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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the 4 June 2020 teleconference of IEEE 802.11 Standing Committee Coexistence.

Andrew Myles (Chair of Coex SC, affiliation: Cisco) brought the meeting to order at 16:03 ET and noted that the meeting would use [11-20/0860r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0860-00-coex-agenda-for-ieee-802-11-coex-sc-teleconference-on-4-june-2020-to-consider-a-ls-from-etsi-erm-tg11.pptx) as the agenda (additional notes were added after the meeting in [11-20/0860r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0860-01-coex-agenda-for-ieee-802-11-coex-sc-teleconference-on-4-june-2020-to-consider-a-ls-from-etsi-erm-tg11.pptx)). There was no objection to the agenda on slide 6. The Chair described a possible decision process (slide 7)

The Chair advised that the focus of the meeting would be to review a Liaison statement from ETSI ERM TG11 and that the Coex SC had been authorized by the 802.11 WG Chair to consider a response (see slides 8-9)

The Chair introduced the LS (slides 10-15) and provided a summary of the related background (slides 16-19). Some concerns that had prompted the LS from ETSI were related to:

* a proposed update to the ECC Decision for SRDs (Short Range Devices) to remove the PSD limits for Wideband data transmission devices, and
* a Qorvo contribution to update section 8.1 (section related to 802.11 equipment) and a specific proposal to redefine the transmitted RF power limit as a limit per transmitter.

The Chair summarised the Qorvo proposal to ETSI ERM TG11 to redefine the transmitted RF power limit as a limit per transmitter, and possible responses (slides 20-22).

The Chair summarised a related proposal to change the Power Density (PD) limit of 10 dBm/MHz, and possible responses (slides 23-24)

Discussion:

* In response to a question from a participant, a TG11 participant confirmed that he was not aware of any data provided to support the proposals made in Qorvo’s contribution
* A participant noted the risks involved with changing to a per transmitter regulation (if this were even allowed at CEPT). He further advised that any removal of the PSD requirements would allow more narrowband equipment into the band that could equally have a per transmitter limit and Wi-Fi should be very concerned with these potential changes.
* Stuart Kerry (Ruckus) provided the following statement for the minutes:
	+ *The proposals from Qorvo, if accepted, will not benefit Wi-Fi in 2.4 GHz at all. Other technologies, i.e. non-Wi-Fi, have a choice to market within the EU and this is recognised in the current regulations. In simple terms current regs for 100mW e.i.r.p are embedded in EN 300 328 and there is no need to change these. The alternative is with a lower TX power of 10mW e.i.r.p and relaxations elsewhere as described in EN 300 440. This current situation has benefitted European Society and should be remembered that North America has more Wi-Fi spectrum than most of Europe and will get even more than Europe at 6 GHz, therefore from a European perspective we should not alter a regulation that is working and provides fair access for all.*
	+ Stuart Kerry further clarified that the above statement also applied to the removal of Power density as well as per transmitter limit proposals.
* Another participant agreed with the previous commenters and further pointed out that EC Decision for SRDs, where the removal of the PSD limits is being proposed, is specific to Wideband Data transmission systems and that this part of the regulation was never intended for narrowband devices.

Based upon the discussions, there was consensus that:

* Changing the regulation to a per transmitter limit is not a good way to go.
* The PSD limits in the regulation should not change

Based upon the consensus of the group, the Chair introduced a draft response (see [802.11-20/0861r0](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0861-00-coex-proposed-ls-to-etsi-erm-tg11-in-response-to-a-ls-wrt-ieee-802-11-section-in-tr-103-665-2-4-ghz-srdoc.docx)). Changes were made to the draft based upon comments from the group and this was later uploaded as [802.11-20/0861r1](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/20/11-20-0861-01-coex-proposed-ls-to-etsi-erm-tg11-in-response-to-a-ls-wrt-ieee-802-11-section-in-tr-103-665-2-4-ghz-srdoc.docx)

There were no objections to using r1 as the basis for a draft response to the LS. The group was asked to further consider performing a detailed review of clause 8.1 so that the comments & recommendation can be included in the response LS (see slide 26)

The Chair proposed using email to provide comments for section 8.1 within the next week or so and noted, if required, we can have a teleconference to finalize. The intent is that the LS response will be presented for approval at the 802.11 WG meeting in July, however the 802.11 WG Chair advised that the SC has the option to hold a motion with 10 days advance notice of the teleconference where the motion is held.

Edgard Vangeel (who is the Chair of TG11) requested that the SC participants perform a thorough review of section 8.1 (including the marketing information) but that the review comments in the latest revision can be ignored. He noted that the WG needs to highlight the importance of the 2.4GHz band to Wi-Fi devices by showing interest and providing input to this work, otherwise CEPT may take this the wrong way and the outcome may be negative for Wi-Fi.

The meeting was adjourned at 16:58 ET.