

IEEE 802 Emergency Services Executive Committee Study Group
Atlanta 802 Plenary Session, November, 2009

The meeting was called to order by Geoff Thompson/ Chair of the Study Group

He discussed study group decorum (see slide)

He then asked the participants to each introduce themselves and provide their affiliations.

The following are those who attended during the day. Those listed were not necessarily present for the entire meeting.

Geoff Thompson	InterDigital
Scott Henderson	RIM
Anthony Magee	ADVA Optical Networking
Kim Chang	Huawei
Nancy Bravin	Self
Andrew Myles	Cisco
Paul Nicolich	YAS/BBV LLC
Terry Cobb	CommScope

The IEEE patent policy for pre-PAR study groups was reviewed and there was an explanation of the study group's copyright policy based on what is expected to be the (forthcoming) IEEE-SA copyright policy.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the actions leading to the creation of the ECSG in July.
(Text from the EC slide)

Motion to form Emergency Services ECSG

As finally voted by EC on Friday

Request the IEEE 802 Executive Committee to create an IEEE 802 ECSG to address Emergency Services issues in IEEE 802 networks with the following objectives:

- Develop an architecture (scope(s) and purpose(s)) as to how to fit Emergency Services into the IEEE 802 architecture (i.e., state the problem in terms that we can deal with).
- Define, in conjunction with upper layer SDOs, L2 requirements (including regulatory requirements) to support ES for IEEE 802 technologies
- Develop a set of PAR/5C to satisfy the above requirements
- Moved: Vivek Gupta
- Seconded: Pat Thaler

Andrew Myles opened the meeting with the comment that he was of the opinion that the entire project was a bad idea and should be abandoned.

There was a free form discussion of where we are going as a project, the boundaries of our scope with respect to the problems we are addressing and possible solutions.

We also discussed how this project moved from 802.21 to an ECSG. That was followed with discussions of what kind of solutions we are addressing along with what informal discussions have taken place with other groups (IETF-ECRIT and The 6th Stds SDO Emergency Services Workshop)

The location of person making the emergency calls and mapping it back to the appropriate piece of the network whose location is known is a major portion of the project problem.

Emergency Services requirements are imposed by regulatory authorities. In the US, this is the FCC and those requirements are already in place. (see: <http://www.fcc.gov/pshs/services/911-services/enhanced911/> (this URL was not provided during the meeting))

The requirements are mandatory and are already being implemented by wireless carriers. The service agreement notifications that they do not provide 911 service have been deemed by courts to not relieve carriers of their ES responsibilities.

Our job is to determine what is the 802 part of that. For the initial 802 project it is the Chair's desire to limit the scope to 911 calls over VOIP. It is hoped that this will limit the requirements we have to meet to those provided by IETF-ECRIT and therefore provide a sufficiently narrow scope to allow a crisp manageable project that we can get 802 to support.

This was followed by a discussion of how the sequence of packets and packet exchange associated with the emergency call will need to have unique location information to give across the network

It was agreed that there was a need for a dictionary of terms for the terminology associated with Emergency Services in order to get everybody on the same page.

The ES requirements are for a local breakout/location/ 90% of the time to within 150 feet. If we can not do 150 feet, then we will do the best that we can.

Our assumption for our “breakout” approach is that VoIP service with PSAP access is available at the router at the edge of the 802 Layer 2 network. Every ‘commercial router’ will have to be a VoIP service access point.

We discussed conversations that were had by 802.21 and those that Geoff and Scott had with other organizationsrelative to where we are going to target for our proposed approach to the ES problem. Specifically, that we feel that we can do a more satisfactory job of meeting all of the requirements with an approach that recognizes an Emergency Call at the source terminal and routes it via a dedicated 802 emergency VLAN. The result of this will be that the call will be originated at a local router rather than a SIP server service at the head of any normal VPN normally servicing the source terminal.

(Jan 14, 2010, 9:00 AM) MOTION to approve the attached minutes, Atlanta

Moved by: Scott Henderson

2nd by: Bob Moskowitz

Approve __5__ No_0__ Abstain_0_ PASS