
Project	IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group < http://ieee802.org/16 >	
Title	Responses to Comments from RevCom Members regarding P802.16g/D9 RevCom Application	
Date Submitted	2007-06-05	
Source(s)	Roger Marks Chair, IEEE 802.16 Working Group	r.b.marks@ieee.org
	Phillip Barber Chair, 802.16 NetMan Task Group	pbarber@huawei.com
Re:	IEEE 802.16-07/028: RevCom Submittal of IEEE P802.16g	
Abstract	This is a response to RevCom member comments on the P802.16g/D9 submittal.	
Purpose	Clarification of issues surrounding concerns raised by RevCom member.	

Responses to Comments from RevCom Members regarding P802.16g/D9 RevCom Application

Roger Marks

Phillip Barber

Text in blue shows comments from RevCom Members regarding the P802.16g/D9 RevCom application.

Text in black represents responses from Chair of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group (Roger Marks) and the Chair of 802.16's Network Management Task Group (Phillip Barber).

Satish Aggarwal

Disapprove: Sponsor did not use myBallot. This ballot should be declared as "invalid." I am unable to determine ballot resolution.

The Sponsor did conduct the ballot using myBallot.

Bob Grow

Disapprove:

1. It is disconcerting that the majority of comments are submitted outside myBallot by ballot group members.

A number of comments were submitted directly to the Working Group, though the Working Group did not encourage the ballot group members to do so.

I did not track all of these, but I am aware of one disapprove set of comments submitted outside myBallot.

Some Disapprove comments were submitted directly to the Working Group.

Were all comments and responses recirculation requirements met?

Yes. All disapprove comments were brought to the Working Group's attention and were recirculated. See the following answer.

If the comments were not part of myBallot, how were the responses uploaded to myBallot as claimed in the ballot cover letters?

This is explained in the ballot cover letters. The D9 recirculation cover letter

<http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_024.pdf> says:

"We have uploaded the resolutions, along with the editor's implementation notes, to the IEEE-SA myBallot system. In addition to the 17 comments submitted through myBallot, the 802.16 Working Group received another 139 comments directly. Comment #18 includes a PDF file documenting all

156 of these comments, including their resolutions. In the PDF, the myBallot comments are numbered 1-17, matching the myBallot numbers. The additional comments are numbered 101-239.”

The D8 recirculation cover letter

<http://iee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_015.pdf> says:

“We have uploaded the resolutions, along with the editor’s implementation notes, to the IEEE-SA myBallot system. In addition to the 14 comments submitted through myBallot, the 802.16 Working Group received another 59 comments directly. Comment #15 includes a PDF file documenting all 73 of these comments, including their resolutions. In the PDF, the myBallot comments are numbered 1-14, matching the myBallot numbers; the additional comments are numbered 115-173.”

The D7 recirculation cover letter

<http://iee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_007.pdf> says:

“We have uploaded the resolutions, along with the editor’s implementation notes, to the IEEE-SA myBallot system. In addition to the 85 comments submitted through myBallot, the 802.16 Working Group received another 131 comments directly. Comment #86 includes a PDF file documenting all 216 of these comments, including their resolutions. In the PDF, the myBallot comments are numbered 1-85, matching the myBallot numbers; the additional comments are numbered 1001-1131.

2. The WG list has not been provided nor is it included in the draft.

We are happy to provide this list (which we do not understand to be an application requirement):

<http://iee802.org/16/netman/ballot20/report20.html>

3. I am very interested in understanding why multiple balloters did not submit comments through myBallot.

Nearly all of those submitting comments directly to the Working Group were members of the Working Group. I would suspect that they took this approach because they preferred the Working Group’s balloting utilities for its ease of use and ability to precisely convey intent (through its support of font formatting to allow strikeouts, underlines, and color coding). However, the Working Group did not encourage submittal using this format. If at some future date the myBallot system were modified to allow ballot group members to provide comments using more specific formatting change notation, and the if myBallot system were modified to allow ballot group members to upload multiple comments simultaneously, then it is likely that ballot group members would not choose to use alternate methods to supply their comments. Currently, ballot group members familiar with the Working Group are aware that the ballot resolution process will absolutely resolve their comments, regardless of the method in which those comments are supplied, so there is little incentive for them to choose a method that is less user-friendly to their needs.

Jim Hughes

The submittal form points to http://iee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_027.pdf as the list of unresolved negatives and rebuttals – which includes a number of comments, more than the 2

negatives reported in the summary for Draft D9. I suspect this list is **not** the list of currently unresolved negatives – correct? Are the two reported negatives in this list?

The document cited includes comments from two individuals: Pieter-Paul Giesberts and Vladimir Yanover. The final ballot summary shows that the same two individuals were the only two Disapprove voters. I do not see any discrepancy here.

David Law

Disapprove:

[1] In respect to the first recirculation it appears that there was a comment process associated with this ballot that was run outside the myBallot system. Only 85 comments were submitted through the myBallot system yet another 131 comments submitted through another system. These comments, from multiple individuals, were then compiled into a single file that was then uploaded to the myBallot system as a single file. What were the instructions provided to balloters in relation to the use of this alternative comment database?

Instructions were provided in the recirculation cover letters. For details, see my response to Bob Grow.

I have a number of issues with the impact of this. I have listed them in the order of severity as I see them:

[2] Two voters are recorded as negative votes without comments - these are Siamack Haghghi and Vladimir Yanover. If however the additional 131 comments [http://www.ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_002r5.pdf#240] are examined you will see that Vladimir Yanover has actually submitted seven comments, comment #1125 is even recorded as 'Part of Dis' which I assume means 'Part of a Disapprove'. So we have somebody that voted negative and submitted at least one comment which was indicated as the reason for the disapprove, yet myBallot records the ballot as negative without comments and therefore removes that vote from the Approval Rate - falsely increasing it.

