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Abstract

This document contains working notes, straw poll results and action items from the workshop.

These notes have been reviewed by the attendees after the workshop and any corrections indicated have been made.

# Actions Arising from the workshop

## Actions carried forward from previous workshop

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AI ID  | Who | Due Date | Action Item description | Status | Completion Date | Notes |
| WS12-05 | Law and Gilb | 02/05/2013 | Develop an IEEE 802 policy for branding, including OpenStand branding | Open | 22/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-12 | GilbNow: d’Ambrosia | 04/01/2013 | Write template document for new 5C | Open | 15/04/2013 |  |
| WS12-14 | Thaler | 02/05/2013 | Draft a email reflector policy on subscriber behaviour. | Open | 18/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-15 | Thaler | 02/05/2013 | Draft a WG email reflector policy on who can subscribe/post to reflectors | Open | 18/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-16 | Thompson & Stephens | 12/31/2012 | Propose an improved communication mechanism with IEEE IT | OpenGeoffrey and Adrian to write a paper to create a “bottom-up” request. |  |  |
| WS12-22 | Thaler | 03/01/2013 | Bring a liaision statement on RFC 4441rev to the EC for approval at the March 2013 Plenary | OpenOngoing, will target March 2014 | 18/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-23 | McCabe and Thaler | 02/05/2013 | Investigate establishing an MOU between IEEE-SA and IETFRevised: MOU to enable sharing of drafts without requiring individual permission. | Open |  |  |

## Actions from 2013 workshop

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AI ID**  | **Who** | **Due Date** | **Action Item description** | **Status** | **Completion Date** | **Notes** |
| WS13-01 | Paul Nikolich |  | Investigate how/what the 802 execs can enforce (compliance to 802 PAR process) |  |  |  |
| WS13-02 | Roger Marks & Clint Chaplin |  | Draft language for notification of WG ballots to EC that is an improvement of the current policy. |  |  |  |
| WS13-03 | Walter Pienciak |  | Can IEEE-SA webex provide an overview of all 802 telecons? |  |  |  |
| WS13-04 | All WG chairs | March 2014 plenary | Review by WGs of OmniRAN slideware level description of project. Provide comments to Max Riegel |  |  |  |
| WS13-05 | James Gilb & John d’Ambrosia |  | Bring concrete proposal to EC to coordinate emerging applications. |  |  |  |
| WS13-06 | Pat Thaler | March 2014 plenary | Research TISWSAB (technical interchange session with snacks and beer) & bring proposal to EC. Target for first trial - July Plenary |  |  |  |
| WS13-07 | Bruce Kraemer |  | Bring information on IEEE future direction activities to EC. |  |  |  |
| WS13-08 | Jon Rosdahl | March 2014 plenary | Bring issues raised on election process up with James for next EC |  |  |  |
| WS13-09 | Trish Gerdon | March 2014 plenary | Determine whether it is possible to remove the human element from recircs, or create a pre-review process & report to EC at next plenary. |  |  |  |
| WS13-10 | Karen McCabe |  | Clarify & report to EC on future status of Mentor. |  |  |  |
| WS13-11 | John d’Ambrosia |  | Create a mission statement: 1) For marketing activity; 2) For 802 |  |  |  |
| WS13-12 | Paul Nikolich |  | Conduct 10 day EC ballot to confirm revised agreement. |  |  |  |
| WS13-13 | Karen McCabe |  | Fix numbering problem (2.2) in Get 802 agreement. |  |  |  |
| WS13-14 | Bob Heile, Glen Parsons & Bruce Kraemer |  | Put together a workshop plan for March 2014 China plenary. |  |  |  |
| WS13-15 | Walter Pienciak | Before Jan 2014 meetings | Find out if next generation publishing system can be demoed at the January interim meetings (2 independent meetings in the same week). |  |  |  |

