



Meeting Notes: INTELEC ADCOM/CEC “AD HOC” STRATEGIC
PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE INTELEC 2010—Orlando, Florida,
USA

Monday, June 7, 2010. 11:30 hrs. to 13:40 hrs. Dixie Room, Hilton Bonnet
Creek Hotel Convention Center.

AGENDA:

1. Introductions—Dick Vleeskruijer
2. Approval of the proposed agenda—Dick Vleeskruijer.
3. Approval of the Teleconference Meeting Notes of January 27,
2010—Mark Jacobs
4. Review and comments of PELS MOU---Ralph Kennel
5. Proposal to INTELEC ADCOM
6. Next Topic—John Hawkins
7. Other Business
8. Next Meeting or Teleconference
9. Close of Meeting

Attendees:

Dick Vleeskruijer
John Hawkins
Steve Natale
Chris Seyer
John Parsons
Ralph Kennel
Bob Jurewicz
Donna Florek
Lars Bjorkstrom
Mark Jacobs
Dushan Boroyevich
Hee Jun Kim
George Tiemstra

Marc Durocher

1. Introductions.

Dick Vleeskruijer opened the meeting with welcoming remarks and introductions. He expressed our general concerns discussed at earlier meetings related to the uncertain future of INTELEC. In particular, he cited among other concerns dwindling conference revenue, attendance, and satisfaction with the technical program. The initiative introduced in San Diego by John Hawkins regarding the future of INTELEC was briefly discussed. Important elements of that initiative included future seed financing by PELS, assumption by PELS of financial risk, and the general technical direction of the conference.

2. Approval of the Proposed Agenda.

A motion to approve the agenda (reproduced above) was requested by Dick Vleeskruijer. A respective motion was introduced by John Parsons and seconded by Lars Bjorkstrom. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the Teleconference Meeting Notes of January 27, 2010.

A motion to approve the Teleconference Meeting Notes of January 27, 2010 posted on the INTELEC website was requested by Mark Jacobs. A respective motion was introduced by John Hawkins and seconded by Chris Seyer. The motion carried.

4. Review and Comments of PELS MOU.

Ralph Kennel briefly discussed the Memorandum of Understanding that is required by PELS to seed and bear financial responsibility for a technical conference when such responsibility is shared with an outside organization such as EPE (in Europe), KIP (in Korea), or the Dutch INTELEC Foundation. Ralph Kennel expressed general interest by PELS in having financial responsibility with non-North American conferences. Dick Vleeskruijer stated an INTELEC 2011 interest in having seed money from PELS. The MOU is not needed if PELS is a 100% sponsor of a conference (*e.g.*, North American INTELECs)

5. Proposal to INTELEC ADCOM.

John Hawkins reminded us that the proposal establishes as ADCOM policy that each conference is to have PELS financial sponsorship. He reminded us that a second sponsoring society must be a not-for-profit technical organization. The US model wherein 50% of the surplus is transferred to PELS and 50% to the other sponsoring society would be generally applied for non-North American conferences. Generally, there was an understanding that the non-North American conferences should be conducted under the same rules as the North American conferences.

In further side discussion, it was suggested that PELS financial sponsorship would be the choice of each conference.

Mark Jacobs observed that there is no apparent reason that financial responsibility would necessarily be shared by PELS 50:50 with another

sponsoring organization. The split could be 90:10. Ralph Kennel indicated that PELS had no requirement for a 50:50 sharing with another sponsoring organization. Chris Seyer indicated the need for financial guidelines for any conference in which PELS has a financial stake. A question for further discussion is whether the INTELEC ADCOM or PELS itself would approve and/or track the conference budget.

Steve Natale discussed the need for INTELEC to establish a level of continuity of conference management and to cross-pollinate non-North American conferences to preserve conference continuity. Bob Jurewicz indicated that one way to maintain continuity of conference management is overlapping terms. John Hawkins indicated that a responsibility of the INTELEC ADCOM is to assure international representation on the Program Committee.

