Editorial Task Group – 2007/05/03 Conference Call – Minutes

Time:
The call was scheduled for 12:00-1:00PM EDT the actual duration of the call was 1:45 minutes.

Call Recording Secretary: Mark Klerer

Agenda:

The following agenda had been proposed:
1. Approval of Minutes of last call
2. Review of WG Chair's proposed "EDITORIAL TASK GROUP TASK DESCRIPTION"
3. Discussion and Agreement on going forward mark-up and comment handling procedures
4. Status of Action Items[1] from last Call

Actual discussion proceeded first with agenda item 2. The discussion then moved on to item 1, which was interrupted with a discussion of items 3 & 4 as the meeting ran over in time and one of the participants had to leave at the scheduled time. The call subsequently returned to agenda item 1 and concluded the review of the previous minutes.

Summary of Discussions:

Agenda Item 2: Editorial task Group Description

The Working Group chair had submitted a Draft ETG task description to the ETG for discussion on the conference call. The draft was circulated by e-mail and changes had been proposed by two members of the ETG. In addition to some minor editorial changes, the changes provided clarification that "purely editorial changes" proposed by the editor would be able to be included in a revised draft with the proviso that these are reviewed and approved by the ETG. All changes (including those deemed to be purely editorial) to be incorporated in the draft will comply with the diff-marking policy described below. The revisions were accepted by the ETG and the WG chair, and the revised approved text is included as Attachment 1 to these minutes. This document will be presented to the WG at the Montreal meeting.

There was also discussion on the ETG related to Task Groups as defined in the 802.20 P&P. The WG Chair stated that the ETG will operate in consistency with 802.20 P&P. The conclusion of the discussion was that the ETG is not the equivalent of a TG but is an editorial group that has been designated for the specific task described and is not a regular TG as described in the P&P. The ETG calls are open to ETG members only and will be scheduled to accommodate maximum attendance by the ETG members.

---

[1] There were no formal action items assigned or agreed by the group during the last call. Mark Klerer volunteered to prepare a document with traceability while keeping the ballot going.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of April 25, 2007 Conference Call Minutes.

As stated above the discussion took place in two segments of the call; this summary captures both discussion segments.

The draft minutes had been circulated for comment by Anna Tee (Recording Secretary of the previous call) and comments had been incorporated for a second draft to which further comments had been made.

Val Oprescu had requested that a disclaimer be included in the minutes that states that the specific statements attributed to individuals in the minutes are according to the best recollection of the participants and individuals. There was spirited discussion on various aspects of the minutes; however, most of the changes were accepted by consensus.

The minutes of the discussion between Arnie Greenspan and Val Oprescu pertaining to the preparation of a marked-up document that would be used in conjunction with the Practice Ballot draft were amended to reflect what Arnie had stated. Val Oprescu requested that the minutes note that there has been controversy with respect to the resolution of this item.

Similarly, with respect to Mark Klerer's request that the minutes record his concern about a revote on a the readiness of the draft after the deadline, Anna Tee and Val Oprescu stated they did not hear that statement during the call

The rest of the changes were approved without controversy and Anna Tee was requested to prepare a final draft for review and approval by the ETG members.

Agenda Item 3: Going forward mark-up and comment handling procedures

Val Oprescu had sent out an e-mail describing a process based on multi-colored text to indicate sources and trace changes. Mark Klerer had sent out an e-mail describing a process based on the traditional IEEE 802 comment resolution process.

The following process was agreed to by the ETG and Working Group Chair:

Individuals submitting comments in response to Practice Letter Ballots or Letter Ballots will be required to submit their comments via the Ballot Comment form. These comment sheets will be specifying specific changes to the text and will be resolved by the working group. The disposition of the comment will give a precise description of how the comment is being accommodated and any alternate wording that the group approves; this disposition will be recorded in the Comment Resolution column of the form. The result of that resolution will be incorporated in the revised draft with *full Microsoft Tracking* turned on (in line option enabled); that will show any deletions by strike out and additions in an alternate color. These two mechanisms together allow everyone to determine how their comment was handled and also accommodates more than one source

for a particular change. If a comment includes a proposal for a new feature that involves changes to multiple sections, a general comment can be included in the form and an attachment can describe the feature and its impact; however, specific comments showing the text changes requested shall also be supplied.

Agenda Item 4: Status of Action Items from last Call

According to the editor, the current Practice Letter Ballot text (Draft D0.1m) consists of the Overview (with appropriate edits for the new merged material), MIB, architectural compatibility sections and a couple of other sections (e.g in the Common Algorithm section) from the 802.20 draft D2.1, and merged with the UMB standard text, which was the V&V version as referenced by the Motorola. Material from LG was included via incorporation of the UMB text, and C802.20-07-21r1 from Qualcomm has also been included.

Mark Klerer reported that a marked-up version of the current Practice Letter Ballot text is in preparation and will be available by next Friday (prior to the Montreal meeting).

The text will be a markup of the UMB V&V version of the text referenced by Motorola in their March contribution. The UMB text will be shown in red, remaining unchanged 802.20 D2.1 text will be shown in black, TDD text will appear in green and any changes made beyond that will be shown via Microsoft Word's track changes tool. The latter includes the text on performance parameters from C802.20-07-21r1 and any wording changes and additions by the editor. In general each UMB document corresponds to a single chapter in the PLB draft. However, the UMB Overview document was distributed over three chapters due to the nature of its content. The first part went into the 802.20 Overview section, the content dealing with common algorithms and procedures went into the Common Algorithms section of the 802.20 draft and the content dealing with assigned numbers went into the Assigned Numbers section of the 802.20 draft. It was noted that the deleted 802.20 text would not be shown with strikeout in those cases where whole sections have been deleted, (A partial markup doing this had been previously posted on the website). Similarly the front matter that was deleted (due to redundancy) from the UMB documents has been deleted without being shown with strikeout. (Generally that is the front cover, table of content, lists of tables and figures, Forward, Notes and References [these latter are consolidated up front]). It was also noted that changes in table numbers and references when automatically generated are not diff-marked.

Val Oprescu expressed the opinion that the TOC (Table of Content) should go to deeper levels as there was one case where there was no entry for 50 pages. It was noted that currently this was a byproduct of using the IEEE template that only accommodates section numbers to a depth of 5. Since this is a matter of IEEE editorial policy, if we get consensus from the WG to preserve a deeper numbering scheme, the chair and editor will have to take this up with the IEEE editorial staff. A deeper TOC can then be simply generated by overriding the template defaults.

ATTACHMENT 1

EDITORIAL TASK GROUP (ETG)
TASK DESCRIPTION

The Editorial Task Group (ETG) will be responsible for maintaining the editorial integrity of the 802.20 draft standard. Included in these responsibilities will be deciding upon and implementing an appropriate and effective tracking mechanism that will allow changes to the new draft standard to be traced clearly and unambiguously from its inception as a draft to its final form.

The ETG shall also be responsible for merging changes approved by the 802.20-working group into the draft standard. This process shall not result in arbitrary or unapproved non-editorial changes to the draft that were not explicitly approved by the 802.20-Working group. The Editor may include purely editorial changes, as long as they are clearly and distinctly marked, and explicitly submitted first to the ETG for review and approval.

In the event that the ETG is unable to agree upon the manner in which a change is to be implemented they shall return the suggested change or alternative versions of the suggested change to the 802.20 working group and shall abide by the judgment of the working group as to how the change shall be implemented.