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Abstract

This submission proposes the resolutions to 11be initial SA ballot CIDs 22252, 22253 and 22259, all on EMLSR co-ex indication.

The page and line numbers refer to those in 11be\_D5.0 [1].

**Introduction**

This submission proposes the resolutions to 11be initial SA ballot CIDs 22252, 22253 and 22259, all on EMLSR co-existence indication.

The page and line numbers refer to those in 11be\_D5.0 [1].

**Comment:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Commenter | Page.  Line | Clause | Comment | Proposed change | Resolution |
| 22252 | Pascal VIGER | 206.01 | 9.4.1.70 | A non-AP MLD may have limitations/constraints on its links (EMLSR, NSTR…). One of these constrained links may be used for communications that are not directed to the AP MLD associated with the non-AP MLD (e.g. TDLS, P2P). The current specification only proposes in-device coexistence for EMLSR carried in the EML notification frame. | Please propose a way to signal coexistence issue for NSTR similar to EMLSR or a generic one that could cover all kind of coexistence issue with one signaling decoupled from EMLSR. | Reject.  This comment lacks sufficient technical detail. |
| 22253 | Pascal VIGER | 573.13 | 35.3.17 | A non-AP MLD may have limitations/constraints on its links (EMLSR, NSTR…). One of these constrained links may be used for communications that are not directed to the AP MLD associated with the non-AP MLD (e.g. TDLS, P2P). The current specification only proposes in-device coexistence for EMLSR carried in the EML notification frame. | Please propose a way to signal coexistence issue for NSTR similar to EMLSR or a generic one that could cover all kind of coexistence issue with one signaling decoupled from EMLSR. | Reject.  This comment lacks sufficient technical detail. |
| 22259 | Pascal VIGER | 575.20 | 35.3.17 | Note 4 is unclear. For example, In-device coexistence event has no example. Therefore, it seems difficult that "The AP is recommended to consider the in-device coexistence indication and select appropriate transmission parameters and methods for the non-AP MLD." | Please clarify the in-device coexistence, for illustrating what issue may occur at the non-AP and what countermeasure could be considered by AP. | Reject.  “In-device co-existence” is an existing term used in the base 802.11 spec. See for example, page 4093/line 9, page 4154/line 10, and page 4381/line 64 in 802.11REVme\_D5.0.  At any particular instance, if an AP has not received any prior indication from a STA about its co-existence event for that instance, it can be difficult for the AP to determine the transmission failure is due to the link quality or the co-existence issue, or both. The 11be group discussed the issue in-depth and there was no consensus on other alternative text on AP’s actions. |
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Amendment 4: Enhancements for positioning