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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for 11 CIDs (3295, 3394, 3396, 3399, 3417, 3473, 3303, 3069, 3070, 3402, 3486) in subclause 9.4.1.73.1, 9.4.2.320, 9.3.1.19.1, 11.55.1 in P802.11bf D2.0.

NOTE – Set the Track Changes Viewing Option in the MS Word to “All Markup” to clearly see the proposed text edits.

**Revision History:**

R0: Initial version

## 

## Reporting CIDs: 3295, 3394, 3396, 3399, 3417

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3394 | 9.4.1.73.1 | 50.18 | The Sensing Measurement Report Control field size is either 4 or 8 | change "0 or 5 or 9" to "0, 4, or 8" | **Accept** |
| 3417 | 9.4.2.320 | 71.60 | The two fields of B26 and B27 have the same name. Please change B26 to I\_{N\_b} | As in comment | **Accept** |
| 3295 | 9.4.2.320 | 71.60 | Figure 9-1002bd has a typo, field of B26 should be Inb, not Ing. | As in comment | **Revise**  The proposed change by this comment is considered in CID 3417  TGbf editor: No further changes are required |
| 3396 | 9.4.2.320 | 71.60 | This should be I\_Nb | As in comment | **Revise**  The proposed change by this comment is considered in CID 3417  TGbf editor: No further changes are required |
| 3397 | 9.4.2.320 | 75.41 | Change to "Sensing Measurement Request frame | As in comment | **Accept** |

## Exchange CID: 3473

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3473 | 9.3.1.19.1 | 29.43 | For ranging and sensing, an NDPA can also be sent to an unassociated AP in non-TB sensing. | Change into "STA Info field is addressed to an associated AP or mesh if the NDP Announcement frame is not a Ranging or a Sensing variant. STA Info field is addressed to an associated AP or unassociated AP if the NDP Announcement frame is a Ranging or a Sensing variant. " | **Revise**  The proposed change is reflected in the resolution with some editorial change.  TGbf editor: please incorporate changes shown in 11-23/1552r0 below under the tag (#3473). |

***TGbf editor: please make the following change in subclause 9.3.1.19.1, P29L43 in 11bf D2.0.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * AID11 subfield encoding in an NDP Announcement frame | | | | | | |
| AID11 subfield | Description | NDP Announcement frame variant applicability (see NOTE) | | | | |
| VHT | HE | EHT | Ranging | Sensing |
| 0 | If the NDP Announcement frame is not a Ranging or a Sensing variant, (#3473) STA Info field is addressed to the associated AP or mesh.  If the NDP Announcement frame is a Ranging or a Sensing variant, STA Info field is  addressed to the associated AP or unassociated AP(#3473). | Applicable | | | | |

## OST CIDs: 3303

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3069 | 9.4.2.320 | 72.16 | Should Sensing Measurement Report Requested field be always set to 1 in an SBP Request frame? Otherwise when Sensing Receiver field is reserved, how to interprete this Sensing Measurement Report Requested field? | Add "Sensing Measurement Report Requested field is always set to 1 in an SBP Request frame" | **Revise**  Since reporting in SBP is mandatory, then it makes sense to always set the Sensing Measurement Report Requested field to 1 in an SBP Request frame. The suggested proposal is adopted.  TGbf editor: please incorporate changes shown in 11-23/1552r0 below under the tag (#3069). |

***TGbf editor: please make the following change in subclause 11.55.2.3, P165L5 in 11bf D2.0.***

The SBP initiator shall be present in the sensing availability window assigned by the SBP responder if it

intends to receive SBP Report frames from the SBP responder obtained as a result of TB sensing measurement

exchanges in the corresponding sensing availability window.

(#3069)The Sensing Measurement Report Requested field is always set to 1 in an SBP Request frame.

## OST CIDs: 3069, 3070

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3069 | 11.55.1.1 | 134.13 | what does 'zero' means here? | change 'zero' to 'one' | **Rejected**  The establishment of a sensing measurement session does not guarantee that sensing measurement exchanges will follow. There may be scenarios where a sensing measurement session is not followed by any sensing measurement exchanges. |
| 3070 | 11.55.1.1 | 134.31 | since 'may' equals 'is permitted to', it means a sensing initiator can be a sensing transmitter or not be a sensing transmitter. thus, why we highlight "or as neither a ..." | Remove "or as neither a sensing transmitter nor a sensing receiver" and maybe add the condition into note. | **Rejected**  The case where the sensing initiator is neither a sensing transmitter nor a sensing receiver cannot be inferred from the other cases mentioned in this paragraph, so it should be mentioned explicitly as in the current draft. |

## OST CIDs: 3402, 3486

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page.Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 3402 | 9.6.7.50 | 112.50 | Status Code field name is not consistent across the draft. In a gloabal search you could find "Status code", "status code", " STATUS CODE", and "Status-Code". | As in comment | **Revised**  The cases where this field name is capitalized incorrectly are listed in the table below  TGbf editor: please incorporate the changes shown in 11-23/1552r0 as listed in the table below. |
| 3486 | 11.55.1.4.1 | 140.18 | Typo | change to lower case of "STATUS CODE" | **Revised**  This case is addressed in the table below with the correct capitalization of the field name  TGbf editor: please incorporate the changes shown in 11-23/1552r0 as listed in the table below. |

***TGbf editor: please make the following changes in 11bf D2.0 as listed in the table below.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Line** | **Current** | **Change To** | **Notes** |
| 80 | 63 | Status code | Status Code |  |
| 117 | 17 | status code | Status Code | 2 occurrences |
| 128 | 39 | Status code | Status Code |  |
| 129 | 21 | Status code | Status Code |  |
| 129 | 26 | Status code | Status Code |  |
| 139 | 2 | status code | Status Code |  |
| 139 | 5 | status code | Status Code |  |
| 140 | 18 | STATUS CODE | Status Code |  |
| 161 | 37 | Status-Code | Status Code | Check this case |
| 164 | 7 | status code | Status Code |  |

SP

Do you support the proposed resolutions to the 11 CIDs (3295, 3394, 3396, 3399, 3417, 3473, 3303, 3069, 3070, 3402, 3486) and incorporate the text changes into the latest TGbf draft?

Y/N/A