Material for P802.3REV appeal

Sent to:
LMSC Recording Secretary
Bob O'Hara bob.ohara@ieee.org

1. General background

1.1 802.3 concerns

The 802.3 WG has no consistent editorial guidelines or policies for ensuring editorial correctness. The effort expended fighting requested changes generally dwarfs the effort needed to implement the changes. Thus, the errors within document exceed those associated with benign neglect.

The results are shocking to amateur/professional editors, and result in documentation that is unreadable by many, especially non-native English speakers. Inconsistencies and multiple equivalent definitions abound, oftentimes found within the same paragraph. The number of available review comments is relatively unbounded, limited only by typing hours and tool-submittal efficiencies.

Normative definitions are specified in terms of code which has no formal definition, compiler, or run-time environment, but has been rumored to have compiled some time in the past. As a result, formal discussions are often limited to the 20-year veterans, since others can't really understand this ill-specified code.

Attempts to remedy this problem have been met with denial, active top-down opposition, and career-limiting attacks in other forums. This appeal focuses on denial; personal attacks are out of scope.

1.2 802.x groups

Other 802 groups have similar problems with inconsistent nomenclature or writing conventions, oftentimes based on their previous 802.3 exposure. However, other groups have been found to be more receptive when errors are identified.

With 802.1, the editor and commenter worked to resolve most "consent agenda" topics, withdrew sensitive topics, and extracted the few possibly-controversial topics for WG review.

With 802.16, the Chair/Editor approved most editorial issues and utilized the commenter to incorporate these 100s (probably 1000s, with search and search-and-replace) of changes. The WG then quickly reviewed and approved the change-bar text, before other approved changes were inserted.

While the flexibility and reception from other 802.x groups is remarkable, there remains a need to establish a set of 802.3 guidelines. Without these, the IEEE Style Manual goals (see 3.1.4) will remain elusive.

2. Appeal requirements

The following information is provided in accordance with:
    LMSC Policies and Procedures, November 19, 2004
    Fetched on 2005Apr13 from:
        http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/policies-and-procedures.pdf

2.1 Nature of the objections

This appeal focuses on the inequities in the Sponsor Ballot review process, as utilized by the IEEE 802.3 WG Chair and Vice Chair. Several basic problems are identified:

a)   Obscure responses. Responsive responses to rejected comments were not provided.

b)   Content violations. Document content and responses knowingly violate the IEEE Style Manual.

c)   Procedure violations. No attempts were made to reconcile rejections; the commenter was effectively excluded from key comment-resolution discussions.

2.2 Resulting adverse effects

As a direct consequence of actions, the 802.3 document retains many inconsistencies, apparently conflicting definitions, and illegible text. Simply stated, this document is for anyone w/o extensive experience.

As an indirect consequence, 802.3 examples have propagated into other IEEE 802 standards, where the sticky caps-lock key syndrome is prevalent. Other documents use other conventions, where even the use of hexadecimal subscripts/flags varies from draft to draft.

With the standards for nomenclature remaining obscure and inconsistent, editors can only be selected from among those that understand the folk-lore. Editing decisions are made based on "what's used most" searches (see 4.3.13), rather than rules of English or the IEEE Style Manual.

As an example, the incorrect/inconsistent spelling of *Value/comment* is now being (sometimes) applied to ongoing projects, due to comments received on this draft. Had these been resolved, rather than deferred to the IEEE Editors, the rules for leading compound rules would have retained the (now known to be correct) *Value/Comment* usage.

Allowance for misleading or irrelevant response has limited the number of qualified 802.3 editors, due to the bad examples of behavior and text.

To cope with all of the draft particularities, preferential treatment is required of IEEE Editors, to produce a credible draft that can be shipped quickly. From past experience, this results in unnecessarily delaying other standards, which typically receive a lower-priority in the editing process.

2.3 Clause(s) of the procedures or standard(s) that are at issue

2.3.1 IEEE Style Manual

IEEE Style Manual: multiple clauses and subclauses, as listed in 3.1.

Other clauses and subclause are hereby incorporated by reference.

2.3.2 Standards companion

From:
http://standards.ieee.org/guides/companion/annexb-c.html#top

If the BRG does not accept the objection "as is" but proposes an alternative solution or if the BRG rejects the objection, the voter must be contacted by a technical reviewer who will explain the decision. If the voter accepts the change, the objection will be considered resolved. If the voter maintains his or her objection, the objection will remain unresolved.

As a practical matter, all negative voters should be contacted by email or phone if possible to discuss their rationale and possible solutions. The final result must be followed up in writing and confirmed by the balloter.

If a negative comment cannot be resolved positively, the BRG should try to negotiate a change that will cause the objector to change his or her vote to affirmative. At this stage, a phone call is often more effective than several back-and-forth notes. If it's resolved to the objector's satisfaction, it should be confirmed in writing. If it's unresolved, the objector *must* formally receive a written reply giving the rationale for the rejection of the voter's comment.

Other companion pages and associated documents are hereby incorporated by reference.

2.3.3 Actions or inactions that are at issue

2.3.3.1 There was no apparent effort to resolve comments from an individual:
    No email.
    No phone call.
    No request to attend resolution meeting.

2.3.3.2 The BRG effectively excluded the commenter from comment discussions, but deferring summary issues to the WG. After the commenter was asked to prepare a proposed resolution, and had done so, the presentation of that resolution wording was prohibited. This reflects a concerted effort to block resolution of the comment, without any attempt to compromise or understand.

2.3.3.3 Isolated. There was no effort to request guidance from IEEE/RAC, despite objections by an IEEE/RAC reviewer. In effect, the acknowledge experts were ignored.

2.3.3.4 Presumptuous. There was no effort to request advice from IEEE Editorial staff, on issues of uncertainty.

2.3.3.5 Unique style. The draft contains excessive violation of the IEEE Style Manual, few of which can be justified.

2.3.3.6 Obscure code. The only functional definition for the Pascal code is informative, rendering the normative meaning of specification code obscure.

2.3.3.7 Recirculation obscurity. The resolutions of unresolved Sponsor Ballot comments were heavily cross-referenced to other comment numbers when recirculated, but the 100s of comments were not sorted by comment number. As a result, effectively parsing of the resolutions would have been extremely difficult for most reviewers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

2.4 Specific remedial action(s) that would satisfy the appellant's concerns

Multiple steps of remedial action are required, as follows:

2.4.1 Specify specific wording to be used in all "principle" resolutions, not plans of action.

2.4.2 Incorporate all such changes and recirculate the draft with all pages (not just changed pages).

2.4.3 Replace the Pascal code with normative C code, that all can understand.

2.4.4 Accept all valid comments, independent of anecdotal evidence.

2.4.5 Submit all OUI related text to the IEEE/RAC for approval and incorporate their suggestions.

2.5 Previous efforts to resolve the objection(s)

This has been a long journey, as described below.

