

IEEE 802 Submitted Policies and Procedures deviations from 2017 Baseline

Overview

- Present deviations from baseline document approved December 2017 by SASB

3.4.1 Chair

- Comment
 - Deleting “b) Forming study groups, as necessary.” text is not allowed
- Rationale
 - In the 2013 and 2015 baselines, this seems to refer “Standards Study Groups” and “Study Groups” (both are used), what is now known as a “PAR Study Group”
 - The 2017 baseline indicates that the Standards Committee forms the PAR Study Group
 - 5.5 “the Sponsor may form a PAR Study Group or may task an existing Working Group to examine the proposal”

3.4.1 Chair (cont.)

- In the 2017 baseline, a Standards Committee vote is required to form all subgroups, including PAR Study Groups
 - 5.0 “The formation and disbandment of subgroups (e.g., Responsible Subcommittees, Executive committees (ExCom), Administrative committees (AdCom), ad hocs, PAR study groups, Working Groups, and other subgroups, such as writing groups) requires approval by a *majority* vote of the Sponsor as described in clause 7.1. Sponsor subgroups, other than Working Groups and their subgroups, operate under these Sponsor P&P.”
- So in 3.4.1 b) what is a “Forming study groups, as necessary.” mean?

4.3 Voting Membership

- Comment “R0: did not select one of the noted case per the instruction text. However, a criteria is indicated.
- JZ: Agree to let AudCom to decide. Criteria listed seem following the case 4 and clause is modifiable.
- Rationale
 - Clause is modifiable and follows case 4. Suggest AudCom approve changes.

5.5.1 PAR Study Group

- R0: modified based on reference to a superior document that states: PAR Study Group can be a subgroup of a Standards Committee or Working group. JZ: Defer to AudCom for decision
- Rationale:
 - The SASB Operations Manual, “5.2 Project Authorization” states:
 - “A PAR Study Group is a subgroup of the Standards Committee or Working Group ...”
 - In keeping with the superior rules, the proposed P&P provides the minimal changes required to match the superior rules

Changes in Clause 5.5, 5.5.1, and 5.5.4

- 5.5. the ~~Sponsor~~ Standards Committee may form a PAR Study Group as a subgroup of the Standards Committee or ~~may task~~ as a subgroup of an existing Working Group ...
- 5.5.1: A PAR Study Group is formed as a either as subgroup of the ~~Sponsor~~ Standards Committee or as a subgroup of an existing Working Group, ...
- 5.5.4 The PAR Study Group ~~or Working Group~~ shall report its recommendations ...”

Changes in 5.5.3

- any participant in attendance (for a PAR Study Group ~~or Working Group~~ developing a PAR under the individual method) or entity, as defined in Clause 5.2.1.2
“Membership requirements for standards developed under the entity method” in the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws (for a PAR Study Group ~~or Working Group~~ developing a PAR under the entity method) may vote on motions in a PAR Study Group ~~or Working Group related to the development of a PAR.~~

New subclause, 5.5.5

- Comment: R0: new section added. JZ: Defer to AudCom for decision
- Rationale:
 - “Other Rules for PAR Study Groups” provides additional process for the PAR Study Group
 - While it could have been added at the end (a new Clause 13?), it seemed to fit better here.
 - Doesn’t upset the numbering of other clauses and subclauses
 - If this location is not acceptable, recommend moving to a new clause at the end.

New subclause, 5.7

- Comment: R0: Similar function exist in 802.11. The name of the group is “Wireless Next Generation (WNG)” The group is categorized as “Standing Committee”. This is a new group of category, defer to AudCom.
- Rationale:
 - This is a special type of group, in IEEE 802, it is used for regulatory and other cross-WG activity that does not generate or require PARs
 - While it could have been added at the end as a new Clause, it seemed to fit better here.
 - Doesn't upset the numbering of other clauses and subclauses
 - If this location is not acceptable, recommend moving to a new clause at the end.

New subclause, 5.8

- Comment: R0: AudCom question: How much, if any, of this should be include here as compared to being in the WG P&P?
- Rationale:
 - These tasks, assignment of PARs, the common WG P&P, hibernation and disbanding of WGs is a Standards Committee task
 - These tasks refer to actions taken by the Standards Committee
 - If this is the wrong location, it can be moved to the end as a new clause.

7.1.2 Actions requires 2/3 Vote

- Comment: R0: There 5 sections in the entire P&P referenced section 7.1.2.; Items a) and e) are modified and added note related to P&P modification. Both changes are violating instruction
- Two issues:
 - Approval of changes to the Standards Committee P&P
 - Removal of the Chair (allowed by the baseline in 3.3)

Removal of the Chair

- In the baseline, elected officers (including the Chair)
 - “An officer may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the Sponsor meeting in Executive Session.”
- In the submitted 3.2, the text is:
 - An officer may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Voting Members of the Standards Committee. Grounds for removal shall be included in any motion to remove an officer. The officer suggested for removal shall be given an opportunity to make a rebuttal prior to the vote on the motion for removal.
 - Removal of the Standards Committee Chair requires notification to the IEEE Computer Society Standards Activities Board (C/SAB).

Removal of the Chair

- IEEE 802 requests the change to be consistent with section 3.3 which requires two-thirds vote for removal of any officer

Approval of changes to the P&P

- The current baseline allows a minority of the voting members to approve changes to the P&P
 - Quorum is 50%, $\frac{2}{3}$ of 50% is $\frac{1}{3}$ of the voting members
 - This would include the definition of voting membership
 - No prior notice is required in the rules to make this motion in a meeting.
- Example:
 - 15 voting members, 8 is a quorum and 6 members is $\frac{2}{3}$ of those voting in a meeting
 - $\frac{6}{15}$ is $\frac{2}{5}$ or 40% of the voting members

IEEE 802 approach

- When the same topic came up in 2016, the decision with AudCom was to add the requirement in a separate subclause (Clause 10 in 2016, Clause 11 in this submission)
 - Requires 30 day notice of changes
 - Requires 2/3 of voting members, not 2/3 of members voting
- A note is added in 7.1.2 to point to Clause 11
- IEEE 802 feels that requiring a supermajority of voting members is important before changing the P&P

Clause 11 Changes to P&P

- Comment: R0: Not sure this is needed, if internal documents have been changed to cover electronic ballots, it can remain in section 7.1.2
- Rationale
 - This is the same text as in the currently approved P&P, but the clause number has changed from 10-11
 - The additional clause 11 approved by AudCom in 2020 is **not** present in the submitted P&P

Clause 10.0 Dominance

- R0: New section added. If approved it needs to be consistent with recently approved language
- Rationale
 - Added because there was a question regarding the Standards Committee role in dominance
 - Text has been written to refer to the appropriate superior rules

History of this Clause

- The text is Clause 10 in the P&P approved by AudCom in 2016 and 2020
- In 2020, a new Clause 11 was added and approved by AudCom to allow IEEE 802 to approve changes to certain **inferior rules** via electronic motion rather than at a face to face meeting
 - Based on extraordinary condition in 2020
 - **Not present in current draft.**
- New Clause 10 Dominance has moved this to be Clause 11
- Text is unchanged from what was approved in 2016 and 2020.