

**IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Minutes
1st August 2024 / 14:00 PM UTC – 16:00 PM UTC
Teleconference**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 14:06 UTC.

2. Roll call and Disclosure of [Affiliation](#)

The list of attendees is attached. A quorum was reached and noted.

3. Approval of August Agenda

Motion to add sharing of draft with CEN-CENELEC JTC 21 as new item 8. The motion was approved.

Motion to approve the agenda for the 1st August 2024 meeting. The motion was approved.

4. [IEEE Patent Policy](#) (Call for Patents)

The call for patents was raised; no one raised any concerns or any comments for consideration.

5. [IEEE SA Copyright](#)

The copyright policy was presented.

6. [Participant Behaviour](#)

The participant behaviour slides were presented.

7. Approval of June meeting minutes

Motion to approve the minutes from the 27th June meeting. The motion was approved.

8. Vote to share the P7003 draft D1.4 with CEN-CENELEC JTC 21 through the IEEE SA draft sharing process.

Motion to share P7003 D1.4 with CEN-CENELEC JTC 21. The motion was approved. This will be referred to Christy for the proper procedure. WG members are asked to not share the draft with any contacts they may have with CEN-CENELEC.

9. Comments Resolution Group status

60 out of 75 comments have been dealt with across 3 meetings. Another meeting is taking place tomorrow. Resolutions are likely to be complete in the following week. There is not much that is very contentious for us to deal with; there are some good

suggestions for engaging with other standards that are relevant to contextualise the work.

2 negative votes: one has an issue with stakeholders but it seems that they have misunderstood our definition of stakeholders, and an issue with decisions made by designers, surrounding cultural decision making. Seems to imply there is a simple solution but we feel this is not the case. Chris has drafted a response. Jon pointed out we don't need to address every single comment, especially where there may have been a misunderstanding. We can contact the people who made the negative votes to address their concerns.

The second one is perhaps less reasonable and also harder to address. They appear to have a very prescriptive view about what standards should be, which is not what we are aiming for. There are no concrete actions and the reviewer has not engaged with the process at all, and states he knows it will be rejected and declines to give useful feedback, so we feel that we can reject it on the basis of the IEEE processes. It will be impossible to satisfy this comment.

10. Next steps after Comment Resolution

We can either go for a second recirc or say that we have addressed the concerns and comments and move on. If we don't go to a second recirc, we need to make sure we have contacted the people who have responded negatively. 100% approval is not necessary. Once comment resolution is complete, we will approve it as a WG as a whole – we will ask people to independently review the comments (at least the trickier ones/accept in principle/revise) and draft before the next meeting. Christy will be able to update on the next steps.

Action (ALL): Go through the comments resolution spreadsheet when notified that they are ready <https://ieeesa.imeetcentral.com/7003/folder/WzIwLDE4NjM5NDM1XQ/WzIsODYxMzQ5MzRd/>

Action (ALL): If there are specific comments that people want to address, let Liz know.

11. Use Cases(s) status

With IEEE still, nothing since last meeting. Need to ask Christy to update.

12. Any other business

13. Dates/times for Future Meetings

- Thursday September 5th 1400 UTC

14. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 15:06 UTC

Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	X
Courtney	Patrick	tec-connection	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Gratz	Andreas	Independent	X

Hagar	Jon	Independent
Leppala	Jussi	Valmet
Mohla	Satyam	Independent
Padget	Julian	University of Bath
Pena	Abel	Code Explorers Worldwide
Szczekocka	Ewelina	Independent

