

# APCO REPORTS



## ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC-SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS OFFICIALS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

2040 S. Ridgewood Ave., South Daytona, Florida 32119-8437 U.S.A.

(904) 322-2500 • Fax (904) 322-2501 • (800) 949-APCO

Volume 8 •• 1993 •• Number 10

# Common Air Interface Selected By Project 25

## ALSO: *Reports on Project 25 Meetings In Minnesota and Washington, D.C.*

**T**he Project 25 Common Air Interface (CAI) has been selected by the Steering Committee, and work will now begin on the critical issues associated with digital trunked radio systems and encryption.

APCO President Frank Huggins said the CAI selection "is an important first installment in our proposed comprehensive suite of digital trunked radio standards." Project 25 Co-Chairman Steven Proctor, APCO's President-Elect, said the selection of the CAI "is a giant leap forward to our next task of completing the recommended trunking standards and moving on to begin work on the 6.25 kHz, or so-called narrowband standards."

The Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) gave the Steering Committee a detailed recommendation for the CAI and the Committee received it and accepted the recommendation at its quarterly meeting on October 29 in Bloomington, Minnesota.

*The following is the news release issued by Project 25:*

APCO, the National Association of State Telecommunications Directors (NASTD) and numerous federal agencies have been working with the Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) for more than four years to develop a suite of technical standards for digital land mobile radios. In its inception, the effort was named Project 25, and managed by a group of public safety professionals, known as the Project 25 Steering Committee, who have been designated by their agency and/or national association to represent them. Combined, the group represents a major portion of the public safety radio users in the United States.

Today, the APCO 25 Steering Committee is pleased to announce the Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) has forwarded to them a detailed recommendation for a Project 25 Common Air Interface (CAI). TIA President Allen Frischkorn advised the Committee he was pleased to pass along the CAI, which was "approved for transmittal" to the Committee "by a 2/3 majority" of TIA's TR-8.15 technical subcommittee. The Steering Committee announced receipt and acceptance of this recommendation at its quarterly Steering Committee meeting held in Bloomington, Minnesota, on October 29, 1993.

APCO President Frank Huggins said that accepting this report is an important first installment in our proposed comprehensive suite of digital trunked radio standards. This first step will provide APCO, NASTD, our federal government partners and the manufacturers of land mobile equipment a solid foundation to begin developing the public safety telecommunications systems of the future.

President Huggins said he was particularly pleased by the international scope of this project with the involvement of the British Home Office, APCO Canada, GEC-Marconi, Stanilite and a number of other international manufacturers and users. "The dimension they have brought to this process has been outstanding," Huggins said.

NASTD President Ray Penrod said the Project 25 process represents the wave of the future, "where the consumer and industry work hand-in-hand to solve problems and find solutions." He

pointed out that the release of this document in the very near future will help achieve the federal government's objective to begin implementing 12.5 kHz systems by the spring of 1995.

Penrod's sentiments were shared by Don Speights of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, who said, "Although the CAI primary focus is on 'conventional systems,' it is critical to achieving the spectrum utilization objective we have established within the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)." Speights, one of the federal representatives on the Project 25 Steering Committee, went on to say, "The federal agencies I represent will be the first to benefit from the better than 100% improvement in spectrum utilization that will be derived from accepting this recommended standard."

**W**ith the release of the CAI, the Project 25 Steering Committee has asked TIA and its many working Task Groups to focus on the critical issues associated with digital trunked radio systems and encryption.

Project 25 Co-Chairman Steven Proctor said, "I am convinced our future depends on being able to provide a graceful migration path to the future and the past. The recommended standards we are adopting in the CAI provides us that path, while protecting both our existing and future financial investments. Although the CAI is but a first step, it is a giant leap forward to our next task of completing the recommended trunking standards and moving on to begin work on the 6.25 kHz, or so-called narrowband standards."

"While the Steering Committee is delighted with the progress it has made, it owes a deep gratitude to all of the project participants and particularly TIA and its many members," said Craig Jorgensen, Co-Chairman. He went on to say, "Most of our users are unaware of the massive amounts of time and money that all manufacturers have put into this process. The ethical and honest way the majority of these national and international companies have conducted themselves is a credit to the individual participants, the corporations they work for and the countries they are from. The Steering Committee is extremely proud to be able to work with such a dedicated and hard-working group of telecommunications professionals."

