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Abstract

This document resolves comment with CID 110, 177, 239, 317, 770

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commentor** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 110 | Sigurd Schelstraete | 4.3.21.1 | 17.24 | Looks like first use of the acronym "SBP". Write it out as "Sensing By Proxy" before using acronym. | Replace "SBP" with "Sensing By Proxy (SBP)" |

**Proposed Resolution:** Revise

**Discussion:** SBP should be expanded in the first use. However, the words in it should begin with lowercase letter.

**Modifications:** Editor: Please modify draft 0.2, P18L40-44 following page/line as indicated:

Sensing by proxy (SBP) enables a non-AP STA to obtain sensing measurements of the channel between an AP and one or more non-AP STAs or between a receive antenna and a transmit antenna of an AP. With the execution of the SBP procedure, it is possible for a non-AP STA to obtain sensing measurements useful to estimate features such as range, velocity, and motion of objects in an area of interest(#111).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commentor** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 177 | Mahmoud Kamel | 11.21.19.2 | 73.10 | REQUEST\_REJECTED code is used with no TBD, either this code name is decided so no need for TBD, or it is not decided yet, then we may need to add (TBD) after the code name. | Add (TBD) after the code REQUEST\_REJECTED |

**Proposed Resolution:** Revise

**Discussion:** We should not add new TBDs into the draft. Instead, we reuse REQUEST\_DECLINED (status code = 37) in this case.

**Modifications:** Editor: Please globally replace REQUEST\_REJECTED with REQUEST\_DECLINED in draft 0.2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commentor** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 239 | narengerile narengerile | 9.6.7.55 | 61.08 | Please confirm if there is a Dialog Token field in the SBP Termination frame. If not, why? | As in the comment. |

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject

**Discussion:** SBP Termination does not have a correponding response message. Hence, no need to have a Dialog Token field.

**Modifications:** No modification required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commentor** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 317 | Rojan Chitrakar | 11.21.19 | 72.53 | Isn't SBP one of the features of WLAN Sensing? If so why is it not under WLAN Sensing procedure but pulled out as an independent subclause? | Clarify whether SBP should be placed under the WLAN Sensing procedure subclause. |

**Proposed Resolution:** Reject

**Discussion: “**SBP procedure” is different from “WLAN sensing procedure”, although SBP procedure has WLAN sensing component embedded in it. So, in that sense, SBP is not a feature of WLAN sensing (e.g., SBP does not have session setup, measurement setup etc.). SBP Procedure invokes WLAN sensing procedure at the AP (SBP responder) and has some additional signaling. Hence, it is appropriate to have the section “SBP procedure” outside of “WLAN sensing procedure”.

**Modifications:** No modification required.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commentor** | **Clause Number** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 770 | Alireza Raissinia | 11.21.19.2 | 73.12-15 | The text "The SBP responder should transmit an SBP Response frame within TBD in response to the SBP Requestframe. If no SBP Response frame is received within this time period, or if an SBP Response frame is received with a status code equal to REQUEST\_REJECTED, the SBP procedure setup is terminated." implies that SPB responder doesnot have to send the SPB Response frame as the SPB initiator not knowing the intention it will keep sending the Request frame. It is better to require (should) SPB Responder to send the frame with Reject. Thus suggest changing the text to: | The SBP responder should transmit an SBP Response frame within TBD in response to the SBP Request frame. If an SBP Response frame is received with a status code equal to REQUEST\_REJECTED, the SBP procedure setup is terminated. |

**Proposed Resolution:** Revise

**Discussion:** If SBP request is rejected orif noSBP response is received within TBD interval, there is no “binding” between the SBP initiator and SBP responder, i.e., they both would be in “inactive” state. Hence, using the term “terminate” may be misleading. Rather, we say the SBP procedure setup was unsuccessful. A similar change should also happen in Sensing Measuerement Setup (Section 11.21.18.4).

**Modifications:** Editor: Please modify the text in draft 0.2, P89L12-15 as suggested below.

The SBP responder should transmit an SBP Response frame within TBD in response to the SBP Request

frame. If no SBP Response frame is received within this time period, or if an SBP Response frame is

received with a status code equal to REQUEST\_REJECTED, the SBP procedure setup is terminated

shall be considered unsuccessful.

Editor: Please modify the text in draft 0.2, Section 11.21.18.4 at P83L1-3 as shown below.

The sensing responder should transmit the Sensing Measurement Setup Response frame within TBD ms in response to the Sensing Measurement Setup Request frame. If no Sensing Measurement Setup Response frame is received within this time period, or if a Sensing Measurement Setup Response frame is received with a status code other than 0 (SUCCESS), the Measurement Setup shall be considered unsuccessful.
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