The first attempt to improve 802.3 focused on a recent 802.3 EPON addition and involved submission of comments on the EPON draft, before Sponsor Ballot, which were reviewed in Italy. Most comments were rejected and the commenter was immediately and personally attacked in the forum of three other IEEE groups.

The next attempt to improve 802.3 focused on the same 802.3 EPON addition, and involved submission of comments on the EPON draft, during Sponsor Ballot, which were reviewed in Santa Clara. Most comments were privately grouped into large bins (with 100s of issues) by individual editors. Editors were then allowed to extract individual comments for detailed discussion; the commenter was not similarly allowed. All large bins were then voted down without discussion.

Throughout these discussions and voting, the commenter has repetitively offered to assist with editing and/or creation of writing guidelines. These offers have been continually ignored. Instead, active 802.3 members worked to kill the IEEE FrameMaker Templates project, to avoid any constraints that a consensus based editor-driven project could have implied.

Continued attempts have been made to improve 802 drafts quality, but interacting with other more receptive 802 groups (see 1.2).

For the Sponsor Ballot of 802.3REV, the commenter again provided extensive comments, using specialized tools to improve the efficiency of comment generation. Since many comments from the first attempt (see above) were only partially and inconsistently incorporated, many instances of problems were painstakingly identified.

After these Sponsor Ballot comments were rejected-in-bulk and without consultation, the commenter requested an informal LMSC review. This 2005Mar14 meeting was to be held with mutually agreed-upon parties present. Unfortunately, a surprise last-minute invitation of a hostile third party stifled the likelihood of progress.

The commenter than attended the BRG (ballot review group). At that 2005Mar16 (I think) meeting, the presence of one supporter deadlocked the voting on key issues, which were then brought to the 802.3 WG plenary for resolution, but mutual consent. Implied in that discussion was the opportunity for both parties to propose individual resolutions.

When the time arrived at the 2005Mar17 802.3 Plenary, the commenter was prohibited from presenting a resolution or discussing flaws in the editor-prepared resolution, so a rejection was inevitable (sigh).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

3. IEEE Style Manual

The following text was extracted from the IEEE 2000 Style Manual (Revised 2002), which can be found at:
    http://standards.ieee.org/guides/style/2000Style.pdf

3.1 2000 edition

3.1.1 Deferred corrections

2000 Page 4, 4.1.3: All approved corrections or changes to the final draft should be listed in a separate file, and a description should be provided to indicate where they are to be inserted into the text. If corrections are extensive, a new corrected draft shall be submitted with changes clearly indicated by strikethroughs for deleted text and underscores for new text. Changes to figures or tables shall be clearly indicated.

Technical changes shall not be made to a draft after balloting without recirculation, and certain editorial changes that affect the meaning of the text may require recirculation as well.

3.1.2 Table of contents

2000 Page 8, 9.5: A table of contents listing the main clauses (identified by one digit) and the first series of subclauses under each clause (identified by two digits) shall be supplied. The next series of subclauses (identified by three digits) may be included when deemed appropriate by the IEEE Standards Project Editor and the Working Group.

3.1.3 Acronym definitions

2000 Page 11, 10.4.2: Acronyms shall not be defined in the definitions clause.

3.1.4 Uniformity

2000 Page 14, 12.: Uniformity of structure, of style, and of terminology shall be maintained not only within each standard, but also within a series of associated standards. The structure of associated standards and the numbering of their clauses shall be identical, as far as possible. Analogous wording shall be used to express analogous provisions; identical wording shall be used to express identical provisions.

3.1.5 Same term

2000 Page 14, 12.: The same term shall be used throughout each standard or series of standards to designate a given concept. The use of an alternative term (synonym) for a concept already defined shall be avoided. As far as possible, only one meaning shall be attributed to each term used.

3.1.6 Capitalization

2000 Page 16, 13.8: The initial letter of the first word shall be capitalized in
The initial letter of the first word shall be capitalized in
—Clause, subclause, and annex headings
—Specific cross-references in text [e.g., Table 1, Figure 12, Note 2, Equation (3)]
—Captions for figures
—Captions for tables
—Column and line headings in tables (see Table 1)
—Lettered and numbered list entries

3.1.7 Equation terms

2000 Page 23, 17.: All terms shall be defined, including both quantities and units, in a tabulation following the equation [see Equation (1)]. The list should be preceded by the word *where*, followed by the list of variables and corresponding definitions.

3.1.8 Multiplication sign

2000 Page 26, 17.3: A multiplication sign ($\times$), rather than a multidot ($\cdot$), shall be used to indicate multiplication of numbers and numerical values.

3.2 2005 edition

From the IEEE Style Manual, ...
    http://standards.ieee.org/guides/style/2005Style.pdf

3.2.1 Front matter

2005 Page 3, 4.2.1: The drafts should contain a front matter and main text, and follow the style outlined in this manual.

3.2.2 Deferred corrections

2005 Page 5, 4.2.4: Corrections or changes to the final balloted draft that do not affect the technical content of the standard (e.g. grammatical changes and changes to the style) shall be submitted along with the submission of the final balloted draft to the IEEE-SA Standards Board for approval. The corrections or changes to the final balloted draft should be listed in a separate file, and a description should be provided to indicate where they are to be inserted into the text. If corrections are extensive, a new corrected draft shall be submitted with changes clearly indicated by strikethroughs for deleted text and underscores for new text. Changes to figures or tables shall be clearly indicated. The IEEE Standards Project Editor will determine whether the corrections or changes are acceptable. Corrections or changes that are not accepted may be submitted for consideration in a future amendment, corrigendum, or revision of the standard.

3.2.3 Table of contents

2005 Page 10, 9.5: A table of contents listing the main clauses (identified by one digit) and the first series of subclauses under each clause (identified by two digits) shall be supplied. The next series of subclauses (identified by three digits) may be included when deemed appropriate by the IEEE Standards Project Editor and the working group. The table of contents shall be generated automatically, and not composed manually. Lists of tables and figures shall not be included in the table of contents. Only the appropriate clauses, subclauses, and normative and/or informative annexes shall be listed. (See Annex B for a sample table of contents.)

3.2.4 Acronym definitions

2005 Page 13, 10.5.2: Acronyms shall not be defined in the definition clause.

3.2.5 Uniformity

2005 Page 17, 12: Uniformity of structure, style, and of terminology shall be maintained not only within each standard, but also within a series of associated standards. The structure of associated standards and the numbering of their clauses shall be identical, as far as possible. Analogous wording shall be used to express analogous provisions; identical wording shall be used to express identical provisions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

3.2.6 Same term

2005 Page 17, 12: The same term shall be used throughout each standard or series of standards to designate a given concept. The use of an alternative term (synonym) for a concept already defined shall be avoided. As far as possible, only one meaning shall be attributed to each term used.

