

# Appellee Reply Brief

Reply to David V. James appeal on P802.3REV

Submitted by:

Robert M. Grow, Chair IEEE 802.3

David Law, Vice Chair IEEE 802.3

June 3, 2005

## 1.0 General

This reply brief is provided in accordance with *LMSC P&P*, 7.1.7.3.

### 1.1 Referenced normative procedural documents

The following documents were in effect when the actions under appeal were taken.

*IEEE Project 802 LAN MAN Standards Committee (LMSC) Policies and Procedures*, November 19, 2004 [*LMSC P&P*]

*IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*, January 2004 [*SB Bylaws*]

*IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, January 2004 [*SB OpMan*]

*IEEE Standards Association Operations Manual*, February 2004 [*SA OpMan*]

### 1.2 Other referenced documents

*IEEE Style Manual*, Revised April 2002 [*StyleMan*]

*IEEE Standards Companion*, 2003 [*Companion*]

*Material for P802.3REV appeal*, submitted April 14, 2005 [*Appeal*]

*Appellee Reply Brief*, this document, [*Reply*]

### 1.3 Relevant dates

13 Jan 2005	P802.3REVam initial ballot close
26 Jan 2005	P802.3REVam/D2.0 comment resolution meeting
1 Mar 2005	P802.3REVam/D2.1 recirculation announced to sponsor ballot group, D2.0 comment responses available through myBallot
2 Mar 2005	Notice of intent to appeal and response by Mr. Nikolich to request a meeting to attempt informal resolution of issues
16 Mar 2005	Meeting to attempt informal resolution of issues
24 Mar 2005	Date on appeal brief
31 Mar 2005	Deadline for appeal brief per notice of actions that are under appeal
14 April 2005	Appeal brief filed
21 Apr 2005	Notice of hearing sent to appellant and appellees.
5 Jun 2005	Deadline for reply brief
20 Jul 2005	Scheduled appeal hearing

### 1.4 Failure of appellant to timely file

The appeal brief was not filed within 30 days of notice to the appellant of the actions that are the subject of the appeal as required by *LMSC P&P*, 7.1.7.2. [See Attachment 1, sponsor ballot recirculation announcement establishing date of notice of action.]

The appeal was not filed within 30 days of email from appellant and response by the LMSC Chair on the actions that are the subject of the appeal [see Attachment 2].

The date on the appeal document is inconsistent with its content. The document date should not be used for consideration of the appeal. [See *Appeal 2.0*, where the appellant indicates

download of the LMSC P&P on “2005Apr13”, and Attachment 3, appellant email submitting the appeal.]

The appeal could be dismissed on procedural issues alone. But, it has come to the attention of the appellees, that the appellant may have been relying on advice from the LMSC Chair that the appellant had 30 days from the 16 March informal issue resolution meeting.

Therefore, this reply brief will address the objections raised and the supporting information included in the appeal document which the appellees assert merely represent disagreement of the appellant (as an unsatisfied balloter) with the ballot group consensus, and normative procedures of IEEE-SA.

The appeal panel is requested to base its decision on facts, and ignore the irrelevant information within the *Appeal*, including the assumptions of the appellant unsupported by evidence (and refuted by evidence presented in this *Reply*), false statements and information presented in a misleading way.

### **1.5 Failure of appellant to cite violations of normative process**

The *Appeal* does not cite specific violations of normative procedures.

The appellant cites conflicts between a draft approved by the ballot group and the *IEEE Style Manual*. Differences between the *StyleMan* and the approved draft are not proper items for appeal as the ballot group is the body responsible for determination of consensus, not a WG Chair, Vice Chair, ballot resolution committee or working group. Additional facts follow in *Reply*, 2.1 to appellant’s assertions of action/inaction.

The actions of the IEEE 802.3 Chair and Vice Chair subject to appeal are consistent with normative procedures. The appellant as support for violation of process only cites the non-normative *IEEE Standards Companion*. Additional facts follow in *Reply* 2.2 to appellant’s assertions of inaction/inaction.

### **2.0 Reply to specific objections (Appeal 2.1 and 2.3)**

The essence of the appellant’s objections stated in 2.1 is “inequities in the Sponsor Ballot review process as utilized by the IEEE 802.3 Chair and Vice Chair.” The appellant was treated in the same manner as other balloters. The appellant isn’t the only balloter that had comments rejected. The appellant wasn’t the only balloter that had comments on style deferred to the IEEE publications editor. The *Appeal* does not prove, let alone cite any case where the appellant was treated inequitably in the resolution of P802.3REVam balloting by the Chair and Vice Chair of IEEE 802.3. The facts dispute the appellant’s claim.

The requirement for consideration of comments is outlined in *Bylaws* 5.2.4 and the following from *SB OpMan* 4.3.2.

“Approval or adoption of a standard requires ... that the final results of the ballot and statements submitted by balloters who participated in the development of the standard indicate that consensus has been achieved and unresolved negative ballots have been properly considered, together with reasons why the comments could not be resolved.”

All comments received in balloting of P802.3REVam were considered, and responses published to the ballot group through myBallot consistent with IEEE process as specified in *SB OpMan*, 5.4.3.2:

“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.”

While one balloter agreed with the appellant and changed to a disapprove vote on the first recirculation ballot, the approval of the ballot group increased from 85% in the initial ballot to 91% after the first recirculation and 96% after the second recirculation.

The ballot group is the body responsible to judge the content of the proposed standard and they clearly do not agree with the appellant on issues raised in his comments as evidenced by their votes. [See Attachment 4, P802.3REVam ballot results.]

The Chair and Vice Chair maintain that they, the ballot resolution committees and working group members that acted on ballot comments during ballot of P802.3REVam acted responsibly and consistent with 5.4.3.2 of the *SB OpMan*:

“However, once 75% approval has been achieved, the IEEE has an obligation to the majority to review and publish the standard quickly.”

This is explained in the non-normative *Companion*:

“There are several rules that help to define what final level of consensus you reach. All ballot comments have to be responded to, and in considering a response you may make a change in the draft that may turn a no vote into a yes vote. The issue is what you do to balance your obligations to the majority versus that of the minority. Once you have achieved consensus, an obligation to the majority exists to approve and publish the standard quickly. However, you are obligated to respond to the negative comments of the minority. You should attempt to resolve those negative comments, but if there is no indication that further resolution can be achieved based on that, you should move your document forward for approval, still having met the terms of consensus.

The comment responses included in the first recirculation package clearly indicate that each comment was considered, the vast majority were either accepted or accepted in principle, and an appropriate response for each class of comments was provided to the ballot group. This fulfills the procedural obligations of IEEE-SA process.

