

## Sherman, Matthew J. (US SSA)

---

**From:** Sherman, Matthew J. (US SSA)  
**Posted At:** Sunday, October 10, 2004 9:43 AM  
**Conversation:** +++ LMSC P&P Revision Ballot Results +++ compliance with IEEE-SA and IEEE CS Governance  
**Posted To:** WG Voting Procedures  
**Subject:** +++ LMSC P&P Revision Ballot Results +++ WG Voting Procedures

Voters	DNV	DIS	APP	ABS	Comments Provided?
00 Paul Nikolich			APP		Yes
01 Mat Sherman	DNV				
02 Pat Thaler		DIS			Yes
03 Buzz Rigsbee	DNV				
04 Bob O'Hara		DIS			Yes
05 John Hawkins	DNV				
06 Tony Jeffree		DIS			Yes
07 Bob Grow		DIS			Yes
08 Stuart Kerry	DNV				
09 Bob Heile	DNV				
10 Roger Marks		DIS			Yes
11 Mike Takefman		DIS			Yes
12 Mike Lynch	DNV				
13 Steve Shellhammer		DIS			Yes
14 Vivek Gupta	DNV				
15 Carl Stevenson		DIS			Yes
-----					
TOTALS	DNV	DIS	APP	ABS	
total:	-07-	-08-	-01-	-00-	

### Ballot Comments:

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
Paul Nikolich [paul.nikolich@att.net]

Tue 9/5/2006 11:20 AM

I vote approve.

My editorial non-binding comments on the ballot:

1) 7.2.3.4.g Rights--upon reading this one could take the interpretation that the combined membership of the WGs (exclusive of TAGs) could force resolution implementation. What is meant, I believe, is the combined membership of WGs and TAGs. This doesn't require a change--I am just alerting you to a change that may be needed in the future.

2) 7.2.4.2.2 -- I would remove the specific sub-clause reference to the IEEE-SA SBOM - leave it general so we don't have to worry about how SBOM may be restructured

3) 7.2.4.4 -- I would remove the specific sub-clause reference to the IEEE CS SAB P&P--leave it general, or better yet, refer to the appropriate IEEE SA document to eliminate the dependancy on CS SAB.

-----  
-----  
Shellhammer, Steve [sshellha@qualcomm.com]

Wed 9/6/2006 3:26 PM

I vote NO but will change my vote to YES if the following changes are made.

1. In Section 7.2.4.3 (Chair's Function) change "output documents of the Working Group" to "either a PAR or a draft." The phrase "output documents" is too vague for my taste. Since those are the two output documents of a working group I think it is better to list them than to use such a vague phrase.
2. In Section 7.2.4.2.1 drop the sentence "Non-technical motions, when allowed, are determined in accordance with parliamentary procedure." Once again the phrase "parliamentary procedure" is way too vague. If the working groups want to describe how they hold these non-technical motions using specific language that would be fine, but this vague statement does not work.
3. In Section 7.2.4.2.1 drop the phrase "at least." A majority is well defined and does not require that phrase, since it is included within the definition.

Just one observation. In this document the section entitled "Chair's Function" is numbered 7.2.4.3, but that section number is also used later. I thin there is a small typo in the section number.

---

Mike Takefman (tak) [tak@CISCO.COM]

Wed 9/6/2006 4:46 PM

I also vote NO and I'll come up with a list of my concerns. But reading Steve's comments made me think and I feel it necessary to comment immediately.

While I agree with Steve that "output document" seems vague, the set "PAR and Draft" is merely a subset of useful documents that a WG or TAG could produce that require 75% approval (IMO).

WG's produce liaisons both internal to 802 and external to IEEE, press releases etc. So an output document (to me, and I'd think the majority of people), means anything that leaves the WG, and I see that as the minimum acceptable set.

WGs produce documents for their own internal use that are technical in nature and affect a draft and so I'd personally want to see the bar set at 75% for those documents too.

For example, in 802.17 there was a lot of discussion on simulation requirements and methods for benchmarking proposals. The phrase output document doesn't include a document that would specify how simulations should be run, nor the minimum acceptable performance, yet it is clearly an important document, technical in nature as it will affect the draft.

Imagine the host of appeals that would insue if such a document was classified as procedural as it wasn't an output document and then someone objects to the draft moving forward when its technical content was based on simulation requirements that couldn't achieve 75% consensus.

