Meeting notes : of the INTELEC® Executive Committee (IEC)
Meeting : Extended IEC-meeting, during the 35th annual INTELEC® conference
Called by : John Hawkins, President of the IEC
Date : Thursday and Friday, October 15th 14.00 – 17.30 & 16th 09.00 – 13.00 h.
Place : Hamburg (Germany), Conference center

Attendees	*Thursday, October the 17th Day 1*	*Friday, October the 18th Day 2*
IEC members		
John Hawkins, president	present	present
Dick Vleeskruijer, vice president	present	present
George Tiemstra, secretary	present	present
Bob Jurewicz , chair steering comm.	present	present
Lars Bjorkstrom	present	present
John Parsons	present	present
Keiichi Hirose	present	present
Alexis Kwasinski	present	present
Fujio Kurokawa	present	not present, apology
Dusty Becker	present	not present, apology
Norbert Grass	present	not present, apology
John Gagge	not present	not present
Steve Vechy	not present, apology	not present, apology
Julian Lee	not present, apology	not present, apology
Charles McManus	not present	not present
IEC member via webex		
Steve Natale, treasurer	present	not present, apology
IEC ex officio's		
Chris Wade	present	present
Ashton Curtis	not present, apology	not present, apology
Braham Ferreira	present	present
PELS		
Donna Florek	present	present
Mike Kelly	present	present

For both days, the numbers of attendees was quorate in respect to voting IEC members.

Extended meeting, day 1; Thursday, October the 17th

Agenda

1. Welcome, purpose — *John Hawkins*
2. President and BoD status report — *John Hawkins*
3. Special reports
   - Special seminar; 'Preparing ICT systems for extreme events, New jersey, USA – 16th July 2013 — *Alexis Kwasinski*
   - Mini conference; 'Telecommunications Energy', Zaltbommel, Netherlands – 18th April 2013 — *Dick Vleeskruijer*
4. Projects, initiatives and sub-committee reports
   - Intelec website (ADMCOM) — *George Tiemstra*
   - C&BL's, amendment recommendations (CBLCOM) — *Lars Björkström*
   - Elections (NOMCOM) — *Bob Jurewicz*
   - Financial report (FINCOM) — *Steve Natale*
   - Strategy (STRATCOM) — *Dusty Becker*
5. TT activity reports
   - TT 7.2 – HVDC — *Keiichi Hirose*
   - TT 7.3 – Extreme event resilience, next steps — *Alexis Kwasinski*
6. Other reports
   - Suozzi fellowship report, new blind assessment process — *John Hawkins*
   - Energy storage award, status report — *John Hawkins*
   - ODC database activities — *John Hawkins*
7. Future of Intelec/TC 7; goals, strategy, PELS interaction and relationship — *John Hawkins*
8. Any other business — *John Hawkins*
9. Close of meeting — *John Hawkins*

1 – Welcome

John H welcomed all present and said that he intended to cover as much as possible of the agenda over the next 2 days. However, by agreement from the Wednesday Annual meeting, it was the first order of business to consider and finish Item 4.2 of that meeting.

4 – Future conferences proposals

4.2 INTELEC 2016

John H presented a summary of the situation with the Austin proposal for INTELEC 2016, explaining it had been received in incomplete form at the end of 2012, and was held in abeyance pending some resolution of the then un-filled 'vacancy' for INTELEC 2015. The BoD had some reservations about many elements of the Austin Proposal, but since it was incomplete, and therefore did not meet many of the expectations in the 'IEC Requirements to host an INTELEC conference' document, the Austin Proposal is not tabled and is not brought by the CSC Chair to the IEC for approval. After some discussion, it was agreed that the proponents of the Austin Proposal would liaise with the CSC Chair. The proponents of the Austin Proposal set themselves a deadline of December 1st 2013 to revise and represent the proposal.