3.2.7 Capitalization

2005 Page 19, 13.8: The initial letter of the first word shall be capitalized in
—Clause, subclause, and annex headings
—Specific cross-references in text [e.g., Table 1, ...]
—Titles for figures
—Titles for tables
—Column and line headings in tables (see Table 2)
—Lettered and numbered list entries

3.2.8 Equation terms

2005 Page 26, 17.1: All terms shall be defined, including both quantities and units, in tabulation following the equation [see Equation(1)]. The list should be preceded by the word where, followed by the list of variables and corresponding definitions.

3.2.9 Multiplication sign

2005 Page 26, 17.3: A multiplication sign ×, rather than the letter "x" or a multidot (*), shall be used to indicate multiplications of numbers and numerical values.

This is an unapproved draft, subject to change

4. Specific comment concerns

4.1 "Accepted in principle" comments

There is a _major_ problem with the "principle" resolution: the outcome is unclear to the commenter and all Sponsor Ballot reviewers. An action plan is not a resolution: issues should either be accepted, rejected, or withdrawn. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.1).

4.1.1 "Value/Comment" comments

This is a classic example of problems with "accepted in principle". Since the resolution was unclear, and similar issues were being addressed in other forums, I checked with Yvette. She noted that compound headers should be spelled as though each word were at the start, so this should remain "Value/Comment".

However, given the lack of a specific response, this could have been implemented differently by multiple IEEE Editors, if more than one were assigned to the task. Thus, the result could change on a per-clause or per-draft basis. Worse yet, others have read the response and (with good intent) are not writing the incorrect spelling "Value/comment" within amendments.

Based on IEEE Editor discussions, all of the following items should have been **rejected**:

1957 1958, 1951, 1950, 1939, 1934, 1932, 1927, 1924, 1918, 1917, 1917, 1916, 1915, 1906, 1905, 1904, 1900, 1899, 1898, 1892, 1886, 1883, 1879, 1878, 1877, 1870, 1867, 1866, 1861, 1858, 1857, 1852, 1850, 1848, 1844, 1843, 1833, 1832, 1829, 1828, 1818, 1817, 1810, 1809, 1808, 1805, 1804, 1803, 1802, 1801, 1800, 1799, 1798, 1796, 1789, 1788, 1787, 1783, 1782, 1781, 1778, 1777, 1770, 1767, 1766, 1763, 1762, 1760, 1757, 1754, 1753, 1744, 1741, 1740, 1738, 1735, 1734, 1732, 1729, 1728, 1721, 1719, 1717, 1714, 1711, 1709, 1703, 1702, 1699, 1698, 1694, 1693, 1692, 1688, 1686, 1683, 1682, 1680, 1676, 1674, 1673, 1672, 1665, 1664, 1663, 1662, 1661, 1659, 1658, 1657, 1652, 1651, 1650, 1649, 1648, 1647, 1646, 1645, 1644, 1642, 1636, 1635, 1634, 1630, 1629, 1620, 1619, 1612, 1609, 1607, 1603, 1596, 1592, 1588, 1585, 1582, 1577, 1575, 1572, 1568, 1565, 1561, 1559, 1557, 1555, 1550, 1548, 1546, 1543, 1539, 1532, 1529, 1526, 1523, 1393, 1387, 1384, 1380, 1376, 1372, 1371, 1370, 1365, 1364, 1363, 1362, 1357, 1356, 1351, 1350, 1349, 1346, 1345, 1340, 1337, 1336, 1333, 1331, 1328, 1325, 1322, 1320, 1312, 1311, 1309, 1308, 1306, 1305, 1304, 1303, 1302, 1300, 1297, 1296, 1293, 1292, 1290, 1283, 1282, 1280, 1278, 1268, 1265, 1263, 1260, 1257, 1252, 1250, 1248, 1244, 1243, 1242, 1238, 1236, 1234, 1228, 1225, 1221, 1220, 1219, 1216, 1213, 1212, 1211, 1210, 1205, 1192, 1191, 1190, 1116, 1114, 1113, 1109, 1108, 1106, 1104, 1102, 1099, 1098, 1095, 1094, 1075, 1074, 1073, 1072, 1071, 1070, 1062, 1060, 1059, 1058, 1057, 1056, 1055, 1054, 1053, 1052, 960, 958, 955, 954, 952, 947, 946, 944, 938, 937, 932, 914, 913, 906, 904, 903, 902, 892, 887, 886, 885, 854, 851, 848, 844, 841, 838, 833, 827, 824, 821, 815, 814, 813, 785, 783, 781, 780, 773, 762, 756, 755, 749, 742, 476, 439

4.1.2 Figure font: 8-point Arial

Many figures in this draft, as well as pending amendments, use a variety of extraneous fonts; the standard is to use 8-point Arial. Extensive font changes (which may change key-work hyphenation) cannot be safely done by Editors. Also, I suspect that the IEEE Editors may not have the proper tools or source material, so most of these issues were really (and perhaps knowingly) rejected. Stating acceptance, while rejecting the issue, is dishonest and misleading to the other Sponsor Ballot reviewers.

1157, 1156, 1155, 1154, 1153, 1152, 1151, 1150, 1149, 1148, 1147, 1146, 1145, 1144, 1143, 1142, 1141, 1140, 1139, 1138, 1137, 1136, 1135, 1134, 1133, 1132, 1131, 1130, 1129, 1128, 1127, 1126, 1125, 1124, 1123, 1122, 1121, 1082, 1081, 696, 664, 662, 654, 653, 597, 594, 592, 587, 586, 542, 494, 491, 483, 473, 335, 334, 333, 332, 331, 330, 329, 327, 271, 222

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

4.1.3 Figure text: mixed callouts

Many figures in this draft, as well as pending amendments, use a variety of mixed callout conventions. The IEEE Style Manual recommends "ALL CAPS" or "Some caps", but not both in the same figure. Asking the IEEE Editors to make such changes is hazardous, particularly given the use of "RESET STATE" nomenclature for state machine names and the frequent use of acronyms (such as MAC). Also, one could incorrectly change "MEDIA ACCESS CONTROL" to "Media access control", unaware that the term "Media Access Control" is meant to be capitalized for historical reasons.

Also, I suspect that the IEEE Editors may not have the proper tools or source material, so most of these issues were really (and perhaps knowingly) rejected. Stating acceptance, while rejecting the issue, is dishonest and misleading to the other Sponsor Ballot reviewers.

