it is “PS-Poll” not “PS Poll” at 1776.22 and 3849.42.

At 1776.22:



At 3849.42:



At 2299.27, the hyphen already exists:



***Proposed resolution for CID 4258:***

Revised.

At 1776.22 and 3849.22, replace “PS Poll” with “PS-Poll”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4308 | 11.1 | 2501 |  | "off-operating channel" should be "off-channel" (2x) | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

At 2501.11:



At 2501.52:



***Proposed resolution for CID 4308:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4346 | 13.9.3 |  |  | Figure 13-15--R1KH state machine, including portions of the SME (part 1) -- some of the arrowheads are pointing the wrong way | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution for CID:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4354 | 11.5.2.2 | 2472 | 7 | "If an ADDBA Response frame is received with the matching dialog token and the TID and with astatus code equal to SUCCESS, the STA has established (#3174)or modified a block ack mechanism" should be "... the block ack mechanism" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commente to replace “a block ack mechanism” with “the block ack mechanism”.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4354:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4110 | 11.8.10 | 2495 | 44 | Typo | Correct to "permits all STAs \_to\_ know" |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter to replace “permits all STAs know” with “permits all STAs to know”.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4110:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4120 | 11.3.5.2 | 2436 | 33 | Non-"hot" link | The reference to 11.3.5.4 is not a "hot link". Same thing at 2439.22. |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that the cross referencing was not activiated at both locations.

***Proposed resolution for CID 4120:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4121 | 11.1.4.3.2 | 2359 | 64 | Capitalization | In bullet (j), the second occurrence of "Probe Responses" is generic, not to specific frames, so it shoud be lower case. |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the commenter that capitalization is not needed.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4121:***

Accepted

Note to the Editors: The page number is 2358, not 2359.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4394 | 11.1.3.8.6 | 2352 | 36 | "The procedure helps ensures that" | Replace "helps ensures" with "helps to ensure" |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the comment.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4394:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4041 | 11.21.15 |  |  | "Timeout Interval Element" is sometimes referred as TIE abbreviation and sometime as whole. Would be good to have consistence, e.g. always refer to as TIE. | As in the comment |

***Discussion:***

There are two instances of “Timeout Interval Element” in 11.21.15 and both refer specifically to “Timeout Interval Element field”. For the name of a field, no abbreviation is allowed as per the editorial guideline.

***Proposed resolution for CID 4041:***

Rejected

There are two instances of “Timeout Interval Element” in 11.21.15 and both refer specifically to “Timeout Interval Element field”. For the name of a field, no abbreviation is allowed as per the editorial guideline.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 4135 | 11.10.17 | 2529 | 49 | "the Available Admission Capacity field value of the BSS Load value" should be "the Available Admission Capacity field of the BSS Load element" | As it says in the comment |

***Discussion:***

Agree with the comment.



***Proposed resolution for CID 4135:***

Accepted