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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the July 2025 meeting of the IEEE 802.11 Coexistence Standing Committee.

# Tuesday, 2025-07-29

1. At 2025-07-29T19:30+02:00 the chair of the IEEE 802.11 Coexistence Standing Committee (SC) calls the meeting to order. Marc Emmelmann acts as chair of the SC. Guido R. Hiertz acts as recording secretary.
	1. The chair presents 11-25/982r1. At this moment, this document is identical to 11-25/982r0, which is available on Mentor server. Any modifications to 11-25/982r0 will be recorded in revision 11/982r1.
2. The chair presents 11-23/448r1 and reminds all attendees of their obligations when attending this meeting. At 2025-07-29T19:34+02:00 the chair ends presenting 11-23/448r1 and continues presenting 11-25/982r1 from this document’s page nine.
3. At 2025-07-29T19:35+02:00 the chair presents the proposed consent agenda in 11-25/980r1. At this moment, 11-25/980r1 is identical to 11-25/980r0, which is stored on Mentor server. Any modifications to 11-25/980r0 will become available as 11-25/980r1. The chair asks if there are any proposed additions to the agenda.
	1. Nobody requests any modifications of the agenda.
	2. At 2025-07-29T19:37+02:00 the chair asks if there is any objection to approve the consent agenda by unanimous consent.
		1. Nobody objects.
		2. The consent agenda is approved.
			1. In approving the consent agenda, the minutes of the previous meeting—as contained in 11-25/935r0—are inherently approved, too.
4. At 2025-07-29T19:38+02:00 Haneya Qureshi presents 19-25/35r2. At 2025-07-29T19:49+02:00 she concludes her presentation.
	1. Comment: What happens with Overlapping BSSs (OBSSs)?
	2. Comment: In this case, you’ll have to compete with other networks.
	3. Comment: Whenever you want preferential treatment there is always the problem of misuse. This can turn into denial of service attacks. You need to think about this hard so that this doesn’t cause issues for others. Anytime you give somebody the right to act different, you give the right to cause issues to others. It’s a shared band and using this with priority is risky. It would be nice to have some regulatory rules but they don’t exist. We must ensure that some rogue person cannot abuse the rules.
	4. Comment: Good point.
	5. Comment: There is a European requirement to sense a child within 10 s after a vehicle’s doors are closed.
	6. Comment: Is sensing operation done all the time or just after the doors are closed?
	7. Comment: Only after the doors are closed.
	8. Comment: Currently, all sensing-related traffic is carried in access category voice.
	9. Comment: Are you using IEEE 802.11bf?
	10. Comment: Yes.
	11. Comment: When the doors are closed, your obligation is to detect a child inside the vehicle within 10 s. If you do not detect a child inside the car, is it then permissible to assume that there is no child or do you continuously have to look for a child?
	12. Comment: Child Presence Detection (CPD) happens only for first seconds. However, we also have intruder detection that might follow later.
	13. Comment: You mentioned that sampling at 1 Hz would be sufficient. Could you please explain why sampling is performed at a refresh rate of 200 Hz?
	14. Comment: We need to take into account interference and disturbance. These are the main reason for the increased rate. In reality, breathing can be irregular It’s not a sinusoidal curve.
	15. Comment: Have you performed simulations? With modifications to EDCA parameters?
	16. Comment: No, we have not done any simulations yet. We identified the problem through demos.
	17. Comment: Simulations would be beneficial because this 10 s detection interval seems critical. You can do a lot during 10 s.
	18. Comment: With rain outside, we need more time for sampling. This is the reason why 10 s or up to 1 min might be needed.
	19. Comment: 10 s after the doors are detected as locked, any child inside the car needs to be detected.
	20. Comment: This problem is quite interesting, some of the solutions might be helpful in other use cases, too.
	21. Comment: Please come back with simulation results at a future meeting.
	22. Comment: I support this suggestion.
	23. Comment: This is about coexistence within the same standard.
5. At 2025-07-29T20:16+02:00 Ben Rolfe presents 11-25/1375r0. He concludes his presentation at 2025-07-29T20:47+02:00.
	1. Comment: I would like to comment on the limits you mention. In standards, we have the term shall, should etc. So why do we use shall statements in standards?
	2. Comment: In a recommended practice you can also use shall statements. We can have an optional clause that is full of shall statement. The shall statements define the things that you must do to be interoperable.
	3. Comment: A shall statement represents something that a group thinks to be a requirement. I believe that coexistence should be on requirement list. Traffic rules should be a shall rule. Each technology needs to define some requirements for basic coexistence. Each group has its own duty to define behavior for coexistence. IEEE 802.19 can further analyze them.
	4. Comment: The standards provide the capabilities. I talk about providing guidance how to use the capabilities. We are constantly evolving our standards. While we develop a recommended practice, we will find things that we may want to add to our standards.
	5. Comment: We need requirements not just operational capabilities.
	6. Comment: From a high level we agree that we need requirements.
	7. Comment: The major discussion is about what are the right requirements.
	8. Comment: We need requirements even if some chose to ignore shall statements.
	9. Comment: Some of the past discussions have blended over in this coexistence group. It is very collaborative. However, many groups represent very different interests. We need to think about how to create a collaborative environment.
	10. Comment: I have a very different memory how IEEE 802.19 was formed. You have to bear regulations and other aspects in mind. If your standard does not comply, you may lose regulatory protection etc. People who ignore standards take a big risk. I agree with the other speaker that standards should strive for cooperation but they never do. I am not talking about who is right or wrong. Some things are decided by regulators and some things are decided by commercial realities. I have never seen commercial entities to work outside the scope of their own interest.
	11. Comment: A common coexistence method would be good. But that doesn’t exist.
	12. Comment: With IEEE 802.19.3 we did not try to achieve a common mechanism but to describe what is available, already.
	13. Comment: Can you name what is not just a paper thing?
	14. Comment: Today, IEEE 802.11ah can be shipped in Japan because of IEEE 802.19.3. This standard showed how IEEE 802.15.4 devices are protected by IEEE 802.11ah. That was a positive outcome.
	15. Comment: It’s great to note that IEEE 802.15 and IEEE 802.11 agree on the use of shall and should statements. But what is the meaning of such statement outside the standard? Is it influential to a regulatory domain if we write a shall statement? Or is the shall statement the result of a democratic process? We can define as many shall statements as we want. How can we create mutual benefits of this? We should not have one group telling the other what is best to do. We need to sit together. We need to consider the different group sizes, too.
6. Discussions close at 2025-07-29T21:19+02:00.
	1. Comment: What are your plans as next steps?
	2. Comment: We aim to develop a PAR. We propose to start this in September.
	3. Comment: We need to consider how to define the voting procedures if one group rushes in and another group follows.
	4. Comment: This might be premature. It’s probably not going anywhere if we start to think about voting rights first. We need to identify mutual benefits.
	5. Comment: Things wont’t work if people believe that rules are being dictated to them.
7. The chair declares the SC’s meeting to be in recess at 2025-07-29T21:30+02:00.

