

RevCom Conventions and Guidelines are developed for the benefit of RevCom members and IEEE participants who interact with RevCom. These documents outline accepted protocol, and are not intended to define policy. IEEE Standards policies are defined only in IEEE Policies and Procedures documents, available at <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/>. If there are discrepancies between these documents and IEEE Policies and Procedures, the policies and procedures take precedence.

IEEE-SA RevCom Comment Resolution Preparation Guidelines

Introduction to RevCom

The role of RevCom is to review proposals for the IEEE-SA Standards Board (SASB) approval of IEEE standards and adoption of non-IEEE standards, withdrawal of existing standards, and to ensure that the proposals represent a consensus of the members of the official IEEE Sponsor balloting groups. RevCom ensures that all applicable requirements of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Policies and Procedures (e.g., Operations Manual and Bylaws; <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/index.html>) have been met and makes recommendations to the IEEE-SA Standards Board for approval or adoption as an IEEE standard.

RevCom process

The SASB, and therefore RevCom, establishes a yearly meeting calendar that includes RevCom submission deadlines (see <http://standards.ieee.org/about/SASB/meetings.html>). RevCom members begin their review of the material when notified by the RevCom Administrator that the submissions are complete and have been added to a RevCom meeting agenda. Should RevCom members have questions about the submitted material, their comments are distributed to the submitter of the material, the Sponsor's Standards Liaison, other RevCom members, and relevant IEEE-SA staff.

RevCom members review materials (the submittal package) to determine whether the IEEE-SA standards development process was followed correctly. This material is supplied by IEEE-SA electronic tools (e.g., myBallot/myProject), the Sponsor or (or the Sponsor's designee), and the IEEE-SA staff. RevCom reviews cover letters, explanatory documents, comment files, the PAR, balloted drafts, correspondence between the Sponsor and members of the Sponsor balloting group, and any other relevant documents.

RevCom members may ask the submitter to clarify various items prior to a RevCom meeting and there may be debate on significant issues during the RevCom meeting. Failure to provide complete, coherent answers to questions posed prior to or during the meeting may result in delay of approval.

When RevCom convenes, its members collectively review the Sponsor's submitted material, RevCom members' questions, and the Sponsor's replies for each of the submitted projects. After each project review, a vote is conducted on whether or not RevCom will forward a recommendation to approve or adopt as an IEEE standard to the Standards Board.

Should the RevCom members not recommend approval or adoption of a draft as an IEEE standard, a remedy is proposed to the Sponsor.

Explicit rules

IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual [Section 5](#) "Standards development" currently addresses balloting in clause 5.4.3.

RevCom observations regarding rule interpretations

RevCom notes that both Sponsors and RevCom members sometimes require clarification concerning the directives on balloting. The following further explains the intent of Section 5.4 and introduces no additional requirements:

Further guidance and interpretation with reference to myBallot tools

There is an obligation for the Sponsor to provide evidence of consideration of each comment via approved IEEE-SA balloting tools regardless of whether the comment is associated with a Do Not Approve, Approve, or Abstain vote.

During the appropriate ballot period, IEEE public review and non-voter comments shall also be considered and presented to the ballot (comment) resolution group.

Mandatory coordination does not accompany a vote (vote field contains coordination in a myBallot report). RevCom looks for evidence of consideration of mandatory coordination comments in the myBallot report.

Upon the close of a ballot, the Sponsor may immediately begin to hold discussions with any Do Not Approve voters. The Sponsor must be careful not to incorrectly represent IEEE-SA rules or make any promises to change the draft. If discussions result in all Do Not Approve voters changing to Approve, the ballot cycle is complete.

Upon the close of a ballot, the Sponsor has an obligation to communicate the results (vote count, comments received, and comment resolutions) to the Sponsor balloting group. In practice, this information is conveyed as part of the package that accompanies the start of a recirculation ballot. If the ballot cycle is complete and the project is to be submitted to RevCom, the Sponsor should similarly supply status information to the ballot group.

