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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to the following comments submitted in LB276 under SBP topic. The CIDs are referring to D2.0. The text used as reference is D2.0.

CIDs: 3306 3504

Revision history:

R0: Original version

R1: Format fix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 3306 | 9.4.2.322 | 78.61 | The Sensing Responder field should be changed to 2 bits. There are 3 possible cases: SBP initiator demand to be a responder (meaning Yes); SBP initiatior demand not to be a responder (meaning No); SBP initiator does not mind and AP is free to use it or not. (Meaning Abstain). | Change Sensing Responder field to 2 bits and cover the cases as commented. Also add normative text in P162L5. | Rejected. See reason below in <DCN1559r1>. |

**Proposed resolution**: Rejected.

**Discussion**: The contributor failes to understand why we need to define an abstain option for the SBP initiator to indicate to the AP in terms of its intention to become a sensing responder or not. The contributor thinks as an SBP initiator, the decision of whether to become a sensing responder should be clear to the SBP initiator itself, so the contributor does not agree with defining an Absatin option for the SBP initiator.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 3504 | 11.55.2.4 | 165.57 | When SBP initiator is also the sensing responder, there are two procedures between SBP initiator (STA) and SBP responder (AP): SBP procedure and sensing session. If SBP intiator or SBP responder wants to terminate a SBP procedure and the corresponding sensing session, it could send a SBP termination frame and the recipent device termiante the corresponding sensing session identified by the MSID in SBP termination frame. There is not need to send the Sensing Measurement Session Termination frame in this case. | Add normative text for this case if it is needed. | Revised. Added normative text for this scenario. See proposed text below in <DCN1559r1>. |

**Proposed resolution**: Revised.

**Discussion**: When the SBP initiator is also a sensing responder and if the SBP procedure is terminated either by the SBP initiator or the SBP responder, it is indeed true that the SBP iniator should already clearly understand that the corresponding sensing measurement session between the SBP initiator and the SBP responder is also terminated. In this sense, the commenter is correct that in this case there is no need to send another Sensing Measurement Session Termination frame between the SBP initiator and the SBP responder,

***TGbf editor, make the following changes in 11.55.2.4:***

If the SBP responder transmits an SBP Termination frame or receives an SBP Termination frame from theSBP initiator, or after the expiry of the SBP procedure expiry timer, the SBP responder should terminate corresponding sensing measurement session(s) with all the sensing responders, except for the SBP initiator if the SBP initiator is also a sensing responder, identified by the Measurement Session ID(s) associated with the sensing procedure(s) triggered by the terminated SBP procedure(s).

## SP

Do you support the proposed resolutions to the CIDs and incorporate the text changes into the latest TGbf draft?

Y/N/A