Project	**IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group <http://ieee802.org/16>**
Title	**Rapporteur Group Chair Guidance for the interval between Session #57 and Session #58, and at Session #58**
Date Submitted	**2008-10-08**
Source(s)	Phillip Barber E-mail: pbarber@huawei.com Huawei Rapporteur Chair Coordinator, IEEE 802.16 TGm
Re:	RG Chair Guidance
Abstract	This document provides guidance to Rapporteur Group (RG) Chairs on Chair practices, RG plan creation, and process for RG activity for the interval between Session #57 and Session #58, and at Session #58
Purpose	RG Chairs will use the practices and procedures embodied in this document to conduct Rapporteur Group activity.
Notice	*This document does not represent the agreed views of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group or any of its subgroups*. It represents only the views of the participants listed in the "Source(s)" field above. It is offered as a basis for discussion. It is not binding on the contributor(s), who 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	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE-SA Patent Policy and Procedures: <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6> and <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3>. Further information is located at <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-material.html> and <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat>.

Rapporteur Group Chair Guidance for the interval between Session #57 and Session #58, and at Session #58

Phillip Barber
Huawei

1. Overview

This document provides guidance to Rapporteur Group Chairs on Chair practices, RG plan creation, and process for RG activity for the interval between Session #57 and Session #58, and at Session #58. The document is written as a series of requirements and recommendations to the Chairs.

2. General Chair Guidance

First and foremost, as Chair you are representing IEEE 802.16. You do not represent yourself, your company, or your special interest group. You are appointed to act in proxy for the TG Chair on a specific matter. A Chair does not have the luxury of a personal or company agenda.

In most respects, you have the same duties and privileges as the Task Group Chair. Indeed, your duties and privileges devolve from your writ from the Task Group Chair, just as his devolve from the Working Group Chair, as his come from the 802 P&P. So, reviewing the 802 P&P and IEEE-SA Operations Manual are a first, good step in understanding what your mandate is, and how you may go about accomplishing your Group objectives.

I would draw special attention to 7.2.2.1 WG Chair of the 802 P&P:
     The Chair has the following responsibilities:
     a) Decide which matters are procedural and which matters are technical
     b) Decide procedural matters or defer them to a vote by the WG
     c) Place issues to a vote by WG members
     d) Preside over meetings and activities of the WG according to all of the relevant policies and procedures
     e) Entertain motions, but not make motions
     f) Delegate necessary functions as needed
     g) Set goals and deadlines and endeavor to adhere to them
     h) Prioritize objectives to best serve the group and the goals
     i) Seek consensus of the Sponsor if required as a means of resolving issues

     The Chair also shall:
     j) Be objective
     k) Not bias discussions
     l) Ensure that all parties have the opportunity to express their views
     m) Be knowledgeable in IEEE standards processes and parliamentary procedures

I want to emphasize those last items: objective, no bias, all parties have opportunity to express views, be knowledgeable about procedure. The Chair's job is to move the standards process forward in a neutral manner. Be assured that Brian and Roger are unlikely to overlook transgressions on these covenants. They demonstrate these characteristics themselves, and expect it of their appointed Chairs.

Second, IEEE 802.16 is an individual Membership organization, not an entity or corporate membership organization. While it would be ridiculous to overlook that many individual Members may be from the same company, and that they may have common views on certain matters, no one individual may make claim to represent the view of a company or interest group. Indeed, company and interest group grouping are irrelevant for 802.16 purposes. If multiple individuals support a common idea, comment, or contribution they can demonstrate this support by co-signing the contribution, or speaking in favor of the proposal. Any grouping or identification of contributed material by 'Company' or other entity is disallowed. Grouping ideas and matters by supporting Members with common views is appropriate. For instance, the appropriate way to group the HARQ options and their relative support would be 'synchronous', 'asynchronous', and 'both'. It would be inappropriate to attribute these as the 'Company X Proposal', the 'Company Y Proposal', and the 'Harmonized Proposal'. As Chair, you should avoid referencing companies and focus on individuals.