### **3.0 Reply to the procedures or standards at issue (*Appeal, 2.3*)**

#### **3.1 IEEE Style Manual (*Appeal, 2.3.1*)**

While the *StyleMan* is a very important guide used in development of a draft, it is not a normative document. It is not listed in the *SA OpMan* and is listed as a related document in the *SB OpMan*. The appellant has not cited violation of any of the *SB OpMan* requirements that reference the *StyleMan*.

The appellant has not cited normative P&P that require absolute adherence to the *StyleMan* in preparation of a draft. The opening paragraph of the *StyleMan* in fact makes it clear that editorial style is not arbitrary, that slavish adherence to the *StyleMan* is not intended, and that editorial style may be adapted to the needs of a particular standard.

“This manual establishes preferred style for the preparation of proposed IEEE standards. IEEE Standards Project Editors are available for advice and assistance throughout this process. Please note that many of the suggested guidelines can be adapted and restructured to suit the needs of a particular group; however, it is strongly recommended that working groups consult with IEEE Standards Project Editors before deviating from this style.

This statement makes it clear, that IEEE Standards Project Editors are the arbiters of style, not the WG officers and certainly not any individual ballot participant. Once approved, the publication editor may make any appropriate non-substantive changes, as indicated in *StyleMan* clause 3:

“The sponsor or a designated representative (usually the working group technical editor or chair) shall serve as the liaison between the working group and the

IEEE Standards Project Editor to answer questions and to review the document when it is in its final stages of production to ensure that editorial changes have not affected the technical content of the standard.”

In addition, in the second paragraph, the *StyleMan* itself makes its status clear in reference to procedural issues:

“This manual is not intended to be a guide to the procedural development of standards.”

While the organized presentation of comments included in *Appeal* clause 4 would have been appropriate, even elegant, as an attachment to the appellant’s first recirculation ballot comment, the D2.0 comments included in that clause are not relevant to this appeal.

What is relevant is conformance to IEEE-SA process in balloting the project and in properly recirculating negative comments to the ballot group. All of the appellant’s comments were considered, a response was provided to each comment, and the unresolved comments were recirculated to the ballot group. The ballot group approved the draft, the ballot group had an opportunity to change their ballots in recirculation based on the appellant’s comments and the responses provided; but as the ballot statistics emphasize, the ballot group did not agree with the appellant. The simple fact is , process was followed and there is no procedural ground for appeal on the issues of style.

To reiterate, the initial ballot on P802.3REVam comfortably exceeded the IEEE-SA requirements for consensus, with 85% approval. That approval percentage increased to 91% after the ballot group reviewed the appellant’s comments and the responses to those comments in first recirculation ballot. Subsequently, in response to, and in spite of, the one pile-on first recirculation disapprove ballot in support of the appellant’s comments, the approval percentage increased to 96% in the second recirculation ballot.

### **3.2 IEEE Standards Companion (Appeal, 2.3.2)**

The *Companion* is not a normative document. Quoting from its introduction:

“It is not a rule book in and of itself, but something a bit more expressive, that may be able to offer some background and detail that a series of rules can’t. If there’s any discrepancy between this and the official rules, those rules are correct and this companion is in error.”

The comment resolution processes described in the *Companion* are not required, but are only a recommended practice. [See Attachment 5, email on non-normative status of the *Companion*.]

The normative procedural documents and relevant requirements (*SB Bylaws* 5.2.4 and *SB OpMan* 5.4.3.2) do not require the actions listed in *Appeal* 2.3.3.1. As highlighted in *Appeal* 2.5, this is not the first time editorial style has been raised on 802.3 project ballots with the appellant remaining unsatisfied by the response to his comments. Failure to resolve comments in the past was sufficient basis for determination that similar failure was likely with P802.3REVam.

The appellant’s assertion that there was no invitation to attend a comment resolution meeting is false. [See Attachment 6, appellant’s email in response to the announcement of the D2.0 comment resolution meeting. *Appeal*, 2.3.3.2 also indicates appellant’s attendance at a comment resolution meeting (the D2.1 comment resolution meeting)].

The appellant’s assertion in *Appeal*, 2.3.3.2 that the “BRG effectively excluded the commenter from comment discussions but [sic] deferring summary issues to the WG” is also false. Deferral to the 802.3 meeting was by mutual consent when the ballot resolution committee meeting could not approve consensus responses to specific comments [see *Appeal* 2.5, 8<sup>th</sup> paragraph]

There are further errors of fact in the assertions of *Appeal*, 2.3.3.2. [See Attachment 7, extract from the unapproved minutes of 802.3.] The appellant was given the opportunity to speak in the 802.3 WG meeting on multiple unresolved comments. The appellant advocated alternate responses to a number of unresolved comments. The P802.3REVam editor’s recommended

responses were overwhelmingly adopted as the response to comments. This process took 44 minutes (based on recorded time of motions).

The minutes clearly indicate the point when, by motion of the WG, the order of business was established to consider the editor's proposed responses to all remaining comments in a "bucket" vote. Only at that point was the appellant not allowed to present the alternate response, as the order of business had been established to vote on the editor's proposed responses. However, the appellant was allowed and did speak against the bucket motion. The comment resolution process completed after 59 minutes.

At no point did the Chair or Vice Chair prevent the appellant from speaking. The Chair only ruled that discussion be consistent with the order of business of the group. It is important to note that the appellant (an 802.3 observer) did not have the right to speak, but was extended that courtesy by the WG Chair [*LMS P&P*, 7.2.3.5]:

"Working Group meetings are open to anyone who has complied with the registration requirements (if any) for the meeting. Only members have the right to participate in the discussions. The privilege of observers to participate in discussions may be granted by the Working Group Chair."

The minutes record that during this work, the Chair received a report that a non-member was voting against the motions adopting responses to comments. The appeal panel is advised that the Chair was told that it was the appellant that was voting though not a member, the Chair did not publicly identify the appellant as violating the rules, but rather choose to reprove without naming the offender. An examination of the vote counts indicate that the opposition to accepting the P802.3REVam editor's proposed responses then dropped by one vote.