*The following is a list of participants in Project 25:*

State of California	State of Colorado
State of Florida	State of Georgia
State of Minnesota	State of New Jersey
State of Oklahoma	State of Utah
State of Wyoming	University of California
State of Delaware	State of Kentucky
State of New York	State of Virginia
County of Orange, California	
Association of Public-Safety Communications	Officials-International, Inc.
APCO Canada	
British Home Office	
National Association of State Telecommunications Directors	
Northern California Chapter of APCO	
Telecommunications Industry Association	
Defense Information Systems Agency	
Department of Energy	
Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)	

Federal Bureau of Investigation  
National Communications System  
National Telecommunications & Information Administration

U.S. Department of Defense  
U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service  
U.S. Park Service  
U.S. Secret Service  
U.S. Treasury

Bendix/King Inc.	Clearsoft Inc.
Dataradio Inc.	Transcript International
E.F. Johnson Company	Ericsson GE
Harris Corporation	MATRA Corporation
Miter Corporation	Motorola Inc.
NTT America	Phillips Communications
Racal Communications	Raytheon Service
Teleresources PIC	TeleTec Corporation
Union Pacific Railroad	Cycomm Corporation
GEC-Marconi Glenayre	MX COM
Midland International	Quantum Telecommunications
Stanilite Electronics	
Digital Voice Systems Inc. (DVSI)	

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** The following reports on two recent Project 25 meetings were prepared and submitted by the APCO Project 25 Steering Committee. The descriptions and opinions used herein are those of the APCO Project 25 Steering Committee report author(s).

## Washington, D.C. - September 1993

**I**n spite of a number of procedural challenges, the Project 25 recommended standards process remains on track and accelerating in progress. The Project 25 Steering committee, its partners in the Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) and interested users have been moving forward aggressively to ensure the entire Project 25 process reaches a successful conclusion.

A lively and sometimes confrontational meeting in New Orleans culminated with a clear majority of the participants ready to move forward with the pending issues surrounding the Common Air Interface (CAI).

The September TIA/USER meetings in Washington, D.C., began with TIA's various committees reviewing the minutes of the previous month's meeting, then launching directly into continuing standards work. The TIA-TR-8.15 Committee provided the most animated discussions because of the pending vote on the CAI, and what some considered to be TIA's arbitrary voting standards. That meeting was opened by Chairman George Kamerer, who quickly asked for approval to modify the agenda, allowing TIA's Vice President Peter Bennett an opportunity to discuss TIA's controversial decision on the so-called "default ballot."

Bennett presented a number of slides outlining TIA's position. He told the group that consensus could not just be defined in "purely numerical terms" but had to reflect a willingness to "consent." He reminded the attendees that TIA's voting process is very formal and requires strict compliance to the requirement that

there be a consensus for any proposed standard or interim standard.

Bennett then advised the TR-8.15 Committee that he and his staff did not feel the CAI subcommittee had reached the consensus requirement to become a "TIA Standard" because only 66% of the participants were in favor of making the CAI a TIA standard. He also said he felt the complaint from a TIA member, that the August 10, 1993, TIA-TR-8.15 default ballot was not in conformance with the TIA engineering manual, was valid and would be upheld by TIA. He didn't say which member complained, but there appeared to be little doubt among the Committee members.

Bennett also expressed concern that the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TIA and the Project 25 Steering Committee would not allow them to produce either a Standard or an Interim standard, due in large measure to the fact that TIA does not maintain total control over the process. In his opinion, the current MOU only allows TIA to act in an advisory roll and recommend standards to Project 25, which they are doing in the case of the CAI.

The subtle, yet distinct delineation, therefore, must be drawn between an APCO-recommended standard prepared by TIA and a "TIA" standard developed in the same process. Therefore, APCO can adopt the "recommended CAI standard" as its base-line standard, but TIA cannot yet adopt it as a TIA interim standard because the TR-8.15 Committee vote was one vote short of a 7-2 TIA staff requirement for consensus on this document.