1838, 1837, 1653, 1637, 1615, 1598, 1315, 1270, 1197, 1173, 1160, 1159, 1046, 1045, 1044, 1043, 1019, 1015, 1014, 1009, 1007, 961, 915, 859, 858, 857, 856, 855, 803, 802, 801, 799, 798, 797, 796, 795, 793, 788, 787, 786, 688, 683, 680, 677, 661, 660, 652, 650, 649, 648, 487, 484, 474, 470, 463, 461, 448, 443, 442, 441, 328, 326, 293, 292, 291, 290, 289, 281, 280, 278, 277, 275, 274, 273, 272, 268, 228, 225, 208, 207, 206, 204, 198, 164

4.1.4 Centered title

Many items address the issue that "small items and numbers should be centered in the cell". Leaving these as tasks for the IEEE Editors is inappropriate: if easily done w/o doubt, these changes could easily be done an presented in a recirculation. Given the commonality of this error, the 802.3 staff should include this in a checklist applied _before_ Sponsor Ballot, so as to not waste valuable reviewers time and effort.

1953, 1952, 1946, 1945, 1944, 1943, 1928, 1925, 1923, 1922, 1920, 1919, 1909, 1908, 1907, 1903, 1902, 1901, 1897, 1896, 1895, 1893, 1887, 1885, 1882, 1881, 1880, 1871, 1869, 1868, 1862, 1860, 1859, 1853, 1851, 1849, 1847, 1846, 1835, 1834, 1831, 1830, 1827, 1826, 1825, 1824, 1823, 1822, 1821, 1820, 1813, 1812, 1811, 1807, 1806, 1797, 1792, 1791, 17901786, 1785, 1784, 1780, 1799, 1773, 1771, 1769, 1768, 1765, 1764, 1761, 1759, 1756, 1755, 1751, 1750, 1745, 1743, 1742, 1739, 1736, 1733, 1731, 1730, 1722, 1720, 1718, 1716, 1715, 1712, 1710, 1705, 1704, 1701, 1700, 1697, 1696, 1695, 1691, 1690, 1685, 1684, 1681, 1633, 1625, 1624, 1623, 1622, 1614, 1613, 1611, 1610, 1608, 1606, 1605, 1597, 1595, 1594, 1591, 1587, 1584, 1581, 1580, 1574, 1571, 1567, 1564, 1554, 1553, 1545, 1542, 1534, 1531, 1528, 1527, 1395, 1394, 1388, 1386, 1385, 1383, 1381, 1379, 1377, 1375, 1374, 1373, 1369, 1368, 1367, 1366, 1361, 1360, 1359, 1358, 1355, 1353, 1352, 1348, 1347, 1341, 1339, 1338, 1335, 1334, 1332, 1330, 1329, 1327, 1326, 1324, 1323, 1321, 1314, 1313, 1310, 1307, 1301, 1299, 1298, 1295, 1294, 1291, 1287, 1285, 1284, 1279, 1269, 1266, 1264, 1262, 1261, 1251, 1241, 1239, 1235, 1230, 1229, 1224, 1223, 1222, 1215, 1214, 1206, 1196, 1195, 1194, 1193, 1185, 1184, 1183, 1180, 1179, 1172, 1171, 1170, 1169, 1168, 1167, 1165, 1164, 1120, 1118, 1117, 1112, 1111, 1110, 1107, 1105, 1103, 1101, 1100, 1097, 1096, 1002, 1001, 998, 996, 994, 992, 991, 989, 987, 986, 981, 980, 853, 850, 847, 843, 840, 839, 837, 836, 832, 831, 830, 826, 823, 819, 818, 809, 782, 777, 776, 761, 760, 754, 745, 696, 647, 646, 645, 644, 643, 642, 641, 640, 638, 637, 636, 635, 634, 633, 632, 631, 628, 627, 626, 625, 624, 623, 622, 621, 620, 619, 615, 614, 613, 607, 604, 585, 584, 583, 582, 581, 580, 579, 578, 577, 576, 575, 574, 573, 572, 571, 570, 569, 568, 567, 566, 565, 564, 563, 562, 561, 557, 552, 547, 540, 539, 538, 537, 536, 535, 534, 533, 532, 530, 529, 527, 526, 525, 524, 523, 522, 521, 520, 519, 518, 517, 516, 515, 514, 513, 512, 511, 510, 509, 508, 507, 504, 503, 502, 481, 480, 479, 478, 477, 468, 465, 459, 434, 430, 429, 428, 423, 422, 416, 415, 408, 402, 401, 396, 391, 384, 383, 382, 378, 369, 368, 363, 362, 357, 356, 349, 339, 337, 258, 254, 253, 252, 251, 250, 249, 248, 247, 245, 244, 243, 242, 241, 240, 239, 236, 235, 158, 157, 156, 155, 154, 153, 152, 150, 149, 148, 147, 146, 145, 144, 143, 142, 141

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

4.1.5 Capitalization

A large number of capitalization errors were accepted in principle. Many of these errors may correspond to normal words in one place, but special names in code or state machine locations. Since global changes are needed to catch all instances, and some instances may be incorrect if changed, the IEEE Editors cannot be safely burdened with this task. Given the commonality of this error, the 802.3 staff should include this in a checklist applied _before_ Sponsor Ballot, so as to not waste valuable reviewers time and effort.

1926, 1910, 1888, 1884, 1078, 1077, 1076, 1033, 1032, 1013, 1008, 1006, 1005, 1004, 965, 964, 963, 962, 694, 693, 692, 691, 690, 672, 663, 651, 603, 589, 588, 497, 482, 447, 446, 444, 343, 342, 341, 340, 317, 316, 310, 309, 308, 304, 302, 301, 300, 299, 297, 294, 191, 190, 189, 188, 187, 186, 185, 184, 183, 182, 181, 180, 178, 176, 175, 170, 166, 162

4.1.6 Blank table lines

A large number of tables have blank lines on the bottom, when the break across pages. This can cause significant confusion, since the blank line could be interpreted to mean a concatenation of rows with the row on the next page. For that reason, the IEEE Editors recommend the use of a thin line on the bottom of a split-across-page table.

This is a widespread problem throughout 802 documents. There is a well known solution, but 802.3 staff has prevented these fixed templates from being adopted by the IEEE. The IEEE Staff has not been able to fix this bug for over a year, and many published drafts contain this erroneous "feature". Given the published examples, and the reluctance of 802.3 to use bug-fixed templates, these must be corrected before being passed to the IEEE Editors.

1446, 1069, 1068, 1067, 1066, 1065, 1064, 1063, 1061, 1042, 1041, 1040, 1039, 1038, 1037, 1036, 1035, 1034, 1030, 1029, 1010, 1000, 948, 939, 907, 893, 816, 794, 769, 765, 759, 758, 757, 751, 630, 629, 472, 467, 460, 325, 256

4.1.7 PICS capitalization comments

The resolution of this issue was proper, but there is no mechanism to ensure its adoption within other 802/802.3 standards.