The appellant's assertion in *Appeal*, 2.3.3.3 is also false. The Chair of the RAC was contacted to clarify the status of the appellant's comments, and contrary to the wording of the appellant (that the comments were by an IEEE/RAC reviewer), it was clarified that the comments were those of an individual and had no official status with the RAC. Subsequent to the 16 March informal appeal resolution meeting and in response to a request of the appellant, the appellant's OUI related comments were forwarded to the Chair of the RAC, without any further request for action from the RAC. [See Attachment 8, email to Chair of RAC.] The assertion that the acknowledged experts were ignored is also false. The OUI text in IEEE Std 802.3 was in fact generated in cooperation with the RAC and was reviewed by the RAC when introduced into the document. The panel should also note that the appellant is not the only ballot group member with RAC credentials.

The appellant's assertion in *Appeal*, 2.3.3.4 is false. IEEE editorial staff has been consulted during all stages of the project. The plan for phasing P802.3REVam with other amendment projects was developed with IEEE editorial staff. It was through consultation with editorial staff that the work plan for P802.3REVam was agreed. P802.3REVam/D1.0 was produced by an IEEE editor. The draft was then passed to the TF editor for WG ballot. The draft was passed back to IEEE editorial staff to merge the recently published IEEE Std 802.3ah-2004 into P802.3REVam. The TF editor only added the approved maintenance responses after that merge to create the D2.0 initial Sponsor ballot draft. It was through consultation with IEEE editorial staff that the TF received instruction that the IEEE editor would only handle comments on style during publication preparation. IEEE editorial staff in fact was even consulted on the draft response to some of the appellant's comments that are included in *Appeal*, clause 4.

While the appellant may not be satisfied, as indicated in *Appeal*, 2.3.3.5 that differences in style are not justified, he is at odds with the ballot group that saw the comments and responses in recirculation and approved the recommendation to defer such issues to the publication editor.

Similarly, the ballot group did not agree with the appellant on the issue of Pascal code raised in *Appeal*, 2.3.3.6.

The issue raised in *Appeal*, 2.3.3.7 is not relevant as there is no procedural violation cited. It is the appellant that in fact made issues obscure by submitting hundreds of comments on each

instance of an editorial style issue. For example, the appellant submitted 304 now admitted incorrect comments on the capitalization of the PICS table column heading “Value/Comment” as listed in *Appeal*, 4.1.1.

There is no requirement that comment responses be presented in a particular order in the recirculation package. But, the appellant has another error of fact in the *Appeal*. MyBallot did in fact display comments in comment number order. As an alternative aid for the ballot group participants, a searchable PDF of the comments and responses in document order was posted on the 802.3 web pages, but not included in the ballot package available through myBallot.

Other false assumptions of the appellant, misleading statements and false statements included in the *Appeal* are commented on in Attachment 8.

#### **4.0 Reply to assertions of adverse effects (Appeal 2.2)**

The consensus approval by the ballot group of the standard is the ultimate indication of the acceptability of a proposed standard’s content, not the preferences of a single balloter. The appellant wrote, “Simply stated, this document is for anyone w/o extensive experience.” (Most likely, appellant intended to write the opposite sentiment.) The appellees wouldn’t agree with the appellant statement as written, but will reiterate a fact expressed in comment responses that illustrates the usefulness of the standard. The successful deployment by hundreds of implementers of hundreds of millions of interoperable Ethernet devices is factual proof that the standard can be successfully used by competent engineers.

The appellant’s assertion that “editors can only be selected from those that understand the folklore” and that “responses has limited the number of qualified 802.3 editors” are also false and contradicted by the facts. The five amendments to IEEE Std 802.3-2002 give editor credits to 25 different individuals, the vast majority having had limited experience within 802.3 when appointed as editors. These editors were chosen for their technical expertise and ability to accurately document the complex technical material included in 802.3 projects. It is unprofessional for the appellant to belittle the qualifications of these dedicated volunteer editors in this way.

The appellant’s assertion that “preferential treatment is required of IEEE Editors” is also not supported by any facts. When the statement of the appellant was provided to the IEEE Manager, Standards Publishing, the simple summary of the response was: “In short, the statement is inaccurate.”

#### **5.0 Recommendations of Appellees**

While the appeal could be disallowed on procedural grounds, that might not best serve the interests of either the appellees, the members of IEEE 802.3, the IEEE Standards Association or the industry in general.

Consequently, we respectfully request that based on the evidence included in this reply brief the appeal panel rule:

1. That the appellant has not proven any violation of normative IEEE-SA process.
2. That the actions in question of the Chair and Vice Chair of IEEE 802.3 (the appellees) were consistent with IEEE-SA process.
3. That the appeal panel finds no basis on which to question the sponsor ballot process of P802.3REVam and consequently its approval by the Sponsor ballot group.
4. That no remedial action is required of the Chair and Vice Chair of IEEE 802.3.

P802.3-REVamrecirc1-announce.txt

Dear IEEE P802.3-REVam-1 Balloting Group Member:

This e-mail is to advise you of the opening of IEEE Standards Sponsor Revision Ballot Recirculation - 1 for:

Title: Information technology -- Telecommunications and information exchange between systems -- Local and metropolitan area networks -- specific requirements Part 3: Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method and Physical Layer Specifications

Scope: This project is a revision of IEEE Std 802.3-2002 integrating approved amendments and corrigenda plus corrections and clarifications submitted as maintenance changes through the IEEE 802.3 maintenance process. The project will not add any significant new functionality.

Purpose: This project is expected to merge at least four amendments into the base standard. It also adds maintenance changes submitted through the IEEE 802.3 maintenance process (www.ieee802.org/3/maint) to fix errors and ambiguities in the published standard. This will provide a single base document for ongoing work and satisfy IEEE-SA SB requirements.

\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT \*\*\*\*\*

If this is a recirculation of a Reaffirmation Ballot it may include amendments and/or corrigenda to the base Standard.

Since this is a recirculation ballot, you need only respond if you wish to change your initial vote. If you do not respond to this recirculation ballot, your last vote will be carried forward. Also, as this is a recirculation ballot, a change to 'do not approve' (i.e., a negative vote) which is submitted with comments, shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted document, clauses affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted document that are the subject of the unresolved negative votes." (IEEE Standards Board Operations Manual, Part 5.4.3.2)

BALLOT OPENS: 1-Mar-2005

BALLOT CLOSES: 16-Mar-2005.

No votes and/or comments will be accepted after 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the close date. Make sure you review the document, cast your vote, and submit your comments before the closing date/time.

\*\*\*\*\* TO ACCESS THE DOCUMENT, SUBMIT YOUR VOTE, AND SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS \*\*\*\*\*

1. Log onto myBallot the IEEE Standards Association's (IEEE SA) Electronic Balloting System at <https://balloting.standards.ieee.org>
2. Click on "Manage myBallot Activity." If your logon provides Sponsor access, you must click on MyBallot Control Panel first.
3. Locate P802.3-REVam.
4. Click on the DRAFT# to open the draft/standard; click on the drop-down box to change your vote; click on the comments link to submit your comments.

