

IEEE-SA STANDARDS BOARD PROCEDURES COMMITTEE (PROCOM)

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

08 September 2011

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Seoul, Korea

Members:

Bill Bartley
Bob Grow
Jim Hughes, Chair
David Law
Sam Sciacca
Curtis Siller
Howard Wolfman

Guests:

Dennis Brophy
Wael Diab
Richard Hulett
Bruce Kraemer
John Kulick
Hung Ling
John Messina
Steve Mills
Ted Olsen
Claire Topp
Yatin Trivedi
Don Wright

Staff:

Bill Ash
Karen Evangelista
Jodi Haasz
Mary Ellen Hanntz
Yvette HoSang
(by phone for Item 4.4)
Karen Kenney
Bob LaBelle
Karen McCabe
Dave Ringle
Sue Vogel
Lisa Yacone, Administrator

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. There was a round of introductions by all present.

2 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Hughes asked ProCom to consider a request to move Items 4.4 and 4.5 to the top of the agenda. Yvette HoSang would be calling in for Item 4.4 from NJ where it was currently midnight and Wael Diab had requested that Item 4.5 be discussed earlier. There was a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

3 APPROVAL OF THE 14 JUNE 2011 PROCOM MINUTES

There was a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

4 OLD/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4.1 SASB Reaffirmation Ad Hoc – Information – Hughes

Chair Hughes gave a brief presentation that he will also present at the Standards Association Standards Board (SASB) meeting on Saturday. The plan is still on target for an implementation date of 1 January 2012 and final version of FAQ and other documents will be brought to the December SASB meeting for final approval.

4.2 Access to Ballot Group Information Ad Hoc – Information - Chaplin

The ad hoc reported that the changes to clause 5.4 of the SASB OpsMan, presented in June and approved by SASB ballot were sufficient to address the situation as it currently stands. No further action is required. The ad hoc was disbanded.

4.3 Introductions Ad Hoc Update – Information - Sciacca

The ad hoc addressed the introduction in three parts (introduction, abstract and key words and other front matter, e.g. list of participants) and presented a short explanation of each section and how it would be treated in balloting, etc. The ad hoc noted that the IEEE P&P are silent as to which parts of a standard are (or are not) balloted. The ad hoc recommends that ProCom suggest to AudCom that WG P&Ps specify the requirements for being listed as a participant in the Working Group to avoid any confusion on the matter. ProCom agreed in principle with the recommendations provided by the ad hoc but further work is needed.

Chair Hughes reconstituted the ad hoc: Sam Sciacca (Chair), David Law, Jim Moore, Bill Bartley, Phil Winston, Kim Breitfelder, and Dave Ringle.

4.4 Response to Changes in the ANSI Essential Requirements RE: Balance Ad Hoc – Action - Grow

ANSI Essential Requirements require that interest categories for “safety-related” standards balloting must be no larger than 1/3 of balloters (vs. current 50% rule in IEEE-SA). Follow-up by staff confirmed that a definition of “safety standard” was not included in the rule or provided by ANSI. The IEEE-SA was left with three choices: Adopt the 1/3 rule across the board, Define safety standards, or Implement the 1/3 rule if the word “safety” was included anywhere in the document. A resolution responding to this requirement must be reached by the IEEE-SA in order to close ANSI’s audit of IEEE-SA’s procedures for 2009.

After much discussion and a realization that changing the ANSI Essential Requirements would be difficult, the following motion was made and approved:

Motion: Propose that we implement the change to IEEE-SASB OpsMan as submitted with an implementation date of 1 March 2012. ProCom is instructed to develop a supporting set of educational material for this change.

The proposal will be included in Chair Hughes’ ProCom report to the SASB on Saturday.

5.4.1 Balloting group

The balloting group shall meet the criteria in subclause 5.2.2.3 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*. Balloting group members vote on the acceptability of a new, revised, or stabilized standard based on their interest in and commitment to reviewing and voting on a specific proposed standard. The balloting group shall provide for the development of consensus by all interests significantly affected by the scope of the standard. This is achieved through a balance of such interests in the balloting group membership. Balance is achieved by not permitting any single interest category to comprise ~~50% or~~ more ~~than one-third~~ of the Sponsor balloting group.

No balloter shall have more than one vote.

The *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws* allow for the participation of invited individual experts in ballots of specific standards projects upon approval of the IEEE-SA Standards Board. An invited individual expert is a non-IEEE-SA member who has been invited by a Sponsor to ballot on a specific standards project for the purpose of providing his or her technical expertise to improve the quality of that document. The Sponsor shall provide the following information to the IEEE-SA Standards Board when requesting the participation of an invited individual expert in a particular balloting group:

- a) A rationale as to why the invited individual expert is needed
- b) Brief background information on each invited individual expert, including qualifications
- c) A statement explaining the detrimental impact if the invited individual expert does not participate
- d) The total number of individual experts invited to participate in this balloting group
- e) The contact information for the individual

Upon approval by the IEEE-SA Standards Board, an invited individual expert is entitled to the same balloting privileges as an IEEE-SA member for the specified standards project.

