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Saturday November 16, 2024, Pacific Standard Time (PST)

# 1.00 Meeting Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 08:00 PST

# 1.01 Roll Call 08:01 Stephen M.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Position** |
| Paul Nikolich | Nikolich Advisors LLC, Huawei, HPE | LMSC member emeritus,  past LMSC chair |
| Clint Chaplin | Self | LMSC treasurer |
| Jon Rosdahl | Qualcomm | LMSC executive secretary |
| Chad Jones | Cisco | IEEE 802.3 executive secretary |
| Dave Halasz | Morse Micro | LMSC 1st vice-chair |
| Tim Godfrey | EPRI | IEEE 802.24 chair |
| John D’Ambrosia | Futurewei | LMSC recording secretary |
| Stephen McCann | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd | IEEE 802.11 vice-chair |
| Subir Das | Peraton Labs | IEEE 802.21 chair |
| Robert Stacey | Intel | IEEE 802.11 chair |
| Tuncer Baykas | Ofinno | IEEE 802.19 chair |
| Ann Krieger | US Department of Defense | IEEE 802.15 2nd vice-chair |
| Ben Rolfe | Blind Creek Associates | IEEE 802.24 vice-chair |
| Phil Beecher | Wi-SUN Alliance | IEEE 802.15 1st vice-chair |
| David Law | HPE | IEEE 802.3 chair |
| James Gilb | GA-ASI | LMSC chair |
| Jessy Rouyer | Nokia | IEEE 802.1 vice-chair |
| Jason Potterf | Cisco | IEEE member emeritus, assistant LMSC treasurer |
| Peter Yee | NSA-CSD | LMSC JTC1/802 Standing Committee chair |
| George Zimmerman | CME Consulting | LMSC 2nd vice-chair |
| Beth Kochuparambil | Cisco | IEEE LMSC member emeritus, assistant recording secretary |
| Clint Powell | HID Global | IEEE 802.15 chair |
| Adam Healey | Broadcom | IEEE 802.3 vice-chair |
| Glenn Parsons | Ericsson | IEEE 802.1 chair |
| Geoff Thompson | GraCaSI S.A | LMSC member emeritus |
| Dorothy Stanley | HPE | LMSC wireless standing committee chair |

# Edward Au, Huawei, IEEE 802.18 chair not present

# 2.0 Approve Agenda 08:05

Draft Agenda: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0228-03-00EC-nov-2024-workshop-agenda.xlsx>

Various agenda items from ec-24-0228r2 were moved around and more time was asked for on item 5.01. The agenda was then revised to ec-24-0228r3.

No objection to approving the agenda: ec-24-0228r3.

Due to time constraints, some agenda items were considered out of sequential order.

# 2.0 Round Table Introduction - 08:10 All

Everyone in the meeting introduced themselves, as there are some new people present in addition to the IEEE 802 LMSC. For example, the working group vice-chairs.

# 3.0 Announcements from the Chair - 09:30 Paul N.

Workshop chairs deck:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0305-00-00EC-16nov2024-802lmsc-workshop.pptx>

The success criteria for the workshop were summarized (slide #6). The objective is to reduce the burden of various task for the IEEE 802 members.

# 4.0 Actions from previous IEEE 802 LMSC Workshop (July 2022) - 09:40 Stephen M.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0291-00-00EC-workshop-action-list-from-july-2022.docx>

In the interest of time, everyone was invited to review the actions from previous meetings offline.

# 5.0 Short Term Topics

# 5.01 Attendance requirements – in person vs remote - 09:45 David L.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0289-02-00EC-workshop-item-3-1-attendance-requirements.pdf>

Thank you to several people for creating these slides. It’s great to discuss this in a workshop, as there is no pressure to come to a formal conclusion at the moment.

Initially any changes in attendance behavior resulting from membership qualifying criterion should be considered over a period of time. There should be no immediate impact on the membership. The current situation is that voting rights are established by attending 2 out of 4 sessions in person or remotely.

C: People have been asking about these rules within the November 2024 session. There are many opinions circulating at the moment. Therefore, we need to define the exact problem to solve.