### To Seek a Resolution

**B**oth APCO and TIA have resolved to continue to seek resolution of outstanding issues in an effort to obtain TIA's required 75% consensus; it will, however, no doubt be a long and arduous process.

After Bennett completed his presentation, TR-8.15's dedicated and hard-working Chairman, George Kameroner, Bendix/ King, strongly objected to what he considers TIA's interference in the process. He pointed out to Bennett that in his opinion the engineering manual is "vague" but does say that, "If a clear consensus is believed to exist" it is reasonable to proceed with a default ballot. In addition, he felt the complaining TIA members "distorted" the issues and failed to present all the facts.

Kameroner was unhappy because he felt the TIA staff failed to consider three other important issues that were extremely relevant to their decision-making process. Particularly troubling to Kameroner was TIA's failure to consider that he had informally polled his members and had received a clear indication that he had the potential support to obtain the 2/3 majority required to pass a letter ballot.

Kameroner went on to say that in his opinion the decision to require a 7-2 margin in favor of publishing was an "arbitrary" decision made by TIA and its staff and could not be supported by either written policy or the engineering manual. The debate ended with the "consensus" to agree to disagree on the appropriateness of the CAI ballot and TIA rulings. However, almost everyone agreed to move on and continue the rest of the current project work in the spirit of cooperation and support.

### A Series of Motions

**T**he TR-8.15 Committee then turned its attention to a series of motions, beginning with a motion by Kameroner to continue under the TIA rules of order as an advisory body to

Project 25 for the Common Air Interface. The motion was seconded and passed with Bendix/King, Cycomm, E.F. Johnson, GEC-Marconi, Harris, Motorola, MX-COM Inc. voting "yes." A single "no" vote was cast by Ericsson GE.

The next motion Kameroner made was to authorize the TR-8.15 Committee to forward the current version of the CAI document as a standard recommendation to the Project 25 Steering Committee. This motion was temporarily tabled by the offerer because of a procedural problem in allowing Harris Corp. another opportunity to express its concerns with the CAI.

Kameroner then made a motion to strongly recommend to TIA that it initiate discussions with the Project 25 Steering Committee to modify the MOU to permit the formulation of a joint Project 25/TIA standards process. The motion was seconded and passed by a 9-0 vote.

The Chairman then turned the floor over to Fred Anders of Harris Corp. to present his objection to Kameroner's tabled motion to forward the CAI to the Project 25 Steering Committee as a recommended standard. Anders said his company's objections included the following: (1) The CAI does not contain criteria for the radio IF filter; (2) Harris questions how contentions will be handled for voice and data on a single channel; (3) Harris Corp. wants to know more about error protection of symbols; (4) His company has concerns that the Golay and Hamming codes are not specified for decoding as "hard" or "soft." They would like to see exact specifications included in the CAI; (5) Harris believed the project should have adopted the "Top Down" standards development approach by first publishing a systems specifications, then developing a CAI standard.

### Consensus of the Group

**T**he consensus of the group was that most of Anders' concerns were being addressed by other Project 25/TIA task groups.

Al Wilson of Motorola thought Fred's requirements for strict specification on "hard" and "soft" coding would unnecessarily restrict design engineers.

Harrison Reeves of the FBI said he felt like it was now time to move forward. However, before a motion could be made or a vote taken, the conversation turned to what three manufacturers consider as the potential dangers of publishing the CAI recommendations without the rest of the system specifications. A couple of the members said they would prefer to withhold the recommended standards until the entire system standards were developed.

At that point, Kameroner reminded the Committee that there were a large number of conventional system users that had pressing needs. He felt releasing the CAI would benefit those users.

Dr. John Gregory of the Stanilite Corp. agreed with that notion and said it was time for the Committee to put its differences aside and move forward in a cooperative spirit to build a "Great Product."

