

Information required to support request for unconditional approval to forward a draft standard

IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual Clause 12

Ballot close date and results

1. Date the ballot closed:

The 2nd Standards Association recirculation ballot on IEEE802.3ca closed 12th March 2020 at 23:59 UTC-12

- Note: D3.1 was recirculated a second time

2. Vote tally including Approve, Disapprove and Abstain votes

	Initial Draft D3.0			1 st Recirculation Draft D3.1			2 nd Recirculation Draft D3.1			Req %
	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	#	%	Status	
Abstain	3	4	PASS	3	4	PASS	3	4	PASS	< 30
Dis with comment	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-
Dis w/o comment	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-
Approve	62	96	PASS	67	97	PASS	69	97	PASS	≥ 75
Ballots returned	67	81	PASS	72	87	PASS	74	90	PASS	≥ 75
Voters	82	-	-	82	-	-	82	-	-	-
Comments	17	-	-	7	-	-	1	-	-	-
Public comments	0	-	-							

Unresolved negative comments

3. Comments that support the remaining disapprove votes and Working Group response.

Where a voter has accepted some comment resolutions and rejected others, only the comments of which the voter has not accepted resolution should be presented.

4 comments from 2 commenters: 3 ER and 1 TR comments, as shown below

Cl 0 SC 0 P0 L0 # R1-8
Thompson, Geoffrey Independent Consultant
Comment Type ER Comment Status R
While I recognize that the ship has already sailed on this particular decision and group consensus for change is unlikely, I persist in the view that PON with P2MP does not conform to or even align with the legacy Ethernet architecture. While clearly deserving of a standard, I don't believe it belongs within IEEE Std 802.3 Standard for Ethernet.
SuggestedRemedy
Move all clauses associated with P2MP into a separate standard with a consistent architectural description and approach which applies to the entire standard.
Response Response Status C
REJECT.
Such work would be out of scope for the IEEE P802.3ca PAR. Also, the very same request has been brought to the IEEE 802.3 Maintenance Task Force (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1337.pdf), and subsequently rejected (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision_history.html#REQ1337).
No changes to the draft needed.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P24 L40 # i-14
Rannow, R K Myself
Comment Type TR Comment Status R
Verbose "both" for A and B
Nearly 25 instances
SuggestedRemedy
Remove the word "both" to help make a more succinct document.
Response Response Status C
REJECT.
The use of "both" in all of the referenced locations is intentional. The term is used when and if needed to emphasize the fact that indeed both A and B are applicable. Removing 25 words from 270 pages of text does not seem to lead to a more "succinct document".

Cl 141 SC 141.3.2 P69 L51 # i-17
Thompson, Geoffrey Independent Consultant
Comment Type ER Comment Status R
The statement "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" addresses aspects of an implementation that are outside the scope of the standard and are not definitively known.
SuggestedRemedy
Change the text to read: "these may not be readily testable in a system implementation"
Response Response Status C
REJECT.
Text is already in use in approved IEEE Std 802.3-2018, see 38.2.1, 39.3, 58.2.1, 59.2.1, 60.2.1, 75.3.2, 115.6.2.1

Cl 141 SC 141.3.2 P70 L52 # R1-9
Thompson, Geoffrey Independent Consultant
Comment Type ER Comment Status R
The statement "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" addresses an aspect of implementation that is outside the scope of the standard. As stated, it would lead one to believe that making it testable would make an implementation not compliant. Such is definitely not the case. (The DoC for D3.0 doesn't seem to be posted as of 2020-02-15 so I can't check how my D3.0 comment was addressed.)
SuggestedRemedy
Change "are not" to "may not be" -OR- eliminate the parenthetical statement entirely.
Response Response Status C
REJECT.
The comment responses were available to balloters through the myProject system throughout the ballot recirculation.
The comment is in support of an unsatisfied previous comment (i-17) associated with a disapprove vote and does not provide substantive additional rationale.
The statement "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" is not a normative requirement. Rather it is a statement of fact that at least one compliant implementation is envisioned (or already exists) that does not have these test points exposed, though other, also compliant, implementations may have these test points exposed.
Note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 58.2.1, 59.2.1, 60.2.1, 75.3.2, 115.6.2.1)
No changes to the draft needed.

Future schedule

4. Schedule for recirculation ballot and resolution meeting.

None required. Balloting is complete and no changes were made to D3.1.