

**IEEE-SA Standards Board Procedures Committee (ProCom)  
Meeting Minutes  
8 December 2014  
IEEE Operations Center, Piscataway, New Jersey, USA  
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.**

Members Present:

Ted Burse  
Gary Hoffman  
Rich Hulett  
David Law  
Glenn Parsons  
Jon Rosdahl, Chair  
Phil Winston  
Don Wright

Members Absent:

Oleg Logvinov

IEEE Outside Legal Counsel:

Claire Topp – Dorsey & Whitney

Guests:

Peter Balma  
Monica Barone  
Dennis Brophy  
Ted Burse  
Clint Chaplin  
Stephen Dukes  
James Gilb  
Travis Griffith  
Ron Hotchkiss  
Jeffrey Katz  
John Kolakowski  
Bruce Kraemer  
John Kulick  
Hung Ling  
Xiaohui Liu  
Paul Nikolich

Gil Ohana  
Kishik Park  
Annette Reilly  
Adrian Stephens  
Yatin Trivedi  
Yingli Wen  
Phil Wennblom  
George Willingmyre  
Howard Wolfman  
Yu Yuan

IEEE Staff:

Melissa Aranzamendez  
Christy Bahn  
Kathryn Bennett  
Catherine Berger  
Christina Boyce  
Kim Breitfelder  
Georedna Brown  
Justin Caso  
Matthew Ceglia  
Karen Evangelista  
Tricia Gerdon  
Lloyd Green  
Mary Ellen Hanntz  
Yvette Ho Sang  
Konstantinos Karachalios  
Karen Kenney  
Mike Kipness  
Juanita Lewis  
Brenda Mancuso  
Greg Marchini  
Adam Newman  
Mary Lynne Nielsen  
Maira Patterson  
Lisa Perry  
Walter Pienciak  
Dave Ringle, Administrator  
Ana Sainvilus  
Rudi Schubert  
Sam Sciacca  
Norman Shaw  
Erin Spiewak  
Ravi Subramaniam  
Walter Sun

Susan Tatiner  
Cherry Tom  
Michelle Turner  
Lisa Weisser  
Jim Wendorf  
Joan Woolery  
Malia Zaman  
Meng Zhao

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rosdahl called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Chair Rosdahl noted that item *6.7 Recess at 5:00 p.m.* was being added to the agenda to accommodate the scheduled start time for PatCom. Those ProCom members who were able to reconvene post-PatCom were asked to do so.

Chair Rosdahl noted that item *2 Introductions* would occur later in the meeting.

2 INTRODUCTIONS

3 APPROVAL OF [AGENDA](#)

There was a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was approved, as there was no objection to unanimous consent.

4 APPROVAL OF THE [19 AUGUST 2014 ProCom MINUTES](#)

There was a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes. The motion was approved, as there was no objection to unanimous consent.

5 OLD/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5.1 Review of [SASB Comments Received](#) on P&P Ballot – Ringle

Dave Ringle indicated that the P&P changes recommended for SASB approval in [item 5.1 of the August ProCom meeting](#) were approved by the SASB and that some comments had been received for consideration by ProCom.

**There was a motion to recommend the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* changes, noted below in **blue highlight**, to the SASB for approval consideration.**

**The motion was unanimously approved.**

## 1.2 Types of IEEE standards

IEEE standards include but are not limited to:

- Lists of terms, definitions, or symbols, applicable to any field of science or technology within the scope of the IEEE.
- Expositions of scientific methods of measurement or tests of the parameters or performance of any device, apparatus, system, or phenomenon associated with the art, science, or technology of any field within the scope of the IEEE.
- Characteristics, performance, and safety requirements associated with devices, equipment, and systems with engineering installations.
- Recommendations reflecting current state-of-the-art in the application of engineering principles to any field of technology within the scope of the IEEE.