# Wednesday, 2025-07-30

1. At 2025-07-30T17:00+02:00 the chair of the SC calls the meeting to order. Marc Emmelmann acts as chair of the SC. Guido R. Hiertz acts as recording secretary.
	1. The chair presents 11-25/982r1. The chair reminds attendees of the content contained in 11-23/448. The chair reviews the agenda contained in 11-25/980r1.
2. At 2025-07-30T17:02+02:00 Guido presents 11-25/1040. He concludes his presentation at 2025-07-30T17:18+02:00.
	1. Comments: Will self-identifying antennas (SIAs) require regulatory changes?
	2. Comment: Yes
	3. Comment: Could you comment about the European Commission’s (EC’s) plans to develop their own standards?
	4. Comment: This is a very new topic. ETSI has published a related statement. If the EC intends to develop “common standards” in “urgent” cases, the EC will need to have the required expertise. Furthermore, we don’t know how the EC defines an urgency.
	5. Comment: What do you mean by a small cell and antenna gain?
	6. Comment: In a concert hall, there can be two to four seats per m². In this case, APs may be positioned within close proximity of each other so that each AP serves only 100 spectators. In this case, directional antennas are needed to form cells that have a small footprint. Current regulatory requirements on Low Power Indoor (LPI) devices prohibit APs to use external antennas. Thus, a vendor would need to sell LPI APs with normal, unidirectional coverage and APs with built-in, directional antennas. SIA help APs to reduce transmit power by the antenna gain provided so that EIRP limits won’t be exceeded.
3. At 2025-07-30T17:25+02:00 Rich Kennedy presents 11-25/1051r0. He concludes his presentation at 2025-07-30T17:29+02:00.
	1. Comment: In the US, is any Frequency Hopping (FH) allowed in the 6 GHz band?
	2. Comment: Can you predict when FCC will allow FH?
	3. Comment: The FCC’s current is not on license-exempt spectrum.
	4. Comment: It’s impossible to predict when FCC will permit for FH operation.
	5. Comment: The Bluetooth SIG made presentations in April 2024 to FCC commissioners and OET.
	6. Comment: SIG continues to work on their plan.
	7. Comment: Today, no 6 GHz BT is allowed in the FCC region.
	8. Comment: Current rules were entirely drive by Wi-Fi industry. The rules fit for them.
	9. Comment: Could please you elaborate on discussions within the SIG? Is there an alignment? What will they do? LBT?
	10. Comment: I try to be non-specific as possible. I don’t not aware of there being consensus. Without consensus there is no way forward.
	11. Comment: What is the use of an HS if the HS is listed in the OJEU with a note?
	12. Comment: The parts that are not affected by the note can be used for self-certification.
	13. Comment: They claimed that IEEE 802.11ax is not an international standard. Therefore, this test cannot be used.
	14. Comment: In the OJEU, note 1 for EN 303 687 states that you cannot use v1.1.1 at all for Narrowband FH devices. Note 2 says you cannot use the test signal as specified in IEEE 802.11ax. Everything else you can test yourself.
4. Rich Kennedy states that he attends IEEE 802 meetings for the last time.
	1. The SC thanks Rich Kennedy for his outstanding services in IEEE 802.11, IEEE 802.18, and especially in the IEEE 802.11 Coexistence SC over many years. Attendees applaud Rich and thank him for more than 25 years of invaluable services and input to IEEE 802 wireless groups. The SC recognizes Rich for his superb input and dedication to spectrum regulatory topics and the coexistence of different technologies. The SC wishes Rich well.
5. At 2025-07-30T17:39+02:00 the chair presents from page 15 of 11-25/982r1.
6. At 2025-07-30T17:41+02:00 chair declares the SC’s meeting adjourned.