# Review of actions from last meeting

Green = done. Purple = action outstanding.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AI ID  | Who | Due Date | Action Item description | Status | Completion Date | Notes |
| WS12-01 | D'Ambrosia | 12/14/2012 | Establish an Ad Hoc of IEEE 802 members to identify and prepare source material for the IEEE 802 story through the OpenStand lens. | First Draft Completeongoing |  | Need to expand the presentation to better cover WGs beyond 802.3 |
| WS12-02 | Karachalios and McCabe | 02/05/2013 | Identify target audiances where the IEEE should tell the OpenStand message | David: Presented 802.3 at meeting in European Parliament + othersSeptember, 3 weeks outreach in China.When should 802 talk about openstand? | 15/02/2013 |  |
| WS12-03 | Gilb | 03/01/2013 | Create a process for IEEE 802 by which we identify target venues for the OpenStand message |  |  |  |
| WS12-04 | Nikolich | 1/31/2013 | Add a formal endorsement of IEEE 802 to the OpenStand web site | Open | 22/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-05 | Law and Gilb | 02/05/2013 | Develop an IEEE 802 policy for branding, including OpenStand branding | Open | 22/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-06 | Kraemer | 12/01/2012 | Post ISO new project process on 802 EC Mentor and a send a note to the EC reflector notifiy the EC that is posted | Complete |  | In the 802.11 document server. Will post to the EC reflector. Will discuss at March Plenary |
| WS12-07 | Gilb | 1/15/2013 | Determine content of 5C and new name | Open | 15/02/2013 |  |
| WS12-08 | Gilb | 12/12/2012 | Develop a mission statement for the new 5C and get EC approval | Open | 01/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-09 | Gilb | 02/05/2013 | Write a proposed 5C and circulate to WGs for review and comment | Open | 15/02/2013 |  |
| WS12-10 | Gilb | 2/17/2013 | Develop proposed process for 5C review and maintenance and get EC approval | Open | 01/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-11 | Gilb | 3/22/2013 | Get EC approval of the new 5C | Open | 22/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-12 | GilbNow: d’Ambrosia | 04/01/2013 | Write template document for new 5C | Open | 15/04/2013 |  |
| WS12-13 | Nikolich and Marks | 12/01/2012 | Request from the IEEE the cost of putting revisions into the Get802 program as soon as they are published | Made request to Karen McCabe | 11/20/2012 | Discussed with Karen since November. Karen has some draft text. Submit to EC reflector 2/8/13  |
| WS12-14 | Thaler | 02/05/2013 | Draft a email reflector policy on subscriber behaviour. | Open | 18/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-15 | Thaler | 02/05/2013 | Draft a WG email reflector policy on who can subscribe/post to reflectors | Open | 18/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-16 | Thompson & Stephens | 12/31/2012 | Propose an improved communication mechanism with IEEE IT | OpenGeoffrey and Adrian to write a paper to create a “bottom-up” request. |  |  |
| WS12-17 | Rosdahl & Heile | 02/05/2013 | Write an SOW for a Meeting Manager and circulate it to the EC for review and feedback | In process |  |  |
| WS12-18 | Rosdahl & Heile | 02/05/2013 | Write an MSA for a Meeting Manager and circulate it to the EC for review and feedback | In process |  |  |
| WS12-19 | Law & Stephens | 12/31/2012 | Develop a cross comparison of what information is on each of the WGs home pages | Done | 11/12/2012 |  |
| WS12-20 | Thaler | 11/18/2012 | Send IETF RFC 4441rev document to the EC reflector for review and specify the date when feedback is due to Pat | Done | 17/11/2012 |  |
| WS12-21 | EC Members | 12/18/2012 | Provide comments to Pat on IETF RFC 4441rev  | Ongoing | 18/02/2013 | Comment collection ongoing in 802.11. A new draft of the RFC is available. The comment collection is running on the newest version. Pat will send a link with the newest version. Comments from 802.11 will be available on 2/18/13 |
| WS12-22 | Thaler | 03/01/2013 | Bring a liaision statement on RFC 4441rev to the EC for approval at the March 2013 Plenary | OpenOngoing, will target March 2014 | 18/03/2013 |  |
| WS12-23 | McCabe and Thaler | 02/05/2013 | Investigate establishing an MOU between IEEE-SA and IETFRevised: MOU to enable sharing of drafts without requiring individual permission. | Open |  |  |
| WS12-24 | Thaler | 12/01/2012 | Notify Steve Mills, Karen Bartelson, Russ Housley and Konstantinos Karachalios about the March 16 IEEE 802/IETF meeting | ClosedSept 29, 2014 is next 802/IETF meeting (Boston?) Pat to invite Konstantinos, Karen McCabe et al. |  | Karen reached out and covered this. |
| WS12-25 | Nikolich | 3/15/2013 | Identify cross-802 relationships with external organizations | In process | 15/03/2013 |  |
| WS13-26 | Marks | 12/10/2012 | Reach out to 3GPP and explain to that organization why it would be beneficial to their members to participate in OmniRAN | Done | 11/12/2012 | Riegel sent announcement to 3GPP TSG SA and RAN chairs. Followup developed in OmniRAN SG in January 2013. |

# Attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSOCIATION** | **LAST NAME** | **FIRST NAME** |
| 802 Chair | NIKOLICH | PAUL |
| 802 1st Vice Chair | THALER | PAT |
| 802 Executive Secretary | ROSDAHL | JON |
| 802 Recording Secretary | D'AMBROSIA | JOHN |
| 802 Treasurer | CHAPLIN | CLINT |
| 802.1 WG Chair | JEFFREE | TONY |
| 802.1 Vice Chair | PARSONS | GLENN |
| 802.3 WG Chair | LAW | DAVID |
| 802.3 WG Vice Chair | HEALEY | ADAM |
| 802.11 Vice Chair | STEPHENS | ADRIAN |
| 802.11 WG Chair | KRAEMER | BRUCE |
| 802.15 WG Chair | HEILE | ROBERT (BOB) |
| 802.16 WG Chair | MARKS | ROGER |
| 802.18 WG Chair | LYNCH | MIKE |
| 802.19 WG Chair | SHELLHAMMER | STEPHEN |
| 802.21 WG Chair | DAS | SUBIR |
| 802.22 WG Chair | MODY | APURVA |
| OmniRAN SG Chair | RIEGEL | MAX |
| Member Emeritus | THOMPSON | GEOFF |
| IEEE SA | GERDON | PATRICIA |
| IEEE SA | MCCABE | KAREN |
| IEEE SA | PIENCIAK | WALTER |

# Workshop running notes

1. Review Goals, Objectives and Constraints for Workshop Adrian 10 08:00 08:10
	1. Document ec-13-0066r0
2. Review actions from previous meeting Adrian 30 08:10 08:40
	1. See “Review Actions…” section above.
3. Review and approve agenda Adrian 10 08:40 08:50
4. Next Gen publishing system Walter Pienciak 30 08:50 09:20
	1. Document: (Right click, presentation object, open to view)



