# Restructuring ad hoc meeting notes15 December 12:00-13:00 ET802

Participants:
802 EC Members: Paul Nikolich (CH), James Gilb (VC1), Roger Marks (VC2), Jon Rosdahl (ES), John D’Ambrosia (RS), George Zimmerman (T), Glenn Parsons (.1), David Law (.3), Jay Holcomb (.18), Steve Shellhammer (.19), Tim Godfrey (.24), Clint Chaplin (EO), Geoff Thompson (EO), Subir Das (.20)
802 WG/TAG designees: Stuart Kerry (.18), Tuncer Baykas (.19), Jessy Rouyer (.1), Robert Stacey (.11), Rick Alfvin (.15), Ben Rolfe (.24)
former EC members: Bruce Kraemer, Radhakrishna Canchi
observers: Jodi Haasz, Peter Jones, Carl Kain, Joseph Levy,

Notes (combined effort, Rolfe, Zimmerman, Nikolich):

Nikolich chaired the meeting, called to order at 12:05 ET.

Nikolich presented slide deck ec-20-0256-00-00EC-15dec2020-802-restructure-ad-hoc.pptx

Nikolich reviewed the agenda:

1. Discuss, refine and agree on the scope of the ad hoc:
	1. Specify what problem(s) we are trying to solve
	2. consider the pros and cons of various restructuring options
2. Discuss the proposed deliverable:
	1. a well vetted and socialized recommendation for EC consideration within 12 months
3. Discuss day/time monthly meeting recommendation:
13:00-14:00 ET 3rd Tuesday of each month in 2021
4. Review action items, draft agenda for our next meeting

Mr. Thompson requested the following addition to the agenda

* Limit the scope of today’s discussion to what the problems we are trying to solve.

Chair presents background slide (4)

Discussion:

A participant asked the following clarification question:

What is the difference between the EC and the collective set of WGs and TAGs that is 802? Differentiate between improving WG and TAG efficiency vs EC efficiency.

The Chair answered: We want to do both.

Another participant indicated Agreement with increasing efficiency and responsiveness, but was not not sure about the sub-bullets on slide (4), which he indicated seemed to be assuming there are issues which have not been determined. Perhaps first sub-bullet should be "what do people see as the current bottlenecks". Cautious about making the EC "board" too strategic leading to disconnection from operational reality.  Need to be very cautious.

A third participant commented that slide (4) is not background, this is presupposing there is a problem and presenting proposed solutions.

 A participant questioned, regarding sub-bullet 1: if WGs go directly, what is the point of the EC?

The Chair responded: Not intending these as proposed changes, just as means to stimulate discussion.

Discussion then centered around identifying the problems, and the process to take”.

One participant noted that starting with a solution before identifying the problem is backwards. Disagree with some of the points about lack of efficiency or responsiveness of the PAR review process. Disagree with removing review of PARs and other submissions. These steps make 802 as a whole better. We should review of our processes is a good thing, but needs to be without a preconceived set of solutions.

Another noted Concern that if we do not have 802 wide quality assurance it harms the 802 brand; Ambition to maintain technical coherence across standards which we missed, but maybe we need to get it back. Identify the values we have and how to maintain them.

Another indicated agreement with identifying the problem and identifying the values and costs. Identify desired value of LMSC process. Identify problems. Do cost/benefit analysis.

Finally, a participant suggested perhaps using simpler fixes and not total overhaul. Example: Handling PARs on monthly EC meetings improved responsiveness. When we have specific problems then we can look at fixes, some may be simple.  We can do the same level of review by all WGs with 60-90 day cycle instead of 6 months.

The chair moved on with a discussion of scope of the Ad Hoc.

                There was some discussion of whether the EC has a significant efficiency problem.  Some participants mentioned the delay of the PAR review.  Others mentioned that the new monthly calls had improved delays

The discussion moved to discuss, refine and agree on the scope of the ad hoc, and specifying the scope of the ad hoc.

