

# November 2022 Rules Meeting

# 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>

## Participants in the IEEE-SA “individual process” shall act independently of others, including employers

- The [IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws](#) require that “participants in the IEEE standards development individual process shall act based on their qualifications and experience”
- This means participants:
  - **Shall act & vote** based on their personal & independent opinions derived from their expertise, knowledge, and qualifications
  - **Shall not act or vote** based on any obligation to or any direction from any other person or organization, including an employer or client, regardless of any external commitments, agreements, contracts, or orders
  - **Shall not direct** the actions or votes of other participants or retaliate against other participants for fulfilling their responsibility to act & vote based on their personal & independently developed opinions
- By participating in standards activities using the “individual process”, you are deemed to accept these requirements; if you are unable to satisfy these requirements then you shall immediately cease any participation

## IEEE-SA standards activities shall allow the fair & equitable consideration of all viewpoints

- The [IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws](#) (clause 5.2.1.3) specifies that “*the standards development process shall not be dominated by any single interest category, individual, or organization*”
  - This means no participant may exercise “*authority, leadership, or influence by reason of superior leverage, strength, or representation to the exclusion of fair and equitable consideration of other viewpoints*” or “*to hinder the progress of the standards development activity*”
- This rule applies equally to those participating in a standards development project and to that project’s leadership group
- Any person who reasonably suspects that dominance is occurring in a standards development project is encouraged to bring the issue to the attention of the Standards Committee or the project’s IEEE-SA Program Manager

# IEEE SA Copyright Policy

By participating in this activity, you agree to comply with the IEEE Code of Ethics, all applicable laws, and all IEEE policies and procedures including, but not limited to, the IEEE SA Copyright Policy.

- Previously Published material (copyright assertion indicated) shall not be presented/submitted to the Working Group nor incorporated into a Working Group draft unless permission is granted.
- Prior to presentation or submission, you shall notify the Working Group Chair of previously Published material and should assist the Chair in obtaining copyright permission acceptable to IEEE SA.
- For material that is not previously Published, IEEE is automatically granted a license to use any material that is presented or submitted.

# IEEE SA Copyright Policy

- The IEEE SA Copyright Policy is described in the IEEE SA Standards Board Bylaws and IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual
- IEEE SA Copyright Policy, see
  - Clause 7 of the IEEE SA Standards Board Bylaws
  - <https://standards.ieee.org/about/policies/bylaws/sect6-7.html#7>
  - Clause 6.1 of the IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual
  - <https://standards.ieee.org/about/policies/opman/sect6.html>
- IEEE SA Copyright Permission
  - <https://standards.ieee.org/content/dam/ieee-standards/standards/web/documents/other/permissionltrs.zip>
- IEEE SA Copyright FAQs
  - <https://standards.ieee.org/faqs/copyrights/>
- IEEE SA Best Practices for IEEE Standards Development
  - [http://standards.ieee.org/content/dam/ieee-standards/standards/web/documents/other/best\\_practices\\_for\\_ieee\\_standards\\_development\\_051215.pdf](http://standards.ieee.org/content/dam/ieee-standards/standards/web/documents/other/best_practices_for_ieee_standards_development_051215.pdf)
- Distribution of Draft Standards (see 6.1.3 of the SASB Operations Manual)
  - <https://standards.ieee.org/about/policies/opman/sect6.html>

# 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](mailto:patcom@ieee.org)

# Agenda

- Removal of student registration restriction (CG)
- Membership, interim substituted for plenary (WG P&P)
- Session vs. meeting in minutes (WG P&P)
- Update for affiliation letter information (CG).
- PAR removal for URL (OM)
- Remove “Distinct Identity” from CSD (OM)
- Any other new stuff? Abstain reasons in ballot?