With the discussion ended, Kameroner made a motion to forward the latest version of the CAI as a recommendation to the Project 25 Steering Committee for use in "Conventional Systems." The motion was seconded and then modified to include language in the cover letter to make it clear that the CAI was dealing primarily with "Conventional Systems." The motion passed by a 6-3 margin with Ericsson GE, Harris Corp. and E.F. Johnson voting "no." Because of TIA procedural issues, Stanilite Corp. was not allowed to vote.

The Committee then unanimously agreed to allow anyone who

had comments on the release of the CAI to provide them within two weeks and they would be included in the letter of transmittal to the Steering Committee.

The final day of the monthly TIA meeting was devoted to the APCO Project Interface Committee (APIC) meeting. That meeting was highlighted by a major disagreement between EGE and the Project 25 Trunking Task Force.

The debate started because the Trunking Task Group, chaired by Rich Comoro of Motorola, adopted a motion to require that "the trunking control channel be consistent with the CAI, provided that APCO Project 25 user requirements can be met." That motion was made by Dr. Stone of Immigration and Naturalization, seconded by David Taylor of GEC-Marconi and approved by a 7-2 vote, with E.F. Johnson and EGE voting "no." Cymcomm, the State of Florida and the FBI abstained.

### Motion Called Unfair

**S**teve Montealegre of Ericsson GE felt the motion to restrict trunking technologies to those that were compatible to the CAI was unfair to EGE and others. He said in good faith EGE can no longer support or participate in a process that, in his opinion, is controlled and manipulated by Motorola. He also indicated the process as it exists today puts EGE and other companies at a competitive disadvantage because Motorola is the only company ready to manufacture equipment. Finally, he said that EGE had submitted to the Trunking Task Group creative solutions that were rejected out of hand in an arbitrary manner.

APIC Chairman Stuart Meyer asked Montealegre to put his comments in writing, which he did, in a hand-written note. However, Chairman Meyer was reluctant to release the note to APCO or the Project 25 Steering Committee until he receives further clarification on Ericsson GE's intent.

At that point, Dr. Stone reminded Montealegre that in order for the Task Group to adopt Ericsson GE's recommendations, it would need to completely revise the CAI, to which he was unalterably opposed. He also reminded Montealegre that the majority of the Trunking Task Group voted in favor of this position and only EGE and E.F. Johnson voted "no."

John DiSalvo, from the State of Florida, said he felt if EGE had a legitimate proposal, we ought to find a way to look at it, without putting the CAI in jeopardy.

### Motion to Table Issue

**B**ob Schwartz of E.F. Johnson then made a motion to have the entire issue tabled. However, Chairman Meyer ruled the motion would have to be delayed until the November meeting in Bloomington, Minnesota, in order to resolve an outstanding question as to what constituted a quorum in the APIC Committee.

After the close of this meeting, Project 25 Co-Chairmen John Powell and Craig Jorgensen had a number of discussions with some of the participants in an effort to resolve this issue in a more amenable way.

Co-Chairman Jorgensen asked APIC Committee Chairman Meyer to include this item in the October Project 25 Steering Committee/APIC Committee agenda. In addition, Chairman Meyer arranged with Dr. Stone and Ed Kelly from EGE to produce a trunking requirements matrix as quickly as possible, to help all concerned wade through this complaint.

### Process Continues Forward

**I**n spite of the healthy differences of opinion, the process continued to move forward with APCO Project 25 now being assured of receiving the first section of a multi-section suite of standards. When asked about the apparent contention among a few of the TIA participants, Co-Chairman Powell indicated it was not only expected, but an important part of the process of ensuring all points of view are heard and considered.

Powell said, "These companies are investing a tremendous amount of resources into Project 25, and we support and recognize their right to disagree with both our recommended standard and the technologies included in those standards. The Steering Committee on the other hand has the responsibility to select technologies which we believe best fit public safety's current and future needs. The Steering Committee is the first to recognize that even though our recommended standards will meet and exceed the needs of the majority of public safety users, there may be a few situations where a different system is more appropriate, based on individual requirements. However, these standards will ensure backward and forward compatibility, interoperability, a defined migration path and improved spectrum efficiency for those who can use them and choose to do so."

