

David Aragon	No	<p>Appreciate the reasons for the proposed one-at-a-time treatment of elements in 1.1.1.1 – 1.1.5, and the excellent terms. However, the division only makes technical sense as far as two or three elements – the data transfer interface (1.1.2), the voting equipment (1.1.1), and possibly the data storage/transfer equipment (1.1.5).</p> <p>The creation of separate Standards for communication protocols and for equipment is normal and long-established, so the conceptual division is sound up to that point.</p> <p>To separate the reassurance interfaces, however, returns us to the posture of P1583 – in about 2003 or 2004, when it was argued that transparency was not a functional requirement on voting systems per se, but an optional feature that could be specified and provided separately. One effect of that division was to implicitly favor a specific design, namely, a DRE with an added paper printer – the only available architecture reflecting that conceptual organization. Thus, a Standard developed under that framework was effectively constrained to be design based rather than performance based.</p> <p>In fairness, IEEE P1583 was not the only group to take that approach, for example, the State of California's XUVIAT requirements also described a voter-verified paper trail as specific additional equipment, and vendors did briefly produce DREs with added paper printers. The reports, that, although resulting from well-intentioned compromises in their current understanding of the issues, these systems were not particularly satisfactory from anyone's standpoint, and have largely been abandoned despite the great effort that went into them.</p> <p>To summarize, the proposed P&amp;P would err by organizing the Standards development in 1.1 according to a distinction which, already attempted by others for similar reasons, has already failed in practice.</p>	<p>Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&amp;P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&amp;P will copy it.</p>
Charles Cory	No	Section 1.0.2 does a very poor job of attempting to maintain a balanced committee.	The IEEE SA procedures must comply with the ANSI Essential requirements. The ANSI Essential requirements do NOT require balance except for the Sponsor Consensus Ballot. What this P&P tries to do is indicate a goal of balance but not force it, in order to comply with the ANSI Essential Requirements.
Charles Cory	No	Section 1.1 Scope is terrible. We don't know everything in advance as to what voting issues will require inclusion in the standards. Scope was a main goal of P1582 and it appears this draft wants to go down the same narrow path again. This isof advocacy research where one defines the answer and then only seeks and accepts data that confirms one's ideology.	Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it.
Charles Cory	No	Section 1.0 The TGDC rep should be an officer and term limited. That has always been a major issue in SCC 38.	The IEEE rules define that this position reports to the IEEE SA and not the SCC.
Charles Cory	No	Section 3.4.1 does not require the Chair to rotate meeting locations to allow all members of the committee to physically attend. Again, a major point of contention in the past.	Conditionally Accept, if there is sufficient support, by vote, in SCC38, then it should be accepted into the P&P.
Charles Cory	No	Section 3.4.4 was dropped regarding EAC TGDC rep.	The IEEE rules define that this position reports to the IEEE SA and not the SCC.
Charles Cory	No	No office of Treasurer is defined although Section 6.4 requires a Treasurer to collect meeting fees. Either drop the office or add a Treasurer.	This clause was left in just in case SCC38 had a reason to collect a meeting fee. If it did decide to collect a meeting fee, then the issue of Treasurer would be raised. At this time I do not foresee a meeting fee, so possibly we could remove this clause.
Charles Cory	No	Section 6.0 All meetings must be open to participation by teleconference or videoconference, not optionally. Also, meeting locations must rotate geographically across the country to give all members a chance to physically attend. Holding meetings only in New Jersey caused a great deal of frustration and anger in the past. There is good reason not to hold committee meetings in a variety of locations rotating from east to west and back again over time.	Conditionally Accept, if there is sufficient support, by vote, in SCC38, then it should be accepted into the P&P.
David Dil	No	Vote Reassurance Interface: true purpose. The purpose of such a facility is to ensure that there exists an indelible voter-verified record of the vote cast to enable audits and vote counts that are independent of any complex systems. While I hope that voters find such devices reassuring, their primary purpose is not to provide reassurance but to enable auditing.	I believe this comment is in reference to the Scope. Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it.
Chuck Gaston	Abs	I must abstain on the SCC38 Procedures, because (to the best of my knowledge) I have not received a "final" copy after all the August comments.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed.