Dick Vleeskruijer indicated that it is generally difficult in small countries such as The Netherlands for a technical conference to obtain financial sponsorship and seed money. Because of this, many countries in Europe (even the larger ones such as Spain) face these problems to organize an INTELEC.

Steve Natale asked if a manufacturer can provide “gifts” (including cash support) to a conference within IEEE guidelines. Ralph Kennel indicated that is not a problem.

John Hawkins indicated that PELS and another not-for-profit sponsor can be on the cover of an INTELEC proceedings. We were reminded generally by the group that future proceedings would be contained in a flash drive.

John Hawkins asked generally how PELS policy is published or otherwise made known. An obvious vehicle is the PELS website.

Bob Jurewicz cited the lack of visibility of PELS finances, particularly as it relates to INTELEC.

Donna Florek encouraged management committee members to attend POCO to learn how to conduct a conference, including preparing budgets. Most of the presentations are published on-line after the conference.

Dick Vleeskruijer requested a motion to describe INTELEC policy as it relates to PELS sponsorship. The motion was introduced by John Hawkins and seconded by Bob Jurewicz. The motion carried. The motion indicated that PELS would be our primary financial sponsor for all conferences, and that a Memorandum of Understanding would be executed if a second, not-for-profit entity was also a sponsor. It was requested that a more careful wording of this motion be drafted after this meeting. Bob Jurewicz was tagged to prepare the draft. This new policy is to start January 1, 2011.

6. Next Topic

John Hawkins indicated that he had prepared and distributed before this meeting a discussion paper on ‘Possible areas of (new) technical directions for INTELEC’ as the next topic for review and consideration by the ad-hoc

committee. However, he suggested that the meetings over the financial arrangements had identified additional areas that were not yet resolved and he thought that it was more important to resolve them. He then proposed that the planned discussion on be postponed to a late date (perhaps a teleconference), and the time available under this agenda item be used to further discuss financial situation of INTELEC. It was agreed to do this.

John Hawkins raised the question of the fate of the accumulated 50% surplus. Ralph Kennel advised us that there is no separate bank account maintained by PELS for INTELEC. However, the surplus exists and internal accounting can be performed.

There was general discussion of INTELEC underwriting itself.

Chris Seyer asked why a previous \$5200 request was limited by a \$5000 internal PELS approval process. Donna Florek advised the group that PELS operates under broad IEEE policies regarding financial accountability, which we were unlikely to change.

Donna Florek reminded the group that INTELEC needs an annual operating budget that is approved by PELS to cover expected expenses over the coming year.

Steve Natale indicated that at the present time we don't completely forecast our yearly expenses. There was general discussion that the INTELEC annual PELS budget should be of the order of \$150,000 or more.

Ralph Kennel reminded us that each conference in which PELS has a financial stake needs to be closed quickly, or else a penalty is assessed.

Dushan Boroyevich indicated that there are restrictions on what can be withdrawn against our accumulated surplus. The money can be withdrawn, but it is a lengthy process.

Ralph Kennel indicated that INTELEC cannot have a private account.

Donna Florek indicated that seed money is available for The Netherlands. In order to approve the seed money request, a request must be made to PELS AdCom prior to the ECCE meeting, September 12, 2010, Atlanta, Georgia USA. For INTELEC 2011, Dick will see to this together with his financial officer, Ron Ottenhof.

Lars Bjorkstrom reminded the group that a surplus was generated from the conference that was held in Sweden, which they used for various INTELEC-related purposes. They formed a not-for-profit foundation and decided these

purposes themselves with careful control without the need for an external approval.

Dushan Boroyevich stated that it would be hard just to "withdraw" the \$800,000 surplus that we had accumulated.

John Hawkins stated that the issue, then, is our accessibility to the surplus. He also open the question of what does PELS bring to the table for INTELEC?

Donna Florek reminded us of the future accessibility to papers provided by Xplore, which is a strong attractant for authors.

Mark Jacobs introduced the option that INTELEC could constitute itself as a not-for-profit organization, and accumulate its own surpluses.