A balloter who voted Do Not Approve with comments will typically designate some portion of them as Must Be Satisfied. A subsequent vote change to Approve or Abstain allows the Must Be Satisfied designation to be removed but does not cause the comment to be deleted or ignored. After ballot comment resolution there might remain some Do Not Approve voters with new, valid Must Be Satisfied comments and a recirculation ballot is required.

RevCom recognizes as valid a Do Not Approve ballot with comments but none marked Must Be Satisfied.

Further RevCom guidance regarding balloting process

During RevCom review, it is disappointing to discover that a significant Sponsor balloting error was made that would require that approval be deferred until corrective actions

specified by RevCom or the IEEE-SA Standards Board are completed by the Sponsor. This guideline is intended to provide assistance to the Sponsor in preparing comment resolutions that increase the likelihood of quick project approval.

Provide correct instructions to members of the Sponsor balloting group

Balloters should be provided with correct guidance or feedback that reflects the policies and procedures published by IEEE-SA. Improper guidance that materially affects the Sponsor ballot process is a serious issue. The following are some examples of improper guidance that may lead to delayed project approval:

- Any instruction that conflicts with the IEEE Code of Ethics, *the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*, or the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* is a violation of process.
- If a balloter was told that he or she could not change from Do Not Approve to Abstain, that instruction is contrary to the rules.
- The Sponsor should not suggest that a Do Not Approve Sponsor ballot vote not be entered because it would cause the project to be cancelled.
- The Sponsor shall not coerce balloters.
- Any correspondence by the Sponsor to a member of the Sponsor balloting group with a confidentiality statement included in the correspondence, or vice versa, cannot be considered by RevCom (see IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual 4.1.1.5 "[Confidentiality Statements](#)").

RevCom guidance on the contents of the disposition and disposition detail fields

The disposition status field of a comment resolution must be set to one of: Accepted, Revised or Rejected. This section gives guidance on how to determine which is the appropriate disposition status, and based on that, what might go in the disposition detail field. In these guidelines, the term comment resolution committee (CRC) is used to refer to the group or subgroup that reviewed the ballot comments on behalf of the Sponsor, and entered the comment resolutions (disposition status and disposition detail) in the MyProject system. The CRC may be termed a ballot resolution committee (BRC) or may be the Working Group as a whole, depending on the procedures of the individual Sponsor.

Disposition status is "Accepted"

- Means: The CRC agreed exactly with comment and change proposed by the commenter.
- Prerequisite: The changes proposed in the comment contain sufficient detail so that voters can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter and the editor can make the change.
- The disposition detail field should be left blank.

Disposition status is "Revised"

- Means: CRC agrees in principle with the comment and/or proposed change, and one or more of:
 - o the CRC disagrees with all or part of the specific details in the proposed change in the comment,
 - o the proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient

- detail so that the CRC can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter, or
 - the changes made by the CRC contain additions or modifications to what was proposed by the commenter ¹
- The disposition details field should contain sufficient detail so that voters can understand the specific changes determined by the CRC and the editor can make the change

Disposition status is “Rejected”

- Used when one or more of these applies:
 - the CRC disagree with the comment
 - the comment is out of scope
 - the proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRC can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter
 - the CRC cannot come to a consensus to make changes necessary to address the comment
 - the comment is in support of an unsatisfied previous comment associated with a disapprove vote and does not provide substantive additional rationale
- The disposition detail field should explain why the comment is being rejected using one or more of these reasons:
 - an explanation of why the CRC disagrees with the comment,
 - a statement that the comment is out of scope, and the rationale,
 - a statement that the proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRC can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter
 - a statement that the CRC could not reach consensus on the changes necessary to address the comment, along with the reason
 - a statement that the CRC has previously considered the comment (or a substantively similar comment), along with identification (by reference or copy) of the original comment and its disposition detail and status

Copy dependent disposition details, don’t cross-reference

Disposition details of the form: “Disagree – see disposition detail of comment 1234” create a potential trap for violating process requirements. If the referenced comment (e.g., 1234) does not end up as an Unsatisfied comment (e.g., the commenter of comment 1234 change his or her vote to Approve or Abstain), it won’t be included in an Unsatisfied comments file that some working groups generate. So, this reference would then be broken as far as the Unsatisfied comments file is concerned. Of course, the comment is still in a file containing all comments, but the Sponsor balloting group member may not be able to find the response, which can be problematic. In addition, it is inadvisable to make it more difficult for RevCom members to evaluate the project.

