

March 2022 Rules Meeting

Guidelines for IEEE-SA Meetings

- All IEEE-SA standards meetings shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including antitrust and competition laws.
 - Don't discuss the interpretation, validity, or essentiality of patents/patent claims.
 - Don't discuss specific license rates, terms, or conditions.
 - Relative costs of different technical approaches that include relative costs of patent licensing terms may be discussed in standards development meetings.
 - Technical considerations remain the primary focus
 - Don't discuss or engage in the fixing of product prices, allocation of customers, or division of sales markets.
 - Don't discuss the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation.
 - Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed ... do formally object.

For more details, see IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, clause 5.3.10 and
Antitrust and Competition Policy: What You Need to Know at
<http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/antitrust.pdf>

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at
patcom@ieee.org

Participant behavior in IEEE-SA activities is guided by the IEEE Codes of Ethics & Conduct

- All participants in IEEE-SA activities are expected to adhere to the core principles underlying the:
 - IEEE Code of Ethics
 - IEEE Code of Conduct
- The core principles of the IEEE Codes of Ethics & Conduct are to:
 - Uphold the highest standards of integrity, responsible behavior, and ethical and professional conduct
 - Treat people fairly and with respect, to not engage in harassment, discrimination, or retaliation, and to protect people's privacy.
 - Avoid injuring others, their property, reputation, or employment by false or malicious action
- The most recent versions of these Codes are available at <http://www.ieee.org/about/corporate/governance>

Guidelines for IEEE-SA Meetings

- All IEEE-SA standards meetings shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including antitrust and competition laws.
 - Don't discuss the interpretation, validity, or essentiality of patents/patent claims.
 - Don't discuss specific license rates, terms, or conditions.
 - Relative costs of different technical approaches that include relative costs of patent licensing terms may be discussed in standards development meetings.
 - Technical considerations remain the primary focus
 - Don't discuss or engage in the fixing of product prices, allocation of customers, or division of sales markets.
 - Don't discuss the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation.
 - Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed ... do formally object.

For more details, see IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, clause 5.3.10 and
Antitrust and Competition Policy: What You Need to Know at
<http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/antitrust.pdf>

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at
patcom@ieee.org

Agenda

- Voting rules in WG ballot
- Draft Sharing
- Changes for Electronic meetings (Rolfe)
- LMSC review of CSD is procedural (OM)

So, what did James mess up?

- In previous WG P&P (18 March 2021, v 20) it says:
 - Excepting recirculation letter ballots membership may be lost if two of the last three Working Group letter ballots are not returned, or are returned with an abstention for other than “lack of technical expertise.”
- In current WG P&P (2 December, 2021, v23), I messed up and it says:
 - A Letter Ballot Series is the initial ballot plus any recirculation letter ballots on that question.
 - A voting member that fails to return 2 of the last 3 Working Group Letter Ballot Series in which they are eligible to vote loses membership. Their previous Session Attendance Credits do not count towards regaining voting membership.
 - If a Working Group letter ballot closes within 14 days prior to a Session, any changes to voting membership resulting from the ballot shall be delayed until the end of that Session.

Balloting – Law (background)

- [1] The old text read 'Excepting recirculation letter ballots membership may be lost if two of the last three Working Group letter ballots are not returned, or are returned with an abstention for other than "lack of technical expertise."'. The new wording seems to have removed the text about abstaining, other than for 'lack of expertise', not counting. So, it seems that an abstain 'lack of time' is now considered sufficient to retain voting membership. I don't think this was intended.
- [2] Imagine an individual has lost their voting membership for not returning a vote on the last two ballot series. I'll represent this as 'Y N N' (see key below). There are then several ballot series while the individual is not a voting member. I'll represent this as 'R R R - - - -'. The individual then regains voting membership and returns a vote on the next ballot series after that. I'll represent this as 'R R R - - - - Y'.
- If, however, I was to apply the '... last 3 Working Group Letter Ballot Series in which they are eligible to vote ...' literally, this would seem to include the two ballots before they lost their voting membership and the one after they regained their voting membership. Doing this would mean they would immediately lose their voting rights again as their record would be 'Y N N - - - - Y' and would not have returned a ballot for 2 of the last 3 Working Group Letter Ballot Series in which they are eligible to vote in.