REMEMBER: This draft/standard is posted for your review for balloting purposes only and should not be copied or redistributed.

NOTE: If you are fulfilling coordination duties only, you will not be able to cast a vote. Coordinators can only submit comments. Please follow the instructions above to access the document and submit your comments

\*\*\*\*\* MESSAGE FROM THE WORKING GROUP CHAIR \*\*\*\*\*

Because of the large size of IEEE Std 802.3, and to simplify your review of changes made to the draft, please make your comments on changes against the comparison document that only includes the pages changed from D2.0 to D2.1.

\*\*\*\*\* QUESTIONS \*\*\*\*\*

If you should have any questions about the document, please contact :

DAVID J LAW  
david\_law@ieee.org  
or the Sponsor Chair:  
ROBERT M GROW

P802.3-REVamrecirc1-announce.txt

bob.grow@ieee.org

NOTE: To show our appreciation of your effort, the names of all voters will be listed in the front matter of the published standard. Your vote and your contact information will *\*not\** be included.

Thank you for your participation in this ballot.

**Grow, Bob**

---

**From:** David V James [dvj@alum.mit.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 02, 2005 9:37 AM  
**To:** Paul Nikolich  
**Cc:** Grow, Bob; David Law  
**Subject:** RE: Appeal on P802.3-REVam-1 Sponsor Ballot

Paul,

Thanks for the timely response.

Your suggestion appears productive as well as procedurally correct. Sounds good.

Since I will be somewhat outnumbered, with folks that have far more political expertise than myself, I would like to ask a simple request. Can I invite a compatriot that has also had extensive experience in editing and IEEE rules?

Respectfully,  
DVJ

David V. James  
3180 South Ct  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Home: +1.650.494.0926  
+1.650.856.9801  
Cell: +1.650.954.6906  
Fax: +1.360.242.5508  
Base: dvj@alum.mit.edu

>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Paul Nikolich [mailto:paul.nikolich@att.net]  
>> Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2005 7:26 AM  
>> To: David V James; Paul Nikolich  
>> Cc: David Law; Bob Grow  
>> Subject: Re: Appeal on P802.3-REVam-1 Sponsor Ballot  
>>  
>>  
>> David,  
>>  
>> I would prefer to avoid the formal appeals process if possible.  
>> Let's try  
>> to resolve your concerns and move forward with the draft. I offer my  
>> services as a means to facilitate the informal resolution of  
>> your concerns.  
>> I recommend you, me, David Law and Bob Grow meet and work this  
>> out at the  
>> upcoming plenary session.  
>>  
>> As for your question on initiation of the appeal process, it is  
>> specified in  
>> the 802 P&P section 7.1.7 Appeal and complaint process.  
>>  
>> Step number one is as follows: "Every attempt should be made to resolve  
>> concerns informally, since it is recognized that a formal  
>> appeals process  
>> has a tendency to negatively, and sometimes permanently, affect  
>> the goodwill  
>> and cooperative relationships between and among persons."

>>  
>> If we cannot work out your concerns at a meeting at the plenary session,  
>> then you should take the next step. But let's try to resolve  
>> the concerns  
>> informally. OK?  
>>  
>> Regards,  
>>  
>> --Paul  
>>  
>>  
>> ----- Original Message -----  
>> From: "David V James" <dvj@alum.mit.edu>  
>> To: "Paul Nikolich" <p.nikolich@ieee.org>  
>> Cc: "David Law" <David\_Law@eur.3com.com>; "Bob Grow" <bob.grow@intel.com>  
>> Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2005 2:58 AM  
>> Subject: Appeal on P802.3-REVam-1 Sponsor Ballot  
>>  
>>  
>> > Paul,  
>> >  
>> > Based on the P802.3-REVam-1 D2.1 nonspecific comment  
>> > rejections (generally titled accept in principle), along  
>> > with the lack of any attempt to resolve comments, I will  
>> > be appealing the conclusion of this Sponsor Ballot  
>> > process.  
>> >  
>> > Since (I believe) the LMSC is the first avenue of  
>> > appeal, please let me know when and how your would  
>> > prefer this appeal to be initiated.  
>> >  
>> > Appreciation in advance,  
>> > DVJ  
>> >  
>> > David V. James  
>> > 3180 South Ct  
>> > Palo Alto, CA 94306  
>> > Home: +1.650.494.0926  
>> > +1.650.856.9801  
>> > Cell: +1.650.954.6906  
>> > Fax: +1.360.242.5508  
>> > Base: dvj@alum.mit.edu  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >

**Grow, Bob**

---

**From:** David V James [dvj@alum.mit.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2005 11:32 PM  
**To:** bob.ohara@ieee.org  
**Cc:** Paul Nikolich; David Law; Grow, Bob  
**Subject:** My appeal of 802.3REV BRG actions

**Attachments:** dvjAppeal2005Apr14.pdf



dvjAppeal2005Apr14.pdf (115 KB...

Bob,

Here is the contents of appeal, which by my reading of LMSC rules should be sent to the Recording Secretary, which (based on the last LMSC minutes) is yourself.

Please let me know if anything is missing or incorrect.

From the last meeting, I assume this will be discussed at the 802.3 LMSC meeting in San Francisco.

Thanks,  
DVJ

David V. James  
3180 South Ct  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Home: +1.650.494.0926  
+1.650.856.9801  
Cell: +1.650.954.6906  
Fax: +1.360.242.5508  
Base: dvj@alum.mit.edu

**Initial Ballot**

RESPONSE RATE

This ballot has met the 75% returned ballot requirement.

69 eligible people in this ballot group.

41 affirmative votes

7 negative votes with comments

2 negative votes without comments

2 abstention votes

52 votes received = 75 % returned

4 % abstention

APPROVAL RATE

The 75% affirmation requirement is being met.

41 affirmative votes

7 negative votes with comments

48 votes = **85% affirmative**

**Recirculation #1**

RESPONSE RATE

This ballot has met the 75% returned ballot requirement.

69 eligible people in this ballot group.

50 affirmative votes

5 negative votes with comments

0 negative votes without comments

2 abstention votes

57 votes received = 83 % returned

4 % abstention

APPROVAL RATE

The 75% affirmation requirement is being met.

50 affirmative votes

5 negative votes with comments

55 votes = **91% affirmative**

**Recirculation #2**

RESPONSE RATE

This ballot has met the 75% returned ballot requirement.