Our old language was much more open, but that might not be a bad thing since once you try to restrict things, you end up risking creating the wrong set of limitations.

I'll think some more about a better phrase then merely output document but I think a more inclusive term would be better.

---

Shellhammer, Steve [sshellha@QUALCOMM.COM]

Wed 9/6/2006 5:15 PM

Mike,

Thanks for thinking of other "output documents" the only ones I could think of were the PAR and draft. Those were the technical ones I could think of.

I think you bring up some other good points about the problems with attempting to define "what is technical." Before we left it to the chair to make the determination on whether something is technical or not. If we attempt to give a precise definition of what is technical we may have difficulty in generating such a definition. But a phrase like

those issues that "can impact the substance of an output document" may not work. We have in essence replaced "technical" with "substance."  
And of course what we mean by "substance" is something technical.

-----  
-----  
Al Petrick [apetrick@WIDEFI.COM]

Thu 9/7/2006 6:07 AM

Mike/Steve

Both of you have very good questions!

Let me try to help clarify the issues that were raised by Steve and yourself, as I was worked with a small Ad-Hoc group inside 802.11 that came up with the suggested recommended changes. This should help clarify your concerns.

Clarification: Clause 7.2.4.3;

\* The WG Chair (as well as the TG,SC,SG Chairs) decides what is technical and non-technical wrt issues and motions on the floor. This is the first determination. Procedure is the next step.

o It was recommended to change "procedural" to "non-technical" because the chair then applies parliamentary rulings to motions on the floor to seek proper "procedure". Some motions under parliamentary procedure require 50% approval, while others require, 2/3 or a majority approval.

\* Sentence: "Technical issues are those that can impact the substance of "output documents" of the Working Group.

o "Output documents" are those that leave the WG and passed on to the IEEE 802 hierarchy seeking approval or to bodies (liaisons, stds organizations, or other entities) outside the IEEE. Such output documents include specifically PARs, Drafts, but may include for example letters to outside bodies that has technical content (substance). For this reason, "Output documents" was specified.

-----  
-----  
Tony Jeffree [tony@JEFFFREE.CO.UK]

Thu 9/7/2006 7:12 AM

Steve -

PARs and drafts are NOT the only output documents of a WG. We also generate liaisons and position papers to other organizations, and meeting minutes, for example; I believe that motions approving these are rightly considered to be technical motions also.

I agree that "output documents" is vague, but the way to fix that is to add a definition of what the list of things that constitute "output documents" actually is, and then use the term. However, the list of things that need to be decided by a "technical" (75% approval) vote of the WG is ABSOLUTELY NOT IMHO restricted to output documents; for example, a motion to impose a directed position on a Chair, or a motion to remove a Chair from office, should very definitely be considered to be "technical" votes as opposed to procedural (decided by the Chair) matters! So I think the fundamental problem with this change to defining the "procedural/technical" distinction only in terms of output documents is that in doing so, there is a class of decisions that must be made by the WG that fall outside the (current) definition of "Technical" and that should have been included.

Mike Takefman (tak) [tak@CISCO.COM]

Thu 9/7/2006 9:37 AM

Al,

Was there a specific problem or concern that prompted the Ad-Hoc group to go about suggesting these changes?

---

Tony Jeffree [tony@jeffree.co.uk]

Thu 9/7/2006 10:49 AM

I vote Disapprove.

Nits:

There is something screwed up about the subclause numbering (there are two instances of 7.2.4.3 and one of them precedes 7.2.4.2).

Substantive issues:

As Steve Shellhammer has pointed out, and as amplified in my response to his comments, the whole issue of Technical vs Procedural in this set of rules is somewhat screwed up.

Firstly, it makes no sense at all to say that the Chair decides procedural (sorry, non-technical) issues, and then to go on to say that when the Chair decides to use the WG's help in determining a procedural issue by taking a vote of the WG, that it should be done in a particular way. For example, if I decide that an issue is procedural (choosing the venue for the next interim, maybe), but that I want the WG to assist me in that decision by running a straw poll, I don't want the P&P to impose rules on how that straw poll is conducted, and I absolutely DO NOT want that informal mechanism suddenly to be subject to parliamentary procedure. That is just plain nuts. Either an issue is procedural, and the Chair gets to decide the outcome (including taking advice/help from the WG, if he/she feels it appropriate, and in any way that he/she may choose), or it is not procedural, and the WG gets to vote, and with the outcome subject to 75% approval. So introducing the concept of some other kind of "non-technical motion" into the vocabulary, surrounded with wooly words about them being subject to parliamentary procedure, isn't helpful and simply allows us to continue to get wrapped around this particular axle.