C: Attending the meetings in person is so much better than remote participation.

Q: Are we trying to change the current rule of 2 out of 4? Is this rule a problem?

A: There was a proposal to change this in an earlier rules meeting to make it 2 out of 4 in person, as mentioned in ec-24-0261r1 slide 11. However, nothing has been concluded at the moment.

Q: Does the slide show a change to the rules?

A: No, we need to review the situation. This is not a rules meeting. We need to step back, gather data, and review this.

C: Prior to COVID-19 (February 2020), there was a stable situation. However, changes were then forced upon us and changes to the rules had to be made to accommodate the new reality. It appears that many members are not willing to lose the option of remote participation capability. Of course, any future changes are bound to disappoint some of the members.

C: There was a concern that changes may result in a negative reaction from the members. We need to determine why people are concerned.

C: There is an option to leave the rules as they are.

**802.11 WG - 11:00 Robert S.**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0268-00-00EC-in-person-remote-attendance-stats-for-802-11.pptx>

Slide #9 shows a summary of 802.11 attendance statistics for the last 5 session.

There are 2 issues:

1. The 802.11 WG membership is ~500 individuals and this means it takes longer to reach consensus than smaller groups. Reducing the membership to the more active participants may help.
2. Some companies are affiliated with a large number of members and this may cause issues, if they have a large number of members in any one meeting.

C: The data from 802.11 can be interpreted in many ways. However, there still doesn’t appear to be one central problem to be solved here. We’re all assuming the cause of issues from our differing perspectives. Some groups consider remote participation to be a good thing, but some groups think otherwise. There were 1025+ people attending this past week, ~500 in person, ~500 remote.

C: On slide #9, there are actually about 10 people who have attended all 5 sessions remotely, according to feedback from the meeting organizers. Some people planned to attend in person, but were then unable due to issues such as visa problems and sickness.

C: Remote attendance allows people to quickly join a teleconference and “pack the room”. This may be a potential problem.

C: The 10% of slide #9 attending remotely implies that any rule change will not have much impact on behavior.

C: It’s difficult to determine if members are taking advantage of participating remotely or not, in the way that they vote.

C: The statement that there are too many people in a group is not a problem. Everyone’s’ view point must be considered.

C: With a large group, opinions and statements are sometimes repeated.

C: I would like to see similar data for other working groups, apart from 802.11.

C: What does a large group mean. In the 802.11 WG there is one very large task group, whereas the other 802.11 task groups are functioning without any problems. I don’t think in-person and remote participation is the issue. I think it’s just the number of individual positions at the beginning of a large project. Some of the 802.11 members don’t appear to want to collaborate. Some members appear to want to delay the process.

C: I don’t think remote and in-person is the actual problem. The data in the presentation can be interpreted in a subjective way. We need to be cautious. Sometimes the meeting planners do not capture all of the changes and nuances as to why people are attending remotely. Let’s try to estimate the uncertainty of the figures in this presentation.

C: I agree that there are inaccuracies in the data in the presentation.

C: Regarding “stacking the room”, this proposed rule change would not change that, as this rule is about obtaining/losing voting rights.

C: I don’t believe that the number of participants increasing should slow down progress.

C: I disagree, as I think this is a problem.

C: Remote participation does not change this behavior.

C: The data on slide #20 indicates that there was no problem in behavior around 2004.

C: In one of the larger 802.11 projects, one issue is that technical items from many years ago are being discussed, and many new participants are not aware of the background.

C: If people are tempted to “pack the room” then perhaps we should try and remove that temptation. We need to encourage participation for all our technology.

C: This data is raising more questions in this meeting. I think the more people that you have, the more discussion you will have.

C: Remember that whenever we have a rule, some people will find a way around it.

C: Slide #9 implies that reducing the remote attendance will not make much of a difference to the overall attendance. I agree that the problem is more about behavior, rather than where people are attending.