So, while it is perfectly appropriate to identify company or other affiliation, Participants must refrain from identifying a proposal as 'XYZ Company proposal'. It is appropriate to include a list of authors on contributions with identification of individual company or other relevant affiliation. While this can make author lists excessively long, long lists in fact can be a testament to the degree of broad support that a contribution may enjoy. A word of caution: Participants must exercise proper care to ensure that author lists include only those authors that have given express, explicit

permission to include their name as a co-contributor on a contribution.

3. Primary Mission of the Rapporteur Group

Keep something important in mind when developing your RG plan and conducting RG activity: we are up against a tough deadline here and the objective is to get good Stage 2 SDD text out of these Rapporteur Groups such that we can immediately accept that material, without additional discussion or debate, during the upcoming IEEE 802.16 Session #58 in Dallas in November.

By 'good Stage 2 SDD text', I mean text of sufficient detail and completeness such that Stage 3 802.16 feature protocol implementation text may be written based on that Stage 2 text. Prior to Session #57, we had problems in that the agreed Stage 2 texts have been incomplete and lacked sufficient detail. The outcomes of the Kobe RG outputs were a noticeable improvement from previous performance. We are looking to duplicate that success during the upcoming Session #58 meeting cycle.

4. RG Project Plan

RG Chairs must develop and submit a plan to the RG Coordinator for approval by Oct 9, if they have not already done so.

RG Chairs must announce their approved RG plans via the Google Group reflector by Oct 10 AOE.

RG Chairs have significant latitude in formulation of their project plans. However I encourage Chairs to review and adopt plans similar to those used successfully for RG activity during the previous cycle.

The submitted plans must adhere to the announced schedule for TGm activity and delivery.

Something else you may want to bear in mind when developing your project plans is human nature. People will always react with skepticism to the new and unknown. The more times you put material in front of people, the more familiar they will become, and the more accepting. I encourage you to process through multiple drafts (a minimum of three is a good guideline) during this process. This is not a requirement, just a recommendation.

5. Consensus and Voting in RG Activity

While it is possible to vote as part of a Rapporteur activity when so authorized by the TG Chair, as a practical matter it is very difficult. The 802 P&P and IEEE-SA OM identify only three ways to vote on a matter: in person during a Plenary or Interim meeting, via teleconference, or via email ballot. The Plenary vote is out during inter-meeting intervals for obvious reasons. You are not allowed to schedule Interim F2F meetings for a variety of reasons, so that is out. Brian has disallowed the use of teleconferences, and in any case voting via teleconference is a cumbersome roll-call affair. Finally, you could do a WG Letter Ballot to conduct a vote on a matter, but Roger has to set those up and notify the Membership, and I doubt that he is going to be inclined to do that in anything but a most serious and immediate need. So, voting is pretty much out.

Without voting, you are down to consensus building, and that can be a tough task in the current work environment. Notice I say consensus, not unanimity. The better the consensus you can achieve in your group, the more positively the material is likely to be received when submitted for approval by the TG. But unanimity is not required. The minority must be given the opportunity to be heard, but the minority does not have the right to halt progress of the group.

The traditional definition of consensus is 'agreement without sustained objection'. The concept of 'sustained objection' is temporal. Over what period of time do we assess the 'sustained' part of objection? The reality is that you are trying to achieve your consensus over a period between two face-to-face sessions, through a medium of less-than-perfect feedback. Limited time and limited rich medium feedback. So assessing consensus is not easy, it is purely a judgment call. A good rule-of-thumb is that consensus is something more than simple majority and less than unanimity. You will have to pick your point in-between. For me, I like to use 75%, but that is a personal preference.

The importance of consensus cannot be overstated. Your 'consensus document' submitted as the output of your RG will be a whole composed of many parts. If several portions of the consensus document enjoyed only very narrow support with meaningful opposition from disparate individuals, and if those individuals were to vote against the document as a whole at time of consideration at TGm then the outcome could become one of rejection. This is a very bad result for an allegedly 'consensus' document and invariably identifies a failure in the consensus process. The way to overcome this is to ensure that all parts of the consensus document have substantially more than a simple majority support.

How you go about gaining consensus is up to you as Chairs.