He concluded by saying, "The APCO Project 25 Committee is convinced that its decisions in these matters have been fair, correct and equitable. The record clearly shows it has given full consideration in an open and public forum to every proposal that has been submitted." ■

## Project 25 Joint Steering Committee and APCO Project 25 Interface Committee (APIC) Meeting Bloomington, Minnesota October 29, 1993

**T**he week of October 26-29 once again kept the APCO 25/TIA working groups extremely busy. Unfortunately, most of the people following this process are unaware of the amount of time and energy the participants in this project are putting forth.

At a normal Project TIA/Project 25 meeting, the participants work from eight in the morning until 10 or 11 at night. It is not unusual to see one or more of the TIA committees working well into the night with only a few minutes out for lunch and dinner. Many first-time observers are amazed at the level of detail and intensity of the dialog.

The chairmen of the task groups and committees are all volunteers who have offered to do the work because no one else would step up and take the assignments. The committee and task group members are dedicated professionals who are employed by TIA-member firms or representatives from the various governmental agencies who participate in the project at their agencies' expense.

The public safety committee owes all its partners in TIA a debt of gratitude and appreciation for the work they are doing and the progress being made.

## All Major Task Groups Meet

October meetings were held at the Airport Hilton Hotel in Bloomington, Minnesota, from October 27-29. Although all the major task groups met that week, only reports from the Trunking, Data, User Needs, Ad Hoc Project 25 Interface Committee (APIC) and the Steering Committee were available at the time necessary to have this material published in this issue of the APCO Bulletin.

The Format Task Group, chaired by Al Wilson of Motorola, with members from Bendix/King, Cycomm, DVSI, E.F. Johnson, Ericsson GE, GEC-Marconi, Motorola, Stanilite, Transcript International, State of Florida, Union Pacific Railroad, NTIA, FBI, Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Secret Service announced it is transitioning TIA voting procedures that will have the net effect of dropping eligible voters if they don't attend meetings. Since there were no outstanding Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues, the group started off with a detailed presentation on packet and circuit service on how this technology related to similar technology in the cellular industry.

At the conclusion, Ed Kelly of Ericsson GE offered to research that issue and provide a follow-up report.

A number of members also expressed some concern that the proposal being considered does not support all the requirements that were listed in APCO's data requirements. Because of that and other outstanding issues, the Task Group decided to leave the item open.

The committee then considered the motion of John DiSalvo (State of Florida) to move the Data Overview Document forward to the APIC Committee. The motion passed unopposed. The group also agreed to accept a proposal from Kelly on a different link layer and the need to have the System Task Group consider the problems and benefits associated with establishing individual IP addresses for each radio.

### Potential IPR Problems

The Trunking Task Group, chaired by Motorola's Richard A. Comroe, began its meeting with David Taylor of GEC-Marconi giving a report on potential IPR and patent problems. Simply stated, some of the patented technology that some believe is required to make the proposed Project 25 standards work may not be covered under existing IPR agreements.

Then, Roger Madden of Cycomm gave a presentation on MPT 1327. Both Motorola and Stanilite had some concern with the robustness of MPT 1327.

David Taylor, on the other hand, felt there was enough commonality with the proposed Project 25 recommended standards that it should be considered. He said that both GEC-Marconi and Phillips already had waived the patents under MPT 1327, but Motorola had not.

### Motion Made, Withdrawn

The Committee then considered and then withdrew a motion to forward the trunking overview to the APIC Committee because both GEC-Marconi and E.F. Johnson felt some additional material was required. That led into a lengthy discussion on trunking control channel capacities.

As the discussion came to a close, Kelly made a motion to prohibit the Task Group from forwarding any additional recommendations to the APIC Committee until the system's performance analysis, based on user requirements, is completed.

The motion was supported by Stanilite, Cycomm, GEC-Marconi, Ericsson GE and E.F. Johnson. It was opposed by the FBI, Union Pacific Railroad, U.S. Secret Service, State of Florida, Motorola and Bendix/King. The NTIA abstained.

The next item to be considered was a proposal by David Taylor to adopt a dedicated trunking control access method that was covered by a Phillips IPR. Most of the group felt that the proposal needed further consideration. A similar decision was made with regard to the existing proposal on protected trunking and the problems associated with building a system that would function well in both a protected and unprotected environment.