C: One of the objectives is to encourage in-person attendance. In the past, the main incentive to attend in-person was to maintain voting rights. We should encourage people to attend in-person. It’s going to difficult to change a rule and not upset some people. Remember that prior to COVID-19, there was no issue about remote attendance, as credit for remote participation did not exist.

C: Let’s define the goals are what we are trying to do here. There may be other ways, apart from a rules change, to achieve this. On slide #5 (ec-24-0268r0), the in-person number is similar to the numbers prior to COVID-19. The extra remote people were not previously attending. Within the IETF, they create a “design team” when a difficult problem arises. This allows the experts in a subject to determine a potential way forward.

C: I think it’s the 802.11 perceived market size of the technical topic that is also driving the membership increases.

C: The geographic distribution countries in which participants are domiciled has shifted in 802.11 over the last 20 years.

**802.3 WG - 11:25 Beth K.**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0297-01-00EC-additional-data-for-in-person-and-remote-attendance-voting-discussion.pdf>

Attendance affiliation statistics taken from 802.11 and 802.3 records.

Regarding slide #8:

* Redline is total attendance
* Green dots are the voters in attendance
* the discontinuity towards the right hand side covers the March 2020 session, which did not happen dur to COVID-19.

Q: Where is the attendance data from?

A: This is from IMAT.

C: On the right hand side, there are more voters than attendees, as there is a lag of voting members losing their rights compared to attendance.

C: Regarding the 802.11 July 2020 plenary, the jump in numbers seems unusual. Also remember that in 802.11, people need to be on the Webex tool to actually vote in a meeting.

C: If the attendance rules are changed, anyone can still participate. Nonvoters can also participate.

C: In addition, many members are physically present in the session venue, but decide to attend several meetings simultaneously via WebEx, so they appear to be remote.

C: There has always been a a small difference among Working Groups as to how a member obtains voting rights and maintains them.

C: Regarding the 802.3 “voter roster over time” slide, the 2007/8 peak shows the start of a new task force. Therefore, you have to understand what is happening within the working group to explain some of the data.

C: Another reason for the data spike, is the cost of travel. This was especially true of the initial remote session in 2020 during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic. There were no registration fees and no travel required.

C: There would be about 37% of people who would be disadvantaged from a change in the rules, i.e., if participation credit is disallowed for remote participants, as mentioned at the start of this topic.

C: Regarding 802.3 “voter roster over time”, in 2015, there was a peak membership that is about the same as now. Generally speaking it doesn’t show any abnormalities.

C: We have looked at this data and making some guesses as to what is happening. I think we need to be careful about the causality.

Quick questions to all the meeting attendees:

Q: From the 802 LMSC leadership’s point of view, do you believe that in-person attendance is better?

A: The general answer was yes.

Q: From the 802 LMSC leadership’s point of view, do you believe that remote attendance is beneficial?

A: The general answer was yes.

C: If you are a voter and you unable to attend an in-person session, I don’t think you should lose voting rights.

Q: Do you agree that the LMSC leadership wants to encourage in-person attendance?

A: The general answer was yes.

**802.15 WG – 11:45 Clint P.**

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0304-00-00EC-nov-2024-802-workshop-considerations-on-changes-to-voting-rights-requirements.pptx>

Considerations of changes to voting rights

C: To obtain voting rights requires a name and an email address. These can be made up. I don’t think this actually happens, but it is possible. In other words, no personal information is verified for accuracy. Therefore, how can someone be qualified to obtain voting rights. Therefore, there should be a new rule for someone to turn up in person once with ID to verify who they are. This goes back to determine what the exact problem is that we are trying to solve.

Q: Is this proof of affiliation?

A: No, it’s the ability to verify people exist.

C: The current concern is how to prove that someone is real. We do not check people’s affiliations. On slide #7, running 2 IMATs would cause issues for the meeting planners, WG chairs and the treasurers.

C: Perhaps this should be addressed in another way.

C: This is a proposal “At some time in the future, for sessions, only in person participants may vote”.

Many people mentioned that they are not ready to provide feedback on this proposal at the moment.

C: I think the rules about attendance also need to stabilize.

