-- --

IEEE P1003.2 Draft 11.2 − September 1991

Annex G
(informative)

Balloting Instructions

This annex will not appear in the final standard. It is included in the draft to provide instructions for balloting that cannot be separated easily from the main document, as a cover letter might.

If you have received a copy of this draft before October 1991 it is important that you read this annex, whether you are an official member of the P1003.2 Balloting Group or not; comments on this draft are welcomed from all interested technical experts. **Your ballot is due to the IEEE office by 21 October 1991. This is not the date to postmark it—it is the date of receipt.**

Summary of Draft 11.2 Instructions

This is the fifth ''recirculation draft'' of P1003.2. The recirculation procedure is 2
described in this annex. For this recirculation, we are accepting objections 2
against any normative changes that occurred from Draft 11.1 to Draft 11.2 and 2
the contents of the Unresolved Objections List, provided as a separate document 2
from the draft. 2

This is the first ballot in which the draft is available for online review; see the 2
Editor's Notes for details on accessing this information. 2

Send your ballot and/or comments to:

IEEE Standards Office
Computer Society Secretariat
ATTN: P1003.2 Ballot (Anna Kaczmarek) 2
P.O. Box 1331
445 Hoes Lane
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331

It would also be very helpful if you sent us your ballot in machine-readable form. Your official ballot must be returned via mail to the IEEE office; if we receive only the e-mail or diskette version, that version will not count as an official document. However, the online version would be a great help to ballot resolution. We can accept e-mail to the following address:

hlj@Posix.COM or **uunet!posix!hlj**

or IBM PC 3.5-inch/720K diskette (plain file) or Macintosh 3.5-inch diskette (plain text file [preferred], Word, or Write) or Sun-style QIC-24 cartridge tapes to:

Hal Jespersen, Chair P1003.2
POSIX Software Group
447 Lakeview Way
Redwood City, CA 94062

Some degree of judgment is required in determining what actually changed in Draft 11.2. Use the diff marks as a guide, but they will frequently mark text that has no real normative changes. Please limit your objections to the actual changes: for example, if we change the `foo -x` option to `-y`, don't use that as an opportunity to object that we have no `-z` option. Your objection should only address why the `x` to `y` change is a problem. (We have been balloting for a long time now and it is time to tighten the consensus and finish this up.) If you find problems unrelated to changes, submit them as comments and they will be considered seriously in that category. Thanks for your cooperation on this.

Background on Balloting Procedures

The Balloting Group consists of over 160 technical experts who are members of the IEEE or the IEEE Computer Society; enrollment of individuals in this group has already been closed. There are also a few ''parties of interest'' who are not members of the IEEE or the Computer Society. Members of the Balloting Group are required to return ballots within the balloting period. Other individuals who may happen to read this draft are also encouraged to submit comments concerning this draft. The only real difference between members of the Balloting Group and other individuals submitting ballots is that *affirmative* ballots are only counted from Balloting Group members who are also IEEE or Computer Society members. (There are minimum requirements for the percentages of ballots returned and for affirmative ballots out of that group.) However, objections and nonbinding comments must be resolved if received from any individual, as follows:

(1) Some objections or comments will result in changes to the standard. This will occur either by the publication of a list of changes or by the republication of an entire draft. The objections/comments are reviewed by a team from the P1003.2 working group, consisting of the Chair, Vice Chair, the Chair of the TCOS Standards Subcommittee, and one or more Technical Reviewers. The Technical Reviewers each have subject matter expertise in a particular area and are responsible for objection resolution in one or more sections.

(2) Other objections/comments will not result in changes.

   (a) Some are misunderstandings or cover portions of the document (front matter, informative annexes, rationale, editorial matters, etc.) that are not subject to balloting.

   (b) Others are so vaguely worded that it is impossible to determine what changes would satisfy the objector. These are referred to as *Unresponsive* . (The Technical Reviewers will make a reasonable effort to contact the objector to resolve this and get a newly worded objection.) Further examples of unresponsive submittals are those not marked as either *Objection* or *Comment* ; those that do not identify the portion of the document that is being objected to (each objection must be separately labeled); those that object to material in a recirculation that has not changed and do not cite an unresolved objection; those that do not provide specific or general guidance on what changes would be required to resolve the objection.

(c) Finally, others are valid technical points, but they would result in decreasing the consensus of the Balloting Group. (This judgment is made based on other ballots and on the experiences of the working group through almost five years of work and fifteen drafts preceding this one.) These are referred to as *Unresolved Objections* . Summaries of unresolved objections and their reasons for rejection are maintained throughout the balloting process, are circulated to members of the Balloting Group for their consideration, and are presented to the IEEE Standards Board when the final draft is offered for approval. Unresolved objections are only circulated to the balloting group when they are presented by members of the balloting group or by parties of interest. Unsolicited correspondence from outside these two groups may result in draft changes, but are not recirculated to the balloting group members.