* 1. Norm Finn, Pete Anslow, Adrian Stephens are primary interface from 802
	2. Keep WG chairs copied on developments
	3. Demo in January
		1. Can we do this in the Jan Interim meeting?
			1. A: Walter Penciak: Will need to find out.
	4. Do you use frame?
		1. No. Xopus?
	5. Process of adoption will be voluntary. Existing projects won’t be forced to move from existing tools. But do want to migrate.
	6. “Starting a new project” doesn’t make sense to most of us, i.e. groups like 802.11, 802.3. Need to be able to migrate at an appropriate point, and will need planning, as it’s non-trivial.
	7. Not having to pay for Frame will save a lot of cost.
		1. No cost to users
	8. Will work with all modern browsers.
	9. Do you need to be online?
		1. No.
		2. You can work offline.
	10. Development cost?
		1. Can’t say
	11. Replace mentor?
		1. No.
	12. When is next update?
		1. January
		2. Action: Walter, +1 week Can do demo at January interims (LA, Indian Wells)?
			1. 19-24 Jan.
	13. When will descriptive material be available?
		1. Training is important. Can’t give dates.
		2. We’re in early stage of building this. Will have open training information to share will all groups. Material will be multi-faceted.
1. How much background info in a PAR Bruce Kraemer 30 09:20 09:50
	1. Objectives contract with working group. 5C contract with EC. PAR contract with SA.
	2. Need to look at both docs to understand fully the project. It’s the combination that’s important.
	3. Not all details meaningful to NesCom. Feasibility based on objectives. Objectives are not the PAR or the 5C – separate documentation. PAR should provide enough detail to know if there is project overlap.
	4. Bulk of projects are amendments. Amount of oversight by SA has been reduced. Need to be concise for SA/NesCom. Purpose it to get project approved. PAR form is constraining, hence need for other sets of documentation.
	5. Objectives are important to folks outside project. Par/5C only of interest internally.
	6. Some modification of 5C with Objectives perhaps more useful. Communication more important/useful. If not using 5C outside group, show’s its value is dwindling. We just changed rules to say you have to keep 5C up to date.
	7. 5C still perform a task, ensure that a project starts only that has a real need.
	8. Action: Share examples of objective lists. Pat offers to come to talk to any working group.
2. Adherence to process for PARs.
How strict does the EC want to be in applying existing rules? Tony Jeffree 30 09:50 10:20
	1. PAR process behaviour increasingly dysfunctional. We care about documents. We have a process describing when information is provided/reviewed etc… Review by other WGs is important to understand how the project affects them. 802.1 has a coordination role. PARs have been approved without giving 802.1 time to perform this coordination role.
		1. 802.1 has responsibility for “maintaining the architecture” of 802. Will talk with other groups to determine how they impact on the architecture.
		2. If 5C question on compatibility is “no”, need 802.1 sign-off.
	2. Recent two PARS from 802.15 with impact on 802.1 were drafted without coordination with 802.1. Drafting a PAR without previous discussion with affected WGs is not “friendly”.
		1. PARS had been communicated in advance by email.
	3. We are stuck with some level of dysfunctinality because we serve our own interests. Silos exist that prevent meeting the needs of the industry. Used to have technical plenaries, but stopped. Some architecture activities never took root.
		1. Last tuesday night was a technical plenary. Also 802.1 discussing with 802.11.
	4. Need to move from “if you vote for mine, I’ll vote for your’s” behaviour. Need a cultural change.
	5. If we’re trying to encourage better behaviour, dialogue is good. If we want enforcement, needs a different remedy. Rules could say you can’t circulate a PAR & 5C without approval from 802.1. Say give 802.1 an extra month to review the PAR.
		1. That would take it too far.
	6. Issue people answering 5C question on compatibility too lightly.
	7. Technical plenary. We do not get adequate coordination by each group talking pairwise with 802.1.
	8. Either make rule that 802.1 has “veto”, or we have to live with idea that EC may allow a project to start without meeting 802.1’s coordination needs. Answer needs to be somewhere between these extremes. Perhaps a checklist, and failure to comply requires explanation/presentation to EC.
	9. Resource issues in 802.1 make it difficult to require them to put a lot of effort into reviewing PARs.
	10. Action: Can 802.1 provide comments that something is not compliant before Tuesday 5pm at a plenary? Can we create a checklist of “danger signals” to look for?
		1. Action: Paul Nikolich to investigate how/what the 802 execs can enforce (compliance to 802.1 PAR process)
3. Break 15 10:20 10:35
4. Should WG ballots be announced to the EC? Paul Nikolich 20 10:35 10:55
	1. We have a rule that says WG ballots should be announced to the EC reflector. Should we eliminate or keep.
	2. Nobody has ever been chastised for not notifying.
	3. Nobody knew about the rule.
	4. EC members are members of other groups.
	5. Thinks we should eliminate the rule from the OM.
	6. EC members are ex-officio. Might not want to see all traffic from another WG. But is interested in key activities (ballots).
	7. Could use this information to enforce policies, better visibility. Gives a better overview of the entire community.
	8. Could extend to sponsor ballot announce results
		1. Can declare interest in MyBallot
	9. Notification creates an overhead for WG chairs. We have two balloting systems. Manual email.
	10. Doesn’t see need to announce start of sponsor ballots. Can always join the ballot group.
	11. Opt in vs Opt out. Original topic of this item unnecessary. Simple to copy ballot information to EC reflector.
	12. Straw poll:
		1. Keep requirement for notification of start of ballot 9
		2. Keep requirement and separate reflector 7
		3. Remove requirement for notification 7
	13. Action: Roger & Clint to draft language for notification of WG ballots to EC that is an improvement of the current policy.
5. Cooperation and contributions of the other WGs in the 802.1-OmniRAN project?
 What is the opportunity/impact on WGs? Max Riegel 30 10:55 11:25
	1. Document (right click, presentation object, open – to view).
	2. Also available at: <https://mentor.ieee.org/omniran/dcn/13/omniran-13-0094-00-ecsg-considerations-for-cooperation-with-802-wgs.pptx>



