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The IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee (LMSC) is pleased to submit the following reply comments in response to the Commission’s NPRM proposing to allow greater flexibility for radar operations in the 57 to 64 GHz band while continuing to ensure that this unlicensed band continues to support multiple communications technologies, such as IEEE 802.11ad, IEEE 802.11ay, and IEEE 802.15.3c (“IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technologies”)[[1]](#footnote-2) without harmful interference.

IEEE 802 LMSC is a leading consensus-based industry standards body, producing standards for wireless networking devices, including wireless local area networks (“WLANs”), wireless specialty networks (“WSNs”), wireless metropolitan area networks (“Wireless MANs”), and wireless regional area networks (“WRANs”). We appreciate the opportunity to provide these reply comments to the Commission.

IEEE 802 is a committee of the IEEE Standards Association and Technical Activities, two of the Major Organizational Units of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE). IEEE has about 420,000 members in about 190 countries and supports the needs and interests of engineers and scientists broadly. In submitting this document, IEEE 802 acknowledges and respects that other components of IEEE Organizational Units may have perspectives that differ from, or compete with, those of IEEE 802. Therefore, this submission should not be construed as representing the views of IEEE as a whole.[[2]](#footnote-3)

**SUMMARY**

IEEE 802 supports the FCC’s objective to provide greater flexibility of use in the 57 to 64 GHz band by proposing to allow radar use at higher power levels while ensuring co-existence with other unlicensed services[[3]](#footnote-4). To promote reasonable coexistence, the current proposed rules impose a duty cycle restriction of 10% on radar operation, as originally accepted by Google as a condition to obtain a 60GHz waiver[[4]](#footnote-5) for higher power operations and has been accepted as a condition by other radar providers in waivers thereafter[[5]](#footnote-6). As others have noted on the record, the 10% duty cycle limit for radar operation has not been shown to be sufficient by itself to prevent harmful interference to the operation of IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technologies.[[6]](#footnote-7) IEEE agrees that to ensure reasonable coexistence between radar operation at higher levels and IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technologies, the FCC must provide adequate coexistence measures.

IEEE agrees with others on the record that implementing the “2ms condition,” as it has in its most recent waiver decisions,[[7]](#footnote-9) is one approach that holds the prospect of effectively ensuring reasonable coexistence with IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technologies. IEEE also agrees with others on the record[[8]](#footnote-10) that, in the interest in providing flexibility for radar manufactures to choose appropriate technical parameters to support a range of applications, the FCC may consider establishing emission limits tailored to radar operations at specific bandwidths and/or to specific applications, such as vehicle in-cabin radar operations. Furthermore, the FCC may also consider requiring radar devices to employ a contention-based mechanism such as listen before talk (LBT). In the latter case, the Commission must ensure that the contention-based mechanism is effective in providing the same level of protection as exists between unlicensed communications devices such as IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technologies today.[[9]](#footnote-11)

**DISCUSSION**

**The 10% Duty Cycle Proposal Has Not Been Shown to be Sufficient on Its Own to Ensure Reasonable Coexistence of Radars with IEEE 802-based 60 GHz Technology**

IEEE 802 believes that the duty cycle definition in the Commission’s NPRM is not sufficient by itself to ensure reasonable coexistence. Specifically, the duty cycle definition in the proposed rule permits a radar device to meet the 10% duty cycle limit with, for example, a 10 µs transmission ‘on-time’ and a 90 µs ‘off-time,’ which would effectively block or corrupt communications from a closely spaced radar. This is because the short radar transmission ‘off-time,’ which is of the order of a fraction of a millisecond, will effectively prevent communication applications from accessing the medium for much longer periods of time, or repetitively interrupt and corrupt the communication sequences that generally require certain minimum time to complete.  As a result, applications that utilize IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technology would experience an increase in latency, which would be particularly harmful to highly immersive AR/VR/XR applications.  It should be noted that this impact is most significant when a Frequency Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) radar is operating over the entire 57 to 64 GHz band and transmits without any form of channel sensing. Therefore, additional, appropriate coexistence mechanisms should be considered for radars.