Discussion moved to filling out candidates for problems. (see slide 6 of chairs deck):
Specify what problem(s) we are trying to solve: discuss and enumerate

1. 3 time/year PAR submission limitation vs value of review
2. Identify the benefit/services 802 provides
3. What service does the 802 EC provide and what is the cost of providing it?
4. PAR review is valuable, 3 times per year is too infrequent, 6 times per year is better
5. 802 EC should provide more technical oversight or coordination between WGs&TAGs, draft PAR review provides this to a degree, this is one of the benefits the 802 EC provides, perhaps we should formalize technical coordination?, e.g., IETF example,
6. Potential Values: competent technical review, training for new groups, ensure process is followed to avoid appeals/delays, what we do should be closely aligned to the SASB calendar, e.g., NesCom and RevCom deadlines,
7. Efficiency gains wrt rules, e.g., need for face to face mtg requirements, registration rqmts, gaining voting membership, look for a shift from FtF meetings to online meetings, perhaps FtF meeting become more social than necessary to complete work
8. Support technical coherence/coordination. Comparing to other societies, 802 provides value as a family
9. Need to be able to initiate and complete a stds project within a 2.5 year time frame, because it is essential to the success of the std, allow participants to gain membership at electronic meetings, permit more frequent meetings to gain membership
10. There is redundancy in the above list. 802 has outside of the formulating group reviewers, this provided better review, built in set of naïve readers. A new project brings in new participants that want to make quick progress, but the 802 EC has a broader, long range perspective that helps fit the process better. Quality – what we have is a loose confederation that enables us to form systems of value over time, e.g., operational technology networks/factory automation is occurring, going towards 802 wired/wireless/TSN technologies.
11. We discussed cost/benefit analysis, but we now have monthly EC meetings which has raised the cost of EC participation. We talk about the value of 802, 802 has become the General Motors of networking, which brings significant brand value to networking. Perhaps we need to split the larger WGs into smaller WGs?

Notes on the discussion that resulted in items 1 to 11 above, from individual participants:

Several participants voiced a desire to select the problems to work on. Suggestions included:

\* Selecting problems to work on by identifying where efficiciency lacks, e.g. the PAR process being streamlined by allowing PARs to be handled on TCs.

\* Identifying the cost/benefit of changes, as well asthe deliverables that 802 is striving to provide.

\* Resisting our nature to jump to solutions, and instead analyze the problem first.

\* PAR review is valuable: it can avoid delays. Need to do it more often, so we can get PARs through quickly while still getting thorough review. Example of where our process might take longer up front but is faster overall.

\* EC should be providing technical oversight or coordination.  PAR review facilitates technical coordination. We need as stronger technical coordination function.

\*  A couple values that we provide or should provide:

·        Competent technical review.  Cannot rely on SA or SASB for technical review.

·        Training for new groups (share experience)

·        Assuring process

\* What we do should be aligned to SASB calendar. E.g. PAR review often enough to match REVCOM so we can hit the REVCOM deadlines. Match schedule to SASB schedule

\* Supporting of improved technical coordination. Favor looking at efficiency gains to make effective use of lessons learned from 2020. E.g. review voting membership requirements to provide alternatives to face to face attendance.

\* Support Roger and James comments on value of consistency LMSC brings across an architecture. Can improve on this, it makes a difference. 802 standards are of high quality compared to other SA examples.

\* High level problem statement: be able to initiate and complete meaningful standards project in 2.5 to 3 years. Bring in new people and bring them on-line faster.

\* Review from outside the TF/TG/WG provides a better review. A new group brings in new participants who want quick progress, and the 802 EC broader long range view adds value to the focused view.  Quality: our 802 "confederation" enables forming systems which are increasingly important and becomes more so over time. Awareness across groups is important. Creates greater value for 802 as a whole.

\* Question to chair: do you see the scope of this as restructuring EC operations, or restructuring 802 as a whole?

Response:  My perspective is both. Not imposing that on the group. Fine if the group chooses to focus on one or the other (or both).

\* Move to monthly EC meetings was done without cost/benefit. Cost has risen. Need to do the analysis.  Value of 802 brand "clout".  802 has become the GM of networking, need to recognize the value of brand. Reorganization may help, but need to keep brand management in mind.

Begin wrap-up at 12:55 ET:

Next meetings:
Proposed to hold monthly meetings third Tuesday of each month 13:00-14:00 ET. No objections to holding the next meeting 13:00-14:00ET 19 January 2021

Action Items:

1. Rolfe/Zimmerman/Nikolich to publish meeting notes
2. Ad hoc members to continue discussion on what problem(s) we are trying to solve on the 802 EC reflector.

Having reached the end of the agenda, the meeting was adjourned approximately 12:59 ET