

October 17, 2005

Jerry Upton  
Chair, IEEE 802.20 Working Group

Dear Jerry:

The undersigned members of the 802.20 Working Group ("WG") are writing to you in your capacity as Chair of the WG to advise you of our concerns with specific actions taken by you and the WG at the WG's September 2005 interim session ("September Session"). We are particularly concerned with the WG's adoption of your document, C802.20-05/57r1 ("Contribution 57r1"), as the Technology Selection Process ("TSP") document at the Thursday afternoon meeting and the subsequent call for proposals distributed on September 26, 2005.

When you presented your document during the meeting, you indicated that you had made only editorial changes to the existing TSP draft, C802.20-05/46r1 ("Contribution 46r1"), and that these changes merely simplified the draft. We could not confirm this at the time because you had only provided your contribution to the WG immediately prior to the Thursday afternoon meeting. Yet when we reviewed Contribution 57r1 after the meeting, we were surprised to see that you had made a number of substantive technical revisions to Contribution 46r1 – for example, you modified Section 3.4.1 to eliminate all proposals in the initial round that do not obtain at least 35% of the vote. In our view, the changes you made to Contribution 46r1 significantly altered the intent and substance of Contribution 46r1. In our view, Contribution 46r1 more accurately reflected the consensus of the WG as developed over the previous five sessions.

In light of these facts, we ask that you invalidate the vote of the WG adopting Contribution 57r1 as the TSP document. Such action is entirely appropriate since there was no quorum at the Thursday afternoon meeting. We believe that a review of the manual sign-in book will confirm our recollection that only 38 voters, at most, attended the meeting on Thursday afternoon. It is our understanding that there are 81 voters in the WG and thus that 41 voters are required for a quorum. At the same time that you invalidate the vote, you would of course withdraw the call for proposals. The call for proposals cannot stand if no TSP document has been adopted.

Because we view this as a serious matter, we have prepared an appeal of your actions to the 802 Sponsor Executive Committee pursuant to Section 7.1.6 of the IEEE Project 802 LAN MAN Standards Committee Policies and Procedures. We anticipate filing our appeal this coming Friday. Nonetheless, we would very much prefer to resolve this matter with you in an amiable and informal fashion. To that end, we would appreciate the opportunity to speak with



you. If you let Radhakrishna Canchi know when you are available for a conference call, he will notify the other signatories to this letter and arrange for a conference bridge.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Canchi".

---

Radhakrishna Canchi  
Kyocera Telecommunications Research  
Corporation  
2480 N. First Street, Suite 280  
San Jose, CA 95131, USA  
Phone: +1-408-952-4701  
Email: [cradhak@ktrc-na.com](mailto:cradhak@ktrc-na.com)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Murakami".

---

Kazuhiro Murakami  
Kyocera Corporation  
2-1-1 Kagahara, Tsuzuki-ku,  
Yokohama, KANAGAWA 224-8502  
JAPAN  
Phone: +81 45 943 6102  
Email: [kazuhiro.murakami.xm@kyocera.jp](mailto:kazuhiro.murakami.xm@kyocera.jp)

cc: Paul Nikolich, Chair of IEEE 802  
Glenn Manishin, Esq.  
Joan M. Griffin, Esq.