IEEE standards are classified as:

- *Standards*: documents with mandatory requirements.
- *Recommended practices*: documents in which procedures and positions preferred by the IEEE are presented.
- *Guides*: documents in which alternative approaches to good practice are suggested but no clear-cut recommendations are made.
- *Trial-Use documents*: publications in effect for not more than **two-three** years (see 5.7). They can be any of the categories of standards publications listed above. **(See 5.7.)**

The IEEE standards development process may result in one or more of the following documents:

- *New*: A document that does not replace or modify another standard.
- *Revision*: A document that updates and replaces (i.e., supersedes) an existing IEEE standard in its entirety.
- *Amendment*: A document that adds to, removes from, or alters material in a portion of an existing IEEE standard and may make editorial or technical corrections to that standard.  
NOTE – An amendment to a standard may be prepared to maintain the state-of-the-art within the standard due to advancing technology or techniques. An amendment facilitates the timely change of an existing IEEE standard prior to its complete revision.
- *Corrigendum*: A document that only corrects editorial errors, technical errors, or ambiguities in an existing IEEE standard. A corrigendum does not introduce new material.  
NOTE – A typical corrigendum may contain:
  - Corrections to equations, tables, or figures, or their associated numbering or citations in the text
  - Corrections to technically incorrect sentences or paragraphs
- *Erratum*: A document that contains only grammatical corrections to, or corrections of errors introduced during the publishing process of, an existing IEEE standard. An erratum is based on the comparison of the final balloted version of the standard as compared to the published version.

IEEE Standards Project Editors can assist Sponsors in determining whether an amendment or revision is appropriate.

IEEE Standards may be in one of three states of activity:

- *Developing*: Standards projects that have not yet been approved as standards.
- *Active*: Approved standards that have not been transferred to inactive status.
- *Inactive*: Standards that are no longer being reviewed or assessed for accuracy, relevance to current practices, or further applications; these standards are removed from active status (i.e., these standards are transferred from active to inactive status). (See 9.2).

#### 5.4.3.5 Completion of the standards balloting process and submittal to RevCom

A minimum of 75% of those voting *Approve* or *Do Not Approve (Negative with comment)* must approve the draft in order to submit the ballot result to the IEEE-SA Standards Board. In the event that 30% or more of the returned ballots are *Abstentions*, the standards balloting process shall be considered invalid.

In the event that a 75% return cannot be obtained, the standards balloting process is considered to have failed and further disposition of the proposed standard shall be the responsibility of the Sponsor.

Once all required recirculations have been completed and 75% approval has been achieved, the IEEE requirements for consensus have been met. Efforts to resolve *Do Not Approve* votes may continue for a brief period; however, if such resolution is not possible in a timely manner, the Sponsor should forward the submittal to RevCom because the IEEE has an obligation to the majority to review and publish the proposed standard quickly.

Copies of all unresolved *Do Not Approve* votes, together with the reasons given by the *Do Not Approve* voters and the responses by the Sponsor, shall be included with the ballot results submitted to RevCom.

The Sponsor shall, if not included in a recirculation package, provide to the *Do Not Approve* voter and to RevCom an explanation why any comments associated with a *Do Not Approve* vote were not required to be recirculated. In order for a *Do Not Approve* vote to be changed to an *Approve* or *Abstain* vote, the Sponsor shall obtain and provide to RevCom written confirmation from each voter (by letter, fax, or electronic mail) that indicates concurrence with any change of his or her vote. Any *Do Not Approve* vote with comment that RevCom is asked to consider as a *Do Not Approve (Negative without comment)* shall be explained to RevCom.

