

From: []@aol.com  
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 8:53 AM  
To: bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com  
Subject: BPDG: Re: BPDG Report

Having watched this process over the past months, and as a veteran of numerous groups, committees, panels, etc. within CEA, SAE, CSA, IEC, UL, NEMA, EPRI, and numerous others, both consensus and otherwise, I have to agree with what I see as the closest thing to a true consensus that has come out of this process. This has not been a consensus process.

While I believe the co-chairs have done a huge (and thankless) job of capturing the issues and positions of the various contributors, and the many contributors have equally done a tremendous amount of work to vet the issues surrounding a very complicated and controversial subject, I would characterize the output as a report on the issues, the pros and cons to some potential solutions, and a statement of the positions of the contributors - in effect a Summary Report of the meetings of the BPDG.

The BPDG has performed an extremely valuable first step and one that is required in any such process that sets out to come to a consensus on a subject such as this. However, it is only the first step. In any consensus process I have participated in, and as has been pointed out by many of the members, a firm statement of purpose and goals needs to be identified, and a concrete set of rules, including the criteria for membership, voting and resolving differences, needs to be established in advance and must be understood by all participants. In the face of such a controversial and complicated task, it is often the case that such a process can be defined only after the issues have been aired.

Having aired the issues adequately, the consensus process can now be initiated. Before proceeding with the "Parallel Group" or whatever is deemed to be the next steps, I urge the members to take the time to form a true consensus process under whatever auspices that they may agree to, set the rules that will govern the process, establish consensus statements of purpose and goals, and move forward. I also urge you not to shortchange the importance of well written, focused consensus statements of purpose and goals. I have seen more groups fail due to vague or lacking purpose and goal statements than for any other reason. It is the tool that allows both the chairs and membership to keep the process on track.

The above represents my own opinions and does not represent those of the CEA, the groups I chair, or any client companies. However, the solutions to these issues are crucial to the success of the Home Networking Industry and therefore of great interest to all involved in providing the products and services that will move both protected and unprotected content throughout the home. We, along with the consumers and their dollars, are waiting for you to complete the task you set out to do.

[], President  
WJR Consulting, Inc.  
Chairman: CEA Technology and Standards Council  
CEA R7 Home Networking Committee

-----

From: []@renonevada.net  
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 11:01 AM  
To: bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com  
Cc: CommStudios; EFF.ORG; Reno\_Perl\_Group  
Subject: Re: BPDG: Re: BPDG Report

[]@renonevada.net  
On Friday 31 May 2002 08:53, []@aol.com wrote:

> > Having watched this process over the past months, and as a veteran of  
> numerous groups, committees, panels, etc. within CEA, SAE, CSA, IEC, UL,  
> NEMA, EPRI, and numerous others, both consensus and otherwise, I have to  
> agree with what I see as the closest thing to a true consensus that has

> come out of this process. This has not been a consensus process.

- - - snip - - -

Hello: I believe [] has put forth a most revealing and important observation, along with extremely relevant suggestions on how this process should proceed. Rather than use it to clearly demonstrate the unprofessional and immature approach the conveners chose to pursue, these observations might better reflect how the process can be adjusted and progress from this point forward.

I applaud Mr. Rose's candor and professionalism, and look forward to the BPDG's response to his observations. In particular, I would suggest that his message be forwarded directly to the individuals that received the May Report, and request it be placed on the site along with the May Report.

Respectfully,

[]

Reno, NV

<http://www.studioforrecording.org/>

<http://www.ibiblio.org/studioforrecording/>

<http://renotahoe.pm.org/>