

DISPOSITION OF SPONSOR BALLOT COMMENTS ON

IEEE *Draft* P802.1X-Rev/D10

***DRAFT* IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks—Port Based Network Access Control— Revision**

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: +44-161-973-4278 Fax: +44-161-973-6534 Email: tony@jeffree.co.uk

Commentary:

This Disposition of Sponsor Ballot Comments has been prepared to document the ballot comments received in the Working Group ballot on **P802.1X-Rev/D10**, and to record the resolutions of those ballot comments, agreed during the meeting of 802.1 held in Portland, OR, in July 2004. 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 P802.1X-Rev/D11.

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

1. Ballot summary

The ballot summary produced by the IEEE balloting service is appended to this Disposition of Ballot Comments. The results of the ballot can be seen in Table 1. The two disapprove voters were Adrian Stephens and David James.

Table 1—Results

CATEGORY	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
Yes	96	98%
No	2	2%
Abstentions	4	3%
No. of Voters	119	
Voters responding	102	85%

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

Comment 1 Adrian P Stephens

The following comment was made by Adrian P. Stephens in the initial Sponsor ballot:

page =
line = General
subclause =
comment_type = Technical
comment = There is no clear "home" for the 802.1X entities related to the 802 architecture. It is not clear from this document whether these entities reside within a layer or between existing layers. This confusion has manifested itself elsewhere - for example in 802.11i that views 802.1x as being both within the MAC (for the purposes of managing interaction between the MAC and 802.1x) and above the MAC (for the purposes of authentication state machines and distribution services filtering). The picture shown of an EAPOL protocol entity talking to a controlled port is a partial solution to this issue - but it creates its own problems of two entities talking across multiple layers of the network stack via interfaces that are not standardised.
suggested_remedy = Provide near the start of this document an architecture picture showing entities residing between existing architecture entities. Identify the management interfaces of 802.1X and define standardised interfaces to manage them. Similarly if this picture shows separate EAPOL and port-filtering entities, identify and standardise this interface.

Disposition of Comment 1

The following rebuttal was agreed by the ballot resolution committee:

Reject. This was considered to be too extensive a change to be undertaken within the scope of this revision; it will be considered for a future revision of the standard.

Comment 2 Adrian P Stephens

The following comment was made by Adrian P. Stephens in the first recirculation ballot:

page = General
line =
subclause =
comment_type = Technical
comment = I maintain my negative vote on the basis of rejection of comment # 2 (as shown in the D10_disapprove_comments document).

<numbered comment #1 in this comment summary>

I believe the time to address these issues is now and delaying to a later revision is not an adequate response.
suggested_remedy =

1
2
3
4

Disposition of Comment 2

5
6
7

Reject. The first recirculation produced no support within the balloting group for this additional work.

8
9

Comment 3 David James

10
11
12

Comment Type: Technical
Page:
Line:
Subclause:

13
14
15
16
17

File Format: IEEE supplied Excel template format
Original Name (can supply needed clues): D:\MyDocuments\Standards\P802.1x\Review2004Jun\P802.1x.xls
Description: 1) Please disregard my previous ballot comments; I had mistakenly thought you were dropped from the ballot if nonresponding on the first pass, which the Chair helped to clarify.
2) I continue to be disturbed by the excessive use of capitalization, making English appear to be German. Since capitalization is also often the only way to delineate Variable Values, its _very_ hard to parse such documents successfully, and technical interpretation is severely compromised.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Disposition of Comment 3

29
30
31

1) Accept. The previous comments submitted by the commenter have been disregarded, as requested.
2) See the dispositions of individual comments that follow.

32
33
34
35

Comment 4 David James

36
37
38

page = 7
line = 7
subclause = 0
comment_type = Technical
comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. The 802.1/802.3 habit of capitalizing every other word in the glossary (based on the current editor's level of "importance") makes the entire document hard to read, particularly when capitalization is also

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 used to differentiate between regular words and variables, constants, state machine names,
2 etc.