* 1. Slide 6. LAN functional design bullet needs to separate 802.1/802.3.
	2. Propose that the recommendations in this document be reviewed by WGs and approved by EC before taking it further.
	3. We do other networks that are not access networks. Need to understand how these fit into the OmniRAN picture.
		1. Even a PAN might have services and a central controller
		2. Don’t yet consider peer to peer
	4. Should OmniRAN include work from non-802 groups?
		1. Focus to keep on 802.
		2. Keep external references to minimum, might need some though
	5. Are you going to include the functional design, e.g. accounting?
		1. A network has to report something to an accounting process.
		2. Disagree. Need network functions used by accounting, but don’t provide accounting functions themselves. Higher level is outside our scope.
		3. Suggest calling it network statistics.
		4. Accounting is counting bits and bytes.
	6. Document is of interest externally. “technical support for accounting” is better terminology.
	7. Action: Walter, can IEEE-SA webex provide an overview of all 802 telecons?
	8. Action: All WGs. Review by WGs of OmniRAN slideware level description of project. Provide comments to Max by next plenary.
1. Technical interchange between WGs
 We have tutorials. But should there be a way of encouraging increased technical interchange between each others' groups. John D'Ambrosia 30 11:25 11:55
	1. How do we implement this? Extending scope of 802.24 TAG might be a way of doing it.
	2. Exchange of casual comment might lead to creative ideas.
	3. Replace social with technical interchange session, including snacks, wine & beer.
	4. Straw poll replace social with a TISWSAB (technical interchange session with snacks and beer):
		1. Yes – 3 times a year 4
		2. Yes – 1 time a year 16
		3. Try it once, asap, then choose frequency 13
		4. No way. I love the anti-social 4
	5. Straw poll: extend 802.24’s scope to coordinate some emerging applications
		1. Yes 5
		2. No 7
	6. Straw poll: EC to identify a way to coordinate emerging applications
		1. Yes 12
		2. No 0
	7. Action: James/John to bring concrete proposal to EC to coordinate emerging applications.
	8. Action: Pat to research TISWSAB (technical interchange session with snacks and beer) & bring proposal to EC. Target July Plenary
	9. Action: Bruce to bring information on IEEE future direction activities to EC.
2. Why are there term limits for elected members of the EC vs there are no term limits for chair of 802 and voting appointees. Tony Jeffree 20 11:55 12:15
	1. Changed title: Issues with the 802 Sponsor election process.
	2. Document: 
	3. Right click, presentation object, open to read.
	4. Rules state sponsor chair appoints.
	5. Hurdle vote has taken place, but hurdle has not been the cause of a chair to be replaced.
	6. Rules might be ambiguous as to status of “non-voting” members.
	7. Appointees likely to vote for incumbent because it is less likely that the challenger would appoint the same slate of appointees.
	8. In early days, EC chair was appointed by SASB, and EC chair appointed WG chairs.
	9. Term limits not useless. Forces incumbent chair to state position early.
	10. Hurdle may discourage some from seeking re-election. Successful hurdle might discourage challenger from making a challenge.
	11. Should we require incumbent chair to announce their candidacy in November?
		1. Should we require any candidate to announce in November?
	12. Current process biases towards stability. If want fairness, should announce at the same time.
	13. Action: Jon to bring issues raised on election process up with James for next EC
3. Lunch 60 12:15 13:15
4. IEEE-SA service levels
Inc. time to get ballot started discussion.
What are people seeing, what would they like to see?
Reflector delay times, reliability
Ability to provide feedback and get status updates Pat Thaler 20 13:30 13:55
	1. Presentation:

* 1. 
	2. Why not fully automatic? Why do we need liaison in the loop?
		1. To allow staff to do due diligence
		2. Can we get automatic release on recircs?
	3. Ballots start in range 0-1 days, excluding holidays/weekends.
	4. Timing is usually critical. Few days guarantee is good. Email confirmation for special cases is OK.
	5. Experience is variable. Some previously was “nothing we can do” to prepare. Recently is better.
	6. Mentor will be maintained, but Central desktop is the IEEE-SA’s focus.
	7. There are no plans to remove mentor.
	8. Basic reliability of IEEE alias service.
	9. Action: Trish determine whether it is possible to remove the human element from recircs, or create a pre-review process & report to EC at next plenary.
	10. Action: Karen McCabe clarify & report to EC on future status of mentor.
1. 802 Marketing for 2014 D'Ambrosia/McCabe 25 14:00 14:25
	1. Job of marketing is to get more people involved in 802 standards.
	2. What is goal of this marketing topic? Goal determines message.
	3. What is the audience? Users. Technology. Operator?
		1. All of them
	4. Why do we not have press releases from 802?
	5. Job/role of chairs to promote their technology.
		1. Disagree. That’s the role of alliances.
		2. We shouldn’t be marketing our technology in the standards group.
	6. Do we need a mission statement? Condense purpose into a few sentences.
		1. “The best place to develop network standards”
	7. We don’t have a process to develop collateral in 802.
		1. Industry connections is an IEEE-SA way of doing this.
	8. Don’t want the distraction of having marketing discussions in our groups.
	9. Purpose of 802 marketing would be to have a scope that is not technology-specific, but is 802-specific.
		1. Disagree. We’re not a marketing organization.
	10. Could have a “summit” and come up with a tag-line.
	11. Job of marketing is to highlight/communicate core value that 802 brings to the world. Will increase attendance. Some of the smaller groups are doing good stuff, but don’t have enough participation.
	12. Like a tagline for promotion – e.g., like 802.16. Consistency would be good.
	13. Whoever does the marketing needs input from us
	14. Action: John to create a mission statement.
		1. For this activity
		2. For 802
2. Review of Get 802 programme Paul Nikolich 25 14:25 14:50
	1. Copy of the proposed agreement was reviewed. As this document is confidential, it is not reproduced here, neither are any comments on confidential parts of the agreement.
	2. Do we have to re-negotiate every year?
		1. Yes. At least for this year’s agreement.
	3. It’s a problem that IEEE-SA won’t commit very far into the future.
	4. Plus other bits which have been redacted for no obvious good reason.
	5. We need to agree to this as amended. Can’t do this today. Will do a 10-day letter ballot.
	6. Need to get the next agreement don’t earlier than November next time round.
	7. Action: Paul to arrange 10-day letter ballot on Get 802 agreement.
	8. Action: Karen to fix numbering problem (2.2) in Get 802 agreement.
3. China outreach for March plenary Kraemer 15 14:45 15:00
	1. Straw poll, should we have these activities:
		1. Before (IETF 2 weeks before) 9
		2. After (note SASB is 25th March) 3
	2. Could do a tutorial
	3. 14-15th March potential slot
	4. Workshop potentially on 14-15th to satisfy sponsor.
	5. Do we want outreach during the plenary? E.g. invite leadership from various standards organizations to attend some or all of the session.
	6. Opening handshake and greetings. Plan for it.