1955; 1954, 1951, 1950, 1948, 1947, 1941, 1940, 1936, 1935 1930, 1929, 1913, 1912, 1890, 1889, 1875, 1874, 1864, 1863, 1855, 1854, 1840, 1839, 1815, 1814, 1794, 1793, 1775, 1774, 1724, 1723, 1707, 1706, 1678, 1677, 1667, 1666, 1655, 1654, 1639, 1638, 1628, 1627, 1626, 1617, 1616, 1601, 1600, 1521, 1520, 1391, 1390, 1343, 1342, 1318, 1317, 1255, 1254, 1232, 1231, 1202, 1201, 1175, 1174, 1092, 1091, 1051, 1049, 1017, 979, 978, 928, 926, 908, 896, 878, 876, 875, 808, 805, 748, 746, 687, 685, 606, 605, 549, 499, 498, 348, 346, 345, 344, 234, 232

4.1.8 General

Deferral of the following items to the IEEE is unlikely to be fully successful, based on previous documents that have passed through IEEE Editors before being published, with similar (and oftentimes identical) errors. The IEEE Editors are excellent at their job, but their overburdened agenda makes this difficult.

#496: Split table headers.
#1772: Trailing 'r' on number.
Detailed change bars will be hard to give to the IEEE Editors, so these should not be deferred.

#1938: Maker header vertical.
#1842: Table line widths.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

#1289: Page break.

#1012: Extra blank page

#807: Page break

#698: Table headers spanning

#686: Pagination

#682: Incorrect font size

#674: Splitting: ==> Splitting and same for other cell entries.

#673: Be consistent, either all left or right aligned.

#656: Additional reference material ==> Bibliography

#602: Separate Max and Var headers (unstraddle these two cells)

#548: Insert page break before 17.5

#471: Include the "continued" marker in the table header, so the continued portions of the table ….

#469: Narrow the columns

#466: Narrow the columns

#464, #462: Eliminate the blank row.

#458: Excessively wide columns

#350: Inconsistent table header fonts.

#338: columns too wide

#226: 8.4.2.1d) ==> 8.4.2.1(d) or 8.4.2.1-d Here and throughout.

#224: Use nonbreaking hyphen.

#223: 8.4.2.1.1 b) ==> 8.4.2.1.1 (b) and similar changes throughout.

#221: Put a line break before the first note, so that the numbered items are consistently aligned.

#209: Special words should not be hyphenated across lines.

The IEEE Editors have let many of these pass through before; there is no promise they will not do this again.

4.2 Rejected

4.2.1 "The title of this clause is too long" comments

Many long titles can be reduced in length by simply not repeating the entire clause within them, as is done below. The loss of context is minimal, because the clause title is provided in the first line of following text. Instead of performing this simple change, the BRG excludes the TOC from the Sponsor Ballot draft and forces the IEEE Staff to delay other standards while the errors in double(triple?) line TOCs are corrected. This special 802.3 processing strategy contradicts common sense, the 2005 IEEE Style Manual, and equality of standards.

Example text:

23.12 Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma for Clause 23, Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer, and baseband medium, type 100BASE-T41

23.12.1 Introduction

The supplier of a protocol implementation that is claimed to conform to Clause 23, Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer, and baseband medium, type 100BASE-T4, shall complete the following Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma.

Comment: The title of this clause is too long and would overflow the automatic formatting of the table of contents, if one were to be provided (which is, perhaps, the reason one was not provided).

1956, 1949, 1942, 1937, 1931, 1921, 1914, 1894, 1891, 1876, 1865, 1862, 1845, 1841, 1836, 1819, 1816, 1795, 1776, 1752, 1725, 1708, 1679, 1668, 1656, 1641, 1640, 1618, 1602, 1522, 1392, 1344, 1319, 1256, 1253, 1249, 1247, 1246, 1245, 1241, 1240, 1233, 1203, 1176, 1162, 1093, 1088, 1050, 1018, 977, 927, 909, 895, 877, 806, 747, 741, 675, 550, 501, 475, 347, 233

4.2.2 OUI problems

Despite the objections of an IEEE/RAC reviewer, this group continues to propagate erroneous and misleading OUI material. Since mistakes in encoding have (and continue to) cause incorrect usage, this places the IEEE in a tenuous legal position. The acknowledged experts are contained in the IEEE/RAC, not the Working Group, and their expertise should be followed, not rejected. If the WG doubt the individual IEEE/RAC reviewer, or conflicting comments from multiple IEEE/RAC reviewers, then a clarification-requested letter should be sent to the Chair of the IEEE/RAC (as was done when such controversies occurred in 802.17).

1749, 1748, 1747, 1746, 1519, 1517, 1516, 1514, 1501, 1499, 1494, 1492, 1487, 1484, 1464, 1461, 1449, 1398, 730, 486, 395

4.2.3 Blank cells

The same requested clarifications for 802.3 were accepted by 802.1 and 802.16. As such, their rejection by 802.3 seems otherwise motivated. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.2.5).

1737, 1727, 1726, 1713, 1675, 1671, 1670, 1669, 1643, 1632, 1631, 1621, 1604, 1593, 1590, 1589, 1586, 1583, 1579, 1578, 1576, 1573, 1570, 1569, 1566, 1563, 1562, 1560, 1558, 1556, 1552, 1551, 1549, 1547, 1544, 1541, 1540, 1538, 1537, 1536, 1535, 1533, 1530, 1525, 1524, 1288, 1286, 1281, 1277, 1267, 1259, 1258, 1237, 1227, 1226, 1218, 1217, 1209, 1208, 1207, 1204, 1188, 1187, 1186, 1182, 1181, 1178, 1177, 1165, 1163, 1115, 1086, 1085, 1084, 1083, 1080, 1079, 1048, 1047, 1031, 1011, 999, 997, 995, 993, 990, 988, 985, 984, 983, 982, 972, 959, 957, 956, 953, 951, 950, 949, 945, 943, 942, 941, 940, 936, 935, 934, 933, 931, 930, 929, 920, 919, 918, 917, 912, 911, 910, 905, 901, 900, 899, 898, 897, 894, 891, 890, 889, 888, 884, 883, 882, 881, 880, 879, 874, 873, 872, 871, 870, 869, 852, 849, 846, 845, 842, 835, 834, 829, 828, 825, 822, 820, 817, 812, 811, 810, 804, 784, 779, 778, 775, 774, 772, 771, 770, 768, 767, 766, 764, 763, 753, 752, 743, 608, 601, 551, 506, 495, 436, 355, 257, 246, 238

4.2.4 R/W type

Using the same term, in a column heading and cell entries, is highly confusing. Also, this is inconsistent with other tables that use a distinct header name to avoid this inconsistency. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.2.5).

