

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.

1. Ballot summary	3	1
		2
2. Ballot Comments	6	3
		4
		5
		6
		7
		8
		9
		10
		11
		12
		13
		14
		15
		16
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21
		22
		23
		24
		25
		26
		27
		28
		29
		30
		31
		32
		33
		34
		35
		36
		37
		38
		39
		40
		41
		42
		43
		44
		45
		46

1. Ballot summary

Table 1—Responses

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

Table 1—Responses

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 1—Responses

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

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%

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

2. Ballot Comments

2.1 Comments sorted by clause/page/line

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 5
 Rouyer None entered

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 802.1AB-2009 has the following occurrences of the "End Of LLDPDU TLV" mentioned as being mandatory or necessary though this corrigendum makes this TLV optional: 6.1:h, first row of Table 8-1, the NOTE of 8.5.1, 9.1.2.1:c, 9.1.2.2:d (in contrast to mention that "The shutdown LLDPDU does not include any optional TLVs"), 9.2.7.2:c, 9.2.7.3:c, 10.2.3:d, A.4:basiclv.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the referenced parts of 802.1AB-2009 in this corrigendum to appropriately reflect the optionality of the "End Of LLDPDU TLV".

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 06 SC 6.1 P 2 L 1 # 1
 Mack-Crane None entered

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 The End Of LLDPDU TLV is now optional and the text in 6.1 should reflect this.

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.

Cl 06 SC 6.6.1 P 2 L 21 # 4
 Rouyer None entered

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 "implementations"

SuggestedRemedy
 "implementations"

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 06 SC 6.6.1 P 2 L 23 # 7
 Congdon None entered

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The approach of allowing unknown extra fields is good for compatibility, but it isn't clear from the description what the MIB should do? The easy answer is to discard the extra information and not store it, but I believe we have a precedence of storing unknown information as opaque strings/values for organizational specific TLVs. Maybe the same practice should be considered here - though the implications may have a large ripple effect on the MIB.

SuggestedRemedy
 Consider if the extra portions of TLVs should be stored somewhere in the MIB. If so, the MIB needs to be updated. If not, further clarify that this extra info will not be available to management.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Take the second option. Add a NOTE to indicate that this extra info is not available to management via the standard MIB.

Cl 06 SC 6.7 P 2 L 25 # 3
 Mack-Crane None entered

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Maintenance Request 34 includes the suggestion that the text in 6.7 be clarified. The statement that the MSAP Identifier (Chassis ID + Port ID) is sufficient to uniquely identify an LLDP agent is not clear in the case that more than one LLDP agent is associated with one MSAP (e.g., as in Figure 6-7). The maintenance request also suggests that the reference to 7.2 is not accurate. Perhaps 6.1 is the intended reference (text "The chassis ID and the port ID values are concatenated to form a logical MSAP identifier that is used by the recipient to identify the sending LLDP agent/port.").

SuggestedRemedy
 Perhaps clarify the text in 6.7 to indicate that the MSAP Identifier is sufficient to uniquely identify the LLDP Agent from the perspective of a receiving LLDP Agent (if that is the intent).

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change reference from 7.2 to 6.1. Add a NOTE after para 3 of 6.1 "NOTE - The statement above is true for any LLDP agent; however, there can be multiple LLDP agents sending and receiving LLDPDUs using different MAC addresses." In 6.7, change "It follows that each LLDP agent makes use of a unique MSAP, and that the agent can be uniquely identified by that MSAP's identifier as specified above (7.2)." to "It follows that each LLDP agent makes use of a unique MSAP, and that the agent can be uniquely identified by the receiving agent using the MSAP's identifier as specified above (6.1)."

Cl **08** *SC* **8.4.1** *P* **3** *L* **40** #

Mack-Crane None entered

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 8-1 should indicate the End Of LLDPDU TLV is optional.

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.5.1** *P* **3** *L* **43** #

Parsons None entered

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This should be clause 8.5.8

SuggestedRemedy

change to 8.5.8

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

1 **2.2 Comments sorted by comment number**

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46

CI 06 SC 6.1 P 2 L 1 # 1 [REDACTED]
Mack-Crane None entered

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The End Of LLDPDU TLV is now optional and the text in 6.1 should reflect this.

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.

CI 08 SC 8.4.1 P 3 L 40 # 2 [REDACTED]
Mack-Crane None entered

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Table 8-1 should indicate the End Of LLDPDU TLV is optional.

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 06 SC 6.7 P 2 L 25 # 3 [REDACTED]
Mack-Crane None entered

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Maintenance Request 34 includes the suggestion that the text in 6.7 be clarified. The statement that the MSAP Identifier (Chassis ID + Port ID) is sufficient to uniquely identify an LLDP agent is not clear in the case that more than one LLDP agent is associated with one MSAP (e.g., as in Figure 6-7). The maintenance request also suggests that the reference to 7.2 is not accurate. Perhaps 6.1 is the intended reference (text "The chassis ID and the port ID values are concatenated to form a logical MSAP identifier that is used by the recipient to identify the sending LLDP agent/port.").

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps clarify the text in 6.7 to indicate that the MSAP Identifier is sufficient to uniquely identify the LLDP Agent from the perspective of a receiving LLDP Agent (if that is the intent).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change reference from 7.2 to 6.1. Add a NOTE after para 3 of 6.1 "NOTE - The statement above is true for any LLDP agent; however, there can be multiple LLDP agents sending and receiving LLDPDUs using different MAC addresses." In 6.7, change "It follows that each LLDP agent makes use of a unique MSAP, and that the agent can be uniquely identified by that MSAP's identifier as specified above (7.2)." to "It follows that each LLDP agent makes use of a unique MSAP, and that the agent can be uniquely identified by the receiving agent using the MSAP's identifier as specified above (6.1)."

CI 06 SC 6.6.1 P 2 L 21 # 4 [REDACTED]
Rouyer None entered

Comment Type E Comment Status A

"implementatios"

SuggestedRemedy

"implementations"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 5
 Rouyer None entered

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

802.1AB-2009 has the following occurrences of the "End Of LLDPDU TLV" mentioned as being mandatory or necessary though this corrigendum makes this TLV optional: 6.1:h, first row of Table 8-1, the NOTE of 8.5.1, 9.1.2.1:c, 9.1.2.2:d (in contrast to mention that "The shutdown LLDPDU does not include any optional TLVs"), 9.2.7.2:c, 9.2.7.3:c, 10.2.3:d, A.4:basic1v.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the referenced parts of 802.1AB-2009 in this corrigendum to appropriately reflect the optionality of the "End Of LLDPDU TLV".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 08 SC 8.5.1 P 3 L 43 # 6
 Parsons None entered

Comment Type E Comment Status A

This should be clause 8.5.8

SuggestedRemedy

change to 8.5.8

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 06 SC 6.6.1 P 2 L 23 # 7
 Congdon None entered

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The approach of allowing unknown extra fields is good for compatibility, but it isn't clear from the description what the MIB should do? The easy answer is to discard the extra information and not store it, but I believe we have a precedence of storing unknown information as opaque strings/values for organizational specific TLVs. Maybe the same practice should be considered here - though the implications may have a large ripple effect on the MIB.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider if the extra portions of TLVs should be stored somewhere in the MIB. If so, the MIB needs to be updated. If not, further clarify that this extra info will not be available to management.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Take the second option. Add a NOTE to indicate that this extra info is not available to management via the standard MIB.