

IEEE 802 July 2019 Rules Meeting

Agenda

- P&P Responses from AudCom
- Proposed OM changes
- Proposed CG changes

Updates to the IEEE 802 LMSC Policies and Procedures and IEEE 802 LMSC Working Group Policies and Procedure

Update to 2018 Baselines

- LMSC P&P
 - Proposed: ec-18-0102-09
 - Comparison of proposal and current version: ec-18-0129-04
 - AudCom checklist:
-

AudCom Reviewers Additional Comments

- AudCom was directed by the Standards Board to allow the change from Sponsor to Standards Committee to be an acceptable change. As such the checklist has been updated into R1Please take into account respond to both R0 and R1 comments.
 - Section 1.7 IEEE Sponsor - Scope may worth some discussion.
 - Section 3.1 and 3.3 - Need to complete the procedures in a new officer generation and removal process
 - Section 10 Dominance – Standards Committee action need to be aligned with IEEE-SASB bylaw.
 - Section 11 Standards Committee Ombudsman – Content may be disseminated to section 3.0 and 3.4
 - Section 12 - May be moved to an O&P document of P802
 - Other minor changes in verbiage has also been made in several sections.

Section 0.0

- On Page x, Table of Contents is not allowed in P&P document; per Standards Committee P&P Review Process item 1 b
- Marked as not acceptable
- AudCom conventions 1 b
 - “The Standards Committee’s P&P shall be limited to topics (major headings) addressed in the baseline, which details procedures, responsibilities, or actions necessary to standards development at the Standards Committee level”
- From 2017 Instructions in “Format and Style”
 - “A Table of Contents may be added to the document if desired. It shall be located after the cover page and before the main body of the document.”
- Actions:
 - Suggest pointing this out to AudCom reviewers
 - No change to proposed P&P

1.2 Conduct

- Hyper link appears inserted correctly.
- Marked as acceptable.
- Action:
 - Say thanks?
 - No change to proposed P&P

1.7 IEEE Sponsor Scope - Comments

- Substantive:
 - 1) “using an open and accredited process,” Perhaps, we can change it to “using an open, IEEE-SA acceptable accredited process”
 - 2) “Its technical scope is intended to be flexible and is ultimately determined by the sum of its approved PARs.”
- In IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws 4.2.2.1, The PAR project scope shall be within the scope and purpose of the IEEE, that standards projects are assigned to the proper Society. Hence, suggesting revise the text:
- “Its technical scope is intended to be flexible in coordination with other Standards Committee(s) within IEEE as technical merits required and is ultimately determined by the sum of its approved PARs.”

1.7 IEEE Sponsor Scope - Response

- The instructions say “In Clause 1.7, “IEEE Sponsor Scope,” the Sponsor’s scope shall be focused on the content of the specific standards, and the standards process within the Sponsor’s responsibilities. Discussion of other non-standard activities should be placed in the Sponsor’s Operating Manual or similar document.”
- The document says “This clause shall include the Sponsor's approved scope.”
- Marked as not acceptable
- Actions:
 - What document has our approved scope?
 - Is that correctly represented in the document?
 - Do we want to change it, and if so, how would it be done?
 - May require change to proposed P&P

3.0 Officers

- Substantive:
- Since additional officers are allowed, altering the titles to include additional officers is within the spirit of allowance.
- Marked as acceptable
- Actions:
 - Acknowledge comment from reviewers, no change.
 - No change to proposed P&P

3.1 Election or Appointment of Officers (1)

- Substantive:
- 1. This P&P did not follow officer generation schema in the template: Case 1, Case 2, and Case 2 (or the combination of case 1/2/3). P&P designed a new schema that elect Chair and Chair appoint other officers. AudCom allows this the alternation of schema. There are few important procedural steps missing in the proposed schema:
 - a. Election term – once per year?
 - b. Election administrator and appointment procedure
 - c. Nomination procedure and nominee acceptance procedure
 - d. Election voting procedure
- Marked as not acceptable

3.1 Election or Appointment of Officers (2)

- a. Election term – once per year?
 - It says “The term for all officers of the Standards Committee ends at close of the first plenary session of each even numbered year.”
 - Actions:
 - Point this out to AudCom Reviewers, ask for discussion
 - No change to proposed P&P (or do we add words to clarify that it is a 2 year term?)
- b. Election administrator and appointment procedure
- c. Nomination procedure and nominee acceptance procedure
- d. Election voting procedure
 - Proposed P&P is silent on these
 - Actions:
 - Option 1: Point out that Roberts Rules has procedures for this
 - Option 2: Define these in the document.

