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Abstract

This submission proposes to address the following CIDs 4058, 4061, 4064, 4100, 4189, 4192, 4246, and 4190 (8 CIDs total), changes are relative to Draft P802.11be\_D4.0, Draft P802.11REVme\_D4.2, and Draft P802.11bf D3.0.

Revisions:

Interpretation of a Motion to Adopt

A motion to approve this submission means that the editing instructions and any changed or added material are actioned in the TGax Draft. This introduction is not part of the adopted material.

***Editing instructions formatted like this are intended to be copied into the TGbk Draft (i.e. they are instructions to the 802.11 editor on how to merge the text with the baseline documents).***

***TGbk Editor: Editing instructions preceded by “TGbk Editor” are instructions to the TGbk editor to modify existing material in the TGaz draft. As a result of adopting the changes, the TGbk editor will execute the instructions rather than copy them to the TGbk Draft.***

**The text preceded by “Discussion” is not part of the adopted changes.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **P.L** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| **4058** | 76.22 | 9.4.2.321 | My previous CID3086 was rejected with a reason "lack of consensus" as shown in doc 23-2093r2. This is not a valid reason to reject a technical comment | Refer to CID 3086. | **Rejected**  While the TG supports the idea of defining a “20 MHz sensing transmitter only” STA, see straw poll results in XXX, the TG did not converge yet on the required normative text. |
| **4061** | 76.22 | 9.4.2.321 | My CID 3139 to LB276 was rejected with the reason "The TG could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comments ...". This is not a valid reason for rejection to a technical comment. Resolution to my comment is still required. | Add a capability bit definition to allow a sensing STA to claim its capability. |  |
| **4064** | 77.01 | 9.4.2.321 | In SFD motion was passed to make CSI reporting optional but in capabilites there is no field to know if CSI reporting is supported by RSTA/ISTA | Add a capability field for CSI reporting |  |
| **4100** | 76.22 | 9.4.2.321 | "CID3086 remains unresolved as per doc 23-2093r2 - lack of consensus  there needs to a valid reason please provide an appropriate resolution for CID 3086" | As in comment |  |
| **4189** | 76.22 | 9.4.2.321 | My previous comment was rejected with "lack of consensus", which is not valid to reject a technical comment.. | Refer to CID3086 |  |
| **4192** | 76.22 | 9.4.2.321 | The most popular and simplest WiFi sensing applications do not necessitate the CSI report. The rejections of CSI report feedback is optional due to a lack of consensus should not be considered as a justification for a technical comment. | In the Sensing field of Sensing Capability Element, add 1 bit to signify the support for CSI report at the responding STA. |  |
| **4246** | 76.22 | 9.4.2.321 | According to Motion 60, transmission of Sensing Measurement Report frames by a sensing responder is optional. | Add a one-bit subfield "Reporting" to Figure 9-1001bi (Sensing field format) |  |
| **4190** | 135.20 | 11.55.1.2 | CID3098 is not fully resolved | Please check CID3098 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. ***Discussion:***

Add a capability for 20 MHz only IoT STAs to be sensing transmitter only (and avoid sending CSI feedback).

# Strawpoll

Do you support the definition of a “20 MHz sensing transmitter only” STA?