

**Comment ID:** 1

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.:** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 1      **Page:** 4    **Line:** 11

**Comment**

'to standardize a small number of the technologies applicable' is unclear in its intent. What does this mean?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Clarify statement.

**Response**

Accept.

The text '... a small number of the ...' has been deleted

The text now simply reads:-

'to standardize technologies applicable to local and metropolitan area networks.'

There was no greater meaning ever intended.

---

**CommentID:** 2

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 1      **Page:** 4    **Line:** 13

**Comment**

Letters do not fit within the boxes in the diagram

**SuggestedRemedy**

Fix layout.

**Response:**

These diagrams look correct on my Word formatted copy, maybe it is a cross platform format problem. We are using PDF on the web site to distribute this document which does not appear to have this problem. I hope this will prevent this problem in the future.

---

**Comment ID:** 3

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 1      **Page:** 4    **Line:** 15-16

**Comment**

'The rules' don't provide an overview, the document does.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete first sentence, change paragraph to: 'brief overview of the standards development process is provided in clause 7.1 of this document.'

**Response:**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 4

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

**Subclause:** 2.1      **Page:** 4   **Line:** 29

**Comment**

The Chair cannot assist himself.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to: 'WG Chair who is assisted by the remainder of the advisory core, consisting of the Vice-Chair, recording secretary, '

**Response:**

Accept in principle. The WG Chair is not a member of the advisory core (see 2.4.2), it was an error in this particular paragraph. Also there is seems to be no need to list the membership of the Advisory core here as it duplicates 2.4.2 where is should be done. Will now read 'WG Chair who is assisted in this task by the Working Group Advisor Core (see 2.4)'

---

**Comment ID:** 5

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.4      **Page:** 5   **Line:** 18

**Comment**

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change comma following 'EC' to a semicolon.

**Response:**

Accept in principal, due to other comments this sentence simply now reads:-  
'The 802.3 WG AC has no formal meetings, voting procedures nor policies'

---

**Comment ID:** 6

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.8.2      **Page:** 8   **Line:** 3-4

**Comment**

Drafts may be supplements, revisions, or stand-alone documents.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete ' as a supplement to the published standard.'

**Response:**

Accept.

---

**Comment ID:** 7

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.8.2      **Page:** 8   **Line:** 11-16

**Comment**

The validity requirements are stated, but not the approval requirements.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Include the approval requirements, even if redundant with respect to LMSC rules.

**Response:**

## Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

Accept in Principal. While it is correct that the full validity requirements are not provided here the intent of this clause was to specify the additional 802.3 requirements for a ballot to be valid, not to specify the validity requirements as a whole as this is already provided in the 802 rules. I want to avoid duplicating normative text from the 802 rules so on this basis the subclause will be change to read:-

'The rules and procedures governing voting by WG letter ballot, comment resolution and confirmation Letter Ballot are contained in the Operating rules of IEEE Project 802 (See ref [1], 5.1.4.2.2). An overview of the process is also provided in subclause 7.1 of this document. The following addition requirement are imposed within WG 802.3.

....

The following additional condition shall be met for a WG letter ballot to be considered valid:

- a) Of the returned ballots the abstention rate must be less than 30%.'

---

**Comment ID:** 8

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.9      **Page:** 9      **Line:** 5-7, 10

### Comment

It is unclear what the 'two-thirds' refers to. Is it two-thirds of the voting members, or two-thirds of the members voting? Similarly, no clarification is given of the 50% requirement on line 10.

### SuggestedRemedy

Change to, 'two-thirds of the members voting', and '50% of the members voting', or alternatively, show the approve/not-approve ratios required.

### Response:

Accept in principal. The requirements will be clarified as follows:-

- a) A minimum 75% approval of the sum of attending WG 802.3 voting members voting "Approve" or "Do Not Approve" taken at the WG 802.3 closing plenary.
- b) An affirmative WG 802.3 letter ballot. This ballot shall follow the normal letter ballot

requirements (see 2.8.2).

