EC Workshop Meeting Minutes

November 08, 2014

San Antonio Texas, USA

Workshop Chairs: Apurva Mody and Subir Das

Minutes taken by Subir Das

1. Review Goals, Objectives and approve agenda for Workshop

Apurva and Subir did the agenda bashing and mentioned the ground rules (Ref: DCN EC-14-0069-06)

1. Review actions from previous meeting

Refer to Paul's email: Open Action items from Nov 2013. Geoff's one is dropped. Roger's one is in today's agenda.

1. Altering the plenary week to allow for more project meetings

David suggested moving the EC opening plenary from Monday to Sunday evening. Discussions took place. David, Glenn and John D supported the idea. Adrian, Jon D, James, Dorothy Clint, Steve, Geoff, Roger did not support the idea. Jon D supports but he needs time to prepare for EC meeting. Paul suggested starting the EC opening plenary on Monday morning at 7 am and finish at 8:30am. Pat supported this idea. After this proposal, David withdrew his proposal and supports Paul's idea. Adrian called for a straw poll. A straw poll was conducted using Chicago Rules:

* Regarding the Opening EC Meeting
  + Option 1 – Leave as is
  + Option 2 – Change meeting time to 7 to 8:30am
  + Option 3 – Change meeting time to 7 to 9:30am
  + Option 4 - Change meeting time to 8 to 9:30am
* Results
  + 1 9
  + 2 9
  + 3 7
  + 4 11

Consensus was to run **Option 4 in March, 2015**.

**Action items:**

* Jon R will inform F2F and John D will use it.
* Paul was requested to give guidance on how this will be conducted.
* Paul will provide the guidance at the end of the Jan, 2015 closing meeting.

1. Long Range Financial Planning - When and where the registration fee needs to be adjusted/Conflict of registration fees/meeting notices

Discussion started. It was asked: what is the implication on F&B higher or lower? In the contract F&B is normally specified; there is a minimum and there is what is being charged due to price change (due to the time difference between when the contract was signed and when it is executed/meeting is taking place). There was a question on why future was not projected? Answer was that there was not enough time. What is the reasonable expectation per person expense? Answer was $600- $900. Additional expense is $150-$450 when it is in a foreign venue. It was mentioned that Clint did a very good job. Suggestion was to add two more points: F&B guaranteed and what meeting space cost is. Clint explained that second point is already being covered. So there is no need for additional input. David requested a sanitized version of this spread sheet so that he can present it in his group. Clint mentioned that the sanitized version is already in his plenary report.

**Action Item:** Clint and David will work together to find a way to sanitize the version.

It was noted that North American venue has zero meeting space fee. Adrian suggested maintaining and posting these data.

**Action Item:** Clint will work on this.

Next discussion point was: how do we keep the non-NA set aside and how? Clint did as his treasurer’s job and figured out the magic number. Additional discussions took place to understand member's view on whether other organizations provide the similar benefit that we do or are we better? IETF example was cited. OTH, it was mentioned that IETF meeting durations are shorter for individual WG and comparison is not fair in that respect. Moreover, they get the sponsorship. 3GPP was mentioned, in particular it was mentioned that mega meetings are held in a different way. They negotiate with the hotel. However, 3GPP does not have any social and also F&B is very minimal. IETF gets better sponsorship and they do not have Social if there is no sponsorship. Suggestions were welcome; Adam and David suggested increasing the transparency of sharing the cost data. Adrian suggested including few metrics: duration, number of attendees, target reserve; Jon D suggested to re-run the survey on what services are being expected? David suggested considering the registration fee variation by location. Glenn suggested inviting sponsors their technologies if we need to build the overlay network service; otherwise negotiate with the hotel for network service. Geoff suggested having a standard format form Non-NA venue (e.g., include BF with the hotel rate, eliminate social). Bob reinforced that our meeting cost is fixed. Whether we do F&B instead of meeting room or get separate room fee with F&B. For Non-NA venue, it is different. We do pay for the meeting space. It was suggested that reducing the one side and increasing the other side is not a good idea. It was suggested tracking per person cost/venue, if possible. For non-NA venue, explore tier-2 cities. Paul thinks that the cost information should be made public and suggested adding three rows in Clint's spreadsheet: estimate for lodging, estimate for F&B, and transportation.

