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1. Ballot summary

The following table indicates the status of each ballot response received. Where comments have been received without an accompanying ballot, this is indicated in the Comments column. The Status column indicates the voting status of the responder. V(voting) indicates 802.1 voting member at the start of the ballot period. N(on-voting) indicates a comment only response. L(iaison) indicates a voting liaison response. The Vote column indicates the vote cast; Y=Approve, N=Disapprove, T=Abstain due to lack of time, E=Abstain due to lack of expertise, O=Abstain for other reasons, C=Comments only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Brandon Barry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Les Bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Mike Bolza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Paul Botloff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Jim Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Diloto Cavendish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Paul Congleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Sharan Davat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Arjan de Hoer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Uriq Easley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Anathi Elangovan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Hen Havlik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>David Ellef-Desusque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Nori Finn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Lizzi Frattura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Gerard Goubert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Steve Hasklock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Han h-Shalom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Alyas Hétapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Neil Jarvis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Tony Jeffree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Hal Keen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Yingjun Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Shobhan Lakraajnada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Bill Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Loren Lansen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Yanick Le Sill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Marcus Leisch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>John Messenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Deyan Mohan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Bob Moskowitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Don O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Don Pannell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Glenn Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ken Patton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Karen Randell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Alyn Romanow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Dan Romacanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Jessy Y'Roysier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ali Sabahi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Doris Saha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Sahib Samalibian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>John Sauer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Kichiro Ikeda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Nick Shearer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Muneyoshi Suzuki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Jonathan Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Geoff Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Michel Thorsan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>John Viega</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Fred Vinaya Lay-Jeni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>John Vollbracht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Dennis Vogano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Karl Weber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ludwig Winkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Michael O. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Arloop Dhanwani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Francois Teller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ballot can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Voters</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters responding</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Ballot Comments

Comment 1    Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: Process
CLAUSE: Editor's Foreword
PAGE: 3
LINE:
COMMENT START:
This is a comment to do with the development process and not the final result. However I for one would find it useful if the editor's introduction to the current draft etc. was filled in on the next, pre-sponsor ballot revision. I say this because it is currently dangling at the end, and one has to know to pick up at Annex Z, which will be removed for sponsor ballot. I frequently have cause to examine the audit trail of revision of our standards, usually to determine when and why we made an apparent mistake. The editor's foreword as it notes draft to draft changes is incredibly useful for this purpose, and even filling in the short amount of material called for in Q-REV could be a great help in 5 years time.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Complete editor's foreword with necessary material from Annex Z and anything else relevant for the inevitable recirc of the recirc. If a recirc is not required produce an archive "immediately prior to sponsor ballot copy".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 1

Accept.

Comment 2    Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Introduction to 802.1Q
PAGE: 7
LINE:
COMMENT START:
While the introduction is not formally part of the standard it should be factually correct. Currently it refers to "this revision of the standard" as incorporating .1u, .1v, and .1s.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
I would be happy with any description of the current state and development history of 802.1Q that the editor could provide. I believe that this is in scope of changes in this ballot or subsequent to the ballot since the material is not in any case part of the formal standard that we are balloting.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 2

Accept in principle. The most recent published Q was an edition (and has never been formally balloted), its status is not really much different from an editor’s draft. So formally, this is indeed the point at which those amendments are properly incorporated into the standard. We should clarify the text to indicate that this is the case. “This revision is the result of balloting Q, mumble as a single project. Q and the individual amendments were previously published collectively as Q 2003 Ed”.

Comment 3  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE: Figures
PAGE: 19
LINE: 40-50
COMMENT START:
The length of the figure titles for figs 13-14 through 13-17 are so long as to cause a formatting problem in this clause.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove the "Part n:" designations from the titles of the relevant figures and the trailing "role transitions" as this repeats what is said at the beginning of the figure title.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 3

Accept.

Comment 4  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE: 1.2
PAGE: 24
LINE: 10
COMMENT START:
Bullet (a) is clearly not a benefit, rather an observation, and the reason it is here at all will be entirely missed by those who do not know the particular development history.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
I am aware this comment is out of scope of the ballot. Archive it for next time, of for the sponsor ballot.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 4

Accept - remove bullet A.

Comment 5 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 1.3
PAGE: 24,25
LINE: 28-

COMMENT START:
This subclause (1.3) has now been entirely superseded for all it useful purposes with the improvements to clause 5, including those made immediately prior to ballot. It is now just clutter, at best, and at worst could be found to conflict with Clause 5. Most of Table 1-1 actually deals with informative annexes, which are not "provisions of the standard". Removing the subclause and Table 1-1 will give us one less thing to keep in sync.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete clause 1.3 and Table 1-1.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 5

Accept.

