

**MINUTES (Unconfirmed) - IEEE 802 LMSC
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, Revision 1**

Friday, January 22, 2016 – 13:00.
All times Eastern Standard Time (EST)

Atlanta, GA, USA

EC members present:

Paul Nikolich – Chair, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee
Pat Thaler – 1st Vice Chair, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee
James Gilb – 2nd Vice Chair, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee
Clint Chaplin – Treasurer, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee
Jon Rosdahl – Executive Secretary, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee
Glenn Parsons – Chair, IEEE 802.1 – HILI Working Group
David Law – Chair, IEEE 802.3 – Ethernet Working Group
Adrian Stephens – Chair, IEEE 802.11 – Wireless LAN Working Group
Bob Heile – Chair, IEEE 802.15 – Wireless PAN Working Group
Roger Marks – Chair, IEEE 802.16 – Broadband Wireless Access Working Group
Mike Lynch – Chair, IEEE 802.18 – Regulatory TAG
Steve Shellhammer – Chair, IEEE 802.19 – Wireless Coexistence Working Group
Subir Das – Chair, IEEE 802.21 – Media Independent Handover Working Group
Tim Godfrey – Chair, IEEE 802.24 – Vertical Applications TAG

Non-voting members present:

Geoff Thompson – Member Emeritus

EC members absent:

John D'Ambrosia – Recording Secretary, IEEE 802 LAN/MAN Standards Committee
Apurva Mody – Chair, IEEE 802.22 – Wireless RANs Working Group

Non-voting EC members absent:

John Lemon – Chair, IEEE 802.17 – Resilient Packet Ring Working Group
Radhakrishna Canchi – Chair, IEEE 802.20 – Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Working Group

Other attendees:

Rich Kennedy – Unlicensed Spectrum Advocates.
Peter Ecclesine – Cisco Systems
Walter Pienciak – IEEE
Osama Aboul-Magd – Huawei
Micael Mayer – Huawei Technologies Canada, Ltd.
Hesham Elbakoury – Huawei
Baewon Lee – Newracom
Jeonghwan Park – Newracom
Dimitri Kirimis – Newracom
Sean Coffey – Realtek Semiconductor
Jonathan Golderg – IEEE-SA
Guido Heirtz – Ericsson
Edward Au – Huawei
Bob Grow – RMG Consulting
Juan Carlos Zuniga – Interdigital Labs
John Messenger – Adva Optical Networking Ltd.
Kome Oteri – Interdigital Communications, Inc.
Dorothy Stanley – Hewlett Packard Enterprise
Rolf De Vegt – Qualcomm

Junichi Iwatani – NTT
 Stephen McCann - Blackberry
 Dimitry Cheriansky – SiBEAM
 Prabodh Varshney – Nokia
 Hyeong-Ho Lee – ETRI
 Shusaku Shimada – Schubiquist Technologies Guild
 Yasu Inoue - NTT

Meeting called to order at 13:00

V2		AGENDA - IEEE 802 LMSC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE			
		Friday 1:00PM-5:00PM ET, 22 Jan 2016			
		Special Orders			
1.00		MEETING CALLED TO ORDER	Nikolich	0	01:00 PM

James Gilb was appointed acting Recording Secretary by the Chair as the Recording Secretary pro-tem.

Nikolich is the acting Chair in the absence of Law, who is in an 802.3 meeting.

Gilb recorded two EC affiliation changes.

EC affiliation changes:
 Jon Rosdahl – Qualcomm
 James Gilb – Self

Gilb called the roll, 13 voting members present.

2.00		Review / approve agenda, administration items	Nikolich	5	01:00 PM
------	--	---	----------	---	----------

Motion is to approve the agenda ec-16-0004-02-00EC
 Moved by Das, second Rosdahl
 12/0/0 – Motion passes.