Richard Johnson	No	The SCC38 Public Procedures document is far too unfinished and uncrafted to approve at this point. More editing and a focus on basic procedures are required. There are too many afterthought additions; it would help to separate out controversial aspects and could a separate set of Policy and Procedure provisions to get on with the task.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed.
Cam Kaner	No	IEEE P&P has modified things that cannot be modified, the draft is not ready for ballot.	This is a rule of the IEEE SA. / SCC38 wishes to change this rule then they have to contact the IEEE SA.
Arthur Keller	No	I agree with the comments by Mercuri, Simons, and Klien.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed.
Arthur Khoo	No	SCC 38 Chair and Officers shall be nominated and voted for in an election instead of appointment.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed.
Stan Klein	No	1. The document is incomplete regarding required choices and thereby inappropriate for balloting. 2. There is no mention in the scope section of security, integrity, or auditing. 3. There is material in the scope section that addresses specific system requirements and is inappropriate for a general requirements document.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed.
Al Kowalc	No	Section 1.0.2 does a very poor job of attempting to maintain a balanced committee.	The IEEE SA procedures must comply with the ANSI Essential requirements. The ANSI Essential requirements do NOT require balance except for the Sponsor Consensus Ballot. What this P&P tries to do is indicate a goal of balance but not force it, in order to comply with the ANSI Essential Requirements.
Al Kowalc	No	Section 1.1 Scope is terrible. We don't know everything in advance as to what voting issues will require inclusion in the standards. Scope was a main goal of P1582 and it appears this draft wants to go down the same narrow path again. This isof advocacy research where one defines the answer and then only seeks and accepts data that confirms one's ideology.	Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it.
Al Kowalc	No	Section 1.0 The TGDC rep should be an officer and term limited. That has always been a major issue in SCC 38.	The IEEE rules define that this position reports to the IEEE SA and not the SCC.
Al Kowalc	No	Section 3.4.1 does not require the Chair to rotate meeting locations to allow all members of the committee to physically attend. Again, a major point of contention in the past.	Conditionally Accept, if there is sufficient support, by vote, in SCC38, then it should be accepted into the P&P.
Al Kowalc	No	Section 3.4.4 was dropped regarding EAC TGDC rep.	The IEEE rules define that this position reports to the IEEE SA and not the SCC.
Al Kowalc	No	No office of Treasurer is defined although Section 6.4 requires a Treasurer to collect meeting fees. Either drop the office or add a Treasurer.	This clause was left in just in case SCC38 had a reason to collect a meeting fee. If it did decide to collect a meeting fee, then the issue of Treasurer would be raised. At this time I do not foresee a meeting fee, so possibly we could remove this clause.
Al Kowalc	No	Section 6.0 All meetings must be open to participation by teleconference or videoconference, not optionally. Also, meeting locations must rotate geographically across the country to give all members a chance to physically attend. Holding meetings only in New Jersey caused a great deal of frustration and anger in the past. There is good reason not to hold committee meetings in a variety of locations rotating from east to west and back again over time.	Conditionally Accept, if there is sufficient support, by vote, in SCC38, then it should be accepted into the P&P.
Vince Lipsio	No	My comments fall into 3 categories. 1. Items which need to be changed for me to change my vote to YES. 2. Optional comments I would make even if my vote were YES. 3. My choices in section 3.1 which I hope would be solicited. Also, I have noted numerous typographical errors and, while I would be happy to help proof a draft that otherwise is ready, I am not taking the time to note them here.	After the P&P is modified and accepted, you and others can review for typos and grammatical improvements, before final vote, Thank you for you offer.