Comment 6 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 2
PAGE: 26
LINE: 47

COMMENT START:
The reference to 802.4 token bus is not used anywhere in this document.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete this reference. If the comment is out of scope for this ballot raise it for sponsor ballot.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 6

Accept.
Comment 7  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:  3
PAGE:  28
LINE:  -
COMMENT START:
There are chunks of this draft that are not consistent with the note to 3.2, i.e. they do abbreviated part of Bridged Local Area Network to Bridged LAN thus inviting confusion between a single LAN that is bridged to others, and the resulting concatenation or part thereof. I know that this was a result of post-sponsor ballot editorial processing on 1Q-1998 and 1Q-2003. It would be extremely convenient if we could get the terminology lined up with that in .1D-2004 now. In particular there are parts of clause 6 which are exactly the same as the parts of .1D except that "Virtual Bridged Local Area Network" or "Virtual Bridged LAN" has been substituted for "Bridged Local Area Network". In most cases "network" or "bridged network" would do just fine. If the wholesale and slightly incorrect replacement of names by partial abbreviations can be done as an editorial exercise post-sponsor ballot, it should be possible to do it now. It may save some long comments during sponsor ballot, although it could be raised then as an alternative.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add a definition of "Virtual Bridged Local Area Network" to clause 3. It is just "A concatenation of individual IEEE 802 LANs interconnected by bridges, including VLAN-aware Bridges."
In the NOTE to clause 3.2 replace "the use of the word ‘network’ in this Standard refers to a Bridged Local Area Network. The term Bridged Local Area Network is not otherwise abbreviated."
with "the use of the word ‘network’ and the term "bridged network" in this Standard refers to a Virtual Bridged Local Area Network or Bridged Local Area Network. The terms Virtual Bridged Local Area Network and Bridged Local Area Network are not otherwise abbreviated."
Throughout the document replace every instance of "Virtual Bridged LAN" or "Bridged LAN" with "network" except in the following cases:

pg 7, l 17 - use "Bridged Local Area Network"
pg 7, l 11 - delete "in Bridged LANs"
pg 7, l 128 - replace "Virtual Bridged LANs" with "Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks"
pg 7, elsewhere - delete "in order to support ..." and "administer Virtual ..." to avoid unnecessary repetition
pg 38, l 4 - "bridged LANs" is exactly what is meant here, and should stay as is.
pg 38, l 49 - use "Virtual Bridged Local Area Network"
pg 44, l 10 - use "bridged networks"
pg 62, l 22 - "bridged LANs" is exactly what is meant here, and should stay as is.
pg 156, l 12 - use "bridged network"
pg 292, l 6 - use "Bridged Local Area Networks"
Similarly "VLAN Bridge" is used often when just "bridge" is meant. Replace all occurrences of "VLAN Bridge" in Clause 6 with "bridge" except in the following cases:
pg 43, l 32 - leave as is.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 7

Accept.

Comment 8       Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.3 (h) and Table 5-1
PAGE: 35
LINE: 12-13 and 26-43
COMMENT START:
Table 5-1 is completely full of "shall" apart from the not applicable box. It was a way of beating requirements into skulls one upon a time, but now serves no useful purpose within the improved Clause 5, an should be removed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the last sentence of bullet (h) and remove Table 5-1.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 8

Accept.

Comment 9       Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.3
PAGE: 35
LINE: 3
COMMENT START:
Incorrect reference: specification of Acceptable Frame Types, PVID, and VID
Set parameters have moved to 6.7.
This applies to:
section 5.3  page 35  line 3, 5  (two places)
section 5.3.1  page 36  line 10
section 10.3  page 104  line 11
section 12.10.1.1.3  page 139  lines 15, 21, 22 (three places)
section 12.10.1.2.1  page 139  line 39
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Section 12.10.1.3.1 page 140 lines 5, 11 (two places) 1
Section 12.10.1.5.1 page 140 line 50 2
Section A.21 page 245 line 50 3
Section A.21 page 246 line 5 4

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "8.6.2" to "6.7".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 9

Accept.

Comment 10  Steve Haddock

Comment Type: E
Clause: 5.3
Page: 35
Line: 7

Comment Start:
Incorrect reference: Untagged set is specified in 8.8.2.
This applies to:
Section 5.3 page 35 line 7
Section 5.3.1 page 36 line 12
Section 10.3 page 104 line 30
Section 12.10.2.1.3 page 142 line 49

Section A.21 page 247 line 35

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(8.6.2 and 8.10.9)" to "(8.8.2)".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 10

Accept.

Comment 11  Steve Haddock

Comment Type: E
Clause: 5.3.1.2
Page: 37
Line: 7

Comment Start:
Also applies to section A.21 page 246 lines 16, 19, 21, 25 (four places).

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(8.6.1 and 8.6.2)" to "(6.8)".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 11

Accept.

Comment 12  Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6
PAGE: 38
LINE: 24
COMMENT START:
IEE should be IEEE.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change it.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 12

Accept.

Comment 13  Anoop Ghanwani

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.3.2
PAGE: 41
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
This statement conflicts with NOTE 1 on page 40 which says that admission control is
beyond the scope of this standard. Rate-limit is a form of admission control.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove the statement from NOTE 1.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 13

Accept.

Comment 14  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.3.6
PAGE: 42
LINE: 28
COMMENT START:
The conformance requirements do not use "must", however given its status in IETF documents its use id to be avoided in this standard as it creates ambiguity. Moreover its implication is only indirect in this sentence.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete "must".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 14

Accept.

