IEEE ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY SOCIETY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Monday, 7 July 2011

Please Reply to:
Kermit Phipps
EPRI
942 Corridor Park Boulevard
Knoxville, TN 37932
Tel: (865) 218-8021
Fax: (865) 218-8001
Email: kphipps@epri.com

IEEE ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY SOCIETY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Monday, 7 March 2011, 11:00 am Eastern USA

TC MEMBERS PRESENT

Bruce Archambeault – Chair
Jun Fan – Vice-Chair
Kermit Phipps – Secretary

Chairs	Vice Chairs	Secretaries
TC-1 – Doug Kraemer		Kimball Williams
TC-2 – Don Heirman		
TC-3 – Fred Heather		
TC-4 – Philip Keebler		
TC-5 – Bill Radasky		
TC-6 – Karen Dyberg		
TC-9 – Allen Roden	Sam Connor	
TC-10 –	Xianoning Ye	
TC-11 – Chris Holloway		Marina Y. Koledintseva
SC-1 – Don Heirman		
SC-2 – Magnus Olofsson		
SC-3 – Mark Steffka		Jeremy Cambell

TCs Unrepresented

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Frank Sabath, Global Symposium Coordinator for EMCS Region 8 Conference Coordinator

IEEE EMCS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE – TAC

11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

1.0   Call to Order and Introductions
The Chair, Bruce Archambeault, opened the TAC meeting at 11:00 a.m. There were 18
attendees, with all TCs and SCs represented.

2.0   Approval of Meeting Minutes
Don Heirman motioned for approval. **The motion was** seconded. Motion passed with all in favor
with none opposing.

3.0   Technical Papers for 2011 Symposium (Long Beach)
The following TCs gave their reports as:

TC1-Doug Kramer stated that four out of five papers have been completed, pending an issue
expected to be resolved within the next few hours. Bruce Archambeault stated that the system is
currently shut off. Doug should send review information to the TC chair, and the chair would take
the revision into account before making the final decision.

TC2-Don Heirman said that there are 46 papers total with 13 suggested changes, 21 sent for
second round review, and 11 rejected.

TC3-Fred Heather discussed a server error that prevented him from getting on the system. Bruce
Archambeault said that he had no problem, but yes the status indicator did have errors but should
have been correct as of this meeting (not verified). Fred Heather will work on his review. Bruce
Archambeault said he would support Fred off line in completing the review process.

TC4-Philip Keebler said that 33 papers were submitted, with two rejected.

Philip Keebler asked, "What has to happen for the authors to receive the comments?" Bruce
Archambeault and Jun will review papers and send the comments out to the authors.

TC5- Bill Radasky said that 23 high quality papers were submitted, with four rejects and three
mandatory reviews. He said that the paper review system worked well for him.

Bruce stated that the summary table is still coming up with a server error; Bill Radasky said it had
worked in the past. Bruce Archambeault stated that something happened recently but it is being
reviewed.

Bill Radasky used his subcommittees to review the paper comments and tasked them to return a
consolidated list, which he sent the reviewers.

TC 6- Karen Dyberg said that 1 paper was submitted.

TC8- Alan Roden said that 28 papers were submitted, with five rejections, four having mandatory
changes, and all others needing minor changes.

Alan Roden commented that half of the papers did not indicate final acceptance, and that
modifications could still be made.

Don Heirman and Bill Radasky said they did not go back in the review site and that this may be problem. Bruce indicated that he would look at the issue after the meeting.

TC10- Xianoning Ye said that 34 papers were submitted, with 30 accepted, four rejected, 12 requiring changes, 16 suggested changes, and two accepted as is.

TC11-Chris Holloway said that five papers were submitted, with one requiring changes and others having suggested changes.

Summary of Submitted Papers by Bruce:

TC 2	46
TC10	34
TC4	33
TC9	28
TC5	23
TC3	8
TC11	5
TC6	1
TC1	**5?**

The rejection rate is 20%.

2011 Paper Schedule

- The notification goes out March 11.
- The required resubmit is 31 March.
- Reviews must be completed by 15 April.
- Final papers are due 30 April.

Don Heirman rewrote a second review procedure. If the majority approves, the decision will be simple. It is accepted if the majority of the changes are made and there are no technical flaws. It will not be accepted if there have not been any changes.