3 suggested_remedy = Standard for Local and Metropolioian Area Networks--Port-Based
4 Network Access Control (Revision)==>Standard for Local and metropolioian area net-
5 works--Port-based network access control (revision)

7 ***Disposition of Comment 4***

8
9
10 Reject. The title of the document is represented as it is presented in the PAR for the
11 project, and uses the same capitalization as the standard that is under revision. One of the
12 requirements of the RevCom submittal process is for the project title to match the title on
13 the draft; making gratuitous revisions to the PAR at this stage in the process would delay
14 the project to no particular purpose. There has been no concern expressed by IEEE edito-
15 rial staff on this point, despite two editorial reviews conducted during this revision project.

16 ***Comment 5*** **David James**

17
18
19 page = 7

20 line = 36

21 subclause =

22 comment_type = Technical

23 comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word
24 of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. The 802.1/802.3 habit of cap-
25 italizing every other word in the glossary (based on the current editor's level of "impor-
26 tance"), or the existence of a three letter acronym (TLA) makes the entire document hard
27 to read, particularly when capitalization is also used to differentiate between regular words
28 and variables, constants, state machine names, etc.

29 suggested_remedy = "the Ports of MAC Media Access Control (MAC) Bridges==>the
30 ports of media access control (MAC) bridges"

31 32 ***Disposition of Comment 5***

33
34
35 Reject. We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is
36 useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary
37 English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. This document has
38 undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff, both during the devel-
39 opment of the original standard, and twice during the conduct of this Sponsor ballot and
40 recirculation, and excess capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them.

41 42 ***Comment 6*** **David James**

43
44 page = 13

45 line = 11

46

subclause = 1
 comment_type = Technical 2
 comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word 3
 of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. The 802.1/802.3 habit of cap- 4
 italizing every other word in the glossary (based on the current editor's level of "impor- 5
 tance"), or the existence of a three letter acronym (TLA) makes the entire document hard 6
 to read, particularly when capitalization is also used to differentiate between regular words 7
 and variables, constants, state machine names, etc. 8
 suggested_remedy = Ports==>ports 9

Disposition of Comment 6 10
11
12

Reject. We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is 13
 useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary 14
 English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. This document has 15
 undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff, both during the devel- 16
 opment of the original standard, and twice during the conduct of this Sponsor ballot and 17
 recirculation, and excess capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them. 18
19

Comment 7 David James 20
21

page = 13 22
 line = 21 23
 subclause = 24
 comment_type = Technical 25
 comment = This clause is normative, and thus should not use definitions from an informa- 26
 tive bibliography. Also, the term "port" is defined in 5 ways in my 1992 edition. Also, this 27
 reference is very expensive and thus cannot be expected to be used by readers of this stan- 28
 dard. 29
 suggested_remedy = Provide explicit terms, rather than rely on nonce and Port definition 30
 in the informative boot of cumulative definitions. 31
32
33

Disposition of Comment 7 34
35
36

Reject. The change in this draft to make use of these definitions was made in order to sat- 37
 isfy a comment on the initial Sponsor ballot, requiring the use of the IEEE 100 definitions 38
 where these exist and are applicable, in line with existing IEEE editorial policy<<ref the 39
 style guide>>. The 1992 edition of IEEE 100 is badly out of date and is not an appropriate 40
 reference. 41
42

Comment 8 David James 43
44

page = 14 45
46

1 line = 7
2 subclause =
3 comment_type = Technical
4 comment = This clause is normative, and thus should not use definitions from an informa-
5 tive bibliography. Also, some of these acronyms (RIF) conflict with definitions in my
6 1992 edition. Also, this reference is very expensive and thus cannot be expected to be used
7 by readers of this standard.
8 suggested_remedy = "Delete: The Authoritative Dictionary
9 of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition [B1], should be referenced for terms not
10 defined in this clause."
11

12 **Disposition of Comment 8**

14 Reject. The meaning of the wording is that:

- 16 a) The acronyms explicitly defined in Clause 4 have the meanings stated in Clause 4
17 (i.e., they override any similar acronym in IEEE 100); and
- 18 b) That IEEE 100 should be referenced for any acronyms that are not explicitly
19 defined in Clause 4.

20 This is:

- 21 a) Exactly what is intended; and
- 22 b) Consistent with IEEE editorial policy<<ref the style guide>>; and
- 23 c) Consistent with the usage in IEEE 802.1X-2001.