1518, 1515, 1513, 1512, 1511, 1510, 1509, 1508, 1507, 1506, 1505, 1504, 1503, 1502, 1500, 1498, 1497, 1496, 1495, 1493, 1491, 1490, 1489, 1488, 1486, 1485, 1483, 1482, 1481, 1480, 1479, 1478, 1477, 1476, 1475, 1474, 1473, 1472, 1471, 1470, 1469, 1468, 1467, 1466, 1465, 1463, 1462, 1460, 1459, 1458, 1457, 1456, 1455, 1454, 1453, 1452, 1451, 1450, 1448, 1447, 1445, 1443, 1442, 1441, 1440, 1439, 1438, 1437, 1436, 1435, 1434, 1433, 1432, 1431, 1430, 1429, 1428, 1427, 1426, 1425, 1424, 1423, 1422, 1421, 1420, 1419, 1418, 1417, 1416, 1415, 1414, 1413, 1412, 1411, 1410, 1409, 1408, 1407, 1406, 1405, 1404, 1403, 1402, 1401, 1400, 1399, 1397, 1276, 1200, 1199, 1998, 1090, 1028, 1027, 971, 970, 969, 968, 966, 735, 733, 725, 711

4.2.5 State names

Some of the state machine names use spaces between components, other use underscores. The review of 802.1 also had this inconsistency, and changed to using underscores, so the names could be easily parsed. Faced with internal inconsistencies, the possibility of improved clarity, and 802.1 precedence, the choice is clear and underscores should be used. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.2.5).

1911, 1873, 1872, 1389, 1316, 1274, 1273, 1272, 1271, 1026, 1025, 1024, 1023, 1022, 1021, 1020, 1016, 976, 975, 974, 974, 973, 925, 924, 923, 922, 868, 867, 866, 865, 864, 863, 862, 861, 860, 792, 791, 790, 600, 595, 593, 590, 545, 544, 493, 492, 490, 489, 488, 324, 322, 320, 319, 318, 312, 305, 288, 287, 286, 285, 284, 283, 282, 276, 270, 269, 265, 219, 218, 217, 215, 214, 212, 211

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

4.2.6 Confusing capitalization

Clarity and consistency required.
There is no other common usage for "media access control" to be confused with!
Given the common abuse of capitalizing all words in figures, the special meaning is lost.
The IEEE Style Manual does not list this as a reason for capitalization (see 3.1.6).

1599, 1161, 689, 445, 279, 205, 200, 199, 196, 194, 193, 186, 177, 174, 173, 172, 171, 163

4.3 "Power On" inconsistencies

Inconsistencies are inappropriate for a standard; in this case, there are so many of them that only the most common usages are listed. This serves no useful purpose, while unnecessarily confusing the reader. Acknowledging this error (text emphasized by the commenter) doesn't help. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.2.5).

Proposal: Power On ==> PowerOn (as is done elsewhere)
Response: The recommended changes do not significantly improve the readability of the document and would only change where inconsistencies appear. There are more usages of Power On in the standard than uses of PowerOn. *Many different forms of power on are used interchangably within the standard (e.g., Power On, PowerOn, power-on, etc.).* This has not been a significant problem to implementers as evidenced by the large number of interoperable implementations.

916, 599, 598, 596, 591, 323, 321, 315, 314, 313, 220

4.3.1 State name consistency

Pick one name, not many. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.2.5).

#216
Comment: Choose one of: RESET IDLE POWER_ON….

4.3.2 Inconsistent bit reversals (MSB on the left)

If you think that the LSB is clearer on the left, get the buy-in from some Hewbrew scholars and change all figures to do this consistently(:>). Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.4).

1748, 695, 197, 195

4.3.3 Unrelated indirection

This item simply tried to remove apparently unnecessary capitalization from a meaning column. A double-level of indirection to an unrelated (largely irrelevant) response indicates the items was not considered responsibly. Conflicts with 2.3.2.

#789
Comment: Capitalize only first word in Meaning column.
Resolution: See MyBallot comment #1911.
#1911
Resolution: REJECT. See MyBallot comment #790
#790
The standard is in wide use with many interoperable implementations, and the current style has not been a detriment to interoperable implementation. Signal and state names have been used in many different design

systems and there is no reason to favor the syntax requirements of a single programming language (i.e., C). The variable/signal naming is consistent with the state machine formats described within the standard (see Clause 1.2.1). Also, the committee has an obligation to both past and current users of the standard. In this case, the signal and state names are likely to have been used in product documentation, and a change would be a disservice to users of the current standard.

4.3.4 Improper nouns

The Style Manual has no provisions for capitalizing terms to avoid confusion with ordinary English usage. Instead, such words are defined in the glossary. Also, I can't imagine what else this could be confused with, other than the read-only punch-out hole on a floppy disk, which is not discussed anywhere in this standard. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.6).

#163
Comment: In 1-ii, the capitalization was "media access control", which is proper and inconsistent.
Proposal: Media Access Control ==> media access control
Resolution: REJECT.
We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. This standard has undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff many time during its development, the first version was published in 1985, and this capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them.
The usage on page ii, line 17 will be corrected, that is media access control ==> Media Access Control.Media Access Control.
The rationale is bogus. The term "media access control" is never used in a different way within this standard. There is no confusion whatever. What was the real reason for the rejection?

4.3.5 Normative/informative PASCAL

The use of non-normative PASCAL to document normative features is either a gross mistake or an attempt to ensure job security, since only about 5 people can possibly understand this. ALSO, there is absolutely no way to even test if this compiles, much less functions as intended.

#679, #678, #657

4.3.6 Acronyms in definition

The IEEE Style Manual specifically states that acronyms are not to be defined in the definitions, which is obviously what was done here. I suspect that without the bracketed text this was unclear to the BRG, so a mistake was made, and that mistake would have been discovered if the BRG had communicated with the commenter. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.3).

#179
Define acronyms in the acronym subclause [not the definition subclause]
"**1.4.231 NRZI:** *See:* **Non-Return-to-Zero, Invert on Ones**."
Response: Rejected.

4.3.7 Obscure notation

The IEEE Style Manual clearly states that defined values are to be defined shortly thereafter. Providing parameters in an equation-like specification, without the slightest hint of where these values are defined, is inappropriate. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.7).

#165

Comment: Tw, Td, and Tb are not described.

Proposal: Describe them and illustrate their usage. Also, I think there are more operators than * and + that need to be described. If so, define them in a consistent fashion. Disagree

Resolution: REJECT.

Additional description of Tw, Td, and Tb for their usage in each Clause is provided in each Clause. The general definition here is appropriate for Clause 1 and need not be enhanced.

The additional operators are defined in subclause 21.5.4.

4.3.8 Table of contents

The IEEE Style Manual requires front matter and a table of contents. The fact that 802.3 has been given an exemption on this requirement, in the past, does not justify this exemption in the future. Furthermore, the statement of "therefore is not within the scope of an initial sponsor ballot" is highly misleading and not (I believe) specified within any of the IEEE references. This apparent attempt to mislead other Sponsor Ballot reviewers is inappropriate. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.2).