		Items which need to be changed for me to change my vote to YES: ITEM 1: In section 1.1.1, 'Vote-Casting Equipment' in the third paragraph specifying 'Every such layout shall be adaptable; there needs to be at least a third criterion, corresponding to section 5.6.5.2, Voting Variations' of IEEE 1583/DS-3.2b, or, at least, parts thereof, e.g., Ranked order voting, 'Cumulative voting', Provisional or challenged ballots, 'Write-in voting', Multiple ballot languages, Casting of a totally blank ballot, and so on (see IEEE 1583/DS-3.2b for a list of 19 parameters). Alternatively, the criteria might be replaced with some generalized language, e.g., 'Adaptable to all parameters required by the laws in jurisdictions that the said equipment is designed for use in', and the existing two criteria and the above proposed third criterion can be used as examples. ITEM 2: In section 1.1.3, 'Voter Reassurance Interface,' in the second paragraph, in permanent form such as a paper printout, replace the word 'permanent' with 'stable, tangible, and directly sensible (e.g., readable) by a human' because some electronic media are more permanent than some types of paper, and a bar code can be used on permanent...paper, but these defeat the intent of the requirement. ITEM 3: In section 1.1.4, 'Receipt (Physical) Reassurance Interface,' strike the paragraph "This interface shall not be capable of recording information allowing an individual voter's identity to be associated with the voter's cast." This would make the interface or equipment unusable in certain jurisdictions, e.g., Great Britain, where law requires that an individual vote be revealed when so ordered by a court. Perhaps this belongs as a criterion to which equipment needs to be adaptable, probably in section 1.1.1. ITEM 4: In section 1.1.5, 'Election Data Storage and Transfer Equipment,' strike the paragraph "The transferred or stored information shall not allow an individual voter's identity to be associated with voter's cast." See previous item for objection and proposal. ITEM 5: In section 6.0, Meetings', in the third paragraph, in the sentence, 'Preferably, all meetings should be open to participation via teleconference and/or videoconference,' change 'should' to 'shall' and 'preferably,' 'Teleconferencing was available for P-1582, and is common in other IEEE-SA projects, but its absence was a serious grievance in P-1583 during the time period when teleconferencing was not provided.' Also, in the same paragraph, insert 'and document' after 'provided the Secretary does not determine.'	Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it.
		Optional comments I would make even if my vote were YES: ITEM 1: In section 1.0.1, 'Openness,' some mechanism for further refereeing is needed in the Chair determine that expressions made given the history of accusations that an individual acted as a censor, perhaps all comments should be posted after a period of time, inappropriate ones removed, or perhaps some complex mechanism requiring multiple censors needs to be devised. ITEM 2: In section 3.0, 'Officers,' in the case of the formation of a new Committee, SCC-38 should elect the new chair, or, at least, have veto power over the IEEE-SA Standards Board's appointment. ITEM 3: In section 4.3.4, 'Secretary,' responsibility for: concerning the email reflector, should include a recommendation, at the least, to remove spam; the reflectors use mharc, which I also use for similar email lists, and it is trivial to remove an email. Choices in section 3.1 where balloters'input appears to be solicited. ITEM 1: Case 2 - Chair appointed and other officers elected.	Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it.
Rebecca Mercuri	No	IEEE-SA procedures must comply with the ANSI Essential requirements. The ANSI Essential requirements do NOT require balance except for the Sponsor Consensus Ballot. What this P&P tries to do is indicate a goal of balance but not force it, in order to comply with the ANSI Essential Requirements.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed which complied with AutoCom.
Santoro Morganstein	no	This merged P&P has gone a little further than the AutoCom had expected in that some sections that were not changed were changed. Some sections were changed in things added which the AutoCom might not accept. Therefore AutoCom may return the SCC38 P&P unapproved and ask for some changes.	This must pertain to the first 'strawball' A final version was distributed which complied with AutoCom.
		If AutoCom makes changes or indicates that it won't make changes, that would be a better ballot. I cannot approve a ballot measure that may be overridden. Second: There is a problem with the electronic method in which this ballot is being transmitted. Some respondents have sent the ballots to others. That's fine. But when I open those ballots and look at the document's properties, the ballot has my company's name. I am uncomfortable with a ballot that loses its authenticity this way.	
