

**Submission to:  
IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANS**

---

Title: TGb REPORT FOR MEETING OF 05/04/98 TO 05/08/98 (Utrecht, Netherlands)

Date: May 1998

Author: John Fakatselis  
Harris Semiconductor  
2401 Palm Bay Road  
Palm Bay, Florida  
32905  
USA  
Tel: (407)-724-7000  
Fax: (407)-724-7886  
email: jfakat01@harris.com

---

**IEEE802.11 TASK GROUP B  
MAY 4-8 1998 , UTRECHT, the NETHERLANDS  
AGENDA**

**MONDAY**

- **CALL TO ORDER**
  - **SECRETARY APPOINTMENT**
- **PROCEDURAL**
  - **PARLIAMENTARIAN APPOINTMENT**
  - **COMPARISSON MATRIX TEAM**
- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**
- **APPROVAL OF MARCH 1998 MINUTES.**
- **BACKGROUND**
- **SELECTION PROCESS OVERVIEW.**
- **CALL FOR PAPERS**
  - **PROPOSERS (submissions estimate)**
    - **ALANTRO 3 submissions**

- HARRIS 6 submissions
- LUCENT 8 submissions
- MICRILOR 6 submissions
- RAYTHEON 3 submissions
- OTHERS
  - DEAN 1 submission
  - GREG 1 submission/presentation
- ORDER OF PRESENTATIONS (BY PROPOSAL)
- ADJURN

## TUESDAY

- PRESENTATIONS BY PROPOSERS
  - 8:15 - 9:00 A. Raytheon
  - 9:00 - 9:45 B. Micrilor
  - 9:45 - 10:30 C. Lucent
  - 10:30 - 10 :45 BREAK
  - 10:45 - 11:30 D. Harris
  - 11:30 - 12:15 E. Alantro

- First round of voting
- Announcement of voting results

## WEDNSDAY

■ **PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS**

■ **8:15 - 9:00 A. LUCENT**

■ **9:00 - 9:45 B. RAYTHEON**

■ **9:45 - 10:30 C. MICRILOR**

■ **10:30 - 10 :45 BREAK**

■ **10:45 - 11:30 D. HARRIS**

■ **11:30 - 12:15 GENERAL PAPERS PRESENTATIONS**

■ **A Lucent**

■ **B Raytheon**

■ **C Micrilor**

■ **D Alantro**

■ **E Harris**

**WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON AND/OR EVENING.**

- **MATRIX OVERVIEW**
- **PANEL DISCUSSION 1:50 - 3:15**
- **BREAK**
- **CLOSING ARGUMENTS 3:45- 4:05**
- **FINAL VOTING ROUNDS**
- **ANNOUNCEMENTS AT EACH**
- **ADJURN 8:30 AM (Thursday)**

**FRIDAY**

- **VOTER MEMBERS COUNT.**
- **STATUS SUMMARY.**
- **DISCUSSION AND CLARIFICATION OF PLENARY DIRECTION TO THE TASK GROUP b.**
- **SCHEDULE FOR TASK GROUP b.**
  - **Left up to the chairs not discussed.**
- **NEXT MEETINGS AGENDA/**
- **present papers ( priority to proposals that will be available on the web a week prior to the July meeting, proposals need to be available at the start of the July meeting.)**
- **Define selection process**
- **DISCUSSION ON PATENT POLICY (not discussed).**
- **CLOSING SUMMARY BY CHAIR .**
- **ADJURN (12:10)**

**In accordance to Roberts Rules of Order, the chair can appoint a parliamentarian (p 456). The parliamentarian will advise on the proper rules. Stuart Kerry and Vic Hayes will act as parliamentarians.**

**DOWN SELECTION BALLOT  
TASK GROUP b  
05/05/98**

**Motion to adopt one of the following choices as the BEST option for the 2.4 GHZ high rate PHY. as stated in the selection process document (98/54) step 14.**

