

**IEEE P802.11  
Wireless LANs**

**Report of Letter Ballot 14**

**Date:** September 30, 1998

**Author:** Vic Hayes  
Lucent technologies  
Zadelstede 1-10  
3431 JZ Nieuwegein, the Netherlands  
Phone: +31 30 609 7528  
Fax: +31 30 609 7556  
e-Mail: vichayes@lucent.com

## Summary

This morning, September 30, 01:00 UTC, the Letter Ballot 14 closed. The ballot was distributed as doc.: 98/340 on Saturday September 19, via the Mailing Reflector and was available on the web site.

61 of the 98 Voting members returned the ballot. That is a return rate of 62 % (50 % required to be a valid ballot).

All recommendations passed with 93.0 % or higher and are herewith passed motions of the Working Group. The abstention rate reached 19.7 % for two recommendations. That would still be within the limits of 25 % IEEE uses for Sponsor Ballots.

During the ballot period, two concerns were raised regarding the Letter Ballot. One by Stan Reible regarding the legality of the LB and the fact that the meeting where the recommendations were made did not have a quorum. The concerns were only repeated in 3 ballots as comments, in an e-mail from John Cafarella while one e-mail from Bob O'Hara expressed support and the Chair responded to the last letter from Stan. Geoff Thompson, 802.3 Chair, commented on the length of the letter ballot. No one in the WG had any concerns on the length. The correspondence is provided at the end of this report.

In conclusion, the chair rules that the Letter Ballot is valid and the 8 recommendations are passed motions of 802.11.

## Summary of tallies

Rec #	Abstain	Do Not Approve	Approve	Total Votes	Approval Rate	Abstention Rate
1	3	1	57	61	98.3%	4.9%
2	12	2	47	61	95.9%	19.7%
3	5	3	53	61	94.6%	8.2%
4	4	4	53	61	93.0%	6.6%
5	7	1	53	61	98.1%	11.5%
6	12	2	47	61	95.5%	19.7%
7	1	1	59	61	98.3%	1.6%
8	34	1	57	61	98.3%	4.9%

In addition, I received a vote from Mike Lemieux and Gary Kessler. They are not yet voting members, but vote to approve all recommendations.

## Actual votes of Voting Members

Full name	vt 1	cmnt 1	vt 2	cmnt 2	vt 3	cmnt 3	vt 4	cmnt 4	vt 5	cmnt 5	vt 6	cmnt 6	vt 7	cmnt 7	vt 8	cmnt 8
Mr. Jeff Abramowitz	y		y		y		y		y		a		y		y	
Dr. Reza Ahy																
Mr. Keith B. Amundsen	y	y	y	y	n	y	n	y	y		y		y		y	
Mr. Carl F. Andren	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Kazuhiro Aoyagi																
Mr. David Bagby	n	y	n	yy	n	y	n	y	n	y	n	y	n	y	n	y
Mr. James R. Baker	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Phil Belanger																
Mr. John Biddick																
Mr. Simon Black	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Timothy J. Blaney	a		a		a		a		a		a		y		y	
Mr. Jan Boer	y		a		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Ronald Brockmann																
Mr. Wesley Brodsky	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Dr. John H. Cafarella																
Mr. Naftali Chayat																
Mr. Wim Diepstraten																
Mr. Darrol Draper																
Mr. Peter Ecclesine																
Mr. Darwin Engwer	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Greg Ennis	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. John Fakatselis	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Jeff Fischer																
Mr. Michael Fischer	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. George Fishel	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. John Fisher	a		a		a		a		a		a		y		y	
Mr. Ian Gifford	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Motohiro Gochi																
Mr. Tim Godfrey	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Jan Haagh	y		a		y		y		y		n		y		y	
Mr. Karl Hannestad	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Mohammed Hasan																
Mr. Victor Hayes	y		a		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Dr. Chris Heegard	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Robert Heile	a		a		a		a		a		a		a		a	
Mr. Maarten Hoeben	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Duane Hurne																
Mr. Masayuki Ikeda	y		a		a		a		a		a		y		y	
Mr. Richard Jai																
Mr. Donald C. Johnson	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Ad Kamerman	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Nobuo Karaki																
Mr. Dean M. Kawaguchi																
Mr. Stuart J. Kerry	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Patrick Kinney																
Mr. Bruce P. Kraemer	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	

