
Disposition of comments on the 2nd Working Group Recirculation Ballot of **P802.1AEef/D1.3**

Disposition of Comments as agreed in the August 10th 2026 Security Task Group electronic meeting acting as the Comment Resolution Group for this ballot. The ballot closed on August 7th 2026.

Cumulative Ballot results (summary)

Ballot responses 39

Approve	25	96% of Approve or Disapprove
---------	----	------------------------------

Disapprove	1
------------	---

Abstain	13
---------	----

Voters	49	80% Response rate
--------	----	-------------------

Comments on this recirculation ballot from:

Fumihide Goto (Approve, 4 comments)

Alon Regev (Approve, initially voted Disapprove on the ballot but changed following comment resolution and sent email confirming change to Approve, 7 comments)

P802.1AEef Working Group ballot totals

Voters 49 Voting pool is fixed at time of first successful WG ballot
 Approved 25 Approval rate 96% of those voting Approve or Disapprove, Approved
 Disapproved 1 Response rate 80% of eligible voters returned ballots
 Abstained 13 Comments column shows number of voters returning comments on each ballot

	Cumulative			First successful WG ballot of D1.0				First WG recirc ballot of D1.2				Second WG recirc ballot of D1.3			
	Approve	Disapprove	Abstain	App.	Dis.	Abst.	Comments	App.	Dis.	Abst.	Comments	App.	Dis.	Abst.	Comments
Ahmed, Mahin			1			1								1	
Arunarathi, Venkat			1											1	
Assmann, Ralf			1			1									
Boiger, Christian	1			1											
Bottorff, Paul	1											1			
Canchi, Radhakrishna	1											1			
Chen, Lihao			1			1									
Choudhury, Abhijit															
Congdon, Paul	1							1							
Farkas, Janos															
Fedyk, Donald	1			1			1								
Goto, Fumihide	1			1								1			1
Haddock, Stephen															
Hantel, Mark	1							1							
Holness, Marc															
Hopf, Daniel			1			1									
Huh, Woojung	1							1							
Ito, Yoshihiro	1			1								1			
Jabbar, Abdul			1			1				1				1	
Kehrer, Stephan	1			1											
Kiessling, Marcel	1							1							
Lai, Gavin	1			1											
Li, Jieyu															
Lyu, Yunping(Lily)															
Mangin, Christophe	1			1											
Mansfield, Scott															
Mater, Olaf			1			1									
McCall, David															
Mittelberger, Martin	1			1											
Nakano, Hiroki	1							1				1			
Nomura, Takumi	1			1								1			
Parsons, Glenn		1							1		1				
Proell, Dieter	1			1				1							
Randall, Karen	1			1			1								
Regev, Alon	1											1			1
Rodrigues, Silvana			1			1									
Rouyer, Jessy	1							1							
Roy, Rajeev			1			1				1					
Sato, Atsushi	1			1											
Seaman, Michael	1			1											
Seewald, Maik	1			1				1				1			
Sivakolundu, Ramesh	1			1				1				1			
Specht, Johannes			1			1									
Turner, Max			1			1								1	
Wang, Tongtong															
Wessels, Leon			1			1									
Woods, Jordon															
Yamaura, Takahiro			1			1									
Zein, Nader	1			1				1							
49	25	1	13	16	0	12	2	10	1	2	1	9	0	4	2

Updated from initial ballot responses following resolution of ballot comments in the 802.1 Security Task Group meeting Aug 10, 2026.

#1 Fumihide Goto – Editorial 5.4 pg 26 line 18

Comment:

The current text says "An implementation of a SecY." For consistency with line 11, please consider changing it to "An implementation of a MAC Security Entity (SecY)."

Suggested Remedy: as comment

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: "The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

Past editorial practice has been to not to repeat the expansion of an acronym after first use in a scope which a reader of the standard could be expected to consult, but that principle does not help the choice between subsequent use of "SecY" or "MAC Security Entity" in subsequent items. Guidance may be sought from editorial staff prior to publication, as changes from one to another would be non-technical.

