# IEEE 802 Executive Committee – July 2014 Taskforce Minutes

Chair opens the meeting at 10:35 on 2014-07-17

Status: as of the posting date 2014-07-25, these minutes are tentative and unapproved.

## Present:

* Paul Nikolich – chair
* Christina Boyce
* Soo Kim
* Adam Newman
* Karen McCabe
* Lisa Perry
* Adrian Stephens - secretary
* Glen Parsons
* Geoffrey Thompson
* Juan Carlos Zuniga
* Michelle Turner

## Agenda:

1. IEEE Internet initiative
2. SA tools re-architecture status update
3. We conferencing pilot program status
4. Follow up on March Action items from 802/SA relevant EC workshop items
5. 802/SA Roles and Responsibilities
6. Status of IEEE feedback on indemnification clarification request
7. Get 802 program feedback from 802 constituents
8. Action item review
9. Executive Session commences

## Summary of Actions

*Note that time ran out in the meeting, so there wasn’t time to review this, and (in particular) assign due dates.*

1. Geoffrey Thompson to assist Karen McCabe to find a way to represent views of the constituency (i.e., IEEE members, IEEE-SA project members) on this topic.
2. Soo Kim to alert appropriate body (Yvette, Dave Ringle) that this might cause significant issues for 802 standards publication / progressions. To consult with Geoffrey Thompson on a suggested approach.
3. Paul Nikolich to advertise that Jon Rosdahl is the person to submit change/enhancements to these tools to.
4. Christina Boyce to report stats on use of join.me
5. Christina Boyce to write down description of mechanism she described used to evaluate user experience.
6. James Gilb to provide feedback to Soo Kim on roles and responsibilities document.

## Minutes:

1. Motion: “**Approve agenda”** (as shown above), Moved: Michelle Turner, Seconded: Sue Kim, Passes with unanimous consent.
2. IEEE Internet initiative.
	1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/14/ec-14-0049-00-INTL-ieee-internet-initiative.pptx>
	2. Presented by Karen McCabe
	3. Q: will this annoy our partners already in this space?
		1. A: we’ve spoken to them. They view this as a win.
	4. Q: what effect will this have on the development of standards?
		1. A: no changes to process. But might open opportunities for new standards.
	5. C: if this has no effect on standards, it consumes resources.
		1. A: it’s about getting our voice heard in these environments.
	6. C: I support this, but it has nothing to do with standards development. We can provide feedback from 802. How are you going to get feedback from IEEE if you are claiming to represent IEEE?
		1. A: That’s the question. How do you mobilize various societies? We are working how to achieve this.
	7. C: how do you get a single position from 400K members? It’s not easy.
	8. **Action: Geoffrey Thompson to assist Karen McCabe to find a way to represent views of the constituency (i.e., IEEE members, IEEE-SA project members) on this topic.**
3. IEEE-SA tools re-architecture status update
	1. https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/14/ec-14-0054-00-00sa-etools-updatejuly2014.ppt
	2. Presenter: Christina Boyce – IEEE-SA
	3. On virtual meeting tool:
	4. On myProject:
		1. Project announced March 2014.
		2. Active development starting shortly.
		3. First target deliverable is the public review process, by end of the year.
		4. There will eventually be a cut-over to the new system
		5. On the public review process:
			1. Q: is public review and expansion of rogue comments?
				1. A: no it’s a different system.
			2. C: there is no change to our process.
				1. A: There’s a bit that can’t be automated. If the comment effects a change to the standard, the commenter can come to the WG chair and ask for an updated copy of the draft.
			3. Q: will public review comments get into the existing system, or a new system?
				1. A: They will appear as rogue comments
			4. C: comments might be received after the initial comment resolution process has completed.
			5. C: incoming public review comments should not delay start of a recirculation. This means that it must be possible to provide resolutions to these comments after recirculation has started.
			6. **Action: Soo Kim to alert appropriate body (Yvette, Dave Ringle) that this might cause significant issues for 802 standards publication / progressions. To consult with Geoffrey Thompson on a suggested approach.**
		6. Expect end 2015 for EOL of existing system.
		7. Have talked to the “Face to face” meeting planners to ensure that changes won’t affect integration with their system.
		8. Q: how do we get input to IEEE-SA related to this project?
			1. A: Jon Rosdahl meets with Christina and Soo closely.
			2. **Action: Paul Nikolich to advertise that Jon Rosdahl is the person to submit change/enhancements to these tools to.**
		9. C: does this mean a feature freeze until end of 2015?
			1. A: not sure, but probably yes.
	5. On website migration:
		1. C: project will take 5 months to complete
		2. Q: will urls remain static
			1. A: yes
4. Web conferencing pilot program status
	1. C: On join.me usage: would be interesting to see statistics on meeting length – distribution curve.
		1. **Action: Christina Boyce to report stats on use of join.me**
	2. C: works well, with large numbers.
	3. C: But voice from computer does not work when connected to corporate network.
	4. C: there is no local number for china attendees.
	5. C: If two people join logged in to the one account, this resets the meeting.
	6. C: when does pilot program transition to full?
		1. A: webex pilot ran nov 2013-april 2014 this year. Costs to IEEE-SA were too high. So they looked for an alternative solution.
		2. A: the pilot has now ended.
		3. A: the “join.me” program is not a pilot.
5. Follow up on March Action items from 802/SA relevant EC workshop items
	1. Chair reviewed action item list.
	2. **Action: Christina Boyce to write down description of mechanism she described used to evaluate user experience.**
6. 802/IEEE-SA Roles and Responsibilities
	1. Chair reviewed points of contact between IEEE-SA and 802 members.
	2. James Gilb was in receipt of a document from IEEE-SA on this relationship.
		1. C: This document was too light in detail.
		2. **Action: James Gilb to provide feedback to Soo Kim on roles and responsibilities document.**
7. Status of IEEE feedback on indemnification clarification request
	1. C: IEEE-SA believe this process of defining this policy is complete. We need to tell our volunteers. All communications have been marked confidential.
		1. A: Soo Kim has a file that contains a public position.
		2. See: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/14/ec-14-0055-00-00sa-responses-to-ieee802-queries-17jul2014.pdf>
8. Get 802 program feedback from 802 constituents
	1. Aggregate (across all WGs) support for this program: 316,19,24.
	2. 802.1’s view was that the IETF model was strongly preferred.
	3. 802.11 did have more opposition. Some individuals feel that the cost per user per session is too high. Previously had corporate sponsorship.
		1. C: Companies can still sponsor the program if they so wish.
	4. Chair presents 2015 desired terms and conditions in order of preference:
		1. Make all 802 standards and work in progress available at no charge
		2. Make all drafts available at no charge, keep standard availability at no charge after 6 months
		3. Charge for drafts, make standards available at no charge with zero delay
		4. No changes to the program
	5. C: Thinks that the IEEE should compensate the IEEE-SA based on the value that the Get802 program provides to humanity.
9. Action item review
10. Executive Session
	1. Separate minutes will be circulated to those present