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**Abstract**

This document proposes comment resolutions for CIDs 2088 and 2219.

R0: initial version on June 13, 2023.

R1: revised version on July 7, 2023, editorial changes.

R2: revised version on July 11, 2023, changed the resolution to 2219.

# CID 2088

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 2088 | 9.6.21.8 | 155.60 | In DMG sensing, how USID is assigned has not been stated clearly. DMG Sensing Measurement Setup Request frame shall contain an USID field. The behavior of USTA in DMG sensing is not stated clearly. | As in comment. | REVISED.Please incorporate the modifications specified in 23/1084r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1084-00-00bf-lb272-cr-for-dmg-cid-2088-2219.docx>) for CID 2088. |

**Discussions for CID 2088:**

I can see the point raised by the commenter. For sub-7, we have explicit text about the unassociated case for sensing. For DMG, the viability of the unassociated case seems not to be very clear. Based on some brief offline discussions, it is agreed that the unassociated case is excluded from DMG sensing. The main reason is that, the transmission in 60 GHz bands is directional. Full beam training is needed for the PCP/AP STA and the non-PCP/non-AP STA to communicate. The overhead caused by association is almost negligible compared with beam training. So, there is no need to avoid it. And, including the unassociated case will no doubt bring a lot of complexity to the spec.

Given the latest draft D1.1,

* For DMG sensing procedure, we have the following texts in 11.55.3.3 DMG sensing session setup exchange:



This is clear enough that the DMG STA and the DMG PCP/AP that participate in DMG sensing shall be associated.

* For DMG SBP procedure, we do not have any text mentioning the association status between the SBP initiator (non-PCP/non-AP DMG STA) and the SBP responder (DMG PCP/AP STA). To maintain consistency with the DMG sensing procedure, it is better that we specify that the SBP initiator and the SBP responder shall complete the association between the SBP setup. Therefore, the following modifications are proposed.

**Modifications for CID 2088:**

***To TGbf editor: Please add the following text after P179L37 in 11bf spec D1.1.***

The non-AP or non-PCP DMG STA that acts as an SBP initiator shall complete the association with the PCP/AP that acts as an SBP responder before the DMG SBP setup exchange. (#2088)

# CID 2219

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 2219 | 0.00 | DMG transmission is directional. Before sending back the SBP report to SBP initiator, AP as SBP responder needs to make sure that the beam alignment between SBP initiator and SBP responder is still valid. | The commenter will provide a contribution. | REJECTED.The intention of the comment is understood. Based on offline technical discussions, for DMG communication, the DMG/EDMG STA that is associated with AP/PCP will check the validity of the link to maintain the connection, using e.g., RTS/CTS mechanism. So, the issue mentioned in the comment can be resolved by existing methods.  |

SP:

Do you agree to include the resolutions provided for CID 2088 and 2219 in the latest 11bf Draft?

Y/N/A