Balloting – Abstain (background - 2)

- Again, I don't think that was intended as there would be no way for an individual in this situation to avoid losing their voting membership immediately after regaining it. Instead, I think the intent is for the window to be the three most recent ballot series.
- Key:
 - Y : Submitted a ballot
 - N : Did not submit a ballot
 - - : Not in balloting group for ballot
 - R : In balloting group but subsequently lost voting rights
- [3] There has been a discussion within the IEEE 802.3 leadership about what should happen if a new voter, or a returning voter, fails to respond to the first two ballot series they are eligible to vote in. I'll represent this as '- - - N N'. One argument is that they should immediately lose their voting membership, since even if they do respond during the third ballot series, they can't possibly meet the two out of three requirements. The counterargument is that they don't lose their voting membership until the end of the third ballot series.
- Suggested new text to address the issues above would be 'A voting member that fails to return 2 of the last 2 Working Group Letter Ballot Series, or 2 of the last 3 Working Group Letter Ballot Series, if eligible to vote in the respective Working Group Letter Ballot Series, loses membership. Abstaining, other than for 'lack of expertise', is not considered returning a ballot.'

Balloting – alternate view (Rosdahl)

- I do not see this as ambiguously as you do.
- When I lose my voting rights, the "window" of Letter ballots (Series or not) is closed.
- I then am required to earn my voting rights again with attendance, and after I gain my voting rights again, then I start the "Window" of eligibility on Letter Ballots (Series or not).
- I agree that Letter Ballot Series includes the initial Letter Ballot, and any recirculations as part of the Letter Ballot (the Series).
- Some Letter Ballot Series have only one Letter Ballot (fails), but the requirement to vote have not changed, and if you fail to vote for the initial Letter ballot that fails, it counts as a non vote for the LB Series.
- So, when someone starts over, or initially start being a voting member, it should be the same.
- As for your example of missing the initial 2 LB series after becoming a voter...well, your voting membership was short lived.
 - ----NN = lost voting right....as you point out, the 3rd one won't save you...but remember it is the full series, so are the two "N" a completed series, or just the initial LB?
- That is what makes the difference.
 - The loss of voting rights at the ---NN vs ---NNY, is that the member can start to regain voting rights quicker....
 - so I would say if you notice ---NN, reset them to start over, and hopefully they will do better in the next sequence.

But wait, there is more (Rosdahl):

- If you have too many abstains (lack of time - we are all busy; etc). so we determined that you must provide more incentive to participate to maintain the voting rights. The understanding is that one in 3 ballots you may miss out. As I recollect, Letter Ballots or Recirculation ballots each counted in the window at that time. It is later (last 2 years that at least in 802.11) that the LB series (initial ballot and all recirculations) counted as the entries of 3 in the window.*
- No, I do not support changing the rules, I think that they are sufficient in this matter as well. The Chair may cause the voter rights to be removed at the 2 ballot or 3 ballot point. I don't have issues with either point.

And Rolfe responds!

- While I think the intent is clear, it has proven not valid IMO. Instead of abstaining, voters without the time or interest to properly review a draft simply vote "approve" without comment. This form of consensus by "don't care" does not improve the draft. And we can't tell the "approve because it's really ready" from the "approve because I don't have time or don't care". If we enable more accurate options, we have the possibility we'll see how many voters actually took the time to review the draft, which is useful information. Possibly. Though I admit it is more likely the "don't cares" will simply continue to vote "approve" as it's established habit. So while probably not an intentional change, I think allowing more reasons to abstain is a good change.

Draft Sharing

- What should we recommend to SASB?
 - "unless the originating IEEE Standards Committee allows drafts to be shared among its Working Groups"
 - "unless the originating IEEE Standards Committee allows drafts to be shared among its the originating Standards Committee's subordinate Working Groups"

Input from Rolfe

- Hoping there is something here.

LMSC review of CSD is procedural

- Do we need to add anything here? It is already majority vote.