MyBallot is not overreporting the approval ratio. The ballot report shows 0 “negative votes without Comments.” The only two Disapprove voters are counted as Disapprove voters.

[3] Since Vladimir Yanover is recorded as a negative without comments, a balloter during the recirculation would quite reasonably expect that there were no comments from him. As stated above there were and at least one comment from him that is marked as 'Part of a Disapprove' is rejected. We therefore have a comment that has to be recirculated with a rebuttal. The cover letter for the recirculation [p802-16g_r1-cover.pdf] states that the additional 131 comments are available at the URL -[<http://ieee802.org/16/netman/16g.html#contrib>] however no file name was provided. I search this area and was unable to find the file. Instead I had to use the URL provided in the RevCom submittal form to find the comments, but this was not provided to the balloters. Hence based on the fact that Vladimir Yanover is recorded as a negative without comments and the difficulty I had in locating the file, I don't believe the requirement that 'The verbatim text of each comment, the name of the negative voter, and a rebuttal by the members conducting the resolution of comments shall be included in the recirculation ballot package.' has been met.

This statement reflects a misreading of the cover letter. It does not point to a URL for the comment resolutions. It says the following: “In addition to the 85 comments submitted through myBallot, the 802.16 Working Group received another 131 comments directly. Comment #86 includes a PDF file documenting all 216 of these comments, including their resolutions. In the PDF, the myBallot comments are numbered 1-85, matching the myBallot numbers; the additional comments are numbered 1001-1131.”

[3] There is no response in myBallot to comment #86 which I don't understand. How can a recirculation be started when there is no 'Resolution Status' or 'Resolution Detail' - I thought the system would prevent this. Regardless, from the point of view of the myBallot records, this comment has not been considered.

As noted, the PDF attachment to Comment #86 is a compilation of all the comments and resolutions in the recirculation.

[4] The file 8592100024-80216-07_002r5.pdf reference in comment #86 with the additional 131 comments was not supplied to RevCom. It was also not available at the URL - [<http://ieee802.org/16/netman/16g.html#contrib>] as stated in the cover letter. There is a comment file at the URL supplied in the RevCom submittal, but this file appears to contain more than 131 comments so this may or may not be the file referenced in the cover letter.

As noted, the PDF attachment to Comment #86 was supplied to the ballot group. No, it was not supplied to RevCom. The Sponsor followed the instructions of the RevCom submittal form, which request “Copies of unresolved negative s& rebuttals.” We have never understood RevCom to request copies of ALL comments, including those that were resolved. We are more than happy to provide these materials, but we cannot understand why failure to submit them along with the RevCom application would be consider an oversight, let alone a reason to reject the approval of the draft.

In detail:

http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_027.pdf unresolved negatives
http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_018r5.pdf comments provided with Recirc #3
http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_012r4.pdf comments provided with Recirc #2
http://ieee802.org/16/docs/07/80216-07_002r5.pdf comments provided with Recirc #1

[5] Comment #86 which referenced the additional 131 comments is marked as 'General' yet these comments include Technical comments as well as comments related to a Disapprove vote.

True. We understand that the tag “General” is to be used when both Technical and Editorial comments are included in a single file, as was the case here.

[6] We have a number of balloters recorded in the myBallot system as having voted approve but having submitted zero comments even though they have. Phillip Barber is one example; the myBallot report states Approve with zero comments yet the 802.16 database reports a total of three comments from the balloter. Other examples are Lei Wang with 27 comments and Vladimir Yanover with seven. The remaining 94 comments came from individuals outside the ballot group.

All comments received were addressed and were then recirculated through the myBallot system. The Working Group Chair is not aware of any mechanism to associate comments received by the Working Group directly with the members of the ballot group within the myBallot system. Should the myBallot system be modified in the future to allow comments submitted outside of the myBallot system to be later associated to ballot group members, then this problem would likely be eliminated.

[7] We have the myBallot system reporting less than half of the actual number of comments received and considered on the draft.

All comments received were addressed and were then recirculated through the myBallot system. This is in accordance with the letter and spirit of the rules and procedures. The Sponsor should not be encouraged to ignore comments.

Geoff Thompson

Disapprove: (Reject submittal) Though I did not agree with the decision of the SASB to make the use of myBallot compulsory, that is the decision they made and that's the rule. It appears that this ballot was run under two tracks, one within the system and another parallel system for comments "received directly". In my opinion, this does not meet the requirements to "use myBallot" and, therefore, the submittal is invalid. It makes RevCom's oversight responsibility difficult to impossible and is therefore not permissible.

The Sponsor did use myBallot. A number of comments were submitted directly to the Working Group, though the Working Group did not encourage the ballot group members to do so. The Working Group faithfully followed the direction of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, which says "The Sponsor shall make a reasonable attempt to resolve all comments, objections, and negative votes that are accompanied by comments." That procedure is not limited to comments submitted through myBallot. It is our understanding that it is an issue of both precedent and open standards development policy that the Working Group MUST make reasonable effort to resolve all comments received, regardless of the method of submission. The Working Group is unaware of any specific instruction that allows the group to disregard comments received in a method other than through myBallot. Further, the Working Group can find no reference in either the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws or Operations Manual that compels ballot group members to submit their ballots through the myBallot system.