Procedural vs. non-procedural issues

Dr. James P. K. "Trainwreck" Gilb

3/13/2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Overview

While not stated explicitly, most, if not all of the LMSC review of WG activity involves only "procedural items". This term, however, is not defined anywhere. This document is an attempt to rectify the situation.

2. Procedural

2.1 Examples of procedural Issues

- The required documents not provided to the voters in a timely manner (e.g., Coexistence Assurance Document, comment resolutions to a previous ballot)

- Irregularities in the voting (announcement, insufficient time, number of abstains, return ratio, etc.)

- Issues with comment resolutions, including:

  ○ Lack of a substantive response to one or more comments.

  ○ Lack of proof of consideration of all comments.

  ○ Comment marked accept with additional text in the response

- Invalid ballot group, e.g., too much time has expired from formation of a sponsor ballot pool, not following Working Group (WG) process for a WG ballot pool

- Failure to follow group specific requirements in, for example the WG's Operations Manual

- Sponsor ballot pool formed not within the 6 month of initial ballot.

2.2 Examples of poor responses for comment rejection

- "No one else in the balloting group raised the issue"

- "Everyone in the balloting group thought it was OK"

- Dismissing a well formed technical comment on purely procedural issues. Example: Comment "Change here and search and replace all similar usages", Response: "Insufficient information for Editor to make the change."

  ○ Exception for this "out-of-scope of the recirculation" comments. No one seems to like that term, but that is what is in the rules for comments in a recirculation not on a changed portion of the draft, part of the draft affected by a change or by agreeing with a no voter's previous comment.

3. Non-procedural issues

Note, these examples include editorial and technical issues

- Selection of a technology (e.g., LDPC vs. RS, architecture definition) in a standard.

- Failure to accept the comments input under mandatory coordination (editorial, RAC, SCC-14).
- Comment Resolution Group's evaluation of a proposed remedy if documented in the comment response.
- Failure to follow the Style Guide (perhaps editorial, but not LMSC purview).