69 eligible people in this ballot group.

54 affirmative votes

2 negative votes with comments

0 negative votes without comments

2 abstention votes

58 votes received = 84 % returned

3 % abstention

APPROVAL RATE

The 75% affirmation requirement is being met.

54 affirmative votes

2 negative votes with comments

56 votes = **96% affirmative**



a.ickowicz@ieee.org

22/04/2005 19:18


To David Law/GB/3Com@3Com

cc y.hoSang@ieee.org

bcc

Subject Standards Companion Questions

History:

 This message has been forwarded.

Hi David,

Yvette forwarded me your questions on the IEEE Standards Companion relating to the ballot comment resolution group. Your questions are below and responses are interleaved:

<<1) Does the text mean that the ballot resolution committee has to contact each and every negative balloter to try to resolve their comments prior to recirculating the responses to the ballot group?>>

No. They should try to contact a balloter if they care to negotiate the details of a change with that person. But if there's no need to discuss changes or rejection with them in the hope of avoiding an "unresolved negative" category, they don't need to contact. Remember that this is optional since the Companion is not an official document.

<<2) Is public notification of the location and date of the BRC meeting sufficient to comply with the text?>>

You are not required to comply with the Companion.

<<3) Is this in fact a requirement or a best practice?>>

The latter. The Companion has no official standing as a rules document. It's just guidance.

Let me know if you have further questions.

Thanks and Best,  
Andy

Andrew Ickowicz

Program Manager, Technical Program Development  
IEEE Standards Activities  
Phone: +1 732 562 3810  
Email: a.ickowicz@ieee.org  
Check out our website at <http://standards.ieee.org>

----- Forwarded by Yvette Ho Sang/STDS/STAFF/US/IEEE on 04/19/2005 08:10 AM  
-----

"David Law"  
<David\_Law@eur.3com.com>  
04/18/2005 03:05 PM

To: "Yvette Ho Sang" <y.hosang@ieee.org>  
cc:  
Subject: Urgent - Standards Companion text

Hi Yvette,

Here is the text I was mentioning from the Standards Companion - it's paragraph 3 onwards under the heading 'Negative votes with specific comments' [ <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/companion/annexb-c.html#top> ].

Thanks again,  
David

If the BRG does not accept the objection "as is" but proposes an alternative solution or if the BRG rejects the objection, the voter must be contacted by a technical reviewer who will

**Grow, Bob**

**From:** David V James [dvj@alum.mit.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 21, 2005 4:06 PM  
**To:** David\_Law@ieee.org  
**Cc:** Grow, Bob  
**Subject:** Resolution meeting

David,

I will not be attending the Vancouver meeting.  
 However, feel free to call on questions (if any).

DVJ

David V. James  
 3180 South Ct  
 Palo Alto, CA 94306  
 Home: +1.650.494.0926  
       +1.650.856.9801  
 Cell: +1.650.954.6906  
 Fax: +1.360.242.5508  
 Base: dvj@alum.mit.edu

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: owner-stds-802-3@LISTSERV.IEEE.ORG  
 >> [mailto:owner-stds-802-3@LISTSERV.IEEE.ORG]On Behalf Of David Law  
 >> Sent: Friday, January 21, 2005 3:18 PM  
 >> To: STDS-802-3@LISTSERV.IEEE.ORG  
 >> Subject: [802.3] IEEE P802.3REVam/D2.0 Sponsor ballot results and  
 >> comment report

>> Dear Colleagues,

>> The IEEE 802 LMSC sponsor ballot on IEEE P802.3REVam/D2.0 closed with the  
 >> following results:

>> Eligible balloters	69	
>> Approve	41	(83.7%)
>> Negative with comments	8	
>> Negative without comments	1	
>> Abstention	2	(3.8%)
>>	==	
>> Ballots returned	52	(75.4%)
>>	==	

>> Approval rate = Approve / Approve + Negative with comments  
 >> = 41 / ( 41 + 8 )  
 >> = 83.7% (> 75%)

>> Abstain rate = Abstention / Ballots returned  
 >> = 2/52  
 >> = 3.8% (< 30%)

>> Return rate = Ballots returned / Eligible balloters  
 >> = 52/69  
 >> = 75.4% (> 75%)

>> The draft has therefore met the requirements for return rate,

>> approval rate, and  
 >> abstention rate.  
 >>  
 >> We received a total of 1959 comments on this draft. As those of you that  
 >> participated in the IEEE P802.3REVam sponsor ballot will be  
 >> aware, the MyBallot  
 >> system allows a balloter to mark each of their comments as  
 >> either Editorial,  
 >> Technical or General. In the case where the balloter votes  
 >> Disapprove, they  
 >> additionally have the opportunity to mark each of their comments  
 >> as 'Must be  
 >> satisfied' to identify comments that caused their Disapprove vote.  
 >>  
 >> This combination of three comment types, and the ability to mark  
 >> a comment as  
 >> 'Must be satisfied', results in a total of six different  
 >> comments types, E  
 >> (Editorial), ER (Editorial required), T (Technical), TR  
 >> (Technical required), G  
 >> (General) and GR (General required). I have therefore provided a  
 >> breakdown of  
 >> the 1959 comments we have received into these categories.  
 >>

>> E (Editorial)	59	
>> ER (Editorial required)	1767	
>> T (Technical)	42	
>> TR (Technical required)	79	
>> G ((TechnicalGeneral)		5
>> GR (General required)	7	
>>	----	
>> Total	1959	
>>	----	

>> A preliminary report containing each of these comments can be  
 >> found at the  
 >> following URL:

>> [http://www.ieee802.org/3/am/comments/802.3REVam\\_D2p0.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/am/comments/802.3REVam_D2p0.pdf)

>> The IEEE P802.3REVam Task Force will be meeting next week to  
 >> perform comment  
 >> resolution on Wednesday 26th January during the IEEE 802.3  
 >> Interim sessions at  
 >> the Hyatt Regency Vancouver, Vancouver, BC, Canada. The meeting  
 >> notice can be  
 >> found at the URL:

>> [http://www.ieee802.org/3/interims/vancouver\\_04.html](http://www.ieee802.org/3/interims/vancouver_04.html)

>> Best regards,  
 >> David Law

```
>> |=====|
>> | David Law |
>> | Vice-Chair IEEE 802.3 |
>> | 3Com |
>> | Princes Exchange |
>> | 1 Earl Grey Street |
>> | Edinburgh |
>> | EH3 9BN |
>> | Scotland |
>> | Phone: +44 131 659 8218 |
>> | Fax: +44 131 659 8001 |
>> | E-Mail: David_Law@ieee.org |
>> |=====|
```

**MAINTENANCE – David Law P802.3REVam**

Mr. Law discussed new maintenance requests along with the REVam ballot. Mr. Law indicated that the recirculation ballot closed last night at midnight with a higher approval rating.

