

Project	IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group < http://ieee802.org/16 >
Title	Letter of Complaint to the 802 LMSC Regarding 802.22 Study Group Activity and the Proposed 802.22.1 PAR & 5 Criteria
Date Submitted	2005-11-18
Source(s)	Phillip Barber Huawei [mailto:pbarber@futurewei.com]
Re:	Letter of Complaint to the 802 LMSC Regarding 802.22 Study Group Activity and the Proposed 802.22.1 PAR & 5 Criteria
Abstract	
Purpose	To express my disappointment, frustration, and grave concern regarding the apparent failure of 802.22 to adhere to 802 LMSC published required policies, procedures and guidelines for the operation of 802 Study Groups in the matter of the 802.22 Study Group entitled 'Means to enhance the ability of 802.22 systems to detect and avoid Part 74 licensed devices'.
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.16. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.
Release	The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.
Patent Policy and Procedures	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures < http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html >, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard." Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair < mailto:chair@wirelessman.org > as early as possible, in written or electronic form, if patented technology (or technology under patent application) might be incorporated into a draft standard being developed within the IEEE 802.16 Working Group. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site < http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices >.

Letter of Complaint to the 802 LMSC Regarding 802.22 Study Group Activity and the Proposed 802.22.1 PAR & 5 Criteria

Phillip Barber

Dear LMSC 802 EC Board Members,

I would like to express my disappointment, frustration, and grave concern regarding the apparent failure of 802.22 to adhere to 802 LMSC published required policies, procedures and guidelines for the operation of 802 Study Groups in the matter of the 802.22 Study Group entitled 'Means to enhance the ability of 802.22 systems to detect and avoid Part 74 licensed devices'.

While I may be mistaken in my interpretation, I believe that the 802.22 Working Group and the 802.22 Study Group assigned to consider this matter have failed in their duty to the IEEE 802 community to process their activities in adherence to the published procedures. Further, I believe that this failure has resulted in a PAR and 5 Criteria proposal that exceeds the 802 EC chartered mandate of this Study Group.

I want to make clear that I am not endorsing a slavish adherence to a rigid set of rules, and that I would not make such claims against the 802.22 activity on this matter except that I believe that the failures are so manifest as to undermine the credibility of the work. If it were only some minor lapses in process, I would never consider using these lapses as pretense for complaint. However, I believe the transgressions in this matter do warrant such complaint.

And while I value the output of our collective efforts greater than the process, I observe that for a volunteer participation organization such as IEEE standards activity, adherence to process is imperative. Should members of the 802 community lose confidence that they are participating in an open, fair, and inclusive process they will most assuredly discontinue participation, bringing discredit and disrepute to our collective efforts, undermining our past achievements. I believe that, in the end, people participate in IEEE because they feel they can make a difference here. If we lose that, we have lost everything. So I consider egregious violation of our policies and procedures as a serious threat to the continued viability of the IEEE.

In the matter of the 802.22 Study Group and proposed PAR & 5 Criteria, I have both had discussion with Carl Stevenson, the Chair of the Working Group, and undertaken a careful review of the published Minutes and other relevant documentation of the group's activity. I commend the 802.22 Working Group on the thoroughness and consistency of its record keeping, in most regards. However, the same thoroughness on record keeping on other matters makes the omissions in any recording of Study Group activities especially glaring. Specifically, in reviewing the chronology of the inception, approval, activity, and output of the Study Group, several issues absolutely leap out at me:

First mention of the potential need for a Study Group to study a 'PAR addressing sensing mechanism for protecting Part 74 Wireless Microphone operation' in a Teleconference on July 6, 2005

At the 802.22 Working Group Opening Plenary in San Francisco, in the Chair's Status Report of July 18, 2005, under item - 802.22's goals this session, there is an item 'Consider formation of a study group on means to improve sensing and protection of licensed Part 74 devices (wireless microphones)'

In the 802.22 Working Group Closing Report in San Francisco of July 22, 2005, under item - 802.22 Closing Report – July 2005 Plenary, there is an item ‘Approved motion to request EC approval to form a Study Group to explore means to improve 802.22 devices’ ability to detect and protect Part 74 licensed devices

- Approved unanimously in .22’

And the 802.22 Working Group Minutes for the San Francisco Plenary, dated July 22, 2005, include the Motion for the Study Group creation,

‘In the Thursday AM1 meeting, a motion was moved by Ahren Hartman regarding the “Formation of a Study Group for investigating means to enhance detection and protection of licensed Part 74 devices by the WRAN system, and authorize the Chair to get the Study Group approval from the Executive Committee.”

