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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to the following LB272 CIDs:

* 1951, 1979.

The text used as reference is 802.11bf D1.0.

Revisions:

* Rev 0: Initial version of the document.
* Rev 1: Minor revision based on Ali’s offline comments.
* Rev 2: Revised based on offline discussion.

**Comments:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 1951 | Chris Beg | 11.55.1.4 | 173.58 | It is not clear how the Measurement Setup ID is allocated to different responders. It seems a single Measurement Setup ID may correspond to multiple responders with different Measurement Setup Parameter elements.If this is allowed, it should be made clear. | Currently there are no restrictions on the assignment of a Measurement Setup ID to different responders. Improve description to make this clear.Change: "The Measurement Setup ID shall be assigned by a sensing initiator"To: "The Measurement Setup ID shall be assigned by a sensing initiator, and may correspond to one or more sensing responder. Each sensing responder with the same Measurement Setup ID may have a different Measurement Setup Parameter element." | **Revised.**Agree in principal with the commenter. TGbf Editor make changes as in doc.: 11-23/0526r2 |
| 1979 | Robert Stacey | 11.55.1.4 | 173.59 | Bad grammar. Two requirements with comma separator? Also both requirements seem silly. The first because it is easily met (the sensing initator can't fail to comply); the initiator has to put something in the ID field and putting anything there meets the requirement. The second is silly because it recommends behavior that can't be implemented any other way on the responder side. And is either unnecessary or can't be met on the initiator side. Unnecessary if the initiator only talks to one reponder and impossible if the inititor talks to more than one responder. | Change to "The tuple <sensing initiator MAC address, sensing responder MAC address, measurement setup ID> uniquily identifies operational parameters. A sensing initiator shall assign a measurement setup ID that has not currently use for operational parameters between the sensing initiator and sending responder." | **Revised.**Agree in principal with the commenter.Two requirements are divided into two sentences to avoid the “bad grammar” issue.TGbf Editor make changes as in doc.: 11-23/0526r2 |

**Discussion on CID 1979:**

* The first talks about “The Measurement Setup ID shall be assigned by a sensing initiator” **rather than a sensing responder**. Just like AP assigns AIDs to STAs in 802.11 baseline.
* For the second, contribution **11-21/1941r1** proposed that the tuple <Sensing Initiator’s MAC address, Measurement Setup ID> is used to identify a specific Measurement Setup. Please refer to **11-21/1941r1** for more details.

**11.55.1.4 Sensing measurement setup**

***TGbf Editor: Please revise clause 11.55.1.4 (Sensing measurement setup) as below.***

The Measurement Setup ID shall be assigned by a sensing initiator to a sensing responder during sensing measurement setup. The same Measurement Setup ID may be assigned to different sensing responders. The <sensing initiator’s MAC address, Measurement Setup ID> tuple should be used to uniquely identify the corresponding sensing measurement setup. (#1951, #1979)

**SP: Move to approve resolutions to CID 1951 and 1979,**

**as specified in doc.: 11-23/0526r2 and incorporate the text changes into the latest TGbf draft.**