Please refer to [http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/mar05/0305\\_maint\\_close\\_report.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/mar05/0305_maint_close_report.pdf)

There was a discussion on new comments submitted against the latest draft.

There was a suggestion that conditional approval for submission to RevCom following the March meeting would be appropriate.

Mr Law stated that a comment resolution meeting was held earlier in the day however the meeting failed to reach consensus on 5 of the comments. Due to this these comments will have to be resolved during this meeting.

Mr Law then presented MyBallot comment #1.

There was a discussion on comment #1 of IEEE P802.3REVam D2.1. The editor, Mr. Law, showed his proposed response. An alternative wording was proposed by Mr. James, after which the motion below was made to accept the editors recommendation.

The motion below as phrased refers to the comment and proposed response to comment #1 of the REVam D2.1 comment database.

**MOTION #4**

To accept the editor's recommendation.

M: Mike McCormack

S: Simon Muller

Tech 75%

Date: 17-Mar-2005 2:06PM

Y:60 N:2 A:28 MOTION PASSES

There was a discussion on comment #5 of IEEE P802.3REVam D2.1. The editor, Mr. Law, showed his proposed response. Mr. James also suggested an alternate response.

**MOTION #5**

To accept the editor's recommendation for IEEE P802.3REVam 2.1 comment #5.

M: Mike McCormack

S: Hugh Barrass

Tech 75%

Y:56 N:3 A:17  
MOTION PASSES 17-Mar-2005 2:14PM

There was a discussion on the previous motion adopting a comment resolution. The chair ruled that the request to reopen consideration of that comment resolution would require a motion for reconsideration. There was no motion to reconsider.

There was a discussion on comment #6 of IEEE P802.3REVam D2.1. The editor, Mr. Law, showed his proposed response. Mr. James also suggested an alternate response. A motion from the floor was made as recorded below.

**MOTION #6**

The editor provide his recommendations for all unresolved comments and that this body be provided the opportunity to vote all editor recommendations in bucket form.

M: Mike McCormack  
S: Peter Bradshaw  
Tech 75%

MOTION PASSES BY A VOICE VOTE\* 17-Mar-2005 2:29PM

\*Motion 6 was passed by a voice vote and there was opposition. The Chair ruled the motion passed and asked if anyone wanted a count of the vote. No one responded with a request for a count.

Mr. James made a request to present alternative resolution to his comment (MyBallot comment #7 of IEEE P802.3REVam D2.1), which was included within the bucket motion.

The Chair ruled that the previous motion established the order of business which was to consider the editor's proposed responses in a "bucket" vote.

It was reported to the chair that an attendee had been voting on motions even though that attendee was not an IEEE 802.3 voter. A request was made to display the list of voters to the group. Mr. Grow showed the list of voters coming into the meeting and voters that were given voting rights on Monday. Mr. Diab read the names of the attendees that were given voting privileges at the beginning of this session.

Four more comments (MyBallot comments #7, #6, #3 and #17 of IEEE P802.3REVam D2.1) were shown with the editor's proposed responses.

There was a discussion on making a motion to accept response. Following presentation of the editors proposed responses, the following motion was made:

**MOTION #7**

Accept the editors recommendations for 3, 6, 7 and 17 as recorded in the comment database.

M: Mike McCormack

S: Bill Woodruff

Tech 75%

Y:61 N:1 A:15

MOTION PASSES 17-Mar-2005 2:44PM

Mr. Law discussed the future plans for P802.3REVam.

**MOTION #8**

IEEE 802.3 authorises the IEEE P802.3REVam Editor to incorporate the comments and produce D2.2 for Sponsor recirculation ballot.

IEEE 802.3 authorises the IEEE P802.3REVam Task Force to conduct meetings and recirculation ballots as necessary to resolve comments received during Sponsor Balloting.

IEEE 802.3 requests conditional approval (procedure 10) for submission to the REVCOM.

Upon RevCom approval submit to ISO for fast track consideration.

M: D. Law

S: Kevin Q Daines

Tech 75%

PASSED Date: 17-Mar-2005 2:48PM

Y: 70 N: 0 A: 7


Due to the schedule, Mr. Grow asked if there were objections to moving the break to this point. None were given and a break was taken at 2:48pm.

**Task Forces****P802.3an 10GBASE-T – Brad Booth**

Please refer to [http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/mar05/0305\\_an\\_close\\_report.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/mar05/0305_an_close_report.pdf)

Mr. Booth gave a closing report.

Mr. Booth showed the following two liaison reports:

 **David Law/GB/3Com**  
- Consultant Engineer, Technology Group, DBU  
Desk: +44 (0) 131 659 8218 (VPN 410 8218)  
Mobile: +44 (0) 7711 502962

14/04/2005 15:36

To Tony Jeffree <tony@JEFFREE.CO.UK>  
cc  
bcc  
Subject OUI related comments

Hi Tony,

At the plenary we were talking about the comments DVJ placed against IEEE P802.3REVam in realltion to OUIs and I said I would send you a copy of the comments and response. Please find these attached, if you wish to access the draft it is available at:

<http://www.ieee802.org/3/private/maint/am/2.1/index.html>  
Login: 802.3  
Password: D\_Boggs

Bye for now,  
David

## Comments on supplemental material included in *Material for P802.3REV appeal*

*[Header numbers and titles are those in the Appeal.]*

### 1.1 802.3 concerns

The P802.3REVam draft was prepared by a professional IEEE editor. IEEE Std 802.3-2002 including its five published amendments were all professionally edited. The draft was prepared using IEEE-SA provided FrameMaker templates as recommended by IEEE editorial staff, and exception to requirements of the *IEEE Style Guide* are discussed with the IEEE editorial staff. IEEE-SA process does not require development of separate editorial guidelines than those included in the IEEE Style Manual.

While the appellant might be able to find other amateur editors to agree they are “shocked”, that isn’t the reaction of the many professional and amateur editors that produced the draft and its predecessor documents. Few would argue that there are areas where IEEE Std 802.3 editorial consistency could be improved, and that is why some of the appellants recommendations were accepted and implemented in the draft (those possibly affecting technical content); and is why most of the comments of the appellant will be passed to professional editors who can make the proper decision on items not affecting technical content. To quote the IEEE Manager, Standards Publishing [see Attachment 10]:

“These issues are addressed by professional editors during the publication of the document. My only recommendation is that, if a style is chosen, the working group should use that style consistently throughout the document. However, the editor will point out any inconsistencies during the professional edit.”