#2 Fumihide Goto – Editorial 5.4 pg 26 line 20

Comment:

The current text says "An implementation of a MAC Security Entity." For consistency with line 11, it would be better to say "An implementation of a MAC Security Entity (SecY) or "An implementation of a SecY""

Suggested Remedy: as comment

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: "The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

Past editorial practice has been to not to repeat the expansion of an acronym after first use in a scope which a reader of the standard could be expected to consult, but that principle does not help the choice between subsequent use of "SecY" or "MAC Security Entity" in subsequent items. Guidance may be sought from editorial staff prior to publication, as changes from one to another would be non-technical.

#3 Fumihide Goto – Editorial 5.4 pg 26 line 33

Comment:

The current text says "An implementation of a MAC Security Entity." For consistency with line 11, it would be better to say "An implementation of a MAC Security Entity (SecY).or "An implementation of a SecY" "

Suggested Remedy: as comment

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: "The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

Past editorial practice has been to not to repeat the expansion of an acronym after first use in a scope which a reader of the standard could be expected to consult, but that principle does not help the choice between subsequent use of "SecY" or "MAC Security Entity" in subsequent items. Guidance may be sought from editorial staff prior to publication, as changes from one to another would be non-technical.

#4 Fumihide Goto – Editorial 5.4 pg 26 line 37

Comment:

The current text says "An implementation of a SecY." For consistency with line 11, please consider changing it to "An implementation of a MAC Security Entity (SecY)."

Suggested Remedy: as comment

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: "The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

Past editorial practice has been to not to repeat the expansion of an acronym after first use in a scope which a reader of the standard could be expected to consult, but that principle does not help the choice between subsequent use of "SecY" or "MAC Security Entity" in subsequent items. Guidance may be sought from editorial staff prior to publication, as changes from one to another would be non-technical.

#5 Alon Regev – Editorial pg 1 line 1

Comment: The draft is missing line numbers on the PDF, making it hard to comment.

Suggested Remedy: Add line numbers

Disposition: REJECT

Formally this is a REJECT (code for ‘No change to be made to the text of the standard’) but the Editor apologizes for this oversight.

On investigation the omission of line numbers occurred in the generation of the PDF as an unexpected side effect of updating to FrameMaker 2022. Changes to the line number font should have remedied this for future draft generation.

#6 Alon Regev – Editorial 14.9.3 pg 35 line 25

Comment:

"as" inserted in front of "as", creating "asof" instead of being inserted in front of "sociated" (which would have created the correctt word "associated")

Suggested Remedy:

change

"The bit significance of the fields asof the first 14 octets of 'sociated data'."

to

"The bit significance of the fields of the first 14 octets of 'associated data',"

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice:
"The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot. If not addressed in SA Ballot this is a routine editorial change that would be addressed in pre-publication editing.

#7 Alon Regev – Technical 5.4 pg 26 line 41 – Must Be Satisfied

Comment: In the updated text of 5.4, the item letter “i)” is used twice: once for “Support both Integrity Protection and Confidentiality Protection using one or more of the other GCM AES based Cipher Suites...” and again for the newly inserted “Support Confidentiality Protection using the Ascon-XPB-128 Cipher Suite...”. Item labels within the same clause are ambiguous and break any cross-reference to “5.4(i)” (see related comment on Annex A.1, CSV row).

Suggested Remedy: Reletter the new Ascon-XPB-128 item from “i)” to “j)”, and correspondingly reletter the existing Cipher Suite variance item from “j)” to “k)”. Update any cross-references to 5.4(i)/5.4(j) elsewhere in the draft.

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: “The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected.”

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

See next page for disposition detail continuation

#7 continued Alon Regev – Technical 5.4 pg 26 line 41 – Must Be Satisfied

disposition detail continuation

The suggested correction is a routine editorial matter that would be handled in pre-publication editing if not addressed during SA Ballot. If no further changes to the numbering/lettering are made during the course of that ballot, the updates to existing Annex A cross-references in this amendment to 5.3 and 5.4 would be as follows:

Remove the following:

- to 5.4(e) from CSI,

Change the following:

- 5.4(e) to 5.4(f) in CSC
- 5.4(f) to 5.4(g) in CSO
- 5.4(g) to 5.4(h) in CSA
- 5.4(i) to 5.4(k) in CSV

#8 Alon Regev – Technical A.1 pg 38 line 23 – Must Be Satisfied

Comment: The edits to 5.4 (page 26) reletter several items (the Traffic Class Table item moves to new 5.4(e); old (e)→(f), old (f)→(g), old (g) is deleted, old (i)→(j)), but the Annex A.1 PICS table References column was not fully updated to match: CSI's added reference “5.4(e)” points to the unrelated Traffic Class Table item; CSC's unchanged reference “5.4(e)” should now read 5.4(f); CSO's unchanged reference “5.4(f)” should now read 5.4(g); CSA's unchanged reference “5.4(g)” points to an item that was deleted; CSV's unchanged reference “5.4(i)” is now ambiguous given the duplicate-letter issue in 5.4.