'... A minimum 50% approval of the sum of attending WG 802.3 voting members voting "Approve" or "Do Not Approve" taken at the closing plenary is required for a change to be sent out for a WG letter ballot. ...'

---

**Comment ID:** 9

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.9      **Page:** 9      **Line:** 13

### Comment

### SuggestedRemedy

Change 'carrier' to 'carry'.

### Response:

Accept.

---

**Comment ID:** 10

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3      **Page:** 9      **Line:** 27

### Comment

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change 'The TF may choose to establish' to 'The TF Chair may choose to establish'.

**Response:**

Accept.

---

**Comment ID:** 11

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3      **Page:** 9    **Line:** 33

**Comment**

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add a statement that the second paragraph represents the default condition, unless specific action is taken by the TF Chair to institute alternative voting privileges.

**Response**

Accept. Text now reads:-

'Within WG 802.3 a TF operates by default without membership rules for voting.'

Note that the rest of the clause about voting where there are now membership rules has been moved to the more appropriate subclause on TF voting. This subclause (3.4.2) now reads:-

'There are two type of votes in the TF; votes on motions and votes on straw polls.

Where a TF is operating with membership rules for voting (see 3.3) only the TF members can make and vote on motions. Where these membership rules are not in force any TF participants is entitled to make motions and all TF participants who are present at the time the vote is taken have the right to vote on the motion, subject only to the provision that they believe that they are qualified to vote on the matter before the TF.

In all cases, regardless of any membership rules that may or may not be in force, all participants who feels qualified may participate in a straw poll.'

---

**Comment ID:** 12

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3.1    **Page:** 10    **Line:** 6

**Comment**

Since 'membership' in a TF or SG is usually determined on a meeting-by-meeting basis, it is impossible to measure whether any petition has been signed by two-thirds of the members.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to 'two-thirds of the 802.3 WG members voting', and require the vote to be held at an 802.3 plenary (EITHER opening or closing). Any other ideas?

**Response**

Accept.

When this rule is examine it seems to be unnecessary and has now been deleted. It was originally there as these rules are structured in a similar manner to the 802 rules. In the case of the 802 EC there is no way other than a petition for a WG member to force the EC to consider something. In the case of a TF within 802.3 all it needs is two WG voting members to believe that an issue needs raised. They will then be capable of forcing WG 802.3 to consider it simply by proposing and seconding a motion at any 802.3 plenary meeting. The action can then be forced on WG AC 802.3 by a 75% majority vote (or even just a 50% majority in the case of something this is ruled procedural). All this seems to provide the same, if not better, safeguard than the existing text.

---

**Comment ID:** 13

**Name:** Rich Seifert

**Email:** seifert@netcom.com

**Phone:** (408) 395-5700

**Fax:** (408) 395-1966

**Co.** Networks & Communications

**CommentType:**

Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

**Subclause:** 3.3.2    **Page:** 10    **Line:** 10

**Comment**

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change 'If the TF has decided' to 'If the TF Chair has decided' (similar to earlier comment)

**Response:**

Accept.

---

**Comment ID:** 14  
**Name:** Rich Seifert  
**Email:** seifert@netcom.com  
**Phone:** (408) 395-5700  
**Fax:** (408) 395-1966  
**Co.** Networks & Communications  
**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.4.3    **Page:** 11    **Line:** 28

**Comment**

**SuggestedRemedy**

Insert a space between 'reference' and 'a'

**Response:**

Accept.

---

**Comment ID:** 15  
**Name:** Rich Seifert  
**Email:** seifert@netcom.com  
**Phone:** (408) 395-5700  
**Fax:** (408) 395-1966  
**Co.** Networks & Communications  
**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.4.5    **Page:** 12    **Line:** 5

**Comment**

**SuggestedRemedy**

Insert a space between 'take' and 'precedence'.

**Response:**

Accept.