Barbara Simon	No	I have not included comments, because most of my concerns have already been stated by others. I do, however, want to strongly support the idea that in-person meetings should be held to an absolute minimum, and as much of our work as possible be conducted over the internet or via conference calls. When in-person meetings are held, please provide phone-in options for those of us who are unable to fly across the continent to attend in-person meetings.	Accept comment, but don't know how or if it should be included in P&P
Emil Volckoe	No	Section 1.1.3 on Voter Reassurance: This should be about accuracy not reassurance. (cf. DRE) Meetings: Section 6.0 does not require that phone conference be made available as an option. Section 4.2 appears to require physical attendance at every other meeting. Remote participation must be facilitated for the committee to function effectively. Section 1.0.1 on Openness: no due process guarantee (e.g., vote of committee) required for sanctions in this section. Recommendation to consult BONG, which is the specified parliamentary authority. Leadership selection, see Mercuri, Khoo comments. Approval of Chair Case 2. There are some real-time brackets surviving in 4.1, 4.3e, 4.4, and 6.0. 6.4 "and Treasurer" must be removed. 7.1 has a meaningless "... 7.3 header has a bracket.	Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it.
John Williams	Yes	Thank you, types will be fixed before final approval	
OCTOBER 28 COMMENTS			
Hélena Alves	No	I vote NO on this latest version of the SCC38 P&P because I second the petition for a SCC38 meeting provided with a provision for Teleconferencing to allow a SCC38 membership people's present discussion of the SCC38 P&P and proposed modifications. I do believe this is needed to get the group advance in its work.	Meeting will take place
Lean Camp	No	I am voting no because I think it is important not to approve the draft going into the meeting. It may make the meeting more difficult but will make overall progress possible.	Meeting will take place
Charles Cory	No	We regard Dr. Stan's concerns about whether there is any chance of agreement, it is my impression that, with the latest draft P&P, we are converging on solutions and language acceptable to at least a majority of the SCC 38 committee. As to the problem with the SCC 38 Chair being appointed by the IEEE-SA my issues are: (1) With the arbitrary and capricious nature with which it has been done. If the IEEE-SA does not agree with the SCC 38 committee's choice we should be entitled to an explanation and a statement of criteria of what would constitute an acceptable candidate for the committee's Chair. (2) Also, it is reasonable to require that the SCC 38 Chair be chosen from a member of the committee who is familiar both with the work of the committee and the complex problems of elections, which go far beyond issues of just hardware and software. These are not unreasonable requirements and I am at a loss as to why there is so much contention with IEEE-SA on this? I am also in agreement that items currently listed as a member of the SCC 38 committee should be dropped from the rules if they did not vote in the previous P&P ballot or this one. Anyone so dropped could, of course, petition to be reinstated.	These items should be raised during the meeting and if they are not inhibited by the IEEE SA rules they can be put to vote within SCC38.
Chuck Gaston	Abs	I'm forced to abstain because I cannot really tell what the controversy is all about, but I do want to stay involved.	
Richard Johnson	No	My reason is that I would like to see a meeting (with remote participation) convened to resolve issues with the draft of the P&P. There has not been sufficient effect of Gary's efforts to resolve the controversies. Let's rather hash the controversial items out at a meeting of voting members of the committee.	Meeting will take place
Cam Kaner	Abs	At this point, we seem to be facing the existential question Can/Should this committee exist? I think that precedes the P&P.	
Georđe Keit	Abs	I vote ABSTAIN because I have not formed a strong opinion on what the P & P should be and an unwilling to work under a variety of formats. I would like to continue to be a voting member. I expect to participate in the upcoming P & P discussion and afterwards vote up or down on what comes out of that meeting.	
Arthur Keller	No	I do not believe that the previously supplied comments were adequately addressed in this P&P. I vote NO since concerns made by members are not incorporated in the P&P.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Henry Khoo	No	I vote NO. There are several unresolved issues identified by others and a meeting has been scheduled to work on them.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Stan Klein	No	I vote NO. There are several unresolved issues identified by others and a meeting has been scheduled to work on them.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Al Kowalc	No	My Vote is NO since the comments made by the members are not incorporated in the P&P. Due to the pending meeting to discuss perceived problems with the P&P, I think voting on proposed P&P is a moot point.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Vince Lipsio	Abs	My primary reason for voting NO is because Gary has deleted considerable amounts of suggested wording that was suggested that was NOT in violation of the wording that he insists could not be changed. For example, in Section 10.0 Appeals (last to find, is the very LAST section), the clause CAN be modified to include details on the appeals process. I suggested modifications and these modifications were NOT included in Gary's version.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments. It is possible that Gary made an error in section 10.
