

IEEE Draft P802.3ah/D3.3 unresolved negative comments

Cl 00 SC P L # 821

David V. James

Comment Type TR Comment Status R D3.3

2) Most of the DVJ comments were rejected by the editor, without review by the working group.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Distinctively identify which comments were resolved in front of the working group, and which were rejected in private by the editor. Then, perform a recirculation.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.

It is noted that this comment is not made against the contents of the last balloted draft.

The balloter's assertion is untrue. The Ballot Resolution Committee went to great lengths to consider all of the balloter's comments. A team of editors and committee officers examined each and every comment. Members of the BRC were encouraged to review all of the comments, and the BRC devoted a large portion of its meeting to the consideration of the balloter's comments.

After a great deal of effort and a great deal of time, the Ballot Resolution Committee voted to "allow the editors to resolve the comments contained in the file provided by David James with the exception of comments already resolved by previous actions of the Task Force."

The authority to consider and respond to comments on the recirculation ballot was explicitly assigned to the IEEE 802.3ah EFM Task Force by actions of the IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD Working Group. The chair of the Task Force exercised his responsibility to call a duly noticed meeting of the Task Force to act as a Ballot Resolution Committee. All of the comments submitted during the recirculation ballot, including all of the comments submitted by the balloter, were considered by the BRC during a meeting held April 12-13 in Santa Clara, which the balloter attended.

All of the responses produced by this meeting are reflected either as changes in the recirculated draft, or in the reports of unresolved negative comments provided in the recirculation ballot package.

Cl 00 SC P L # 820

David V. James

Comment Type TR Comment Status R D3.3

1) Balloters have not had an opportunity to review DVJ comments, except through a (probably labor intensive) procedure of contacting the Chair. As such, DVJ comments have not been "recirculated" in full.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Password protect the comments, as is the draft, and perform a recirculation, so these comments (not just the revised draft) can be easily read by the WG.

Proposed Response Response Status U

REJECT.

It is noted that this comment is not made against the contents of the last balloted draft.

The balloter's assertion is untrue. The ballot resolution committee went to great lengths to consider, respond to, and recirculate the balloter's 1770 comments, despite the facts that

A) the majority of the comments were out of scope for the recirculation ballot because they concerned previously approved and unchanged text,

B) the majority of the comments were submitted in the form of a "marked-up" altered draft which lacked the necessary legends to protect the IEEE's copyrights. The IEEE-SA manager of contracts and licensing, an attorney, directed the Task Force chairman to not make this "marked-up" altered draft publicly available.

In fact, the ballot resolution committee extracted the balloter's comments from the above mentioned "marked-up" altered draft and compiled them into an appropriate reproducible form that would not infringe the IEEE's copyright. All of those comments, together with a response from the ballot resolution committee, are included in the 3rd recirculation ballot package. The balloter's suggested remedy cannot be applied, because placing the balloter's marked-up draft in a password protected area would infringe the IEEE's copyrights.