---

**Comment ID:** 16  
**Name:** Rich Seifert  
**Email:** seifert@netcom.com  
**Phone:** (408) 395-5700  
**Fax:** (408) 395-1966  
**Co.** Networks & Communications  
**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 4.1    **Page:** 12    **Line:** 12-18

**Comment**

From this document, it appears that the ONLY function that can be performed by a SG is to produce a PAR. We should allow a SG to be formed for other reasons, e.g. to resolve a particular technical issue, to perform research, etc.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Open to suggestions.

**Response**

The informative text dealing with Study Group function has been adapted from the 802 rules and added in to the clause. It now reads:-

'The function of a Study Group is to complete a defined task with specific output and in a specific time frame established within which they are allowed to study the subject. Once this task is complete the function of the SG is complete and its charter expires.

One of the possible functions of a 802.3 Study Group (SG) is to draft a complete PAR, five criteria (see 7.2) and to gain approval for them at WG 802.3, 802 EC, IEEE New Standards

## Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

Committee (NesCom) and the IEEE Standards Board. The decision of whether to utilize the 802.3 WG, or to establish a new WG or Technical Advisory ...'

---

**Comment ID:** 17  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 1.0      **Page:** 4      **Line:** 6

### Comment

References somewhat unclear

### SuggestedRemedy

change text to read

"... hierarchy of rules under which Project 802 operates. In the event of any conflict between the Operating Rules of 802.3 and the Operating Rules of IEEE Project 802, the Operating Rules of IEEE Project 802 take precedence.

### Response:

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 18  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 1.0      **Page:** 4      **Line:** 15

### Comment

see SuggestedRemedy

### SuggestedRemedy

change "These rules do not attempt ..." to "This document does not attempt"

### Response:

Accept in principal, new wording reads:-

'A brief overview of the standards development process is provided in clause **Error! Reference source not found.** of this document.'

---

**Comment ID:** 19  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 2.4      **Page:** 5      **Line:** 17-18

### Comment

more text than needed.

### SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence beginning in line 17 to read "The 802.3 AC has no formal meetings, voting procedures or policies."

### Response:

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 20  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** T

**Subclause:** 2.7    **Page:** 6    **Line:** 31

**Comment**

Include the roll of current voters in the information presented at the opening plenary

**SuggestedRemedy**

See comment.

**Response:**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 21  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** T

**Subclause:** 2.7    **Page:** 6    **Line:** 36

**Comment**

Delete the phrase "and to make decisions of that information". All decision making is covered in the next item (e) in the list.

**SuggestedRemedy**

See comment.

**Response:**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 22

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.4.1    **Page:** 6    **Line:** 4

**Comment**

Change "Manage" to "Managing" so as to have the same form as the preceding items in the list.

**SuggestedRemedy**

See comment.

**Response:**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 23  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 2.8.2    **Page:** 8    **Line:** 9

**Comment**

changes must be approved, not just presented.

**SuggestedRemedy**

changes "presented" to "approved"

**Response:**

Accept in principal, see response to comment 24 below.

---

**Comment ID:** 24  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 2.8.2    **Page:** 8    **Line:** 7-10

**Comment**

This paragraph should be part of preceding list and its wording needs to be modified to match the style of the other lists and for easier reading.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the paragraph to read:-

"It must have be made available for pre-view by the membership by the Friday immediately prior to the plenary week. Any changes to the draft made after the draft was made available for pre-view shall be approved during the closing plenary prior to a request for approval for WG ballot."

and insert the paragraph after item (b) in the preceding list

**Response**

Accept in Principle, actual text will read:-

"It must be made available for pre-view by the membership by the Friday immediately prior to the plenary week. If any changes are made to the draft after the draft was made available for pre-view the textual changes shall be presented for review during the closing plenary immediately prior to the vote for approval for WG ballot."

---

**Comment ID:** 25  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.2    **Page:** 9    **Line:** 24-25

**Comment**

When did the TF Chair change from nominated and approved by the TF position to appointed by the WG Chair and approved by the TF position?  
And who approved the change?

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

While it may have not been obvious in the past this has been the method that has always been used. When a position is free it will be normal for the WG chair to ask that anyone interested in the post approach him and discuss the position. It is this part of the process we are documenting here.