Please ensure that you correctly characterize your ballot by providing one of the following:

(1) Your IEEE member number

(2) Your IEEE Computer Society affiliate number

(3) If (1) or (2) don't apply, a statement that you are a ''Party of Interest''

Ballot Resolution

The general procedure for resolving ballots is:

(1) The balloting cuts off on 21 October 1991. This is a receipt date at the IEEE , not a postmark date. (Please do not telephone or FAX on 21 October 1991 and say that your specific comments will come later; late-arriving comments will not be considered as objections.) We will accept comments after that date, including direct e-mail to the working group officers or the Technical Reviewers, but they will be treated as comments only—not objections. And we don't guarantee a written response to these late submissions.

(2) The ballots are put online and distributed to the Technical Reviewers.

(3) If a ballot contains an objection, the balloter will be contacted individually by telephone, letter, or e-mail and the corrective action to be taken will be described (or negotiated). The personal contact will most likely not occur if the objection is very simple and obvious to fix or the balloter cannot be reached after a few reasonable attempts. Repeated failed

attempts to elicit a response from a balloter may result in an objection being considered unresponsive, based on the judgment of the working group chair. Once all objections in a ballot have been resolved, it becomes an affirmative ballot.

(4) If any objection cannot be resolved, the entire ballot remains negative.

(5) Once more than seventy-five percent of the ballots received (that had voted either affirmative or negative) have been turned affirmative, two lists are published to the entire balloting group: the detailed list of approved changes and the list of unresolved objections, along with our reasons for rejecting them. This is known as a *recirculation* . You have minimum of ten days (after an appropriate time to ensure the mail got through) to review these two lists and take one of the following actions:

   (a) Do nothing; your ballots will continue to be counted as we have classified them, based on items (3) and (4).

   (b) Explicitly change your negative ballot to affirmative by agreeing to remove all of your objections from the unresolved list.

   (c) Explicitly change your affirmative ballot to negative based on your disapproval of either of the two lists you reviewed. If an issue is not on one of the two lists, new objections about this are not allowed. Negative ballots that come in on recirculations cannot be cumulative. They shall repeat any objections that the balloter considers unresolved from the previous recirculation. Ballots that simply say ‘‘and all the unresolved objections from last time’’ will be declared unresponsive. Ballots that are silent will be presumed to fully replace the previous ballot, and all objections not mentioned on the most current ballot will be considered as successfully resolved.

(6) The list of changes will frequently be a new draft document with the changes integrated. This is not a requirement, however, and a small number of changes may prompt merely a change list approach to recirculation.

(7) A copy of all your objections and our resolutions will be mailed to you. You can receive the full package of all resolutions from all ballots by contacting the IEEE Standards Office (who will probably charge you for the copying involved). If you don't agree with one of our resolutions and haven't been contacted personally before you receive this list, please accept our apologies and submit a new ballot against the new draft during the recirculation period.

(8) If at the end of the recirculation period there remain greater than seventy-five percent affirmative ballots, and no new objections have been received, a new draft is prepared that incorporates all the changes. This draft and the unresolved objections list go to the IEEE Standards Board for approval. If the changes cause too many ballots to slip back into negative status, another resolution and recirculation cycle begins.

Balloting Guidelines

This section consists of guidelines on how to write and submit the most effective ballot possible. The activity of resolving balloting comments is difficult and time consuming. Poorly constructed comments can make that even worse.

We have found several things that can be done to a ballot that make our job more difficult than it needs to be, and likely will result in a less than optimal response to ballots that do not follow the form below. Thus it is to your advantage, as well as ours, for you to follow these recommendations and requirements.

If a ballot that significantly violates the guidelines described in this section comes to us, we will determine that the ballot is unresponsive, and simply ignore all the material in it.

Secondly, objections that don't contain a specification so that the correction to resolve the objection ''can be readily determined'' are also unresponsive and will be ignored.

(If we do recognize a ballot that is generally ''unresponsive,'' we will try to inform the balloter as soon as possible so he/she can correct it, but it is ultimately the balloter's responsibility to assure the ballot is responsive.)

Typesetting is not particularly useful to us. And please do not send handwritten ballots. Typewritten (or equivalent) is fine, and if some font information is lost it will be restored by the Technical Editor in any case. If you use `nroff`, you will include extraneous spacing and sometimes backspaces and overstrikes; if you really must use `nroff`, please turn off hyphenation and line adjusting:

```
.hy 0
.na
```

and run the output through `col -b` to remove all the overstrikes. (Also remember that backslashes and leading periods and apostrophes in your text will 1
be treated impolitely by the `*roff` family). The ideal ballot is formatted as a ''flat ASCII file,'' without any attempt at reproducing the typography of the draft and without embedded control characters or overstrikes; it is then printed in Courier (or some other typewriter-like) font for paper-mailing to the IEEE Standards Office and simultaneously e-mailed to the working group Chair.

