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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to the following comments submitted in SA1 Recirculation Ballot. The CIDs are referring to D5.0. The text used as reference is D5.0.

CIDs: R1-7, R1-10, R1-30

Revision history:

R0: Original version

R1: Minor editorial updates.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| R1-7 | Xiandong Dong | 164.42 | add a note in the clause "If a non-AP STA becomes unassociated with a AP, the existed Sensing measurement session(s) should be terminated accordingly " | as in comment | Rejected. See rejection reasons in <DCN1773r1>. |

**Discussion:** The contributor conducted offline discussions with the commenter and decided to reject this CID due to the following reasons. The commenter is fine to have this CID rejected.

1. If the sensing measurement session was established when the non-AP STA was unassociated with the AP, this is already allowed in 11bf. If the STA was unassociated and established a sensing measurement session with the AP, this sensing measurement session would still be valid if the STA stays unassociated later.
2. If the sensing measurement session was established when the STA is associated with the AP, and once the STA becomes unassociated later, the sensing measurement session would be automatically terminated. It is common sense in 802.11 that all post-association protocols will be considered terminated once a STA gets unassociated, because there is no way for a STA to maintain those post-association agreements after disassociation, including sensing measurement sessions. There is no need to add a specific note here. Otherwise, for all post-association protocols we will need to add a similar text in 802.11 spec, which is unnecessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| R1-10 | Stephan Sand | 77.20 | In Figure 9-1074bs the Sensing field is 9 octets long, but in Figure 9-1074bt only 69 bits are shown. | Please add B69, Reserved, 1 after B68, 20 Mhy Sensing Transmitter Only, 1 | Revised. See proposed resolution in <DCN1773r1>. |

**Discussion:** Agree with the commenter in principle. We need to show the remaining reserved bits in Figure 9-1074bt.

***TGbf editor, make the following changes to Figure 9-1074bt***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | B38 B60 | B61 | B62 | B63 | B64 | B65 B67 | B68 | B69 B71 |
|  | Min Measurement Interval | Poll Required | Threshold Based Reporting | N\_g = 16 | SR2SR Support | Max RX Chains | 20 MHz Sensing Transmitter Only | Reserved |
| Bits | 23 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |

Figure 9-1074bt---Sensing field format

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| R1-30 | Stephen McCann | 94.08 | The Report Type subfield in Figure 9-1073cq is 3 bits long, whereas in Figure 9-1074cg (Page 88) it is 5 bits long. | Change the size of the "Report Type" subfield in Figure 9-1074cg to be 5 bits long and adjust the other subfields accordingly. | Revised. See proposed resolution in <DCN1773r1>. |

**Discussion:** Agree with the commenter.

***TGbf editor, make the following changes to Figure 9-1074cq***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | B0 B7 | B8 B15 | B16 B23 | B24 ~~B26~~B28 | ~~B27~~B29 ~~B29~~B31 | ~~B30~~B32 ~~B40~~B42 | ~~B41~~B43 B47 |
|  | DMG Measurement Session ID | Measurement Burst ID | Sensing Exchange SN | Report Type | Num of STAs in Exchange | Channel Measurement Type | Reserved |
| Bits | 8 | 8 | 8 | ~~3~~5 | 3 | 11 | ~~7~~5 |

Figure 9-1074cq---Report Control field format

## SP

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

Y/N/A