DISPOSITION OF TASK GROUP BALLOT COMMENTS ON

IEEE *Draft* P802.1AB-Cor-1/D1.0

DRAFT IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks—Station and Media Access Control Connectivity Discovery— Corrigendum 1: Technical and editorial corrections

Sponsor

LAN MAN Standards Committee of the IEEE Computer Society

Prepared by: Tony Jeffree, Project Editor

Tony Jeffree, 11a Poplar Grove, Sale, Cheshire, M33 3AX, UK Tel/Fax: +44-161-973-4278 Email: tony@jeffree.co.uk

Commentary:

This Disposition of Sponsor Ballot Comments has been prepared to document the ballot comments received in the Sponsor ballot on P802.1AB-Cor-1/D1.0, and to record the resolutions of those ballot comments, agreed during the meeting of 802.1 held in San Antonio, Texas, November 2012. The document contains:

- 1) A table of responses received.
- 2) A listing of comments received, each accompanied by a disposition.

This document constitutes a record of the Instructions to the Editor for the preparation of the next draft.

Ballot summary	
Ballot Comments	

1. Ballot summary

Table 1—Responses

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	Comments?
V		Alon, Zehavit	
V		An, Yafan	
V	у	Ao, Ting	
V		Ashwood-Smith, Peter	
V	у	Boiger, Christian	
V		Booth, Brad	
V		Bottorff, Paul	
V	у	Brandner, Rudolf	
V		Carlson, Craig	
V		Chang, Xin	
V	у	Cheng, Weiying	
V	у	Congdon, Paul	у
V	e	Crupnicoff, Diego	
V		Cummings, Rodney	
V		Desanti, Claudio	
V	у	Eastlake, 3rd, Donald	
V	у	Farkas, Janos	
V	у	Fedyk, Donald	
V		Finn, Norman	
V	У	Fredette, Andre	
V	У	Garner, Geoffrey	
V	у	Ghanwani, Anoop	
V		Goetz, Franz	
V	e	Gravel, Mark	
V		Gray, Eric	

Copyright © 2012 IEEE. All rights reserved. This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.

1

Table 1—Responses

		Table 1—Responses	
V		GU, Yingjie	
V	У	Gunther, Craig	
V	у	Haddock, Stephen	
V	У	Hayakawa, Hitoshi	
V	У	Jeffree, Anthony	
V	е	Jochim, Markus	
V	У	Johas Teener, Michael	
V	У	Jones, Girault	
V	У	Kamath, Daya	
V	e	Keen, Hal	
V		Keesara, Srikanth	
V	У	Kim, Yongbum	
V	У	Klein, Philippe	
V	У	Kleineberg, Oliver	
V	у	Lynch, Jeff	
V	n	Mack-Crane, Ben	у
V	у	Martin, David	
V	у	Messenger, John	
V		Morris, John	
V	у	Multanen, Eric	
V	e	Olsen, David	
V		Pannell, Donald	
V	у	Parsons, Glenn	у
v		Pearson, Mark	
V		Pelissier, Joseph	
v		Raeber, Rene	
V	e	Randall, Karen	
V		Roese, Josef	

 $Copyright @ 2012 \ IEEE. \ All \ rights \ reserved.$ This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.

		·	
V	У	Romascanu, Dan	
V	n	Rouyer, Jessy	у
V		Sajassi, Ali	
V	У	Saltsidis, Panagiotis	
V	У	Seaman, Michael	
V	t	Seto, Koichiro	
V	У	Sharma, Rakesh	
V	У	Shimizu, Takeshi	
V	e	Stanton, Kevin	
V	У	Thaler, Patricia	
V	У	Touve, Jeremy	
V	У	Vissers, Maarten	
V	У	Wei, Yuehua	
V		Xiao, Min	

Table 1—Responses

Table 2—Results

Category	Total	Percentage
Yes	35	94.59%
No	2	5.41%
Abstain	8	17.78%
No. of Voters	67	100.00%
Voters responding	45	67.16%

2. Ballot Comments	1
	2 3
2.1 Comments sorted by clause/page/line	3 4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25 26
	26 27
	27 28
	28 29
	30
	31
	32
	33
	33 34
	35
	36 37
	37
	38
	39
	40
	41
	42 43
	43
	44
	45

