Ballotting

- PAR granted December 2004
  - Initial draft 0.0 May 2005
  - Draft 1.0 July 2005
  - Draft 1.1 August 2005
  - Draft 1.2 November 2005
  - Draft 1.3 May 2006
  - Draft 1.4 June 2006
  - Draft 2.0 January 2007
  - Draft 2.1 May 2007
  - Draft 2.2 October 2007 (Working group ballot)
  - Draft 3.1 September 2007 (WG recirculation ballot)

- 802.1aj Draft 3.1 issued September 2008
  - All D2.2 comments addressed.
Ballot pool comprised those eligible to vote on D2.2
   Results include D2.2 votes and D3.1 changes

55 responses received on the D3.1 recirculation ballot

91 Voters – of which 77 have responded (85%)
   27 Approve         79%
   7 Disapprove       21%
   43 Abstain         56%

Ballot passed!

Disapprove voter breakdown:
   6 have responded to D3.1 with new comments, some after much chasing
   1 is deceased
      This vote must remain and be explained to the 802 executive committee
Commenting statistics

- 133 Comments
  - 43 TR
  - 10 T
  - 58 ER
  - 20 E
  - 2 G
Main ballot comment items

- Management using SNMP-over-Ethernet
- What’s in a TPMR versus a TPMR component?
- CFM: level 0 MIP
- EISS, ISS and multiple traffic classes
- T-component in PIP: architecture
- Link aggregation
Management using SNMP-over-Ethernet

- Mandatory support for one specific management method, over one externally accessible port, was one of the original ideas.
- SNMP-over-Ethernet was chosen after considerable debate.
- Panos proposed removing the requirement in comment #116 to D2.2 on grounds that the rest of 802.1Q does not require it.
- The record shows that this comment was accepted. Is that really correct?

Comments were solicited.
- No opinion but clarification: Stephen Haddock #12, (#9)
- Make optional: Panos Saltsidis #38
- Do not mandate: Jessy Rouyer #105
- Leave as mandatory: David W Martin #81, John Messenger
A few notes on “Management Port”. I believe the text in 5.14 h) 2) was not really referring to the defined term (see below), but loosely to the port over which the management traffic was being received.

A Management Port is a Bridge Port attached to the bridge relay entity but which is not attached to a physical LAN.

- This is a method used by some bridges to ensure management reachability even when certain physical ports are down.

8.13.7 says that the Bridge Management Entity (if there is one) shall be attached to a single Bridge Port, which can be a Management Port or a Port attached to a LAN.
If the MIP is at level 0, then you can’t use an MA to protect the attached physical links.

Comments
- Norm Finn #79
- Panos Saltsidis #40
A TPMR wants to use the priority value in the C-tag of a frame to determine which traffic class the frame belongs to, but to be unaware of the VLAN ID.

How can this best be achieved, given that the rollup of 802.1D and 802.1Q is out of scope of 802.1aj (and should stay out)?

Comments
- Panos Saltsidis #37, #45, #41, (#48)
- John Messenger #221 (D2.2)
What’s the best way to describe the use of a T-component with a PIP?

Comments

Mick Seaman: #65
Use case K.2 shows two TPMRs in LAG links. This conflicts with the addresses in table 8-3.

Comments
- Stephen Haddock #16
Other items

- Do we need to indicate that some sections of 802.1Q don’t apply to TPMRs, beyond what is already said in 5?
  - Comment: Kevin Nolish #104

- Amplification of use cases
  - Review Alan McGuire’s use cases from May meeting
Plan

- Do comment resolution for D3.1 at this meeting
  - I would like to review Editorials and General comments as well as Technical

- Generate 802.1aj/D3.2 following this meeting, incorporating
  - Changes agreed this week

- Submit this for WG recirculation ballot.

- Comment resolution at the January interim

- Perhaps we can get approval to go to sponsor ballot following the meeting.
Thank You

JMessenger@advaoptical.com