

VSO PP Comment Review

Ballot: VSO Policy & Procedures, Revision 1.6a Name: Frank Van Hooft Ballot: DISAPPROVE	Response
Comments I would like to see VITA move towards a "per-company" voting eligibility basis, rather than the current "individual" basis. Many other groups, such as PICMG and RapidIO, are structured on the "company eligibility" system, which (in my opinion) is a fairer system for a commercially-oriented organisation.	

Ballot: VSO Policy & Procedures, Revision 1.6a Name: John Hill Ballot: APPROVE	Response
Comments: a- In section 5: I note that this section only applies to votes at meetings. While I am not aware of a requirement for a letter ballot, this section would not apply, should a letter ballot be necessary.	
b- In section 7.8, paragraph 1: I suggest that the determination of whether to recirculate should be made by the leader of the working group that produced the document in question.	

Ballot: VSO Policy & Procedures, Revision 1.6a Name: Tony Lavelly Ballot: APPROVE	Response
Comments Typos nostly Section 6.4 I believe "addition" s/b "edition"; "specify" s/b "specific"	
Section 7.1.1 now reads "...development a standard..." s/b "...development of a standard..."	
Section 7.1.2: does the last sentence supercede the 2/3 rule above, or intend to invoke it? It seems that this is a different definition; is that intended?	
Section 7.1.5 Again I believe "addition" s/b "edition"	
Section 7.1.10 reads "...shall be approved the VITA Executive..." s/b "...shall be approved by the VITA Executive..."	
Section 12.1 "electronics" s/b "electronic"	

Michael Thompson. Schroff – Comments	Response
<p>In section 1.1 it says:</p> <p>"Changes to this document require a 2/3 affirmative vote of the votes cast at a duly called VSO meeting of VITA members who meet the voting eligibility requirements as stated in section 5.0."</p> <p>It used to say "2/3 majority vote" which is nicely defined in section 5.2. A 2/3 affirmative vote is not defined. Shouldn't section 1.1 say:</p> <p>"Changes to this document require a 2/3 majority vote of the votes cast at a duly called VSO meeting of VITA members who meet the voting eligibility requirements as stated in section 5.0."</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>There is an extra blank line between sections 6.2 and 6.3.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>In section 6.4 it says:</p> <p>"Where Robert's Rules of Order differ with specify provisions of these Policies and Procedures, these Policies and Procedures shall take precedence."</p> <p>It should say"</p> <p>"Where Robert's Rules of Order differ with specific provisions of these Policies and Procedures, these Policies and Procedures shall take precedence."</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>In paragraph 1 of section 7.1.1 it says:</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

<p>"...consensus for the development a standard."</p> <p>In paragraph 2 of section 7.1.1 it says"</p> <p>"...interest in developing the standard..."</p> <p>Consensus and interest are very different things.</p> <p>Paragraph 1 of section 7.1.1 should say:</p> <p>"A study group may be formed by any VSO member that wishes to investigate the need and ascertain the interest in developing a standard."</p>	
<p>At the end of section 7.1.2 it says:</p> <p>"The VSO membership at any meeting where such an appeal is made may grant such a request by 2/3 of those eligible to vote voting in the affirmative."</p> <p>To me this means that a bunch of VSO members can get together anywhere, even on the phone, and grant the request for the working group to continue with no sponsors. It doesn't even have to happen at a VSO meeting!</p> <p>It should say:</p> <p>"The VSO membership at any VSO meeting where such an appeal is made may grant such a request by 2/3 majority vote."</p>	Accepted
<p>In section 7.1.5 it says:</p>	Accepted

<p>"The latest addition of Robert's Rules of Order shall be used..."</p> <p>It should say:</p> <p>"The Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall be used..."</p>	
<p>In section 5.4 Working Group ballots can be marked "REMOVE ME". In section 7.1.6 Working Group ballots can be marked "REMOVE".</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>In section 7.1.9 it says:</p> <p>"Once the draft has received a 2/3 majority in a working group ballot, the working group may decide to move to phase 2 and to select a track to pursue by a 2/3 majority vote."</p> <p>There is a very subtle difference between a 2/3 majority and a 2/3 majority vote. Figure 7.1 and section 7.1.9 say that a 2/3 majority vote is required to move a draft to Phase 2. As defined in section 5.2 you can only have a 2/3 majority vote at any duly called meeting. A duly recognized meeting is defined, but a duly called meeting is not. Is a duly called meeting defined in Roberts?</p> <p>Section 7.1.9 should be changed to say:</p> <p>"Once the draft has received a 2/3 majority vote in a working group ballot, the working group may decide to move to phase 2 and to select a track to pursue by a 2/3 majority vote."</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>In section 10.1 it says"</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

"...including the email for the VITA Executive Director..."

It should say:

"...including the email address for the VITA Executive Director..."