Comment 15  Anoop Ghanwani

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.3.9
PAGE: 43
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
This statement says something to the effect of end-to-end significance of priority. Yet, a few paragraphs later starting line 53, the draft says that priority can be overwritten under management control.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
The statement about maintenance of priority end-to-end should be removed to maintain consistency.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 15

Accept.
Comment 16  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E  
CLAUSE: 6.3.9  
PAGE: 43  
LINE: 45  
COMMENT START:  
The use of access_priority is a hangover.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace "of priority to access priority" with "of priority to the priority requested from the individual LAN or supporting service".  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 16  

Accept.

Comment 17  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE:  E  
CLAUSE: 6.7  
PAGE: 49  
LINE: 32 and 49  
COMMENT START:  
Incorrect references.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
In line 32, change "VLAN tag type specified in 9.2" to "VLAN tag type specified in 9.5".  
In line 49 change "type used to support the EISS (6.7, 9.3)" to "type used to support the EISS (9.5)".  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 17  

Accept.

Comment 18  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE:  T  
CLAUSE: 6.7.1  
PAGE: 50  
LINE: 10
COMMENT START:
There was text in clause 9.9 of draft 3.0 and 4.0 of 802.1ad that indicates it is a change to existing text in 802.1Q-REV, however this text does not appear in 802.1Q-REV draft 1.0 or 2.0. As it pertains to potentially discarding received frames with invalid VLAN tag formats, I believe it is more appropriate to include in clause 6.7.1 with the other conditions for discarding received frames based on ingress filtering. The text included a check of the validity of the E-RIF field when the CFI bit is set. It seems to me that this check should only be done when the E-RIF field is actually being used (either for source routing or if translation is required based on the underlying media access control method), and therefore it is not appropriate to require the check in 6.7.1.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the opening paragraph of 6.7.1 to read:
"On receipt of an M_UNITDATA.indication primitive from the Internal Sublayer Service, the received frame is discarded if:

a) the initial octets of the mac_service_data_unit do not contain a valid VLAN tag type (9.5) and the Acceptable Frame Types is Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames; or
b) the initial two octets of the mac_service_data_unit contain a valid VLAN tag type (9.5) and

1) there are fewer than two octets following the type; or
2) the VID value is FFF, reserved in Table 9-2 for future implementation use; or
3) the VID value is 000 (indicating priority-tagged) and the Acceptable Frame Types is Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames; or
4) the VID value is in the range 001-FFE and the Acceptable Frame Types is Admit only Untagged and Priority-tagged frames."

Perhaps (but I recommend not) add:
" 5) the CFI bit is set and the the subsequent octets of the mac_service_data_unit do not include a properly encoded E-RIF field (9.7)."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 18

Accept in principle. Edit as follows:
"On receipt of an M_UNITDATA.indication primitive from the Internal Sublayer Service, the received frame is discarded if:

a) the initial octets of the mac_service_data_unit do not contain a valid VLAN tag header (9.3) of the type used to support the EISS (9.5) and the Acceptable Frame Types is Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames; or
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b) the initial two octets of the mac_service_data_unit contain a valid VLAN tag header
(9.3) or the type used to support the EIIS (9.5) and

1) the VID value is FFF, reserved in Table 9-2 for future implementation use; or
2) the VID value is 000 (indicating priority-tagged) and the Acceptable Frame
Types is Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames; or
3) the VID value is in the range 001-FFE and the Acceptable Frame Types is
Admit only Untagged and Priority-tagged frames."

**Comment 19  Steve Haddock**

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.7.2
PAGE: 51
LINE: 28

COMMENT START:
Text refers to include_tag parameter, which has been removed from the document, and a
Service VLAN tag, which anticipates 802.1ad.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change: "and the value of the include_tag parameter is False or the tag to be used is a Ser-
vie VLAN tag (S-TAG), then" To: "and no tag header is to be inserted, then"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 19**

Accept.

**Comment 20  Anoop Ghanwani**

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 7.2
PAGE: 58
LINE: 23

COMMENT START:
Statement (b) is true only when using IVL.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify this, especially the part about addresses being treated differently per-VLAN.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 20

Comment 21  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 7.4  
PAGE: 60  
LINE: 11  
COMMENT START:  
Please make sure the occurrence of "VLAN-Bridged LAN" is dealt with in the clean up of  
"Bridged LAN" in general.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 21

Accept.

Comment 22  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 7.5  
PAGE: 60  
LINE: 54  
COMMENT START:  
With the changes following the last ballot it is no longer just the Forwarding Process that  
controls the listed results.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Delete "by the Forwarding Process (8.6) of".  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 22

Accept.

Comment 23  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 7.5
PAGE: 61
LINE: 43 (NOTE 2)
COMMENT START:
With the changes following the last ballot NOTE 2 is no longer accurate. What is more
NOTE 4 (misnumbered) is really a note to a note, which is unnecessary. Also the second
NOTE 1 has clearly been overtaken by the passage of time and .1w.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the second NOTE 1, NOTE 2, and NOTE 4. (There was no NOTE 3).
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 23

Accept.

Comment 24  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:  8.1.7
PAGE:  64
LINE:  37
COMMENT START:
Incorrect reference: Untagged set is specified in 8.8.2.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(8.8.1, 6.7.2)" to "(8.8.2, 6.7.2)".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 24

Accept.