Suggested Remedy: Re-verify and correct every “5.4(x)” cross-reference in the Annex A.1 PICS table (CSI, CSC, CSO, CSA, and CSV rows) against the final, correctly relettered text of clause 5.4.

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: “The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected.”

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

See next page for disposition detail continuation

#8 continued Alon Regev – Technical 5.4 pg 26 line 41 – Must Be Satisfied

disposition detail continuation

The suggested correction is a routine editorial matter that would be handled in pre-publication editing if not addressed during SA Ballot. If no further changes to the numbering/lettering are made during the course of that ballot, the updates to existing Annex A cross-references in this amendment to 5.3 and 5.4 would be as follows:

Remove the following:

- to 5.4(e) from CSI,

Change the following:

- 5.4(e) to 5.4(f) in CSC
- 5.4(f) to 5.4(g) in CSO
- 5.4(g) to 5.4(h) in CSA
- 5.4(i) to 5.4(k) in CSV

#9 Alon Regev – Editorial Clause 3 pg 24 line 5

Comment: Clause 3 'Definitions' contains only the editing instruction "Insert the following definitions, in the appropriate collating order:" with no definitions actually listed beneath it. This placeholder has been carried unchanged since D1.0/D1.1; the draft's own Introduction states it should either receive real content or be removed prior to publication, but as of D1.3 (2nd WG recirculation) it remains empty.

Suggested Remedy: Either insert the intended new definition(s) for this amendment, or delete Clause 3 from the amendment (per the Editor's own note in the Introduction) if no new definitions are needed.

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: "The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot.

This empty Clause has been deliberately carried over to SA Ballot, as suggestions for inclusion in the Clause would be equally valued in SA Ballot.

#10 Alon Regev – Editorial Clause 2 pg 23 line11

Comment: The new normative reference to NIST SP 800-232 renders the title with a comma after “Constrained Devices” (“...Constrained Devices, Authenticated Encryption, Hash, and Extendable Output Functions”). NIST's officially published title uses a colon at that point: “Ascon-Based Lightweight Cryptography Standards for Constrained Devices: Authenticated Encryption, Hash, and Extendable Output Functions” (NIST SP 800-232, August 2025).

Suggested Remedy: Change the comma after “Constrained Devices” to a colon to match the verbatim published NIST title.

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: “The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected.”

The comment may be appropriate for SA Ballot, but should not result in any change at this time with the potential to delay progression to SA Ballot. The suggested correction is a routine editorial matter that would be handled in pre-publication editing if not addressed during SA Ballot.

#11 Alon Regev – Editorial A.1 pg 30 line 20

Comment: in the PICS table in A.1, the ASCII entry item's feature line end with "Suite?^a", with the a being a superscript that would normally refer to a footnote or similar, but I could not find a footnote "a" anywhere

Suggested Remedy: remove the "a" after "Suite?"

Disposition: REJECT

This comment is Out of the Scope of this recirculation ballot. As per the ballot notice: "The subject matter of the ballot is NOT the entire document; the scope of this ballot is ONLY those changes to the draft that were made in order to resolve the ballot comments on the previous draft, any ballot resolutions that may have been incorrectly applied, and any ballot comments that may have been rejected."

The intent of the "a" is to refer to a footnote already present in the base standard, with the PICS entry being a second reference to that footnote reading "This PICS requires the completion of a copy of Table A.16 for each Clause 14 Cipher Suite implemented." There may be a relative timing issue as to the completion of the revision of the base standard and this amendment which will affect where the footnote should appear, but it should not appear in more than project as that would duplicate its final appearance in the complete standard including this amendment.