IEEE 802 agrees with commenters that one such mechanism is to define the duty cycle in terms such that any transmission gap below a given transmission off-time limit is deemed to be part of the transmission ‘on-time,’ i.e. any radar ‘off-time’ period between two successive radar pulses that is less than 2 ms shall be considered ‘on time’. The FCC already imposed this additional “2 ms condition” in its most recent waiver grants[[10]](#footnote-12).

IEEE 802 also agrees with commenters[[11]](#footnote-13) that the FCC should consider other spectrum sharing approaches for some radar operations and applications. For instance, greater radar duty cycle can be permitted for operations using narrower bandwidth[[12]](#footnote-14) or limited to specific installations (e.g., fixed outdoor or in a vehicle). Because many radar use cases need less than 4GHz of bandwidth, and often less than 2GHz, IEEE 802 recommends that rules be written to support these use cases while maximizing the contiguous bandwidth that can be used by other services.

To ensure that radar and IEEE 802-based 60GHz technologies can reasonably coexist, IEEE 802 hence requests FCC to require that a radar implement at least one of the below co-existence techniques:

1. The additional “2 ms condition” included in the most recent waiver grants[[13]](#footnote-15) (#2 below) on any higher power radar system permitted within the 57 to 64 GHz portion of the band, as set out in (b) below:
	1. A radar device may operate in the 57 to 64 GHz band at a maximum +13 dBm EIRP, +10 dBm transmitter conducted output power, and +13 dBm/MHz power spectral density, so long as the radar device does not exceed a transmit duty cycle (i.e., on-time/[on-time + off-time]) of 10% in any 33 ms interval (i.e., the device will not transmit longer than a total of 3.3 ms).
	2. Any radar transmission off-time period between two successive radar pulses that is less than 2 ms shall be considered transmission on-time for purposes of computing the duty cycle.
2. Emission limits for radar operations at specific bandwidths such that radar devices that do not occupy the entire 7 GHz may operate under more flexible rules. Specifically,

Radar devices that operate between 57 and 59.4 GHz are allowed higher transmit power and duty cycle.

1. Emission limits tailored to radar operations in specific applications in which more flexible rules can be adopted. Specifically,

Radar devices that operate between 57 and 61.5 GHz and that are restricted to vehicle in-cabin use should be permitted to operate with relaxed duty cycle limit and transmission off-time period definition.

In this case, IEEE 802 notes that further technical study is required for the Commission to confirm that the considered flexible rules can effectively ensure reasonable coexistence.

1. More flexible rules for radar devices that implement a contention-based mechanism such as LBT. At the same time, IEEE 802 agrees with comments submitted by the Wi-Fi Alliance[[14]](#footnote-16) that the Commission must ensure that the LBT implementation is effective in providing the same level of protection as exists between unlicensed communications devices such as IEEE 802-based 60 GHz technologies today. IEEE 802 also agrees with comments submitted by Facebook, Intel, and Qualcomm[[15]](#footnote-17) that adequately implementing LBT requires a sufficiently sensitive sensing level, a measurement bandwidth, and integration period. In addition, the radar should perform LBT at sufficient frequency and, when the LBT system detects an active medium, a back off scheme (*i.e*., the amount of time the radar waits before attempting to retransmit) to ensure reasonable spectrum coexistence with other users in the band. IEEE 802 notes that further technical study is required for the Commission to confirm that LBT can effectively ensure reasonable coexistence.

# CONCLUSION:

IEEE 802 thanks the Commission for providing an opportunity to submit these reply comments on the NPRM ET Docket 21-264. IEEE 802 supports the FCC goal to expand the use of the 60 GHz spectrum band by allowing other technologies and applications in the band such as the radar use at higher power levels while ensuing reasonable coexistence with IEEE 802 communication technologies.

In order for the above communication technologies to coexist with higher power radars, IEEE 802 strongly recommends that the 10% duty cycle restriction alone is insufficient to protect communications applications and the FCC should implement the “2 ms condition” as outlined above. IEEE 802 also agrees with commenters that the FCC may consider establishing emission limits tailored to radar operations with specific bandwidths and/or to specific applications, or radar devices employing a contention-based mechanism such as listen before talk (LBT) as outlined above.

Regards,

By: /ss/ .

Paul Nikolich

IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee Chairman

em: p.nikolich@ieee.org
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