Comment 25  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:  8.3
PAGE:  66
LINE:  51
COMMENT START:
In Figures 8-3, 8-4, 8-6, and 8-7, change "802.X" to "802.n" to make consistent with Fig-
ures 8-2 and 6-1.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "802.X" to "802.n".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 25

Accept.

Comment 26  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 8.3
PAGE: 66
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
Some of the figures in this section are not obviously related to the text of the section.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change:
"b) The LLC Entity or Entities that support Higher Layer Entities."
To:
"b) The LLC Entity and Higher Layer Entities such as:
  1) Spanning Tree Protocol
  2) Generic Attribute Registration Protocol
  3) Bridge Management"
Also move the paragraph and note preceding the sentence beginning with "Figure 8-5 ..."
to before the sentence beginning with "Figure 8-7 ..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 26

Accept.

Comment 27  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 8.6.2
PAGE: 71
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
The sentence "A VLAN-aware Bridge shall not translate VIDs." offers little value in this
standard because the concept of translating VIDs has not been introduced (and the standard
does not as a rule try to list everything that could conceivably be done and specifi-
cally disallow it). I think it was added in anticipation of 802.1ad changing it to specify a VID translation table, but I'm going to be submitting a comment in the .1ad ballot that this is not the appropriate place in the document for the VID translation table.

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Delete the sentence.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

### Disposition of Comment 27

Accept.

**Comment 28 Steve Haddock**

**COMMENT TYPE:** T

**CLAUSE:** 8.6.4

**PAGE:** 72

**LINE:** 51

**COMMENT START:**

As currently written flow metering applies to all frames for which the set of potential transmission ports is not empty, after having reduced the set of potential transmission ports on the basis of:

- 8.6.1 active topology enforcement,
- 8.6.2 ingress VLAN rules, and
- 8.6.3 filtering on the basis of Forwarding Data Base entries,

but before reducing the set of potential transmission ports on the basis of:

- 8.6.5 egress VLAN rules.

Metering should not apply to frames that are discarded due to the egress rules.

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Reverse the order of 8.6.4 and 8.6.5.

Change the first sentence of "8.6.4 Egress":

"The Forwarding Process shall further reduce the set of potential transmission ports for each received frame by eliminating any ports that are not in the Member Set (8.8.9) for the frame's VID, and then queue the received frame to each port remaining the the set of potential transmission ports."

Change the first sentence of "8.6.5 Flow classification and metering" from:

"... (as determined by 8.6.2, 8.6.1, and 8.6.3 above) ..." to:

"... (as determined by 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, and 8.6.4 above) ...

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**
Disposition of Comment 28

Accept.

Comment 29  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 8.6.7
PAGE: 74
LINE: 31
COMMENT START:
Typo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "manging" to "managing".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 29

Accept.

Comment 30  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 8.7
PAGE: 75
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
Text says that learning follows active topology enforcement, which used to come after application of the ingress rules (ingress filtering based on VID and the corresponding VLAN's Member Set). In draft 2.0 the order of ingress rules and active topology enforcement was reversed, which means that now the ingress rules are not applied prior to learning. I believe this was an unintended technical change in the learning process.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change: "following active topology enforcement"
To: "following the application of ingress rules (8.6.2)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 30

Accept.
Comment 31  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 8.8.2
PAGE: 79
LINE: 10
COMMENT START:
With the removal of the include_tag parameter and moving the determination of whether a
frame is to be transmitted tagged or untagged from the the Forwarding Process to the sup-
port of the EISS, it seems architecturally inconsistent to have the Untagged set be part of
the filtering database. It would be more appropriate to have a list of untagged VLANs per
port as a port parameter, than a list of untagged ports per VLAN as a filtering data base
parameter. However the ripple effect of making this change would extend to many parts
of the document as well as changing the managed objects, and it probably isn't worthwhile
just for architectural purity.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Discuss whether it is worth making this change.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 31

Reject. Steve’s observation on the architectural issue is correct; however, it would cause
considerable churn.

Comment 32  Glenn Parsons

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 8.12
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
As a result of the sun setting of MIB work in the IETF to support 802.1Q and others, sev-
eral RFCs and pointers to Internet Drafts have been added here. However, some of this is
unstable and non-existant.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
I do not believe we can reference unstable Internet Drafts in the normative part of an IEEE
standard. As a result, the information in the notes should probably be moved to an infor-
mative annex on MIBs.
Further, there is no MIB for MSTP. This should be indicated in the text and a PAR initiated to create one (if we do not want to hold back QREV to do it).

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 32**

Accept in principle. See Disposition of Comment 44 on page 29.

**Comment 33**  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 8.13.7  
PAGE:  
LINE:  
COMMENT START:  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace "SNBM" with "SNMP"  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Disposition of Comment 33**

Accept.

**Comment 34**  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 8.13.7  
PAGE: 92  
LINE: 28  
COMMENT START:  
Typo.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace "SNBM" with "SNMP".  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Disposition of Comment 34**

Accept.
Comment 35  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 8.13.9
PAGE: 95
LINE: 39
COMMENT START:
Capitalize the initial "U" and "C" of "Uncontrolled Port" and "Controlled Port". These names are used as proper nouns and capitalized everywhere else they appear (in other documents).
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 35

Accept.

