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Abstract

This document includes proposed resolutions to SBP comments received in CC40.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 527 | 9.6.7.54 | 60.57 | Delete the TBD and define the status code for the REQUEST\_REJECTED | As in comment |
| 572 | 11.21.19.2 | 73.10 | The status code REQUEST\_REJECTED is not defined in the status code in table 9-78. Define it | As in Comment. |
| 505 | 9.4.1.9 | 31.17 | The value of Status code for DENIED\_SENSING\_MEASUREMENT\_SETUP is not defined. | Define the Status code by using the reserved value |
| 506 | 9.4.1.9 | 31.20 | The value of Status code for PREFERRED\_MEASURMENT\_SETUP\_PARAMETERS\_SUGGESTED is not defined | Define the Status code by using the reserved value |

**Proposed resolution**: Revised

**Discussion**: The group has approved the use of REQUEST\_DECLINED (in place of REQUEST\_REJECTED and DENIED\_SENSING\_MEASUREMENT\_SETUP) and REJECTED\_WITH\_SUGGESTED\_CHANGES (in place of PREFERRED\_MEASURMENT\_SETUP\_PARAMETERS\_SUGGESTED), which have status codes defined in Table 9-78 of our baseline (Rev. me/D2.0).

**Modifications**: Modifications that address the comments above can already be found in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 179 | 11.21.19.2 | 73.58 | " ... is defined as a STA that supports SBP." A STA that supports SBP better be defined as "SBP-capable STA" | As in comment. |

**Proposed resolution**: Revised

**Discussion**: For reference, text (D0.4) is:

“Implementation of SBP is optional for a WNM STA. A STA in which dot11SBPImplemented is true is defined as a STA that supports SBP(#176, #717).

A STA in which dot11SBPImplemented is true shall set the SBP field of the Extended Capabilities element to 1(#176, #717).

A STA in which dot11SBPImplemented is false shall set the SBP field of the Extended Capabilities element to 0(#176, #717).

A non-AP STA may act as SBP initiator when dot11SBPImplemented is true.

An AP may act as SBP responder when dot11SBPImplemented is true.”

The cited text looks to be redundant. The definition is captured in “A non-AP STA may act as SBP initiator when dot11SBPImplemented is true. An AP may act as SBP responder when dot11SBPImplemented is true.”

**Modifications**: Delete “A STA in which dot11SBPImplemented is true is defined as a STA that supports SBP(#176, #717)”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 292 | 4.3.21.25 | 17.37 | It is good to provide a list of mandatory and optional features for SBP as is done for other amendments. | Add a list of mandatory and optional features for SBP |

**Proposed resolution**: Rejected

**Discussion**: The group recently discussed similar comment (CID 291, 22/1791r0) – mandatory and optional features for WLAN sensing – and agreed to reject the comment on the basis that “There are multiple ongoing discussions in the TGbf which may need to reach consensus before a stable list of mandatory/optional features gets agreed on. It might be more suitable to add this list after D1.0 is released.” We suggest taking the same approach for the SBP procedure.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 419 | 46.06 | 28 | Is there a need for a capability for serving as SBP responder/Tx | Add such a capability if the group consider it is necessary |

**Proposed resolution**: Rejected

**Discussion**:

* Our draft already includes capability to serve as an SBP responder: “An AP may act as SBP responder when dot11SBPImplemented is true.”
* In D0.4, normative text has been defined for SBP’s reporting phase. Text is agnostic to whether SBP responder assumes the role of sensing transmitter or sensing receiver.
* While defining a capability for the case when an SBP responder assumes the role of sensing transmitter has been discussed early on, to the best of my knowledge, this possibility hasn’t recently been raised – possibly because we now have a better understanding/normative text of the SBP procedure.
* Suggest taking the same approach as in the resolution of CID 292 above and address SBP capabilities, if necessary, at a later stage.