# Student Registration

- (LMSC motion origin, motion approved 9 November 1998.)
- This guideline defines how IEEE 802 will handle student registration fees.
- Moved: Student registration fee at the IEEE 802 plenary sessions of \$100.
  - 1) This motion is effective from the November 1998 plenary session onward.
  - 2) Professors and academic staff need to pay the full registration fee. There are no exceptions to that rule. Retirees, out of work attendees also pay the full rate. IEEE 802 already has a number of university members attending and they will continue to pay the full fee.
  - 3) The student discount is based upon:
    - d) Student attendance will not count toward voting rights.
    - e) Each student can only receive this discount for one meeting. Attendance at future meetings will require payment of the full fee or LMSC waiver.
    - f) Students will not be included in the Membership Data Base for future meeting announcements. Since students are expected to change status rapidly, we don't want to try to keep track of their address.
    - g) Students might join a Working Group Chair's reflector, at the discretion of the Working Group Chair.
- To obtain this discount, a member of the LMSC needs to certify the student. This will typically require the LMSC member to confirm that the individual is a full-time student and that the LMSC member has explained the process for attending IEEE 802 meetings.
- Registration form will be filled out and fee will be paid at the meeting in normal manner. Student Badge will designate "student".
- A student is defined as currently taking at least 50% of a normal full-time academic program in an IEEE designated field of interest for the current academic year.
- The number of student discounts at a meeting will be limited to the first 10 applications.

# Who is a Student? (Thompson)

- Who are you going to include/exclude?
  - High school and trade school
  - Junior college students
  - 4/5 year engineering undergrads
  - 4 year business/liberal arts undergrads
  - Master's degree candidates full time
  - Master's degree candidates, part time with outside tech employment
  - PhD candidates full time
  - PhD candidates, part time with outside tech employment
  - Post docs
- If I am 35, employed as an engineer and I'm taking a course in welding from the art department of my local community college can I get in for free?
- Do we require that they are at least 18? Do we need to explicitly state that?

# Selected discussion - Marks

- I suggest that the student fee be subject to endorsement by an EC member. This would give us a list of names that we would circulate. I think this would be useful in two ways:
  - (1) It would make us more aware of the students, so we could be on the lookout for them and maybe give them a little extra support when we see them.
    - similar to the way we see the names of fee-waivered folks
  - (2) It would make us aware of repeat users, so we could see if someone is wearing out their welcome.
- We could specify variable requirements, such as:
  - (a) the list will specify the number of prior uses of the student fee
  - (b) up to N uses, the student fee is automatically approved based on EC request
  - (c) beyond N uses, EC approval is required

# Selected Discussion - Rolfe

- Some good suggestions, but there is a problem with "variable requirements". We need to have precisely defined requirements that are applied consistently and equally to all participants.
- Having an EC endorsement is good.
- Having a list we maintain and circulate is OK.
- Having a cap that is constant and consistently applied is OK. We can easily ensure everyone is treated the same.
- I think (c) is problematic: demonstrating that it has been fairly and consistently applied is hard. Then again, if a student hasn't learned that life isn't fair and certain traits lead to favorable treatment by the time they become interested in standards, we may be providing a useful educational service. So maybe (c) is ok - it filters out students who have not yet learned to make a compelling argument or learned self promotion. If that is what we want.

# Selected Discussion - Rosdahl

- Roger and I discussed the ideas he proposed.
- The only caveat that he did not include, that we have in place now, is a cap of 10 students per meeting (first come/first served).
- I am also expecting the nominal \$150 is in place for the student fees to help offset their F&B and overhead costs.
- I think we can come to a reasonable set of minimal requirements and low impact process to meet the needs.

# Items to resolve

- How do we define student?
- Is there a limit to # of meetings that can be attended?
  - If so, do we have an option of increasing it?
  - If we increase it, what is the criteria?
- Number of students allowed at a meeting
- Price, set once, set per meeting?
- Do we state that attendees have to be 18 years old? Is that already covered?