Comment 36  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.6
PAGE: 101
LINE: 12
COMMENT START:
Typo at the beginning of bullet (d).
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "In" with "If".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 36

Accept.

Comment 37  Dirceu Cavendish

COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 9
PAGE: 98
LINE: all
COMMENT START:
Comment 44 on D1.0 ballot requested a “tagged frame format”. The comment was rejected on the basis that “it was unclear to the group the scope of such diagram should be – just the tag, or the entire frame.” However, the “suggested change” of the aforementioned ballot comment reads: “Include in Clause 9 a picture depicting the tagged frame format”. It is therefore very specific, it requests a picture of a tagged frame format for .1q bridges, the entire frame. The commenter therefore does not agree with the reason for rejection.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include in Clause 9 a diagram of a tagged frame format supported by 802.1q bridges.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 37

Reject. Although not mentioned in the previous disposition, the discussion of this item in the meeting made the observation that “Include in Clause 9 a picture depicting the tagged frame format” is not actually specific, as the Q-tag is just one possible tag that can be added to a frame. It is therefore a non-trivial task to draw a generalized diagram that shows all the possible ways that the Q-tag might appear in a frame, in relation to other possible tags. Maintaining such a diagram as we go forward with future, and possibly parallel amendments and related standards, would create a continuous and unrewarding burden of effort on the committee and its editors.

Comment 38 Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 9.7
PAGE: 102
LINE: 6
COMMENT START:
Text refers to the include_tag parameter which has been removed from the document. Stating "the include_tag parameter True" is actually unnecessary since the text describes how to encode an embedded RIF field which would not exist if the frame were not to be tagged.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete "and the include_tag parameter True"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 38

Accept.
Comment 39  Mick Seaman

NAME:  Mick Seaman
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.8.2.1.3
PAGE: 132
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Add the NOTE (possibly revised) from 802.1D Clause 7.4 to explain the relationship
between the State used in bullet (b) and the actual Port States of Discarding, Learning, and
Forwarding that are described in clause 8.4 of this document.
Include the Port Role in the list of output parameters, instead of forcing the administrator
to work it out from the evidence provided.
Include the value of the disputed flag.
COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 39

Accept.

Comment 40  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.8.2.2.3
PAGE: 132
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Include the Port Role in the list of output parameters.
Include the value of the disputed flag.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 40

Accept.

Comment 41  Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.10.2.1.3  
PAGE: 142  
LINE: 48  
COMMENT START:  
Port numbers are members of the Member/Untagged set of a VLAN; VLANs are not members of the Member/Untagged set of a Port. Also, reference is wrong.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Change:  
"b) List of Untagged Ports: The set of Port numbers for which this VLAN ID is a member of the Untagged set (8.8.9) for that Port; 
c) List of Egress Ports: The set of Port numbers for which this VLAN ID is a member of the Member set (8.8.9) for that Port."  
To:  
"b) List of Untagged Ports: The set of Port numbers in the Untagged set (8.8.2) for this VLAN ID;  
c) List of Egress Ports: The set of Port numbers in the Member set (8.8.9) for this VLAN ID."  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 41  
Accept.  

Comment 42    Mick Seaman  

COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: Fig 13-1  
PAGE:  
LINE:  
COMMENT START:  
It would be much more convenient for the reader if this diagram was in a frame that took up the whole page, thus avoiding orphaning bullet (c).  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Do it.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 42  
Accept.
Comment 43  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 155-213
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Remove the various editors notes in << >> brackets from the diagrams.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 43

Accept.

Comment 44  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE:  T
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 155 and following
LINE:
COMMENT START:
My comment 53 in the previous ballot still stands. There is no SMIv2 MIB module for management of MSTP by SNMP. I believe that this standard is incomplete without defining such a MIB module, and inconsistent with the WG decision to include SMIv2 MIB modules in the management sections of all 802.1 standards not covered by the IETF Bridge MIB WG work. The reason for rejecting the comment was 'no proposed text is provided'. I cannot accept this reason, as 'the proposed text' is a full section / MIB module and it was the editor's task to fill it in.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
I am aware about the difficulties in recruiting a committed editor for the MIB section and I do not intent to stall the approval of the standard. For this reason I am not casting a Disapprove vote, and I lowered the type of the comment to a T instead of a TR. However, I believe that at a minimum a place holder subsection or a note must be included in Section 13 stating: 'This version of the standard is not fully complete in what concerns the management model for MSTP. Management of networks and bridges supporting MSTP is possible, but the management operations may be complex in the absence of a standard management data model and protocol interface to ensure interoperability with management applications. The Working Group intents to standardize in the future a revision of the standard that will include a SMIv2 MIB module for management of MSTP by SNMP.'
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Disposition of Comment 44**

Accept in principle.

1) Change “...modules defined in the following standards:” to “modules specified in the following documents:” in 8.12

2) Add a note to balloters in 8.12 that the following are expected to be approved before publication. IEEE Editors please update appropriately, or to remove the reference if necessary.”