Secondly, as I pointed out in response to Steve, the set of issues that require a 75% approval certainly include drafts and PARs, but is very much NOT restricted to those two items.

So, what I would like to see an alternative approach along these lines:

- That we only ever talk about one form of "Voting in meetings" - and that one form requires 75% approval to pass.
- That the set of things that we absolutely require to be decided by a WG vote (75% approval) gets clearly stated, along with the principle that lies behind it, so that if we've missed anything from the set then it is as clear as possible how the set would be populated.
- That the question of how the Chair might run a non-technical "motion", or any other kind of procedure for that matter, in order to assist in the determination of a procedural issue, doesn't get discussed in the P&P at all, as it is all covered under the blanket statement that "The Chair decides procedural issues".

If I get time in the next few days I will propose some wording changes.

---

Tony Jeffree [tony@JEFFREE.CO.UK]

Thu 9/7/2006 10:48 AM

Roger -

At 15:30 07/09/2006, Roger B. Marks wrote:

>Tony,

>

>Of the items you suggested should be on the 75% list, several of them  
>are already addressed by existing P&P clauses that specify 75%:

> 9.1 Procedure for Establishing a Directed Position

> 7.2.4.4 Removal of Working Group Chairs or Vice Chairs

> 14.2 Procedure for Communication with Government Bodies

That's fine - what I suggested doesn't contradict that. However (and I have fleshed this out a bit in my comments - you will see them shortly) we could very easily make this all a lot clearer just by saying that there is only one type of "voting in (WG) meetings" and that it requires 75%. Then there would be no need to re-state the 75% threshold everywhere.

>The procedure for liaisons does not specify 75%:

> 14.1 Procedure for Coordination with Other Standards Bodies

I believe that should be 75%.

>I don't think the threshold for meeting minutes is currently  
>established.

Similarly, I think that should be 75%. If 49% of my WG (or even 95% come to that) didn't want to approve the minutes, then I would suspect that there might just be something wrong with them.

---

Roger B. Marks [r.b.marks@IEEE.ORG]

Thu 9/7/2006 11:26 AM

Tony,

I agree 100%.

I'd just like to add a note. You propose that the rules should be such:

-That we only ever talk about one form of "Voting in meetings" - and that one form requires 75% approval to pass.

The point I'd like to make is that this is exactly what the rules say and have always said (since I've been around).

---

Tony Jeffree [tony@JEFFFREE.CO.UK]

Thu 9/7/2006 11:38 AM

Roger -

Absolutely. I can see no good reason to move away from that, other than to clarify and reinforce what that actually means.

---

Pat Thaler [pthaler@broadcom.com]

Thu 9/7/2006 5:57 PM

I vote disapprove primarily due to 7.2.4.3

7.2.4.3 I agree with Mike Takefman's comments on the attempt to define "technical issues." I don't think that the definition of "technical issues" clarifies the boundary between technical and procedure much. Is adoption of a down select process a technical or non-technical vote?

With no definition some say it is and some say it isn't. With this definition, some would

say that it does not impact the substance of output documents because it doesn't directly say what goes into the draft, others would say that in defining how the material to go into the draft is selected it does impact the substance of the draft. Grey area remains grey. I don't understand why "procedural" became "non-technical."

I think the section was better before we touched it. Chair's discretion included the choice on the chair's part to put a procedural issue to a 50% vote.

The one problem I see with the section is that there are various things that aren't technical like directed positions or waiving of term limits that are required to have votes. WGs may also have Working Group rules that require votes on some non-technical issues. Perhaps "non-technical issues" should be "non-technical issues that are not covered by other voting rules in the LMSC or Working Group P&P." (substitute what ever you usually use for self-referring ot the P&P.)

Some picky points:

7.2.4.3 1st sentence might read better: "The Chair of the Working Group may decide non-technical issues or may allow a non-technical issue to be decided by a motion.