Discussion continued on suggestions for cost reduction or revenue increase and following options were put on the table for straw poll:

1. Eliminate F&B costs if beneficial
2. Use hotel networking (requirement for hotel selection)
3. Increase registration fees to achieve target reserve over a defined period of time
4. Identify via a survey to identify services expectation
5. Vary meeting fee by location
6. Seek sponsors to showcase network technologies to use as a needed meeting service
7. Non-North American events should be considered on their own merits & costs, e.g. eliminate socials when possible for cost control, leave breakfasts to hotels
8. Track per person costs for proposed venues
9. Explore Tier2 cities as meeting options for NA events
10. Explore Tier2 cities as meeting options for non NA events
11. Explore obtaining sponsorships, including IEEE-SA
12. Eliminate “Get IEEE 802” Fee
13. Pay for attending socials

Straw Poll result: A- 8; B- 8; C- 16; D-9; E- 8; F-3 ; G- 15; H- 14; I-14; J- 14; K- 10; L-8; M- 4

Adrian suggested strawman **action item:** We ask Jon and Clint to bring a proposal in next meeting in EC (Feb telecon) on item c. James proposes to have **an evaluation** from a network professional if hotel can support our networking requirements. **Action item**: James will work on a proposal and present in March, 2015 Plenary. Jon R presented 2012 EC survey. David suggested an **action item:** Add additional criteria to the study. David will work with Clint and Jon R . David also suggested that we should eliminate the early registration fee for Non-NA venue. David will bring **a motion to EC** February telecon. Steve suggested an **action item**: For all future venues, EC EXSec should add per person expected cost in the proposal. **Action item for Jon**: To re-run the survey; Jon will do this.

1. International Venue Expectations (Wi-Fi, Cancellation Policy, etc).

It was mentioned that People should not get surprised with the charges. Better communication with all information - conditions/no conditions. It was suggested adding an item in the survey what folks think about it. It was also mentioned that future hotel RFP does include an item with the hotel room Internet connectivity (clarification was made that this is for Wireless Interim not plenary).

Morning Break

1. ITU Standing Committee

Glenn presented DCN: EC-082. Question was asked about multi-stakeholder portion? Glenn covered those points. It was mentioned that IEEE members can get the access to the ITU docs. Process is mentioned in this presentation. A Stawpoll was conducted on three questions:

Is current feedback to IEEE 802 sufficient:

No: 1

Don't know: 10

Don't care: 0

Yes: 5;

**Action item:** Suggestion was to cover this topic in telecon meetings.

It was emphasized thatwe do not have any say to ITU. We can certainly influence it. Need to work with the countries. David suggested that we need to keep policy and technical things separate.

**Action items:** Glenn and Mike will work together and make us aware of the developments.

Working Lunch and continue with WG Rules update

1. WG Rules Update

James presented DCN EC-0087. David thinks that the text (Fiduciary duty) in slide #13 may be an issue when we represent in EC as WG representative but may not be an issue in the WG. Some felt that this does not applicable to us. Several questions were raised such as:

What is the definition of Fiduciary responsibility?

What is the definition of 'Interest Groups'?

Is our WG is an interest group?

What is the" best interest of IEEE"?

Lengthy discussions took place regarding rules.

**Action Items:**

David volunteered to send the presentation link on 'fiduciary responsibilities'.

Jon R will help James to write some texts on what it should be from our perspective.

James will reflect the discussion points/suggestions and circulate via email for balloting before March, 2015 plenary.

1. IEEE Internet Governance

Karen walked through her presentation. Presentation will be available to workshop participants. Karen will either upload to Mentor or send to John A. Folks wanted to know Karen's new position. Karen is responsible for Technology Policy for global and International Affairs. Jodi is now under Karen. This is relatively a new organization. More communications will happen from IEEE and 802. It was requested to send an email communication to EC mailing list as these events happen.

The document is now available in EC document server (DCN: EC-14-49-01)

1. LTE-Unlicensed IEEE 802 Strategy

Steve presented the document: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.19/dcn/14/19-14-0080-01-0000-coexistence-lessons-learned.ppt.

