
Mat,

I vote Disapprove, with comments below. I'd like to acknowledge Phillip Barber, an 802.16 member who worked with me on these comments.

I also support most of the disapprove comments I've seen from other EC members.

Roger

Comment 1:

The proposed 7.1.2.1 would be an extremely radical change to EC operation. Such a change is totally unwarranted and is not in any way motivated by the relevant rationale presented along with the ballot: "A clarification of the responsibilities of the Chair."

In particular, the existing P&P defines the EC as a procedural body, not a technical body. For example, 7.1.1(e) gives the EC the authority to "Examine and approve Working Group draft standards for proper submission to Sponsor ballot group...; not for technical content."

The proposed 7.1.2.1(a) (b) (c) would put all procedural issues in the hands of the EC Chair. What, if anything, does this leave to the EC?

Given that the function of the EC is to administer the process, procedural decisions belong to the EC. It is inappropriate to delegate them to the Chair. It is the right and duty of the EC as a whole to make all such decisions, though they as a group may elect to delegate that right on individual matters.

Finally, the LMSC Chair puts these matters to the LMSC EC members for vote, not to the WG Members.

Remedy 1:

Modify the proposed changes as:

7.1.2.1 LMSC Chair

The LMSC Chair has the following responsibilities:

~~a) Decide which matters are procedural and technical~~

~~b) Decide procedural matters~~

ea) Place ~~technical issues~~matters to a vote by WGLMSC EC membership.

db) Lead the participants according to all of the relevant policies and procedures

ec) Entertain motions, but not make motions

fd) Delegate necessary functions as needed

ge) Set goals and deadlines and strive to adhere to them

hf) Prioritize objectives to best serve the ~~group and the goals~~entire LMSC membership

ig) Seek consensus of the Sponsor if required as a means of resolving issues

Comment 2:

The ballot rationale explains that one reason for the ballot is to address an AudCom concern regarding the need for "A better description of the rights of the participants and due process."

This AudCom requirement has not been met, or even addressed, by the proposed revisions. ANSI due process requirements apply to all those "with a direct and material interest", regardless of membership. I believe that AudCom is telling us to recognize those rights.

Remedy 2:

Add the following text at the end of 7.2.3.4:

In addition, all participants, regardless of membership, shall be entitled to due process and have the rights to:

(a) express a position and its basis

(b) have that position be considered

(c) appeal (7.1.6)

(d) access information on the activities of the LMSC and its subgroups in a timely manner

(e) bring matters to the attention of the group for consideration

No action of the LMSC or of its officers shall abridge these rights.

Comment 3:

The ballot rationale relates to the rights of the participants and to the functions of the WG Chair. These issues intersect in 7.2.4.1, which specifies the Chair's function, giving the Chair extraordinary powers to rule matters as procedural and to decide procedural issues. To protect the rights of the members, the P&P should offer some specifications regarding the distinction between technical and procedural issues.

Remedy 3:

In subclause 7.2.4.1, modify the text as follow:

7.2.4.1 Chair's Function

The Chair of the Working Group decides procedural issues. The Working Group members ~~and the Chair~~ decide technical issues by vote. The Working Group Chair generally decides what is procedural and what is technical. However, any matter regarding the establishment or modification of a PAR or that would make a non-editorial change to a draft standard shall be a technical issue.

Comment 4:

The ballot rationale refers to "the lack of requirement to act in accordance with the IEEE Code of Ethics. This requirement for conduct should be added to the P&P." The proposed revision does not directly address this issue. It references the Code of Ethics only by adding material to 8.4; since 8.4 addresses sessions, the change would apparently apply only to sessions. Furthermore, the proposed 8.4 doesn't address the Code of Ethics at all; it simply says that participants will allow other participants "a fair and equal opportunity to contribute." This completely misses the point of the IEEE Code of Ethics.

Remedy 4:

Eliminate the text "in accordance with the IEEE Code of Ethics" from the proposed addition of 8.4.

Add a subclause 6.5:

6.5 IEEE Code of Ethics

All participants in the LMSC and its subgroups, regardless of membership status, shall act in accordance with the IEEE Code of Ethics.

Comment 5:

It is not within the power of the WG Chair to ensure that deadlines are met.

Remedy 5:

Modify the proposed changes as:

7.2.2.1 LMSC Chair

g) Set goals and deadlines and strive to adhere to them