IEEE-SA Standards Board
Industry Connections Committee (ICCom) Minutes
04 March 2013, 4:30p-6:40p (USA Eastern)
Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick, NJ

1. Call to order; Roll call (4:30 PM)
Members Present: Oleg Logvinov (ICCom Chair), Farooq Bari, Wael Diab, Alex Gelman, David Law, Yatin Trivedi, Howard Wolfman, Yu Yuan
Members Absent: None
Legal Counsel: Claire Topp
Staff: James Wendorf (ICCom Administrator), Sam Sciacca (Recorder), Catherine Berger, Terry DeCourcelle, Chirag Desai, Karen Evangelista, Tricia Gerdon, Mary Ellen Hanntz, Yvette Ho Sang, Noelle Humenick, Konstantinos Karachalios, Karen Kenney, Mary Lynne Nielsen, Lisa Perry, Dave Ringle, Erin Spiewak, Susan Tatiner, Cherry Tom, Malia Zaman, Meng Zhao
Guests: Clint Chaplin, Rob Fish, Gary Hoffman, Paul Houzé, Jim Hughes, John Kulick, Steve Mills, Ted Olsen, Adrian Stephens, Yingli Wen, Phil Winston

2. Approval of agenda
Oleg presented the agenda and asked for comments. Jim pointed out some changes from the originally posted version (New item 4, Smart Home Architecture). Motion to approve (Yatin); Second (Howard)

A discussion took place regarding the fact that the previous meeting ended 1.5 hours earlier, but ICCom meeting took place at scheduled time rather than starting immediately after the previous meeting. Points were made regarding schedules, possible call-in attendees, and other planning issues. Wael suggested that meeting notifications could indicate the starting time could be up to one hour earlier, if the previous meeting ends early (F2F only).

No objections to unanimous approval of agenda, as amended.

3. Approval of previous minutes (12 December 2012)
Motion (Alex) and second (Howard) for approval. No objections to unanimous approval.

4. New/Revised ICAIDs
Oleg socialized a new ICAID: IC13-003-01 Convergence of Smart Home Architectures. The work comes out of CAG discussions and involves the convergence of technologies such as TVs, Smart Phones, and Tablets in a smart home. Output would be workshops, standards gap analysis white

papers, and possibly one or more PAR outlines. Oleg answered some questions by attendees with regards to funding, CAG IoT strategy, IEEE 1888, breadth of scope, and CAG as a sponsor (not of last resort). Oleg indicated that CAG will meet in April to consider sponsorship and then submit to ICCom. Alex suggested ComSoc might also be interested in sponsoring. ICCom was asked how they would like to proceed with regards to the proposed ICAID. With some caveats noted (scope breadth), no other major issues were noted. The sense of ICCom is that an email ballot can be run once the sponsor is confirmed.

Sam indicated that a new group is organizing regarding DC distribution in the home. Wael and David noted that Power over Ethernet is playing in some of this space, but not addressing power distribution aspects. When ICAID is presented, this needs more discussion to ensure groups are not overlapping. Maybe joint sponsorship is warranted.

5. Activity Terminations
No activity terminations at this meeting.

6. Activity Status Reports
Jim presented a status report on some of the current activities.

SIIT: Alex generated a report that has been uploaded to Central Desktop (see agenda). Conference is in the formation stage as an IEEE activity. It is looking for a home (Susan Tatiner assisting). They are concentrating on first conference, Sept., France. Advisory Board, Steering Committee and Technical Program Committee have been formed. Budget issues are now being discussed. Under discussion is the hiring of a staff project manager (contractor).

Intercloud Testbed: Progress report submitted (uploaded to Central Desktop).

Higher Speed Ethernet Consensus: Will be concluding.

Actionable Data Book for STEM Education: Moving very fast. Weekly calls. Variety of use cases. They would like to contact IEEE ebook operations staff (details of purpose not immediately known). Howard suggested the group contact Doug Gorham of EAB (Educational Activities Board).