It is likely that many RGs will be granted F2F meeting time in Dallas, BUT DON"T DEPEND ON IT. If you wait until the Dallas meeting to try and overcome differences and achieve consensus you will be sadly disappointed. You must achieve the majority of consensus prior to the Dallas meeting. The Dallas meeting should be seen as a last opportunity to overcome differences and achieve consensus on a very few remaining matters, matters where the interactive nature of F2F meetings combined with the opportunity to take indicative straw poll votes can provide final clarity.

Yes, if you have scheduled RG time in Dallas then you certainly can take indicative straw polls to help identify consensus. For all such straw polls at F2F meetings for RGs at 802.16 Sessions the threshold for determining consensus shall be 75%.

6. Inter-Rapporteur Group Interaction

One of the topics that I have been asked to address is inter-Rapporteur Group interaction, especially as it relates to material dependencies between groups, and assignment and disposition of contributions where Group applicability is unclear or multiple.

In general, it is up to the RG Chairs to recognize when material may have inter-Group dependencies, or when material may more properly be addressed by another group.

For work that the RG Chair determines should be addressed by another RG Group, the proper course of action is to inform the author of such work, the Group at large, and the Chair of any Group to which the material is intended for remand that the material is viewed as being more appropriately handled by the other RG. There may necessarily be some consultation/negotiation between RG Chairs to affirm this determination. While such determination is always at the discretion of the Chairs of the affected Groups, when the Chairs may be in doubt a good rule of thumb is to trust the instincts of the author of the material in selecting the venue for consideration. After all, it is the author's work that will be evaluated by the Group. Should the author choose a Group less well suited to informed consideration of the author's work, it can only injure the author. So the author is incentivized to properly place his work into the appropriate RG Group. On the other hand, Chairs are bound to guard against venue shopping by authors to secure a more favorable if less informed/appropriate Group to revue their material.

For work that the RG Chair determines has dependencies on another Group's work, the Chair should consult with the Chair of the other Group(s) to engage a process for disposition of such work such that both Groups needs are met. In some cases this is merely a sequencing problem, i.e. MAC cannot continue with header design until some decisions on Data Plane are made. In other cases it may be a matter of mutual dependency, i.e. Addressing is critical to both MAC header design and physical allocation assignment method, the granularity and specificity of allocation.

There are no hard rules when it comes to inter-Group dependencies. The only guidance that is important is to ensure that contributions are not disadvantaged by virtue of having inter-Group dependencies, and that work progress and quality is not compromised because of these dependencies. In almost every case, the RG Chair can make that happen. Communication is the key.

If you need assistance with any such inter-Group matter that you are unable to otherwise resolve, I will endeavor to provide guidance.

7. Upload Directories and Email Message Header Tags

Roger has created several upload directories for upload of contributions for TGm Rapporteur Group activity.

The upload directories are:
TGm_LBS
TGm_MBS
TGm_Multicarrier
TGm_Security
TGm_UL_PHY_Ctrl
TGm_UMAC

The email headers for Google Group activity are:
[LBS]
[MBS]

[Multicarrier]
[Security]
[UL_PHY_Ctrl]
[UMAC][HO]
[UMAC][HEADER]
[UMAC][ARQ]
[UMAC][GENERAL]

You can access these upload directories at http://dot16.org/memberupload. The upload page is password protected with the 802.16 Member login name and password.

Please use these upload directories for ALL Rapporteur Group documents. Note that these upload directories are for Rapporteur Group documents only and ARE NOT for TGm documents. Rapporteur Group documents should use the RG document naming convention. Rapporteur Group documents will not be moved to the TGm upload or permanent directory. TGm documents must be uploaded separately at the appropriate TGm upload directory.

8. Method of RG Output and Participant Comment on RG Output

We will be using a different method of RG output and Participant comment on RG output at Session #58 from that used at Session #57.

RG Chairs will NOT file a comment and an associated consensus contribution by the closing date of the Call for Contributions and Comments: October 31 AOE.