~~Proposed standards receiving a significant number of unresolved *Do Not Approve* votes should be considered by the Sponsor for trial use (see 5.7).~~

#### 5.7 Trial-Use standards

~~A Trial-Use standard may be appropriate for the following situations:~~

- a) ~~To bring together concepts for cutting edge technologies that are so new that standardization concepts need to be developed as the technology progresses.~~
- b) ~~To solicit input from a broader community prior to consideration of the development of a full-use standard.~~
- c) ~~As an alternative for a proposed standard that receives a significant number of *Do Not Approve* votes that cannot be resolved.~~

~~Trial-Use standards are effective for not more than two-three years and cannot be amended; it is allowable to have corrigenda against a Trial-Use standard from the date of publication. In the absence of comments received in the trial period, the document is~~

subject to adoption as a full-status standard by the IEEE-SA Standards Board upon recommendation of the Sponsor. Trial-Use standards are prepared through the normal standards process and require a PAR indicating trial-use, Sponsor balloting, ballot resolution, and IEEE-SA Standards Board approval. During the trial-use period, users and those interested in the document may submit comments. The front matter of each approved Trial-Use standards shall contain a published scheduled cutoff date for receipt of comments and shall state the expiration date for the Trial-Use document (dates shall be calendar dates, i.e., dd mmm yyyy) for further revision and approval action. The comment cutoff date shall be at least six-12 months before the end-of-expiration date for the Trial-Use period for the standard. The expiration date for the Trial-Use standard shall be three years from its publication date. Upon expiration, the Trial-Use standard shall be transferred to inactive status (i.e., the document will be labeled *Inactive* and reserved for historical reference.)

The approval period for a trial-use standard that is adopted as a full-status standard without change shall be for a total of ten years from the start of the trial-use period. If the trial-use period demonstrates that a trial-use standard has to undergo changes to become a full-status standard, a PAR for revision of an existing standard shall be prepared. The Sponsor shall consider the comments received. If the document is to be converted to a full-use document, a revision project shall be initiated through the submission of a PAR that indicates full-use status. The normal Sponsor balloting and approval processes applicable to all standards shall be followed. Sponsor balloting for the full-use document shall not be conducted until after the comment cutoff date for the Trial-Use document. Once approved, the full-use standard will follow all of the applicable policies and procedures (e.g., ten-year life; can be amended; can be further revised; etc.).

The Sponsor may consider converting a full-use project to a Trial-Use project. To make this conversion, a Modified PAR indicating the change to a Trial-Use project shall be submitted to NesCom. If the Sponsor balloting process has begun, the Sponsor cannot convert the project from full-use to trial-use without terminating the active ballot.

In addition, the Sponsor may consider converting a Trial-Use project to a full-use project. To make this conversion, a Modified PAR indicating the change to a full-use project shall be submitted to NesCom. If the Sponsor balloting process has begun, the Sponsor cannot convert the project from trial-use to full-use without terminating the active ballot.

Trial-Use standards may result from one of the following:

- a) — *At the Standards Development Level.* When a draft has been generated that generally satisfies the standards-developing group (i.e., subcommittee or working group) but needs input from a very broad constituency, such a draft may be processed as an IEEE Trial-Use Standard. For approval, such a draft requires a letter ballot of the Sponsor and approval by the IEEE-SA Standards Board as a trial-use standard.
- b) — *At the Sponsor Level.* When a Sponsor is unable to resolve negative ballots to a satisfactory level, or uncertain aspects of the document justify preliminary distribution, it may consider submission of the draft to the IEEE-SA Standards Board as a trial-use standard.
- c) — *At the IEEE-SA Standards Board Level.* When the IEEE-SA Standards Board cannot attain a suitable level of approval for a draft submitted for adoption as an IEEE Standard, it may decide to approve it as a trial-use standard.

## 5.2 Industry Connections Work Product Ad Hoc [Report](#) – Law

David Law reported.

**There was a motion to recommend the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* changes, noted below, to the SASB for approval consideration.**

**The motion was unanimously approved.**

## **IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual**

### **6.2 Commercial terms and conditions**

#### **6.2.1 IEEE standards**

Provisions involving business relations between buyer and seller such as guarantees, warranties, and other commercial terms and conditions shall not be included in an IEEE standard. The appearance that a standard endorses any particular products, services, or companies shall be avoided. Therefore, it generally is not acceptable to include manufacturer lists, service provider lists, or similar material in the text of an IEEE standard. Where a sole source exists for essential equipment, materials, or services necessary to comply with or to determine compliance with the standard, it is permissible to supply the name and address of the source in a footnote as long as the words "or the equivalent" are added to the reference. In connection with standards that relate to the determination of whether products or services conform to one or more standards, the process or criteria for determining conformity can be standardized as long as the description of the process or criteria (a) is limited to technical or engineering concerns and does not include what would otherwise be a commercial term, and (b) does not provide for testing conformance with any commercial terms.