P802.1AB Corrigendum 1

IEEE P802-1AB Cor-1 D1-0 LLDP Corrigendum 1 Initial Working Group ballot comments

	SC 0	P	1	# 6		80	6 6 4	P 2	1 00	# 7
CI 00 Rouyer	3C U	P None entered	L	# 5	Cl 06 Congdon	30	6.6.1	P 2 None entered	L 23	# 7
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A			Comment	Tvne	т	Comment Status A		
802.14 being first ro "The s	AB-2009 has the mandatory or ne wo of Table 8-1,	e following occurrences of the "E ecessary though this corrigendu the NOTE of 8.5.1, 9.1.2.1:c, 9. DU does not include any optiona	m makes this I.2.2:d (in cor	TLV optional: 6.1:h, trast to mention that	The ap from th informa informa	proach le desc ation ar ation as e shou	of allowi ription wh nd not sto s opaque	ng unknown extra fields is good nat the MIB should do? The ea ore it, but I believe we have a pr strings/values for organizationa sidered here - though the implic	sy answer is t ecedence of s al specific TL\	o discard the extra storing unknown /s. Maybe the same
Suggested	-									
		d parts of 802.1AB-2009 in this End Of LLDPDU TLV".	corrigendum 1	o appropriately reflect		ler if the	e extra po	ortions of TLVs should be store		
Response ACCE		Response Status C			MIB ne manag		•	ed. If not, further clarify that th	s extra info w	ill not be available to
ACCE	F1.				Response			Response Status C		
<i>CI</i> 06 Mack-Crar	SC 6.1	P 2 None entered	L 1	# 1				E. Take the second option. Administration and the standard N		ndicate that this extra
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A			C/ 06	SC	6.7	P 2	L 25	# 3
	51	TLV is now optional and the text	in 6.1 should	reflect this.	Mack-Cran	е		None entered		
Suaaestea	dRemedv				Comment	Туре	Е	Comment Status A		
SuggestedRemedy Change "Each LLDPDU contains the following four mandatory TLVs" to "Each LLDPDU contains the following three mandatory TLVs" and change item h) to begin with "An optional". Response Response Status C ACCEPT. C				statem an LLE one M referer ID and	ent tha)P agei SAP (e ice to 7 the po	t the MSA nt is not c .g., as in 7.2 is not a rt ID valu	34 includes the suggestion that AP Identifier (Chassis ID + Port lear in the case that more than Figure 6-7). The maintenance accurate. Perhaps 6.1 is the in es are concatenated to form at	ID) is sufficie one LLDP ag request also s tended refere ogical MSAP	nt to uniquely identify ent is associated with suggests that the nce (text "The chassis	
CI 06	SC 6.6.1	P 2	L 21	# 4	Suggested	•		the sending LLDP agent/port."		
Rouyer		None entered						t in 6.7 to indicate that the MSA	P Identifier is	sufficient to uniquely
Comment "imple	<i>Type</i> E mentatios"	Comment Status A				the LL		It from the perspective of a rece		
Suggested					Response			Response Status C		
••	mentations"	Response Status C			6.1 "No multipl 6.7, ch agent o follows agent o	DTE - 1 e LLDF ange "I can be that ea can be	The stater agents s t follows uniquely ach LLDF	E. Change reference from 7.2 ment above is true for any LLDI sending and receving LLDPDUs that each LLDP agent makes u identified by that MSAP's identi agent makes use of a unique identified by the receiving agen	P agent; howe s using differe se of a unique fier as specifi MSAP, and th	ever, there can be nt MAC addresses." In e MSAP, and that the ed above (7.2)." to "It at the

C/ 06 SC 6.7 Page 1 of 2 13/11/2012 17:02:18

P802.1AB Corrigendum 1 IEEE P802-1AB Cor-1 D1-0 LLDP Corrigendum 1 Initial Working Group ballot comments