Full name	vt 1	cmnt 1	vt 2	cmnt 2	vt 3	cmnt 3	vt 4	cmnt 4	vt 5	cmnt 5	vt 6	cmnt 6	vt 7	cmnt 7	vt 8	cmnt 8
Mr. James S. Li	y		a		y		y		y		a		y		y	
Mr. Isao Masaki																
Mr. Jim McDonald																
Mr. Michael D. McInnis																
Mr. Gene Miller	y	yy	y	yy	n	yy	n	yy	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Dr. Akira Miura	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Henri Moelard	y		a		y		y		y		a		y		y	
Mr. Masaharu Mori																
Dr. Masahiro Morikura	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Ravi P. Nalamati																
Mr. Colin Nayler																
Dr. Richard van Nee	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Bob O'Hara	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Dr. Tomoki Ohsawa	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Kazuhiro Okanoue	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Richard H. Paine	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Al Petrick	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Bob Pham																
Ms. Victoria M. Poncini																
Mr. Gregory S. Rawlins	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Dr. Stanley A. Reible																
Mr. Frits Riep																
Mr. William Roberts	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Kent G. Rollins	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Dr. Clemens C.W. Ruppel																
Mr. Chandos Rypinski																
Mr. Anil K. Sanwalka	y		y		y	y	y		a		a		y		a	
Mr. Roy Sebring	y		a		a		n		y		a		y		y	
Dr. Tie-Jun Shan	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Dr. Stephen J. Shellhammer	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Mike Shiba																
Mr. Matthew B. Shoemake	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Thomas Siep	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Donald I. Sloan																
Mr. Doug Smith	y		a		y		y		a		a		y		y	
Mr. Hitoshi Takanashi	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Satoru Toguchi	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Ms. Cherry Tom	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Mike Trompower	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Tom Tsoulogiannis	y		y		y	y	y		a		a		y		y	
Mr. Bruce Tuch	y		a		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Sarosh Vesuna																
Mr. Ikuo Wakayama	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Mark Webster	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		a	

Full name	vt 1	cmnt 1	vt 2	cmnt 2	vt 3	cmnt 3	vt 4	cmnt 4	vt 5	cmnt 5	vt 6	cmnt 6	vt 7	cmnt 7	vt 8	cmnt 8
Dr. Nien C. Wei																
Mr. Leo Wilz																
Mr. Harry Worstell	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Chris Zegelin	y		n		y		y		y		a		y		y	
Mr. Steven A. Zelubowski																
Mr. Timothy M. Zimmerman																
Mr. Johnny Zweig	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	
Mr. Jim Zyren	y		y		y		y		y		y		y		y	

## Comments accompanying the votes

Rec #	Commenter	Comment
1	Keith Amundsen	needs review before publishing (as Geoff Thompson & Rich Seifert have discussed)
1	Gene Miller	needs review before publishing (as Geoff Thompson & Rich Seifert have discussed) Marked this recommendation as technical
1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8	Dave Bagby	As there was no quorum at the interim meeting, this action is impossible until there is a mtg with a quorum – the ne4xt opportunity for that will be at the next plenary mtg. Until then 802.11 can not take any action as it has not held a duly constituted meeting – some people in a room is NOT sufficient reason – the issuing of letter ballot from formally non-existent meetings is wrong and the 802.11 chairman should not have issued the ballot. (note that in the past when this has occurred it was because the previous, duly constituted and convened 802.11 meeting voted to empower an interim meeting to take specific actions even if a quorum was not present – this is not the case this time around – so like it or not, formally, the Sept meeting never took place.)
1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8	Gene Miller	I vote against submitting the document to the plenary for the reasons stated in S. Reible's e-mail dated 9/22/98 which essentially states that according to Roberts Rules of Order, a quorum is required for this activity
2	Dave Bagby	This appears to incorporate options- however the stated formal position of 802.11 is to minimize options. No justification for the options is presented in the letter ballot or minutes of the meeting. Additionally, it is impossible to tell what one would be voting for from the language in the letter ballot – what portions of the referenced paper would or would not “impact” the draft? I must vote no until a clear detailed proposal is presented.
2	Keith Amundsen	using an additional SFD is non-interoperable; use a new scheme from Alan Tro or Harris, et al, that maintains interoperability and allows the 98/302 option
2	Gene Miller	using an additional SFD is non-interoperable; use a new scheme from Alan Tro or Harris, et al, that maintains interoperability and allows the 98/302 option
3	Anil Sanwalka	Marked this recommendation as technical
3	Tom Tsoulogiannis	Marked this recommendation as technical
3; 4	Keith Amundsen	98-314r2 <u>SHOULD go out for REVIEW</u> but Stan Reible quotes Robert's RoFo as to an <u>actual BALLOT being out of order</u> . This also applies to accepting the draft also since that would then require 75% to make changes
3; 4	Gene Miller	I support submitting document 98-314r2 <u>for review</u> . I vote against submitting the document to letter ballot for the reasons stated in S. Reible's e-mail dated 9/22/98 which essentially states that according to Roberts Rules of Order, a quorum is required for this activity.