---

**Comment ID:** 26  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3    **Page:** 9    **Line:** 27-30

**Comment**

If the TF establishes membership rules which are required to be those of 802.3, then there can be no membership in the TF and no votes except straw polls until after two TF meetings which are required to obtain membership.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

Accept. The rule which requires to be documented here is that at the formation of a TF from a SG all the participants are automatically granted membership of the TF. This will be added to the rules.

---

**Comment ID:** 27

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3.2    **Page:** 10    **Line:** 9

**Comment**

Reverse the order of the first two sentences. It reads much better than way.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

Accept in principal, now reads:-

'All TF meetings are open to members and observers. Attention is however drawn to the registration requirements for all members and observers attending the 802 Plenary where TF meetings also occur.'

---

**Comment ID:** 28

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3.2    **Page:** 10    **Line:** 11

**Comment**

The sentence beginning on line 11 is awkward.

**SuggestedRemedy**

change the sentence to read

"In this case, the TF chair may grant observers the privilege of participating in discussions."

**Response**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 29

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.3.2    **Page:** 10    **Line:** 13-14

**Comment**

what is the purpose of the sentence "The WG chair determines, taking into account TF status, ....." There is no action that flows from this, so why include the sentence?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Either delete the sentence or give it a function.

**Response**

Accept, text was missing from previous draft. This now reads:-

'A TF will normally meet during the week of the P802 LMSC plenary. The WG Chair determines, taking into account TF status, if this plenary week TF meeting is not required.'

---

Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

**Comment ID:** 30  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.4      **Page:** 10      **Line:** 22

**Comment**

Change "The operation of the TF has to be balanced..." to "The operation of the TF shall be balanced..." or why even bother with the sentence.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

Reject. This sentences is here is to explain that there has to be balance between the desires of the TF participants and the TF Chairs responsibility to produce the Draft as he is required to do within a certain time. This is also a direct copy of informative text from the 802 rules which seems to add value in the context of the clause.

---

**Comment ID:** 31  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.4.2      **Page:** 10      **Line:** 31

**Comment**

insert "votes on" before "straw polls" for greater clarity.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 32  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.4.2      **Page:** 10      **Line:** 34

**Comment**

Change "greater than" to "at least". This is not a 50% + one vote situation is it?

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

Accept in principal. Now reads 'a minimum 50% approval'.

---

**Comment ID:** 33  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:**

**Subclause:** 3.4.3      **Page:** 11      **Line:** 4

**Comment**

insert "to" before "guide through the approval and ..." for easier reading.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 34  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 3.4.3    **Page:** 11    **Line:** 27

**Comment**

"all members" of what group, the TF, the WG or ....?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "all Members" to "all members of the TF (or what ever is appropriate)."

**Response**

Accept, will now read 'TF participants'.

---

**Comment ID:** 35  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 3.4.3    **Page:** 11    **Line:** 28-30

**Comment**

This paragraph does not belong in this section.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Move paragraph to clause 3.4 which is a more appropriate place.

**Response**

Reject. This clause introduces the following subclause which provide more detail of TF operation. It also follows the same general structure that is found in the 802 Rules which I have used as a model.

---

**Comment ID:** 36  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 3.4.4    **Page:** 11    **Line:** 35

**Comment**

Is it really in general appropriate/desirable/permisible for the TF chair to establish TF rules without some form of blessing from the TF? I don't think so. Either the domain in which the TF chair has sole authority for making rules needs to be restricted and/or a TF approval process needs to be added.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Depends on resolution of the question raised.

**Response**

It is the role of the TF chair to ensure the production of a standard. If the chair sees certain rules are required to complete the job he should require them. It should be noted that any decision like this can be overruled at the WG level.

---

**Comment ID:** 37  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 3.4.4    **Page:** 11    **Line:** 41-43

**Comment**

The meaning of item "g)" is a bit unclear (at least to me). For instance, negative ballots result from sending a draft to WG letter ballot, but are there negative ballots pending when the draft is sent to wg letter ballot?

