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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to the following comments submitted in LB281 under SBP topic. The CIDs are referring to D3.0. The text used as reference is D3.0.

CIDs: 4151, 4008, 4049, 4051, 4262

Revision history:

R0: Original version

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 4151 | Alireza Raissinia | 76.17 | Change the text "The SBP Initiator AID12/USID12 field indicates the 12 LSBs of either the AID or the USID for the SBP initiator that triggers the AP to transmit the associated Sensing Measurement Request frame to satisfy the SBP request from the SBP initiator." to | The SBP Initiator AID12/USID12 field indicates the 12 LSBs of either the AID or the USID for the SBP initiator that requested the AP (i.e. SBP responder) to transmit the corresponding Sensing Measurement Request frame to satisfy the SBP request from the SBP initiator. | Accepted. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 4008 | Chaoming Luo | 81.58 | P81L37 says "The Sensing Responder field is reserved.",so the condition "If the Sensing Responder field and the Preferred Responder List fields are both set to 1" never comes true.Suggest to set the Sensing Responder field in the SBP response according to the SBP request's setting. | As in comment | Revised. See proposed text below in <DCN0115r0>. |

**Discussion:** The contributor agrees with the commenter in principle and proposes the following revision text.

***TGbf editor, revise the following sentence at P81L37 as follows:***

If the SBP Request field is equal to 0,

— The SBP Procedure Expiry Exponent field is reserved.— The Sensing Responder field is ~~reserved~~ set to the same value of the Sensing Responder field within the corresponding SBP Request frame with the same Dialog Token.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 4049 | Chaoming Luo | 166.22 | If the AP misses more than one prefered responders, it should send MS request to more than one other STAs. So, "to a sensing responder" is not sufficient. | Change "to a sensing responder with MAC address" to "to one or more sensing responders with MAC address(es)" | Accepted. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 4051 | Chaoming Luo | 169.29 | The sentence has logical issue. A sensing receiver that is not the SBP initiator never receives the SBPRequest frame, so how does it determine a field according to a field it never received? | Delete this paragraph, and add the following into clause 11.55.2.2 Setup exchange: If the Report Timestamp field within the received SBP Request frame is equal to 1, and if the Status Code field within the corresponding SBP Response frame is set to SUCCESS, the SBP responder shall set the Report Timestamp field within the Sensing Measurement Request frame sent by the SBP responder to initiate a sensing procedure used to satisfy an SBP request. | Revised. Accept the proposed change from the commenter except for the following minor change:If the Report Timestamp field within the received SBP Request frame is equal to 1, and if the Status Code field within the corresponding SBP Response frame is set to SUCCESS, the SBP responder shall set the Report Timestamp field within the Sensing Measurement Request frame to 1 ~~sent by the SBP responder~~ to initiate a sensing procedure used to satisfy an SBP request. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 4262 | Dong Wei | 168.28 | Figures 9-1034, 9-1035, and 9-1036 are only in the context of ranging and are not explicitly related to SBP procedure. | Revise the paragraph right above the Figures in the 11az spec to include SBP | Revised. See proposed change below in DCN0115r0. |

**Discussion:** The contributor has redrawn the 3 figures to relate to SBP procedure.

***TGbf editor, revise the following paragraph at 11.55.2.2 as follows:***

Figure ~~9-1034~~ 11-xxxx1(Example of a bitmap with 200 TU periodicity signaled in the ISTA Availability Window element within the SBP Request frame), Figure ~~9-1035~~ 11-xxx2 (Example of mapping of ISTA’s availability bitmap to ~~RSTA’s~~ SBP responder’s TSF), and Figure ~~9-1036~~ 11-xxx3 (Example of how an ~~RSTA~~ SBP responder assigns an Availability Window to an SBP initiator ~~ISTA~~) together show an example of how an SBP responder assigns a sensing availability window from the received Availability Window element of the SBP initiator.



Figure 11-xxx1--- Example of a bitmap with 200 TU periodicity signaled in the ISTA Availability Window element within the SBP Request frame



Figure 11-xxx2--- Example of mapping of ISTA’s availability bitmap to SBP responder’s TSF



Figure 11-xxx3--- Example of how an SBP responder assigns an Availability Window to an SBP initiator

## SP

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

Y/N/A