

Project	IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group < http://ieee802.org/16 >	
Title	Comment Resolution Procedure for Sponsor Ballot Recirculation of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D4	
Date Submitted	2004-03-31	
Source(s)	<p>Roger B. Marks NIST 325 Broadway, MC 818.00 Boulder, CO 80207</p> <p>Ken Stanwood Ensemble Communications Inc. 9890 Towne Centre Dr. San Diego, CA 92121</p>	<p>Voice: +1 303 497 3037 Fax: +1 303 497 7828 mailto:marks@nist.gov</p> <p>Voice: +1 858 404 6559 Fax: +1 858 638 7142 mailto:ken@ensemble.com</p>
Re:	Sponsor Ballot Recirculation of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D4	
Abstract	At IEEE 802.16 Session #30, the Working Group assigned to the Chair and Vice Chair the development of a process for resolving comments received during the Sponsor Ballot recirculation of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D4, within a general framework. Since these comments are to be resolved without a meeting, a detailed procedure is required. This document details that procedure.	
Purpose	To provide a detailed procedure for the resolution of comments received during Sponsor Ballot Recirculation of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D4.	
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.16. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.	
Release	The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.	
Patent Policy and Procedures	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures < http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html >, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard." Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair < mailto:chair@wirelessman.org > as early as possible, in written or electronic form, if patented technology (or technology under patent application) might be incorporated into a draft standard being developed within the IEEE 802.16 Working Group. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site < http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices >.	

Comment Resolution Procedure for Sponsor Ballot Recirculation of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D4

Roger Marks, Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group
Ken Stanwood, Vice Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group

Abstract

At IEEE 802.16 Session #30, the Working Group assigned to the Chair and Vice Chair the development of a process for resolving comments received during the Sponsor Ballot recirculation of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D4, within a general framework. Since these comments are to be resolved without a meeting, a detailed procedure is required. This document details that procedure.

Background

At IEEE 802.16 Session #30, the Working Group resolved comments in the Sponsor Ballot of IEEE P802.16-REVd/D3. Since the IEEE 802 LMSC granted, on 19 March, conditional approval to forward the document to RevCom, completion of recirculation is the only remaining barrier to submittal. Recirculation is scheduled for 1-15 April 2004, after which comment resolution is required. The Working Group had, at Session #29, adopted a schedule indicating that the final draft would be forwarded to RevCom by the 14 May deadline. Since the RevCom deadline is before Session #31 and no other face-to-face meeting was scheduled to handle the resolution, an alternative procedure is needed.

The issue of how to specify the comment resolution procedure was discussed at great length at the Session #30 Closing Plenary. Eventually, a process based on the use of the *Commentary* software was suggested by the Chair. The proposal was that all comments would be distributed to the Working Group and that reply comments would be accepted. Afterwards, the original commentor would be offered an opportunity to draft a comment resolution in response to the reply comments. Next, the Working Group members would cast votes by email on each modified comment. Those that received the 75% minimum support would be accepted, and the others would be rejected. The general idea here is to engage the participants in an organized dialog without a meeting, requiring both those desiring change and those concerned about proposed changes to take the responsibility to articulate their positions in explicit language usable in the recirculation.

After some further discussion and straw polls, the Working Group decided to modify the plan to allow further consideration of comments that received between 40% and 75% approval. The Working Group unanimously approved the following motion:

To allow the Chair and Vice Chair to work out a detailed plan based on Proposal #1 – An email vote by all members of the Working Group on the proposed resolutions submitted by the commentors. If it is over 75%, accept; if fewer than 40%, reject. If in the middle, further discussion will follow.

Procedure and Schedule

Comments received in the IEEE P802.16-REVd Recirculation Ballot will be resolved by a Ballot Resolution Committee (BRC) composed of the members of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group as of 31 March 2004. The BRC will follow the procedure and schedule described here.

29 March

P802.16-REVd/D4delta (draft showing changes with respect to D3) and 802.16-04/17 (“IEEE P802.16-REVd Recirculation Ballot Cover Letter”) sent to IEEE-SA Balloting Center for recirculation.

30 March

P802.16-REVd/D4, P802.16-REVd/D4delta, and 802.16-04/11r5 (comment database) posted to web site and announced on IEEE 802.16 email reflector.

1 April

IEEE-SA Balloting Center opens recirculation. IEEE 802.16 Working Group participants are requested to submit all comments in *Commentary* format.

15 April (midnight, US Eastern time)

IEEE-SA Balloting Center closes 15-day recirculation.

16 April

Comments posted to IEEE 802.16 web site, and announced. Reply comments invited from BRC members only. These should be in the form of a proposed resolution of the comment. Suggestions to approve should include rationale, from the broad BRC point of view, and explicit instructions to the editor. Suggestions to reject should include specific rebuttal text appropriate for use in recirculation.

24 April AOE

Reply comments, in *Commentary* format, due.

25 April

Reply comments posted. Commentors (whether or not WG participants) invited to address reply comments and propose a resolution that takes them into account.

28 April AOE

Deadline for resolutions as revised by original commentor. These resolutions should be in a form appropriate to verbatim adoption (see notes under April 16).

29 April

Updated database, with commentors' proposed resolutions, posted. Opportunity for members to vote on comment acceptance, using electronic voting system, opened.

1 May AOE

Deadline for voting by BRC members.