3.3 Removal of Officers

- Substantive:
- 1. AudCom allows the alternative schema, but proper procedures need to be developed along with alternative procedures. (e.g., percentage of the vote; rebuttal)
- Marked as not acceptable
- Notes:
 - Our changes were only to remove the requirement for executive session and to add that grounds for removal shall be included in the motion.
 - Vote total and rebuttal are called out using AudCom words
- Action:
 - Suggest pointing out that the requested text is already in the section and ask reviewers for time to discuss, if necessary
 - No change to proposed P&P

3.4 Responsibilities of the Officers

- Marked as not acceptable with no comment
- Our change was from “Sponsor” To “Standards Committee”
- Most likely, AudCom reviewer neglected to mark this as acceptable based on SASB guidance.
- Actions:
 - Ask for clarification from the reviewers, suggest gently that perhaps this was overlooked when updating the checklist
 - No change to proposed P&P

3.4.1 Chair

- Substantive:
- 1) Deleting “b) Forming study groups, as necessary.” text is not allowed
- Marked as not acceptable
- In 5.5 PAR Development the AudCom text says:
 - “the Standards Committee may form a PAR Study Group as a subgroup of the Standards Committee or as a subgroup of an existing Working Group to examine the proposal”
- Actions:
 - Point out that 5.5 assigns responsibility for forming a PAR Study Group to the Standards Committee and not the Standards Committee Chair. Ask for time to discuss with reviewers
 - No change to proposed P&P

4.3 Voting Membership

- Substantive
- 1) Sentence needs to be clarified: “This letter is to document several key factors relative to their participation on the Standards Committee and is to be signed by both the Standards Committee member and an individual who has management responsibility for the Standards Committee member.” What role in the Standards Committee is considered has management responsibility? Chair? First Vice Chair? Second Vice Chair? Etc.
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: In this section, the term “management responsibility” is intended to refer to the member’s manager “from their supporting entity” (previous sentence).
- Actions:
 - Clarify the text as follows: “... an individual [from the supporting entity](#) who has management responsibility for the Standards Committee member.”
 - Update proposed P&P with suggested text.

4.3.2 Request to the Chair for Voting Membership

- Editorial
- 1) Changing Section title from “Request to the Chair” to “Request to the Standards Committee Chair” is usually not allowed with exception of advised in instructional text and special circumstance
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: Throughout the document, for consistency and to avoid confusion, the Chair is always referred to as the “Standards Committee Chair”. In the baseline, it is sometimes “Sponsor Chair” and sometimes “Chair”
- This section is marked “Not Applicable” in our proposed P&P
- Actions:
 - Point out desire for consistency in document and ask it if would be OK.
 - If not, change back to Chair

5.5.1 PAR Study Group

- Substantive
 - 1) 1st Paragraph, Changes are not permitted.
 - 2) 2nd Paragraph, it is a new paragraph, is not permitted.
 - 3) 3rd Paragraph, Changes are not permitted.
- Marked as not acceptable
- Notes:
 - 1st: Change to match superior rules (formed under Standards Committee or Working Group)
 - 2nd: Change to match superior rules and editorial
 - 3rd: Moved to end of section.

5.5.1 PAR Study Group

- Actions
 - Present new text to AudCom reviewers for discussion
 - Provide quote from superior rules
 - SASB OpsMan 5.2 Project Authorization “A PAR Study Group is a subgroup of the Standards Committee or Working Group ...”
 - Previous third paragraph was moved to 5.5.5 Other Rules for PAR Study Groups, ask AudCom reviewers for comments

5.5.3 Participation and Voting (1)

- Substantive
 - 1) 1st Paragraph, Changes are not permitted.
 - 2) 2nd Paragraph, No wordsmith is permitted and changes are permitted
 - a. remove brackets
 - b. increase numbers
- Marked as not acceptable

5.5.3 Participation and Voting (2)

- 1st paragraph: We “fixed” the wording here. The issue was that it referred to as a Working Group developing a PAR, rather than a PAR Study Group formed under a Working Group.
- 2nd paragraph We used proper English, but we can give back on it.
- Actions
 - Discuss 1st paragraph and point out that it doesn't handle all cases as defined by the superior rules
 - For 2nd, the meaning is the same, but it stated more clearly.
 - Potential changes to proposed P&P from this.

