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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes from the IEEE 802.11 TGbr meeting in Warsaw Poland

Abbreviations:

Q: Question

A: Answer

C: Comment

Revision history:

R0: initial version

Enhanced Light Communicaiton Task Group (TGbr)   
Chair: Nikola Serafimovski

Tuncer Baykas (Self) volunteered to be secretary.

**Meeting Agenda:**

The meeting agenda for the May meeting is here:

**Meeting Minutes:**

1. Chair called the meeting to order at 16:02 local time (12/May/2025)) and reviewed slides 1 through 11 of the agenda document.
2. Approval of the agenda
   1. Chair reviewed the draft agenda, no further edits were requested.
   2. **Motion: Approve the TGbr agenda** **in document 11-25-0616r2.**
   3. **Result: Unanimous Consent**
3. Approval of the ELC SG meeting minutes in 11-25461r0.
   1. **Motion: Approve the ELC SG meeting minutes in document 11-25-461r0**
   2. **Moved: Mohamed Islım , Seconded: Volker Jungnickel**
   3. **Result: Unanimous Consent**
4. Presentation by Stefan Videv Kyocera (11-25/830r0)
   1. Q: What is a band and subband in your view?
   2. A: Wording could be improved.
   3. Q: Are you suggesting full duplex?
   4. A: No, just combination of wavelengths.
   5. C: Please update the presentation with date name and affiliation
   6. Q: In SP1 (Slide8), why are only 2 subbands are suggested.
   7. A: Underwater channels are can be divided in to two parts, 480 nms is food for deepwater, 550nm is good for coastal waters.

1. Strawpoll: Propose to include the 400nm – 600nm ???
   1. Y:3 N:2 A:9

1. Strawpoll: Propose to include ?
   1. Discussion
   2. Q: It could be difficult to keep P2P communication if uplink and downlink communicaition of the network is in different bands.
   3. A: I don’t see the argument.
   4. C: More discussion is needed.
   5. C: It is similar to simultanoues transmit and receive in 802.11be.
   6. C: This is not a requirement but an ability.
   7. Q: If this system is included, will the STA indicate this capability?.
   8. A: Yes
   9. SP results:
   10. Y: 6 N:2 A:7
2. Strawpoll: Propose to include new carrier frequencies that allow for baseband signals to be output from WiFi DSP chipsets that support LiFi communications into the baseline TGbr draft?
   1. Discussion
   2. C: Baseline 802.11bb provides the frequencies. How you achieve those frequencies is out of the scope of the standard.
   3. C: SP text should be changed.
   4. SP is tabled.
3. Presentation by chair (11-25/912r0)
   1. Chair suggested the timeline for the group.
   2. C: Thank you for the proposal, I would suggest for everyone to review the timeline. Working group comment collection should be when TG thinks that draft is almost ready for letterballot.
   3. .C: Some of the features will be more contentious.
   4. C: Please us the official timeline format of 802.11
   5. A: We will have the version eventually.
   6. C: Call it workplan instead of timeline.
   7. Q: Are we going to have a evaluation methodoly?
   8. A: In TGbb the main idea was MAC evaluation. If there is a proposal we can review it.
   9. Q: What are core feature? What are side feature?
   10. A: Core features are the feature that are listed in the scope that the group will bring.
   11. C: Draft should have the draft text. Core features could be in specification document.
4. Motion: Approve doc 11-25/0912r1 as the initial TGbr Workplan.
   1. Moved by Volker Jungnickel Seconded by: Mohamed Slim
   2. A counted vote is requested.
   3. Y:11 N:1 A: 0
5. Group discussed agenda for Wednesday meeting.
   1. Group will continue to discuss the workplan.
6. Meeting recessed at.17:22
7. Attendance: 16 attendees in the room, 16 attendees in Webex
8. Chair called the meeting to order at 10:34 local time (14/May/2025) and reviewed slides 1 through 11 of the agenda document in document 11-25-0616r2.
9. Approval of the agenda
   1. Chair reviewed the draft agenda, no further edits were requested.
   2. **Motion: Approve the TGbr agenda in document 11-25-0616r3.**