2 May

Voting totals posted and announced. Database updated to show approval status. Comments with approval ratio of at least 75% sent to editor for incorporation. For comments with approval ratio of at least 40% but less than 75%, commentors notified of opportunity to revise comment again. All ratios computed from Approve and Disapprove votes collected on each comment.

4 May AOE

Deadline for revised comments.

5 May

Revised comments posted. BRC Members offered opportunity to change vote on any comment under discussion.

7 May AOE

Deadline for change of vote.

8 May

Final voting totals posted. Final comment list, showing any changes in acceptance status, posted. Newly approved comments sent to editor for incorporation.

10 May

P802.16-REVd/D5 and P802.16-REVd/D5delta completed by editor.

11 May

Request IEEE-SA Balloting Center to open second recirculation. Recirculation package will include cover letter, P802.16-REVd/D5delta, and rebuttals of unresolved Disapprove comments. Those rebuttals will be constructed by the Chair and Vice Chair and based, where possible, on previously-submitted reply comments.

14 May

Second recirc opens for 15-day period, to close on 29 May.

14 May

P802.16-REVd/D5 submitted for RevCom approval. (By RevCom rules, final recirc may be in progress at this deadline.)

17-20 May

IEEE-SA meets at Session #31. Plans are developed for resolving any comments received during second recirculation (of P802.16-REVd/D5). P802.16-REVd is not the subject of comment resolution during the session.

29 May

Second recirc closes.

If second recirc is successful:

30 May

Inform RevCom of positive recirc results.

23 June

RevCom recommendation on approval as IEEE Standard 802.16-2004.

24 June

IEEE-SA Standards Board action on approval of IEEE Standard 802.16-2004.

If second recirc is unsuccessful:

30 May

Request that approval be deleted from RevCom agenda.

June

Carry out comment resolution and recirculation procedure as defined during Session #31. Should be complete by 28 June.

28 June

Deadline for RevCom Early Consideration submittal.

29 July

RevCom recommendation on approval as IEEE Standard 802.16-2004.

11 August

IEEE-SA Standards Board action on approval of IEEE Standard 802.16-2004.

Scope of Recirculation and Conditions for Comment Acceptance

According to the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, “All substantive changes made since the last balloted draft shall be recirculated to the Sponsor balloting group. All unresolved negative votes with comments shall be recirculated to the Sponsor balloting group. The verbatim text of each comment, the name of the negative

voter, and a rebuttal by the members conducting the resolution of ballots shall be included in the recirculation ballot package.”

Accordingly, the P802.16-REVd/D4 recirculation reviews only the changes to the draft (with respect to D3) and the single unresolved Disapprove comment. Technically, only the changes, and the single unresolved Disapprove comment, are within the scope of this recirculation ballot.

On the other hand, the Working Group and Task Group Chairs do not intend to rule any recirculation comment out of scope. It will, instead, be left to the Ballot Resolution Committee (BRC; i.e., the IEEE 802.16 Working Group) to decide, based on the described procedure. Members of the Committee should consider the following:

- According to the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, “once 75% approval has been achieved, the IEEE has an obligation to the majority to review and publish the standard quickly. Therefore, once 75% approval has been achieved, the IEEE requirements for consensus have been met. Efforts to resolve negative votes may continue for a brief period; however, should such resolution not be possible in a timely manner, the Sponsor should forward the submittal to RevCom.”
- The approval status prior to recirculation was 60 Approve, 1 Disapprove. Given that the ballot has achieved consensus, the draft should basically be considered approved, pending agreement regarding the changes made (and any rebuttals).
- Comment resolution normally continues until the BRC decides to stop changing the draft. Each change provides material for further objection in the next round of recirculation.

The Working Group Chair and Vice Chair recommend that the BRC take a hard line on accepting comments and hold commentors to a high standard. We suggest the following:

- If the BRC wishes to bring the development of this draft to a close, it should limit its acceptance of new material. It need not limit itself to material that is absolutely necessary. However, it *should* limit acceptance to comments that have established broad consensus and will not trigger further recirculation.
- In the view of the Working Group Chair and Vice Chair, the bias of the group should be *against* any changes; anyone proposing further changes should accept the burden of proof to convince the BRC persuasively.
- Sponsor Ballot members who are also Working Group participants and who wish to make changes, whether they be corrections, changes, or new material, should be expected to raise their concerns on the 802.16 email reflector before the close of the recirc. This will give others an opportunity to review and comment on the general principles, giving the commentor a chance to modify the comment appropriately.
- BRC members should carefully scrutinize all comments and respond with targeted reply comments as necessary. These should be in the form of a proposed resolution of the comment, in the style appropriate for insertion in the database as a BRC response to the comment. Suggestions to approve should include rationale, from the BRC point of view, and explicit instructions to the editor. Suggestions to reject should include specific rebuttal text appropriate for use in recirculation.
- Commentors should prepare revised resolutions that fully address the reply comments.
- The BRC members should be willing to vote No on any comment that does not provide explicit text for the editor or does not address the reply comments. There will be no face-to-face meeting to address comments that include only vague remedies. Participants who identify problems but don’t have the full solution have the obligation to find someone to assist, either by direct contact or by the reflector.
- In the final stage, which involves reconsideration of some rejected comments, commentors have a brief period to adjust their comments and try to change the minds of the BRC. They should attempt to understand the concerns of the BRC and consider them carefully.