

From: Bye, Charles T (MN65) [chuck.bye@honeywell.com]
Sent: Monday, September 06, 2004 6:12 PM
To: PLANS: Zueck, Dora A. (E-mail); Bahar PLANS: Uttam (bahar@uttam.biz); Bill O'Halloran; Huddle, James; PLANS: Barnett, Neal J. (E-mail); PLANS: Cortland, Larry (E-mail); Dugandzic, Phil; PLANS: Norling, Brian (E-mail); Scott, Peggy A.; PLANS: Swenson, Marv (E-mail); Soehren, Wayne (MN65); Bye, Charles T (MN65)
Subject: FW: FW: ION/PLANS Merger

Here are the reasons that I gave to Jim about why we were investigating a merger.

Please comment.

Regards
Chuck

-----Original Message-----

From: Bye, Charles T (MN65)
Sent: Friday, September 03, 2004 8:03 AM
To: 'Huddle, James'
Subject: RE: FW: ION/PLANS Merger

Thanks Jim.

The reason for the interest having discussions with the ION in my opinion is three fold:

- 1) There are multiple navigation conferences in a short period about 4 in a six month period, that results in many of the conferences having difficulty filling out their technical program. Even in 2004, we were short about 1 paper per session and we had to recruit a large percentage of our papers.
- 2) The complexity of putting on a conference (Web based paper submissions, registration, IEEE Xplore, etc) increases the skill level necessary to put on a conference. Examples are the 1) allAcademic experience almost lead to the collapse of the technical program - It was a very bad experience. I worked many hours more than I expected, along with my assistant, doing clerical work associated with papers that I never expected to have to do. 2) All the problems with registration at the conference are another example, and 3) then there is IEEE Xplore which we need to now understand - We just got in before the deadline in 2004. A professional staff to manage the conference details would improve the overall conference quality.
- 3) We have not had any relationship with the ION in the past, for reasons that are not clear to me, even though we both serve the Navigation community. By working together we should be able to get PLANS to be better known thus increasing the number of potential customers.

I will review the emails below and condense it to talking points. I will contact next week on this matter.

Regards
Chuck

-----Original Message-----

From: Huddle, James [mailto:jim.huddle@ngc.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 02, 2004 1:13 PM
To: Chuck Bye
Cc: Barry Breen; Jim Leonard
Subject: FW: FW: ION/PLANS Merger

September 2nd

Chuck

Barry Breen asked me to forward these comments from the IEEE Conferences organization that were in response to his request. Obviously the discussions with the ION have not been about Co-Location but about Co-Sponsorship. Some issues have been raised by Mary Ann Fritzinger.

Comparison of Mary Ann's comments below with the ION desires on the latest comparison matrix that Lisa sent you better defines points for any further discussion.

You may want to forward this E-Mail to others on the PLANS Executive Committee where it relates to their areas of responsibility.

The comments I have received from AESS BOG members so far seem to ask:

Why does PLANS have any interest in a merger ?

Regards, Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: m.dewald@ieee.org [mailto:m.dewald@ieee.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2004 6:12 PM
To: Breen, Barry
Cc: 'Huddle, James'; 'Mary Ann Fritzinger'
Subject: Re: FW: ION/PLANS Merger

Barry,

I've read all the material you provided.

Do you really want to "merge" or just "co-locate"

Merge = Joint Co-Sponsor which combines all finances into one budget and each assumes a specific percentage according to an MOU

Co-Locate = Both PLANS & ION are held in the same location, same dates and each has their own budget and own publication

I've been on the ION website and they seem to only have 2 categories for co-sponsor <http://www.ion.org/council/policy/cosponsorship.pdf>

- Technical Co-sponsor of an ION meeting w/another organization

- ION plans everything and manages the finances

- This does not meet IEEE's definition of Co-Sponsor

- Non-profits do not have "profit" they have "surplus"

- ION Cooperative Co-sponsorship of a technical meeting run by another organization

ION has no contractual, management, financial responsibility or liability

-This is not far from IEEE's definition of a Technical Co-Sponsor

You can access IEEE Policy on Conferences from the Conference Organizers Web Page Conference info is in Section 10 of policy
<http://www.ieee.org/conferences/conflink.html>

Also look at the Meetings Organization Manual for guidance.

Either way you go on this you will need an MOU that CLEARLY states exactly what is expected from each organization.

I would also be worried about the fees charged by ION for the management - get this up front - even before the budget

Conference Publication

- Publication must comply with IEEE Xplore requirements (see Conf Org Web Page for info)

- Is ION's process for paper collection similar to PLANS?

- As for the number of copies of the pub IEEE will want - this will be decided in the future by the Conference Publication Program, Contact: Mark Vasquez, <m.vasquez@ieee.org> Also check with Mark on posting papers prior to conference?

- Clear all the IP issues with Bill Hagen, IEEE Copyrights Manager, <w.hagen@ieee.org>

- What is ION's "Tutorial Provider Policy"???

I guess my main worry is that ION will take over PLANS.

This is an important decision and there is a lot more info the AES BoD needs to obtain on this issue - it's a big decision Please keep me in the loop as you proceed and contact me with any questions
- if I don't know the answer I will find out.