C: Let’s re-consider this issue in about 1 year’s time.

C: One side effect may be that motions cannot be held on teleconferences.

Three principles emerged after 90+ minutes of discussion:

1. Encourage in-person attendance.
2. Personal attendance is better.
3. Remote participation adds value
4. At some time in the future, for sessions, voting rights may be restricted to in person participants .

Action item: Create a presentation with these principles. Beth Kochuparambil

# Lunch 12:15

# Photo 13:00

# 5.02 Improving quality and resiliency of mixed-mode experience – 13:10 Jason P./George Z.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0275-00-00EC-july-2024-802-workshop-improving-the-quality-and-resiliency-of-the-mixed-mode-experience.pdf>

At the moment, virtual participation is continuing. This presentation addressed some ideas to create a better experience for remote participation. There were some ideas from the July 2022 workshop that have been implemented. There are also some unsolved earlier problems, these are not covered in this meeting.

Current common practice is to use the Webex to share their submissions during meetings. IEEE 802.3 has a dedicated set of laptops to assist with meetings. If the other WGs wish to do this, then they could replicate the same set of laptops.

C: One disadvantage of these monitors is that you can’t see you slides on the monitor.

C: There are some groups in 802.3 that do not use Webex.

C: Sometimes there have been issues with using people’s laptops, although there can be issues.

C: For dialing into Webex, I think the use of people’s own laptop is adequate.

**Likes/Needs**

* Reliable solution
* Consistent equipment and solution
* Screen for chair’s table
* Scarlet boxes
* Don’t need HDMI dongle to present
* Use the goose neck microphones more often.
* Consistent setup.

**Dislikes/Issues**

* Carrying multiple laptops through customs
* Webex software changes
* Microphone performance
* Inconsistent Audio levels in the in-person meeting rooms
* People’s behavior of using microphones remotely
* Removing user error of in-person participants not following the “do not connect to audio” instructions in the in-person meeting rooms.
* Insufficient number of microphones for in-person meetings.
* Ownership of the bridge or display laptop
* Slido for voting
* More time before the start of a Webex meeting
* Every WG should have people with the knowledge of how this all operates. We should not have to rely on Jon Rosdahl.

C: The dedicated equipment mentioned earlier, for 802.3, does assist with some of the audio issues mentioned above.

Action items: Jason Potterf

1. To follow up and make recommendations to address these items
2. Identify Small room audio issues

Action item: James Gilb to get proposal/quote/ROM for outside company to manage our selected conference hardware and software.

# 5.03 Maintain/improve existing SW platforms – 13:45 Jason P.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0287-00-00EC-nov-2024-802-workshop-maintain-and-or-improve-existing-sw-platforms.pdf>

Here are some items for discussion in this meeting. What are your levels of interest (0 – low to 10 – high)?

* Web pages: 2
* Mentor: 1
* IMAT: 0
* Email archiving: 0
* Calendar: 1
* DVL: 0
* WebEx: 0
* Slido: 10
* MyProject: 4
* Framemaker: 0
* Comment Resolution Tools (e.g. Excel): 4

Therefore, the main items are: Slido, Comment tools and MyProject.

C: There are several items in this presentation that we cannot do anything about.

C: For several years, the IEEE SA has mentioned that some of the IEEE tools will change.

C: There has not been a report from IEEE-SA for some time. IEEE have been concentrating on myProject and the banking tools. Therefore there is a substantial concern some of these tools are not being maintained and may be replaced without adequate input from the LMSC community and leadership.

**Slido**

This is a new tool that we had to use. It does not operate as advertised.

C: We need a function to do a quick straw poll and Slido does not really do this.

C: Could Something like survey monkey be used?

C: There is an authentication and usage problem with Slido.

Action items: Need a better interface/tool for straw polls: Jason Potterf

**myProject**

This is an IEEE SA tool

Action items: Ask the IEEE-SA for better communication of software changes. James Gilb

**Comment Resolution Tools**

C: The access database that Adrian Stephens created for 802.11 works very well.