Instead, RG Chairs will upload a final version of their consensus contribution as a RG contribution document by October 31 AOE. Following a Call for Contributions, participants will then have until Nov 7 AOE to file original comments against the RG output consensus contribution, identifying specific page, line number, and proposed change text against the RG consensus contribution. Participants will file their original comments into RG specific comment databases, not the TGm comment database. Each RG will have its own commentary database to collect and process comments against the RG consensus contribution. RG commentary databases will be given their own RG specific document control number and uploaded to their respective RG directories.

The TGm Chair will renew the RG groups to resolve comments received in their RG specific commentary databases during Session #58. The current RG Chairs will be renewed for their roles as Chairs for this processing, barring unforeseen complications. The TGm Chair will also likely create two or three new Rapporteur Groups at the beginning of the session to review new topic comments on 'Self-Organizing Networks', 'Femtocells', and 'Relay'. These new topic RGs will likely review comments and contributions but are unlikely to develop consensus text during the meeting week. Nevertheless, these new topic RGs will use the same meeting rules and format as for other RGs.

The RGs will conduct F2F breakout meetings at Session #58 to resolve comments through a consensus process which may include use of indicative straw polls. The threshold of acceptance of text into the RG consensus document shall be 75% as assessed through indicative straw poll. To be clear, a 75% result in an indicative straw poll demonstrates consensus support for text. If a comment challenges text in the consensus document, seeking to exclude such text, an indicative straw poll result of 75% would affirm retaining the text. Less than a 75% result would not demonstrate adequate support to include the text in the consensus RG document.

The availability of facilities for these breakout sessions, while POSSIBLY better than Kobe, is still limited. Expect to have no more than a single three-, four- or five-hour interval to resolve all of the comments received. That is roughly enough time to resolve twenty- to fifty-comments. We may be able to provide a little more time, but don't count on it. So it is imperative that the RGs have as much consensus work completed PRIOR TO the beginning of Session #58 or we are going to have some very unhappy and disappointed participants, not to mention that all of your significant efforts during the interleaving interval between Session #57 and Session #58 will have been devalued.

Once all RG comments are resolved, the RG should conduct a final indicative straw poll with a 75% threshold for consensus assessment to approve the overall resolution of the commentary database and modification of the RG contribution to incorporate consensus approved comment remedies. The results of this straw poll will be provided as part of the RG output report for the consideration of the wider TGm community in it disposition of RG material.

At the end of the week the RG Chairs will provide a summary report of their activity during the week, including comment resolution, and provide a final, updated draft of the consensus RG contribution incorporating any changes approved during the week. The final RG contribution associated with this week-end report shall be uploaded as a TGm contribution. The report should likely include a request to add a late comment to the TGm comment database accepting the final, revised RG contribution. As part of discussion on this TGm comment resolution, TGm participants will have the opportunity to make any last minute amendments or changes. As with other process matters for TGm,

the approval of the motion will require only 50%+1 of Members present and voting.

I know that this may seem confusing, that when the RG breakouts conduct indicative straw polls the threshold for consensus is 75% of participants while when voted at the TGm the threshold is lower, only 50%+1 of Members. But the reasoning is simple: the RG consensus process is designed to provide text with nearly guaranteed opportunity for approval, while the TGm process is designed to identify and do final resolution of any outstanding matters while under review by the wider PHY/MAC community. It is usually quite difficult for minority proposals to achieve the 50%+1 approval level at TGm session when all Members realize that addition of such proposals jeopardizes total approval of the complete consensus text. Also, so long as TGm is using 50%+1 as the threshold for approval in TGm for matters it would be a violation of equal treatment and due process to enforce a process that denied Members opportunity to have their material receive final consideration at the TGm approval threshold.

9. Comment Tags

Comment tags will not be used during the process cycle for Session #58. We will be relying on individual RG commentary databases to identify and isolate RG related comments and material. And TGm will rely upon section number/page number/line number alone to identify comments related to the new topics 'Self-Organizing Networks', 'Femtocells', and 'Relay'. All other comments in the TGm general comment database will be resolved as general comments against the existing SDD text, to be resolved by either the PHY or MAC track sessions, respectively.