#### **6.2.2 Industry Connections Work Products**

Provisions involving business relations between buyer and seller such as guarantees, warranties, and other commercial terms and conditions shall not be included in an IEEE Industry Connections Work Product, except for provisions approved by the IEEE in connection with the sale or license of the IEEE Industry Connections Work Product by the IEEE or by an agent authorized by the IEEE. While an Industry Connections Work Product may contain references to products, services, or companies, an Industry Connections Work Product shall not endorse or appear to endorse any particular products, services, or companies.

Chair Rosdahl thanked the Ad Hoc for its efforts; the Ad Hoc was then disbanded.

### 5.3 IEEE Public Review Process Implementation Plan [Update](#) – Marchini

Greg Marchini reported.

## 6 NEW BUSINESS

### 6.1 [Request for Interpretation](#) of the P&Ps RE: Sponsor Responsibility – Rosdahl

Chair Rosdahl reported on the request for interpretation of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*.

**There was a motion to recommend the interpretation response, noted below, to the SASB for approval consideration. The motion was approved [Vote: Yes=6; No=1].**

*In response to your request for an interpretation of whether a Sponsor is entitled to unfettered access to WG materials can be reasonably inferred from SASB OpMan 5.1.1; ProCom agrees that having unrestricted full access to WG materials solely for the purpose of meeting the requirements of SASB OpMan 5.1.1 is reasonable.*

- 6.2 [Proposal](#) of Standards in Database Format – Bennett
- [Draft Procedures](#)
  - [Flowchart](#)

This item was taken after ProCom reconvened at 6:45 p.m. [All ProCom members except Ted Burse were present.]

Kathryn Bennett reported.

An Ad Hoc group was formed to evaluate the proposal and to provide a recommendation to ProCom. It is anticipated that the Ad Hoc will provide a report at the March 2015 ProCom meeting.

Ad Hoc Chair: Annette Reilly

Ad Hoc Members: Bill Ash, Kathryn Bennett, Yvette Ho Sang, David Law, Greg Marchini, Glenn Parsons, Markus Plessel, and Phil Winston

- 6.3 [Proposed Changes](#) to SASB OpMan 8.1.2 – Kim/Ceglia

Matthew Ceglia reported.

**There was a motion to recommend the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* changes, noted below, to the SASB for approval consideration.**

**The motion was unanimously approved.**

## **IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual**

### **8.1.2 Amendments and corrigenda**

Amendments and corrigenda ~~are independent projects and~~ are processed with separate PARs and balloted independently in accordance with the requirements of these procedures, including submission to the IEEE-SA Standards Board. A corrigendum may not extend the scope of the existing standard. An amendment may extend the scope of the existing standard, but if the proposed scope of the amendment PAR or the changes made in the

draft amendment are found to be excessive by the IEEE-SA Standards Board, the Sponsor shall initiate a revision PAR to replace the amendment PAR.

All PARs for amendments and corrigenda shall include a project scope.

All amendments and corrigenda shall follow the style conventions for indicating changes defined in the *IEEE Standards Style Manual*.

Sponsor ballots of amendments and corrigenda shall also include access to the approved base standard and any approved amendments and corrigenda in order to provide sufficient information to the ballot group.

Up to three amendments can be approved before the standard shall be revised, unless the base standard has been approved within the past three years. In such a case, multiple amendments may be added until the base standard is three years old. After the three-year period, RevCom shall defer consideration of additional amendments or corrigenda until a revision or a two-year extension request is approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board.

If, for any extenuating circumstances, an exception to these rules is required, the Sponsor shall take its request for a two-year extension to RevCom. A project plan outlining the rationale for the request, as well as a schedule for the revision, also shall be submitted. RevCom will review the request and make a recommendation to the IEEE-SA Standards Board.