24 **Comment 9 David James**

26 page = 14
27 line = 6
28 subclause =
29 comment_type = Technical
30 comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word
31 of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. The 802.1/802.3 habit of cap-
32 italizing every other word in the glossary (based on the current editor's level of "impor-
33 tance"), or the existence of a three letter acronym (TLA) makes the entire document hard
34 to read, particularly when capitalization is also used to differentiate between regular words
35 and variables, constants, state machine names, etc.
36 suggested_remedy = "Change to: CHAP challenge handshake authentication protocol
37 DHCP dynamic host configuration protocol
38 EAP extensible authentication protocol
39 EAP-TLS EAP transport layer security
40 EAPOL EAP over LANs
41 LAN IEEE 802 local area network
42 LLC logical link control
43 MAC media access control
44 MPDU MAC protocol data unit
45 MACPAE media port access control
46 identity

MPDUPID MAC protocol data unit protocol identifier	1
RIF routing information field	2
SASL simple authentication and security layer	3
SNAP subnetwork access protocol	4
SNMP simple network management protocol	5
VLAN virtual LAN"	6

Disposition of Comment 9

Reject. We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. Further, we consider it to be a requirement to match the capitalization of the term as expressed in the formulating standard. This document has undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff, both during the development of the original standard, and twice during the conduct of this Sponsor ballot and recirculation, and excess capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them.

Comment 10 David James

page = 15
 line = 7
 subclause =
 comment_type = Technical
 comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. Also, capitalization should be consistent with the (revised) glossary, where text has been changed.
 suggested_remedy = Port Access Entity (PAE)==>port access entity

Disposition of Comment 10

Reject. We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. This document has undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff, both during the development of the original standard, and twice during the conduct of this Sponsor ballot and recirculation, and excess capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them.

Comment 11 David James

page = 17
 line = 1
 subclause =

1 comment_type = Technical
2 comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word
3 of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. Also, since port access con-
4 trol isn't listed in the glossary, its unlikely to be an important word.
5 suggested_remedy = 6.2 Purpose of Port Access Control operation==>Purpose of port
6 access control, here and throughout. Do the same for all the other excessively capitalized
7 words, which were listed in previous comments that were not addressed individually, but
8 discarded as a whole. Change all other instances.
9

10 **Disposition of Comment 11**

11
12 Reject. We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is
13 useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary
14 English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. This document has
15 undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff, both during the devel-
16 opment of the original standard, and twice during the conduct of this Sponsor ballot and
17 recirculation, and excess capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them.
18

19 **Comment 12 David James**

20
21
22 page = 17
23 line = 3
24 subclause =
25 comment_type = Technical
26 comment = Excess capitalization. The IEEE policy is clear: capitalize only the first word
27 of a heading, the first word of a sentence, and proper nouns. Also, since system isn't listed
28 in the glossary, its unlikely to be an important word. Also, system and other words are cap-
29 italized inconsistently, due to the vague nature of the distinctive 802 editing feelings/
30 whims/conventions.
31 suggested_remedy = Supplicant system ==> supplicant system, System==>system,
32 Bridge==>bridge, Local Area Network ==> local area network, Supplicant==>supplicant,
33 etc. throughout.
34

35 **Disposition of Comment 12**

36
37
38 Reject. We consider that the use of capitalization for important and significant terms is
39 useful, and intend to continue its use. Such terms must be distinguished from ordinary
40 English usage; in the context of this standard, they are proper nouns. This document has
41 undergone editorial coordination review by the IEEE Editorial staff, both during the devel-
42 opment of the original standard, and twice during the conduct of this Sponsor ballot and
43 recirculation, and excess capitalization has never been raised as an issue by them.
44
45
46

Comment 13 **David James**

page = 167

line = 46

subclause =

comment_type = Technical

comment = There should be a line at the bottom of the table row that ends the page. This can be done by either fixing or overriding the bug in the IEEE templates, as we did within p802.17.

suggested_remedy = Ensure the placement of a very-thin line at table breaks, by fixing the IEEE templates or encouraging them to adopt user supplied templates that have fixed this.

Disposition of Comment 13

Accept.

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