C/ 08 Mack-Crai	SC 8.4.1	P 3 None	L 40 entered	# 2	
Comment Table	51	Comment Status ate the End Of LLDPD			
Suggestee As no					
Response ACCE		Response Status	С		
<i>CI</i> 08 Parsons	SC 8.5.1	P 3 None	L 43 entered	# 6	
	<i>Type</i> E should be clause	Comment Status 8.5.8	Α		
Suggestee chang	dRemedy je to 8.5.8				
Response ACCE		Response Status	С		

C/ 08 SC 8.5.1 2.2 Comments sorted by comment number

P802.1AB Corrigendum 1

IEEE P802-1AB Cor-1 D1-0 LLDP Corrigendum 1 Initial Working Group ballot comments

C/ 06 SC 6.1	P 2	L 1	# 1	C/ 06	SC 6.7	P 2	L 25	# 3
Mack-Crane	None entered			Mack-Crar	ne	None entered		
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A			Comment	51	Comment Status A		
The End Of LLDPDU T	LV is now optional and the text	in 6.1 should	reflect this.			t 34 includes the suggestion that GAP Identifier (Chassis ID + Por		
	J contains the following four ma hree mandatory TLVs" and cha			an LLI one M refere ID and	DP agent is not ISAP (e.g., as ir nce to 7.2 is not d the port ID val	clear in the case that more than Figure 6-7). The maintenance accurate. Perhaps 6.1 is the in ues are concatenated to form a	n one LLDP age request also s ntended referer logical MSAP i	ent is associated with uggests that the nce (text "The chassis
Response	Response Status C				•	y the sending LLDP agent/port.	·).	
ACCEPT.				Suggested	-	t in 6.7 to indicate that the MS	A P. Idontifior is a	sufficient to uniquely
C/ 08 SC 8.4.1 Mack-Crane	P3 None entered	L 40	# 2		y the LLDP Age	t in 6.7 to indicate that the MSA nt from the perspective of a rec		
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A			Response		Response Status C		
51	ate the End Of LLDPDU TLV is	optional.				LE. Change reference from 7.2 ement above is true for any LLD		
SuggestedRemedy As noted.				multip 6.7, cł	le LLDP agents nange "It follows	sending and receving LLDPDL that each LLDP agent makes didentified by that MSAP's iden	Is using differer use of a unique	nt MAC addresses." In MSAP, and that the
Response ACCEPT.	Response Status C			agent		P agent makes use of a unique / identified by the receiving age "		
				CI 06	SC 6.6.1	P 2	L 21	# 4
				Rouyer		None entered		
				Comment	<i>Type</i> E mentatios"	Comment Status A		
				impic	momanoo			
				Suggested				

ACCEPT.

Comment ID 4

P802.1AB Corrigendum 1 IEEE P802-1AB Cor-1 D1-0 LLDP Corrigendum 1 Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI 00	SC 0	Р	L	# 5	
Rouyer		None entered			
being first ro "The s	AB-2009 has the mandatory or ne w of Table 8-1,	Comment Status A e following occurrences of the ' ecessary though this corrigend the NOTE of 8.5.1, 9.1.2.1:c, 9 DU does not include any option	um makes this ⁻ 0.1.2.2:d (in cont	LV optional: 6.1:h, rast to mention that	
	ge the reference	d parts of 802.1AB-2009 in this End Of LLDPDU TLV".	s corrigendum to	o appropriately reflect	
Response ACCE		Response Status C			
C/ 08	SC 8.5.1	P 3	L 43	# 6	
Parsons		None entered			
<i>Comment</i> This s	<i>Type</i> E hould be clause	Comment Status A 8.5.8			
Suggested chang	<i>Remedy</i> e to 8.5.8				
Response ACCE		Response Status C			
C/ 06	SC 6.6.1	P 2	L 23	# 7	
Congdon		None entered			
Comment	Туре Т	Comment Status A			
from t inform inform	he description w ation and not st ation as opaque ce should be co	ving unknown extra fields is gou that the MIB should do? The e ore it, but I believe we have a p e strings/values for organization nsidered here - though the imp	asy answer is to precedence of s nal specific TLV	o discard the extra toring unknown s. Maybe the same	ct
Suggestee	Remedy				
MIB n		oortions of TLVs should be stor tted. If not, further clarify that t			
Response		Response Status C			
		LE. Take the second option. A management via the standard		dicate that this extra	

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Comment ID 7