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Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions to the following comments submitted in SA1 Ballot under Exchange topic. The CIDs are referring to D4.0. The text used as reference is D4.0.

CIDs: 6002 6003 6004

Revision history:

R0: Original version

R1: Editorial changes.

R2: Updated the rejection reasons based on offline discussions with the commenter.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** | **Proposed resolution** |
| 6002 | Benjamin Rolfe | 144.15 | Use of shall not is poor specification practice. Better to specify what is required instead of what is not required, as the prior is verifiable behavior and the latter not. | Change to: The requested bandwidth to be used in the transmission of SI2SR NDPs, SR2SI NDPs, and SR2SR NDPs to a value that is less than or equal to the maximum bandwidth the sensing responder supports for sensing. This value is referred to as aSensingBandwidth. | Rejected. The group disagree with the comment, and the present text clearly and unambiguously conveys the intended requirement. |
| 6003 | Benjamin Rolfe | 142.29 | Use of "shall not" is poor specification practice, creating an incomplete requirement in this case. I deed it is not at all clear what the requirement intended. It would be far better to state the conditions under which the sensing responder sends a Sensing Measurement Report frame. Not all of which are, as far as I can decode, specified here. | Delete sentence. | Rejected. The group disagree with the comment, and the present text clearly and unambiguously conveys the intended requirement. |
| 6004 | Benjamin Rolfe | 140.59 | "A sensing initiator shall not establish more concurrent sensing measurement sessions with a sensing responder than the value of the Max Supported Sessions field in the last Sensing Capabilities element received from the sensing responder. " use of "shall not" is poor specification practice. Better to specify what is required rather than what is not required. If stated correction, the note can be deleted. | change to: "The number of concurrent sensing sessions established by an initiator shall be less than or equal to the value of the Max Supported Sessions field in the last Sensing Capabilities element received from the sensing responder." and delete NOTE 1. | Rejected. The group disagree with the comment, and the present text clearly and unambiguously conveys the intended requirement. |

**Discussion:** After consulting with the REVme editor and the 802.11 Chair, the contributor proposes to reject these 3 CIDs due to the following reasons:

1. “may not” is not recommended in the 802.11 editorial style guide, and “shall not” is fine. See section 2.8 of doc 09/1034r21: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/09/11-09-1034-21-0000-802-11-editorial-style-guide.docx>
2. The use of “shall not” is very common in REVme and all other standards TGs. A simple search in REVme can show you hundreds of “shall not” behavior text.
3. While some of the “shall not” language can be converted to “shall” language, for example “shall not exceed” can be converted to “shall be less than or equal to”, some other behaviors cannot be easily converted to “shall” language. For example, “the STA shall not transmit a xxx frame” cannot be converted to corresponding “shall” language.
4. The contributor does not agree with the commenter’s claim that “shall not” behaviors are not verifiable. Based on the contributor’s knowledge and experience, there definitely have been verifications of “shall not” behaviors in some other organizations.
5. The contributor also reached out to the commenter and explained to him why we propose to reject these 3 CIDs. The commenter was fine with the rejection of these 3 CIDs as long as the group think the present text clearly and unambiguously conveys the intended requirement.

## SP

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

Y/N/A