5.5.4 Submission of PAR to the Sponsor

- Substantive
 - 1) 1st Paragraph, Change (deletion the phrase “or Working Group” is not permitted.
 - 2) 2rd Paragraph is a new paragraph which is not permitted
- Note: The action described in this paragraph seems not belong to the Standard Committee
- Marked as not acceptable
- Actions:
 - 1st paragraph: The issue is the conflict between the superior rules and the wording in the baseline. We should group all of this as one discussion
 - 2nd paragraph has been moved to new subsection. We should socialize this with the AudCom reviewers.

5.7 Technical Advisory Groups

- Substantive
 - 1) Section is new, which is not permitted under AudCom 2017 P&P Template
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: AudCom conventions (3 Dec. 2018) 1 c states:
 - Additional material related to standards development that falls under a topic in the baseline shall be added to that existing topic section.
- Note: P&P template says that it should be added to the end.

5.7 Technical Advisory Groups (2)

- Actions:
 - Discuss with AudCom reviewers if the material is more appropriate here or at the end of the document.
 - This applies to a few sections
 - No change to proposed P&P.

5.8 Additional Rules for Working Groups

- Substantive
 - 1) Section is new, which is not permitted under AudCom 2017 P&P Template
- Marked as not acceptable
- Same analysis and actions as for 5.7

6.2 Executive Session

- Editorial
- Substantive
 - 1) 2st Paragraph, changing “executive session” into “Executive Session” violated the clause shall not be modified instruction.
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: Baseline does not correctly capitalize it at this point, it is correctly capitalized elsewhere in the section
- Actions:
 - Point out to AudCom reviewers that this is not a substantive change, it is editorial to maintain the convention used for this section.
 - No change to proposed P&P

6.4 Minutes

- Editorial
- Substantive:
- Changing “executive session” into “Executive Session” violated the clause shall not be modified instruction.
- Marked as not acceptable
- Same action as for 6.2

7.1.1 Actions requiring approval by a majority vote

- Editorial
 - 1) Editing Item e) violated the instruction only edit bracketed text
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: SASB changed co-sponsor to joint development project
- Actions
 - Discuss with AudCom reviewers how current SASB rules override the baseline and all existing P&Ps. This change simply brings it inline with the superior rules
 - No change to proposed P&P

7.1.2 Actions requiring approval by a two-thirds vote

- Substantive
 - Editing Item a) violated the instruction clause shall not be modified
 - 3rd Paragraph is a new paragraph contain notes which violated the instruction except to include additional voting actions
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: This has to do with changes to the P&P
- Actions:
 - Discuss with AudCom reviewers, pointing out that the baseline allows a minority of the members to change the P&P. Example: 15 members, 8 present is a quorum, 6 in favor meets 2/3 but is only 2/5 (40%) of the members.
 - This was last approved by SASB in 2014
 - No change to proposed P&P

8.2 External Communications

- Substantive
 - 1) Editing text in the section violated the instruction clause shall not be modified
- Marked as not acceptable
- Added “Standards Committee” to Chair
- Actions:
 - Discuss with AudCom reviewers. Point out that the baseline is inconsistent in its usage. There are multiple chairs discussed in the document. Using the correct terminology makes this clear
 - No change to proposed P&P.

10.0 dominance

- Note: Further considering other sections of AudCom convention, taking all sections in context, additional sections are acceptable.
- Substantive:
 - 1) Paragraph 5 “the Standards Committee may direct that the votes of individuals in the dominating party shall be treated as a single vote for the purpose of that activity.”
- This dominance action is in conflict with SASB bylaw section
- 5.2.1.3 Dominance paragraph 3 and 4,
 - Standards Committee “only” monitor/report/recommend corrective actions.
 - SASB shall determine dominance exists, corrective action needed and specify approved corrective action(s).
 - Standards Committee implement SASB approved corrective action(s)
- Marked as not acceptable