During the two-year extension period, Sponsors can submit additional amendments and corrigenda for approval consideration. However, after this period, RevCom shall defer consideration of additional amendments or corrigenda until a revision is approved by the IEEE-SA Standards Board.

#### 6.4 [Proposed Changes](#) to SASB OpMan 6.2 – Ho Sang/Ringle

Dave Ringle reported.

**There was a motion to recommend the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* changes, noted below, to the SASB for approval consideration.**

**The motion was unanimously approved.**

### **IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual**

#### **6.2 Commercial terms and conditions**

Provisions involving business relations between buyer and seller such as guarantees, warranties, and other commercial terms and conditions shall not be included in an IEEE standard. The appearance that a standard endorses any particular products, services, or companies shall be avoided. Therefore, it generally is not acceptable to include manufacturer lists, service provider lists, or similar material in the text of an IEEE standard. Where a sole source exists for essential equipment, materials, or services necessary to comply with or to determine compliance with the standard, it is permissible to supply the name and address of the source in a footnote as long as the words "or the equivalent" are added to the reference. **In connection with standards that relate to the determination of whether products or services conform to one or more standards, the process or criteria for**

determining conformity can be standardized as long as the description of the process or criteria (a) is limited to technical or engineering concerns and does not include what would otherwise be a commercial term, and (b) does not provide for testing conformance with any commercial terms.

## 6.5 [Proposed Changes](#) to SASB OpMan 5.4.5 – Ho Sang

Yvette Ho Sang reported.

There was a motion to recommend the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* changes, noted below in **blue highlight**, to the SASB for approval consideration.

The motion was unanimously approved.

### IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual

#### 5.1.2 Duties of the Sponsor

##### 5.1.2.1 Mandatory requirements

Supervision of a standards project by the Sponsor includes the following mandatory requirements:

- a) Submit a properly completed Project Authorization Request (PAR) for IEEE-SA Standards Board approval within six months of the first decision to initiate the project. Forms and information may be obtained from the NesCom Administrator (see 5.2).
- b) After approval of the project, work with the IEEE Standards Department Staff to give notice of the project in appropriate publications and to appropriate entities, for the purpose of soliciting an expression of interest in the work of the sponsoring committee.
- c) Ensure that mandatory coordination requirements are accomplished (see 4.2.3.2 and 5.4.4).
- d) Organize the technical development work on the standard.
- e) Notify persons who have expressed interest in the time and the place of meetings as specified in the P & P of the Sponsor (see 5.1.1).
- f) Ensure that all meetings involving standards are open to all interested parties.
- g) Conduct the standards ballot **and IEEE Public Review** in accordance with these procedures (see 5.4).
- h) Submit the proposed standard together with the submittal form to the IEEE-SA Standards Board.
- i) Submit annually to the IEEE Standards Department an electronic roster of individuals participating on standards projects.
- j) Without exception, the Sponsor shall ensure the submission of an annual financial report(s) for the operation of the Sponsor and all of its standards development committees (e.g., working groups, task groups). Those groups operating without treasury are required to submit an annual declaration thereof via the report (see 5.3.6).
- k) Monitor standards developing committees for signs of dominance by any single interest category, individual, or organization. If dominance is suspected, the Sponsor shall promptly notify the IEEE-SA Standards Board and shall immediately address the concern with the standards developing committee leadership.
- l) If a Working Group (WG) was created for technical development work on a standard, ensure that a written set of WG policies and procedures (P & P) is created and approved by the Sponsor. Such P & P shall not be in conflict with the *IEEE-SA Standards Board*

*Operations Manual*. Sponsors should note that IEEE-SA Standards Board maintains a baseline WG P & P, and may occasionally request to review a Sponsor's WG P & P for alignment.

#### 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 have an obligation to respond during the balloting period; failure to return a ballot may disqualify the balloter from participation in future balloting groups. 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 more than one-third of the Sponsor balloting group.