I think not.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Rewrite to clearly state its desired intent.

**Response**

Accept. Should read prior to sponsor ballot and standards board approval.

---

**Comment ID:** 38  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 3.4.5    **Page:** 12    **Line:** 2-4

**Comment**

I believe that Robert's Rules of Order are part of the 802.3 WG rules. Therefore, they take precedence over any TF operating rules.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete first sentence.

**Response**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 39  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 5.0    **Page:** 13    **Line:** 5-7

**Comment**

The standing nature of the maintenance TF is in conflict with subclause 3.5 which requires that a TF be completely deactivated when it work (PAR) is done.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Modify either this subclause or 3.5.

**Response**

Accept. Subclause 3.5 has been modified to read:-  
After the objective of the TF is complete, its charter expires and it is deactivated.  
Hence as the objective of the Maintenance TF is ongoing it will never complete and therefore should never be disbanded.

---

**Comment ID:** 40  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 6.0    **Page:** 13    **Line:** 10-13

**Comment**

The is no mention of WG approval of interpretation requests which I believe has been the procedure of the WG.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add the WG approval process.

**Response**

Accept. The following text has been added:-

All interpretations require approval by WG 802.3 before they can be published. This approval can be given by either:

- a) A minimum 75% approval of the sum of attending WG 802.3 voting members voting "Approve" or "Do Not Approve" taken at the WG 802.3 closing plenary.
- b) An affirmative WG 802.3 letter ballot. This ballot shall follow the normal letter ballot requirements (see 2.8.2).

If a request is made for a letter ballot this request will be discussed and voted on at the closing plenary. A minimum 50% approval of the sum of attending WG 802.3 voting members voting "Approve" or "Do Not Approve" taken at the WG 802.3 closing plenary is required for a interpretation to be sent out for a WG letter ballot. If no such request for a letter ballot is made, or the request fails to carry the required votes, the interpretation itself will be voted on at the closing plenary. A motion requesting a letter ballot will take precedence over a motion to approve the interpretation.

---

**Comment ID:** 41  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 3.4.4    **Page:** 11    **Line:** 45

**Comment**

Suggest that "as appropriate" or "as required" be added after "expenses" in item "j)".

**SuggestedRemedy**

See comment.

**Response**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 42  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 3.4.1    **Page:** 10    **Line:** 27

**Comment**

Suggest that the first sentence would read better if changed to read "The Chair of a TF may decide procedural issues or may put them to a vote of the TF."

**SuggestedRemedy**

See comment.

**Response**

Accept

---

**Comment ID:** 43  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 2.8.2    **Page:** 8    **Line:** 15-16

**Comment**

This paragraph is awkward.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the paragraph to something like "Negative votes and comments from the WG letter ballot must be resolved by the TF by developing appropriate changes to the draft standard and acquiring WG 802.3 approval for the changes through a confirmation ballot."

**Response**

Accept in principal, the text has now been deleted.

As this process is defined in a normative clause of the 802 Rules and the duplication of normative text from the 802 rules has been avoided this sentence has now been removed and a pointer to the 802 text added.

---

**Comment ID:** 44  
**Name:** Bill Quackenbush  
**Email:** wlq@cisco.com  
**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596  
**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172  
**Co.:** Cisco Systems  
**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 2.8      **Page:** 7      **Line:** 7

**Comment**

No criteria is provided for determining the duration of WG letter ballots or confirmation ballots. No range is provided for the duration of WG letter ballots.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add text that covers the missing items.

**Response**

Accept in principal.

This process is defined in a normative clause of the 802 Rules and the duplication of normative text from the 802 rules has been avoided. Instead a pointer has been added from this clause to the 802 rules.

