Dear EC members,

Below are notes from the BoG discussion on Friday Feb 27 on the issue of CAG/ Sponsor conflicts. They have been reviewed and approved by the 802 attendees at the meeting, David Law, Mat Sherman and Carl Stevenson. I have also attached a copy of my presentation.

This is an important issue that we will continue discussing at the upcoming 802 plenary session. Please be prepared to allocate 1 hour during the plenary session week for this topic. The objective of the discussion will be to further enhance our specific recommendations to the SA BoG, Stds Board and SA Staff on this topic.

Regards,
--Paul Nikolich

Date/Time: Feb 27 from 8AM through 11:15AM

Attendees:

from 802: Mat Sherman, Carl Stevenson (in person), David Law, Paul Nikolich (via phone)

From BoG: Jim Carlo, consultant-exTI, Don Heirman, consultant, Don Wright, Lexmark, Dick Holleman, consultant-exIBM, Judy Gorman, SA staff, Roy Alexander, PPL Electric Utilities, Georg Arnold, ANSI, Dennis Bodson, consultant(?), Laura Hitchcok, Boeing, Gerald Lane, IBM

SA Staff: Karen Kenney, Yvette Ho Sang, Andy Ickowicz, Jennifer Longman, Susan Tatiner, ML Nielson

From CAG: Steve Mills, HP, Chuck Adams, IBM

Others: Dan Beninin, NIST, Ray Hapeman, T1

Agenda:

  (1) Jim Carlo made opening remarks on the strategic questions of sponsor's turf and individual vs entity membership. (5 minutes).
  (2) Chuck Adams presented the CAG perspective (30 minutes).
  (3) Paul Nikolich presented the LMSC perspective (30 minutes).
  (4) Open discussion (~90 minutes).

Paul Nikolich Conclusion:

  (1) It doesn't appear the SA will be changing the CAG procedures anytime soon.
  (2) LMSC must state in the strongest possible terms that allowing the CAG to sponsor competing projects will be ruinous to LMSC.

Impressions:

a) I thought I made a reasonable case for the fact the industry made a decision on the 2.5G project and having an alternate path in the SA was the beginning of the end for LMSC.

b) A majority of BoG members thought 'openness' was better than being restrictive. Some indicated they were disappointed the SA lost the 2.5G project.' Some believe that any group that wants a standard project should be given the opportunity to get it started. Some believed we need to establish a better set of criteria by which projects are approved/ disapproved.

c) I am disappointed that a several participants didn't seem to understand the value in making decisions and making them early on in the standards development process -- that more projects are not necessarily better.

d) Chuck partially cast the issue as an entity vs individual membership -- we tried to correct that impression to emphasize it was a project scope/ decision issue.

e) I got the impression there may be an attempt to resurrect the 2.5G project -- I strongly discouraged that. I do think it would be good for Steve Mills to attend the next LMSC plenary so he can get a first hand view of how we do business and welcome his participation.

f) Some suggested that restricting the CAG decision making process might raise anti-trust issues.

g) I made the case that making decisions in standards development process is not anti-trust and that ensuring the elimination of non-value added product differences is a benefit to the industry.

h) I made the case that the SA must ensure it has procedures that allow adequate consideration of all affected parties -- and the current CAG process doesn't implement this policy. This is not just a CAG issue, it is any sponsor to any sponsor issue.

i) ML believes that adequate broad consideration occurs at time of ballot.

j) The point was made that the IEEE 802 "brand" is of a high quality, mainly as a direct result of 802's broad industry peer review and open, consensus-based decision making process. The 802 process does a good job of serving the public good.

k) Advice was that the IEEE 802 motion proposals could not be codified.

l) No support for any recorded restrictions on work that CAG (or any other sponsor could take on.

m) If there was a conflict the BoG could be the place for discussion and resolution of it.

n) Some questions as to if the IEEE 802 process was Open enough.

o) Didn't seem to see any issue with CAG doing an amendment to a 802.3 standard.
   [Editorial comment - didn't seem the difference between one standard referencing another vs an actual Amendment was discussed as there appeared to be a statement during the summaries that it was okay for one standard to reference another - of course an amendment includes changes to the base - not just references. Maybe the discussion just didn't get into enough depth on this one.]

p) The 'up front funding' for a CAG project was seen as a big improvement on current situation.