## E-mail correspondence

### First letter from Stan Reible

9/22/98

Mr. Vic Hayes, Chairman 802.11

I was surprised to receive the Letter Ballot: "3 To submit to the plenary doc 98-314r2 with the appropriate editorial changes as instructed by TGB as the draft (at September meeting: 16 approved, 0 disapproved, 0 abstained)." My understanding was that this motion would be reviewed at the next meeting, with quorum present, and then acted upon in an appropriate manner.

As you should be aware, most of us in attendance at the 802.11 Westford meeting, September 14-18, have not yet received copies of the document revisions doc 98-314r2 and doc 98-314r1. In fact we did not even receive a copy of the original doc 98-314 until after the meeting started on Monday, September 14. How can anyone present maintain that there was any real consensus or agreement (or understanding) achieved during the Westford meeting on the revisions to this document (or in fact, on the original document itself)?

At every IEEE 802.11 meeting that I attended thus far, attendance records were carefully kept and quorum requirements observed. Suddenly, meeting attendance and careful discussion and understanding of the critical issues at hand do not appear to make any difference. We now are proceeding in claimed legal manner after just a handful of the TGb members heard the relevant discussions (rather incomplete if I may say so) of the important issues concerning the draft 802.11b Standard. Does not the IEEE 802.11 Standards body now own the standard, or does it remain the IP property of other organization(s)? Sorry, but I do not agree on this apparent rush to terminate valid and joint discussion of the 802.11b Standard Document.

In legal corporate meetings, not only must a quorum exist to transact business, but those making the decision, that is voting and otherwise participating, must hear the discussions which take place before the body votes. For example, in a legal board meeting every director must hear the questions and comments posed by all the other directors before making his decision and casting his vote.

Let me quote directly from 21<sup>st</sup> Century Robert's Rules of Order, edited by the Princeton Language Institute, published by Dell Publishing, New York, NY, November 1995.

*“Why a quorum is important.* A quorum helps to ensure that everyone is treated fairly and that a small group does not act without the will of the majority. However, it is usually advisable not to conduct important business unless a majority of members are present, often far more than a quorum. This is one more way to ensure the will of the majority while protecting the rights of the minority.”

The book referenced above continues:

*“Meetings lacking a quorum.* Business conducted without a quorum present is not valid. Members can conduct only the following business without a quorum:

- Fix the time at which to adjourn
- Adjourn.
- Recess.
- Take measures to establish a quorum.

If the quorum is destroyed because members leave the meeting, no other business can be conducted, and the meeting must be adjourned. Members and officers who continue to conduct business do so at their own risk.”

Therefore, I do not believe TGb gave a true recommendation for the motion in question, or had the legal right to do so. In fact I will question how voting results, relating to any motions submitted in the Letter Ballot, have any real meaning when the actual vote tallies represent such few members.