Motion was seconded by Peter Murray.

The votes were

Yes: 19, No: 0, Abstain: 2

Motion passed.’

The item was placed on the LMSC 802 EC Board Closing Meeting agenda as item 10.21 and was approved as,

‘Formation of 802.22 SG on “Means to enhance the ability of 802.22 systems to detect and avoid Part 74 licensed devices”’

No additional action was taken after the EC approval of the formation of the Study Group until the 802 Interim Meeting in Orange County, the week of September 18. In the Opening Agenda for 802.22 for this meeting, notation is made for selection of a ‘CHAIR for the STUDY GROUP ON MEANS TO ENHANCE DETECTION OF PART 74 DEVICES’.

And the Minutes for the meeting reflect action on this item:

‘William Rose had volunteered to chair the study group (SG) on means to enhance detection of Part 74 devices. During the Monday PM1 meeting, Peter Murray made the motion to approve William Rose as Chair of the SG. The motion was seconded by Paul Thompson. The vote was:

Yes: 22, No: 0, Abstain: 0

William Rose was thereupon appointed by the Chair following unanimous approval by the WG. The SG has to develop the PAR and Five criteria, which will ultimately lead to the creation of a Task Group.’

Unfortunately, the notes for the Study Group activity at this meeting are sparse at best. The Minutes record that ‘During the Friday AM1 meeting, the WG devoted time working on the PAR pertaining to the SG related to means to enhance detection of Part 74 devices. The WG unanimously agreed to delay the start of the plenary till 11 am to advance the work on the PAR and Five criteria.’ So we know of one previously unscheduled interval where the Study Group met and discussed the PAR & 5 Criteria. But note that there is no record that the Study Group met during any of its scheduled intervals. And there is no record of who participated in, nor any actions or motions made at the Study Group.

Importantly, the Orange County Interim Meeting 802.22 Working Group Minutes record a very significant Motion for the Study Group made at the Working Group Closing:

‘William Rose will continue to Chair the SG to enhance detection of Part 74 devices.

William Rose moved to authorize the SG to complete a draft PAR and Five criteria via correspondence and conduct up to two duly noticed teleconference calls to obtain approval by the SG participants to submit the draft PAR and Five criteria for WG approval by a WG electronic ballot. The motion was seconded by Gerald Chouinard.

It was approved by unanimous consent.’

There is no record of any Teleconferences to discuss the PAR & 5 Criteria, either by the Study Group or by any other party. There is no record of any 802.22 WG electronic ballot to approve submittal of a draft PAR & 5 Criteria for comment by the 802 community and consideration by the 802 EC. I can only conclude that such Teleconferences and Study Group approval, and that any subsequent 802.22 Working Group electronic ballot, never occurred.

And yet, through miraculous inception, PAR & 5 Criteria documents dated October 14, 2005, were spontaneously created and submitted to the 802 EC for consideration and comment.

And, again, no activity until the Vancouver Plenary Meeting where no Study Group meetings were scheduled at all, though 802.22 Working Group meetings were scheduled to resolve any comments provided on the proposed PAR & 5 Criteria

Given this chronology, I object to the process (actually, the absence of process) on several grounds:

1. At no time did the Study Group maintain records required under the 802 P&P clause 7.2.4.3 as required under 7.4.1
Specifically, the Study Group is obligated to keep the same detail level of records, separate and distinct of the Working Group records, because the Study Group participation is open to anyone and that Study Group participation may be the foundation for future, subsequent Working Group participation. The Study Group is obligated to maintain record of (from the 802 P&P):
‘The meeting minutes are to include:
 - List of participants
 - Next meeting schedule
 - Agenda as revised at the start of the meeting
 - Voting record (Resolution, Mover / Second, Numeric results)’
2. There is no record that any member of the Study Group (should we ever be able to determine who they were) had any part in developing the PAR & 5 Criteria documents submitted to the 802 EC.
3. There is no record that the Study Group or 802.22 Working Group approved transmittal of the PAR & 5 Criteria documents per the mechanics adopted in the 802.22 Working Group motion approved in the September meeting.
4. The scope of the PAR proposed:
‘This project will create a standard which specifies methods to provide enhanced protection to protected devices such as those used in the production and transmission of broadcast programs (e.g. devices licensed as secondary under FCC Part 74 in the USA and equivalent devices in other regulatory domains) from harmful interference caused by licensed–exempt devices (such as, e.g. IEEE 802.22) that also are intended to operate in the TV Broadcast Bands.’