Kelly then took a few moments to clear up the confusion surrounding Ericsson GE's ID and management and roaming proposal. Once the dust had settled, there seemed to be a general consensus that the proposal should be forwarded to the appropriate committee(s).

At that point, Dr. Greg Stone of Immigration and Naturalization made a motion that Motorola be asked to provide documentation on the addressing scheme it is proposing. The motion passed unopposed.

## Trunking Proposal Questions

Finally, the committee began to reconsider the outstanding questions surrounding Ericsson GE's trunking proposal and Motorola's and GEC-Marconi's questions associated with that proposal. Richard Comroe asked Racek of Ericsson GE why the company hadn't responded to Motorola's question regarding the proposal's apparent inability to go beyond 19 working channels. Kelly responded on behalf of Ericsson GE saying that the company would not supply any further information or responses to Motorola's questions unless the Task Group agreed to adopt the Ericsson GE proposal as an alternative approach. With that, the meeting adjourned.

The Users Needs Task Force, chaired by John DiSalvo of the State of Florida, had a full agenda which included discussions on trunked systems security and data access. During those discussions, Kelly made an excellent proposal to improve other Project 25 documents. Comroe made a shorter presentation concluding with a general statement of support for what Kelly had proposed.

They also agreed to forward to the Steering Committee the petition from the federal users group to include optional Over The Air (OTAR) and encryptions requirements as optional project standards. After that, Chairman DiSalvo presented a number of requests from APCO Canada that were debated at length and then tabled pending a request for additional data. Finally, Chairman DiSalvo closed off the discussion and advised the members the chair would request additional support documentation from APCO Canada.

## Railroad's Networking Needs

Another highlight in the Users Needs Task Group meeting was an outstanding presentation by Ed Kemp of Union Pacific Railroad about the railroad's networking requirements. The group was amazed to find the railroad requires 1,500 systems, with one to 150 sub-systems and 350,000 unique IDs.

On October 29, there was a joint APIC/APCO Project 25 Steering Committee meeting. The meeting's business session began with APCO President-Elect Steven H. Proctor announcing that APCO President Frank Huggins had asked Proctor to serve as APCO Co-Chairman, replacing APCO Past President John Powell.

Proctor said APCO and the Project have been extremely well-served during Powell's term as co-chairman. He noted that Powell's talents and abilities are critical to the successful conclusion of the project, which is why both he and the APCO Board of Officers have asked Powell to continue on as a Project 25 Steering Committee member.

### Project Director

**P**roctor announced that APCO will contract with Craig M. Jorgensen to serve as Project 25 Project Director. NASTD made Jorgensen a Life Member and asked him to continue in his role as Co-Chairman of the project.

Proctor indicated that both association's officers want to focus more attention on Project 25 so that the project and any potential follow-up to it could be completed as quickly and economically as possible.

Co-Chairman Jorgensen then announced that George Christenberry Jr., Deputy Commissioner of the Division of Telecommunications of the Georgia Department of Administrative Services, would replace Paul Warnecke as one of the NASTD representatives. Warnecke, who served on the committee since its inception, asked to be replaced because of the press of his own state's business.

The meeting was then turned over to Stuart Meyer, APIC Committee chairman, for the purpose of considering the various Task Group and Committee reports. Those reports, most of which previously have been reported, were given by John DiSalvo of the User Needs Task Group; Bill Pomper of the Encryption Task Group; Al Wilson of the Data Format Task Group; Richard Comroe of the Trunking and Data Task Group; David Taylor of the System Task Group, and John Gregory of the Lock-Down Task Group.

George Kamerer then gave a report on the TR-8.15 Committee's work, including its proposal to allow the Common Air Interface (CAI) to be published as a TIA-Telecommunications System Bulletin. It was anticipated that the balloting on that proposal would be completed within 30 days.