C: MyProject cannot be used for letter ballots. We have to use our own tools for that, then switch to MyProject for the SA ballots.

C: The full text of comments cannot be seen.

C: In my experience of other SDOs, excel is very common.

Action items: Assess comment processing tools for 802.3 and 802.11 and identify possible, superior, alternatives: George Zimmerman and Jon Rosdahl

# 6.04 Discuss permissible commercial activities - 14:15 Peter Y.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0277-00-00EC-nov-2024-802-workshop-permissible-commercial-activities.pptx>

Presentation covers possible commercial activities within IEEE 802 sessions

IETF meetings currently have sponsors covering various aspects of the meeting, although their meeting fees are higher.

C: David Law and Jon Rosdahl have been looking at some of these options from an IEEE legal point of view and the conclusion that there is no problem.

C: Remember that the IETF bring in revenue for non-meeting aspects.

C: I understand that the IEEE for power engineering does some of these activities. Therefore IEEE 802 should look at other internal IEEE conferences.

Action item: Look at IEEE power engineering standards development meetings running concurrently with conferences to see how their model works. Glenn Parsons.

C: I think there was only one IEEE 802 social that was hosted. My concern is that there may be a conflict between the individual process and company sponsorship. There are also issues about meeting schedules which may be affected by the potential sponsor.

C: If arrangements are made with IEEE projects, as opposed to IEEE-SA, then it should be easier.

C: Perhaps if we could do this once a year, it would be useful.

C: What is the primary benefit for the membership? Is it additional knowledge or reduced fees? We don’t want it to be another trade show. However, an invited tutorial may be fine.

C: The scheduling of a conference to do this, may be difficult. We are already struggling to co-ordinate to the IETF. As was mentioned earlier, you need to determine what is the benefit of such a conference.

C: I am in favor of looking into this and especially reduced registration fees.

C: The IEEE computer society could enable this sort of thing to happen.

C: Other conferences around the world are able to mix trade shows and standardization meetings.

C: There’s also reputation to consider.

C: Some of these aspects are technologies demonstrators as opposed to product pitches.

C: There’s an IEEE CSCN standards conference in Belgrade at the end of November 2024 that will present an 802.11 summary. Therefore, perhaps interaction between IEEE 802 and this sort of show could be considered next year.

Action item: James Gilb – draw up a list of possible commercial activity items to consider as a straw poll

# 6.02 Leadership succession planning and participant support – 15:30 Dave H.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0279-01-00EC-leadership-succession-planning-and-participant-support.pptx>

The presentation discusses issues about the IEEE 802 LMSC regarding what they do and how to educate the larger IEEE 802 membership.

Succession planning appears to be straight forward, but there is an issue with qualified LMSC leadership candidates being available.

C: Knowledge of the rules is certainly useful for the membership. For example, extra drinks tickets at the social when you ask about the LMSC meetings may be useful.

C: Term Limits may not work for some positions that have a long learning curve, like the treasurer. However, that can be off-putting to some people. Planned intervals, with a smooth transition, would be great.

C: The roles need to be made more inviting to encourage fresh people to join in.

C: I think a term limit of 6 years would be a good idea. However, it would be useful for the senior members to be able to stay and provide advice for the younger LMSC members.

C: There are some guidelines for term limits in the LMSC P&P, but it’s only a suggestion.

C: I think there is a 1 or 2 term ramp up. It takes time to learn the roles.

C: There were fixed term limits, but it was changed to a “should” because no new volunteers appeared.

C: Frequent changes for some positions is not a good thing. However, development of new people should also be encouraged.

C: Turn over in an organization is good, but perhaps it should be limited. Hard term limits can produce side issues. The IEEE 802 culture is not to change leadership too quickly.

C: In other groups, they have a chair-elect. This is completely normal behavior in other organizations.

C: Need to remember the Board of Governors (BoG), RevCom and NesCom.

C: The membership also needs to understand the role of the LMSC.

C: For a newbie, it’s quite intimidating to join the IEEE 802 LMSC. In addition to attending an IEEE 802 working group. there’s quite an extra workload in attending the LMSC plenary session.

