


IEEE 802.17 RPR Working Group

# P802.17/D2.4 Draft and Ballot Status

Tom Alexander  
Chief Editor, P802.17



# Agenda



- Status of draft and recirculation ballot
- Status of comments
- Plan for week

# Summary

- D2.4 authorized for recirc by WG in July
- Draft created by editors and posted August 9
  - Ballot period from August 9<sup>th</sup> through 24<sup>th</sup>
    - Standard 15-day electronic recirculation ballot period
  - 764 comments received
  - Comments posted on August 25<sup>th</sup>
- Recirculation ballot passed


# Status of Ballot on D2.4

- 24 ballots received (pool is now fixed at 81 voting members)
- 54 approvals, 12 disapprovals, 4 abstentions
  - 81.82% approval ratio, up from 75.76%
    - 802 requires  $\geq 75\%$
  - 5.71% abstention ratio
    - IEEE requires  $\leq 30\%$
  - **Ballot passes, and approval ratio is increasing**
- Next steps
  - Resolve comments on D2.4, implement them, and recirculate to increase the approval ratio


# Status of Comments on D2.4

- 764 valid comments received
  - 528 Technical, but now 207 Technical-Binding
  - 18 commenters (down from 34 in D2.3)
    - John Lemon wins the cheap wine award with 225 comments
- MAC section received maximum comments
  - 203 comments, 149 of which are technical
  - Topology is runner-up (126 comments, same as D2.3)
- About 2 days to resolve all comments
  - All of Tuesday and all of Wednesday



# Comment Distribution By Clause



# Distribution By Section



# Comparison to D2.3




Technically Binding Only

All Technical Comments



# Status of Draft

- Grown slightly to 684 pages
- Draft is improving
  - PICS tables are complete
  - New formats, MIB cross-references, etc. added
- Some issues with FrameMaker changebars
  - Especially in tables and figures
  - Need to fix for next draft



# Current Editorial Roster


Section	Section Editor	Technical Editor(s)
Intro Section	David James (Clause 1) Tom Alexander (Cls 2, 3, 4)	None
MAC Section	John Lemon	Steve Wood David James (Informative Annexes)
PHY Section	Rhett Brikovskis (in absentia)	Harry Peng (will run comment resolution sessions)
Fairness Section	Bob Sultan	Necdet Uzun
Topology Section	Jason Fan	Jim Kao
OAM Section	Glenn Parsons	Gal Mor (MIB) (absent) Leon Bruckman (OAM&P)
Bridging Section	Bob Castellano	Marc Holness

# Goals For This Meeting

- Resolve comments on D2.4 to produce D2.5
- Produce instructions for generating the next draft
  - Generate instructions to editors and adopt text from proposals
- Authorize creation of D2.5 based on instructions
- Authorize D2.5 to be sent out for 15-day WG recirculation ballot
  - Try and convert some of those disapproves to approves



# Plan For Rest of Week



- Editorial schedule:
  - Tuesday: Presentations, comment resolution
  - Wednesday: Comment resolution, editor's meeting 6 – 7 PM
  - Thursday: Editors' reports, punted comments, Motion Madness
    - The usual stuff ...

# Track Breakdown

- Track 1: MAC, Intro, PHY, Global
  - 267 Technical / Technical Binding comments
- Track 2: Topology, Fairness, OAM, Bridging
  - 261 Technical / Technical Binding comments
- Need to resolve @ 12 technical comments/hour
  - That's 5 minutes per comment!

Room assignments, updates and instructions will be posted outside doors; **please check frequently!!!**

# Posting of CRDs and Reports

- CRDs will be posted by editors on the file server
  - Posting will be done as soon as possible after comment resolution session ends (and editors have had a chance to clean up CRD)
  - Posting will also be done on a nightly basis if comment resolution session spans 2 or more days
  - To retrieve the CRDs, look in the directory “latest\_CRD”
  - File names will be of the form “*section\_CRD\_date\_time*.USR” where *section*, *date* and *time* will be filled in by the editors
    - For example: MAC\_CRD\_5-20-03\_9PM.USR
- Editors reports will also be posted when done
  - To retrieve, look in the directory “editor\_reports”
  - File names will be of the form “*section\_report*.ppt” or “*section\_report*.pdf”

Posted files will be kept up to date on a best-efforts basis!

# Handling of Comments

- The disposition of each comment is determined at this meeting
  - A comment may be accepted (or accepted-modified) – closed
  - A comment may be rejected – closed, but see below
  - A comment may be unresolved – open
- Rejected technically-binding comments will be circulated with the new draft for review
  - This is done to see if anyone will change their vote on the basis of the rejection (in this case, they submit their own technically binding comments)
  - However, the rejected comment is closed and will not appear in new database
- Unresolved comments will be carried forward
- Resolve comments to maintain approval ratio
  - Objective is to convert disapproves to approves
  - If the resolution of a comment would convert an approve to a disapprove, then look for alternate resolutions
- **Editors must obtain signoffs (agree/disagree) from voters on rejected technically-binding comments**