7. Outputs/deliverables and names of IC activities:
A lengthy discussion took place regarding what outputs and deliverables are appropriate, if and/how IPR policy needs to be applied. Some of the salient points raised were the following:

- If the work product output is a specification, it should follow an IEEE-SA policy.
- A definition of what a specification is may be needed. What if an activity calls a specification a report? Are specifications appropriate as an ICCom activity?
- What is a conference? How does this differ from a workshop or a symposium? IEEE Conference implies certain things, such as copyright policy.
- White papers are opinions or just data. Specifications are standards that didn't go through a sponsor ballot.
- What happens when an activity starts encroaching on a standard?
- There needs to be a discussion on what disclaimers should be used. Rather than talk about what is appropriate for work output, what is the appropriate disclaimer for that output?
- Is there a danger that IC activities will be used to avoid the sponsor ballot? How could ICCom identify this in advance?
- Creating a specification by a group of individuals is something that anyone could do external to IEEE.
- Papers that suggest an implementation/specification can be submitted to IEEE publications. There is no liability concern in this case.
- We can't skip steps in the standards process. If specifications are treated like standards (e.g. IPR, LOA) do we also need to be concerned about open participation and other standards tenets?
- Profiles are a similar issue. Profiles on existing standards are specifications that may eventually become standards.
- There needs to be a very clear line. When does the work product begin to look like a standard?
- Do we need an Ad Hoc to look into this?
- There was some discussion on the naming of "Symposium on EDA Interoperability". The ICAID was approved through an email ballot. Is it a symposium? Should it be a forum, workshop, or conference? (This is an approved recommendation, and it will go on the SASB consent agenda as-is, since there was no motion to revise it.)
- How does ICCom control the name of the outputs and activities to reduce confusion with other IEEE terminology?

Oleg announced that in the interest of getting to some of the other agenda items he would suspend discussion, to be resumed later in the meeting.

8. Copyright, patent and confidentiality policies for IC activities
Discussed as part of the previous item (7, above).

9. ICCom Operations Manual
Sam indicated that there are only two aspects of the Ops Manual remaining to be completed: Section 16 (IPR and topics covered in agenda items 7 and

8, above), and the issue of membership in entity-based activities. This latter question revolves around the type of corporate membership required for participation after the first year of an entity-based activity's operation. ICCom is in agreement that for the first year of the activity, participation is open to all entities whether corporate members or not. A previous email sent to the CAG did not clearly reflect that an opinion was being sought from them on this topic. It was proposed that ICCom produce a recommendation for the CAG to act on in its April meeting.

Motion (Alex), second (Howard): Full participation in entity-based IC activities shall require at least Basic IEEE-SA Corporate Membership after the first year of the activity. Advanced Corporate Membership is not required.

Discussion: Having the activity open encourages more participation and bringing new bodies into IEEE. Revenue generation should not be the only consideration.

Motion (Wael), offered as a friendly amendment: Entities that are part of the activity's founding membership (to be defined) are only required to be Basic IEEE-SA Corporate Members to continue as full members (with voting rights) after the first year. New participants that join after the founding period (to be defined) would need to be Advanced Corporate Members to participate after the first year.

Alex did not consider the motion "friendly".

Second: David.

Discussion on the amendment took place. It was argued that the concept could be used to encourage other entities to sign up early on, to derive the benefit of being a founding member. Question called.

Motion to amend passed [For: 4; Against: 2; Abstain: 1].

Revised motion now reads:
Participation (voting membership) after the first year of an entity-based activity will require Advanced Corporate Membership; or Basic Membership for those entities that were part of the activity founding membership.

Discussion took place on the concept of a founding member. How would this be determined? To avoid gaming, it was proposed that the period of establishing the founding membership could be specified on the ICAID. Question called.

Motion passed [For: 4; Against: 2; Abstain: 1].

The appropriate section of the draft ICCom Ops Manual will be modified and sent to the CAG for their consideration and feedback at their April meeting.

10.   IC Program goals/metrics for 2013
Deferred due to lack of time.

11.   Resumption of discussion on IPR/Work Product Classification
The call for an Ad Hoc was revisited, and it was suggested that an Ad Hoc be established to create a matrix which correlates classifications of work products with appropriate IPR requirements (Patent policy, copyright, disclaimers for published work products).

After some discussion, the Ad Hoc was formed with the following membership:
David Law (Chair), Wael, Howard, Yu, Jim, Yvette, Dave Ringle, Sam
The target will be to have a draft proposal by the June meeting in Brussels.

12.   Next Meetings
The next ICCom meeting will be 12 June 2013, 4:30p-6:30p (CEST), Brussels, Belgium.

13.   Adjournment (6:40 PM)