

IEEE P802.3cz D3.2 Multi-Gigabit Optical Automotive Ethernet 2nd Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

CI 166 SC 166.2.2.7.1 P78 L20 # R2-2

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This is in regards to comment R1-24. The reason for rejecting the comment contains a technically incorrect and thus invalid reason for rejection.
The sentence in the draft is technically incorrect. As noted by the comment, only numeric values have "significant" bits, and a numeric value of length 1 bit can have only one ordering. Not only is the sentence not helpful, it is technically wrong (the comment is correct).

The ballot group may have left it as "out of scope of the recirculation" as text not changed. The additional explanation however makes it invalid because it is technically wrong. And any rejected comment is in scope of a recirculation so you'll have to either reconsider the comment or reject this comment for a reason other than "out of scope" (I gave you a hint elsewhere ;-).

SuggestedRemedy

Stop using LSB and MSB when talking about other than numeric values throughout the draft.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
This comment is out-of-scope for the recirculation ballot. IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual 5.4.3.2) states:

"Once the proposed standard has achieved 75% approval, comments in subsequent ballots shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted proposed standard, portions of the balloted proposed standard affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted proposed standard that are the subject of unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. If comments are not based on the above criteria, the comments may be deemed out-of-scope of the recirculation."

The referenced comment #R1-24 is associated with an Approve vote, and the comment is not related to changes in the draft.

CI 166 SC 166.2.2.7.1 P78 L20 # R2-1

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This is in response to the response to comment R1-26. The reason for rejecting the comment is incorrect and invalid.
Had it stopped with "the comment is out of scope of the recirculation" that may be valid. However, the resolution states that "Sentence is correct". This is technically incorrect as non-numeric fields have no lesser or more significant bits - LSB and MSB have no meaning except for numeric values. By feeling the need to elaborate on why you think the commenter is wrong (he is in fact correct) you made the reason for rejecting invalid.

Note that by rule, this comment is IN SCOPE of a recirculation and so don't reject it as "out of scope". You can either take the suggested remedy (stop the practice of using LSB when talking about other than numbers) or you can reject the comment because the consensus of the group is to keep doing the wrong thing (which you may wish to say as "the consensus of the group was to make no change" for a smoother ride through REVCOM).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the sentence as indicated in the original comment, search out where LSB and MSB are used elsewhere in the draft and ensure that these terms are only applied to fields and other data structures containing numeric values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
This comment is out-of-scope for the recirculation ballot. IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual 5.4.3.2) states:

"Once the proposed standard has achieved 75% approval, comments in subsequent ballots shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted proposed standard, portions of the balloted proposed standard affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted proposed standard that are the subject of unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. If comments are not based on the above criteria, the comments may be deemed out-of-scope of the recirculation."

The referenced comment #R1-26 is associated with an Approve vote, and the comment is not related to changes in the draft.