DCN: **ec-21-0204-00-00EC**

Near-term Mixed Mode Practices Ad hoc

8/24/2021

G. Zimmerman

The meeting was called to order at 1PM pacific.

Agenda:

Review document https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/21/ec-21-0203-00-00EC-guide-to-practices-for-initial-mixed-mode-ieee-802-lmsc-sessions.docx

Output document https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/21/ec-21-0203-01-00EC-guide-to-practices-for-initial-mixed-mode-ieee-802-lmsc-sessions.docx

Attendance:

NAME	EMPLOYER/AFFILIATION
Andrew Myles	Cisco
Benjamin Rolfe	Blind Creek Associates
Beth Kochuparambil	Cisco
Chad Jones	Cisco
Clint Chaplin	(affill w/self)
Clint Powell	Facebook
Dawn Slykhouse	Face to Face events
Dorothy Stanley	HP Enterprise
Geoff Thompson	GraCaSI S.A.
George Zimmerman	CME Consulting/ADI, APL Group, Cisco, Commscope, Marvell, SenTekSe
jay holcomb	Itron
Jodi Haasz	IEEESA
John Dambrosia	Futurewei, US Subsidiary of Huawei
Jon Rosdahl	Qualcomm, IEEE 802 Executive Secretary
Joseph Levy	InterDigital
Lisa Ronmark	Face to Face Events
Maximilian Riegel	Nokia
Paul Nikolich	802 Chairman
RICK ALFVIN	Linespeed
Roger Marks	EthAirNet Associates
Steve Shellhammer	Qualcomm

Discussion Notes:

Discussion focused on the document purpose and guiding principles.

There was significant agreement that the initial practices should be viewed as an experiment and that we would learn much in the first meetings. There was also agreement to add to the guiding principles an objective to leave long term decisions open (reflecting that much learning would happen).

Additionally, there was agreement to add a guiding principle that having remote participation should strive to minimally impact the experience of a face-to-face meeting. This is counterbalanced by the already-expressed principle to strive to provide an equivalent experience for remote users.

Much of the meeting was focused on discussion of whether there were two types of remote participants – those with a valid 'barrier to travel' and those who simply chose remote participation. Discussion failed to show a change in the practices beyond these points. Several expressed viewpoints not wanting 802 to have to police reasons given. Others expressed concern that enabling full participation near-term would create a precedent which could not be retracted. The chair stated that in his opinion, this group was dealing with the problems created near-term by a return to some in-person meetings before all could travel, and that this should not be viewed as a precedent for general remote attendance.

Because the reason for an individual's remote attendance did not change the groups practices, the following was added to the guiding principles:

1. Whether individuals have a valid reason for being remote or not is a policy decision not impacting these guidelines, and is for further study.

Beyond that, there was not unanimity, and some of the viewpoints are captured below:

   a. We should not distinguish between classes of attendees. Let's figure out what tools it takes and what the cost is. Wants in person meeting w/remote access. (several participants agreed)
   b. Agrees with (1), adds today we discriminate on reasons (for cancellation refunds)
   c. One participant disagrees and – wants some justification for remote attendance provided. Rationale is to have incentive to be in the room, because it makes meeting more effective
   d. Another voiced there are many valid reasons for not being face-to-face. We should treat these meetings as experiments, (perhaps the first 3), to see if we can achieve our goals.
   e. Another noted that high quality standards happen because of active participation. Need to look at how we engage, assess active participation, and how we give preferential treatment. (goal moving forward)
   f. We trust our chairs, we need to trust them to manage. We have used face to face and virtual meetings together over time. Agrees very near term is experimental. Not practical near-term to separate classes of attendees.
   g. This group needs to be able to dictate requirements for equipment to participate.
   h. Another noted that 'classes of individuals' (which he does NOT support) should be in a rules document.

Following that discussion, the group turned to the definitions of the meeting. There was general consensus to follow a meeting like an in-person meeting, with in-room audio and a presentation screen.

Discussion then turned to the definition of a connected device, and its minimum capabilities. There was general agreement that providing a remote device and connection to it with sufficient bandwidth was the responsibility of the participant. Further definition was in progress when time expired.

Participants were left with homework to consider the equipment required for the room, the connected device, and capabilities of the conference facility.

The next meeting will be held August 31 at 1pm pacific. Webex to be sent to the 802 calendar.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:09PM