Observations about the optional CD ballot

Doing a CD ballot has the drawback that it will create more work (we have to resolve comments, and there could potentially be duplicate comments arising during the CD and FCD).

Doing a CD ballot has the potential advantages that:

- It gives the world more than just a “one and only chance” to comment on our work. (But NBs might be happy to accept whatever we do, and there is some opportunity for the public to give us feedback through non-ballot channels.)
- It could help reduce the (a) volume and (b) risk of FCD ballot comments by addressing some comments early. (But there would probably still be a net increase of total comment resolution work, as noted above; and there could still be a surprise late objection about some small-but-suddenly-controversial feature as happened in the C++98 endgame, especially given that some national bodies probably won’t look at a draft until it is balloted.)
These strawman options are not the only options, and both are mutable. Their purpose is to illustrate two major paths as a starting point for discussion.

The red shading is to indicate the increasing risk of reaching the goal of achieving a 2009 publication date. The yellow boxes show where additional space would be needed between meetings to allow for ballot periods.

Both options shown are realistically achievable, but aggressive. In particular:

- Three meetings is probably the minimum realistic number for each ballot comment resolution phase. Depending on the comment volume, achieving that pace may require some additional work between meetings.
- For Option X (issuing a CD ballot) to have a chance at a 2009 publication date, the three 2009 meetings must be compressed into the first half of the year (e.g., Feb-Apr-Jun).