Rebecca Mercuri	No		
Rich Painter	Yes	After the P&P is modified and accepted, you and others can review for typos and grammatical improvements, before final vote, Thank you for you offer.	
		1. In section 1.1 item #3 should read "that a vote". 2. In section 3.3 does not address the removal of the chairperson. 3. In section 4.1 there is an unmatched bracket "'. 4. In section 6.1 it should read "Members who recuse ...". 5. In section 6.3 add a period to the end. 6. In section 7.1.1 add a colon to the end of "The following ...". The comments provided below are those that I read and shared as suggestions to clarify and improve the policy and procedures (P&P) for SCC38. Where slots to existing P&P text are provided, insertions will be in BLUE; deletions will be in RED and struck out.	Section 1.1 is the Scope as approved by the IEEE SA. The P&P just copies the approved Scope. Therefore the only way to change Section 1.1 Scope, is to change the officially approved Scope statement approved by the IEEE SA. Then the P&P will copy it. With the respect to section 3.0, this should be discussed at meeting.
Iain Piper	No	1. Comment: In Section 1.1 (IEEE Committee Scope), there needs to be a qualification that the technical requirements will be objective and performance based. Current standards have many subjective requirements that are either untestable or require interpretations. IEEE requirements need to be objective and testable. These requirements should also be performance based and not prescriptive. Although there is a need in some areas, the font sizes for human factors where requirements should be prescriptive. In most cases, requirements can be written that don't prescribe the design, but rather state the functions the design shall perform. Objective performance based requirements lend themselves to being testable and also facilitate innovation. Proposed change: Inserting the words "objective and performance based" before the term "technical requirements." The paragraph would read as follows: SCC 38 shall provide an authoritative technical standards resource to provide a system engineering approach in validating election system processes and implementing hardware and software. This will include <del>guiding and</del> <del>defining</del> <del>technical</del> <del>requirements</del> for these systems, testability for validating and calibrating such systems, and providing recommendations for validating alternate election systems approaches. Examples of projects to be considered include: 2. Comment: In Section 3.0 (Officers), although there is language stating that "an officer may serve at his/her own discretion", I believe there needs to be some language providing for the resignation of an officer and the process they should follow. Proposed change: Add a section between 3.3 and 3.4, titled "Officer Resignation" that has the following language: <del>An officer may voluntarily resign their position, provided a notice to the Chair in their role, consistent for resigning the position.</del> 3. Comment: In Section 6.1 (Quorum), it is confusing as to what constitutes a quorum for a committee that has fewer than 50 members. The term "majority" seems to be referring to a "simple majority" (50% +1), but it is not explicit. Subsequently, if it is a simple majority to establish a quorum, then how is that different from the quorum requirements for a committee that is greater than 50 members? Proposed change: Edit the paragraph as follows: A quorum must be identified before the initiation of Committee business at a meeting, but if a quorum is not present, action may be taken subject to confirmation by letter or electronic ballot, as detailed in subclause 7.4. For Committees with fewer than 50 members: A quorum shall be defined as a simple majority of the committee members. For Committees with 50 or more members: A quorum shall be defined as 50% of the current total membership or 65, whichever is greater. Members who recuse themselves shall not be counted in the equation to determine whether a quorum exists. Additional Discussion: Perhaps it would be useful to propose a definition for a sub-quorum, which could result if attendance to a meeting is just shy of a quorum. It almost occurred at a few of the SCC38 meetings that I've attended. Instead of wasting the time that those in attendance have allocated to the meeting, the sub-quorum would at least be able have discussions about the agenda topics and any resolutions developed from those discussions would have to be later ratified at a meeting with a standard quorum. If the IEEE-SA policy does not allow this form of discussion, then so be it, but I thought it worth putting it on the table. 