Discussion took place. Question asked: what would be the strategy here? Are we saying is that let 3GPP do the analysis and then we can review/comment? It was mentioned to emphasize that this is an IEEE 802 document not just from few individuals or one WG. Some minor suggestions were made to improve the letter. It was also suggested that we would like to get 3GPP use cases and their analysis. The point was made: can we have an agreement on this at the RAN meeting? Steve will attend the December, 2014 RAN meeting and present this on behalf of IEEE 802. He is currently discussing with the 3GPP RAN Chair and would like to invite him to January, 2015 meeting in Atlanta. If he succeeds, he will work with Jon R to schedule a session where all the WGs can participates.

Paul has authorized Steve to run an email ballot for approval of the liaison response to 3GPP.

**Action item:** Steve will initiate it as soon as possible.

1. Definition of market relevance in context of Broad Market Potential

Geoff described the problem and issues. He thinks that the 'Broad Market Potential' was an important issue may be in earlier days but may not be an issue now in its original form. We added CSD in the WG ballot and EC approval process. How this can be evaluated is not nailed down yet? The suggestion was to add this in WG letter ballot and sponsor ballot cover letters. Other way it could be done at the O&M level but there is no way we can do this at the IEEE level. It was decided that there is no need to add CSD in the Sponsor Ballot.

1. Address Confidential Communications Policy/Process

It was mentioned that we do not have mechanisms to handle the confidential information. David pointed out the IEEE-SA Ops manual rule on handling confidentiality matters. Paul mentions computer society has a subclause on how to handle confidential information.

* **Action items:** James will look at IEEE-SA and computer society rules and inform EC accordingly.

At this point agenda bashing happened again and following items were dropped or handled differently due to time budget:

1. WG Ballot Notice – Roger uploaded the DCN: EC-14-0088-00 which covers this issue
2. Supply Additional Suggestions to Chair and Recording Secretary – dropped
3. BOF and Tutorial Definition and Effectiveness- dropped

Afternoon Break

1. EC Business Roundtable

A couple of mins discussions happened. It was mentioned that this is hard. Workshop type things were suggested. It was also mentioned that we need to be careful what we ask from industry leaders.

At this point the session was converted to an Executive Session and the meeting was conducted by LMSC Chair, Paul Nikolich.

1. Further discussion on the IEEE indemnification policy
2. Establishing 802 LMSC as a separate legal entity

Executive session ended and following agenda items were discussed.

1. Recap and Review Actions from this meeting

Subir and Apurva did a quick recap and action items were reviewed.

1. Retrospective - has this workshop proved to be a valuable use of time.

It was felt that the workshop became very useful and EC was able to discuss several very important topics that were otherwise couldn’t be covered/discussed during normal plenary meeting hours. General consensus was to continue with this kind of workshop in future.

Agenda Topics and List of Action Items

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Workshop Agenda Topics** | **Consensus and Actions Items** |
| 1. Altering the plenary week to allow for more project meetings | Run **EC Plenary Opening session in March, 2015** from **8:00- 9:30am**   * Jon R will inform F2F and John D will use it. * Paul was requested to give guidance on how this will be conducted. * Paul will provide the guidance at the end of the Jan, 2015 closing meeting. |
| 1. Long Range Financial Planning - When and where the registration fee needs to be adjusted/Conflict of registration fees/meeting notices | * Clint and David will work together to find a way to sanitize the report so that it can be shared at the WG level * Clint will work on maintaining and posting the meeting space fee data. * Jon R and Clint will bring a proposal in EC February, 2015 telecon on item c: Increase registration fees to achieve target reserve over a defined period of time. * James will bring a proposal in March, 2015 plenary, on having an evaluation done from a network professional whether future hotel can support our networking requirements. * Jon R will initiate a survey similar to what was done in 2012. David will work with Clint and Jon R to add additional criteria to the study. * David will bring amotion to EC February, 2015 telecon with the proposal to eliminate the early registration fee for Non-NA venue. * Jon R will add per person expected cost in the future venue proposal (that will be presented to EC for approval). |
| 1. ITU Standing Committee | This topic will be normally covered in telecon meetings.   * Glenn and Mike will work together and make us aware of the developments. |
| 1. WG Rules Update | * David will send the presentation link on 'fiduciary responsibilities'. * Jon R will help James to write some texts on what it should be from our perspective. * James will reflect the discussion points/suggestions and circulate via email for balloting before March plenary |
| 1. LTE-Unlicensed IEEE 802 Strategy | Paul authorized Steve to run an email ballot for approval of the liaison response to 3GPP.   * Steve will initiate it as soon as possible. |