IEEE 802.1Qbf Editor's Report
November 2010 Plenary Meeting
Dallas, TX, USA

Bob Sultan (bsultan@huawei.com)

802.1Qbf Draft 1.0 Working Group Ballot

Ballot Results

Approve	5
Disapprove	7
Abstain	24
Total	36
Commenters	8

Comments Submitted

	Required	Not Required	Total
Technical	15	0	12
Editorial	24	4	23
Total	31	4	35

Going Forward

- Expect to issue D1.1 in time for completion of working group recirculation ballot before January meeting;
- D1.1 will reflect comments made against D1.0 but should otherwise be unchanged;
- Seems possible that draft could go to sponsor ballot after re-circ; propose motion to authorize WG re-circ (for January) and sponsor ballot (for March);

Comment Summary (1)

- Note that comments #44-50 should have been numbered #37-43. This shouldn't cause any significant problem but be aware of the gap in numbering
- The following comments have been accepted and probably require no discussion. Anyone who thinks an item should be discussed should raise the issue: #1, 4, 7-12, 15, 18-28, 31, 32; 44, 46, 49
- The group should review the proposed resolutions for #2 and #3 regarding conformance and PICS for M:1 protection;
- There were a few comments on wording carried over from 802.1Qay. These could be fixed in Q-REV, but I have no objection to fixing them here; the group should have a quick look at the proposed resolutions: #5, 6

Comment Summary (2)

- The following comments have been accepted or accepted in principle but group might want to review the proposed resolutions: #13, 14, 17, 30, 34, 35, 36, 47, 48,
  - 14 (and 30) fix an error made by the editor; he thought a list of SEG-IDs per PNP was needed but did not realize that this is already provided by the CFM stack managed object. So, I think accepting #14 is appropriate.
  - Panos and Jessy should verify that their comments #17 and #36 have the same suggested remedy;
- comment #29 was proposed rejected only because it is superceded by comments #14 and #30;
- comment #33 is proposed rejected based on agreement at the last meeting, but this one should be reviewed by the WG;

Comment Summary (3)

- comment #45 is proposed rejected based a comment in D0.2 that “IPG Endpoint” should not be a defined term. The WG can review this decision, but I don’t want to thrash on this issue in future drafts;
- comment #50 was rejected only because I didn’t understand the comment and there was no suggested remedy; the commenter is invited to describe the problem to the WG