Bill Radasky asked, "How can the other reviewer comments be viewed to make sure that the majority of the changes were made?" Could e-mail be used? Bruce Archambeault said that e-mail could be used.

Don Heirman pointed out that if the comments were not placed in a Word file, then you could not use e-mail or any other method. Bill Radasky said, "That was the point."

Don Heirman discussed the difficulty that most of the buttons were not enabled during the review process. The process should allow the information to be extracted by the Chair, copied, and pasted.

Marina Y. Koledintseva suggested that the authors could highlight the changes in the text, and the highlights would be removed in the final submission.

Don Heirman commented on track changes, and that the authors would state that the reviewers do not know what they were talking about. If challenged then the review process is a manual process.

Bill Radasky said that is why you should use reject or accept up front if the paper appears to have problems.

Don Heirman commented that the review processed saved 25% of the papers last year by doing mandatory changes, and the BoD directed that there would be a second mandatory review. Bill Radasky agreed but stated that for a paper that is not up to par, it should just be rejected and not go into mandatory review.

Bruce Archambeault commented on the lack of support from the software developer. Bruce is looking into other alternatives. Although this one is currently free, we would have to pay for another system. Israel used **system (Name),** and for EMC Istanbul, Turkey, Omnipress in the U.S. was used but it is the most expensive option. German **system (Name)** was used for EMC Europe. Bruce will have more information for the next TC meeting for discussion. Volunteers will be asked to help run a test on a new system.

Action Item: Bruce will have more information for the next TC meeting for discussion.

Don Heirman commented that we should hire someone to do the software changes and updates if **TPMS** would allow the TAC to do so. Bruce Archambeault said that would be a good alternative, but **TPMS** would not consider selling ownership.

Alan Roden asked what other societies are doing. Bruce Archambeault stated that many are using MTT but other societies are using Omnipress. Bruce also commented that it appears that no one at IEEE Headquarters knows what software is being used by the different societies.

Bill Radasky commented that some of these systems are based on abstracts only. Bruce Archambeault commented that this is an issue, and that there are those who have tried this in the past, and we would continue to require full manuscript submission.

Kermit Phipps commented that the system we have is still far better than the approach that was used years back.

Bruce Archambeault stated that he has not been very happy in the past on the review changes, but we are getting positive incremental changes, but we should try other methods. Bruce commented that it may be possible to salvage the system if we could gain control of the software.

Marina Y. Koledintseva commented on the fact that the authors did not remove their names in many cases.

Alan Roden commented that if you do not want authors to put their names on the papers, then the template in the header should say, "Do not put your name here at this time."

Action Item: Alan Roden is to the modify template and get it back to Bruce.

Marina Y. Koledintseva commented that different templates should be made, one for the initial submission and another for the final submission.

Bruce Archambeault thinks that is a good thing to do.

Don Heirman says that the best way to get the author's attention is to reject it.

4.0   TCS Vote for EMC Australia
Bruce Archambeault asked if there was a need to discuss technical co-sponsorship of EMC Australia.

Bill Radasky said that it was a worthwhile conference and that he attended it. The conference had a higher level of high-power magnetic and military participation than here in the U.S.

Bruce Call for vote of approval of TCS of EMC Australia.

TC3 was disconnected from the telecon with no vote recorded.

The motioned passed with all in favor, none opposed.

5.0   iNARTE Questions Response Time
Regarding iNARTE, the overall comment is that the review of iNARTE questions needs to get done and the Chair does not need to do them. The members can review them as well.

Bill Radasky commented that sometimes there is a little trouble that some of the questions do not fall into the purview of the TC. Therefore, iNARTE should be informed that it does not belong to the TC and iNARTE will redistribute the questions.

6.0   Old Business
None mentioned.

7.0   New Business
Bill Radasky commented on the meeting dates and that once the dates are set, they should not change, because it is difficult for him or anyone else to rearrange his schedule.

Bruce Archambeault commented that the dates changed due to holidays and other outside events of TAC that created the last circumstances.

Bill Radasky commented that we should set the date and if someone could not make the meeting, then so be it.

Bruce Archambeault apologized for the conflict of scheduling, but it was primarily out of his hands and scheduled the best date.

8.0   Review New Action Item List
Kermit Phipps reviewed the action list from the October 20, 2010 meeting and recorded whether the actions were completed or not.

9.0   Adjourn
Bruce Archambeault moved to close the meeting. Kimball Williams seconded the motion.