

**in030176**

January 29, 2003

To: INCITS Executive Board (Standards Development Board)

Subject: Investigation of INCITS T20

Reference: INCITS 2002-N1160 (Letter From S. Miller Associates)  
INCITS 2002-N1161 (Letter from RF Technologies)  
INCITS 2002-N1162 (Letter from I-Ray)  
INCITS 2002-N1163 (Letter from Sovereign Tracking Systems)

From: John Neumann (Liaison to T20)

The allegations contained in all four documents revolve around the following three themes:

1. Committee reluctance to discuss or consider alternative technologies
2. Chairman's control of the meeting by limiting debate
3. Chairman's remarks concerning his company's purchasing decisions

The authors of documents N1160 and N1161 were interviewed over the phone. The author of N1162 is not available since his company has apparently gone out of business. The author of N1163 was interviewed in person at the recent meeting of T20. The chairman of T20 was also interviewed at the T20 meeting. I attended the T20 meeting on January 29, 2003 in Mesa, Arizona.

Of note, the authors of N1160 and N1161 indicated they are no longer participating in T20 for financial reasons. Clearly the author of N1162 is also no longer participating in the work of T20. Only the author of N1163 remains an active member of T20.

In addition to discussions with the authors and the chairman, documents related to the committee activities (minutes) have also been reviewed.

Summary:

The formation of T20 was authorized by INCITS at its July 2001 meeting following a presentation by Don Deutsch on behalf of Craig Harmon, chair of T6. Upon his recommendation, a separate committee was formed to deal with the proposed program of work (RTLS). While there is no record in the INCITS minutes of asking Craig Harmon to convene the first meeting of this TC, he did so. During the first meeting the program of work was discussed and Mr. Graham was "nominated and elected by the committee to be the chairman". Mr. Graham then nominated and the "committee elected the vice chairman". During my interview with Mr. Graham, it was his impression that this action was appropriate and final, thus he did not respond to the call for officer candidates issued

by Jennifer Garner (T20-01N06) since he believed he was already the chairman. He finally put paperwork in to cause a third call for candidates to be issued, and was subsequently elected by INCITS. This is mentioned here because the authors of the three letters I talked with believed at that point that the process was rigged and that they would not be able to influence or otherwise affect the outcome of the work in T20. This frustration leads to the first complaint of the authors.

I have taken great pains to educate the authors on procedures and have invited them to submit their own Project Proposal for consideration by the committee. I have also offered to review their proposal to make sure it is correct and reflects the procedures of INCITS. The author of N1163 indicated that he had written a letter to Marsha Harmon (secretary) proposing a new project, but that she declined to put this on an agenda for discussion. I noted to him that he needs to submit a project proposal, and that he should use as a guide the existing project proposal within T20 as the basis for his proposal should he decide to submit one prior to the next meeting. I also offered to review this draft prior to submission. I also indicated that should the committee decline to work on the project, that there are other avenues he can use, including the INCITS Fast Track process.

The second complaint revolves around a decision by the chair to limit discussion on certain items on the agenda by not allowing individual discussion to exceed two minutes per person. He was unaware that this is a decision that can only be taken by the committee by a motion to limit debate according to Roberts Rules. He is now aware of this and I further pointed out that the procedures of INCITS are quite clear with respect to the conduct of meetings, and what is not in our procedures can be found in Roberts Rules (the secondary controlling document). He is also aware that he needs to be familiar with these rules so that he can conduct an orderly proper meeting in the future without assuming responsibility for decisions delegated to the members by the governing rules.

With respect to the third complaint by the authors, the chairman believes that his comments were misinterpreted. It is his position that he made it clear that he was speaking as the representative of General Motors (his employer) and not as chair, and that as a matter of policy, GM will not buy IT products that are not covered by industry standards. The implication is that if you don't provide products in this technology that conform to this new standard, GM will not buy from you.

The current three-part standard was approved by letter ballot for submission to INCITS for further processing. The committee has a further meeting planned for mid-April to deal with Public Review comments and make further decisions relative to progressing the document internationally. It is clear that they also intend to probably move to maintenance status as soon as this project is finished. Given this situation, I would be surprised if they would agree to undertake work on a new project at the next meeting.

Recommendations:

No further action is recommended.