3) Add a NOTE after 8.12 d) along the following lines:

   NOTE—This version of the standard is not fully complete in what concerns the management model for MSTP. Management of networks and bridges supporting MSTP is possible, but the management operations may be complex in the absence of a standard management data model and protocol interface to ensure interoperability with management applications. The Working Group intends to standardize in the future a revision of the standard that will include a SMIv2 MIB module for management of MSTP by SNMP.

**Comment 45  Mick Seaman**

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.11, NOTE 1
PAGE: 170
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The note is out of date. It should refer to the "agree" flag not to "agreed", at present it is true but uninteresting. Also needs to be updated to account for the change to retain information if "better or same" not just "same".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "agreed" with "agree" and "not the same as" with "not better than or the same as".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 45**

Accept.

**Comment 46  Mick Seaman**

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.12
PAGE: 171
LINE: 42-44
COMMENT START:
Re the editor's note question. Do not refer to 802.1D but include the relevant text here.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
As per comment.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 46

Accept.

Comment 47  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:  13.14
PAGE:  174
LINE:  4
COMMENT START:
The two "may"s in this paragraph refer to mandatory requirements, not to options.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace both instance of "may" with "shall".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 47

Accept.

Comment 48  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:  13, Editor's note question
PAGE:  175
LINE:  10-12
COMMENT START:
Retaining a complete blow by blow history is too complex. Simplification rather than
addition should be the result of the passage of time. The second NOTE is really a justifica-
tion, since MSTP has already been standardized and no further change to the BPDU for-
mat is proposed at this revision it can be removed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
delete NOTE 2. Replace NOTE 1 with the following:
NOTE 1—Use of a separate hop count and message loss detection timer provides superior
reconfiguration performance compared to the original use of Message Age and Max Age
by STP. Detection of loss of connectivity to a neighboring Bridge is not compromised by
the need to allow for the overall diameter of the network, nor does the time allowed extend
the number of hops permitted to aged recirculating information. Management calculation of the necessary parameters for custom topologies is also facilitated, as no allowance needs to be made for relative timer jitter and accuracy in different Bridges. MSTP and RSTP (as standardised in IEEE Std 802.1D-2004) treat the CST Message Age field as a hop count.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Disposition of Comment 48

Accept.

Comment 49 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.16 NOTE-5, Editor's Note
PAGE: 180
LINE: 20-24
COMMENT START:
NOTE 5 is out of date, and this is not a suitable place to detail all the refinements made to the Topology Change Machine.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete NOTE 5 and the following Editor's note.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 49

Accept.

Comment 50 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.16
PAGE: 180
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Missing "and"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "loops, do not cause" with "loops, and do not cause"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 50

Accept.

Comment 51  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE: 13.17 Editor's note
PAGE: 181
LINE: 8
COMMENT START:
I believe the contents of this clause are accurate, and should not be extended to detail the changes in the TCM.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the editor's note.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 51

Accept.

Comment 52  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE: 13.19
PAGE: 181
LINE: 45-46
COMMENT START:
Bullet (4) refers back to RSTP per 802.1D-2004 and is no longer true, RSTP has the same capabilities now.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete bullet 4) and its text.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 52

Accept.
Comment 53 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.19 Editor's note
PAGE: 181, 182
LINE: 52-, 7-
COMMENT START:
Update to meet goals of the editor's note. This is easy since the paragraph beginning pg 181, line 48 already says what is required. It is just necessary to remove the following paragraph.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove the paragraph beginning pg 181, line 52 and the editor's note beginning pg 182, line 7.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 53

Accept.

Comment 54 Jessy V Rouyer

COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 13.19
PAGE: 181
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
The Port Timers state machine is said to be "for the Bridge", while it is actually defined on a per-Port basis as specified in 13.27.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "for the Bridge" by "for each Port".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 54

Accept.

Comment 55 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Figure 13-9.
PAGE: 183
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
The figure needs to be updated to reflect the revised state machines included for this ballot. I have supplied the editor with a revised figure with the following modifications:
1. The flags rcvdTc, rcdvTcn, rcvdTcAck are actually 'owned' and set by PIM not by PRX.
2. The unused initPm variables has been removed from PPM.
3. portEnabled is input to PPM.
4. PRX can set edgeDelayWhile and operEdge, now shown and communicated to BDM.
5. fdbFlush (in TCM) is per TREE, not per port. Now shown, previously missing from figure. Needs accompanying change to move bullet (b) of 13.24 to the per tree part of the list.
6. BDM uses proposing from PRT.
7. BDM uses sendRSTP (logically from PPM, but not shown connected all the way because of the spaghetti wiring problem).
8. newInfoCist and newInfoMsti logically belong to PTX, now shown.
9. PIM can clear proposing, now shown with other variables communicated to PRT.
10. disputed was missing from variables set by PRX and communicated to PRT. Also added to PRT variables.
11. PTX does not use ForceVersion directly, only as in sendRSTP from PPM.
12. PRT doesn't use ForceVersion, only as it results in the value of forwardDelay, which is now shown as an input.
13. Added xst prefix to designated... communicated to PTX.
14. learn and forward given a home in PRT, with learning and forwarding added to PST.
15. TCM uses learn, learning, forward - now shown.
16. BDM now added (I think that was one of Les's comments).
17. proposing didn't have a home, now added to PRT.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the figure with the proposed revised figure, including the above changes.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 55

Accept.