#161:

Comment: There is no table of contents. I suspect this is because its too hard to do automatically, due to the excessively long clause names, and too error prone to do manually. However, that is not a good excuse.

Proposal: Add table of contents, changing excessively long clause titles so they do not wrap when it is automatically generated.

Response: The table of contents is part of the frontmatter and therefore is not within the scope of an initial sponsor ballot. Table of contents is added is during preparation for publication - the length of the Clause titles has never been raised as an issue by the IEEE-SA Editorial staff.

4.3.9 Missing notation definitions

Defining notation used elsewhere in the document is not likely to cause errors, but could eliminate them. For example, this glossary notation would have prevented the use of the (certainly unique and highly confusing) notation on page 315. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.4).

#167: Define the xx-yy-zz hex notation, as per definitions available in RPR.

Response: This format has not caused problems in the industry and the committee believes that the risk of introducing errors in attempting the recommended change is not justified by the perceived benefit.

Part 3, 43.4.6, page 315.

The MAC address component of the System Identifier of the remote System to which the Aggregator is connected. If the Aggregator has no attached ports, this variable is set to 0x00- 00-00-00-00-00.

4.3.10 Pseudo subscript notation

The normal convention is to use subscript 16 for hexadecimal numbers and subscript 2 for binary numbers. Using C-code specific notation within English text is perhaps understandable, but not extensible to other number radix, which has oftentimes lead to the absence of binary specifiers. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.4).

#168:

Comment: Eliminate the 0x prefix, and use the more standard subscript(16) in its place.

Response: The 0x prefix has not caused problems in the industry…

4.3.11 Confusing abbreviations

Since the IEEE defined maintenance procedures do not support request for clearer text, no requests for change could have been previously filed. As such, the clarity of text cannot be judged by its years of existence.

#298
Comment: Confusing/unnecessary abbreviations
Resolution:
Coax Seg ==> Coax segment
Link Seg ==> Link segment
Resolution: This figure has been in existence for many years. The uncounted number of users, and hundreds of millions of installed devices, indicate configuration of proper Ethernet topologies has not been impeded by these abbreviations.

4.3.12 Confusing mathematics

The redefinition of '-' to have a distinct meaning when surrounded by "Round" and "Trip" violates normal mathematical conventions. While readers may have coped with such highly irregular notation, this does not justify its usage.

#303
Comment: The mathematical meaningof "Round" - "Trip" is not what was intended.
Proposal: A convention for these field names is needed. Suggestion is either: Round-Trip ==> roundTrip OR 'Round Trip', using single quotes
Resolution: This text has been in existence for many years. The uncounted number of users, and hundreds of millions of installed devices, indicate configuration of proper Ethernet topologies has not been impeded by this name.

4.3.13 Unnecessary capitalization

The correctness of capitalization should be based on English rules for proper nouns, not majority consensus of current text. Since this issue has the possibility of requiring an additional glossary entry (if the meaning is "special"), the change cannot be simply deferred to the IEEE. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.6).

#482:
Comment: Misleading capitalization errors.
Proposal: Star ==> star Principle
Resolution: ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
With one exception, all occurrences of "10BASE-FP Star" have a capitalized "S" in star. The exception is where "10BASE-FP star" is used in a heading (subclause 16.6.7.4). Base on this, and since the IEEE P802.3REVam Task Force believes that this comment is editorial, it will be forwarded to the publication editor.
The commenter should note that IEEE editorial staff has indicated that all such comments will only be considered after RevCom / Standards Board approval during the preparation for publication.

4.3.14 Inconsistent notation

Using the same symbol to mean two different things, depending on the context inferred by the reader, is certainly a recipe for disaster. While some languages support this feature, this is only when the values are strictly typed and the meanings are well defined by the language. Neither is true within this standard, so such usage should be avoided. Other symbols, "||' contained in the C language, should be used. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.4).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

#213:

Comment: Based on the early state machine definition, '+' is a logical symbol, which is not (i believe) what is intended.

Proposal: Use consistent state machine notation throughout.

Resolution: Principle. The definition in subclause 1.2 and 21.5 for '+' will be changed to read '+ logical OR, arithmetic addition'.

4.3.15 Other inconsistencies

Cross reference to abstract excuses are insufficient. Notation must either be defined or eliminated.

#413:

Comment: Unclear notation.

Proposal: Either: a) Define the meaning of the "/1" notation. b) Eliminate the "/1" notation.

Resolution: REJECT. See MyBallot comment #237.

4.3.16 Lines between table rows

Table lines are not redundant: they are better than 3 points of white space for separating distinct rows.

1382, 1378, 1354, 1119, 1089, 1087, 739, 738, 737, 736, 732, 729, 728, 727, 726, 724, 723, 722, 721, 720, 719, 718, 717, 716, 715, 714, 713, 712, 710, 709, 708, 707, 706, 705, 704, 703, 702, 701, 700, 699, 672, 670, 669, 668, 667, 666, 665, 659, 658, 655, 639, 618, 617, 616, 612, 611, 610, 609, 560, 559, 558, 556, 555, 554, 553, 531, 528, 505, 457, **456**, 455, 454, 453, 452, 451, 450, 449, 421, 414, 407, 400, 399, 395, 394, 390, 377, 376, 375

4.3.17 Inconsistent PICS

PICS statements are like the remainder of the document: consistency is required to avoid confusion. Since contracts are based on PICS for a different year of the standard, these contracts would be unaffected. Conflicts with Style Manual (see 3.1.4).

#353

Comment: Inconsistent notation.

Proposal: Put letters before numbers, as done elsewhere.

Resolution: REJECT.

The format for PICS tables has changed during the decades in which IEEE Std 802.3 has been used. As pointed out in various comments, PICS formats vary within this document, including column headings, column order and PICS item numbering. Consideration must be given to both the legacy users of the document and future users of the document. Completed PICS may also be used in contracts.

The IEEE P802.3REVam task force believes conversion of older PICs tables to current format would create too high a probability of introducing errors in very stable portions of the standard and make the material less familiar to legacy users.

Other instances:

438, 437, 435, 433, 431, 427, 426, 425, 424,420, 419, 418, 410, 409, 417, 412, 411,406, 405, 404, 403,398, 397, 393, 392, 389, 388, 387, 386, 385,381, 380, 379, 374, 373, 372, 371, 370, 367, 366, 365, 364, 361, 360, 359, 358, 354, 352, 351

4.3.18 Unclear PICS

PICS statements are like the remainder of the document: clarity is required to avoid confusion. Since contracts are based on PICS for a different year of the standard, these contracts would be unaffected.