Exceeds the scope of the Study Group as approved by the 802 EC:
‘Means to enhance the ability of 802.22 systems to detect and avoid Part 74 licensed devices’

Specifically, the proposed PAR makes no **NORMATIVE** reference to its specific application as an enhancement to 802.2 systems, as specified in the mandate by the 802 EC. The proposed PAR instead proposes standardizing methods and mechanics of Part 74 devices performance and behavior. This in and of itself, while troubling, would not have been unacceptable, except that given the failure of the Study Group to conduct its activities in a well publicized, open, transparent, and inclusive manner,

other interested parties, both within the 802 community and without, were denied opportunity to comment in the formulation of this PAR & 5 Criteria.

But the intent of the proposed PAR to specify behavior of wireless microphones and similar, non-802 type equipment must itself be questioned. It may be that given an open and transparent discussion of the facts, substantial justification can be made to substantiate what would seem on the face of it to be a completely out of scope for 802 proposal. But we did not get that open discussion, so we cannot know.

Again, I object to the 802.22 Study Group exceeding its mandate without open consultation with interested parties. Did the Study Group consider work ongoing at ETSI TG17 or CEPT FM 41 Project? We cannot know, because there is no record. And it is not good enough to say 'take my word for it.' The whole point of an open and transparent process, and requirements in the P&P, is to assure fair and equitable treatment. I would be defending 802.22 activity to the extreme had this PAR and 5 Criteria been the result and had they met their obligation to process and transparency.

In conclusion, I respectfully request that the EC reject the proposed 802.22.1 PAR & 5 Criteria. This could have been the simplest, sanest PAR & 5 Criteria ever, and I would still vigorously object to the lack of adherence to process. The fact that this PAR & 5 Criteria is anything but only adds to my concern. I ask that the 802 EC approve another Study Group to study this matter in a more transparent and adherent manner.

Thank you for your kind consideration of my request.

Sincerely,
Philip Barber

Appendix A

Review of Relevant 802.22 Public Documents

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, June 15, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2:14 hours

Document:

22-05-0047-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_June15.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 14 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted.

Excerpt:

Under Item - **3- Review of the Functional Requirements document**

‘A straw poll was taken on the possibility of the group initiating the process to develop the PAR and 5 Criteria in July to undertake the development of the Recommended Practices for WRAN operation. The PAR and 5 Criteria would be developed during the Plenary in July, submitted at EC in November and then to be approved in December at NavCom. The work would be done in a SG or a TG under the 802.22WG when approved. Because of the fact that the development of these Recommended Practices need to be done in parallel with the development of the standard, an unofficial study group could start the discussions earlier. No objection was raised in the straw poll.

The document to be developed may need to have a stronger title than “Recommended Practice” such as “Recommended minimum system specifications.”

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, June 22, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted until 2:05pm

Document:

22-05-0050-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_June22.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 14 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. Meeting Note Item Under- **2- Review minutes of the June 15th meeting** noted that ‘The minutes were reviewed and approved without change.’ No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to a proposed Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes third teleconference of the 802.22 ad-hoc group on FCC Status Presentation
Tuesday, 28 June 2005 from 12:00pm to 14:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h)

Document:

22-05-0051-00-0000_FCC_Minutes_June28.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 13 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to a proposed Study Group.

Excerpt:

Under Item - **Discussion**

‘The fundamental requirements to protect Part 74 wireless microphones listed on slide 8 were discussed. Rearrangements of the slide were made for better flow and Kirk Skeba was asked to come up with some text on the use of beacons and the restriction that the FCC could impose on the sale/operation of these beacons for legitimate Part 74 users. Kirk agreed to work with Ahren Hartman of Sure to create something that’s likely to be acceptable to all interested parties.’

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, June 29, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 1:55 hour

Document:

22-05-0052-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_June29.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 16 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to a proposed Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Channel Model Sub-group teleconference
Tuesday, July 5th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 1:50 hour

Document:

22-05-0053-00-0000_Channel_Model_Minutes_July05.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 9 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to a proposed Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, July 6th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:

22-05-0054-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_July06.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 12 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted.

Excerpt:

Under Item - **2- Review of the Functional Requirements document**

'He [Carl Stevenson] also expect that there will be a PAR produced to launch the work on the WRAN Recommended Practice as part of the 802.22 mandate and another PAR addressing sensing mechanism for protecting Part 74 Wireless Microphone operation.'