	7. Protocol requires on us doing that.
	8. When will dates be finalized?
	9. Suggest EC members plan on being in Beijing to participate on 14-15th.
	10. Financials to be determined
		1. Either a sponsor
		2. Or an attendance fee
		3. Or cancel the workshop
	11. Who is going to form and run ad-hoc to finalize the plans?
		1. Bob & Bruce
	12. Action: Bob, Glen & Bruce to pull together a plan for March 2014 China plenary.
4. Break 15 15:00 15:15
5. Should the 802 community consider separating from the IEEE SA and establishing an independent SDO? Paul Nikolich 45 15:20 16:05
	1. Need also to include soft values, branding.
	2. Other alternatives to starting our own SDO
		1. Could contribute to SC6 directly
		2. IETF
	3. Other values: MOUs, ISO/IEC membership, Legal support, cross org negotiation, enabling broad partnerships.
	4. ISO branding. What is its value? Very hard to get firm figures.
	5. Where are difficulties:
		1. Quality of IT services that don’t keep up with commercial experience.
	6. IEEE-SA as an org may be weak mentoring inexperienced groups.
	7. Having an IEEE-SA standard does not guarantee success.
	8. 802 is passionate about openness, fairness
		1. Want to see a deeper endorsement of those principles across IEEE-SA.
	9. Process should show some failures. Standards that follow process are approved.
		1. Even in 802.3, we have about 50% market success across the PHYs.
	10. Success in 802 in part based on experience of founding members, starting with a layered model. Backwards compatibility deeply ingrained.
	11. Relationship with other standards groups in the SA – e.g., ComSoc, when there are overlapping areas. Communications difficulties.
	12. SA staff do not understand the markets that we are serving. Subject matter experts.
		1. Disagree. SA should stay in the process area. SA wouldn’t pay market rates for good experts.
		2. Agree. There are some places where expertise is helpful.
		3. Disagree.
	13. Respect for investment industry is making needs to be elevated in SA.
	14. Relationship between staff and volunteers. SA Reorg will affect this. Ongoing topic of debate.
	15. Concern about statements by IEEE being attributed as authoritative.
	16. ITU-R has a “counsellor” staff role. Senior experienced people, do a lot of the admin work of the group.
	17. It would be good to get equivalent feedback from SA staff about their view of the relationship.
	18. About the discussion:
		1. Openness is good
	19. Straw poll:
		1. Should we do this (kind of discussion topic) again?
			1. Yes 8
			2. No 4
	20. Next time be crisper about purpose of the discussion and involve both parties.
6. Non-USA meetings services requirements
 Take feedback on Geneva meeting and identify any issues
 Review existing requirements and discuss if they are adequate Jon Rosdahl 35 16:00 16:35
	1. Network provision was poor
	2. Coffee poor
	3. Lack of Social no big deal
	4. Successful contacts/influence gained
	5. Lack of interchange between groups
	6. New experience
	7. Physical separation between groups (repeated several times)
7. Review Actions from this meeting Adrian 15 16:35 16:50
8. Retrospective - has this workshop proved to be a valuable use of time? Adrian 5 16:50 16:55
	1. Felt needed fewer topics and more depth.
	2. 2-yearly might not be often enough. Prefer 1-yearly
	3. Straw poll: Should we repeat this exercise?
		1. Yes 11
		2. No 0
	4. Straw poll: was this?
		1. Excellent use of my time 0
		2. Good use of my time 9
		3. So so 4
		4. Barely worth attending 0
		5. A complete waste of time 0