Don't quote others' ballots. Cite them if you want to refer to another's ballot. If more than one person wants to endorse the same ballot, send just the cover sheets and one copy of the comments and objections. [Note to Institutional Representatives of groups like X/Open, OSF, UI, etc.: this applies to you, too. Please don't duplicate objection text with your members.] Multiple identical copies are easy to deal with, but just increase the paper volume. Multiple almost-identical ballots are a disaster, because we can't tell if they are identical or not, and are likely to miss the subtle differences. Responses of the forms:

— ''I agree with the item in <someone>'s ballot, but I'd like to see this done instead''

— ''I am familiar with the changes to `foo` in <someone>'s ballot and I would object if this change is [or is not] included'' are very useful information to us. If we resolve the objection with the original balloter (the one whose ballot you are referencing), we will also consider yours to be closed, unless you specifically include some text in your objection indicating that should not be done.

Be very careful of ''Oh, by the way, this applies <here> too'' items, particularly if they are in different sections of the document that are likely to be seen by different reviewers. They are probably going to be missed! Note the problem in the appropriate section, and cite the detailed description if it's too much trouble to copy it. The reviewers don't have time to read the whole ballot, and only read the parts that appear to apply to them. Particularly where definitions are involved, even if the change really belongs in one section but the relevant content is in another, an extra cross-reference would be indicated. If you wish to endorse someone else's ballot, either in whole or part, be specific about whether you will be automatically satisfied if they are satisfied. If you will not necessarily be satisfied if they are, your ballot could be deemed unresponsive because it does not give achievable conditions under which your ballot could be converted to affirmative. You then must give the conditions under which you would be satisfied as well. If you would be satisfied in some areas and not in others, it is best to specifically point to each specific objection in the ballot you point to, giving the conditions for each.

Please consider this a new ballot that should stand on its own. Please do not make backward references to your ballots for previous drafts—include all the text you want considered here, because the Technical Reviewer may not have your old ballot. And, the old section and line numbers won't match up anyway. If one of your objections was not accepted exactly as you wanted, it will not be useful to send in the exact text you sent before; read the nearby Rationale section and come up with a more compelling (or clearly-stated) justification for the change.

Please be very wary about global statements, such as ''all of the arithmetic functions need to be defined more clearly.'' Unless you are prepared to cite specific instances of where you want changes made, with reasonably precise replacement language, your ballot will be considered unresponsive.

Ballot Form

The following form is recommended. We would greatly appreciate it if you sent the ballot in electronic form in addition to the required paper copy. Our policy is to handle all ballots online, so if you don't send it to us that way, we have to type it in manually. For the last POSIX.2 ballot, only one or two balloters could not accommodate us on this and thus we had very little typing to do. See the first page of this Annex for the addresses and media. As you'll see from the following, formatting a ballot that's sent to us online is much simpler than a paper-only ballot.

The ballot should be page-numbered, and contain the name, e-mail address, and phone number(s) of the objector(s). (If you send us only a paper copy, make sure this information appears on every page; electronic ballots just need it once, in the beginning.) The lines before the first dashed line are a page header, and should only appear once on each page. Please leave adequate (at least one inch) margins on both sides. Each objection/comment/editorial comment should be sequentially numbered, not in individual ranges [i.e., not Objection #1, Comment #1]

Since we deal with the ballots online, there is no longer any requirement to put only one objection or section per page.

Don't format the ballot as a letter or document with its *own* section numbers. These are simply confusing. As shown below, it is best if you cause each objection and comment to have a sequential number that we can refer to amongst ourselves and to you over the phone. Number sequentially from 1 and count objections, comments, and editorial comments the same; don't number each in its own range. If you don't do this, we'll number them ourselves, but you won't know what numbers we're using.

Please precede each objection/comment with a little code line (if you don't, we'll have to do it ourselves):

@ *<section>* **.** *<clause>* *<code>* *<seqno>*

where:

@ — At-sign in column 1 (which means no @'sin any other column 1's).

<section> — The major section (chapter or annex) number or letter in column 3. Use zero for Global or for something, like the frontmatter, that has no section or annex number.

<clause> — The clause number (second-level header). Please do not go deeper than these two levels. In the text of your objection or comment, go as deep as you can in describing the location, but this code line uses two levels only.

<code> — One of the following lowercase letters, preceded and followed by spaces:

- o Objection.
- c Comment or Editorial Comment.

<seqno> — A sequence number, counting all objections and comments in a single range.