¹ Note that changes unrelated to the comment should not be included in the disposition detail. The CRC is allowed to make changes to its draft for any reason, and does not need a comment as a justification to make any such change.

The recommended practice is to cut and paste the comment disposition detail from the cited comment and then add "(same comment disposition detail as comment 1234)" in order to track the dependencies between the "original" comment disposition detail and its logical dependents. This practice also helps the document's technical editor determine that no additional action is needed beyond editing the disposition detail of comment 1234.

Copy textual disposition details, don't reference submissions

Referencing an external document does not meet the requirement to use IEEE-SA Ballot Center tools. RevCom expects comment responses to be contained within documents associated with myBallot.

Entering a comment disposition detail such as "Disagree – see 11-09/9876r1" is not appropriate.

If document 11-09/9876r1 contains the disposition detail, it should be cut and pasted into the disposition detail. For example, the following could be cut and pasted from 11-09/9876r1:

“Disagree. The commenter has not shown that the nurgle needs to be flanged, and hasn’t shown us which flavor of flange he requires.”

However, if the disposition detail contains something that cannot be easily and unambiguously represented in plain text, (e.g., graphics or extensive markup edits), it is acceptable to either reference the disposition detail as a separate document that is easily available to Sponsor balloting group members via inclusion in myBallot materials that are shared with balloters during a recirculation ballot, or identify where the change can be found in the Draft during the recirculation required for such a change.

References to comment disposition details in external documents should be public URLs

If external documents are required, it is preferred that document references are to URLs housed on a valid public document server and that does not require a fee for access.

Ensuring accepted changes are incorporated into the Draft

It is not unusual to have hundreds of comments that are reviewed by the Sponsor and which result in changes to the Draft. These comments and responses are also reviewed by RevCom. It is important that the comment disposition detail provided to balloters correctly describes the changes incorporated into the Draft on the next recirculation. Occasionally, during RevCom review, it is discovered that these changes are not fully implemented. Depending on the nature of the change, such omissions may result in a delay in approval. It is the responsibility of the Sponsor (or the Sponsor’s designee) to ensure that the disposition detail is accurately implemented into the Draft before a recirculation is launched. While it is the responsibility of the Sponsor balloting group to carefully examine the Draft to ensure that it is correct with respect to the disposition detail, it is the responsibility of the Sponsor (or the Sponsor’s designee) to ensure that the disposition detail is accurately implemented into the Draft.

Guidance for identifying substantive Draft changes to balloters during recirculations

Clause [5.4.3.4](#) of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual* states: All substantive changes made since the last balloted proposed standard shall be identified and recirculated to the sponsor balloting group.

The intent of this section is to provide the Sponsor comment resolution group with guidance on preferred methods to provide substantive changes to balloters during recirculation ballots. There are two well-proven methods to provide balloters with an indication of the specific substantive changes to the Draft:

1. Provide a listing of the substantive changes to the previous draft in the recirculation ballot cover letter.
2. Identify substantive changes in the next Draft offered for recirculation to the balloters.

Note: If you are producing an amendment there are additional guidelines available in the *IEEE Standards Style Manual* available at

Noting substantive changes in the cover letter

The comment resolution group may decide to identify the substantive changes in the cover letter provided to balloters. Each change should include the clause or subclause affected, along with a statement explaining what text is added, revised, or deleted. It should also include the text from the previous draft and any revised or added text.

Noting substantive changes in the Draft offered for recirculation

The comment resolution group can indicate substantive changes in the recirculation Draft. The following are recommended methods to indicate the specific changes in the Draft:

- a) Deleted material in the Draft should be indicated using strikethrough. Any color may be used for the strikethrough.
- b) New material in the draft should be indicated using a consistent style such as text color, a highlight color, or an underscore. Any color is acceptable to indicate changes.
- c) Location of deleted and new material should be indicated using a change bar in the margin.

Note: The above may be implemented using Track Changes in the preferred word processing program.