3.00		5G and IMT-2020: What it is, its relevance, and ways to participate	Stephens / Marks	90	01:04 PM
------	--	---	------------------	----	----------

Marks presents ec-16-0010-00

IEEE is a sector member (not IEEE-SA)

IEEE is represented by Michael Lynch in ITU-R.

Question: How does IEEE tell ML what is IEEE's position? Lynch says that his charter is to only present non-conflicted positions. If he can't get consensus, he is to go to the BoG.

Question: Is Lynch speaking with the IEEE-SA 5G steering committee? Discussion on how IEEE positions would be formed. Discussion regarding individual WGs submitting liaison statements directly.

Discussion regarding 802.16's submission to IMT-Advanced.

Discussion on ITU Radio Regulations and WRC.

Can we introduce 802 as unlicensed IMT?

802.11 is an RLAN in other ITU specifications.

ITU-T is looking to be a big player in non-radio IMT technologies, e.g., backhaul. This could lead to new standards work.

Items:

IEEE 802 participants should be engaged in ITU-R Task Group 5/1 for WRC 19

We could put in IEEE 802 standards as an amendment to the existing IEEE radio interface (802.16 WirelessMAN-Advanced).

Discussion on ways to get into IMT.

Stephens presents 11-15-1528-02

Nikolich gave the results of the straw poll in IEEE 802.11 WNG

Yes 55, No 6, Need more information 27

Are you interested in participating

Yes 37, No 24, Need more information 25

Will your Sponsor support participation

Yes 12, No 29, Need more information 34

Stephens reported on other straw polls in 802.11.

Nikolich works on getting consensus on actions:

1. Should 802 establish a "5G" 802 EC Standing committee?
2. What would the scope and purpose?
3. What are the success criteria?

Suggestion that the standing committee be tasked with writing a report that identifies the costs, benefits, and the level of support.

AI: 2016-01-1: Parsons will track ITU-T FG 13 and ill update on it in March 2016 during the IEEE 802 ITU-T SC.

AI: 2016-01-2: All EC members are to formulate ideas for the three questions for the item 20 on Saturday.

4.00		Discussion of the impact of updated patent policy on IEEE 802	Nikolich	30	02:41 PM
------	--	---	----------	----	----------

Nikolich read a statement from Yvette Ho Sang

The purpose of this session is to discuss operational issues that may have arisen since the adoption of the updated Patent Policy. Specifically, this session can focus on any issues that the Working Groups may be facing and how the IEEE 802 EC can provide guidance and resources to address them. During the session, the discussion will not address any individual participant's or any participant's employer's implementation of the Patent Policy nor will there be discussion on the merits of the Patent Policy itself. Governance matters are best suited for the appropriate IEEE-SA bodies. The 802 EC will forward to IEEE-SA governance any issues it believes is appropriate for consideration by those bodies.

The IEEE-SA also provides a wealth of information, including a tutorial and a comprehensive set of FAQs located on the PatCom materials webpage.

Should you have any questions about the information on the PatCom materials webpage please feel free to contact the PatCom Administrator. I would be glad to provide you with either the link to the materials page or the contact information for the Administrator if needed.

Gilb asked to strike the text "Governance matters are best suited for the appropriate IEE-SA bodies. The 802 EC will forward to IEEE-SA governance any issues it believes is appropriate for consideration by those bodies."

Comment that the governance boards are representative bodies, hence is is appropriate for members of 802 to discuss governance matters.

Comment that PatCom doesn't answer questions that are presented to them. There seems to be no process to getting an intpretation.

There was no objection to Gilb's request to strike the text.

Nikolich went around the table asking for input on the impact.