Objection:

```
Balloter Name              (202)555-1212       page  x of nn.
E-Mail Address             FAX:   Fax Number
Balloter2 Name                    (303)555-1213
E-Mail Address2            FAX:   Fax Number2
----------------------------------------------------------------
@ x.y o seq#
<Seq#> Sect x.y OBJECTION. page xxx, line zzz:
```

```
Problem:
```

A clear statement of the problem that is observed, sufficient for others to understand the nature of the problem. Note that you should identify problems by section, page, and line numbers. This may seem redundant, but if you transpose a digit pair, we may get totally lost without a cross-check like this. Use the line number where the problem starts, not just where the section itself starts; we sometimes attempt to sort objections by line numbers to make editing more accurate. If you are referring to a range of lines, please don't say ''lines 1000ff;'' use a
real range so we can tell where to stop looking. If you have access to the online 2
versions of a balloting draft, please do not send in a ballot that refers to the page 2
numbers in the `nroff` output version; use only the line and page numbers found 2
in the printed draft or the online PostScript draft. We will really love you if you 2
can manage to include enough context information in the problem statement (such as the name of the utility) so we can understand it without having the draft in our laps at the time. (It also helps you when we e-mail it back to you.) If you are objecting to an action in the Unresolved Objections List, use the section/page/line number reference for the appropriate place in the standard;
don't refer to the UOL except to cite its number and for clarification of your points. 1

```
Action:
```

A precise statement of the actions to be taken on the document to resolve the objection above, which if taken verbatim will completely remove the objection.

If there is an acceptable range of actions, any of which will resolve the problem for you if taken exactly, please indicate all of them. If we accept any of these, your objection will be considered as resolved.

If the Action section is omitted or is vague in its solution, the objection will be reclassified as a nonbinding comment. The Technical Reviewers, being human, will give more attention to Actions that are well-described than ones that are vague or imprecise. The best ballots of all have very explicit directions to substitute, delete, or add text in a style consistent with the rest of the document, such as:

Delete the sentence on lines 101-102:

"The implementation shall not ... or standard error."

On line 245, change "shall not" to "should not".

After line 103, add:

-r Reverse the order of bytes read from the file.

Some examples of poorly-constructed actions:

Remove all features of this command that are not supported by BSD.

Add -i.

Make this command more efficient and reliable.

Use some other flag that isn't so confusing.

I don't understand this section.

Specify a value--I don't care what.

Objection Example:

```
Hal Jespersen             (415) 364-3410            page  3 of 17.
UUCP: hlj@Posix.COM  FAX:  (415) 364-4498
------------------------------------------------------------------
@ 2.6 o 23
23. Sect 2.6 OBJECTION. page 77, line 1217:

Problem:

The EDITOR environment variable is not used as stated
in my company.  This description would cause hundreds
of my shell scripts to break.

Action:

Change the first sentence on line 1217 to:

      The e-mail address of the editor of the user's
      favorite POSIX standard.

-----------------------
@ 3.1 o 24
24. Sect 3.1.6 OBJECTION. page 123, line 17:

Problem:

I support UO 3.01-999-6 concerning the objection to the                  1
definition of "operator".                                                1
This definition would cause great hardship to the users                  1
of the systems I develop.                                                1
I feel your rationale for rejection was inappropriate                    1
because you overlooked the following technical points [etc.]...          1

Action:

Change the term "operator" to "operation-symbol" in this
definition and globally throughout Section 3.
```

Comment:

```
---------------------------------------------------------------------
@ x.z c seq#
<Seq#> Sect x.z COMMENT. page xxx, line zzz:
```

A statement of a problem that you might want to be resolved by the reviewer, but which does not in any way affect whether your ballot is negative or positive. The form for objections is not required, but it increases the probability that your comment will have an effect on the final document.

Although there may be questions to you or responses on the topic, no changes in the drafts are required by a comment, although it will be looked at to determine whether the concern should be addressed. It is possible to abuse this rule and label all of your comments as objections, but it is a significant disservice to the individuals who are volunteering their time to address your concerns.

Remember that any issue concerning the pages preceding page 1 (the Frontmatter), Rationale text with shaded margins, Annexes, NOTES in the text, footnotes, or examples will be treated as a nonbinding comment whether you label it that way or not, but it would help us if you'd label it correctly.

Editorial Comment:

```
---------------------------------------------------------------------
@ x.z c seq#
<Seq#> Sect x.z EDITORIAL COMMENT. page xxx, line zzz:
```

These are for strictly editorial issues, where the technical meaning of the document is not changed. Examples are: typos; misspellings; English syntax or usage errors; appearances of lists or tables; arrangement of sections, clauses, and subclauses (except where the location of information changes the optionality of a feature). Marking these as comments but indicating that they are editorial speeds the process.

Please be aware that after balloting concludes the document will be subjected to more sets of editors at the IEEE and ISO who are empowered to make broad editorial changes and rewording (for example, to get the text ready for translation into French.)

Thank you for your cooperation in this important balloting process.

Hal Jespersen

Identifier Index