Regards,
MA

Mary Ann DeWald
Sr. Manager, Conferences
+1 732 562 3873
+1 732 981 1769 (Fax)
m.dewald@ieee.org

* * * * *

Conference Search <http://www.ieee.org/conferencesearch/>
Conference Organizers Home Page
<http://www.ieee.org/conferences/conflink.html>
Conference Management Services (CMS)
<http://www.ieee.org/conferences/cms/intro.html>

* * * * *

"Breen, Barry"

<m.dewald@ieee.org>, "<barry.breen@hone
'Mary Ann Fritzinger'
ywell.com>"

To: "'Mary Ann DeWald'"

<m.fritzinger@ieee.org>

cc: "'Huddle, James'"

<j.huddle@ieee.org>

08/26/2004 06:47

Subject: FW: ION/PLANS

Merger

PM

Dear Mary Ann's,

One of our conference Executive Boards has been approaching ION (Institute of Navigation) with the idea of merging our AESS PLANS (Position, Location and Navigation Symposium) with their annual June meeting. Although the meetings are quite different, the conference topics have almost 100% overlap and this idea has been proposed before. Currently ION meets every June and PLANS meets in even years only earlier in the Spring.

From the attachments it appears that the IEEE volunteers would be handing most of the work over to ION staff but they seem to be heading for a joint sponsorship (50/50) like we have with AIAA for the Digital Avionics Systems Conference (DASC).

The attachments show some of the dialogue that is going on. The AESS Board of Governors is just now finding out about this and we are wondering how some of the issues in the attachments will be effected by IEEE policy.

For example, they (ION) want to share in the copyright ownership (IP). I'm not sure ION has been made aware of all the financial and contract oversight that we (IEEE) require. Can you take a look at the attached documents and advise? AESS Board is meeting in September and this will be a hot discussion topic. There are already members that want the idea dropped, but I get the feeling that PLANS is having difficulty covering all the bases with their current volunteers and are looking to ION to pick up a lot of the work.

Most of the DASC volunteers are members of both IEEE and AIAA and I suspect that many of the PLANS volunteers are similarly members of both ION and IEEE.

Thanks,

AEISS VP Conferences
Honeywell Barry C. Breen Aerospace Electronic Systems
Senior Principal Engineer 15001 N.E. 36th St.
FAA DERPO Box 97001, M/S L2L
Redmond, WA 98073-9701
(425) 885-8836 (Phone)
(425) 885-2994 (Fax)
(425) 241-4730 (Mobile)
www.egpws.com barry.breen@honeywell.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Huddle, James [mailto:jim.huddle@ngc.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 1:10 PM
To: Barry Breen
Cc: Jim Leonard; Russell Lefevre (IEEE)
Subject: FW: ION/PLANS Merger

Barry

This is currently what is evolving as per the proposal by the ION to merge with the PLANS Conference

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Bye, Charles T (MN65) [mailto:chuck.bye@honeywell.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 12:45 PM
To: PLANS: Zueck, Dora A. (E-mail); Bahar PLANS: Uttam (bahar@uttam.biz); Bill O'Halloran; Huddle, James; PLANS: Barnett, Neal J. (E-mail); PLANS: Cortland, Larry (E-mail); Dugandzic, Phil; PLANS: Norling, Brian (E-mail); Scott, Peggy A.; PLANS: Swenson, Marv (E-mail); Soehren, Wayne (MN65); Bye, Charles T (MN65)
Subject: ION/PLANS Merger

Hi,

As you know, we have initiated negotiations with the ION on merging PLANS and an ION conference.

The merger will change the PLANS conference. One thing that I want to make sure we preserve is the important unique characteristics of the PLANS conference and the PLANS Executive Committee. I am interested in your comments regarding these two items.

Background:

The plan is to negotiate a tentative agreement with the ION that will either approved by the PLANS Executive Committee at the Nov 12th

meeting. My initial polling of the Exec Committee indicated that merging with the ION was an idea worth exploring. If the merger is approved by the Exec Committee then we will go to the IEEE for final approval. It is conceivable that we may have to resolve a few issues to resolve before going to the IEEE.

I have asked Jim Huddle to bring this topic up with the AESS Board of Governors meeting and get their option on a merger.

Meetings with the ION

I have a telecon with Penina Axelrad, and several ION representatives on Aug 31 at noon CDT that anyone is welcome to attend. I do not have a teleconference number at this time. Please email me and I will send you the teleconference number when I get it.

The intent is also to meet with the ION at the ION conference the week of Sept 21-24. Brian has agreed to attend with me. Anyone else is welcome to attend. It will be Sept 20 evening, 21, or 22. Please email me if you want to attend. The date and time of the meeting has not been established.

Status of negotiations

At this time I have exchanged information, but not opinions on any issue related to the merger.

Attached are two documents:

Comparison Chart V3

This was created by the ION and lists many issues. I have added in the far right column "Draft PLANS Recommendation". The contents the "Draft PLANS Recommendation" column has not be shared with the ION, but the rest of the document has.

Large Issues from ION.

This is a list of issues that the ION has raised. I responded to this document, but have since add comments, which are noted in the document, that have not been shared with the ION.

Requests:

Please send me you comments regarding the important characteristics of the PLANS conference and how you would like to see the PLANS Exec role evolve (what roles do we want to keep and what is better handled by the ION National Office) Please review the attached documents and email me any comments that you have regarding the recommendation or comments If you have any other issues or concerns regarding the merger

please send them to me.

Please email me if you are interested in attending the Aug 31 telecon

Please email me if you are interested in attending the meeting at the ION Sept 20-22 conference

<<Comparison Chart V3.doc>> <<Large Issues from ION.doc>> Regards Chuck

Charles T. Bye
Manager
GN&C COE

Honeywell Laboratories
Honeywell International Inc.
3660 Technology Drive
Minneapolis, MN 55418
612.951.7576 (voice)
612.951.7438 (Fax)
Chuck.Bye@Honeywell.com (See attached file:

Comparison Chart V3.doc)(See attached file: Large Issues from ION.doc)