

## **DASC Townhall (Telecon), 12 Jan 2004**

### **Attendees:**

Stephen Bailey  
Oz Levia  
Peter Ashenden  
John Williams  
Yaron Kashai  
Jim Vallenga  
Bill Hanna  
Jim Lewis  
Victor Berman  
Mehdi Mohtashemi  
Karen Bartleson  
Ron Waxman  
Dennis Brophy  
John Shields  
John Willis  
Alex Zamfirescu

Peter Ashenden provided introductory/background information on why we are updating/revising the DASC procedures, including:

- Bring our procedures up-to-date and consistent with IEEE, Standards Association and Computer Society P&P.
- Problems we have recently encountered that could negatively impact our standards work if left unaddressed.

All draft P&P documents at ([www.dasc.org/procedures/procedures.html](http://www.dasc.org/procedures/procedures.html)) were originally based on model P&P documents and then updated to reflect how we have operated historically and wish to operate in the future.

### ***DASC Policies and Procedures***

DASC organization delegates day-to-day operation to the Steering Committee. This has been documented in the revised P&P for DASC.

Discussion: DASC members can be individual expert or organization entity. Peter stated the allowance of organizational entity members to facilitate a WG that has organizational entity membership since WG membership requires DASC membership. Questions were raised as to why a WG would choose organization entity membership over individual expert. The response: To help limit the dominance one organization might otherwise have over a standard development process through a large number of individual experts.

John Shields stated that the P&P does not cover complete background, etc. Peter A. replied that this information is included by reference to parent organization P&P. The DASC P&P do not duplicate information. The DASC P&P do document specifics of our operation.

Peter also stated that we were advised to add this sentence to section 4.1 as the parent organization P&P do not address this issue.

Jim Lewis asked if voting membership required a 2-out-of-3 meeting participation requirement. Peter A. replied that DASC voting membership only requires the payment of the membership fee.

8.1: Counting of abstentions.

Peter A. will remove the sentence “Abstentions shall not be counted.” from this section.

### ***Operating Procedures for DASC-SC***

Section 5.1:

Peter A. will remove the sentence “Abstentions shall not be counted.” From the section.

Jim Lewis asked why we have a Steering Committee? To avoid quorum issues? Peter A. replied that it was also for the need to have a core team of people who are knowledgeable and provide continuity. Oz stated he suggested making the SC completely elected (eliminate the automatic membership for WG Chairs) primarily to eliminate the quorum issues. A smaller executive committee would work more efficiently. John Willis replied that doing so would hinder participation in DASC.

A couple of proposals were discussed:

- Status quo (SC actively eliminates moribund WGs to manage quorum issues)
- SC is completely elected and limited to ~7 members (Oz Levia)
- Quorum rules be restated (perhaps one percentage of DASC officers and another percentage of WG chairs) (I think John Shields).  
Steve B. suggested 75% of officers and 25% of WG chairs.
- SC is the elected officers plus ~5 WG chairs selected by the officers (Ron Waxman)

Oz subsequently suggested that we keep quorum and SC membership as is and give a year to eliminate moribund WGs and inform WG chairs of their responsibilities to the SC.

### ***WG Model P&P***

Peter A. stated that these are now very consistent with DASC P&P.

### ***Summary***

Next steps:

- DASC to ballot on revised DASC and DASC-SC P&P and model WG P&P.

- Ballot requires 30 days for balloting plus 75% approval based on current P&P.