OFWG Meeting Notes and Responses to ARs September 10, 2013

Attendee names received thus far:

* Bill Snapko, SGI
* Rupert Dance, Software Forge
* Frank Berry, Intel
* Sean Hefty, Intel
* Bob Woodruff, Intel
* Susan Coulter, LANL
* Brad Benton, AMD
* Sayantan Sur, Intel
* Linden Mercer, NRL
* Tzahi Oved, Mellanox
* Tom Reu, Chelsio
* Paul Grun, Cray
* Diego, Mellanox

Discussion on candidates to chair the OFWG:

* From the Bylaws it’s clear the Board “selects” the chairs/co-chairs.
* The question discussed at length was whether there was a value in the WG forwarding some sort of straw vote or other form of recommendation to the Board. Some suggested this could give the WG the sense it was participating in its own governance
* However, the dominant position appeared to be this could create a bias on the part of the Board, and that the Board should work with a clean slate
* I believe this means candidates would need to announce their interest and qualification in email to Board members and as a courtesy copy the WG
* I’d like to have your thoughts on whether candidates should call into the Board meeting to give members a chance to hear any thoughts they might wish to offer and ask questions. When I’ve seen this approach used, the candidates then leave the call for Board discussion on the qualifications of the candidates
* The Board would need to decide how to vote, should it be the case we have more than 2 candidates for the co-chair positions

AR: pull in relevant guidance on WG processes and procedures (P&P) from the OFA Bylaws and from the “Operating Guidelines for IBTA Working Groups, Technical Working Group, 3/19/2001”

* References will be offered on each topic covered below

AR: suggest fundamental principles for the WG

* From the Guidelines:
	+ One company, one vote
	+ The P&P as developed by the WG and approved the Board
	+ Robert’s Rules of Order

AR: suggest how to put in place the fundamental P&P for the WG

* The Bylaws only contain the guidance for the WG to determine its own P&P and propose them to the Board for ratification

AR: determine the nature of the WG “framework” work product

* I appreciate there was back and forth on this in the discussion yesterday. Some believe there will be a work product of some sort developed and others believed the WG would essentially only develop code, therefore no special P&P would be needed
* I’m going to suggest we should have rules governing the development of a work product and ask you to first accept or argue with this. If and when this notion is accepted, I’m asking you to debate the specific provisions I got from the Bylaws and Guidelines
* To bolster this position I believe there was agreement, or something close to it, that there was probably going to be a need at some point for the WG to forward something to the Board for approval, and that process implies a vote

AR: determine participation requirements

* Bylaws again are mute on this for WGs. For the Board the expectation for participation is at least 75% of meetings and not to miss 3 consecutive meetings
* From the Guidelines: this was covered in part by the notion “membership standing” which was tied to voting rights. Voting rights are maintained by attending at least two of the preceding four meetings. Voting rights can be regained by attaining 3 meetings in a row.

A quorum is attained by the participation of 2/3 of the member companies in good standing

AR: determine required voting majority levels

* Bylaws again are mute on this for WGs. For the Board a 2/3 majority is required for key decisions such as approving releases of the OFED stack, chartering a WG, and so on. Other decisions are simple majority, and nothing requires more than 2/3
* From the Guidelines: 2/3 a majority is required for the recommendation of documents (that was the work product for the TWG) to the SC
* Note that the Guidelines also contained an interesting appeals process for any members who disagreed with the content of the documents. That might be overkill for us, but possibly worth noting

AR: determine documentation requirements:

* Bylaws are mute on this. From the Guidelines the Chair/Co-Chairs are responsible for capturing meeting minutes and getting approval, and for developing work products (documents) and getting approval

AR: determine administrative tools for developing work products:

* Bylaws are mute on this. From the Guidelines there is a requirement to use Adobe Frame Maker and Acrobat, and to use collaboration tools as mandated by the WG and to use the reflector for WG communications