10. Meeting time at Session #58

After discussions with Brian and Roger regarding facilities and scheduling for the IEEE 802.16 Session #58 the week of November 10 in Dallas, Texas, USA he has decided that there will parallel TGm meeting schedule tracks for the week: PHY, and MAC. Two rooms are scheduled for further subdivision, breakouts or side meetings during the day. This would be one room more than we enjoyed at Session #57. However, 802.16 may be compelled to release one of these rooms back to 802 so will likely instead only have the single breakout room. All SDD comment resolution work is planned to be conducted in the single PHY session track, or single MAC session track with a common TGm opening and closing.

The PHY and MAC sessions will process and decide on the SDD comments received as well as the harmonized/consensus outputs of the various Rapporteur Groups chartered to complete work in the interval between Session #57 and #58 with the intent to deliver harmonized/consensus SDD text of sufficient detail and completeness such that Stage 3 text may be written based on the accepted SDD text. While the Rapporteur Groups chartered to work between Session #57 and Session #58 may wish more time to conduct face-to-face final discussions and complete harmonization/consensus building, there is only limited facility and time to provide such opportunity at Session #58.

This means the Rapporteur Groups chartered to work between Session #57 and Session #58 by necessity MUST complete the vast majority of harmonization activity PRIOR TO the beginning of Session #58.

As Session #58 approaches you will have opportunity to make request for specific allocations for your final consensus F2F discussions at Session #58. We will attempt to accommodate your requests as much as possible. But excessive requests, especially as a substitute for a lack of activity between sessions or due to substantial inability to develop consensus are unlikely to be honored. Your goal should be to avoid needing any F2F meeting time in Dallas at all. If you need time, it had better be limited and focused use.

11. Answers to Previously Received Questions

Q: Frankly speaking, I don't think many chairs conducted their meetings STRICTLY according to the Robert's Rule. And I don't think it is realistic. When we have multiple sessions going, people move in and out. Should we take a roll call at the beginning of the meeting (say, 9am sharp), and ignore all the members who come in afterwards? (There was a couple of incidence in the DL MIMO RG that at one point people flooded into the room and somebody made motions to stop the ongoing technical discussion and forced a vote, which, in my opinion, is very disruptive and against the objective of the RG to have thorough investigations of important technical matters to ensure the quality of the system we design. Should we allow this to happen in the future?)

A: **Working Group Chairs are not obligated by the IEEE-SA or 802 to conduct meetings in strict accordance to Robert's Rules of Order. The 802 P&P only indicates that Robert's Rules SHOULD be used, not that they MUST be used. However, 802.16 has a long history, demonstrated precedence of adherence to the form of Robert's Rules. A good guideline is: requisite bureaucracy. You should adhere to Robert's Rules to the extent to maintain good order and decorum in your Group proceedings. Also remember that it is difficult to impose order, once order has been lost. So you must anticipate when things may be getting out of control and increase your adherence to deliberate process before things become uncontrollable. Also remember that procedures like Roll-Call votes are spelled out in the 802 P&P, so you MUST adhere to that procedure, when called upon, just as you must adhere to any procedure specifically identified in the 802 P&P or IEEE-SA OM regardless of any adherence to Robert's Rules. Finally, as I identified in my previous email, you have the same duties and obligations as the TG Chair, just as he has the same duties and obligations as the WG Chair. And the WG Chair duties and obligations are most certainly enumerated in the 802 P&P. If you want to know what you must do, look to the WG section, and to the WG Chair duties in the 802 P&P.**

Q: About voting. My understanding is that the RG needs to address all the comments submitted to the RG. A lot of times, the members in the room have different opinions. Voting seems to be the way of moving forward, as seen in the TGm and in all RGs so far. Do the RG chairs have the right to conduct a vote?

A: **Again, activity at F2F meetings is different than conducting activity between meetings. When there is a Call for Comments with comments to be resolved at a F2F meeting, the TG may empower a subgroup of itself to resolve those comments. That is the subgroup's mandate. Sometimes we call these subgroups Rapporteur Groups. They have whatever authority the TG grants, including voting and resolving comments. At the end of the F2F meeting week the TG, in its TG Closing, acts to approve the subgroup resolution of comments, and the WG, in its WG Closing, acts to approve the TG resolution of comments. The RG may have further mandate granted by the TG to review contributions received on a given topic, to conduct harmonization and consensus building, in addition to any work to resolve comments received in response to a Call for Comments.**

Call for Comments are a precedent convention used in 802.16 similar and less formal than a WG Letter Ballot. Just as with a WG Letter Ballot, commenters are making comments to improve a draft document. Unlike with a WG Letter Ballot, the entire Membership is not compelled to participate, Membership is not jeopardized by lack of participation, and a vote of Approve, Disapprove, or Abstain is not relevant.