John Hawkins suggested that we needed to form a small discussion group to review how we might use or otherwise access the accumulated surplus funds. John Hawkins suggested further that a better financing model is needed.

7. Other Business

Dick Vleeskruijer indicated the need to convene a smaller/follow-on meeting to continue the discussion. There are further pressing issues that we have not had time to discuss.

8. Next Meeting or Teleconference

Dick Vleeskruijer arranged a follow-on meeting the following day in the same room beginning at 1000 hrs.

9. Close of First Meeting

The first meeting was adjourned at 1340 hrs.

Second Meeting: Tuesday, June 8, 2010. 10:00 hrs. Dixie Room, Hilton Bonnet Creek Hotel Convention Center.

Attendees:

Dick Vleeskruijer
John Hawkins
Steve Natale
Chris Seyer
John Parsons
Bob Jurewicz
Lars Bjorkstrom
Mark Jacobs
George Tiemstra

Dick Vleeskruijer called the meeting to order at 1000 hrs. He briefly recapped the previous meeting, which was a financially oriented discussion. He reminded us that we attempted to look at the future of INTELEC, and how non-North American conferences

are funded. A general concern is the potential for a slow decline of INTELEC. Dick identified several key issues, with help from those present:

1. Where is the money? It is in the PELS surplus account.
2. In small countries a concern is financial commitments. Therefore there is a need to adopt the North American funding structure. It is a lot of work to get funding in small non-North American countries.
3. There is a need to secure funding from PELS for INTELEC to grow.
4. We need a plan to implement these processes.
5. Is the "PELS machine" working for us? An issue is "advance annual budgeting," perhaps under a "miscellaneous" category.

John Hawkins suggested we budget under PELS about \$150,000 annually to meet our various needs. In further discussion, it was suggested that \$50,000 would be sufficient.

Dick Vleeskruijer proposed that the total financial structure needs to be well managed. John Hawkins suggested that the INTELEC ADCOM maintain various forms of checks and balances for the annual conferences.

Dick Vleeskruijer indicated that The Netherlands has an INTELEC'95 Foundation that is managed by four people, all members of INTELEC 1995 that was held in The Hague.

George Tiemstra asked if local conferences will retain financial freedoms and responsibilities.

John Hawkins suggested that annual conferences should request their seed funding from the INTELEC ADCOM, not PELS.

George Tiemstra asked if a monthly financial review would be performed by the INTELEC ADCOM. John Hawkins suggested that the INTELEC ADCOM would not perform monthly reviews.

Chris Seyer recommended that the President of the INTELEC ADCOM appoint Steve Natale (CEC financial officer) to overview conference finances.

John Hawkins recommended that we establish financial guidelines for each conference, and that the INTELEC ADCOM retain overall financial responsibility. John Hawkins indicated that the INTELEC ADCOM is too large to provide day-to-day functional responsibility. There needs to be fewer people for such a

process, and each person on ADCOM should be in an oversight role (either financial or conference), except for the chairman and the secretary.

John Hawkins indicated that the ADCOM needs to operate as a board of directors, and he proposed to outline such a new structure as part of the review and change process.

John Hawkins reminded us that an IEEE technical conference needs to be focused on paper technical content that is not influenced by industrial participants. We are in danger of becoming a trade show. We need to preserve our technical focus. Perhaps each conference should have a “technical/no logo” track and a “commercial” track,

Bob Jurewicz reported that APEC presented about 800 papers, sometimes with seven sessions in parallel. APEC appears to be growing while INTELEC appears to be shrinking.

Dick Vleeskruijer indicated that we need to follow academic guidelines in accepting and presenting papers, and that acceptance of papers requires careful peer review.

John Hawkins stated that the Program Committee requires international representation to reestablish its credibility. There needs to be academic predominance, with a credible paper review committee. We have become too industry-based. The papers contain too much commercial content, and we are not viewed as a peer-reviewed technical forum.

Chris Seyer reminded the committee that the INTELEC 2010 Program Committee decided not to do a blind peer review of abstracts.