#440
Comment: Confusing typo
Proposal: able ==> capable
Resolution: REJECT. See MyBallot comment #353.
The format for PICS tables has changed during the decades in which IEEE Std 802.3 has been used. As pointed out in various comments, PICS formats vary within this document, including column headings, column order and PICS item numbering. Consideration must be given to both the legacy users of the document and future users of the document. Completed PICS may also be used in contracts.
The IEEE P802.3REVam task force believes conversion of older PICs tables to current format would create too high a probability of introducing errors in very stable portions of the standard and make the material less familiar to legacy users.

4.3.19 Grandfather text

I now understand the intent of this text: this is intended to be the equivalent of a Senior Standard: frozen, but not retired. This has value, in that patents releases remain valid.

However, until "Senior Standard" becomes an acknowledged entity, text is expected to be updated by editors as errors in revisions are discovered.

#267
Comment: Misleading capitalization errors.
Proposal:
Bit Loss ==> Bit loss
Invalid Bits ==> Invalid bits
Steady-State Propagation Delay==>Steady-state propagation delay
Start-Up Delay==>Start-up delay
Resolution: REJECT.
As noted at the beginning of subclause 9.9, the content has been superceded by Clause 18. Consequently, changes to the subclause will only make them less familiar to the users of the subclause that created and use those legacy implementations. In addition, the committee consensus is that risks of introducing errors when making the proposed change to a stable part of the standard outweigh any benefits.Grandfather (rejected):

Other instances:
266, 262, 261, 260, 259, 237, 230, 229, 227

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

5. Common excuses

Common (but largely irrelevant) excuses have oftentimes been provided for rejecting comments, as listed in this clause. The intent of providing this list is to refute these arguments, before they arise in the discussions.

5.1 Standard excuses

Common Ballot Review Committee (BRC) responses; a reality check. 2005Mar07 DVJ

a) **Claim:** We don't have enough editorial talent to do this right.
   Reality:

   1) Resources can be found, if invitations are sincere.
   2) This should have been addressed with the PAR request.
   3) Resources can be more efficiently used, if one provides:
      i)   Posted checksheet items.
      ii) Posted editorial guidelines.
      iii) Detailed notation clause within specifications.
   4) This requires little talent, well within the scope of most LMSC editors.
   5) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

b) **Claim:** Our WG members care only about technical content.
   Reality:

   1) Exempting WGs would lower the value of the IEEE brand.
   2) English speaking experts struggle over some passages for quite a while trying to figure out what they mean. This limits the viability of Sponsor Ballot and standard sales (books are much easier to read).
   3) Non-English speakers cannot read broken English, even after struggling.
   4) Strong pressures inhibit the expression of opinions that contradict this claim.
   5) The editorial chaff hides the technical details.
   6) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

c) **Claim:** The IEEE editors will incorporate these changes.
   Reality:

   1) The IEEE editors are too busy and underfunded.
   2) This is unfair to other diligent standards, whose schedule will be unfairly impacted.
   3) The IEEE editors are not technical experts in the field.
   4) If the WG technical experts cannot agree, the IEEE editors can't be expected to understand such details.
   5) There is no formal way to identify/review all changes.
   6) The BRC has no opportunity to review these changes.
   7) The IEEE could become liable for technical errors.
   8) The WG Editor could become liable for technical errors.
   9) They haven't so far.
   10) IEEE SA staff has expressed strong reticence to do this, for fear of causing unintended changes.
   11) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

d) **Claim:** We have always done things this way, why change now?
   Reality:

   1) Sins of the past do not justify those of the future. (women can now vote, for example)
   2) This is unfair to other diligent standards, whose schedules will be unfairly impacted.
   3) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

e) **Claim:** Changing this mistake is likely to create more errors.
   Reality:

    1) If this is true, the standard needs a *major* rewrite.

    2) If the experts can't fix the mistake, the English audience will be confused; non-English readers will be stumped.

    3) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

f) **Claim:** This is an individual preference; ours is different.

   Reality:

    1) Personal preferences should not overrule clarity.

    2) Such preferences should defer to rules of English (as found in Style Manual references).

    3) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

g) **Claim:** This takes our valuable time from other important tasks.

   Response:

    1) Its quicker to fix mistakes, than cause an appeal.

    2) The time is minimal, provided:

      i) Guidelines/checksheets are provided.

      ii) References to such web sites are provided.

      iii) Notation clauses are provided in base documents.

    3) The important task of a standard is to convey information. Since editorial problems oftentimes interfere with the conveyance of information, editing tasks are one of the most important tasks.

    4) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

h) **Claim:** The IEEE staff of experts that can perform edits after the Sponsor Ballot closes.

   Response:

    1) IEEE Staff should do major work before Sponsor ballot, rather than compromise the Sponsor ballot results.

    2) Violates the IEEE Standards Style Manual.

i) **Claim:** "Stay the H*** out of my standard."

   Response:

    1) Standards are owned by the IEEE, not individual Chairs.

    2) The standards process encourages open review.

j) **Claim:** Our standard deviates from the IEEE Style Manual because this has changed over time.

   Response:

    1) The IEEE Style Manual has changed minimally over time.

    2) Revisions are responsible for tracking the IEEE Style Manual.

k) **Claim:** You are not the 802.3 Editor.

   Response:

    1) Each comments should be evaluated based on its relevance, not the political positioning of its source.

    2) The IEEE Standards Style Manual makes no such distinction.

5.2 Irrelevant responses

This text has been in existence for many years. The uncounted number of users, and hundreds of millions of installed devices, indicate configuration of proper Ethernet topologies has not been impeded by this …

Response: This figure has been in existence for many years. The uncounted number of users, and hundreds of millions of installed devices, indicate configuration of proper Ethernet topologies has not been impeded by these abbreviations.

Irrelevance: Longevity does not imply correctness. Even the IEEE 754 floating point standard has been found to have bugs, although in existence and tested extensively for many years.

Response: Consequently, changes to the subclause will only make them less familiar to the users of the sub-clause that created and use those legacy implementations.

Irrelevance: Inconsistencies do no mature over time. If each clause is allowed to maintain distinct notational conventions, the overall document becomes unreadable.

Response: …the committee consensus is that risks of introducing errors when making the proposed change to a stable part of the standard outweigh any benefits.

Response: The … has not caused problems in the industry and the committee believes that the risk of introducing errors in attempting the recommended change is not justified by the perceived benefit.

Irrelevance: Inconsistencies cause interpretation errors. If those maintaining the standard cannot correctly apply consistent notation, the reader certainly cannot read without error.

Response: The standard is in wide use with many interoperable implementations, and the current style has not been a detriment to interoperable implementation.

Irrelevance: Wide use does not imply correctness. Implementations are probably interoperable due to extensive testing at UNH, not due to the clarity of the standard.

Response: The ability of hundreds of implementers to independently build interoperable MACs with hundreds of millions of installed product demonstrates that the representation used is not a problem.

Irrelevance: Ability does not imply correctness. Implementations are probably reading other reference standards, or utilizing well paid consultants, to decipher the standard.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54