C: I agree that determining a succession plan is a good idea. There is no term limit for any of the LMSC officers. They only apply to the WGs.

Action items: Dave Halasz

1. More fully develop the chair-elect position
2. Advertise the value of LMSC membership: including NesCom, RevCom and BoG
3. Tutorial, date: TBD

# 6.03 Collaborative activities with other SDOs, Alliances, SIGs, etc. – 15:50 Tuncer B.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0288-00-00EC-collaborative-activities-with-other-sdos-alliances-sigs.pptx>

The presentation discusses relationships with other SDOs.

C: Could we also add the Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA)

C: Visibility means that data gathering occurs in both directions.

C: Slide #6, BeingWise is for future technology education.

C: Is this about collaboration with SDOs (and alliances), or more about discussions with IEEE 802 members who are also part of these SDOs (and alliances)

Action item: All

Please can you send any candidate SDOs (and alliances) to Tuncer

# 6.05 Improve recognition of exceptional performance – 16:00 Clint P.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0302-02-00EC-nov-2024-802-workshop-improve-recognition-of-exceptional-performance.pptx>

Every IEEE 802 individual member is eligible to be recognized for exceptional performance.

C: Promoting individuals to the position of IEEE Fellow is an important topic. There are several people in IEEE 802 to whom this applies.

C: There are many members who are not IEEE Senior Members

C: Perhaps we need to focus on the Senior Members initially.

C: Could we add “Senior Member” to our badges.

C: I think the recognition scheme is a great idea.

C: Becoming an IEEE Senior Members still requires some work. This then helps people obtain their references.

C: Obtaining these lists is not trivial. It’s possible to try and put these positions on a badge, but the badges then become very busy with other bits of information.

C: The computer society sends an email each year for awards. In previous years, many people have received standards medallion, however these require a few people to endorse them.

C: There’s also the Life Member position

Action item: Create a list of IEEE 802 Fellows – Paul Nikolich

Action item: Create a list of the discussed ideas about advertising IEEE senior members and fellow – Clint Powell

# 6.01 Revisit 802 LMSC Scope – 16:20 James G.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0290-01-00EC-workshop-802-scope.odp>

The IEEE 802 scope has changed over the last 40 years and indeed it’s now the sum of all the PARs within it.

C: The scope is still bound by the Field of Interest of the IEEE Computer Society.

C: I think we already looking at some issues outside of L1/L2, for example power over ethernet (PoE) management.

C: There are already existing conflicts of scope between different IEEE projects.

Action List: All.

Send suggests for scope changes to James Gilb

# 5.04 Initiate additional IEEE 802 Milestone activities and Fellow elevation discussion – 16:30 Paul N.

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0295-00-00EC-nov2024-workshop-additional-ieee-802-milestone-activities.pptx>

This is a recap of this topic from May 2024. For new milestones, refer to slide #3. The IEEE History Committee arranges these milestones.

C: The place where the event took place must be recognized. The plaques within the computer history museum are duplicates of the originals.

Action list: WG chairs

Please can you request any milestones from your WG membership.

Action list: Geoff Thomson

Collect ideas from people about any more milestone ideas.

**8.0 AoB 16:35**

**Group picture**

Q: Does anyone object to posting the earlier group picture from this meeting to Facebook?

A: No.

**Workshop cadence**

C: How often should we have these workshops? Recently it’s been 2 or 3 years. See slide #11 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/24/ec-24-0305-00-00EC-16nov2024-802lmsc-workshop.pptx>

C: I think 2 years’ time would be good.

C: Perhaps 2026 would be good? March 2026 here in Vancouver would be great.

C: I think there was an extra workshop in Atlanta, January 2016 not on the slide.

C: Also in San Antonio, November 2014.

**Hotel staff**

C: It has been a pleasure to stay here this week and the staff are exceptional.

**9.0 Action Item Status review 16:40 Stephen M.**

All the action items described above were reviewed. A separate document summarizing these items will be posted on mentor: ec-24-0308.

**10.0 Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned without objection at 16.46 PST