Most sincerely,

Stanley Reible

## Second letter from Stan Reible

September 29, 1998

Mr. Vic Hayes, Chairman 802.11

I have been asked to reconsider if ratification of a motion, or resolution, which originated in a meeting which had not achieved quorum can properly take place in a Letter Ballot. I further point out that in keeping with my understanding of Robert's Rules of Order, that such motions should have also, on an individual basis, been appropriately tabled, postponed, referred to committee, or otherwise properly posted for future consideration.

Having a quorum and proper notification for any assembly or committee meeting is fundamental to adhering to Robert's Rules of Order. On the other hand, having a discussion or a debate, which is the purpose of any meeting, can very naturally happen anyplace or at any time.

The problem occurred in that we had a meeting and forced adherence to most of the rules presented in Robert's Rules of Order, but "crudely" dealt with one of the more central rules governing such assemblies. We didn't have a quorum, and the chair did indeed announce that we did not have a quorum. But then as a group, we more or less forgot this crucial requirement and proceeded to move, second, and vote on important issues as if there were a quorum present. After the meeting, I heard members argue, "we decided...", but that is exactly the critical action that we couldn't take under Robert's Rules of Order. I guess, we should have only been taking Straw Polls during the meeting, an action which would seem to have caused little damage. Does this now mean that whenever two members of the IEEE gather together, they can generate a motion, and have it placed on a Letter Ballot? Or do we now classify meetings that fail to achieve quorum as nearly quorum, aspirant quorum, or non quorum?

At the meeting in Westford we proceeded to build a "deck of cards" through our actions and decisions: An agenda for the meeting was formally presented, reviewed, and approved. Then this decision became the basis (or one of the guidelines) for proceeding on to the next decision, and on and on. Again, all without a quorum.

Now, "after building this deck of cards," we selected two, or three, of the proposals formulated near the end of the meeting and continued to move them as proper motions towards ratification. However, these motions, or proposals, were formulated in part as a result of, or under the influence of, multiple actions and decisions made earlier in the meeting, which again don't have any basis for having been made, because there was no quorum.

Now, we are in the midst of a Letter Ballot, voting on motions that did not originate in a legal meeting and on motions that were not appropriately tabled, or otherwise set aside, for future consideration. In this clear breach of rules, it would appear that the entire process should be set back to the point where voting on inappropriately generated, or otherwise mishandled, motions first began.

Sincerely,

Stanley Reible

### E-mail from Bob O'Hara

From: Bob O'Hara[SMTP:bob@informed-technology.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 1998 8:23 PM  
To: 802.11  
Subject: WLAN/ Letter ballot...

I have read the protests against the letter ballot that was issued subsequent to the latest interim meeting and have some observations and opinions to offer.

First, there are legitimate business reasons that keep many of the members of 802.11 from attending every meeting. Unfortunately, interim meetings, where a quorum is not guaranteed as in the plenary meetings, seem to suffer the lowest attendance.

Second, when 802.11 is entertaining proposals for new standards, the membership swells as supporters of the various candidates attend meetings to present their proposals. Once the number of candidates is narrowed to the one selected for standardization, the number of members attending meetings naturally declines as some supporters of the candidates not selected decide that it does not make business sense to continue to participate. Unfortunately, it takes as much as a year for those not attending any longer to lose their membership rights.

Having seen and dealt with this problem in the past, 802.11 has decided that interim meetings should be held as if there is a quorum present. If the

quorum does not actually exist, a letter ballot shall be sent out after the meeting, putting each of the questions to the membership. This has the effect of making the decisions of the meeting accessible to the entire membership. The debate is also accessible to the entire membership, through the minutes and the reflector. It also begins the process of reducing the membership to those that are still participating (due to the membership maintenance requirement of responding to letter ballots).

In my opinion, the reason that 802.11 has decided to operate in this fashion is that being able to perform useful work only at 802 plenary meetings does not allow sufficient progress to be made toward completing a standard that meets the needs of the market. It is also my opinion that those participating in 802.11 believe that there are markets to be served by the standards we are developing.

Given that the members of 802.11 do want standards to be developed to meet market needs, I find it difficult to believe the calls to halt progress toward that end are credible, particularly given the lack of any technical discussion on the reflector of the issues on the letter ballot.

