

Proposed Resolution for IEEE 802 LMSC Rules Revision Letter Ballot
on
SEC Electronic Ballots

From: Matthew Sherman, 2nd Vice Chair IEEE 802

To: Sponsor Executive Committee

Date: February 28, 2003

Duration: Till March 14, 2003

Purpose: To facilitate the SEC consensus process by improving the rules for electronic ballots.

Rationale for proposed text:

A prior rules ballot to clarify the rules for electronic ballot (e-ballot), and allow for greater flexibility for the time lines of those ballots failed. The key intent of the original rules change was to reduce the time required for an electronic ballot, and to provide flexibility in the ending time ballot to ease problems with establishing a quorum. Based on response, there was not a lot of concern on these issues, and the ballot failed. However, a number of comments were made that need to be addressed. Key comments include (paraphrased):

- 1) Need to completely replace SEC “paper” letter ballots with e-ballots
- 2) Need to modify how we provide visibility into e-ballots and rule change ballots
- 3) Need adjustments in text concerning initiation of ballot by 1st Vice Chair

Based on those comments, the following adjustments in the text have been made (in Blue):

- 1) Nobody objected to the idea of eliminating paper SEC letter ballots, so the proposed text replaces the concept of a “letter ballot” with the more generic concept of an “Executive Committee ballot”. For consistency the text addressed had to be expanded from that in the original rules change ballot.
- 2) While commenters indicated issues with how to reach ALL 802 attendees within the last 3 meeting, no resolution to the issue was proposed. In addition to the requirement to reach “all attendees” for rule change ballots, there is a general requirement to provide LMSC membership the ability to observe all electronic ballots, with no specific indication how this is accomplished.

The text change here proposes that only LMSC members should normally have the right to comment on ballots and rules changes. People who have attended just one meeting in the last 3 are unlikely to have the interest / background to address the issue. And one of the privileges of membership is the right to comment on such proceedings. It is suggested we should not cheapen that privilege. Those who have attended more than one meeting are in fact members already.

To accomplish these desires in the existing rules, this text change adds specific LMSC notice requirements for all electronic ballots. Specific notice requirements for the LMSC rules ballot have been eliminated. Virtually all such members should be on at least one of the SEC / WG / TAG / reflectors. As long as we are presuming that everyone on the SEC has email (which we are) we should presume this is the fact for the LMSC at large. It is accordingly suggested that LMSC chairs should ensure SEC ballots are reflected to the WG/TAG reflectors within 5 working days of their issue. This should be sufficient notice for an active member to act upon the information so as to influence the outcome of the ballot.

- 3) One commenter suggested text indicating that the LMSC chair should be able to designate someone to run an electronic ballot, and the 1st Vice Chair should be one of those choices. No one objected, so that change has been included. For consistency it was necessary to propagate the

change into more sections than were originally addressed. Note that the 1st Vice Chair would still be able to initiate electronic ballots under their own initiative when acting in the capacity of the chair (assuming the Chair was “unavailable or incapacitated”).

Additional letter ballot resolutions incorporated (in Red):

- 1) In 3.4.2.1 placed actions for ballot in chronological order.
- 2) Added minimum lengths for ordinary ballots and rules ballots
- 3) Adjusted 5.1.5.1 for ballots on disbanding groups
- 4) Disposition of ballot comments from outside the SEC
- 5) Other editorial adjustments

Resolutions yet to be incorporated:

- 1) What to do if a ballot does not get forwarded to a WG in the required time period?
Jeff requested this be left open for discussion on ballot resolution.

Proposed Text:

Proposed text for rules change is shown below using revision markings against the text in the LMSC Rules as last revised July 12, 2002.

3.4.2 Voting Between Plenary Meetings

At times, it may become necessary for the Executive Committee to render a decision that cannot be made prior to the close of one plenary but must be made prior to the following plenary. The Executive Committee balloting mechanism shall be used at the discretion of the Chair or an Executive Committee member designated by the Chair (normally the 1st Vice Chair). To ensure that the LMSC membership can observe and comment on Executive Committee ballots, Working Group and TAG chairs shall forward Executive Committee ballots to their membership for comment by electronic means within 5 working days of initiation of a ballot. All comments from those outside the membership of the SEC shall be considered. Commenters from outside the voting membership of the SEC are urged to seek to have a voter on the SEC (normally their Working Group Chair) include the commenter's viewpoint in their vote.