10.0 Dominance (discussion)

- SASB has updated the rules to create a procedure, taking it out of the LMSC's hands.
 - Standards Committees shall monitor standards developing committees and duly authorized IEEE-SA activities for signs of dominance.
 - If dominance is suspected by the Standards Committee, the Standards Committee shall immediately notify the Secretary of the IEEE-SA Standards Board and should recommend corrective action(s), which may include corrective action(s) listed in the Standards Committee's official P&P.
 - SASB then decides if it exists and if something should be done
 - Standards Committee implements specific corrective action approved by SASB
 - SASB continually monitors efficacy of corrective actions and may take further actions, cease current actions or implement other actions
- Do we want to list in the P&P any specific actions? Do we need a section that references the SASB bylaws?
- Actions:
 - Decide on change for proposed P&P

11.0 Standards Committee Ombudsman

- Note: Further considering other sections of AudCom convention, taking all sections in context, additional sections are acceptable.
- Substantive:
 - 1) Is the ombudsman an officer of the Standards Committee? if yes, please define the role in section 3.0 and define role's responsibilities in section 3.4
- The content of this section can be moved to section 3.0 and 3.4 respectively
- Marked as not acceptable
- Note: Ombudsman is not an officer in current proposal, all of whom are voting members.
- Actions:
 - Should some or most of this be in the operations manual?
 - Depending on consensus, could change proposed P&P

12.0 Revision of Standards Committee P&P

- Substantive:
- This section is more appropriate to be included in a submitters O&P manual or similar document
- Marked as not acceptable

Proposed OM Changes

See ec-19-0047-02

Changes since last OM proposal

- In Figure 1, add Standards Committee PAR Study Group
- In Figure 2, change to Standards Committee PAR Study Group
- We will need to wait for AudCom response to finalize OM changes.

Procedural vs. Technical

- Ad-hoc reviewed ideas and Gilb drafted a document
 - Document ec-19-0113-00
- Further comments after review?

Changes to the Chair's Guidelines

Proposed text for Ombudsman (1)

- New section: 2.21: 802 Executive Committee Chairman's Guideline for the 802 Ombudsman

Purpose: To concisely state the role and responsibilities of the 802 Ombudsman.

802 Ombudsman Position Description:

1. Is a confidential and informal information resource, communications channel, complaint-handler and dispute-resolver, and a person who helps an organization work for change.
2. Purpose is to foster values and decent behavior -fairness, justice, equality of opportunity and respect
3. Is a designated neutral within an organization and reports to the 802 Executive Committee, outside ordinary management channels
4. Comply with all requirements defined in 802 LMSC P&P 11.0 Standards Committee Ombudsman
5. Contact details: 802ombudsman@ieee.org

Proposed text for Ombudsman (2)

802 Ombudsman Position functions and skills

1. Listening impartially
2. Providing and Receiving Information
3. Reframing Issues and Developing Options
4. Referral
5. Helping People Help Themselves
6. Information - Third Party Intervention and Diplomacy
7. Looking into the Problem
8. Generic Approach
9. Systems Change
10. Following Through
11. Investigation and Adjudication or Formal Appeals

Proposed text for Ombudsman (3)

802 Ombudsman operational guidance

1. Conflict of Interest

- a) Should an IEEE 802 participant seek the ombudsman's help on a matter that is related to any of the ombudsman's affiliations, the ombudsman is conflicted.
- b) In case the ombudsman is conflicted, the 802 ombudsman shall refer the help seeking IEEE 802 participant to the IEEE 802 EC chair for assignment of an unconflicted person to act as the 'unconflicted ombudsman' for that particular case.

2. Confidentiality

- a) The 802 ombudsman shall treat all conversation and communication of IEEE 802 participants approaching the ombudsman in his role as ombudsman as strictly confidential.
- b) Without the written consent of an IEEE 802 participant seeking the ombudsman's help, the ombudsman shall not reveal the identity of the participant.

3. Independence and Neutrality

- a) The ombudsman shall act as independent and neutral third party that may bring forward concerns or complaints on behalf of IEEE 802 participants.

Consent Agenda, PAR Study Groups

- 2.16 Consent agenda
- The following should be considered for inclusion on the consent agenda upon request:
 - 1) First renewal of a Study Group (either ECSG or WGSG)
- No such thing as "renewal" - this would be a rechartering - can we get this cleaned up?
- Probably should clean up a lot in the CG.

Various changes

- Memorialize the use of the motion slides. Gilb to develop some text for the CG and publish it
- Review 2.9 and add notes for non-PAR and pre-PAR activity. Gilb will magic this into existence.