Comment 56  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 13.19
PAGE: 183
LINE: 1-40
COMMENT START:
This diagram does not include the Bridge Detection state machine.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add it,
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 56

Accept.

Comment 57  Jessy V Rouyer

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.22
PAGE: 184
LINE: 51
COMMENT START:
Admin Edge Port should take a recommended value of FALSE as a default, which is the
default value recommended in Clause 18.3.3 of IEEE Std 802.1t-2001. However the spec-
ification of RSTP in IEEE Std 802.1D-2004, on which this MSTP specification is based,
does not provide such a default value.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add a Note to indicate that the recommended default value of Admin Edge Port is FALSE.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 57

Accept.

Comment 58  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.22 Editor's note
PAGE: 185
LINE: 6
COMMENT START:
As the editor's note says, MaxHops is nowhere formally defined. Although its use is
described.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add a new subclause '13.22.1 Max Hops', defining MaxHops as the initial value of
remaining Hops for MSTI information generated at the boundary of an MSTI region and
referencing 13.2.3.7 (root Times).
Delete the editor's note.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 58

Accept.

Comment 59    Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.22
PAGE: 184
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
Typo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "parameter is" with "parameters are".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 59

Accept.

Comment 60    Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.22
PAGE: 185
LINE: 6
COMMENT START:
The definition for MaxHops is missing.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add the following definition:
"The maximum number of hops from the Root Bridge to the most distant Bridge in the supported Spanning Tree topology. A hop is the link from one Bridge to the next."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 60

Accept in principle - see Disposition of Comment 58 on page 36.
Comment 61  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:  13.24
PAGE:  187
LINE:  38/39
COMMENT START:
There is separate instance of the fdbFlush variable per tree, as is clear from the new TCM. Whether the implementation can flush just learnt information for a single tree is an implementation issue, since we have not changed the specification in that area at this ballot it appears to be out of scope.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move bullet (b) to the list that currently begin with bullet (t).
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 61

Accept.

Comment 62  David Elie-dit-Cosaque

NAME:  David Elie-dit-Cosaque
COMMENT TYPE:  ER
CLAUSE:  13.24.4
PAGE:  189
LINE:  45
COMMENT START:
The use of "cist" in "cistDesignatedTimes" is now obsolete.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Rename this subclause to "designatedTimes".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 62

Accept.

Comment 63  Jessy V Rouyer

COMMENT TYPE:  TR
CLAUSE:  13.24.4
PAGE:  189
Proposed Disposition of Ballot Comments on P802.1Q-Rev/D2.0:
VLANs: Revision

March 18, 2005

LINE: 48
COMMENT START:
The "HelloTime," component is missing after "ForwardDelay,".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Insert "HelloTime," after "ForwardDelay, ".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 63

Accept.

Comment 64  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.24.11
PAGE: 190
LINE: 50-54
COMMENT START:
The editor's note is correct, this conflicts with updtRcvdInfoWhile().
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
remainingHops should be set to MaxHops.
Delete the Editor's note.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 64

Accept.

Comment 65  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.24.11
PAGE: 191
LINE: 1-4
COMMENT START:
Clarify the origin of the remainingHops value used.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "received with message priority components" with "received in the same BPDUs as the message priority components".
Delete the Editor's note.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 65

Accept.

Comment 66  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.24.16
PAGE: 191
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Typo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "for each MSTI may differ for each MSTI" with "for each MSTI may differ".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 66

Accept.

Comment 67  Francois Tallet

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.25.8
PAGE: 193
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
A cut & paste typo in the MigrateTime parameter definition.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
The migrate time parameter (17.13.9 of Std 802.1D).
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 67

Accept.
Comment 68 Jessy V Rouyer

COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 13.26.5
PAGE: 196
LINE: 21, 26
COMMENT START:
The use of "Cist" in "newInfoCist" is now obsolete.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Rename "newInfoCist" to "newInfo".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 68

Accept.

Comment 69 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.26.6
PAGE: 196
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
Processing received TCN BPDUs has got lost in the changes. Add in received TCN recognition at the start of this procedure. Note that procedure can still return OtherInfo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the following text which starts the first paragraph of the clause:
"Decodes, for a given Port and Tree (CIST, or MSTI), the message priority ..."
with:
"Decodes received BPDUs. Sets rcvdTcn if a TCN BPDU has been received, and extracts the message priority ..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 69

Accept.

Comment 70 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.26.6, Editor's note
Proposed Disposition of Ballot Comments on
P802.1Q-Rev/D2.0:
March 18, 2005 Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks -

PAGE: 196, 197
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The referenced suggested replacement text is not quite right. The change to add "other than Message" age should be removed, and the condition b) 2) should be "infoIs is Received" instead of "infoIs is Mine".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the existing text as follows:
On line 49, replace "Returns ..." with "Otherwise, returns ..." and break the sentence after "Role, and" with the remainder of the sentence becoming sub-bullet 1)
Add sub-bullet 2) to read: "infoIs is Received".
On line 49, replace "Returns ..." with "Otherwise, returns ..." and delete the rest of the sentence beginning on line 51 after "Designated Port Role". On line 54, replace "Returns ..." with "Otherwise, returns ...".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 70

Accept.