- Input to PatCom does not seem to have a response. This is, however, not a change in behavior.
- Directed questions to Standards Board do not seem to get a response.
- Considerable debate in 802.11ah and a negative LoA has been submitted.
- Delay in progress of 802.11ah, 4-6 months.
- Concern that there will be missing LoAs when it reaches Standards Board and there is uncertainty if the Standards Board will approve the standard with missing LoAs.
- One WG has seen more LoAs requested.
- A couple of instances where individuals need to be told to cease speaking about patents. But too few data points to say it is a trend.
- The number of the executive sessions at the SB level, many of which are patent related. There is legal review of everything IPR policy related. This takes time and may lead to the lack of response.
- There has been an evolution of PatCom. Its task is to accept LoAs. Questions about Patent Policy should be sent to the Standards Board and if non-responsive, then an Appeal for Inaction should be filed.
- An LoA doesn't tell you very much as it is only an assertion that patent reads on a standard.
- The flow chart of approval for an IEEE standard, a negative LoA or absence of a response to a request to an LoA is referred to the Standards Board, but they don't know what to do.

Comments from the group

- The policy appears to be not enforceable or implementable.
- It changed the dynamic on how people collaborate on new technology development. IPR is now a major consideration.
- There was loss of momentum for 802.11ah due to the issue.
- It appears that negative LoAs are not being made available in the LoA database. It may be due to the form not

being filled out correctly.

- There has been delay and chaos in 802.11ah as the engineers involved are not trained in these areas, particularly for smaller companies.
- The process seems to be a bit broken in educating engineers who are doing the work, this delays work. Education is required for the engineers in the Task Group who are developing the standard.
- Disagreement on the effect on 802.11ah. IPR has always been an issue and this is simply one of the times it bubbled up. It is a manifestation of the importance IPR is to companies. It was a necessary delay.
- It was the absence of clarification that delayed the process.
- This is an issue at the TG as well and a lack of information is not helping.

AI: 2016-01-3: Nikolich will take pictures of the flip chart and email them to the EC, Lisa Yacone and PatCom administrator

5.00		Break		15	03:35 PM
------	--	-------	--	----	----------

David Law strolled in casually at 3:45 pm and announced that he was Mr. Fun.

Nikolich handed over the Chair's duty to Law.

6.00		Attendance requirements for obtaining membership	Stephens	30	03:48 PM
------	--	--	----------	----	----------

Stephens presents 11-16-0005-00

Discussion:

- In one WG they will perform a check on some meetings and confront individuals.
- With reciprocal credit the differences between 2 slots a day and 4 slots a day make things difficult.
- Credit for slots could be based on number of hours, then it would match better.
- The new tool from IEEE-SA will separate attendance and presence, which may help.
- 802.3 has specific times that individuals must attend in order to get credit for the day.
- Too much time is spent by participants dealing with attendance, but can't see an easier method.
- 75% of 75% is 56%, which is basically the AudCom guidelines.

Stephens runs a straw poll [EC count – Chicago rules]

1. Do nothing - 14
2. Tweak the parameters of the existing rules - 0
3. More trust/less attendee overhead – 8.5
4. More accuracy – 2

AI: 2016-01-4: Stephens will do nothing.

7.00		Radio regulatory (RR) process plan - discuss results of ad hoc	Thaler	45	03:50 PM
------	--	--	--------	----	----------

Thaler presents ec-16-0008-00

Comments

- Suggest Monday 13:30-5:30 instead of Tuesday 0800-1000. Change is made
- Prefers SC versus TAG.
- Concern about the ability of the TAG to act quickly
- Suggestion that there is flexibility in the scheduling.
- Comment that the EC can vote on Monday (or during a conference call). However the requirements for these need to be sent in advance to the Executive Secretary.
- Seems that one person requested a time change and then the time flipped. Ask for a more formal check for why the Tuesday slot was selected.

Law asks for people to express a preference. Result is 8 for Monday, 2 for Tuesday.

Thaler asks how many people would like to just go to motion on the mission statement: 4. There were 6 in favor of an email discussion prior to the motion.

2016-01-5: D'Ambrosia will create a schedule for a plenary week that shows EC meetings, standing committees slot and 802.18 slot

2016-01-6: Thaler to lead the discussion to hone mission statement.

2016-01-7: Thaler to do a motion in March to cover the operation changes of the TAG.