John H also reported that at the previous IEC BoD meeting, it was recognised that the 'IEC requirements' document does not specify a cut-off date for the consideration of received proposals. Also, conference scheduling and approval had slipped from the target minimum 3-years out indicated in the 'IEC requirements' document, and the CSC must look at strategies to 'refill' the conference schedule. As a consequence, the BoD has set a policy of using a cut-off date of 1 June in a given year for proposals. This will provide enough time for the CSC to assess proposals, report to the BoD, and prepare and distribute recommendations prior to the next Annual IEC meeting and any subsequent approval vote. The BoD has set a deadline of 1 June 2013 as the cut-off date for considering proposals for INTELEC 2016, with the intention

of voting to approve a proposal for INTELEC 2016 during the face-to-face IEC meetings during INTELEC 2014 in Vancouver.

2 – President & BoD status reports

John H said that a formal presidents report and BoD report had been prepared but apologised that they were not sent out to members prior to the IEC meeting. However, they would form part the meeting notes. *AP01 & APO2*

President's report

John H provided a summary of the key messages in the president's report. He felt that with the changes taking place in our industry, and the current financial situation, INTELEC was still vulnerable and that much more dialogue was necessary with PELS to map out a way forward. He pointed out that many new initiatives had been started in the year with good success, and he thanked all of the committee members for their support. In response Dick V said that John H had put in a lot of hard work in steering INTELEC into new directions and thanked him for all of his efforts; a point that was supported by Braham F and the remainder of the committee.

BoD report

John H then presented a summary of the BoD report, and went over the main points of the year. He touched on how the meetings are held and covered membership of the BoD, explaining that the 'external member role' had not been filled because of difficulties understanding the purpose, role, and meaning of 'external'.   John H extolled the true value of face to face meetings, and how the recent two BoD face to face meetings had improved the functioning of the Board. In 2012 the BoD has had 2 meetings and in 2013 there were 4 meetings. One of the meetings, which took place thanks to the persistence of George T, was held during the 25 year celebration of PELS, the recent month in Denver. This proved itself to be a 'productive' meeting that also proved useful in improving mutual relations. Furthermore, he said that George T had taken the initiative in getting our website redesigned and said there was a need to consider a universal PCO for our future conferences. Braham F mentioned that any future design of website could have a column on the site for regular updates, touching on new initiatives and that IEEE/PELS was considering producing a pamphlet to encourage people to attend conferences and seminars etc.

A report on smaller conferences held in the year would be covered later. John H felt that this was an area that we should continue to support possibly aiming at having 40 to 50 delegates at some smaller events. Some concern was expressed over the number of people who had registered, or had papers accepted for INTELEC and yet did not show at the conference. These 'no shows' were harmful to the conference and it was considered that one possibility would be to create a 'black list' of names that could be shared with other similar conferences. Braham suggested that speakers should first register and pay before having their papers upload. On a lighter note, John H felt that the number of overall attendees was gradually increasing. Bob J suggested that perhaps we should consider making more contact with Universities.

3 – Special reports

3.1 Preparing ICT systems for extreme events seminar

Alexis K gave a presentation with slides, detailing the programme for the event that was held on 16th July 2013 in New Brunswick, NJ. He had been able to gather some influential people to give presentations during the meetings. The seminar covered other relevant topic areas as well as having resilient electrical supplies. He said that it had taken over 4 months to plan the event. This had taken up a lot of his time but he felt that a good seminar had been delivered at the end of the day.

Steve N covered the finances for the event, including the $15k seed money they had received from PELS. Overall they had been expected to break even, but unfortunately the event had lost money. Part of the problem had been that many of the presenters wanted complimentary tickets, not just for themselves but also for others. Both Alexis K and Steve N felt that more time was needed to plan such an event and that the costs of holding such a seminar needed to be reviewed. John H said that the intention was not to make money, but to spread the word about resilience to enhance the reputation of INTELEC and to encourage others to take part into looking at network resilience.