Balloters are required to classify their relationship to the balloting group relative to the scope of standards activity (for example, producer, user, and general interest). Where appropriate, additional classifications, such as "testing laboratory" or "academic," may be added by the Sponsor. This decision should be based on the effect the standard may have on participants not already recognized by the primary classifications. Individuals classify themselves based on their technical background, which may be related to their employment, job functions, or experience. IEEE-SA entity balloters are classified based on their entity interest as it relates to the scope of the standards project (for example, producer, consumer, general interest). No ~~single group (classification) (interest category)~~ is permitted to constitute ~~50% or~~ more ~~than one-third~~ of the balloting group membership. Care shall be taken to ensure that all classes of interest are represented to the extent possible.

It is desirable to have representation of the materially interested and affected parties when reviewing the balance of the balloting group. Sponsors shall ensure balance prior to conducting a Sponsor ballot. Balloting groups of individuals should have at least 10 members to ensure adequate balance.

Interested or affected persons who pay the appropriate fees associated with voting privileges may join the balloting group for a specific standards project. Once the ballot has begun, the balloting group is closed to additional participants. Even if IEEE-SA membership status changes during the balloting period or recirculation period, there shall be no change to the voting status of the balloter with respect to that ballot.

Persons may also purchase the ballot draft for information only. Such persons may submit comments on the draft within the balloting period. However, they may not vote to approve, disapprove, or abstain on the proposed standard, nor are they entitled to receive any material other than the revised draft and responses to their comments.

Comments from persons who are not members of the balloting group shall be given due consideration and an appropriate response.

Chair Hughes reconstituted the ad hoc. The ad hoc will continue to develop supporting educational material and to address implementation issues. Bill Bartley and Howard Wolfman will be added to the current group of ad hoc members: Bob Grow (Chair), David Law, Howard Wolfman, Sam Sciacca, John Kulick, Dave Ringle, Bill Ash, Yvette HoSang, Tricia Gerdon, Don Messina, Matt Ceglia, Karen Evangelista and Holly Elwood.

AI 110908-01: Dave Ringle will respond to ANSI that we have a solution to the issue in progress.

4.5 Co-Sponsorship – Information – Diab

Wael Diab reported that the ad hoc had met once since June and had a low turnout. The group discussed two options: identifying a lead sponsor whose P&Ps would be followed, or requiring an MOU between co-sponsors. The MOU option led to questions about conflict in Sponsor P&Ps, necessity of AudCom review and possible transparency issues. The ad hoc received ProCom comments and will continue to meet. Chair Hughes reconstituted the ad hoc: Wael Diab (chair), Sam Sciacca, David Law, Mike Seavey and Phil Winston.

5 NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Invited Experts – Proposed Bylaws and OpsMan Changes – Action – Olsen

Ted Olsen presented a proposal to delete the concept of Invited Experts from SASB material. The rationale provided states:

Previous to 1998, IEEE membership was required to ballot an IEEE standard, and IEEE membership requires certain technical/educational credentials. At that time, having invited experts in IEEE standards ballots was a valued process for

including standards expertise in a ballot who could not qualify for IEEE membership.

With the creation of the IEEE Standards Association in 1999, the requirement for IEEE membership in order to ballot a draft standard was removed. In its place, IEEE-SA membership was required. There are no technical/educational criteria to obtain an IEEE membership; the only requirement is payment of annual dues.

Therefore, invited experts in IEEE-SA's balloting processes is no longer needed, as anyone can qualify for membership. Removing invited experts from the rules also reduces the concern that only those 'favored' or known to the working group are made aware of the option for invited experts, and that those not involved end up having to pay membership dues. It creates an equal participation field for all those interested in an IEEE ballot.

If the deletion of invited experts is approved there will be a need to promote/educate those familiar with the history of invited experts to mitigate potential confusion. In myProject the "invite an expert" option can be turned off as of 1 Jan 2012.

Following discussion, the following motion was made and approved:

Motion: ProCom recommends that the SASB accept the proposed changes to the IEEE-SASB Bylaws and IEEE-SASB OpsMan as defined below. The implementation date will be 1 January 2012. The Standards Board shall not consider any invited expert requests after 31 December 2011. Any invited experts approved before 1 January 2012 shall be allowed to participate in the ballot group.

IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws

5.2.2.3 Sponsor balloting group

Potential dominance in Sponsor ballots as evidenced by an unduly high proportion of individuals employed by or affiliated with a single entity or from a particular balloting classification is unacceptable, counter to open and fair participation by all interested parties, and deprecated by the IEEE-SA Standards Board. All individuals joining a ballot group shall declare their employer and affiliation (see subclause 5.3.3.1 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*). The Sponsor shall review the ballot group for balance and possible dominance. If it is determined that the ballot group may be dominated (see 5.2.1.3), the Sponsor shall recommend remedial actions to the IEEE-SA Standards Board to ensure a fair and open ballot. The IEEE-SA Standards Board may also take action independent of any Sponsor recommendation.

The balloting group shall consist of persons who are members of the IEEE-SA and non-IEEE-SA members. A person is an individual or entity. An entity can be any for-profit or not-for-profit enterprise, as defined in IEEE Bylaw I-403. ~~In addition, with the approval of the IEEE-SA Standards Board, invited individual experts who are non-IEEE-SA members may participate in ballots of proposed IEEE standards.~~

A single type of balloting group for a standard shall be established at the time of PAR approval and officially approved prior to the formation of a balloting group. A statement of the type of balloting membership to be used shall be included in all versions of the draft standard and the final approved standard.

IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual

5.4.1 Balloting group

The balloting group shall meet the criteria in subclause 5.2.2.3 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*. Balloting group members vote on the acceptability of a new, revised, or stabilized standard based on their interest in and commitment to reviewing and voting on a specific proposed standard. The balloting group shall provide for the development of consensus by all interests significantly affected by the scope of the standard. This is achieved through a balance of such interests in the balloting group membership. Balance is achieved by not permitting any single interest category to comprise 50% or more of the Sponsor balloting group.

No balloter shall have more than one vote.

~~The IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws allow for the participation of invited individual experts in ballots of specific standards projects upon approval of the IEEE SA Standards Board. An invited individual expert is a non-IEEE-SA member who has been invited by a Sponsor to ballot on a specific standards project for the purpose of providing his or her technical expertise to improve the quality of that document. The Sponsor shall provide the following information to the IEEE-SA Standards Board when requesting the participation of an invited individual expert in a particular balloting group:~~

- ~~a) A rationale as to why the invited individual expert is needed~~
- ~~b) Brief background information on each invited individual expert, including qualifications~~
- ~~c) A statement explaining the detrimental impact if the invited individual expert does not participate~~
- ~~d) The total number of individual experts invited to participate in this balloting group~~
- ~~e) The contact information for the individual~~

~~Upon approval by the IEEE SA Standards Board, an invited individual expert is entitled to the same balloting privileges as an IEEE-SA member for the specified standards project.~~

Balloters are required to classify their relationship to the balloting group relative to the scope of standards activity (for example, producer, user, and general interest). Where appropriate, additional classifications, such as "testing laboratory" or "academic," may be added by the Sponsor. This decision should be based on the effect the standard may have on participants not already recognized by the primary classifications. Individuals classify themselves based on their technical background, which may be related to their employment, job functions, or experience. IEEE-SA entity balloters are classified based on their entity interest as it relates to the scope

of the standards project (for example, producer, consumer, general interest). No group (classification) is permitted to constitute 50% or more of the balloting group membership. Care shall be taken to ensure that all classes of interest are represented to the extent possible.

It is desirable to have representation of the materially interested and affected parties when reviewing the balance of the balloting group. Sponsors shall ensure balance prior to conducting a Sponsor ballot. Balloting groups of individuals should have at least 10 members to ensure adequate balance.

Interested or affected persons who pay the appropriate fees associated with voting privileges may join the balloting group for a specific standards project. Once the ballot has begun, the balloting group is closed to additional participants. Even if IEEE-SA membership status changes during the balloting period or recirculation period, there shall be no change to the voting status of the balloter with respect to that ballot.

Persons may also purchase the ballot draft for information only. Such persons may submit comments on the draft within the balloting period. However, they may not vote to approve, disapprove, or abstain on the proposed standard, nor are they entitled to receive any material other than the revised draft and responses to their comments.

Comments from persons who are not members of the balloting group shall be given due consideration and an appropriate response.

5.2 IEEE-SA Match Rule Ad Hoc proposed changes to IEEE-SASB OpsMan – Action –Law

David Law reported on the results of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Match Rule Ad Hoc and asked that ProCom support eliminating the requirement in the SASB OpsMan that for new and revision projects, the scope and purpose of the draft document submitted to RevCom shall match the scope and purpose stated in the approved PAR. The following rationale was provided:

RATIONALE:

Eliminate the requirement in the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual that for new and revision projects, the scope and purpose of the draft document submitted to RevCom shall match the scope and purpose stated in the approved PAR. This is based on the recent update to the balloting cover letter boilerplate text to make it clear that one of the responsibilities as a balloter is to ensure that the scope of the draft is within the scope of the work authorized by the PAR.