8.00		End of Day Wrap up	Nikolich	15	04:35 PM
------	--	--------------------	----------	----	----------

Gilb reviewed the action items.

Law recessed the meeting until Saturday, 23 January, 08:00

9.00		Break for Day			05:00 PM
------	--	---------------	--	--	----------

Saturday 8:00AM-5:00PM ET, 23 Jan 2016

10.00		MEETING RECONVENED	Law	0	08:00 AM
-------	--	--------------------	-----	---	----------

Nikolich reconvened the meeting at 8:15 am.

Non EC participants present:

Guido Heirtz – Ericsson

Jonathan Goldeberg – IEEE

Juan Carlos Zuniga – Interdigital Labs

Law had a personal issue and is not present in the morning.

11.00		Review / approve agenda, administration items	Law	15	08:00 AM
-------	--	---	-----	----	----------

Nikolich reviewed the agenda noting that there is a time specific item, 13.00 which will be in executive session.

Parsons will lead item 11.00, Thaler will lead item 12.00, Chaplin will lead item 19.00.

12.00		Clarification on 'affiliated block' text	Thompson	60	08:15 AM
-------	--	--	----------	----	----------

Thompson presented "GOT for Sat.pdf"

Discussion is regarding how to determine when there is block voting rather than acting as an individual.

Comments:

- Responsibility is on the participant, not the individual that sent them.
- Before a big project, SIGs form and attract support from multiple companies and the proposals are merged. When the SIGs merge and agree on a single proposal, they have 80% of the votes. Is this a dominance position?
- Consensus is a goal, so agreement is what we seek. Is this agreement on technical merits or on collusion? This is very difficult to determine.
- In one case, there were rumors that a company exerted commercial pressure on other companies to vote a certain way.
- Another example is individuals showing up at the back of the room only for the vote. The Chair at the time indicated that if there was a problem, there would be a roll call vote.
- In other instances, a standard was produced that relied on an alliance specification. This was done in the open and was therefore OK.
- Issue is when individuals are pressured to vote a certain.
- "When you are the winning side of a vote, it is consensus. When you are on the losing side of a vote, it is block voting."
- To get your idea adopted, a participant will need to encourage people to attend to vote. This can look like room packing.
- How will does a leader determine that people entering the room are there under pressure or because they agree technically.
- A roll call vote is one method that a Chair can use.
- The SIG process is OK if it is to improve consensus and to get work done ahead of time, then it is OK. If the terms

of the SIG require support of the members, then it is coercive.

- The difficulty is that the Chair needs to extrapolate from what is visible to what is happening behind the scenes.
- Block voting is voting when voting is coerced or via agreement.
- Affiliation rules don't apply to SIGs. Affiliation with a SIG is not reported, only with the entity that is providing financial support.
- From the WG P&P ““Working Group members shall participate in the consensus process in a manner consistent with their professional expert opinion as individuals, and not as organizational representatives.”
- Many SIGs include language that indicate that participants act as individuals in the IEEE process and are not bound by the SIGs decision.
- In the Standards Board Bylaws “Dominance is normally defined as the exercise of authority, leadership, or influence by reason of superior leverage, strength, or representation to the exclusion of fair and equitable consideration of other viewpoints. Dominance can also be defined as the exercise of authority, leadership, or influence by reason of sufficient leverage, strength, or representation to hinder the progress of the standards development activity. Such dominance is contrary to open and fair participation by all interested parties and is unacceptable.”
- How do we determine that a SIG is not operating in an acceptable manner? What evidence do we use to determine that there is a problem?
- 802 needs a set of actions as remedies.
- Gilb presents ec-16-0011-00, slides 1-3
- Suggest as actions
 - Develop suggestions for Chairs to use when block voting is suspected.
 - Create language to be included in SIG agreements that conforms with our policies
 - Encourage SIGs to state publicly that they adhere to these rules
- If a SIGs rules and membership are open, then it is likely OK. If it meets in secret and votes as a block, then it is likely not OK.

