

IEEE P802.11 Wireless LANs

TGs Selection Procedure

Name	Company	Phone	Email
Tricci So	Nortel	+1-613-763-5915	tso@nortel.com
Juan Carlos Zuniga	InterDigital	+1-514-904-6251	juancarlos.zuniga@interdigital.com
D. J. Shyy	MITRE	+1-703-883-6515	djshyy@mitre.org
Tyan-Shu Jou	Accton	+1-408-712-8595	ts_jou@accton.com
Ted Kuo	Accton	+1-408-747-0994	ted_kuo@accton.com
Guido R. Hiertz	ComNets, RWTH Aachen University	+49-241-802-5829	hiertz@ieee.org
Jarkko Knecht	Nokia	+358-50-48-21-55-0	Jarkko.Knecht@nokia.com
Timothy Wakeley	Hewlett Packard	+1-916-785-1619	tim.wakeley@hp.com
Lily Yang	Intel	+1-503-264-8813	Lily.l.yang@intel.com
Donald Eastlake 3 rd	Motorola	+1-978-786-7554	Donald.Eastlake@motorola.com

Abstract

This document contains the selection procedure that will be followed by the IEEE 802.11s Task Group.

1 General Rules (Normative)

1.1 TGs Etiquette

All members must respect all opinions during the discussion of the proposals and be open minded to work with others to enhance proposals via mergers according to the best technical solutions.

1.2 Call for Proposals and Changes to the Procedures

The terms of the Call for Proposals, document 11-04/1430r12, remain in effect and should be studied carefully. Note that they provide that “TGs reserves the right to establish and amend procedures for selecting among proposals, including the possibility of rejecting all proposals and/or soliciting further proposals.” By 802.11 policy such matters are considered technical and require a 75%

1.3 Proposal Presentations and Panels

1.3.1 Audience Questions

At least the last 1/6th of the time for each scheduled proposal presentation slot shall be reserved for questions from the audience.

1.3.2 Presentation Slot Sliding

If a scheduled proposal presentation takes less time than scheduled or is not given because of the absence of presenters or because they decline to present, subsequent proposal presentations in the same session (normally 2 hours) may be slid earlier but scheduled proposal presentations may not be slid across breaks between sessions.

1.3.3 Missed Proposal Presentations

If the submitting person or their representative fails to present during the assigned time slot, [possibly as slid in compliance with general rule 1.3.2] for a scheduled proposal presentation, no other possibility for the presentation shall be granted.

1.3.4 Final Summation

Before the voting starts, each proposal presenter must be given the opportunity to make a final 5 minute statement to the group advocating their proposals.

1.3.5 Format

As with all 802.11 presentations, an approved template (currently Power Point, MS Word, or Excel) must be used.

1.4 Voting

1.4.1 Yes Ratio

The Yes Ratio for a vote is defined as the number of “yes” votes plus ½ as a percentage of the total “yes” and “no” votes plus 1, ignoring those not voting, “Abstentions”, and “No Opinion” votes. That is:

$$\text{Yes Ratio} = \frac{\text{Yes Votes} + \frac{1}{2}}{\text{Yes Votes} + \text{No Votes} + 1}$$

1.4.2 Motto

The TGs motto shall appear on every TGs written ballot form.

1.4.3 Sample Ballot

In the sample ballot shown below, a single registered voter has voted for Proposals A and C to continue to be under consideration, Proposals D and E to no longer to be under consideration, and offered no opinion on Proposal B.

Voting Members Name: <u>John Smith</u>					
TGs Motto: <i>Perfection is achieved not when there is nothing left to add but when there is nothing left to take away.</i>					
VOTE TYPE	PROPOSAL A	PROPOSAL B	PROPOSAL C	PROPOSAL D	PROPOSAL E
CONSIDER	√		√		
NOT CONSIDER				√	√
NO OPINION		√			

Note: Only one vote per proposal per voter is allowed for a valid ballot. It is acceptable to vote “No Opinion” on any number of proposals on a ballot. A blank column is the same as a “No Opinion.”

1.5 Other General Provisions

1.5.1 Definition of full proposal

A proposal is considered complete for the purpose of these rules if the proposer asserts via the checklist required by 11-04/1175r10 that it provides complete coverage of at least seven of all Minimum Functional Requirements (MFRs) specified in adopted TGs document 11-04/1174r13 and partial coverage of all other MFRs.

1.5.2 Submission of Revised Proposals

Starting with the September 2005 meeting, all surviving proposals that wish to continue to be considered must inform the TGs Chair (Donald.Eastlake@motorola.com) and Secretary (srayment@belairnetworks.com) by email as to which submission(s) constitute their proposal. This notice must be given after the previous meeting and by midnight (North American Eastern Time) of the Monday of the week before each meeting.

Proposers are required to upload a preliminary version of their presentations by this deadline. The guiding principle is that a diligent TGs participant who has read all proposal submissions uploaded by the deadline should have a good enough understanding of the proposals that they could prepare some questions in advance.

These submissions must conform to the requirements in the Call for Proposals (11-04.1430r12) and must have been uploaded no later than midnight Monday of the week before the meeting.