Remember that RG activity is distinctly different at a F2F meeting versus between meetings. Between meetings the objective is consensus building to develop a single, final contribution that can be voted on and accepted at a F2F meeting. At F2F meetings the objective is to resolve any remaining conflict on proposed consensus language, including by voting, to resolve comments received in response to a Call for Comments, to review any contributions received to begin consensus building on a topic, and to do whatever else the TG empowers the RG to do.

So, answering your question of 'Do the RG chairs have the right to conduct a vote?' is not so simple. It depends on the authorization, activity, and matter. To resolve comments at a F2F meeting in response to a Call for Comments, certainly yes. To resolve matters of consensus building at a F2F meeting, yes, but with caution as this can be divisive. To resolve matters of consensus building between meetings, technically yes, but impractical.

Q: About the P&P. I went through the P&P and Operations Manual. I don't even see any description of how Task Group chairs should conduct the meetings or voting. There is no mentioning of RG at all. Who has the authority to decide how the RG meetings should be conducted? In my understanding, since it is not in the P&P, the WG chair should have his/her rights to run the WG as he sees fit. In that sense, the RG chairs' duty is derived from the duty of the TGm chair which is in turn derived from the duty of the WG chair. However, unless the TGm chair instructs specifically that all RG meetings should be conducted strictly according to the Robert's Rule, I don't see it as a

mandate. In fact, it is quite confusing to simply say the meeting should be conducted by the parliamentary process or by the Robert's Rule. How much should we adhere to it, to the full extent, or just a little bit?

A: See my comments above. An RG, as a subgroup of a TG, is empowered and conducts its activity just as the TG. The TG, as a subgroup of a WG, is empowered and conducts its activity just as a WG. If you want to know what you must do, look to the 802 P&P under WG operation for guidance. But we ALSO have precedence of 802.16 activity. Roger and Brian conduct their activity/procedure with certain adherence to Robert's Rules AND with certain use of precedent process. While as RG Chair you have certain latitude to conduct process as you determine, Roger and Brian are unlikely to be understanding to RG Chairs that conduct their process in ways other than those established in years of precedent 802.16 activity.

Q: Here are a few suggestions of how the RG discussions and meetings should be conducted. Instead of making RGs parallel meetings to vote through all the comments, I strongly recommend that the RG focus on technical matters and consensus building. We can keep all the official voting and procedural matters in TGm. In fact, as the TGm chair clarified multiple times, the members always have the opportunity to vote against any agreements that come out of an RG, if he/she is not satisfied of the outcome. Within the RG, although the "voting" does not carry authority in TGm, the "voting" (or straw-poll to be more politically correct) can be conducted and the results can be used to make a recommendation within the RG. I see this as the only way to go through the hundreds of comments that an RG needs to resolve in the limited amount of time.

A: Thanks for your suggestions for conducting voting at F2F meetings. I am sure that Brian will take them under advisement. However, the RG will do whatever the TG mandates them to do at F2F meetings. If that is to resolve comments via vote for certain technical material submitted in response to a Call for Comments, then that is what the RG will do. And we have ample precedent for doing just that. And it makes certain sense, given that only specific subject matter experts may be interested and informed on voting on certain matters. As Brian has indicated previously, if the wider TG community (or even WG community) is unhappy with what material is approved at the RG, they can always bring the matter to the attention, and possible vote, of the TG or WG.

But the short answer is: the RG does the job of the TG, just as if the TG were doing the job itself, on matters identified and delegated by the TG.

So, sometimes the TG may have the RG do consensus building. Sometimes the TG may have the RG do comment resolution. Sometimes a bit of both. Depends.

For now, the RGs have a mandate to conduct consensus building during this inter-meeting cycle, no more.