The appellant simply is in disagreement with the BRC recommendation to pass those strictly editorial items to the professional IEEE editors– a position endorsed in recirculation by the Sponsor ballot group

The appellant raises one technical issue in this section, (reiterated in 2.3.3.6) that of the Pascal code used to specify the CSMA/CD MAC. Comments consistent with this complaint were rejected with reason for rejection recirculated to the ballot group.

### 1.2 802.x groups

The actions or inactions of other 802 working groups are not relevant to the appeal of specific actions or inactions of the 802.3 WG Chair and Vice Chair.

## 2.4 Specific remedial action(s) that would satisfy the appellant’s concerns

**2.4.2** The appellant implies that the complete draft was not available in recirculation which is false. The complete draft was included in ballot recirculation. The appellants request to “recirculate the draft with all pages (not just changed pages) would in fact be an exception to normal IEEE-SA process, where as specified in *SB OpMan*, 5.4.3.2 it is the substantive changes that are to be recirculated.

**2.4.4** The BRCs did accept all comments it considered valid and implement them in the draft. It did refer many comments that were strictly of an editorial nature to the publication editor as was agreed with IEEE editorial staff prior to providing that response to those editorial comments. It should be reiterated though that it is the ballot group that is the judge of comment validity, not the BRC, and all unresolved comments, including those of the appellant, were recirculated to the ballot group for their review of the response.

**2.4.5** The OUI related comments were forwarded to the Chair of the RAC prior to the filing of the *Appeal*, and prior to the final recirculation ballot. It should also be reiterated that the appellant was not the only ballot participant with RAC credentials, and the appellant was an individual, not a designated representative of the RAC, in his ballot participation. It should also be reiterated that the OUI text in IEEE Std 802.3REVam was originally generated and reviewed by RAC members during its original inclusion in the standard.

## **2.5 Previous efforts to resolve the objection(s)**

The historical information provided in section 2.5 is not relevant to the actions under appeal other than providing clear documentation that the appellant has previously not been able to provide sufficiently convincing arguments to ballot groups to reduce consensus in recirculation.

The appellant's misidentification of the project is clear evidence of his obsession with editorial style issues at the expense of technical substance. The project referred to here as EPON was P802.3ah, Ethernet in the First Mile (EPON only being one of four major subgroups in that project).

The appellant's criticism of the comment resolution process for P802.3ah are similarly not backed up with evidence of violation of process. There is no normative requirement that responses need be written by more than one individual. The appellant is also incorrect in his summation of the P802.3ah Santa Clara meeting -- it was not only editors that could pull comments out of one of the "bins".

It should be noted when P802.3ah was reviewed at RevCom, multiple members commented that the P802.3ah Task Force went much further than was required in processing the comments of the appellant. The comments could simply have all been disposed of by refusing to accept them in their non-responsive form of submission.

The appellant has no factual basis for his statements of why the FrameMaker Template project was killed. The appellant fails to mention that he had asserted personal copyright on a group work item and had not provided copyright release for use of the material to IEEE.

While the specialized tools mentioned by the appellant may make comment generation more efficient, they certainly make comment processing more difficult. (For example, 304 separate comments to change capitalization of "Value/Comment".) The negative reaction to the appellant's tools in a recent 802.1 ballot could be cited here, but are not relevant to the appeal.

The description of the March BRC meeting deadlock is also misleading. The fact is that the few attendees voting in the D2.1 comment resolution meeting could not establish 75% consensus on some comment responses, and therefore it was by consent of the negative balloters present that the comments were deferred to the IEEE 802.3 meeting. The WG minutes speak well to the reaction of 802.3 to the appellant's approach to resolution of these comments.

It is important to reiterate as established by the minutes that the commenter was prevented from presenting his proposed response to his comment by a motion of the WG that established the order of business. The appellant is here providing misleading information as he was allowed to present alternate comment responses on other comments each of which was overwhelmingly rejected by the WG by motions adopting the P802.3REVam editor's proposed responses.

### **3.1.1 Deferred corrections**

No substantive changes were deferred to the publication editor. All comments were individually reviewed on all ballots and only those that were clearly editorial and did not affect the meaning of the text were deferred.

### **3.1.2 Table of contents**

This is a publication requirement, not a requirement for ballot. It is obvious that complete front matter cannot be provided for Sponsor ballot. For example, it would be inappropriate to speculate on the date of Standards Board approval and the members of the Board before Sponsor ballot is initiated. Similarly, copyright statements and other "boilerplate" information must be changed in the same way header and footer information is changed as part of the publication process.

The P802.3REVam draft did include all appropriate substantive front matter (e.g., the Introduction), the TOC is not substantive

### **3.1.3 – 3.1.5**

Items of this sort were considered and either accepted, rejected with reason or if determined by the BRC to be strictly editorial style were referred for consideration during publication preparation.

### **3.1.6 Capitalization**

Capitalization issues not considered of technical substance were referred to the publication editor for consideration.

### **3.1.7 – 3.1.8**

In cooperation with SCC 14 coordination, issues in this area were addressed and included in the approved draft. The SCC 14 D2.2 ballot coordination comment indicated satisfaction with the draft.

## **3.2 2005 edition**

Any requirements in the draft 2005 style manual are irrelevant to the appeal as balloting of P802.3REVam began in 2004. More importantly the 2005 IEEE Style Manual referenced by the appellant is only a draft.

## **4. Specific comment concerns**

As pointed out in the reply brief, the comments recounted in this clause are not valid items for appeal. All that is appropriate for appeal is if proper procedure was followed. It is evident from the comment responses that each comments was considered, responses were written to those comments and those comments requiring recirculation were included in the recirculation package provided to the ballot group.

The commenter simply is in disagreement with the consensus opinion of the ballot group as expressed by the ballot results.

Many of the appellant's comments have been referred to the publication editor. The wisdom of this is evidenced by that action on the 304 comments about capitalization of Value/Comment. It is clear from appellants recounting of consultation with IEEE editorial staff that the professional editor will do the right thing and will not implement the appellant's recommendation. It is important to restate that the P802.3REVam project plan was developed in consultation with IEEE editorial staff, including the decision to defer issues that were strictly ones of style for consideration during the publication process.