1.5.3 Last minute changes

Changes to these documents after the above mentioned deadline and before they are presented is strongly discouraged; it is allowed to make editorial and clarifying changes, such as fixing a typo or adding a figure for the purpose of clarifying text.

These presentations MUST be within the scope of (1) the document(s) of which they gave notice as above and/or (2) the document(s) for which notice was given for another proposal if (2a) they merge with that other proposal before their presentation or (2b) that other proposal drops out and fails to present.

2 Rules for July 2005 Meeting (Normative)

The objectives of July meeting are:

- 1) Allow all proposals time for presentation to TGs participants.
- 2) Conduct initial low hurdle vote to provide feedback to all proposals and eliminate a portion of the proposals for further considerations.

The rules and procedure for July meeting are

1. Proposers who fail to upload submissions documenting their proposal or fail to give notice as to which those submission are by the deadline as called in the Call For Proposals (11-04/1430r12) will be considered to have dropped out. All remaining proposers will be required to present, answer questions.
2. All proposals shall be given time for presentation in July meeting. Full proposals shall be given more time (e.g., twice as much) than partial proposals
3. The order of presentations will be random as determined by Stuart J. Kerry, chair of 802.11.
4. After all scheduled proposal presentation slots and final summation, **each voting member shall cast a single ballot and vote to further consider or not to consider each individual proposal.** The proposals will be ranked according to the Yes Ratio, as defined in 1.4.1. **Any proposals with a “yes” ratio of 25% or less will be eliminated from consideration except that they may merge with a remaining proposal.**

3 Rules for September 2005 Meeting (Normative)

The objective of the September meeting is to continue pruning the surviving proposals to eliminate a portion of the proposals from further considerations while encouraging proposals to merge among themselves.

The rules and procedure for the September meeting are similar to those for the July meeting except a higher down select threshold is used:

1. All proposals shall be given time for presentation in September meeting. Full proposals shall be given more time (e.g., twice as much) than partial proposals.
2. The order of presentations will be determined by the chair in accordance with IETF RFC 3797.
3. After all scheduled proposal presentation slots and final summation, **each voting member shall cast a single ballot and vote to further consider or not to consider each individual proposal.** The proposals will be ranked according to the Yes Ratio, as defined in 1.4.1. **The bottom third (rounded down) of the proposals with lowest rankings will be eliminated from consideration except that they may merge with a remaining proposal.**

4 Rules and Down Selection for November 2005 onward (Normative)

The objective in this section is to arrive at one single technical specification from multiple proposals. Such a single technical specification could be from a single winning proposal selected by the TG from the candidate proposals, or it could be the result of merging multiple proposals.

Starting from Nov meeting, only full proposals surviving from September down selection shall be considered. More down selection votes are conducted until only one winning proposal left. Subsequent confirmation votes might be needed to ensure over 75% Yes vote for the winning proposal. If Yes vote over 75% is not achieved within 6 confirmation votes, dissolution of TGs PAR is considered.

1. Presentation and down selection of surviving full proposals is conducted in each meeting, using the same ballot as in July and Sept meetings. The proposals will be ranked according to the Yes Ratio, as defined in 1.4.1. The bottom 40% (rounded down) or at the minimum one of the proposals with lowest rankings will be eliminated per vote from consideration except that they may merge with a remaining proposal. There is only one down selection vote per session
2. If the winning proposal achieves 75% Yes vote, it becomes the basis for TGs technical specification.

3. If the winning proposal fails to achieve 75% Yes vote, it will be given opportunity to get feedback from the TGs, especially from the “no” voters to understand why they don’t support the proposal and what they would like to see changed in the proposal. After the proposal is being modified, another confirmation vote will be taken in TGs. The proposal is adopted as the basis specification for TGs when 75% Yes vote is achieved in the confirmation vote. Multiple confirmation votes can be taken during one meeting to facilitate fast convergence.
4. If Yes vote over 75% is not achieved within 2 confirmation votes, the last 2 highest ranked proposals will be considered again in the down selection votes. If 75% Yes vote is not achieved within 6 confirmation votes, the Task Group will vote on a motion to request it be dissolved.

5 Draft Preparation for WG Letter Ballot (Normative)

The IEEE 802.11s Editor shall prepare Draft 0.1 from the single technical specification emerged from the Selection Procedure and present it to the TG. The editor will rely on technical experts in TGs, likely to include the authors of the winning proposal, to prepare the draft. During the preparation of the initial draft, the editor or TGs members may uncover technical inconsistencies, inaccuracies or omissions in the initial technical specification. The editor or TGs members will present these technical issues to the task group to be debated and resolved. TGs members should be given sufficient time to review and revise the draft until it has gained 75% affirmative support for the Confidence Vote, “Is the Draft Document ready for WG letter ballot?”

Once the Draft Document has gained 75% support on the Confidence Vote, it will be marked as Draft 1.0 and it will be forwarded to the working group for approval for Letter Ballot.

References

This selection procedure was originally adapted from documents 11-03/0665r9 and 11-04/1107r1.

See also:

11-04/1430r12 Call for Proposals

11-04/1549 TGs Proposal Presentation Procedures