No balloter shall have more than one vote.

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 classification (interest category) is permitted to constitute 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.~~

#### 5.4.3.3 Comments in the ballot

The Sponsor shall consider all comments that are received by the close of the ballot. ~~Comments received after the close of balloting will be provided to the Sponsor. The Sponsor shall acknowledge the receipt of these late comments to the initiator and take such action as the Sponsor deems appropriate.~~

The Sponsor shall make a reasonable attempt to resolve all Do Not Approve votes that are accompanied by comments. Comments that advocate changes in the proposed standard, whether technical or editorial, may be accepted, revised, or rejected.

Sponsors shall provide evidence of the consideration of each comment via approved IEEE Standards Association balloting tools.

Until the proposed standard has achieved 75% approval, comments can be based on any portion of the proposed standard. Comments not based on the proposed standard may be deemed out-of-scope of the standards balloting process by the Sponsor.

Once the proposed standard has achieved 75% approval, comments in subsequent ballots shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted proposed standard, portions of the balloted proposed standard affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted proposed standard that are the subject of unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. If comments are not based on the above criteria, the comments may be deemed out-of-scope of the recirculation. Such comments need not be addressed in the current standards balloting process and may be considered for a future revision of the standard.

Comments addressing grammar, punctuation, and style, whether attached to an Approve or a Do Not Approve vote, may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. It should be borne in mind that proposed standards are professionally edited prior to publication.

Comments received before the close of ballot from participants who are not in the Sponsor balloting group, including from the mandatory coordination entities, require **acknowledgement sent to the commenter and** presentation to the Sponsor comment resolution group for consideration. The Sponsor shall send an explanation of the disposition of the mandatory coordination comments to the commenter.

#### **5.4.3.4 Recirculation ballots**

Changes may be made in the proposed standard to resolve Do Not Approve votes that are accompanied by comments or for other reasons. All substantive changes made since the last balloted proposed standard shall be identified and recirculated to the Sponsor balloting group. All unresolved Do Not Approve votes with comments shall be recirculated to the Sponsor balloting group. The verbatim text of each comment, the name of the Do Not Approve voter, and a response by the Sponsor conducting the resolution of comments shall be included in the recirculation ballot package. Responses to comments that are not accepted verbatim shall include sufficient detail for Sponsor balloting group members to understand the rationale for rejection of the comment or revision of the change proposed by the commenter.

Further resolution efforts, including additional recirculation ballots, shall be required if Do Not Approve votes with new comments within the scope of the recirculation are submitted.

The Sponsor is not required to conduct a recirculation ballot solely for Do Not Approve (Negative without comment) votes.

#### **5.4.3.5 Completion of the standards balloting process and submittal to RevCom**

A minimum of 75% of those voting Approve or Do Not Approve (Negative with comment) must approve the draft in order to submit the ballot result to the IEEE-SA Standards Board. In the event that 30% or more of the returned ballots are Abstentions, the standards balloting process shall be considered invalid.

In the event that a 75% return cannot be obtained, the standards balloting process is considered to have failed and further disposition of the proposed standard shall be the responsibility of the Sponsor.

Once all required recirculations have been completed and 75% approval has been achieved, the IEEE requirements for consensus have been met. Efforts to resolve Do Not Approve votes may continue for a brief period; however, if such resolution is not possible in a timely manner, the Sponsor should forward the submittal to RevCom because the IEEE has an obligation to the majority to review and publish the proposed standard quickly.

Copies of all unresolved Do Not Approve votes, together with the reasons given by the Do Not Approve voters and the responses by the Sponsor, shall be included with the ballot results submitted to RevCom.

The Sponsor shall, if not included in a recirculation package, provide to the Do Not Approve voter and to RevCom an explanation why any comments associated with a Do Not Approve vote were not required to be recirculated. In order for a Do Not Approve vote to be changed to an Approve or Abstain vote, the Sponsor shall obtain and provide to RevCom written confirmation from each voter (by letter, fax, or electronic mail) that indicates concurrence with any change of his or her vote. Any Do Not Approve vote with comment that RevCom is asked to consider as a Do Not Approve (Negative without comment) shall be explained to RevCom.