AI 2016-01-16: Gilb to distribute suggested updates for affiliated block to the EC for considerations.

Discussion is paused at 9:15 am.

13.00	Final clarification of the indemnification policy	Nikolich	60	09:15 AM
-------	---	----------	----	----------

Nikolich declares start of the Executive Session, and excuses non-EC members.

The individuals allowed to attend are members of the EC and Jonathan Goldberg, IEEE

Report out of session is as follows:

IEEE 802 EC specifically requested that the material that was presented be released publicly. The request was not allowed, but that Agassi and Wiggins would try to provide derivative material by the end of February for public release.

AI: 2016-01-8: Thompson will draft language for duly authorized activities.

14.00	Break		15	10:15 AM
-------	-------	--	----	----------

Break is taken at 10:25 am

Law takes over as Chair and calls the session to order at 10:45 am

Discussion continues on item 12.00

Are sessions for consensus building open? If they are using meeting rooms, it should be an open meeting.

Should we write a method to gather evidence? The 802 rules are that the WG Chair is to bring evidence to the EC for consideration.

15.00	A single sentence tag line for 802 projects, press releases, and similar	Gilb	15	10:30 AM
-------	--	------	----	----------

Gilb presented ec-16-0011-00, slides 4-6

Discussion regarding the tag line and logo.

Straw poll on tag line:

- IEEE 802, (network) standards that connect the world. (16)
- The premier transnational (global?) forum for wired and wireless network standardization. (0)
- IEEE 802, building network standards for the benefit of humanity. (4)

Straw poll on having the word “network” in the logo: 6 for, 5 against, no consensus.

16.00		Discussions on the development of YANG models	Law	30	11:35 AM
-------	--	---	-----	----	----------

Law discusses YANG models verbally.

Comments:

- Should IEEE 802 define the model or should network management experts who may not understand the underlying protocols as well.
- It may depend on the type of standard, PHYs may be easier for an external body than would be for a bridge.
- Both internal and external are fine.
- Part of the problem is the barrier to entry of IEEE 802, IETF may be considered to be easier.
- We need to create a process for network experts to create network models for IEEE 802.
- Suggestion for a more continuous maintenance process.
- First YANG project should be a new PAR, subsequent ones could be fast-tracked.

Meeting recessed at 12:10 for Lunch

17.00		Can a Study Group develop more than one PAR?	Law	45	11:15 AM
-------	--	--	-----	----	----------

Items skipped over unless there is time at the end.

18.00		Lunch		60	12:00 PM
-------	--	-------	--	----	----------

19.00		2 year backward (actuals) and 2 year forward looking (budgetary estimates) for the 802 treasury	Nikolich	60	01:00 PM
-------	--	---	----------	----	----------

Chaplin discussed our actuals and future estimates.

Comments:

- The loss of the reserve is not too much
- Can we cut back on expenses to prevent loss in the reserve.
- Why is the reserve \$1.2 M
- Reserve is used in part to pay deposits
- Numbers in the reserve includes deposits that have been paid.
- The purpose of the reserve is to cover deposits, risks and cash flow.

20.00		IEEE 802 plans for IMT-2020	Stephens / Marks	60	01:30 PM
-------	--	-----------------------------	------------------	----	----------

Stephens leads the discussions on 802 plans for IMT-2020

Suggestion is phased approach

- EC standing committee tasked with writing a report on the costs and benefits of writing a proposal to ITU-R
- Invite WGs to participate.
- Determine support based on the number of people in the room.

Comments

- Need to determine what is the result for which 802 is looking.
- How many groups should be part of this? Does it include non 802 technologies?
- Do we do 5G or IMT 2020?
- Standing committee or an Industry Connections?
- Should not do a liaison to WP 5D as they are not given much notice. Contributions from members, like IEEE are noticed.

- One task of the group should be if we can assemble an 802 proposal

IEEE BoD has initiated 5G as a future directions activity. There is a 5G steering committee, but members have not been identified. IEEE-SA was given responsibility for the standards portion.