---

**Comment ID:** 45

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 2.8      **Page:** 7-8      **Line:** all lines of subclause 2.8

**Comment**

I feel that the organization of this whole subclause needs work. I make some specific suggestions in other comments. This comment applies to the entirety of 2.8.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change the subclause to something like an opening sentence such as:-

"A draft or revised standard must successfully pass a WG letter ballot before it can be forwarded to the Executive Committee for approval for Sponsor Group voting. In order for a draft standard to successfully pass a WG letter ballot, it must meet the requirements and complete the process detailed in this subclause.

subclause 2.8.2 Draft Standard Balloting Requirements as modified by my comments on 2.8.2.

subclause 2.8.1 Draft Standard Balloting Group

A paragraph on the letter ballot, its use and its requirement for closure and success.

A paragraph on the negative vote and comment resolution process.

A paragraph on the confirmation ballot, its use and its requirement for closure and success.

**Response**

Accept in principal.

These issues are all covered in detail in a normative clause of the 802 Rules. As the duplication of normative text from the 802 rules has been avoided a pointer has been added from this clause to the 802 rules. The additional requirements that 802.3 imposes is all that

## Operating Rules for IEEE Project 802 CSMA/CD Working Group 802.3 Draft 4.0 Comments

is listed now. In addition a pointer to the informative overview section, which was provided to give a general guide to this process without repeating normative text, has also been added.

Incorporating some of the suggestions above the first clause now reads:-

'A draft or revised standard must successfully pass a WG letter ballot before it can be forwarded to the Executive Committee for approval for Sponsor Group voting. The rules and procedures governing the WG letter ballot, comment resolution and confirmation letter ballot are contained in the Operating rules of IEEE Project 802 (See ref [1], 5.1.4.2.2). An overview of the process is also provided in subclause 7.1 of this document.'

---

**Comment ID:** 46

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 2.1      **Page:** 4      **Line:** 22-25

### Comment

The phrase "Since the scope of standards work ..... time, technology and structure," appears to have no causal relationship to the rest of the sentence and therefore appears to be unnecessary.

### SuggestedRemedy

Change the 3rd and 4th sentences of the paragraph to read something like:

"Standards activities with WG 802.3 may, at the discretion of the 802.3 WG, be carried out either by 802.3 as a whole or by a Task Force (TF) operating under and reporting to the 802.3 WG. A TF may in turn create Sub-Task Forces as necessary to accomplish the work of the TF."

### Response

Accept in principal. The causal relationship that was intended was that as time goes by and the technology we are writing standards for changes different groups of people come

together to write the standards within 802.3. For that reason a TF is set up only for the duration of that work and is disbanded at the conclusion of that work.

Some of the suggested changes to the sentences are however accepted and the sentence has been reworded as follows which I hope will make the intent clearer:

"... individual standards activities with WG 802.3 are, at the discretion of the 802.3 WG, carried out by a Task Force (TF) operating under and reporting to the 802.3 WG. A TF may in turn create Sub-Task Forces as necessary to accomplish the work of the TF."

---

**Comment ID:** 47

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:** E

**Subclause:** 2.1      **Page:** 4      **Line:** 26

### Comment

The phrase "The 802.3 WG is expected to maintain ..." seems a bit strange to me. Maintenance, etc. is part of the WG charter and should be stated as such.

### SuggestedRemedy

### Response

Accept. Will reword '... is expected ..' to read '... is chartered ..'.

---

**Comment ID:** 48

**Name:** Bill Quackenbush

**Email:** wlq@cisco.com

**Phone:** 1 (408) 526-4596

**Fax:** 1 (408) 527-5172

**Co.:** Cisco Systems

**CommentType:** TR

**Subclause:** 2.8      **Page:** 7    **Line:** 5-9

**Comment**

There is no explicit discussion of the difference between letter ballots and confirmation ballots with respect to their use, their requirements for their and successful completion.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add adequate discussion.

**Response**

Accept in principal.

These are all fully documented and explained in the 802 rules. On the basis that we should not reproduce normative text from these rules (see 802.3 rules subclause 2.2), but rather we should refer to them, they are not copied into this document. A reference to the clauses of the 802 rules has however been added with a pointer to our informative guide at the end of the 802.3 rules.

---