

Cl 03 **SC 3.56** **P10** **L 39** # **2**

Chaplin, Clint Individual

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**

Extra "and"

SuggestedRemedy
delete "and"

Response **Response Status** **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The proposed change is purely editorial, and will be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication, as provided for in clause 5.4.3.2 of the Standards Board Operations Manual.

Cl 08 **SC 8.8** **P58** **L 6** # **1**

Malinen, Jouni Individual

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**

Comment 29 in the initial sponsor ballot requested two changes related to inc() function in Figure 8-6. This was accepted and partially implemented in D4.5, but it looks like the editor missed the second part of the proposed change: removal of the inc(x) definition. This function is not used in the figure anymore and as such, should be removed.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "The following abbreviation is used in this diagram: inc(x): {x = x + 1; If (X > 255) then (x = 0);}" from Figure 8-6.

Response **Response Status** **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
As the comment notes, the inc(x) definition is no longer used anywhere in the document. Its removal (or retention) would therefore not have any technical effect on the document. Any change would be purely editorial, so this comment will be referred to the IEEE publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication, as provided for in clause 5.4.3.2 of the Standards Board Operations Manual.

Cl 11 **SC 11.12** **P107** **L 7** # **3**

Chaplin, Clint Individual

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **R**

This diagram looks incomplete. Is it possible that the left side of the diagram has been cut off? And it looks like quite a bit of information that should be present on the right side of the box is missing. I would also point out that if the diagram is indeed incomplete, then we as voters have no way of judging if the missing information is correct or not. That makes the issue technical, rather than editorial.

SuggestedRemedy
Investigate, and fix if some of the diagram is missing.

Response **Response Status** **U**

REJECT.
This comment is out of scope of the recirculation ballot. The relevant text from the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual is quoted below for your information. As the comment addresses an issue of presentation style it will be forwarded to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication.

NOTE--This diagram is unchanged from the initial sponsor ballot. None of the diagram is missing. The style of this particular diagram (no line on the left) was extensively used in earlier drafts, though other diagrams were revised (without technical changes) to add such a line.

The IEEE Standards Board Manual states:
"During a recirculation ballot, balloting group members shall have an opportunity to change their previously cast votes. Until the document has achieved 75% approval, a balloter's comments can be based on any portion of the document. Once the document has achieved 75% approval, comments in subsequent ballots associated with a "do not approve" vote shall be based only on the changed portions of the balloted document, portions of the balloted document affected by the changes, or portions of the balloted document that are the subject of unresolved comments associated with negative votes. If comments associated with a "do not approve" vote are not based on the above criteria, the comments may be deemed out of scope of the recirculation. Such comments need not be addressed in the current ballot and may be considered for a future revision of the standard."

CI 12 SC 12.3 P118 L 23 # 4
 Chaplin, Clint Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

"In the case of successful EAP authentication as an Authenticator the authorization data used should also reflect the set of client controls or permissions conveyed by AAA protocol acting as the EAP transport, e.g. as RADIUS attributes (see Annex E)." Talk about a run-on sentence. How about a comma for clarification?

SuggestedRemedy

"In the case of successful EAP authentication as an Authenticator, the authorization data used should also reflect the set of client controls or permissions conveyed by AAA protocol acting as the EAP transport, e.g. as RADIUS attributes (see Annex E)."

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The ballot resolution committee considers that the proposed change is purely of an editorial nature, and has confirmed that this is the case in discussion with one of the IEEE editors. This comment will therefore be deferred to the publications editor as provided for in Clause 5.4.3.2 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual.

NOTE - the only change to this sentence following the successful sponsor ballot was the addition of "used" and "also" around "should", there has been no change to structure of the sentence.

"5.4.3.2 Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes

The Sponsor shall make a reasonable attempt to resolve all comments, objections, and negative votes that are accompanied by comments. Comments that advocate changes in the document, whether technical or editorial, may be accepted, revised, or rejected. Comments addressing grammar, punctuation, and style, whether attached to an affirmative or a negative vote, may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

CI 12 SC 12.3 P118 L 26 # 5
 Chaplin, Clint Individual

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"Authorization data can be absent (null) or restricted to that locally configured if AAA protocol is not used by the EAP Authenticator or if the PAE acted as an Supplicant, as existing AAA protocols do not provide it to a Supplicant" "that" is ambiguous in this sentence. In fact, it is unclear where "that locally configured" fits into the sentence structure in the first place. Also, "it" is ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

"Authorization data can be absent (null) or restricted to locally configured authorization data if AAA protocol is not used by the EAP Authenticator or if the PAE acted as an Supplicant, as existing AAA protocols do not provide authorization data to a Supplicant"

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

The ballot resolution committee considers that the proposed change is purely of an editorial nature, and has confirmed that this is the case in discussion with one of the IEEE editors. This comment will therefore be deferred to the publications editor as provided for in Clause 5.4.3.2 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual.

"5.4.3.2 Resolution of comments, objections, and negative votes

The Sponsor shall make a reasonable attempt to resolve all comments, objections, and negative votes that are accompanied by comments. Comments that advocate changes in the document, whether technical or editorial, may be accepted, revised, or rejected. Comments addressing grammar, punctuation, and style, whether attached to an affirmative or a negative vote, may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

<i>Cl</i> B	<i>SC</i> B	<i>P</i> 196	<i>L</i> 19	# <input type="text" value="6"/>
Chaplin, Clint		Individual		

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

IETF drafts are only valid for a maximum of six month, and then are deleted from the IETF web site. You run the risk of having the URL reference here be invalid even before this document is published.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a URL or a refrence that will be valid for longer than six months.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

This comment is out of scope of the recirculation ballot. The relevant text from the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual is quoted in the response to comment #3 for your information.

This reference to the IETF Draft was present in the original (successful) sponsor ballot draft. Annex E (informative) explicitly drew attention to the temporary nature of the reference, and no comment was received on that potential issue:

"An Internet Draft "Radius Attributes for IEEE 802 Networks" was under development at the time of the completion of this standard. Readers of this standard ... are encouraged to consult the latest revision of the draft or its successor RFC."

The reference and URL are thus only intended to help the reader in locating the latest information, possibly by using an updated draft number in the URL. The change bar in the document at this draft was a consequence of updating to the currently latest draft and fixing the 'click on' aspect of the URL, showing the full URL as part of that fix. This comment will be referred to the publications editor for editorial updating to the latest draft current at the time of publication, and consideration of how the URL should be displayed.

Note that the reference is not part of the normative provisions of this standard. It is in the Bibliography because of the mention in Annex E (informative).