Deleted: SEC

Deleted: electronic

Deleted: may

Deleted: the 1st Vice Chair

Deleted: The electronic balloting mechanism shall include a means by which non SEC members can observe and comment on the discussion.

3.4.2.1 Electronic Balloting

Executive Committee Ballots between plenaries shall be conducted by electronic means. The Chair or his designee shall determine the minimum duration of the ballot, issue the ballot, and tally the results. A majority of eligible voting SEC members must vote approve in order for the ballot to pass. The minimum length of the ballot will be no less than 10 days except for urgent matter that require a resolution in less time.

Deleted: the 1st Vice Chair

Deleted: ,

Inserted: ,

Deleted: of the ballot

Deleted: and determine the minimum duration of the ballot

Deleted: The Executive Committee Vice Chair, (or other Executive Committee member) designated by the LMSC Chair, shall distribute the proposed change to all persons who have attended the current Plenary Session or one of the preceding two Plenary Sessions at least sixty (60) days prior to the next Plenary Session and further; invite and collect comments for presentation to the Executive Committee.¶ Concurrent with distribution to the LMSC members, an

Deleted: letter

Deleted: ,

Deleted: The disbanding of a Working Group requires a letter ballot of the LMSC Executive Committee. A disbanded Working Group is then completely abolished. ¶

3.6.3 Distribution and Executive Committee Ballot

Executive Committee ballots on rules changes shall be at least 30 days in length and, conducted to close at least thirty (30) days prior to the next Plenary Session so as to allow for comment resolution.
Distribution of rules change ballots to LMSC membership shall be accomplished as per section 3.4.2.

5.1.5.1 Disbanding a Working Group.

After all standards, recommended practices and Technical Reports for which a hibernating working group is responsible are withdrawn or transferred to another group or groups, an Executive Committee ballot shall be initiated, in order to determine whether the hibernating working group will be disbanded.

If this Executive Committee ballot passes (i.e., shows that a majority of the Executive Committee is in favour of disbanding the Working Group), then the Working Group is disbanded. If the ballot fails, then the Chair shall determine a future date for a re-run of the ballot.

3.6.5 LMSC Approval

After distribution of a proposed rules change and an Executive Committee ballot has been conducted, the LMSC Chair (or other LMSC Executive Committee member designated in accordance with Section 3.4.2.) shall tabulate the ballot results, attempt to resolve comments, and present the comments and proposed resolution at an Executive Committee meeting in conjunction with a Plenary Session. The Executive Committee shall approve, assign, or fail to accept the proposal.

LMSC approval shall require the affirmative vote of at least two thirds of all voting members of the Executive Committee. LMSC approval will result in the rules change becoming effective at the end of Plenary Session during which approval is voted. The revised LMSC Operating Rules shall be forwarded to the Computer Society Standards Activities Board (CS SAB). When the rules are known to be in conflict with the CS SAB Policies and Procedures the cover letter shall request formal CS SAB approval of the variance. In the case where the rules change is in conflict with the Policies and Procedures of CS SAB, the rule change will be put into effect as stated above but will be withdrawn immediately if rejected by the CS SAB. CS SAB rejection shall be announced to the LMSC Executive Committee by the most expeditious means available (e-mail, FAX, regular mail) and to the LMSC membership at the next Plenary Session.

If LMSC approval is not achieved, a vote to assign the proposal for further study and recommendation shall be taken. Assignment shall require the affirmative vote of at least one third of all voting members of the Executive Committee, otherwise no further action is taken on the proposal.

5.1.5.1 Disbanding a Working Group.

After all standards, recommended practices and Technical Reports for which a hibernating working group is responsible are withdrawn or transferred to another group or groups, the hibernating working group will be disbanded.

The disbanding of a Working Group requires an Executive Committee ballot. A disbanded Working Group is then completely abolished.

Deleted: letter

Deleted:

Deleted: Vice

Deleted: 3.6.3

Deleted: ;

Deleted: w

Deleted: letter ballot of the LMSC
Executive Committee