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Abstract

This document contains minutes of IEEE 802.11 Regulatory Ad Hoc meeting in Los Angeles.

**January 18, 2011 (Tuesday) AM 10:30 – 12:30**

Notes – Tuesday, January 18th, 2010; with 15+ attendees

1. Peter Ecclesine (Cisco) as acting Chair called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM local time.
2. Dave Halasz (Aclara) as recording secretary for this meeting.
3. Proposed agenda in submission 11/106
4. At end of agenda, added a discussion of India regulatory situation
5. No objection to agenda in submission 11/106r1
6. Administrative items
   1. Chair went through slides 4, 5, 6 and 7 of submission 11/106r1
   2. Review of meeting minutes
      1. **MOTION: Approve the 802.11 Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee minutes from Dallas: 11-10-1443-00-0reg-Dallas-2010-meeting-minutes posted 12-Dec-2010 10:22:31**

**Moved by: Dave Halasz, Aclara**

**Seconded by: Jim Lansford, CSR**

**Discussion on the motion? None**

**Vote: 17-0-1 Motion passes**

1. Regulatory Summary – North America, slide 9 of 11/106r1
   1. Brief discussion
2. FCC 10-174 Petition, slide 10 of 11/106r1
   1. Q: Out of band emmisions. How different is WiFi vs Motorola?
   2. Comment: Absolute rather than relative.
   3. Comment: Search 04 186 for comments on proceedings
3. Regulatory Summary – European Union, slide 11 of 11/106r1
   1. ERM TG11 – EN 300 328
      1. Q: Do we need attendance at EN 300 328?
      2. Comment: Regulatory Ad Hoc Chair has traveled in the past. It would be good to have some attendance from 802.11 knowledgeable person.
      3. Q: When is the next meeting?
      4. Comment: First week of February
      5. Comment: Will be difficult to find people to attend in time.
      6. Q: Will Edgar Vangeel attend?
      7. Comment: Believe yes
      8. Q: Do we think we will have sufficient representation?
      9. Comment: Need to recruit more attendance
      10. Comment: Try to recruit from Europe since European based
   2. ETSI BRAN EN 301 893
      1. Comment: This is the radar bands. Wider than 20 MHz. Non controversial.
4. Critical Issues Action, NOI FCC 10-198, slides 13 & 14 of 11/106r1
   1. Chair reviews submission 11/104r0
   2. Comment: Paragraph 48 and 50 are the most important
   3. Q: When is response needed?
   4. Comment: Feb 28 day when response is needed
   5. Comment: This is more of a research topic than a rules change.
   6. Comment: But this doesn't make a rules change.
   7. Comment: This is a notice of inquiry.
   8. Chair: Reason it is critical is because there is a date when response is needed.
   9. Comment - Regarding 10-198, not sure how we will get a response out and past .18 in time.
   10. What can we wo in an hour and 10 minutes?
   11. What is important to make comment on? Against 10-198A1
   12. 48 Real time databases. Submission 11/104 has series of suggestions.
   13. Comment: The comments are general. Suggest we make general responses.
   14. From 10-198A1, Highlighted by chair
       1. An alternative approach for enabling dynamic spectrum use is to extend the concepts underlying the rules for Television Band Devices to additional spectrum bands. Under such a system, devices would rely on a real-time database to obtain up-to-the-minute information on spectrum availability for any given location
   15. Comment: Interest from .11 is to avoid strict license access. Rather it is in shared spectrum.
   16. Comment: We are experienced in sharing in response times well under 1 minute. And expect to be be ever more secure and more timely responsive to the other authorized spectrum users.
   17. **STRAWPOLL: Guideline of 802.11 to 802.18 on response to FCC 10-198 NOI**
       1. **We believe the real time database approach provides a scalable solution. Knowing geolocation is ever less expensive, in ever more circumstances. The interest of most of our members is not in exlusively licensed spectrum, rather it is in shared use spectrum. We are experienced in response times well under one minute and expect to be ever more timely and securely responsive to the other authorized spectrum users.**
       2. **Results for above 20 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain**
       3. **Sometime after 2:30 is when .11 will discuss with 802.18**
5. Regulatory situation in India
   1. Comment: How can we influence regulators in India? Currently regulators are looking at making bands licensed. Wouldn't we want to promote unlicensed below 1 GHz. Follow TVWS in FCC and Ofcom.
   2. Comment: Wouldn't it be in .11 interest for shared access?
   3. Comment: Will be difficult and long process.
   4. Discussion by Sid Shetty on regulatory situation in India.
      1. Helpful link, wpc.dot.gov.in/DocFiles/IITB\_proposal\_TV\_White\_Space.pdf
      2. Presenting what is being done in the rest of the world.
      3. Q: What would you like to see happen next?
      4. Q: Asked for some background on Indian Institute of Technology Bombay
      5. Comment: Similar to Berkley but industry funds 90% approx
      6. Comment: Need to understand the competing interests.
      7. Comment: Responses given so far are mostly licensed
      8. Q: What date is a timeline?
      9. Comment: Feedback will be looked at in March
      10. Comment: Discussion will come up in mid week plenary
6. Meeting adgurned at 12:25