

P802.17 Editors' Closing Report

Tom Alexander
Chief Editor, P802.17

Agenda

- Comment resolution track summary
- Editors' reports
- Motions for adopting resolutions


Comment Resolution Tracks

- Global Section and Intro Section Clauses 2, 3, 4
 - 40 technical/tech-binding comments dealt with
 - 1 rejected, 4 punted to other CRGs, 2 to WG
- Intro Section (Clause 1)
 - 45 technical comments, all dealt with, 0 to WG
- MAC Section (Clauses & Annexes)
 - 223 tech comments + 2 punt-in, 21 to WG
- PHY section
 - 244 technical comments, 2 punts to WG

Comment Resolution Tracks

- Fairness Section
 - 136 comments + 2 punts, 109 tech, 2 punt to WG
- Topology Section
 - 155 technical comments dealt with, 4 punt to WG
- OAM Section
 - 109 comments dealt with; 6 rejected, 9 punt to WG
- Bridging Section
 - 65 comments dealt with, 1 punt to WG

All Technical / Technical-Binding Comments Dealt With!!!



Draft Creation/Posting Schedule

(tentative)

- **18 days** for Editors to create D2.3 from comment resolutions
 - Draft clauses sent to Chief Editor by June 12th
- 4 days to clean up, review and assemble D2.3
 - Update MIB to reflect changes in remainder of the draft
 - Draft 2.3 posted on June 16th
- **Ballot** period runs from **June 16** to **July 17**
 - 30 days to review draft and post comments
- Comment database posted for review by July 18th
 - 4 days to review comments prior to starting comment resolution
- Plenary meeting starts July 21st
 - First comment resolution session on July 22nd

Process

- Each section will be dealt with in turn
 - Order: Intro, Bridging, OAM, PHY, Topo, Fairness, MAC
- Editor will present summary of resolutions by ad-hoc
 - No more than **20 minutes per report**, including questions
- Comments punted to WG will then be debated and resolved
 - Any WG member can also request that any comment be broken out of the bucket and debated by WG as a whole
 - Chair will limit debate to **5 minutes each** in the interests of progress
- Single motion per section to accept ad-hoc group's resolutions to remainder of comments as a bucket
- Authorize creation and balloting of D2.3 based on instructions

WG Comment Resolution

- D2.2 has failed, so we start from scratch
 - No comments will be carried over into D2.3 database
 - Members are free to resubmit any comment they choose
- If the WG deadlocks on a comment, it is rejected by default
 - Rather than having technically-binding unresolved comments be forgotten, it is preferable that they actually be resolved as “rejected”
 - They can then be circulated with D2.3 for members to look at, and potentially resubmitted with new disapprove votes
- Therefore, a modification of the WG resolution process:
 - Only Accept or Accept-modified resolutions to comments should be proposed
 - If none of the proposed resolutions obtain 75% approval, then the comment is rejected *by default*
 - Editors can be given responsibility for crafting a suitably detailed response to go with the rejection (with assistance from WG if necessary), to avoid wasting time

Clause 0, 2, 3, 4 Comments Report

Tom Alexander
Chief Editor, P802.17

Clause 0 Comments

- Submitted to Clause 0: 18 comments (9 tech-binding)
- All comments looked at
 - 2 rejected, 2 deferred to WG, rest accepted/accept-modified
- Major issues
 - PICS tables
 - Draft completeness
 - Introduction of an index
 - Miscellaneous formatting stuff
- Deferred to WG:
 - Open issues in draft
 - PICS proforma

Clause 2, 3, 4 Comments


- 53 comments; 25 technical-binding: all handled
 - 1 rejected, 4 punted to other CRG, rest accepted/accept-modified
 - All editorial stuff
 - Definitions improvements
 - References (update/delete or move to bibliography)
 - Remove unused acronyms and definitions
 - Formatting and capitalization
 - Cross-references within definitions
 - Replace “Ethernet” with “PacketPHY”
 - Use of “must”, “will”, instead of “shall”

Clause 11,12 Comments Report

Tom “Glenn Parsons” Alexander
Chief Editor, P802.17



Clause 11 Comment Summary




- 129 comments + 2 punted-in
 - 29 Technical Binding, 33 Technical, rest editorial
- 3 rejected, 1 superseded, 8 deferred to WG, rest accepted or accept-modified
- 8 comments punted to WG
 - Userdata size limit
 - Various editorial issues
 - Echo functionality

Clause 11 Comment Summary

- Key issues handled in comments
 - Editorial improvements in figures
 - Word usage: ‘will’, ‘must’ -> ‘shall’
 - State machine format, structure improvements
 - OAM frame descriptions and fields
 - Echo functionality
 - Word usage: “organization” instead of “vendor” or “company”
 - PICS need to be filled out
 - Syntax of functions in state machines
 - Miscellaneous minor issues



Clause 12 Comment Summary



- 66 comments
 - 18 Technical Binding, 33 Technical, rest editorial
- 3 rejected, 1 withdrawn, 1 deferred to WG, rest accepted or accept-modified
- 1 comment punted to WG
 - Userdata size limit

Clause 12 Comment Summary

- Key issues handled in comments
 - Editorial improvements & formatting
 - PICS & word usage: ‘will’, ‘must’ -> ‘shall’
 - State machine format, structure improvements
 - Various MIB issues and omissions
 - Interval counters
 - Promiscuous mode and related stuff
 - OAM stuff related to management