

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.1 comments

Cl 00 SC P L # 26

Glen Kramer Teknovus

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

I am not satisfied with the response to D1.0 comment #7.

SuggestedRemedy

The comment response provides an explanation that would make this criterion less ambiguous:

- Compatibility with "existing IEEE 802.3 architecture and specifications".

And even better text would be:

- Compatibility with the existing IEEE Std 802.3 architecture and interfaces.

The latter text follows in spirit the idea given in 1.1.2.1 Architectural rationale:

"The architectural model is based on a set of interfaces that may be different from those emphasized in implementations. One critical aspect of the design, however, shall be addressed largely in terms of the implementation interfaces: compatibility."

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This is a restatement of a previous disapprove comment.

Cl 00 SC P L 8 # 25

Ganga, Ilango Intel Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

For consistency use "IEEE Standard 802.3" in both lines 7 and 8.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will use 'IEEE Std 802.3'.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 3 # 23

Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The last draft, like this one, proposed deleting text (not shown in the draft, but in 802.3 rules 7.2), and incorporating new text by reference (also not shown in the draft, but in LMSC P&P 17.5). I commented on the new text incorporated by reference. I was very surprised to see a response claiming that this is "Out of scope". This shows a "democratic deficit" in the proposal to abandon 802.3 five criteria if comments on rules are "blown off" like this.

SuggestedRemedy

802.3 should keep its five criteria under the control of 802.3 voters. See my D.10 comments for how to wordsmith this.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This is not a ballot on the IEEE 802 operating rules. If you wish to see a change to the 802 rules please contact the LMSC 1st vice chair, Mat Sherman. The issue of referencing the IEEE 802 5 Criteria rather than incorporating has been covered in your other comments.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 3 # 22

Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The response to D1.0 comment 10 says that the obsolete points noted in the current 802.3 rules "are thus illustrative of the problem of copying rather than referencing." No they aren't; they just remind us that maintenance has to be done, sometimes. As even this draft proposes that 802.3 has its own material for 2 out of 5 criteria, and 802.3 would still need to review and understand any changes 802 makes or proposes, there is no "solution" to the "problem".

SuggestedRemedy

802.3 should keep its five criteria under the control of 802.3 voters. See my D.10 comments for how to wordsmith this.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The IEEE 802.3 Working Group will own the IEEE 802.3 additions while IEEE 802 will own the IEEE 802 5 Criteria. What we control will therefore be clear.

IEEE 802.3 Rules change 3-03/07 draft D1.1 comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 3 # 21
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

In D1.0 comment 9 I said that 802 might remove some criteria to suit circumstances e.g. in wireless, and it may be inappropriate or impossible for 802.3 to stop them. The response that "The Chair of 802.3 would always vote upon any change to the superior rules that define the IEEE 802 five criteria." does not address this concern. He might still be persuaded to vote yes for the greater good. And at present, I and all other 802.3 members get to vote; under this proposed change we wouldn't.

SuggestedRemedy

Rather than referring to the LMSC P&P's five criteria, modify 802.3's criteria 1 (Broad Market Potential) and 5 (Economic Feasibility) to be identical to the equivalent current LMSC P&P's criteria. Modify 802.3's criterion 4 (Technical Feasibility) to be identical to LMSC P&P 17.5.4 without 17.5.4.1. Add an informative note saying that these three are identical to those in LMSC P&P 17.5 (edition referenced) with the exception of wireless coexistence which is not considered to be relevant to 802.3. Criteria 2 (Compatibility) and 3 (Distinct Identity) differ anyway: write them out in full in 802.3's rules.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

In the hypothetical case presented in the comment, if the IEEE 802.3 Chair votes for a compromise he/she believes to be appropriate for LMSC but the IEEE 802.3 Working Group believes to be detrimental to the integrity of IEEE 802.3 requirements, the IEEE 802.3 rules may be modified to restore a more rigorous requirement.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 3 # 20
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

After reading the BRC's responses to comments raised I conclude that the proposal for 802.3 to abandon its own five criteria is bad. For example, while it is narrowly true that "We are already bound by the LMSC Five Criteria since they are defined in a superior document - all we can do is augment.", the reverse is not true. The implication that our Five Criteria are useless is false. Without them, LMSC can lower the bar if they wish and we, 802.3 voters, have no say in the matter. A wish to "reference rather than duplicate" may be a bureaucratic justification but (i) it's not working; we would still have our own modifications to 2 out of 5, and (ii) bureaucratic convenience should not over-ride substance.

SuggestedRemedy

Rather than referring to the LMSC P&P's five criteria, modify 802.3's criteria 1 (Broad Market Potential) and 5 (Economic Feasibility) to be identical to the equivalent current LMSC P&P's criteria. Modify 802.3's criterion 4 (Technical Feasibility) to be identical to LMSC P&P 17.5.4 without 17.5.4.1. Add an informative note saying that these three are identical to those in LMSC P&P 17.5 (edition referenced) with the exception of wireless coexistence which is not considered to be relevant to 802.3. Criteria 2 (Compatibility) and 3 (Distinct Identity) differ anyway: write them out in full in 802.3's rules.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This comment is a restatement of a comment submitted on he previous recirculation. Further, it is not 'narrowly true' that we are already bound by the LMSC Five Criteria. Since the LMSC Five Criteria are required by IEEE 802 rules, which are superior to the IEEE 802.3 rules, we are bound, period. We are allowed to add additional requirements that IEEE 802.3 can judge proposals on, although they can't be in conflict with IEEE 802 rules which override, and therefore can't be modifications.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L 8 # 24
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

D1.0 comment 3 not implemented correctly

SuggestedRemedy

Should say "Conformance with the IEEE Std 802.3 MAC"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.