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Channel Model Sub-group teleconference
Tuesday, July 12th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 1:05 hour

Document:

22-05-0056-00-0000_Channel_Model_Minutes_July12.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 7 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to a proposed Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, July 13th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:

22-05-0058-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_July13.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 12 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. Meeting Note Item Under- **2- Review of the Functional Requirements document** noted that:

'After some explanations from Carl Stevenson, Carlos Cordeiro moved that the group approve the minutes of the past teleconference calls. It was seconded by Peter Murray and accepted with unanimity. Tom Gurley mentioned that his name was misspelled in the attendance list. This will be corrected in the coming minutes.'

No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to a proposed Study Group.

From:

San Francisco IEEE Plenary Meeting, IEEE 802.22 WG Status Report – July 2005
2005-07-18

Document:

22-05-0059-00-0000_802.22_WG_Status_Rpt.pdf, 22-05-0059-00-0000_802.22_WG_Status_Rpt.ppt

Notes:

Single slide (with cover page).

Excerpt:

Under Item - **802.22's goals this session**

'Consider formation of a study group on means to improve sensing and protection of licensed Part 74 devices (wireless microphones)'

From:

San Francisco IEEE Plenary Meeting, 802.22 Closing Report – July 2005 Plenary
2005-07-22

Document:

22-05-0064-00-0000_802.22_Closing Report.ppt

Notes:

Single slide (with cover page).

Excerpt:

Under Item - **802.22 Closing Report – July 2005 Plenary**

‘Approved motion to request EC approval to form a Study Group to explore means to improve 802.22 devices’ ability to detect and protect Part 74 licensed devices

- Approved unanimously in .22’

From:

San Francisco IEEE Plenary Meeting, IEEE 802.22 Wireless Regional Area Networks, San Francisco Session, July 2005, MINUTES
2005-07-22

Document:

22-05-0066-02-0000_WRAN_Minutes_July05.doc

Notes:

The Meeting Minutes include a list of 75 Attendees, and identifies 43 Members listed as attending. Note that the r0 of these Meeting Minutes listed 74 Attendees and identified only 31 Members.

In the Minutes it is noted that the:

‘Chair reviewed agenda: agenda approved by unanimous consent. (see 22-05-0045-01-0000_802.22_Tentative_Agenda_Jul05.xls)’

and that,

‘May meeting minutes were reviewed and accepted by unanimous consent.’

Note that both of the items were not approved as appropriate motions, with notation of the initiator and second of the motion. Note that there was no note that the previous Teleconference Minutes were approved by the Working Group.

Excerpt:

Under Item - **List of functional requirements**

‘During the Monday PM1 meeting, an initial strawpoll was conducted for the “Formation of a study group to investigate means to enhance detection and protection of Part 74 devices.”

After a short discussion, it was decided that the matter would be revisited later in the week.’

And,

‘In the Thursday AM1 meeting, a motion was moved by Ahren Hartman regarding the “Formation of a Study Group for investigating means to enhance detection and protection of licensed Part 74 devices by the WRAN system, and authorize the Chair to get the Study Group approval from the Executive Committee.”

Motion was seconded by Peter Murray.

The votes were

Yes: 19, No: 0, Abstain: 2

Motion passed.’

From:

San Francisco IEEE Plenary Meeting, LMSC Closing Meeting Minutes

Document:

Notes:

Note that the approved SG focus was specifically restricted to application to 802.22, deals with 802.22 behavior and specification, while the SG generated PAR is not specific to 802.22 at all, is general to the entire 802 community, and deals with Part 74 device behavior and specification.

Excerpt:

Under Agenda Item – **10.21**

‘Formation Of 802.22 SG on “Means to enhance the ability of 802.22 systems to detect and avoid Part 74 licensed devices”’

The Motion was approved by the EC.

From:

Teleconference Minutes

Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference

Wednesday, August 3rd, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:

22-05-0067-01-0000_Requirements_Minutes_August3.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 15 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes

Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference

Wednesday, August 10th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:

22-05-0068-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_August10.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 17 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes

Minutes of the Channel Model Sub-group teleconference

Tuesday, August 16th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2:55 hour

Document:

22-05-0070-00-0000_Channel_Model_Minutes_August16.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 11 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:
Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, August 17th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:
22-05-0071-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_August17PMu.doc

Notes:
Attendance was noted. 18 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:
Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, August 24th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hour 19 minutes

Document:
22-05-0072-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_August24.doc

Notes:
Attendance was noted. 17 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:
Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, August 31st, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:
22-05-0077-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_August31.doc

Notes:
Attendance was noted. 12 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:
Orange County IEEE Interim Meeting, Opening Agenda for 6th Session of the IEEE P802.22 WG,
Wireless Regional Area Networks
September 18th-23rd, 2005

Document:
22-05-0076-03-0000-802.22_Tentative_Agenda_Sept05.xls

Notes:
MS Excel Spreadsheet.