4. Comment: In Section 7.1 (Approval of an Action), the number of approval votes required is confusing. Section 7.1.1 refers to a "majority" vote and Section 7.1.2 refers to a "two-thirds" vote, yet section 7.1 refer to either a "majority" vote or a "two-thirds" vote. I believe that section 7.1 is just referring to the types of required votes in its sub-clauses and how they are applied to two different voting scenarios, but I think the sentence that begins with "A majority (or two-thirds) vote is defined as either..." is inaccurate and misleading in the language that follows that sentence is not a definition of a majority vote or a two-thirds vote, but rather how they are applied against a type of meeting (teleconference or person or strictly through electronic mail). I know that this section is not meant to be modified, but I would strongly suggest re-wording it for clarity if you can. Proposed change: Replace the sentence "A majority (or two-thirds) vote is defined as either..." with "A vote for approval is defined as either". Edit the section as follows: Approval of an action requires approval by a majority (or two-thirds) vote (as specified below in 7.1.1 and 7.1.2. A majority or two-thirds vote by <del>approval</del> is defined as either: a) at a meeting (including teleconferences) where a quorum has been established, a vote carried by majority (or two-thirds) approval of the votes cast (i.e., Approve or Do Not Approve votes, excluding abstentions) by the voting members' attendance. b) at a meeting not scheduled to complete this document, I vote NO so that we do not pre-empt the meeting.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Whitney Quesenberry	no	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments	
Barbara Simon	No	The IEEE rules define that this position, TGDC rep, reports to the IEEE SA and not the SCC.	
		I agree with Chuck Cory's comment that "Validation of election machine functioning" should not be part of the scope of SCC 38. We are not in a position to validate any function; thus, we need to focus on conditions that voting systems must to satisfy. I also note that there is no mention of electronic poll books, for which there appear to be no standards whatsoever. These devices interface with voting devices and really are part of voting systems. When electronic poll books malfunction, contain inaccurate information, or even are too slow, voters are disenfranchised. So, I would like to respectfully recommend that electronic poll books be explicitly included within the scope of SCC 38. I'd be interested in hearing others' thoughts about expanding our mandate to explicitly include poll books. Finally, I agree that the TGDC rep should be an officer. I'd like to propose that any standards reports relating to voting technology that come out of the work of our committee be made publicly available on a website with no fee. I think it is perfectly appropriate for IEEE to charge for reports, but I believe that the work of our committee should be available to all. I've reviewed items are examples only, other projects can and will be considered -perhaps adding a phrase like they include but is not limited to ... 2.0 (editing) a) and b - move PAR definition from b to a 2.0 h - I don't agree that the membership roster distribution should be limited 2.0 m - The TGDC representative -should disseminate all information -she should not have to receive a request to do so. 3.4.3 -c -minutes should be distributed within 15 days 3.4.3 e -details on how documentation should be distributed (web/email) 3.4.3 -h list of members should be sent out when there are changes and upon request should also be posted to the website 4.3 What are the privacy concerns? Is/Is this an open committee? 4.4 Membership list must be posted (not can be posted) on the website 6.0 All meetings should be available thru teleconferencing (Preferably last paragraph) should be replaced with trust)	
Greg Vanderheiden	No	The reason is that it does not appear that the development of the document is complete. And there are requests to discuss the draft to address the open issues.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Emil Volckoe	No	I wish to vote against adopting this version of P&P. Although it seems to be in fairly good shape, I don't want to approve it prior to our meeting. Also, I found a few typos and places where some clarification would be helpful. It would be good to do another draft. Here are a few issues I noticed. p. 2: parliamentary authority should be the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, unless there is a particular reason to choose the older edition. Some terms are used shortly before they are defined (p. 3, PAR; p. 5 Elections Officer). p. 7: en bloc (no "X") p. 16: the definition of quorum is awkward. p. 16: the wording about the process to approve interpretations refers to an appointed group. I think this could be made clearer.	After the P&P is modified and accepted, you and others can review for typos and grammatical improvements, before final vote, Thank you for you offer. Other comments should be discussed during the meeting. Other non editorial issues can be discussed during meeting.
John Williams	Yes	I suggest that the vote on this version be used only to determine who should be permitted to remain on the SCC38 membership list. I concur with Emil and vote no, although I think there are only a few changes that need to be made and they can be best addressed on the call.	Meeting will take place to attempt to resolve comments
Vern Williams	No		