The appellant claims inequitable treatment. An examination of the comment responses will show that the ballot resolution group provided the same response to strictly editorial comments submitted by other balloters. That is evidence of equitable treatment based on the content of the comment, not as asserted based on the source of the comment.

The appellant speculates in 4.1.2 that comments were not accepted because sources for figures were not available. The facts prove otherwise. Some comments that were accepted did result in changed figures. Some of these changes required simple modifications of figures drawn in FrameMaker but others were best implemented by redrawing figures in FrameMaker. The responses adopted by the BRC were based on merit, not on unavailability or the difficulty of editing the figure source file.

## **5. Common excuses**

The appellants listing in this clause is not a faithful report of comment responses. The language in this section is that of the appellant, and it is misleading, inflammatory, and unprofessional.

### **5.1 Standard excuses**

Editorial talent not an issue. As pointed out earlier, IEEE 802.3 has a large pool of experienced volunteer editors. That is not the concern. Where there is disagreement between appellant and others is a general concern among 802.3 experts about the technical bandwidth required to

appropriately review proposed changes to stable portions of the document where many see significant risk of introducing technical errors and more serious inconsistencies in IEEE Std 802.3.

The claim that 802.3 WG members only care about technical issues is blatantly false as indicated by the comment record. This is an example of the appellant's irresponsible and misleading rhetoric. The appellees do believe that the majority of the membership of 802.3 cares more about and would prefer to spend their valuable technical talent addressing technical accuracy rather than things like font sizes and table line widths.

Comment responses do not promise that IEEE editors will accept the editorial comments deferred to them. That would be inappropriate. The responses only promise that the comment will be forwarded for their consideration. The appellant makes a false assertion that technical judgment is required on issues deferred to the publication editor. The BRC and ballot group make the judgment if there is technical risk in deferring a comment through their votes. The appellant chooses to ignore the normative statement in the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* that states: "It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

Many of the other "claims" stated in this section have no resemblance to any comment response ever provided to the appellant. Other "claims" mislead by only stating a portion of the rationale provided in comment responses. It is true that IEEE style has changed since the original publication, and that fact has been stated in responses, but the appellant leaves out the substantive reason for not making a style change. That being the consensus that there is also a responsibility to the current users of the standard. This is similar to the judgment required in making technical changes. There is a responsibility to properly balance the important goal of maintaining interoperability with installed equipment, with the desire to add new capabilities that allow Ethernet to be applied in new markets applications. The fact that users of IEEE Std 802.3 based equipment can plug a 10BASE-T repeater built in 1990 into a 10/100/1000 switch port built in 2005 and have the network function properly is evidence of the wisdom of considering both legacy equipment and legacy users of IEEE Std 802.3.

## **5.2 Irrelevant responses**

While the appellant may find these responses irrelevant, the fact is that the appellant is nearly in the minority and an unsatisfied negative balloter. The ballot resolution group accepted the comment responses in recirculation, and the Sponsor ballot group was not swayed by the argument presented in the appellant's initial ballot comments nor in the appellant's summary restatement of those comments in recirculation ballots.

## Grow, Bob

---

**From:** y.hoSang@ieee.org  
**Sent:** Friday, May 27, 2005 5:41 AM  
**To:** David Law; Grow, Bob  
**Subject:** Question

David,

The official IEEE templates are the ones located at the following URL:

<http://standards.ieee.org/resources/development/writing/templates.html>

These templates will be updated in late June, so I have suggested that working groups wait until then to transfer new drafts into the template.

There could be an intense discussion about what is "better" or "flawed" and I'd prefer not to do so. We recommend that working groups use the official templates to avoid delays in publication.

Bob,

The use of FrameMaker templates by working groups makes the production system much more efficient. As you can imagine, there are different levels of expertise in using FrameMaker. What we've tried to do is keep the templates simple enough to reach the widest audience. We've also tried to address unfamiliarity with the tool through the EMS tutorials that are given. The working groups are not expected to be experts on grammar or style. These issues are addressed by professional editors during the publication of the document. My only recommendation is that, if a style is chosen, the working group should use that style consistently throughout the document. However, the editor will point out any inconsistencies during the professional edit.

The structure of IEEE 802 documents that we receive in FrameMaker does not require the type of additional effort that is inferred by the statement you quoted below. Any significant issues usually have to do with volunteers who are more sophisticated and introduce elements into the template that affect our production system in ways of which they are not aware. Most of the issues that we have experienced have to do with aspects of the electronic document that are often outside the control of the working group, e.g., platform issues (and this should soon be resolved), changing OS, or updated versions of the software. The main problems we face for Computer Society documents have to do with graphics and intellectual property issues outside the norm. We are developing a presentation on graphics that should assist volunteers, and we can arrange a tutorial at a Plenary. Unusual intellectual property issues have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

In short, the statement is inaccurate.

Regards,

Yvette Ho Sang  
Manager, Standards Publishing Programs  
IEEE Standards Activities  
Ph: +1 732 562 3814  
Fax: +1 732 562 1571  
<http://standards.ieee.org>

"David Law"  
<David\_Law@eur.3com.com>

To: y.hoSang@ieee.org  
cc: "Grow, Bob" <bob.grow@intel.com>  
Subject: Re: Question

05/26/2005 11:14  
AM

Hi Yvette,

Sort of related to Bob's question, I note that in a number of comments DVJ states as a suggested remedy:

1) Fix your templates, so this doesn't happen. 2) Use better templates, available on the MSC Sponsor web site:  
<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/msc/WordProcessors.html>

I wonder if you could comment on the assertion that the template available on the MSC Sponsor web site is indeed a better template. I see that the above referenced web site, somewhat to my surprise, states:

The MSC provides documentation tools for the development of its standards. Standards' developers are discouraged from using the IEEE providee templates, due to the incomplete/inconsistent nature of their styles and the known bugs contained within the IEEE templates.

Thanks very much,  
David

"Grow, Bob" <bob.grow@intel.com> wrote on 26/05/2005 01:01:47:

> Yvette:

> An assertion has been made about 802.3:

> "To cope with all of the draft particularities, preferential treatment  
> is required of IEEE Editors, to produce a credible draft that can be  
> shipped quickly. From past experience, this results in unnecessarily  
> delaying other standards, which typically receive a lower-priority in  
> the editing process."

> It was my impression that publication was comparatively easier than  
> average. I believe that the five amendment were published an average of  
> 33 days after approval (and most of the delay was at our end).

> Is this less than the publication goal for IEEE standards?

> Is there anything else factual that could be used to counter this  
> assertion.

> Of course if you agree with the assertion, I would be interest in  
> hearing that also.

> --Bob