

OPENING REMARKS – part 1  
London Meeting  
January 2007

LET US BEGIN TODAY WITH A REMINDER AND REFOCUS OF OUR PURPOSE HERE TODAY AND FOR THAT MATTER, OUR PURPOSE AS MEMBERS OF 802.20.

WE ARE HERE TO PRODUCE A STANDARD! I, AS YOUR CHAIR, WILL AGGRESSIVELY TAKE STEPS TO ENSURE THAT ALL OF THE PEOPLE WHO ATTEND THE PROCEEDINGS OF 802.20 ARE ENGAGED IN, AND DEDICATED TO, THAT PURPOSE. I CAUTION ALL THAT ACTIVITIES TARGETED SOLEY TO OBSTRUCT, DELAY OR AVOID THE SOLE GOAL OF THIS WORKING GROUP TO CREATE A STANDARD, WILL BE RESPONDED TO STRONGLY AND PURPOSELY. THIS COULD INCLUDE THE REMOVAL OF VOTING RIGHTS.

I ALSO WILL REITERATE THAT ACHIEVING OUR GOAL OF PRODUCING A STANDARD WILL BE DONE FAIRLY, OPENLY AND EVEN CONGENIALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY. WE WILL MOVE FORWARD WITH ALL DUE SPEED, BUT WE WILL NOT DO SO AT THE SACRIFICE OF DUE PROCESS. EVERYONE WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD. THE VIEWS OF EVERYONE WILL BE TREATED WITH COURTESY AND RESPECT. WE WILL OPERATE OPENLY. WE WILL FOLLOW THE RULES SET DOWN BY OUR SPONSOR GROUPS; THE IEEE

STANDARDS ASSOCIATION, AND THE 802 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

I HAVE BEEN GIVEN SOME SPECIAL AND EXTRAORDINARY AUTHORITY TO MODIFY OR EVEN IGNORE SOME OF THE RULES OF THE 802.20 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOAL. I WILL BE VERY JUDICIOUS IN THE MANNER IN WHICH I EXERCISE THAT AUTHORITY AND VERY CONSCIOUS OF MY NEED TO RESPECT THE RESPONSIBILITY THAT IS ATTENDANT TO THAT AUTHORITY.

WE ARE MOST DEFINITELY NOT HERE TO KEEP A STANDARD FROM BEING PUBLISHED BECAUSE WE BELIEVE A SUPERIOR STANDARD EXISTS ELSEWHERE OR BECAUSE OUR CORPORATE SPONSOR HAS INVESTED IN AN ALTERNATIVE STANDARD OR APPROACH. IT IS THE PUBLIC THAT WILL DECIDE WHICH OF TWO ALTERNATIVE STANDARDS WILL BE SUCCESSFUL IN THE MARKET PLACE. IT IS NOT AND MUST NOT BE THE DECISION OF ENGINEERS GATHERED IN A WORKING GROUP TO PRECLUDE THE DECISION OF THE MARKET PLACE BY THE PROCESS OF DELAY.

IN SUMMARY – WE ARE NOT HERE TO RUSH A STANDARD TO PUBLICATION WITHOUT DUE CARE, CONSIDERATION AND CONCERN FOR THE VIEWS AND INPUTS OF OUR COLLEAGUES WHO PROVIDE GUIDANCE INTENDED TO MAKE THE STANDARD THAT WE PRODUCE BETTER. NOR ARE WE HERE

TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE MARKETING PLANS OF ANY TECHNOLOGY VENDOR TO RUSH A STANDARD TO PUBLICATION OR TO ENSURE THAT THE STANDARD FAILS TO BE PUBLISHED BECAUSE THEY ENDORSE A COMPETITIVE APPROACH. TO DO EITHER IS A VIOLATION OF THE CODE OF ETHICS OF THE IEEE AND 802 AS WELL AS THE CODE OF ETHICS AND HONORABLE PRINCIPLES OF THE ENGINEERING PROFESSION THAT WE SHOULD BE COMMITTED TO UPHOLD.

AS YOUR CHAIR AND AS THE CHAIR OF THE 802 OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE THAT IS CHARTERED TO INVESTIGATE SEEMING VIOLATIONS OF THE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES THAT WE MUST FOLLOW, I AM COMMITTED TO BOTH PRODUCE A PROPER STANDARD IN A PROPER WAY IN THE SHORTEST REASONABLE TIME AND REMOVE IMPEDIMENTS WITHIN THIS WORKING GROUP TO ACHIEVE THAT GOAL WHEN AND IF I BECOME CONVINCED THAT SUCH IMPEDIMENTS EXIST AND ARE ACTING IN A MANNER ONLY TO BLOCK RATHER THAN SUPPORT PROGRESS.