Dick Vleeskruijer asked the general question of how we implement change.

John Hawkins suggested that if technical quality is retained in the technical program, then exhibitors will have other suitable opportunities to present their commercial interests. In other conferences a commercial stream is maintained that is suitably separated from the technical program. There needs to be a process to eliminate commercial background information in paper presentations. It is "pathetic" to see name brands so blatantly displayed.

John Hawkins introduced the question of the appropriate size of the ADCOM. Is there a need to downsize the ADCOM? Chris Seyer indicated that 18-21 members is identified in our Constitution and Bylaws. Each member of the ADCOM needs an identified "role." Twenty members is too large a number.

Possible sub-committees are Program Committee oversight, a finance committee, and a governance rules committee.

Dick Vleeskruijer reported that George Tiemstra will chair the Nominations Committee. Mark Jacobs will advise and help George on the relevant "processes." They will work as a team.

Mark Jacobs asked whether INTELEC needs a CEC. Can its functions be absorbed more efficiently into the ADCOM?

John Hawkins suggested that the CEC has an oversight role.

Chris Seyer reminded the committee that the CEC has a financial officer, but not the ADCOM.

Bob Jurewicz stated that the CEC has a budget, but not the ADCOM.

John Hawkins indicated that the ADCOM has a collective responsibility, but its members need to be functional members.

There were various discussions that an "INTELEC foundation" could be a functional not-for-profit organization. Its annual budget could be \$200,000 to provide suitable access to accumulated funds. Mark Jacobs would make inquiries about whether such an organization would be a national or international organization, and what possible legal and reporting issues would have to be addressed. Its funding could be established by taking \$50k to \$100k a year out of the PELS-held surplus as a line item on the CEC budget request to PELS (*e.g.*, "Miscellaneous").

It was agreed that Mark Jacobs would explore the mechanism whereby ADCOM would request a series of large sums from PELS (*i.e.*, \$200k over a number of consecutive periods) against the agreed PELS-held surplus amount (*ca.* \$800k), and deposit the sum into an "ADCOM" bank account to be managed by ADCOM (or the new Board of Management). The amounts drawn from PELS would be for 'strategic planning', which according to Dushan, would be sufficient for PELS authorization. Mark Jacobs would need to explore options for security of the 'ADCOM' funds, given the international nature of ADCOM.

There appeared to be general consensus that future teleconferences would need to be held to continue the discussion. An item of particular importance is possible new directions for the technical content of the conference. Composing draft rules for governance of the ADCOM is a further likely action item.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 hrs.

Mark Jacobs

CEC Secretary
George Tiemstra
ADCOM Secretary

No.	Action	Who	Expire date
- 01 -	Prepare a draft of INTELEC policy vs. PELS sponsorship	Bob Jurewicz	Oct. 01, 2010
- 02 -	Draw a request to PELS Adcom for funding INTELEC 2011	Dick Vleeskruijer	Sept. 01, 2010
- 03 -	John Hawkins suggested that we needed to form a small discussion group to review how we might use or otherwise access the accumulated surplus funds. John Hawkins suggested further that a better financing model is needed.	Mark Jacobs. Others?	
- 04 -	John Hawkins introduced the question of the appropriate size of the ADCOM. Is there a need to downsize the ADCOM? Chris Seyer indicated that 18-21 members is identified in our Constitution and Bylaws. Each member of the ADCOM needs an identified "role." Twenty members is too large a number. Possible sub-committees are Program Committee oversight, a finance committee, and a governance rules committee.	John Hawkins	
- 05 -	Organize the next teleconference	Chris Seyer	
- 06 -	Composing draft rules for governance of the ADCOM is a further likely action item.	John Hawkins	
- 07 -	Form a small committee to provide financial oversight of conference activities. To monitor conference progress against a budgetary plan.	S. Natale?	
- 08 -	Identify the exact amount and how to extract it for beneficial causes. We need a general plan for useful expenditure.	S. Natale?	
- 09 -			
- 10 -			