Excerpt:
Under Tab - **802.22 WRAN Graphic**

Study Group on Pt 74 Devices sessions are shown for Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday evenings.

Under Tab - **802.22 WG Agendas**

Item 5.1 of the agenda is 'CHAIR for the STUDY GROUP ON MEANS TO ENHANCE DETECTION OF PART 74 DEVICES'

From:

Orange County IEEE Interim Meeting, IEEE 802.22 Wireless Regional Area Networks, Garden Grove Session, September 2005, MINUTES
2005-09-23

Document:

22-05-0085-00-0000_WRAN_Minutes_Sept05.doc

Notes:

The Meeting Minutes include a list of 59 Attendees. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted.

In the Minutes it is noted that the:

'Chair reviewed agenda: agenda approved by unanimous consent.
(see 22-05-0076-03-0000_802.22_Tentative_Agenda_Sept05.xls)'

and that,

'July meeting minutes were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent.'

Note that both of the items were not approved as appropriate motions, with notation of the initiator and second of the motion. Note that there was no note that the previous Teleconference Minutes were approved by the Working Group.

Note that in the San Francisco Plenary the WG authorized the group to work at the Interim meeting without a Quorum.

Excerpt:

Under Item - **List of requirements**

'William Rose had volunteered to chair the study group (SG) on means to enhance detection of Part 74 devices. During the Monday PM1 meeting, Peter Murray made the motion to approve William Rose as Chair of the SG. The motion was seconded by Paul Thompson. The vote was:

Yes: 22, No: 0, Abstain: 0

William Rose was thereupon appointed by the Chair following unanimous approval by the WG. The SG has to develop the PAR and Five criteria, which will ultimately lead to the creation of a Task Group.'

And,

'During the Friday AM1 meeting, the WG devoted time working on the PAR pertaining to the SG related to means to enhance detection of Part 74 devices.

The WG unanimously agreed to delay the start of the plenary till 11 am to advance the work on the PAR and Five criteria.'

Note that there is no record that the Study Group met during any of its scheduled intervals. And there is no record of who participated in, nor any actions or motions made at the Study Group.

Under Item - **Closing plenary**

'William Rose will continue to Chair the SG to enhance detection of Part 74 devices.

William Rose moved to authorize the SG to complete a draft PAR and Five criteria via correspondence and conduct up to two duly noticed teleconference calls to obtain approval by the SG participants to submit the draft PAR and Five criteria for WG approval by a WG electronic ballot. The motion was seconded by Gerald Chouinard. It was approved by unanimous consent.'

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, September 7th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 2 hours

Document:

22-05-0078-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_Sept07.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 12 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:

Teleconference Minutes
Minutes of the Requirements Sub-group teleconference
Wednesday, September 14th, 2005 from 12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (GMT-4:00h) and lasted 1:55 hours

Document:

22-05-0079-00-0000_Requirements_Minutes_Sept14.doc

Notes:

Attendance was noted. 14 People attending teleconference. Affiliation noted. Assessment of Member status of attendees and determination of any Quorum was not noted. No mention of any discussion or action on any item related to the approved Study Group.

From:

Vancouver IEEE Plenary Meeting, 802.22 Opening Report – November 2005
2005-11-14

Document:

22-05-0111-00-0000-802.22_Opening_Report_Nov05.ppt

Notes:

Three slides (with cover page).

Excerpt:

Under Item - **Report on July 2005 Plenary and September 2005 Interim**

'At the September 2005 interim, a PAR/5C were also crafted with a goal of developing standardized methods of improving the ability to detect and protect low power secondary licensed devices such as wireless microphones'

From:

Vancouver IEEE Plenary Meeting, Opening Agenda for 7th Session of the IEEE P802.22 WG,
Wireless Regional Area Networks
November 13th-18th, 2005

Document:

22-05-0089-04-0000_802.22_Tentative_Agenda_Nov05.xls

Notes:

MS Excel Spreadsheet.

Excerpt:

Under Tab - **802.22 WRAN Graphic**

There are no session times allocated for any Study Group activity. There is a session time on Tuesday evening allocated for '802.22 - Consider any WG Comments On PAR', and on Wednesday afternoon allocated for '802.22 - Respond to any WG Comments On PAR - SUBMIT FINAL BY 5:00 pm'

Under Tab - **802.22 WG Agendas**

Item 4.1 of the agenda is 'REVIEW/APPROVAL OF "PART 74 PAR"'