OPENING REMARKS – part 2  
ACTIVITIES – LONDON MEETING

FROM A REVIEW OF THE AGENDA YOU WILL SEE THAT I HAVE PLANNED A VERY HEAVY WORKLOAD FOR THIS WEEK. WE WILL HAVE TWO MAJOR FOCUSES. WE WILL REVIEW THE BASE DOCUMENT COMMENTS THAT HAD IN THE PAST BEEN REJECTED BY THE COMMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE. WE ARE DOING THIS FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS. FIRST, THERE HAD BEEN CRITICISIM THAT THE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THESE COMMENTS HAD NOT BEEN DONE OPENLY. THUS WE WILL REVIEW THE REJECTED COMMENTS OPENLY IN COMMITTEE AND SEE IF WE CONCUR THAT THE REJECTION WAS APPROPRIATE OR IF NOT, HOW THE COMMENTS SHOULD BE INTEGRATED INTO THE BASE DOCUMENT. IN OUR REVIEW AND DISCUSSION, IF ANYONE HERE FEELS THAT A COMMENT WAS IMPROPERLY REJECTED I WILL EXPECT THEM TO COME FORTH WITH CHAPTER AND VERSE AS TO HOW THE REJECTED COMMENT SHOULD BE INTEGRATED INTO THE BASE DOCUMENT. SUGGESTIONS THAT A COMMENT SOMEHOW, SOMEWAY, SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE.

I AM ALSO REVIEWING ALL OF THE PREVIOUSLY REJECTED COMMENTS IN THE HOPE THAT WHEN WE ARE DONE THE BASE DOCUMENT WILL BE AS CLEAN, AS COHERENT AND AS

COMPLETE AS POSSIBLE. THIS WILL FACILITATE MY PLAN TO REOPEN THE PROPOSAL SUBMITAL PROCESS. I WILL INVITE ALL WHO WISH TO SUBMIT A COMPLETE OR PARTIAL PROPOSAL TO DO SO. I WILL ALSO ASK THESE SUBMITTERS TO, IF POSSIBLE, TARGET OUR BASE DOCUMENT. THAT IS REQUESTED IN THE HOPE THAT OUR BASE DOCUMENT WILL BE SUFFICIENTLY STRONG, SO THAT SUBMITTERS WILL BE ABLE TO EXTEND, ENHANCE AND IMPROVE THIS BASE DOCUMENT IN A REALITIVELY SEAMLESS MANNER. IN THE CASE OF COMPLETELY NEW PROPOSALS, SHOULD WE RECEIVE THEM, A SOLID BASE DOCUMENT WILL PROVIDE A SOLID BASIS FOR ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIVE MERITS AND SUBSEQUENT BASIS FOR CHOICE. MY PLANS ARE TO ALLOW 60 DAYS FOR SUBMITTALS AND WE SHOULD BE READY TO DISCUSS THESE SUBMITTALS AT OUR NEXT MEETING.

THE SECOND MAJOR EFFORT PLANNED FOR THIS WEEK IS DISCUSSION OF THE 802.20 REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT, CHANNEL MODELING DOCUMENT AND TECHNOLOGY SELECTION PROCESS DOCUMENT. WE DID THIS ON AN OVERVIEW BASIS AT OUR LAST MEETING IN DALLAS. AT THIS MEETING I WILL ASK THAT THOSE THAT FEEL THAT CHANGES ARE IMPERITIVE TO OUR PREDECESSOR DOCUMENTS ACTUALLY CREATE THE CHAPTER AND VERSE THAT THEY FEEL ARE NECESSARY. IT WILL NOT BE ENOUGH TO MERELY EXPRESS DISSATISFACTION WITH ANY AREA OF OUR DOCUMENTS. I WILL ASK AND EXPECT THAT THE EXPLICIT

CHANGES THOUGHT TO BE NECESSARY BE PRODUCED AND PREPARED FOR REVIEW CONSIDERATION AND VOTE BY THE WORKING GROUP. THIS APPROACH SHOULD PUT TO BED AND CLEAN UP THE ISSUES THAT MAY EXIST IN OUR DOCUMENT SET WHICH LED TO OUR BASE DOCUMENT. IT WILL ALSO PROVIDE A CLEARER POINT OF REFERENCE FOR THOSE WHO MAY WISH TO SUBMIT PARTIAL OR FULL PROPOSALS IN THE SIXTY DAYS PRIOR TO THE ORLANDO MEETING. THIS EFFORT SHOULD ALSO, I HOPE AND EXPECT, PUT TO BED ANY FEELINGS OF DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF SEGMENTS OF OUR WORKING GROUP THAT FEEL THEIR VIEWS ARE NOT RESPECTED AND TAKEN SERIOUSLY. THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO EFFECTIVELY PROMULGATE YOUR VIEWS AND MITIGATE YOUR CONCERNS.

### OPENING REMARKS – part 3

IN OUR EFFORTS TO PRODUCE A STANDARD WE WILL, OF COURSE, TRY TO CREATE A GOOD STANDARD. AT THE SAME TIME WE MUST ALSO REMEMBER THAT WE ARE NOT HERE TO PRODUCE A PERFECT STANDARD. NO ONE HAS EVER DONE SO. KNOWING THIS, THE IEEE HAS PUT IN PLACE THE MEANS FOR EVOLVING AND IMPROVING STANDARDS ONCE THEY HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED. I ASK THAT YOU REMEMBER THIS IN THE PROCESS OF REVIEW AND COMMENTARY. THIS IS NOT A SUGGESTION THAT WE ALLOW CLEAR AND PRESENT PROBLEMS THAT ARE IDENTIFIED TO GO UNADDRESSED. IT IS A REQUEST THAT IN OUR REVIEW AND COMMENTARY WE BE REASONABLE, PRACTICAL AND COGNIZANT OF THE VALUE OF TIME AND EFFORT IN RESPECT TO THE CHANGES THAT WE RECOMMEND OR DESIRE.