# Membership: Interim for Plenary

- While subclause 4.2 'Voting Membership' of the IEEE 802 Working Group P&P includes the text 'Membership starts at the third Plenary Session attended by the participant.', it also includes the text '... one credited recent Working Group or Task Group Interim Session may be substituted for one of the two Plenary Sessions required to establish membership.'
- I (David Law) have always interpreted the latter to also apply to the former. That is, if an interim is substituted for a plenary in the two out of the last four plenary attendance calculation, the same interim is substituted for a plenary in the third plenary attendance calculation. In addition, and please correct me if I'm wrong, if that was not the case there is no point being able to substitute an interim for a plenary when calculating the two out of the last four as 'Membership starts at the third Plenary Session attended by the participant.' on its own requires attendance at two plenaries to gain membership.
- I'd like to confirm that my above interpretation is correct, and if so, suggest we might consider an update to the rules to make this clear.

# Responses

- Rosdahl
  - " Membership starts at the third Plenary Session", so P1+P2+P3 starts voting rights.
  - An Interim can be substituted for either P1 or P2, as membership starts on a Plenary 3, This leads to P1+P2+P3 or P1+I1+P3 or I1+P2+P3 as options to gain membership.
  - " one of the two Plenary Sessions" would not be the third.
- Marks
  - It might be clearer to say "Membership starts at a Plenary Session attended once the membership requirement has been established and remains current." This is based on the text earlier in the paragraph about "establishing" membership.



# Session vs. Meeting in minutes

- In IEEE 802 WG P&P, we have in 6.4:  
Minutes shall be published to **Session** attendees within 60 calendar days of the end of the **Session**. Minutes shall be published for meetings held outside of a **Session** within 15 calendar days of the end of the **meeting**. The minutes shall concisely record the essential business of the Working Group, including the following items at a minimum:  
...  
d) **Meeting** participants, including affiliation;

# Session vs. Meeting, discussion

- What do we want here?

# Affiliation letters (Chair's Guidelines)

- 4.6 Letter of affiliation

All members of the Standards Committee and WG/TAG Vice Chairs that are confirmed or elected, prior to confirmation or election, shall provide a signed letter that states their affiliation. In this instance, the individual's affiliation(s) shall consist of all affiliation(s) associated with their participation in any standards development activity associated within the Standards Committee. This requirement may also be met by having an explicit statement of affiliation in the endorsement letter described in the “Voting membership” subclause of the IEEE LMSC Policies and Procedures. A statement of affiliation should be in the form of “For the purposes of IEEE 802, <potential Standards Committee member's name>'s affiliation(s) is(are) <affiliation(s)>.”

# Rationale

- This should rectify the potential mis-interpretation that an LMSC Executive Committee (EC) member need only declare an affiliation solely associated with their LMSC EC position and not for any of their other LMSC standards development activities.
- My rationale is that if an individual has the potential to influence actions of the Standards Committee as an EC member (as all confirmed positions have the potential to do), your Standards Committee affiliations are the sum of all the affiliations for all your Standards Committee activities.

# Update to OM, PARs

- 9.3 Plenary Review
- Prior to the start of the IEEE 802 LMSC session, draft PARs and CSDs under consideration for approval by the IEEE 802 LMSC shall be available at a publicly accessible URL and an email sent to the IEEE 802 LMSC reflector should contain the URLs required for viewing the PAR and associated documentation. Working Group chairs should inform their Working Groups of the PARs that have been circulated to the IEEE 802 LMSC. ~~Once approved or disapproved by the IEEE 802 LMSC, PARs and supporting material should be removed from the public URL.~~

# Distinct Identity in OM

IEEE 802 criteria for standards development (CSD)

## 14.2.3 Distinct Identity

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of a distinct identity. Identify standards and standards projects with similar scopes and for each one describe why the proposed project is substantially different.

- It is not at all clear what this really means
- Often the scope of the project is not clearly “substantially different” other than the project amends a different standard
- In practice, this generally includes little useful information
  - e.g. “uses a different MAC” is deemed a distinct identity (stating the obvious)
- In practice, there has been very useful examples where the project has made sense and had value despite seeming to be very similar to another project
  - e.g. 802.15.3 and 802.11 mmWave
- The Broad market potential establishes the need for the project. At best the unique identity “this amends standard x instead of y” is redundant

# Proposed change

- Remove 14.2.3 from the OM
- Revise the document templates accordingly
- Check for other ripples