### Appreciation Expressed

**C**o-Chairman Jorgensen expressed the Steering Committee's appreciation for the excellent work product that was coming out of all the task groups and committees. He said, "The Steering Committee was extremely pleased with the transceiver maintenance and test report prepared by John Oblak of E.F. Johnson and his task group and the CAI prepared by George Kamerer and the TR-8.15 Committee, to name just two."

At the conclusion of the APIC reports, Co-Chairman Jorgensen asked Ericsson GE and E.F. Johnson if they wanted to make a brief report on why their companies could not support the release of the CAI to the Project 25 Steering Committee.

Dan Prichett and John Oblak of E.F. Johnson addressed the group, first expressing their company's concern that the CAI was not mature enough from which to build or buy products. Prichett said he was concerned that releasing the CAI at this time would imply the work was finished and would then create a level of false expectation in the marketplace in the form of bid requests and specifications requiring compliance with Project 25's recommended standard, before the standards were complete.

### Outstanding IPR Issues

**T**hey were particularly concerned that buyers would attempt to acquire sophisticated systems based on only a part of the proposed suite of standards. Oblak said he felt there were also a number of other outstanding IPR issues that needed to be resolved. In conclusion, he stressed E.F. Johnson's continued support for the project in spite of its negative vote on releasing the CAI.

Ed Kelly of Ericsson GE repeated the company's position that it has "long been on record as saying that the current CAI is not in the best interest of the public safety users." He then repeated a number of complaints the company had made in a white paper, which included, but were not limited to: The TIA Committee failed to use a "top-down approach"; the CAI is representative of a "mediocre" design and "reflects one manufacturers' existing product line," etc. In conclusion, Ericsson GE said that "Because of these facts, we believe that this CAI is fundamentally flawed and results in a technological dead end." None of these purported problems were new to the Steering Committee because they had heard Ericsson GE's complaint a number of times before and considered them again when they received the company's white paper.

### Explanation Requested

**B**efore Ericsson GE completed its presentation, Co-Chairman Jorgensen asked Ericsson GE to explain the position it had taken in the Trunking Committee, whereby it refused to provide any additional information in its trunking proposal. Ericsson GE responded that its intent was not to withhold information for the sake of withholding it, but the company felt it was not in its corporate interest to provide further information and spend more time and money answering questions on a proposal that already had been turned down.

Co-Chairman Jorgensen pointed out to the group that it had been working on the CAI for more than four years, and the Steering Committee was ready to move on. He then asked each of the Steering Committee members and the other TIA participants if any of them wanted to comment.

Don Speights of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) said he was tired of the continual delays in the process, and if things didn't change soon, the feds would drop out.

Co-Chairman Proctor said it was time to move on. Loren Kragh of Cycomm expressed concern that he has not been able to get some of his questions on IPRs resolved with Motorola. Past President Powell, concluding the discussions on the CAI, reminded the Steering and APIC committees of the strong message the APCO Board of Officers received from its membership in attendance in New Orleans "to conclude the Project 25 standards process as quickly as possible."

After the Steering Committee listened to those and other comments, Art McDole of Northern California APCO made a motion to adopt the CAI and withhold its publication for up to 60 days until TIA has had a chance to vote on publishing it as a Technical Bulletin. McDole said he felt the Project 25 Steering Committee had the responsibility to allow TIA first right of refusal on publishing all Project 25 recommended standards. In fact, the project-proposed MOU with TIA will require it.

### Motion Passed

**T**he motion passed with nine in favor and two absent. However, Powell returned to the meeting and asked that the record reflect his affirmative vote also. The Committee then heard a report from Powell on the resolution that passed at the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) conference two weeks before.

Powell said that the resolution that was adopted fully endorsed the project; the IACP was not asked to, nor did it, endorse any of the recommended standards. Powell said that almost everyone involved supported the IACP resolution.

The Committee then discussed the problems associated with Ericsson GE's complaint that its proposal on trunking was turned down because it might cause changes in the CAI. Although the Steering Committee understood and supported the rationale of protecting wholesale modifications of the CAI, it also felt very strongly that a process had to be put in place that would allow legitimate proposals a fair opportunity to be considered.

Harrison Reeves of the FBI said he was concerned with the concept of piecemeal change, but he would support minor changes that improved the CAI.