3.2 Mini conference 'Telecommunications & Energy'

Dick V said that this event had been held in Zaltbommel, Netherlands on the 18th April 2013. It was inspired by the already existing 'Swedish INTELEC' conference that had been running for many years. It was set up to provide a short version of last year's INTELEC conference in Scottsdale for people who could not attend the main event. 65 people had participated, and there had been 6 sponsors. Much of the information disseminated had come from the Scottsdale conference and Dick V felt that the seminar had both strengthened and preserved the INTELEC brand. The event was considered to be a success and had made a surplus. It is intended to hold another mini conference in 2014. Some discussion ensured about the effort needed to organised such events. Mike K suggested that we should perhaps consider using existing templates, or write new templates to cover areas such as conference planning, projects, sponsorship, power point presentations, etc . For conferences, he said that templates could be created for seminars and/or conferences for a small, medium or large number of attendees. John H said that we might develop toolkits for this. A decision was taken to consider this.

4 – Projects, initiatives and subcommittee reports

4.1 INTELEC Website

George T began by stating that the current website was both unprofessional and lacking in security i.e. the site can be hacked very easily. It has many overlapping links as a number of different people had worked on the site. In short, it doesn't live up to today's requirements. Therefore he brought the mater to the BoD who agreed that he and the Administration sub-committee should come up with a proposal for a redesign. A specification of requirements for the redesign of the website for INTELEC was prepared, which he, John P and John G had sent to companies in the US, UK, The Netherlands and worldwide. The AdminCom received 6 quotations for the work.

George displayed these in a slide that showed the details of bids returned. Quotes varied from $8.8k to $44k . George T and the BOD felt that we should use a company that had a reasonable number of employees and on this basis any quotations from a single person companies were discounted. The lowest bids were considered. These were from DeepBlue in the US and BondMedia in the UK. Both offers seemed complete and appear to satisfy all the requirements in the specification.

In reality, the proposals were hard to compare as in many cases it wasn't clear what was included in the quotes and what would become extras. However, the team believed that the DB and BM proposals couldn't be beaten.

Mike K expressed serious concern over the quotations in general and the range of prices. Additionally, he saw no reason to go outside of the IEEE's own IT supplier, where contracts were already in place for this sort of work. He asked that he and his suppliers be given a chance to look at the set of requirements and to prepare a proposal as well. George T had no problem with this and he and John H agreed to Mike's request. *AP05* The meeting asked George T to progress. *AP06*

4.2 C&BL's, amendments and recommendations

This area was initially covered by Lars B and later widely discussed in detail by the meeting.

Lars B explained the background to the review, and that he and his committee had initially taken a common sense approach, and at this stage, were only tackling the major issues. He also mentioned that due to the resignation of one of its members, his committee was one person short. A considerable amount of discussion took place on the issues below which expanded to more than the initial points looked at by Lars B's team. Only the highlights of the debate are captured here. The italicised paragraph numbers refer to those in the C & BL's.

Write in candidates

It was decided that IEC members can only put themselves forward as a candidate and nominations for candidacy are allowed, within the given time limits set by the NomCom. There are no other options i.e no write-in's are allowed.

Para 4.2.1   Constitution

The mail alternative for ballots is to be removed and the sentence saying that the count shall be carried out by the chair of the Nom Com shall be removed and replaced by a sentence saying that the process to vote shall be electronic and the count made electronically. There will therefore no longer be a need for the Nom Com Chair to temporarily step down if he is a candidate. The only reason for him to temporarily step down is, if there is a tie in the vote for a position that he is applying for. Clarification of the sentence 'in the event of a tie the President shall break the vote' shall be made to make

it clear, that in this case the President has two votes, one his vote in the original ballot and secondly his vote to break the tie.

Considerable further discussion took place considering whether or not the Nom Com Chair should have initial visibility of the outcome of the ballot. A vote was taken and the majority decision was that the vote should be electronically carried out and therefore (blind) to the Nom Com chair. The feeling in the room was that somehow this appeared to indicate that there was some element of mistrust within the IEC. John P suggested that further discussion take place. Following this a second vote took place. Despite some members revising their initial vote, the vote was still carried that 'the voting procedure should be carried out (blind)'. The relevant sentences in the C&BL's will therefore be revised accordingly.