Proposed standards receiving a significant number of unresolved Do Not Approve votes should be considered by the Sponsor for trial-use (see 5.7).

#### **5.4.5-7 Comments received as a result of an IEEE Public Review**

Upon the opening of the initial Sponsor ballot, an IEEE Public Review shall start and last for 605 days. Any person may purchase the initial ballot draft for information only, and have the ability to submit public review comments on said draft without vote. All public review comments shall be submitted electronically through the IEEE Standards Association public review tools.

If a comment is received as a result of a All public review comments received during an IEEE Public Review process, that comment will shall be considered addressed by the Sponsor and a disposition response shall be provided returned to the commenter, along with information concerning the right of appeal. If the response indicates that a change is to be made to the draft, the commenter is entitled to receive a copy of the revised draft from the Sponsor upon request.

#### **5.4.5 IEEE 100**

IEEE 100, *The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms*, is a compendium of terms from both approved IEEE standards and non-IEEE sources. Terms given in the definitions clauses of approved IEEE standards shall be added to IEEE 100.

#### **5.4.6 Comments received from persons who are neither in the balloting group nor an IEEE Public Review commenter**

Any person may purchase a ballot draft for information only. Such persons may submit comments on the draft. Comments received before the close of a ballot shall be considered by the Sponsor (see 5.4.3.3) and a response shall be provided to the commenter. If the response indicates that a change is to be made to the draft, the commenter is entitled to receive a copy of the revised draft from the Sponsor upon request.

Comments received after the close of a ballot will be provided to the Sponsor. The Sponsor shall acknowledge the receipt of these late comments to the commenter and take such action as the Sponsor deems appropriate. If the Sponsor considers the comments and provides a response to the commenter indicating that a change is to be made to the draft, the commenter is entitled to receive a copy of the revised draft from the Sponsor upon request.

## 6.6 [Proposed Changes](#) to SASB OpMan 5.4.3.4 – Hoffman

Gary Hoffman reported.

**There was a motion to recommend the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* changes, noted below, to the SASB for approval consideration.**

**The motion was NOT approved [Vote: Yes=0; No=4; Abstain=2].**

### **IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual**

#### **5.4.3.4 Recirculation ballots**

Changes may be made in the proposed standard to resolve *Do Not Approve* votes that are accompanied by comments or for other reasons. All substantive changes made since the last balloted proposed standard shall be identified and recirculated to the Sponsor balloting group. All unresolved *Do Not Approve* votes with comments shall be recirculated to the Sponsor balloting group. The verbatim text of each comment, the name of the *Do Not Approve* voter, and a response by the Sponsor conducting the resolution of comments shall be included in the recirculation ballot package. Responses to comments from only Do Not Approve balloters that are not accepted verbatim shall include sufficient detail for Sponsor balloting group members to understand the rationale for rejection of the comment or revision of the change proposed by the commenter.

Further resolution efforts, including additional recirculation ballots, shall be required if *Do Not Approve* votes with new comments within the scope of the recirculation are submitted.

The Sponsor is not required to conduct a recirculation ballot solely for *Do Not Approve (Negative without comment)* votes.

An Ad Hoc group was formed to review SASB OpMan 5.4.3.4 for possible improvement/clarification and to provide a recommendation to ProCom. It is anticipated that the Ad Hoc will provide a report at the March 2015 ProCom meeting.

Ad Hoc Chair: Gary Hoffman

Ad Hoc Members: Matthew Ceglia, Karen Evangelista, Ron Hotchkiss, David Law, Ron Petersen, Dave Ringle, Gary Robinson, Adrian Stephens, Phil Winston, and Howard Wolfman

6.7 Recess at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was recessed at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 6:45 p.m.

7 NEXT MEETING

The next ProCom meeting is scheduled for 24 March 2015 in Vienna, Austria.

8 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.