The Steering Committee agreed to consider that issue and recommended some changes in its process that would accommodate both sides of the issue.

The Steering Committee then adopted the federal government's proposal to add an optional standard for backward compatible OTAR. It also gave the chairmen its support in finalizing the MOU with TIA with a few minor modifications proposed by various Steering Committee members.

Finally, it agreed to put off the vote on the first section of the trunking standard and the transceiver maintenance standard until all the members had an opportunity to read them. Once again, progress was made toward completing the 12.5 kHz Project Standard so that the Committee and the TIA can go on to consider the 6.25 kHz recommended standard. ■

## Public Safety Microwave Committee Asks FCC to Reinstate Rules to Exempt State and Local Government Microwave Licensees From Forced Relocations From the 2 GHz Bands

**T**he Public Safety Microwave Committee (PSMC) has submitted reply comments and asked the Commission to reinstate rules to exempt state and local government microwave licensees from forced relocation from the 2 GHz bands.

The Committee submitted the reply to comments filed in opposition to the Public Safety Microwave Committee's Petition for Partial Reconsideration of the Commission's Third Report and Order in the redevelopment of spectrum to encourage innovation in the use of new telecommunications technologies (ET Docket No. 92-9).

Most of the parties opposing PSMC's Petition die little more than argue that restoring the exemption for all state and local government microwave licensees would have a negative impact on the development of the PCS industry. They suggest that the Commission's new definition of "public safety" strikes an appropriate "balance" between the interests of PCS operators and public safety. However, the Commission's statutory mandate is to give "top priority," not balanced treatment, to the protection of life and property. Congress has often stated that "radio services which are necessary for the safety of life and property deserve more consideration in allocating spectrum than those services which are more in the nature of convenience or luxury," the PSMC said in its reply comments.

Those opposing the PSMC Petition also have overstated the impact of restoring the exemption for all state and local government licensees. The majority of communications on most state and local government microwave systems is clearly for the "protection of life and property" and, therefore, the PSMC said, would be exempt from mandatory relocation under any definition of "public safety."

While the Commission's arbitrary and capricious narrowing of the public safety exemption will generate unnecessary disputes and have a serious negative impact on some state and local government microwave facilities, those facilities represent a small minority of 2 GHz microwave facilities, the PSMC said.

PSMC also took issue with the suggestion of American Personal Communications (APC) that the "primary motivation for those who wish to broaden the exemptions" is to "reap a profit" in a voluntary negotiation.

"State and local government microwave licensees are not businesses seeking profit," the PSMC said. "Rather, they are public servants whose principal concern in this matter is to avoid any disruption to vital public safety communications."

Finally, MCI suggested that the Commission establish a system of priority access to the 1710-1850 MHz government band for displaced licensees, with first priority going to "public safety" licensees, and lower priority for "other" state and local government licensees.

PSMC has no objection to giving state and local government licensees priority access to the 1710-1850 MHz band, which would facilitate relocation for those state and local government agencies that choose to relocate. However, the Commission should not attempt, the PSMC said, to establish arbitrary distinctions among state and local government agencies. "Moreover, such priority access to the government band should supplement, not supplant, the state and local government exemption from mandatory relocation," the PSMC said.

"For the reasons stated above and in its Petition for Partial Reconsideration, the Commission must reinstate rules to exempt state and local government licensees from forced relocation from the 2 GHz bands." ■

**APCO Reports is published 12 times a year by the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. Subscriptions are \$24 a year for APCO members; \$60 a year for non-members.**

**To subscribe, call the APCO Membership Department at (800) 949-2726 Ext. 238.**

**Editor: Alan W. Chase**

**Production Coordinator: Kathy O'Connell**

**Assistants: Gwen Segren, Ray Barnes**

**APCO REPORTS**  
**2040 S. Ridgewood Ave.**  
**South Daytona, FL 32119-8437**



*Serving*  
**Public Safety Communications**  
**Since 1935**



**FIRST CLASS MAIL**

AR 218  
GREGORY T RIDDLE  
901 BRANTWOOD AVE  
ELK GROVE VILLAGE, IL 60007-3950