-Bob

### E-mail from Vic Hayes

From: Vic Hayes[SMTP:100071.3061@compuserve.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 1998 8:12 PM  
To: IEEE 802.11, reflector  
Subject: WLAN/ Re: WLAN Letter Ballot Approval of results of Westford meeting

To Stan Reible and all members of 802.11,

Stan, thanks for your reaction to John's and my conversations to you. I will address your concerns below leading to the conclusion that the procedure is OK in 802.11 view.

#### Introduction

-----

First of all, my apologies for my late reacting to the group. The reason was that John Fakatselis and myself wanted to clear the issue with Stan first via the telephone, but it took till today to receive Stan's reaction. I consider the first letter one superseded by the second one and will respond to the second letter.

#### Stan's concerns

-----

Stan brings to us the concern that we held a meeting where there was no quorum, that the motions taken were not tabled and that the motions that passed (as Recommendations) are the subject now of a letter ballot. In fact, what Stan did not mention in his letter, but did to me, is that he is concerned that the debate is not available to the voters not present.

#### Validity of the Westford meeting

-----

Stan's concern is with the fact that we held a meeting without a quorum and that the motions that passed without the quorum present could be taken to a letter ballot, more specifically his concern is that a small group could call a meeting and have a letter ballot started even if only two members would have been present.

Well, first of all: the Westford meeting was a properly called meeting:  
i.e. the chair called the meeting, the meeting was announced at the July



meeting and the venue and agenda were posted one month before the meeting. The quorum for the Westford meeting was 49 while 41 voting members were registered. So we are far away from Stan's concern of 2 voters only.

During the lifetime of 802.11, we have worked according to the procedure to hold interim meetings, and, if no quorum was reached, to call the passed motions "Recommendations", which would then be shown to the whole membership in a letter ballot for 10 days. Indeed, Stan, you are right, the Recommendations are not yet decisions. John Fakatselis did mention the Letter ballot method in the beginning of his meeting.

#### Procedure for lack of quorum

-----

Stan quotes a piece from Robert's rules that have never been enforced in 802.11, and may even not in 802. Would it be enforced, we would never plan for an interim. Just imagine:

1. the host is taking a large risk in cancellation charges from the hotel,
2. none of the members would plan to pay the air travel, hotel and time loss if he would be running the risk to just have to be in a quorum call and then have to go back home (for the highest travel rate).
3. no progress would be made at all because we would have to replay all the debates.

Further, nobody at the meeting , and Stan was at the meeting, used his possibility to call for the quorum and treat us to a journey home on Monday. No, all present came out to make progress on the work.

Nobody did move to table or to postpone the motions either.

#### Duration of the letter ballot

-----

The LMSC Operating procedures quote that the letter ballots need to have a duration of 40 days. It is clear to me that this was meant for letter ballots on draft standards. The rules say further that the chair can also call for letter ballots on other subjects, without making the point that the duration may be different. All working groups have violated this rule for recirculation WG ballots.

I contend that in the spirit of progress we need to accept LB14 as a recirculation type ballot and thus as a 10 day letter ballot.

#### Conclusion

-----

We held a meeting in Westford that has to be considered as valid because nobody called for the quorum. The passed motions at the meeting are still to be considered as Recommendations, until ratified by LB14, after which they become passed motions of 802.11.

All those that want to change the rules need to bring a motion to the November meeting with a method to either improve the procedures to approve the results of interim meetings where no quorum was reached or to reschedule our plans because we can not hold interim meetings.

Vic Hayes, Chair, IEEE P802.11

#### E-mail from John Cafarella

From: John H. Cafarella[SMTP:JohnCafarella@worldnet.att.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 1998 4:39 PM  
To: Hayes, Vic (Vic); '802.11 reflector'  
Subject: RE: WLAN/ Again, call for the Letter Ballot

---

Vic:

Some of us who have not voted are registering a mild protest against rigid enforcement of Roberts rules when it's convenient and casual interpretation when it's not. I understand the need for interim meetings, but I feel that some of the discussions which took place at the interim meeting should be opened again at the next meeting. Forcing a vote now, when many details are not available, seems imprudent to me. Speaking for myself, you can publish my name in this list of non-voters all you like. I do not intend to return a ballot under these circumstances.

Warmest regards, as always....John