**Stewart/Al , unanimous**

**VOTING BALLOT:**

**Indicate your vote by checking the appropriate choice. One check only.**

<b>PROPOSAL/ OPTION</b>	<b>YES (BEST OPTION)</b>
<b>ALANTRO</b>	
<b>HARRIS</b>	
<b>LUCENT</b>	
<b>MICRILOR</b>	
<b>RAYTHEON</b>	
<b>NONE</b>	

Company	ROUND 1	%	round 2	round 4	round 5	round 6 not completed
Harris	25		26	24	28	
Lucent	14		15	16		
Micrilor	12		15	17	29	
Raytheon	3		1			
Alantro	1					
None	1		1	1	1	
INVALID	1		0	0	0	
Abstain	0		0	0	0	
total valid	56		58	58	58	

### ROUND 3 WAS INVALID

Motion by Keith/Bruce to postpone the ballot process to the Friday TGb meeting because it looks like there is no clear direction and ask the interested parties of their willingness to work on a compromise through the start of the Friday TGb meeting.

**Jeff Abramowitz: Point of Order: I question the validity of our voting due to voting irregularities that could be explained by “Block voting”. I believe that the 802 rules allow that if block voting is shown, the voting rules change to one vote per company.**

**The chair and the parliamentarians after a 1.5 hr recess resulted for the chair ruling that:**

**The matter is forwarded to the executive committee for final direction while we keep moving with task group b business.**

**THE CHAIR AND THE PARLIAMENTARIANS DECIDED ON THIS RULLING DUE TO THE SENSITIVITY OF THE POINT RAISED AND THE INDICATION THAT MORE**

**THAN 1 PERSON BELIEVED THAT THERE WAS SOME KIND OF A “BLOCK” BASED ON THE DEFINITION PRESENTED BELOW. NO CLEAR EVIDENCE THOUGH. THERE ARE NO RULES THAT WE COULD FIND REFERRING TO WORKING GROUP ACTION ON A “BLOCK”.**

**THE FOLLOWING REFERENCES WERE USED FOR THE CHAIRS DECISION.**

**THE CHAIR WAS APPEALED AND OVERULED.**

Standards companion

It is also the chair's responsibility to ensure that the working group knows they represent only themselves, not their company or another interest.

LMSC Operating rules

ExCom

3.4.1 Voting Guidance

It is expected that LMSC Executive Committee members will vote as both professionals and as individual experts, except under the Directed Position provisions of Procedure 8, and not as a member of any affiliate block (organization, alliance, company, consortium, special interest group, etc.). If substantive evidence is presented to the LMSC Chair that this provision is violated, the LMSC Executive Committee will meet to consider what, if any, action to take on the presented evidence. Such action may include any action up to and including a recommendation for removal from office.

Working group

5.1.4.4 Working Group Chair's Authority

To carry out the responsibilities cited in 0 5.1.4.3 Working Group Chair's Responsibilities, the Working Group Chair has the authority to:

- a) Call meetings and issue meeting minutes.
- b) Decide which issues are technical and which are procedural.
- c) Establish Working Group rules beyond the Working Group rules set down by the Executive Committee. These rules must be written and all Working Group members must be aware of them.
- d) Assign/unassign subtasks and task leaders or executors, e.g. secretary, subgroup chair, etc.e) Determine if the Working Group is dominated by an organization, and, if so, treat that organizations' vote as one (with the approval of the Executive Committee).
- f) Make final determination if and how negative letter ballots are to be resolved when a draft standard, recommended practice, or guideline, is to be sent to the Executive Committee for approval for Sponsor Ballot Group voting.
- g) Collect fees to meet Working Group expenses.

The following motion passed at the task group , defining the acceptable proposals.

**Motion to accept the text below defining what is considered as an acceptable proposal for considerations of task group b.**

- **The acceptable proposals are the existing 5 proposals, possibly modified (but not to the extent that makes them new proposals as determined by TGb ) by the original proposers, and any proposals which combine substantial elements of two or more of the 5 existing proposals, with the addition of any required additional elements to render the merged proposal viable, and are presented willingly and jointly by the original proposers of the proposals being merged.**

**Carl/Anil  
passes 29/1/7.**