**Result: Unanimous Consent**

1. Approval Stefan Videv (Kyocera SLD Laser) and Mohamed Islım (pureLifi) as the ViceChairs for TGbr
   1. **Moved: Sovan Das, Seconded: Volker Jungnickel**

**Result: Unanimous Consent**

1. Approval Tuncer Baykas as TGbr Secretary
   1. **Moved: Volker Jungnickel Seconded Sovan Das**

**Result: Unanimous Consent**

1. Approval Volker Jungnickel as TGbr Editor
   1. **Moved: Tuncer Baykas Seconded Sovan Das**

**Result: Unanimous Consent**

1. Presentation by Aravind Krishnamoorthy (Univeristy of Cambridge) (11-25/954r0)
   1. Q: In slide 13, is the processing in time domain or frequency domain?
   2. A:. It can happen IF or Tıme domain.
   3. Q: Slide 5 explaim A-law algoritim
   4. A: It is a nonliner distortion algorithm
   5. C: Group discussed SP1 language
   6. C: I would like to see more evidence that PAPR reduction since it may change silicon. Second techniques would for non uniform signals. They add nonlinear transformation. The gains will be very marginal. I would suggest to see more data.
   7. C: Motions would be better than strawpolls
   8. C: Even if the SPs fails in slide 12-13, group should get feedback from chip vendors.
2. SP: ELC PHY TX may support techniques for PAPR reduction of the LC şntermediate signal
   1. Y N A : 5/4/7
3. SP: RF ELC Converter may support techniques for PAPR reduction of the intermediate frequency IF signal
   1. Y N A :1/4/10
4. Presentation by Volker Jungnickel (Fraunhofer) (11-25/956r0)
   1. C: We are extremely busy. Haiving expections is important to achieve goals.
   2. C:There should be a date for closing SFD.
   3. C: A new version will be uploaded.
5. Presentation by Stefan Videv (Kypocera SFD Laser) (11-25/962r0)
   1. Presented a possible motion.
   2. C: Definition shouldn’t have ‘should’
   3. C: Definitions are not normative. The terms ‘can’ and ‘must ‘ should be used.
   4. C: Current wording of ‘can be capable’ Indis not good.
   5. C: Instead of indicating bands that a STA can support we can indicate the bands ELC PHY can support.
   6. C: Simplify the sentence: STA is capable in at least one of the three bands…
   7. C: We shouldn’t mandate all bands.
   8. C: Overdescribing could be dangerous.
6. Motion • **Include the following text in the 802.11br SFD 11-25/0941:**   
   **3.2 Definitions specific to IEEE Std 802.11**   
   ***Insert the following definition in alphanumeric order as follows:***   
   **Enhanced light communications station (ELC STA):** A station (STA) that can in one or more of the following bands:   
   •800 nm – 1000 nm   
   •400 nm – 600 nm   
   •1200 nm – 1600 nm
   * 1. Motion by: Sovan Das, Seconded by: Stefan Videv
     2. C: I would like to speaj against the motion. If there is a LC STA definition, ELC STA can be defined as a LC STA which can support some bands.
     3. Yes: 2 No: 5 Abstain 1
     4. Motion fails.
     5. Group djounred.
   1. Teleconference discussion.
      1. Early July teleconference şs possible.
   2. AOB.
   3. Motion:
   4. Move to TGbr Chair to have a motion booklet as a TGbr document on mentor. The motion booklet shall contain all strawpoll and motion run by in any TGbr meeting. Motions and strapoll shall have consecutive unique numbers
7. Marc emmlamnn, Volker jungnickel
8. Unanimous approval.,
9. Group adjourned.
   1. 16 in Webex 14 in room.