Para 4.2.2 Constitution
The same reference to the mail alternative shall also be removed and the use of the electronic voting system reiterated.

Para 5.5.1 Constitution
This sentence is to be changed to say that a non cast vote or an abstained vote shall count as a no vote . As a result, what is meant by a majority vote will need to be redefined.

At this point the first days meeting was closed.

Extended meeting, day 2; Friday, October the 18th

John H opened the meeting by saying that there were insufficient members for the meeting to be quorate and offered the option for the meeting to be disbanded. However, all felt that this would not affect the work programmed for that day and the decision was taken to continue with the agenda. John H suggested that we continue with the important updating the C&BL's, followed by the other points of the agenda.

Subsequently, two voting members arrived, with apologies for being late, and at this stage the meeting became quorate in relation to IEC voting members.

Continue of: 4.2 C&BL's, amendments and recommendations IEC Constitution Forward
Reference needs to be made to the BoD, and the term 'BoD' needs to be added to the abbreviations.

Para 3.1.3 Constitution
Some discussion took place on the post of 'Outside Director with vote'. George T. reminded all that this position was proposed during INTELEC 2011 in Amsterdam but since then, the BoD hadn't known what to do with this position. Personally, he didn't foresee this would change and therefore proposed that this post be eliminated. After some further discussion, this was accepted by all and therefor any references to it in the C&BL's, is to be deleted during this revision.

Para 3.2.8 Constitution
Remove the word "except"

Para 5.5.3 Constitution
The paragraph dealing with write-ins proposed by John P and the C&BL team was accepted.

Para 4.1 Bylaws
Add 'the candidate must provide a candidate statement' and delete the reference to photo etc.
Also add "irrespective of the length of the term' at the end of the paragraph.

Para 4.2 Bylaws
Add 'the number of returned votes must be quorate and the vote outcome shall be decided by a simple majority vote'.

6.3 Bylaws
Reduce the sentence, so that it only caters for the situation where the Nom Com Chair is applying for a role where there is a tied vote, so as to comply with Para 4.2.1 in the Constitution.

Finally a few general remarks were made:
Mike K suggested that a candidate for the position of president at least, should have BoD-experience; 'we don't want candidates just because it looks that good on your cv'. There was some discussion about typical succession within committees, but there were differing views and the suggestion wasn't voted on.

George T suggested that the BoD terms should be extended from 2 to 4 years, or else, at least 3 years. The reasons he mentioned were: it takes some time to get the hang of a role then, you have to leave just when you started to be productive. In his view it's a loss of experience if the terms are that short; many things concern strategic matters and these take long time to get to grips with. With a BoD change every 2 years, strategic affairs will never be realised. This subject also, wasn't voted on.

All of the above suggested changes in the C&BL's, section are listed as: *AP07* for Lars B and his team.

5 – TT Activity reports
5.1 TT 7.2 HVDC
Keiichi H started by showing slides of the structure of various committees and subgroups that considered DC voltages up to 1500VDC. There were clearly many people involved, but Keiichi felt that there was a lack of expertise from the Telecommunications industry, and would like help in getting perhaps more relevant people involved. He and his group were proposing to increase their work through INTELEC, and highlight this area at both the Vancouver and Osaka conferences. He suggested that more attention could be given to this subject by the call for papers and presentation /workshops at the coming INTELEC conferences.