Proposed:

The scope of the IEEE 802 5G/IMT-2020 standing committee (Type 2)

To provide a report on the following items to the EC:

- Costs and benefits of creating an IEEE 5G specification
- Costs and benefits of providing a proposal for IMT-2020, considering possible models of a proposal:
 - as a single technology,
 - as a set of technologies,
 - or as one or more technologies within a proposal from external bodies (e.g., 3GPP)

During its lifetime, to act as the communication point with other IEEE organizations on this topic.

Organization:

The committee is chartered for 6 months as an EC SC (i.e., due at the July 2016 plenary session). Any 802 WG voting member of the committee.

Marks will be in Beijing near the end of February for ITU-R WP 5D, he can take issues

AI: 2016-01-9: Parsons will start an EC email ballot of the scope and duties for an IEEE 802 5G/IMT-2020 Standing Committee.

AI: 2016-01-10: Nikolich will appoint a chair of the new IEEE 802 5G/IMT-2020 Standing Committee if it is created.

Return to item: 17.00

17.00		Can a Study Group develop more than one PAR?	Law	45	11:15 AM
-------	--	--	-----	----	----------

Law begins discussion.

Comments:

- SG is for a single PAR as assigned by the EC.
- An SG can determine in its deliberation that two PARs, not one are required.
- Can you take an existing SG and put in new work.
- Can an SG have staggered output, i.e., one PAR in a plenary and another a second plenary.
- The SG is the group that has the experts who can determine if more than one PAR is needed.
- For staggered output of PARs, a new SG can be formed after the first PAR is formed.
- SG should be focused on a single topic. If the PARs are not similar, then they should be in separate SGs.

Key takeaways:

- Within the scope of the SG, the SG can create as many PARs as required to address the topic as determined by the SG participants.
- Once an SG has created a PAR that is approved by the EC, if it still has more work in a different area, a new SG should be formed to continue the work.

AI: 2016-01-11: Gilb to write Chair's Guidelines submission for multiple PARs in an SG.

21.00		Break		15	03:00 PM
-------	--	-------	--	----	----------

Meeting recessed at 2:50 pm

Meeting called to order at 3:15 pm.

22.00		Draft distribution and USPTO	Thompson	30	03:15 PM
-------	--	------------------------------	----------	----	----------

Thompson presents "Draft isn Public Presentation.pdf"

Discussion indicated that all contributions should be posted publicly first.

23.00		End of Day Wrap up	Law	15	03:35 PM
-------	--	--------------------	-----	----	----------

Law held the wrap up session.

Text adopted:

Duly authorized activity includes but is not limited to: activity approved by the Institute, standards development activity for an approved PAR, an activity authorized by an ICAID, IEEE-SA managing director approved initiatives and other activity provided for and/or authorized by IEEE Standards Association Standards Board approved procedures.

Suggest that this is added as a ProCom submission.

AI: 2016-01-12: Nikolich will send the information to Agassi and Wiggins

AI: 2016-01-13: Rosdahl will fill out a ProCom submission based on this text.

AI: 2016-01-14: Paul will monitor Agassi, Lach and Wiggins action to provide public information.

24.00		**802 EC Executive Session** Get program, Treasury	Marks / Chaplin	60	04:00 PM
-------	--	--	-----------------	----	----------

Non-EC members were excused.

Executive session called to order at 3:55 pm.

Attendees are EC members listed above.

Output from the session:

A straw poll was held on the question “To approve the Get IEEE 802 Program Guidelines and confidential attachment as amended during the workshop.”

The straw poll results were 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

AI: 2016-01-15: Rosdahl: Add a consent agenda item to approve the Get IEEE 802 Program Guidelines and confidential attachment as the last item on the agenda for the February conference call. Prepare a second conference ID for the potential executive session.

25.00		ADJOURN			05:00 PM
-------	--	----------------	--	--	-----------------

Respectfully submitted
James Gilb
IEEE 802 Second Vice Chair