The fundamental requirement is ensuring that the scope of the final approved standard is within the scope of the work authorized by the PAR [which is the public statement of what we are going to do and is published by ANSI through its Project Initiation Notification System (PINS) Form].

If the scope of the approved standard were to go beyond the scope published in the PAR we could have the situation where a materially interested person may not have had the opportunity to participate - because we didn't say that we were

going to work on that area. We will therefore have failed to meet the openness imperative principle of IEEE-SA standards development.

As a matter of practicality, we couldn't have RevCom reviewing the content of a standard to see if it is within scope of the PAR. Hence the way to see if we had met the above was to rely on the scope statement in the draft as an accurate statement of the scope of what the standard contains.

Further, to avoid RevCom members having to make the judgment whether a scope statement in a draft was within the scope of the PAR, we have the rule today where the scope has to match (with the exception of what are considered editorial changes by both staff and RevCom).

This however has resulted in PAR modification requests late in the process to change the PAR scope statement to match the draft scope statement. It is also feared that sponsors simply place the scope text from the PAR in the draft so they can get through RevCom - regardless what the scope of the draft actually is. That again puts us at risk of failing to meet the openness imperative principle.

On considering the above the IEEE-SA Standards Board Match Rule Ad Hoc concluded that those best placed to make the decision that the scope of the final approved standard is within the scope of the work authorized by the PAR are the balloters through the balloting process. Based on this the balloting cover letter boilerplate text has already been updated with the addition of the text:

One of the responsibilities as a balloter is to ensure that the scope of the draft (including the scope statement in the draft, if any) is within the scope of the work authorized by the PAR. A draft that has a scope that exceeds the work authorized by the PAR can be a reason for a disapprove vote.

Note: It is acceptable for the scope of the draft to be less than the scope of the work authorized by the PAR.

With this change it is no longer necessary to require that RevCom check that the Scope and Purpose match.

After discussion, the following motion was made:

Motion: ProCom approves in principal the proposal from the IEEE-SA Standards Board Match Rule Ad Hoc to eliminate the Match Rule.

[Vote: Approve = 5, Disapprove = 1 (Sciacca)]

IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual

4.2.3.2 Review of draft standards

The RevCom Administrator shall distribute a copy of each proposed standard to the members of RevCom, together with the submittal form and any other pertinent information, for review. An IEEE-SA Standards Board member or the liaison representative may request a copy of the proposed standard from the RevCom

Administrator. RevCom members are responsible for reviewing the documents and submitting comments to the RevCom Administrator. All comments and objections with reasons shall be distributed by the RevCom Administrator to RevCom members and the liaison representative of the Sponsor.

All requests for approval of a standard shall be reviewed by RevCom to ensure that the submittal is complete and that appropriate IEEE procedures are followed completely and correctly (see the IEEE-SA Working Guide for Submittal of Proposed Standards).

Examples of some of the points that must be carefully analyzed are given in the following paragraphs:

- *Title of Document.* The title on the draft document and submittal form shall be within the scope as stated on the most recently approved PAR, or action(s) shall be taken to ensure this.
- ~~*Scope and Purpose of Document. For new and revision projects, the scope and purpose of the draft document submitted to RevCom shall match the scope and purpose stated in the approved PAR.*~~
- *Coordination.* Mandatory coordination comments shall be addressed. If the Sponsor believes that satisfying specific mandatory coordination comments will impede the utility of the draft standard, appropriate documentation of this position shall be presented to RevCom.
- *Ballot Summary.* A ballot summary of the vote of the members is required, e.g., showing the classification of members of the balloting group and including comments accompanying unresolved negative ballots. For complete details, see 5.4.1 and 5.4.3.
- *Balloting Group.* The balloting group shall be formulated according to 5.4.1.
- *Classification of Balloting Body.* Classification of the balloting body shall be in accordance with 5.4.1.
- *Comment Responses.* All comments shall receive consideration and response in accordance with 5.4.3.

5.3 Definitions for Abstain and Recuse – Information – Law

David Law shared the results of a RevCom ad hoc which had resulted in RevCom's adoption of convention definitions for "abstain" and "recuse". He asked whether or not the definitions should be more widely adopted in the IEEE-SA. ProCom chose to not take any action but recommended that the definitions be shared with NesCom.

5.4 SA OpsMan rules changes for RA competition – Information – Parsons/Grow

Bob Grow reported that due to a concern over losing several new registries in the past few years to other registration authorities, the BOG had created an ad hoc to recommend an appropriate SA OpsMan rule for the handling of new registries for

IEEE standards. A few potential options were presented and discussed. Any further input from ProCom members can be given to the BOG ad hoc.

6 NEXT MEETING

The next ProCom meeting is scheduled for 5 December 2011, in Piscataway, NJ, USA.

7 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:57 p.m.