5.2 TT 7.3 Extreme event resilience next step.
Alexis showed slides covering the work areas and said that irrespective of solutions to quickly recover after disasters, disasters will unfortunately always keep happening. At best we can only hope to minimise disruption and enable power systems and infrastructure to restore some form of normality as soon as possible. In particular, failure of power will always have a devastating effect on the ability to recover after a disaster. He mentioned that power and Communications were evolving at a rapid pace and if we do not lay down standards, users will finish up with systems that they do not want. He wanted to work with more with equipment manufacturers, electric utilities, power and energy societies and even the American Society of Civil Engineers, to hopefully encourage infrastructures to be more resilient to disasters. Whilst he felt that most of his work would relate to the US, he wanted to understand problems in other countries, including the effect of the recent floods in Germany. It was suggested that Alexis could possibly gain some information and statistics from Government bodies such as the Army Corp, but he felt that they would probably not release such information. Lars B said suggested that the work that INTELEC and Alexis K were doing could perhaps be placed on the web and be linked to various search engines. Mike K suggested that via our or IEEE's website, we could have a relevant Industry tab and utilise RSS feeds. John H asked if the BoD could in any way facilitate a mini conference/seminar to be held in Germany/France covering this subject, and Alexis K agreed it would be a good idea. *AP08* (JH/AK to consider facilitating a mini conference/seminar in Germany/France).

6 – Other reports
Due to time constraints, this Item not covered

7 – Future of INTELEC goals strategies
Because a lack of time this item was not discussed. It will there for be dealt with in the near future.

8 – Any other business
8.1 Elections
Bob J said that last year had been quite hectic with the running of the new BoD arrangements and the number of member elections that had taken place. He also said that he would shortly be going out with a nominations process for the BoD posts. Some debate took place on an apparent difference in the rules that exists in the IEEE and within INTELEC, for the minimum number of candidates for any post, but Donna F was unable to establish the current IEEE requirements from her contacts during the meeting. It was decided to continue to use our own INTELEC rules since it is INTELEC's C&BL's document. *AP09* (the NomCom to use the Intelec C&BL's and rules for elections).

8.2 Expenses

John H said that he was aware that some of the members of the committee did not have corporate or other sponsorship to attend the Hamburg conference, and said that a sum had been put aside to deal with this. Attendance at the meetings meant that some members would be able to claim for an additional 3 nights accommodation over and above the length of the conference, and that claims must be submitted via IEEE using the IEEE forms. They would be subject to a maximum of $2kper claim with all individual expenses over $25 dollars needing a receipt. John agreed to send out the relevant information. **AP10** (John H to send out information on expenses).

8.3 Vancouver
Bob J mentioned that Don D had requested additional expenses for the conference and he would be discussing this when he attended a meeting in Vancouver in Nov 2013.

8.4 Meeting format
John H noted asked if the current format of holding a meeting midweek, followed by a half day meeting on the Thursday afternoon and a half day meeting on the Friday meeting, was a suitable arrangement. He noted that attendance at the Friday meeting was less than the day before. Following some discussion, Mike K suggested, that perhaps the time in meetings could be reduced by having more information, such as presentations etc. available on the web before attending the meeting. However, whilst it was felt that some information could be broadcast or available before the meeting, it was decided to leave the meeting arrangements as they currently stand. George T than made the remark that he hoped that everybody would be present since many voted for the Thursday/Friday 'after' instead of the Saturday/Sunday 'before' as meeting days but that still, many were absent and that he hoped those weren't the same as last year. To him, being a IEC-member, 'beholds responsibilities'.

9 – Close of the meeting
Without doing a 'last question-round', the meeting was closed at 12.30 and John H thanked all of those attending for their support for INTELEC and a safe journey home.

- . - . - . - . -

Action points :

No.	who	Action point	deadline	ready
01	JH	Issue the written President's report with the meeting notes		
02	JH	To issue the written BoD report with the meeting notes		
03	AK, DV, GT, KH	To send the slides of the given presentations to George (secretary)	15 Nov. 2013	
04	JH	Consider whether to develop toolkits for seminars, conferences		
05	GT	To send Mike K the set of requirements for the website	01 Nov. 2013	
06	GT/ADMCOMM	To proceed with developing a new website		
07	LB/C&BL's COMM	To adjust all changes made in the C&BL's, particularly in the election-section		
08	JH/AK	To consider facilitating a mini conference, seminar in Germany or France		
09	RJ/NOMCOMM	To conduct the present IEC-rules concerning elections		
10	JH	To send out information on claim & expenses		