7.2.4.2.1 increases the quorum requirement for any group with an even number of members by one member (changes a greater than or equal to half requirement to majority which is greater than one half).

The text of 7.2.4.2.3 says the WG chair has discretion on what can be decided by electronic ballot which isn't quite consistant with other parts of the rules that require certain votes to take place at a plenary. Text of 7.2.4.2.3:

"7.2.4.2.3 Voting by Electronic Ballots

Other matters may also be decided by an electronic ballot at the discretion of the Working Group Chair.

The response time for these ballots shall be at least fifteen days."

For example, 7.2.2 says that WG chairs are elected at plenary sessions.

Possibly we should add: "Except for votes that are explicitly required to take place at a meeting,"

-----  
Grow, Bob [bob.grow@intel.com]

Tue 9/19/2006 8:21 PM

Colleagues:

I opted to eliminate all of the previous discussion from this message, but I may reference some of it.

Though I support much in this ballot, I vote Disapprove.

The primary textual problems are 7.4.2.3 and one issue related to 7.4.2.1. I also vote disapprove because changes in this area are premature based on active work at the IEEE-SA and IEEE levels.

1. Disapprove, General -- There is currently a Voting ad-hoc committee working to refine IEEE requirements for IEEE-SA standards development needs. One item of discussion is if our letter ballot process is consistent with IEEE Bylaws. LMSC representatives at the Standards Board have argued that it is because it really isn't a "vote". The action is taken by the LMSC EC which is consistent with IEEE Bylaws requirements for electronic process.

This work also could also affect quorum and "voting in a meeting" requirements. Though the major issue is with electronic voting which includes our "letter ballots".

We should wait to see what is resolve here before we start fixing language about what votes are required, the process required for those votes and the language used to describe them.

2. Disapprove, p.2, 1.4 -- I agree with others that 7.4.2.3 is totally messed up. The

lack of parallel construction (issues v. motions) is very broken. Should use parallel construction.

3. p.2, 1.3 -- While these changes attempt to remove the non-parallel procedural and technical, the use of procedural was useful in refining what is appropriately considered non-technical.

4. Disapprove, p.2, 1.4 -- I agree with others that attempting to define "technical" is an ill-advised "rat hole". I could live with language that is inclusive rather than definitive "(e.g., actions that affect the content of a draft)".

5. Disapprove, p.2, 1.3 -- The old language allowed the Chair to decide a procedural issue, to put a procedural issue to some kind of decision process consistent with open, fair and democratic process, or even (as some might wish to be the only alternative) to be decided via motion and Robert's Rules of Order.

6. Disapprove, p.2, 1.15 -- The added second sentence to 7.2.4.2.1 give far too much weight to RROR as it is now the recommend guide for parliamentary procedure. Remove it.

7. p.2, 1.28 -- Inconsistent capitalization of Voter. Make consistent.

8. p.4, 1.4 -- With changes, should also include electronic ballots.

---

Bob O'Hara (boohara) [boohara@cisco.com]

Tue 9/19/2006 10:05 PM

I disapprove on this motion.

Comments that must be satisfied for my vote to change to approve:

7.2.4.3: I think that the change of the chair deciding procedural issues to deciding non-technical issues is wrong. In particular for those groups operating with treasury, expending money from the treasury should be decided by the group and not the chair alone.

7.2.4.3: The rest of this clause is a hash. I would prefer the following:

"The Chair of the Working Group decides procedural issues. The Chair decides which issue are procedural. The Chair may seek the guidance of the Working Group before deciding procedural issues. The method and choice of seeking guidance on a procedural issue is solely at the discretion of the Chair."

7.2.4.2: There needs to be a statement here on what must be voted upon.

I would suggest:

"Decisions on all issues that are not procedural are decided by a vote of the Working Group."

7.2.4.2.1: Delete "technical" from the first sentence. Delete the sentence beginning "Non-technical motions".

7.2.4.2.2: Delete the two paragraphs beginning "The Working Group Chair determines if and how negative votes...". Replace them with the following:

"The processing of the comments received from a letter ballot shall be done in accordance with the procedures for Sponsor Ballots, as described in the IEEE-SA Operations Manual."

---

Carl R. Stevenson [wk3C@WK3C.COM]

Fri 9/22/2006 1:27 PM

I agree with Bob's comments and also vote Disapprove.