Comment 71 Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.26.6
PAGE: 196
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
Both the priority vector and timer values must be the same to indicated RepeatedDesignatedInfo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "port priority vector or timer values" with "port priority vector and timer values".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 71

Accept.

Comment 72 Francois Tallet

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.26.8
COMMENT START:
The definition of recordDispute() is not clear as to whether the one way communication is
detected independently by each instance or by the CIST only (I guess that recordDispute() always consider the "RST or MST BPDU" received by the CIST, even when invoked in the context of an MST Instance). Either way, there may be an issue when receiving inferior designated information that is not internal to the region, as the MST Instances will not have their disputed variable set.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Here is a possible solution, assuming that only the CIST is driving the unidirectional link failure detection:
RecordDisputeCist()
For the CIST on the given Port, if an RST or MST BPDU with the learning flag set was received, for all MST Instances on this port:
a) the disputed variable is set; and
b) the agreed variable is cleared.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 72

Accept in principle. Francois to supply text.

Comment 73  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.26.16 Editor's note
PAGE: 199
LINE: 49
COMMENT START:
The phrase "in the CST message" is used as a cliche for "for the CIST in the received BPDU".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the 5 instances of "in the CST message" with "for the CIST in the received BPDU".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 73

Accept.
Comment 74  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE:  E  
CLAUSE:  Figure 13-12  
PAGE:  205  
LINE:  
COMMENT START:  
A better solution than adding portEnabled in the two places shown is to simply add "!portEnabled" to the BEGIN initialization condition.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Remove " && !portEnabled" from the transition to TRANSMIT_PERIODIC and "portEnabled &&" from the transition to "TRANSMIT_RSTP". Replace the condition "BEGIN" with "BEGIN || !portEnabled".  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Disposition of Comment 74  

Accept.  

Comment 75  Jessy V Rouyer  

COMMENT TYPE:  TR  
CLAUSE:  13.26.22  
PAGE:  202  
LINE:  47-48  
COMMENT START:  
The text "Otherwise, if the Port is not Disabled and the CIST port priority information was not received from a Bridge external to the Region (infoIs != Received or infoInternal == TRUE):" has not been updated as required for proper merging of the text in former "updRolesCist()" and "updRolesMsti()" subclauses.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace those two lines by:  
"Otherwise,  
- For each Port of the CIST, or  
- For each Port of a given MSTI that is not Disabled and whose CIST port priority information was not received from a Bridge external to the Region (infoIs != Received or infoInternal == TRUE),  
the CIST or MSTI port role for each Port is assigned, and its port priority vector and Spanning Tree timer information are updated as follows:".  

Copyright © 2005 IEEE. All rights reserved. 
This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 75

Accept.

Comment 76  Jessy V Rouyer

COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 13.26.22
PAGE: 201
LINE: 38-39
COMMENT START:
The text "(this second condition applying only when calculating the Bridge’s root priority vector in the CIST)" was added to match one of the changes to Clause 13 found in P802.1ad/D3.0 (more specifically, the change proposed to subclause 13.26.26 on page 84). However, it appears that the text "and whose Port’s restrictedRole parameter is FALSE" is missing after the last "; and" in the change to bullet b) proposed for subclause 13.26.26 on page 84 of P802.1ad/D3.0. The text "(this second condition applying only when calculating the Bridge’s root priority vector in the CIST)" should consequently be deleted.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete "(this second condition applying only when calculating the Bridge’s root priority vector in the CIST)".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 76

Accept.

Comment 77  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.26.23 Editor’s note
PAGE: 202
LINE: 41-
COMMENT START:
The editor’s note has served its purpose.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove the editor’s note and update the figure to remove the change indications. They are too complex in origin to serve any purpose during sponsor ballot.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 77

Accept.

Comment 78  Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.34
PAGE: 207
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
It is not satisfactory to have this state machine split across two standards. Include the first part, which is a copy of Figure 17-20 of 802.1D-2004, in this specification.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Do it, updating references to the figure.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 78

Accept.

Comment 79  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 13.29
PAGE: 203
LINE:
COMMENT START:
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 79

Accept.

Comment 80  Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 13.32
PAGE: 206
LINE: 31
COMMENT START:
The UPDATE state should not set synced = FALSE. It subsequently, correctly, sets synced = synced && agreed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the statement "synced = FALSE;".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 80

Accept.

Comment 81    Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.34
PAGE: 207
LINE: 22-24
COMMENT START:
This paragraph lists 5 figures, then refers to them as "both" and "either".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "both" with "all of these". Replace "either" with "any".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 81

Accept.

Comment 82    Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: A.21
PAGE: 247
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
Incorrect reference: Transmitting frames tagged/untagged now in 6.7.2.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(8.6.5)" to "(6.7.2)".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 82

Accept.