

**Board Minutes**  
**Advanced Television Systems Committee, Inc.**  
**Board of Director's Meeting**  
**Conference Call**  
**March 28, 2007**

1. **Call to Order; Determination of Quorum; Approval of Agenda.** Chairman Glenn Reitmeier (NBC-U) called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM. The Attendance List is **ATTACHMENT 1**. A quorum was determined. The agenda (**ATTACHMENT 2**) was approved.
2. **Opening Comments**  
Mr. Reitmeier thanked everyone for making themselves available for this special meeting. He said that he thought the focus of the meeting should be on the NWIP for ATSC-H/M submitted by the Planning Committee. He expressed his view that it was important for ATSC to move forward in this area to meet market requirements.
3. **Consideration of February 22, 2007 Draft Minutes**  
Jay Adrick (Harris) made a motion to approve the February 22, 2007 minutes (**ATTACHMENT 3**) as presented. The motion was seconded by Gavin Schutz (SMPTE) and approved.
4. **ATSC-H/M NWIP**  
Graham Jones (NAB) presented the New Work Item Proposal (NWIP) ATSC-H/M (**ATTACHMENT 4**) submitted by the Planning Committee (PC). Mr. Jones reminded the Board that a preliminary version of the document was made available to the Board at its last meeting and that he posted a revised version to the Board reflector on February 27<sup>th</sup>. He said that he did not receive any written comments from Board members, but PC did incorporate suggestions made during the last Board meeting. He went on to report that the PC met by conference call on March 22<sup>nd</sup> and approved the NWIP with the understanding that the appendix listing the requirements may be revised. PC-2 met on March 26<sup>th</sup> and made some revisions to the appendix. The revised document was then distributed to the PC and the Board. Mr. Jones pointed out that the NWIP provides for an ongoing dialog between PC and TSG as the work moves forward.  
  
Brian Markwalter (CEA) said that while he recognized that the requirements may change, he suggested that the original requirements of the NWIP should be preserved as a record of the trade-offs.  
  
Bill Miller (ABC) said that he thought the process for interaction between PC and TSG is helpful, because it allows this important project to move forward, with a mechanism for ongoing feedback from the PC and the Board.

Joe Flaherty (CBS) said that he did not think that the Board had enough time to review the final document. He also expressed the view that the document scope should specify that ATSC-H/M will be an auxiliary service. Ed Barrett (Sony) said that he was concerned that he did not think all of the Board's comments from the last meeting were taken into account.

Craig Todd (Dolby) asked about the interest of manufacturers of receiving devices and the automobile industry in this type of service. Mr. Jones indicated that broadcasters have primarily driven the work. Sterling Davis (Cox Broadcasting) pointed out that the companies proposing technologies are manufacturers of receivers including handsets. Mr. Barrett questioned whether mobile operators would support such a service. John Godfrey (Samsung) said that his company believes that the technology can support service to laptops, portable TVs, handsets, and receivers in vehicles.

Mark Richer (ATSC) said that while he did not think the term "auxiliary service" would be acceptable to many organizations, he agreed with Mr. Flaherty that the substance of the first bullet in Appendix 1 should also be in the scope of the document. He said that it does put bounds on the project and it would therefore be helpful to be in the scope.

Mr. Richer reminded the Board that the Bylaws clearly define the criteria for approval of new work items.

Mr. Reitmeier said that there is significant opportunity for broadcasters to provide local programming to mobile and handheld device utilizing broadcaster's spectrum.

Mr. Adrick said that two of the companies on the list of project supporters have publicly indicated their intent to provide a mobile service.

Mr. Barrett expressed concern about the willingness of mobile service providers to incorporate this technology into their handsets. Mr. Godfrey said that there was nothing in the NWIP that limits it to use with cell phone handsets.

Mr. Davis said that from a broadcaster point of view the NWIP was a good document. He pointed out there are nineteen companies that have agreed to support the work, and he did not think that business issues were pertinent to ATSC discussions.

Mr. Markwalter expressed a concern that the schedule described in Section 7 of the document. He went on to say that he thought that the CE industry would welcome a standard for mobile and handheld television. He expressed concerns over the items listed under "The standards documentation shall specify the following optional capabilities".

Victor Tawil (MSTV) said that the document was good enough and that it would not be productive to spend more time fine-tuning it. He said that there is a lot of work to be done and the sooner it is started the better.

Mr. Todd said he shared the concern about the items listed as optional capabilities.

Mr. Schutz said that available research shows that the handheld market is going to continue to grow rapidly. He said he couldn't imagine why individual Board members would question that there is a need for handheld and mobile services.

Mr. Flaherty made a motion that the document be sent back to the PC with gratitude and a suggested list of changes with a target for Board review of a revised document from PC at the next Board meeting. Mr. Barrett seconded the motion. After some discussion, Mr. Flaherty asked for confirmation that there was still a quorum. A roll call was made and a quorum was confirmed. A roll call vote was made and the motion was defeated.

Mr. Tawil made a motion that the NWIP be revised (i) to move the four bullet points under the section "The standards documentation shall specify the following optional capabilities:" to the section which begins "Consideration should also be given to the possible need for:", (ii) to include text in Section 2 (Scope of Project), similar to that of the first bulleted point in Appendix 1 and (iii) to provide that Section 7 (Proposed schedule for completion of the work) of the NWIP will be revised to state that the Board will approve any changes to the requirements listed in Appendix 1. Mr. Tawil further moved that if there are no significant objections from the Planning Committee to these changes, the document will be transmitted to TSG with the understanding that further revisions to the document are likely to occur, and with the urging to TSG to begin work immediately. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adrick and approved.

## **5. Annual Meeting**

Mr. Richer briefed the Board on the draft program (**ATTACHMENT 5**) for the Annual Meeting. He asked Board members to contact him if they have any suggestions or questions.

## **6. Board Retreat**

Mr. Richer reported that the results of polling Board members about new dates for the retreat indicated that there were no better alternatives in the summer to the original dates of July 11 & 12. The staff will poll the Board about potential locations.

## **7. Sony Patent Statement Review**

In the interest of time, the Board agreed to move review of the Patent Statement to the next meeting.

## **8. Schedule of Future Board Meetings**

Future meetings are scheduled as follows:

April 25 (Conference Call)

May 18

July 11 & 12 (Retreat)

September 26  
December 12

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM