

DISPOSITION OF BALLOT COMMENTS ON

IEEE *Draft* P802.1Q-Rev/D2.0

***DRAFT* IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks—Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks — 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 Ballot Comments has been prepared to document the ballot comments received in the Working Group ballot on **P802.1Q-Rev/D2.0**, and to record the resolutions of those ballot comments, agreed during the meeting of 802.1 held in Atlanta, GA, in March 2005. 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 P802.1Q-Rev/D3.0.

1	1. Ballot summary	4
2		
3	2. Ballot Comments	6
4		
5	Comment 1: Mick Seaman	6
6	Comment 2: Mick Seaman	6
7	Comment 3: Mick Seaman	7
8	Comment 4: Mick Seaman	7
9	Comment 5: Mick Seaman	8
10	Comment 6: Mick Seaman	8
11	Comment 7: Mick Seaman	9
12	Comment 8: Mick Seaman	10
13	Comment 9: Steve Haddock	10
14	Comment 10: Steve Haddock	11
15	Comment 11: Steve Haddock	11
16	Comment 12: Anoop Ghanwani	12
17	Comment 13: Anoop Ghanwani	12
18	Comment 14: Mick Seaman	13
19	Comment 15: Anoop Ghanwani	13
20	Comment 16: Mick Seaman	14
21	Comment 17: Steve Haddock	14
22	Comment 18: Steve Haddock	14
23	Comment 19: Steve Haddock	16
24	Comment 20: Anoop Ghanwani	16
25	Comment 21: Mick Seaman	17
26	Comment 22: Mick Seaman	17
27	Comment 23: Mick Seaman	17
28	Comment 24: Steve Haddock	18
29	Comment 25: Steve Haddock	18
30	Comment 26: Steve Haddock	19
31	Comment 27: Steve Haddock	19
32	Comment 28: Steve Haddock	20
33	Comment 29: Steve Haddock	21
34	Comment 30: Steve Haddock	21
35	Comment 31: Steve Haddock	22
36	Comment 32: Glenn Parsons	22
37	Comment 33: Mick Seaman	23
38	Comment 34: Les Bell	23
39	Comment 35: Mick Seaman	24
40	Comment 36: Les Bell	24
41	Comment 37: Dirceu Cavendish.....	24
42	Comment 38: Steve Haddock	25
43	Comment 39: Mick Seaman	26
44	Comment 40: Mick Seaman	26
45	Comment 41: Steve Haddock	26
46	Comment 42: Mick Seaman	27
	Comment 43: Mick Seaman	28
	Comment 44: Dan Romascanu	28
	Comment 45: Mick Seaman	29
	Comment 46: Mick Seaman	29
	Comment 47: Mick Seaman	30
	Comment 48: Mick Seaman	30
	Comment 49: Mick Seaman	31
	Comment 50: Mick Seaman	31

Comment 51: Mick Seaman	32	1
Comment 52: Mick Seaman	32	2
Comment 53: Mick Seaman	33	3
Comment 54: Jessy V Rouyer	33	4
Comment 55: Mick Seaman	33	5
Comment 56: Les Bell	34	5
Comment 57: Jessy V Rouyer	35	6
Comment 58: Mick Seaman	35	7
Comment 59: Les Bell	36	8
Comment 60: Les Bell	36	9
Comment 61: Mick Seaman	37	10
Comment 62: David Elie-dit-Cosaque.....	37	11
Comment 63: Jessy V Rouyer	37	11
Comment 64: Les Bell	38	12
Comment 65: Les Bell	38	13
Comment 66: Les Bell	39	14
Comment 67: Francois Tallet	39	15
Comment 68: Jessy V Rouyer	40	16
Comment 69: Mick Seaman	40	17
Comment 70: Mick Seaman	40	17
Comment 71: Les Bell	41	18
Comment 72: Francois Tallet	41	19
Comment 73: Mick Seaman	42	20
Comment 74: Mick Seaman	43	21
Comment 75: Jessy V Rouyer	43	22
Comment 76: Jessy V Rouyer	44	23
Comment 77: Mick Seaman	44	23
Comment 78: Mick Seaman	45	24
Comment 79: Les Bell	45	25
Comment 80: Les Bell	46	26
Comment 81: Les Bell	46	27
Comment 82: Steve Haddock	46	28
		29
		30
		31
		32
		33
		34
		35
		36
		37
		38
		39
		40
		41
		42
		43
		44
		45
		46

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(oting)* 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.

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	Comments?
V	y	Brandon Barry	
V	n	Les Bell	y
V		Mike Borza	
V	y	Paul Botorff	
V	y	Jim Burns	
V	n	Dirceu Cavendish	y
V	y	Paul Congdon	
V	y	Sharam Davari	
V	y	Arjan de Heer	
V	y	Craig Easley	
V	y	Anush Elangovan	
V	y	Hesham Elbakoury	
V	n	David Elie-Dit-Cosaque	y
V	y	Norm Finn	
V	y	David Frattura	
V		Gerard Goubert	
V	y	Steve Haddock	y
V	y	Ran Ish-Shalom	
V		Atsushi Iwata	
V		Neil Jarvis	
V	y	Tony Jeffree	
V	y	Hal Keen	
V	y	Yongbum Kim	
V		Shobhan Lakkapragada	
V		Bill Lane	
V	y	Loren Larsen	
V	y	Yannick Le Goff	
V		Marcus Leech	
V		John Messenger	
V	y	Dinesh Mohan	
V	e	Bob Moskowitz	
V	y	Don O'Connor	
V		Don Pannell	
V	y	Glenn Parsons	
V	y	Ken Patton	
V	e	Karen Randall	
V	y	Allyn Romanow	
V	o	Dan Romascanu	
V	n	Jessy V Rouyer	y
V	y	Ali Sajassi	
V	e	Dolors Sala	
V	e	Sam Sambasivan	
V	y	John Sauer	
V	y	Koichiro Seto	
V	y	Mick Seaman	y
V	y	Muneyoshi Suzuki	
V		Jonathan Thatcher	
V	y	Geoff Thompson	
V		Michel Thorsen	
V	e	John Viega	
V		Preeti Vinayakray-Jani	
V		John Vollbrecht	
V	y	Dennis Volpano	
V	y	Karl Weber	
V	y	Ludwig Winkel	
V	y	Michael D. Wright	
N	c	Anoop Ghanwani	y
N	c	Francois Tallet	y

The results of the ballot can be seen in the following table.

Category	Total	Percentage
Yes	33	89.19%
No	4	10.81%
Abstain	6	13.95%
No. of Voters	56	100.00%
Voters responding	43	76.79%

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

1 **2. Ballot Comments**

2
3 **Comment 1 Mick Seaman**

4
5
6 COMMENT TYPE: Process

7 CLAUSE: Editor's Foreword

8 PAGE: 3

9 LINE:

10 COMMENT START:

11 This is a comment to do with the development process and not the final result. However I
12 for one would find it useful if the editor's introduction to the current draft etc. was filled in
13 on the next, pre-sponsor ballot revision. I say this because it is currently dangling at the
14 end, and one has to know to pick up at Annex Z, which will be removed for sponsor ballot.
15 I frequently have cause to examine the audit trail of revision of our standards, usually to
16 determine when and why we made an apparent mistake. The editor's foreword as it notes
17 draft to draft changes is incredibly useful for this purpose, and even filling in the short
18 amount of material called for in Q-REV could be a great help in 5 years time.

19 COMMENT END:

20 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

21 Complete editor's foreword with necessary material from Annex Z and anything else rele-
22 vant for the inevitable recirc of the recirc. If a recirc is not required produce an archive
23 "immediately prior to sponsor ballot copy".

24 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

25
26 **Disposition of Comment 1**

27
28 Accept.

29
30 **Comment 2 Mick Seaman**

31
32
33 COMMENT TYPE: E

34 CLAUSE: Introduction to 802.1Q

35 PAGE: 7

36 LINE:

37 COMMENT START:

38 While the introduction is not formally part of the standard it should be factually correct.
39 Currently it refers to "this revision of the standard" as incorporating .1u, .1v, and .1s.

40 COMMENT END:

41 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

42 I would be happy with any description of the current state and development history of
43 802.1Q that the editor could provide. I believe that this is in scope of changes in this ballot
44 or subsequent to the ballot since the material is not in any case part of the formal standard
45 that we are balloting.

46 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:

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

1 **Disposition of Comment 4**

2
3 Accept - remove bullet A.
4

5 **Comment 5 Mick Seaman**

6
7
8 COMMENT TYPE: T

9 CLAUSE: 1.3

10 PAGE: 24,25

11 LINE: 28-

12 COMMENT START:

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

18 COMMENT END:

19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

20 Delete clause 1.3 and Table 1-1.

21 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
22

23 **Disposition of Comment 5**

24
25 Accept.
26

27 **Comment 6 Mick Seaman**

28
29
30 COMMENT TYPE: E

31 CLAUSE: 2

32 PAGE: 26

33 LINE: 47

34 COMMENT START:

35 The reference to 802.4 token bus is not used anywhere in this document.

36 COMMENT END:

37 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

38 Delete this reference. If the comment is out of scope for this ballot raise it for sponsor bal-
39 lot.

40 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
41

42 **Disposition of Comment 6**

43
44 Accept.
45
46

Comment 7 Mick Seaman

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

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 7 - use "Bridged Local Area Network"
- pg 7, l 11 - delete "in Bridged LANs"
- pg 7, l 28 - 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 2 - use ""bridged network"
- pg 292, l 6 - use "Bridged Local Area Networks"

1 Similarly "VLAN Bridge" is used often when just "bridge" is meant. Replace all occur-
2 rences of "VLAN Bridge" in Clause 6 with "bridge" except in the following cases:

3 pg 43, l 32 - leave as is.

4 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

5
6 ***Disposition of Comment 7***

7
8 Accept.

9
10
11 ***Comment 8*** **Mick Seaman**

12
13 COMMENT TYPE: E

14 CLAUSE: 5.3 (h) and Table 5-1

15 PAGE: 35

16 LINE: 12-13 and 26-43

17 COMMENT START:

18 Table 5-1 is completely full of "shalls" apart from the not applicable box. It was a way of
19 beating requirements into skulls one upon a time, but now serves no useful purpose within
20 the improved Clause 5, an should be removed.

21 COMMENT END:

22 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

23 Delete the last sentence of bullet (h) and remove Table 5-1.

24 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

25
26 ***Disposition of Comment 8***

27
28 Accept.

29
30
31 ***Comment 9*** **Steve Haddock**

32
33 COMMENT TYPE: E

34 CLAUSE: 5.3

35 PAGE: 35

36 LINE: 3

37 COMMENT START:

38 Incorrect reference: specification of Acceptable Frame Types, PVID, and VID
39 Set parameters have moved to 6.7.

40 This applies to:

41 section 5.3 page 35 line 3, 5 (two places)

42 section 5.3.1 page 36 line 10

43 section 10.3 page 104 line 11

44 section 12.10.1.1.3 page 139 lines 15, 21, 22 (three places)

45 section 12.10.1.2.1 page 139 line 39
46

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: 5
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 6
 Change "8.6.2" to "6.7". 7
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 8

Disposition of Comment 9

Accept.

Comment 10 Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E 17
 CLAUSE: 5.3 18
 PAGE: 35 19
 LINE: 7 20
 COMMENT START: 21
 Incorrect reference: Untagged set is specified in 8.8.2. 22
 This applies to: 23
 section 5.3 page 35 line 7 24
 section 5.3.1 page 36 line 12 25
 section 10.3 page 104 line 30 26
 section 12.10.2.1.3 page 142 line 49 27
 section A.21 page 247 line 35 28
 COMMENT END: 29
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 30
 Change "(8.6.2 and 8.10.9)" to "(8.8.2)". 31
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 32

Disposition of Comment 10

Accept.

Comment 11 Steve Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: E 41
 CLAUSE: 5.3.1.2 42
 PAGE: 37 43
 LINE: 7 44
 COMMENT START: 45

1 Incorrect reference: Protocol based VLANs now in 6.8.
2 Also applies to section A.21 page 246 lines 16, 19, 21, 25 (four places).
3 COMMENT END:
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5 Change "(8.6.1 and 8.6.2)" to "(6.8)".
6 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
7

8 ***Disposition of Comment 11***
9

10 Accept.

11
12 ***Comment 12 Anoop Ghanwani***
13

14
15 NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
16 COMMENT TYPE: E
17 CLAUSE: 6
18 PAGE: 38
19 LINE: 24
20 COMMENT START:
21 IEE should be IEEE.
22 COMMENT END:
23 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
24 Change it.
25 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
26

27 ***Disposition of Comment 12***
28

29 Accept.
30

31
32 ***Comment 13 Anoop Ghanwani***
33

34
35 COMMENT TYPE: E
36 CLAUSE: 6.3.2
37 PAGE: 41
38 LINE: 4
39 COMMENT START:
40 This statement conflicts with NOTE 1 on page 40 which says that admission control is
41 beyond the scope of this standard. Rate-limit is a form of admission control.
42 COMMENT END:
43 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
44 Remove the statement from NOTE 1.
45 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
46

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.

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

1 **Comment 16 Mick Seaman**

2
3 COMMENT TYPE: E

4 CLAUSE: 6.3.9

5 PAGE: 43

6 LINE: 45

7 COMMENT START:

8 The use of access_priority is a hangover.

9 COMMENT END:

10 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

11 Replace "of priority to access priority" with "of priority to the priority requested from the
12 individual LAN or supporting service".

13 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

14
15 **Disposition of Comment 16**

16
17
18 Accept.

19
20 **Comment 17 Steve Haddock**

21
22 COMMENT TYPE: E

23 CLAUSE: 6.7

24 PAGE: 49

25 LINE: 32 and 49

26 COMMENT START:

27 Incorrect references.

28 COMMENT END:

29 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

30 In line 32, change "VLAN tag type specified in 9.2" to "VLAN tag type specified in 9.5".

31 In line 49 change "type used to support the EISS (6.7, 9.3)" to "type used to support the
32 EISS (9.5)".

33 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

34
35 **Disposition of Comment 17**

36
37
38 Accept.

39
40 **Comment 18 Steve Haddock**

41
42 COMMENT TYPE: T

43 CLAUSE: 6.7.1

44 PAGE: 50

45 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

1 b) the initial two octets of the mac_service_data_unit contain a valid VLAN tag header
2 (9.3) or the type used to support the EISS (9.5) and
3

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

10 **Comment 19 Steve Haddock**
11

12 COMMENT TYPE: T

13 CLAUSE: 6.7.2

14 PAGE: 51

15 LINE: 28

16 COMMENT START:

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

19 COMMENT END:

20 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

21 Change: "and the value of the include_tag parameter is False or the tag to be used is a Ser-
22 vice VLAN tag (S-TAG), then" To: "and no tag header is to be inserted, then"
23

24 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
25

26 **Disposition of Comment 19**
27

28 Accept.
29

30 **Comment 20 Anoop Ghanwani**
31

32 COMMENT TYPE: E

33 CLAUSE: 7.2

34 PAGE: 58

35 LINE: 23

36 COMMENT START:

37 Statement (b) is true only when using IVL.

38 COMMENT END:

39 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

40 Clarify this, especially the part about addresses being treated differently per-VLAN.

41 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 20

1
2
3
4

Comment 21 Mick Seaman

5
6
7

COMMENT TYPE: E

8

CLAUSE: 7.4

9

PAGE: 60

10

LINE: 11

11

COMMENT START:

12

Please make sure the occurrence of "VLAN-Bridged LAN" is dealt with in the clean up of "Bridged LAN" in general.

13
14

COMMENT END:

15

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

16

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

17

18

Disposition of Comment 21

19

Accept.

20

21

22

Comment 22 Mick Seaman

23

24

25

COMMENT TYPE: E

26

CLAUSE: 7.5

27

PAGE: 60

28

LINE: 54

29

COMMENT START:

30

With the changes following the last ballot it is no longer just the Forwarding Process that controls the listed results.

31

32

COMMENT END:

33

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

34

Delete "by the Forwarding Process (8.6) of".

35

36

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

37

38

Disposition of Comment 22

39

Accept.

40

41

42

Comment 23 Mick Seaman

43

44

COMMENT TYPE: E

45

46

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

Disposition of Comment 23

15 Accept.

***Comment 24* Steve Haddock**

19
20 COMMENT TYPE: E
21 CLAUSE: 8.1.7
22 PAGE: 64
23 LINE: 37
24 COMMENT START:
25 Incorrect reference: Untagged set is specified in 8.8.2.
26 COMMENT END:
27 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
28 Change "(8.8.1, 6.7.2)" to "(8.8.2, 6.7.2)".
29 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 24

33
34 Accept.

***Comment 25* Steve Haddock**

37
38 COMMENT TYPE: E
39 CLAUSE: 8.3
40 PAGE: 66
41 LINE: 51
42 COMMENT START:
43 In Figures 8-3, 8-4, 8-6, and 8-7, change "802.X" to "802.n" to make consistent with Fig-
44 ures 8-2 and 6-1.
45 COMMENT END:
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 1
 Change "802.X" to "802.n". 2
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 3

Disposition of Comment 25 4

Accept. 5

Comment 26 Steve Haddock 6

COMMENT TYPE: E 7

CLAUSE: 8.3 8

PAGE: 66 9

LINE: 21 10

COMMENT START: 11

Some of the figures in this section are not obviously related to the text of the section. 12

COMMENT END: 13

SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 14

Change: 15

"b) The LLC Entity or Entities that support Higher Layer Entities." 16

To: 17

"b) The LLC Entity and Higher Layer Entities such as: 18

1) Spanning Tree Protocol 19

2) Generic Attribute Registration Protocol 20

3) Bridge Management" 21

Also move the paragraph and note preceding the sentence beginning with "Figure 8-5 ..." 22

to before the sentence beginning with "Figure 8-7 ..." 23

SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 24

Disposition of Comment 26 25

Accept. 26

Comment 27 Steve Haddock 27

COMMENT TYPE: E 28

CLAUSE: 8.6.2 29

PAGE: 71 30

LINE: 54 31

COMMENT START: 32

The sentence "A VLAN-aware Bridge shall not translate VIDs." offers little value in this 33

standard because the concept of translating VIDs has not been introduced (and the stan- 34

dard does not as a rule try to list everything that could conceivably be done and specifi- 35

1 cally disallow it). I think it was added in anticipation of 802.1ad changing it to specify a
2 VID translation table, but I'm going to be submitting a comment in the .1ad ballot that this
3 is not the appropriate place in the document for the VID translation table.

4 COMMENT END:

5 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

6 Delete the sentence.

7 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

9 ***Disposition of Comment 27***

10
11 Accept.

12 13 ***Comment 28 Steve Haddock***

14
15 COMMENT TYPE: T

16 CLAUSE: 8.6.4

17 PAGE: 72

18 LINE: 51

19 COMMENT START:

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

23 8.6.1 active topology enforcement,

24 8.6.2 ingress VLAN rules, and

25 8.6.3 filtering on the basis of Forwarding Data Base entries,

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

27 8.6.5 egress VLAN rules.

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

29 COMMENT END:

30 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

31 Reverse the order of 8.6.4 and 8.6.5.

32
33 Change the first sentence of "8.6.4 Egress":

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

38
39 Change the first sentence of "8.6.5 Flow classification and metering" from:

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

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

42 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.

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

1 **Comment 31 Steve Haddock**

2
3 COMMENT TYPE: E

4 CLAUSE: 8.8.2

5 PAGE: 79

6 LINE: 10

7 COMMENT START:

8 With the removal of the include_tag parameter and moving the determination of whether a
9 frame is to be transmitted tagged or untagged from the the Forwarding Process to the sup-
10 port of the EISS, it seems architecturally inconsistent to have the Untagged set be part of
11 the filtering database. It would be more appropriate to have a list of untagged VLANs per
12 port as a port parameter, than a list of untagged ports per VLAN as a filtering data base
13 parameter. However the ripple effect of making this change would extend to many parts
14 of the document as well as changing the managed objects, and it probably isn't worthwhile
15 just for architectural purity.

16 COMMENT END:

17 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

18 Discuss whether it is worth making this change.

19 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

20
21
22 **Disposition of Comment 31**

23
24 Reject. Steve's observation on the architectural issue is correct; however, it would cause
25 considerable churn.

26
27 **Comment 32 Glenn Parsons**

28
29 COMMENT TYPE: T

30 CLAUSE: 8.12

31 PAGE:

32 LINE:

33 COMMENT START:

34 As a result of the sun setting of MIB work in the IETF to support 802.1Q and others, sev-
35 eral RFCs and pointers to Internet Drafts have been added here. However, some of this is
36 unstable and non-existent.

37
38 COMMENT END:

39
40 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

41
42 I do not believe we can reference unstable Internet Drafts in the normative part of an IEEE
43 standard. As a result, the information in the notes should probably be moved to an infor-
44 mative annex on MIBs.
45
46

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.

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

1 **Comment 35 Mick Seaman**

2
3 COMMENT TYPE: E

4 CLAUSE:8.13.9

5 PAGE: 95

6 LINE: 39

7 COMMENT START:

8 Capitalize the initial "U" and "C" of "Uncontrolled Port" and "Controlled Port". These
9 names are used as proper nouns and capitalized everywhere else they appear (in other doc-
10 uments).

11 COMMENT END:

12 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

13 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

14
15
16 ***Disposition of Comment 35***

17
18 Accept.

19
20 **Comment 36 Les Bell**

21
22 COMMENT TYPE: E

23 CLAUSE: 9.6

24 PAGE: 101

25 LINE: 12

26 COMMENT START:

27 Typo at the beginning of bullet (d).

28 COMMENT END:

29 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

30 Replace "In" with "If".

31 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

32
33
34 ***Disposition of Comment 36***

35
36 Accept.

37
38 **Comment 37 Dirceu Cavendish**

39
40 COMMENT TYPE: TR

41 CLAUSE: 9

42 PAGE: 98

43 LINE: all

44 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.

1 **Comment 39 Mick Seaman**

2
3 NAME: Mick Seaman
4 COMMENT TYPE: T
5 CLAUSE: 12.8.2.1.3
6 PAGE: 132
7 LINE:
8 COMMENT START:

9
10 Add the NOTE (possibly revised) from 802.1D Clause 7.4 to explain the relationship
11 between the State used in bullet (b) and the actual Port States of Discarding, Learning, and
12 Forwarding that are described in clause 8.4 of this document.
13 Include the Port Role in the list of output parameters, instead of forcing the administrator
14 to work it out from the evidence provided.
15 Include the value of the disputed flag.
16 COMMENT END:
17 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
18 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
19

20 ***Disposition of Comment 39***

21
22
23 Accept.

24
25 **Comment 40 Mick Seaman**

26
27 COMMENT TYPE: T
28 CLAUSE: 12.8.2.2.3
29 PAGE: 132
30 LINE:
31 COMMENT START:
32 Include the Port Role in the list of output parameters.
33 Include the value of the disputed flag.
34 COMMENT END:
35 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
36 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
37

38
39 ***Disposition of Comment 40***

40
41 Accept.

42
43 **Comment 41 Steve Haddock**

44
45 COMMENT TYPE: T
46

CLAUSE: 12.10.2.1.3 1
 PAGE: 142 2
 LINE: 48 3
 COMMENT START: 4
 Port numbers are members of the Member/Untagged set of a VLAN; VLANs are not 5
 members of the Member/Untagged set of a Port. Also, reference is wrong. 6
 COMMENT END: 7
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 8
 Change: 9
 "b) List of Untagged Ports: The set of Port numbers for which this VLAN ID is a member 10
 of the Untagged set (8.8.9) for that Port; 11
 c) List of Egress Ports: The set of Port numbers for which this VLAN ID is a member of 12
 the Member set (8.8.9) for that Port." 13
 To: 14
 "b) List of Untagged Ports: The set of Port numbers in the Untagged set (8.8.2) for this 15
 VLAN ID; 16
 c) List of Egress Ports: The set of Port numbers in the Member set (8.8.9) for this VLAN 17
 ID." 18
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 19

Disposition of Comment 41

Accept.

Comment 42 Mick Seaman

COMMENT TYPE: E 28
 CLAUSE: Fig 13-1 29
 PAGE: 30
 LINE: 31
 COMMENT START: 32
 It would be much more convenient for the reader if this diagram was in a frame that took 33
 up the whole page, thus avoiding orphaning bullet (c). 34
 COMMENT END: 35
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 36
 Do it. 37
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 38

Disposition of Comment 42

Accept.

1 **Comment 43 Mick Seaman**

2
3 COMMENT TYPE: E

4 CLAUSE: 13

5 PAGE: 155-213

6 LINE:

7 COMMENT START:

8 Remove the various editors notes in << >> brackets from the diagrams.

9 COMMENT END:

10 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

11 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

12
13 **Disposition of Comment 43**

14
15
16 Accept.

17
18 **Comment 44 Dan Romascanu**

19
20 NAME: Dan Romascanu

21 COMMENT TYPE: T

22 CLAUSE: 13

23 PAGE: 155 and following

24 LINE:

25 COMMENT START:

26 My comment 53 in the previous ballot still stands. There is no SMIV2 MIB module for
27 management of MSTP by SNMP. I believe that this standard is incomplete without defin-
28 ing such a MIB module, and inconsistent with the WG decision to include SMIV2 MIB
29 modules in the management sections of all 802.1 standards not covered by the IETF
30 Bridge MIB WG work. The reason for rejecting the comment was 'no proposed text is pro-
31 vided'. I cannot accept this reason, as 'the proposed text' is a full section / MIB module and
32 it was the editor's task to fill it in.

33 COMMENT END:

34 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

35 I am aware about the difficulties in recruiting a committed editor for the MIB section and I
36 do not intent to stall the approval of the standard. For this reason I am not casting a Disap-
37 prove vote, and I lowered the type of the comment to a T instead of a TR. However, I
38 believe that at a minimum a place holder subsection or a note must be included in Section
39 13 stating: 'This version of the standard is not fully complete in what concerns the man-
40 agement model for MSTP. Management of networks and bridges supporting MSTP is possi-
41 ble, but the management operations may be complex in the absence of a standard
42 management data model and protocol interface to ensure interoperability with manage-
43 ment applications. The Working Group intents to standardize in the future a revision of the
44 standard that will include a SMIV2 MIB module for management of MSTP by SNMP.'

45 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:

1 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
2 As per comment.
3 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
4

5 ***Disposition of Comment 46***
6

7
8 Accept.
9

10 ***Comment 47 Mick Seaman***
11

12 COMMENT TYPE: E

13 CLAUSE: 13.14

14 PAGE: 174

15 LINE: 4

16 COMMENT START:

17 The two "may"s in this paragraph refer to mandatory requirements, not to options.

18 COMMENT END:

19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

20 Replace both instance of "may" with "shall".

21 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
22

23 ***Disposition of Comment 47***
24

25
26 Accept.
27

28 ***Comment 48 Mick Seaman***
29

30 COMMENT TYPE: E

31 CLAUSE: 13, Editor's note question

32 PAGE: 175

33 LINE: 10-12

34 COMMENT START:

35 Retaining a complete blow by blow history is too complex. Simplification rather than
36 addition should be the result of the passage of time. The second NOTE is really a justifica-
37 tion, since MSTP has already been standardized and no further change to the BPDU for-
38 mat is proposed at this revision it can be removed.

39 COMMENT END:

40 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

41 Delete NOTE 2. Replace NOTE 1 with the following:

42 NOTE 1—Use of a separate hop count and message loss detection timer provides superior
43 reconfiguration performance compared to the original use of Message Age and Max Age
44 by STP. Detection of loss of connectivity to a neighboring Bridge is not compromised by
45 the need to allow for the overall diameter of the network, nor does the time allowed extend
46

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:

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

1 **Disposition of Comment 50**

2
3 Accept.

4
5 **Comment 51 Mick Seaman**

6
7
8 COMMENT TYPE: E

9 CLAUSE: 13.17 Editor's note

10 PAGE: 181

11 LINE: 8

12 COMMENT START:

13 I believe the contents of this clause are accurate, and should not be extended to detail the
14 changes in the TCM.

15 COMMENT END:

16 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

17 Delete the editor's note.

18 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

19
20 **Disposition of Comment 51**

21
22 Accept.

23
24 **Comment 52 Mick Seaman**

25
26
27 COMMENT TYPE: E

28 CLAUSE: 13.19

29 PAGE: 181

30 LINE: 45-46

31 COMMENT START:

32 Bullet (4) refers back to RSTP per 802.1D-2004 and is no longer true, RSTP has the same
33 capabilities now.

34 COMMENT END:

35 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

36 Delete bullet 4) and its text.

37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

38
39 **Disposition of Comment 52**

40
41
42 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

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

1 LINE: 1

2 COMMENT START:

3 The figure needs to be updated to reflect the revised state machines included for this bal-
4 lot. I have supplied the editor with a revised figure with the following modifications:

5 1. The flags rcvdTc, rcdvTcn, rcvdTcAck are actually 'owned' and set by PIM not by PRX.

6 2. The unused initPm variables has been removed from PPM.

7 3. portEnabled is input to PPM.

8 4. PRX can set edgeDelayWhile and operEdge, now shown and communicated to BDM.

9 5. fdbFlush (in TCM) is per TREE, not per port. Now shown , previously missing from
10 figure. Needs accompanying change to move bullet (b) of 13.24 to the per tree part of the
11 list.

12 6. BDM uses proposing from PRT.

13 7. BDM uses sendRSTP (logically from PPM, but not shown connected all the way
14 because of the spaghetti wiring problem).

15 8. newInfoCist and newInfoMsti logically belong to PTX, now shown.

16 9. PIM can clear proposing, now shown with other variables communicated to PRT.

17 10. disputed was missing from variables set by PRX and communicated to PRT. Also
18 added to PRT variables.

19 11. PTX does not use ForceVersion directly, only as in sendRSTP from PPM.

20 12. PRT doesn't use ForceVersion, only as it results in the value of forwardDelay, which is
21 now shown as an input.

22 13. Added xst prefix to designated... communicated to PTX.

23 14. learn and forward given a home in PRT, with learning and forwarding added to PST.

24 15. TCM uses learn, learning, forward - now shown.

25 16. BDM now added (I think that was one of Les's comments).

26 17. proposing didn't have a home, now added to PRT.

27 COMMENT END:

28 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

29 Replace the figure with the proposed revised figure, including the above changes.

30 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

31
32 ***Disposition of Comment 55***

33
34
35 Accept.

36
37 ***Comment 56 Les Bell***

38
39 COMMENT TYPE: TR

40 CLAUSE: 13.19

41 PAGE: 183

42 LINE: 1-40

43 COMMENT START:

44 This diagram does not include the Bridge Detection state machine.

45 COMMENT END:

46 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Add it,
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2

Disposition of Comment 56

3
4

Accept.

5
6
7

Comment 57 Jessy V Rouyer

8
9

COMMENT TYPE: E

10
11

CLAUSE: 13.22

12

PAGE: 184

13

LINE: 51

14

COMMENT START:

15

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 specification of RSTP in IEEE Std 802.1D-2004, on which this MSTP specification is based, does not provide such a default value.

16
17
18
19

COMMENT END:

20

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

21

Add a Note to indicate that the recommended default value of Admin Edge Port is FALSE.

22

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

23

Disposition of Comment 57

24
25

Accept.

26
27
28

Comment 58 Mick Seaman

29
30

COMMENT TYPE: T

31
32

CLAUSE: 13.22 Editor's note

33

PAGE: 185

34

LINE: 6

35

COMMENT START:

36

As the editor's note says, MaxHops is nowhere formally defined. Although its use is described.

37
38

COMMENT END:

39

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

40

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).

41
42
43

Delete the editor's note.

44

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

45

46

1 **Disposition of Comment 58**

2
3 Accept.

4
5 **Comment 59 Les Bell**

6
7
8 COMMENT TYPE: E
9 CLAUSE: 13.22
10 PAGE: 184
11 LINE: 47
12 COMMENT START:
13 Typo.
14 COMMENT END:
15 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
16 Replace "parameter is" with "parameters are".
17 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

18
19 **Disposition of Comment 59**

20
21 Accept.

22
23 **Comment 60 Les Bell**

24
25
26 COMMENT TYPE: T
27 CLAUSE: 13.22
28 PAGE: 185
29 LINE: 6
30 COMMENT START:
31 The definition for MaxHops is missing.
32 COMMENT END:
33 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
34 Add the following definition:
35 "The maximum number of hops from the Root Bridge to the most distant Bridge in the
36 supported Spanning Tree topology. A hop is the link from one Bridge to the next."
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

38
39 **Disposition of Comment 60**

40
41
42 Accept in principle - see Disposition of Comment 58 on page 36.
43
44
45
46

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).(next page)

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

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

1 LINE: 48
2 COMMENT START:
3 The "HelloTime, " component is missing after "ForwardDelay, ".
4 COMMENT END:
5 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
6 Insert "HelloTime, " after "ForwardDelay, ".
7 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
8

9 ***Disposition of Comment 63***

10
11
12 Accept.

13
14 ***Comment 64 Les Bell***

15
16 COMMENT TYPE: T
17 CLAUSE: 13.24.11
18 PAGE: 190
19 LINE: 50-54
20 COMMENT START:
21 The editor's note is correct, this conflicts with updtRcvdInfoWhile().
22 COMMENT END:
23 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
24 remainingHops should be set to MaxHops.
25 Delete the Editor's note.
26 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
27

28 ***Disposition of Comment 64***

29
30
31 Accept.

32
33 ***Comment 65 Les Bell***

34
35 COMMENT TYPE: E
36 CLAUSE: 13.24.11
37 PAGE: 191
38 LINE: 1-4
39 COMMENT START:
40 Clarify the origin of the remainingHops value used.
41 COMMENT END:
42 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
43 Replace "received with message priority components" with "received in the same BPDU
44 as the message priority components".
45 Delete the Editor's note.
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1

2

Disposition of Comment 65

3

4

Accept.

5

6

7

Comment 66 Les Bell

8

9

COMMENT TYPE: E

10

CLAUSE: 13.24.16

11

PAGE: 191

12

LINE: 45

13

COMMENT START:

14

Typo.

15

COMMENT END:

16

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

17

Replace "for each MSTI may differ for each MSTI" with "for each MSTI may differ".

18

19

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

20

21

Disposition of Comment 66

22

23

24

Accept.

25

26

Comment 67 Francois Tallet

27

28

COMMENT TYPE: E

29

CLAUSE: 13.25.8

30

PAGE: 193

31

LINE: 37

32

COMMENT START:

33

A cut & paste typo in the MigrateTime parameter definition.

34

COMMENT END:

35

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

36

The migrate time parameter (17.13.9 of Std 802.1D).

37

38

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

39

40

Disposition of Comment 67

41

42

Accept.

43

44

45

46

1 **Comment 68 Jessy V Rouyer**

2
3 COMMENT TYPE: ER

4 CLAUSE: 13.26.5

5 PAGE: 196

6 LINE: 21, 26

7 COMMENT START:

8 The use of "Cist" in "newInfoCist" is now obsolete.

9 COMMENT END:

10 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

11 Rename "newInfoCist" to "newInfo".

12 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

13
14 ***Disposition of Comment 68***

15
16
17 Accept.

18
19 **Comment 69 Mick Seaman**

20
21 COMMENT TYPE: T

22 CLAUSE: 13.26.6

23 PAGE: 196

24 LINE: 30

25 COMMENT START:

26 Processing received TCN BPDUs has got lost in the changes. Add in received TCN recog-
27 nition at the start of this procedure. Note that procedure can still return OtherInfo.

28 COMMENT END:

29 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

30 Replace the following text which starts the first paragraph of the clause:

31 "Decodes, for a given Port and Tree (CIST, or MSTI), the message priority ..."

32 with:

33 "Decodes received BPDUs. Sets rcvdTcn if a TCN BPDU has been received, and extracts
34 the message priority ..."

35 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

36
37 ***Disposition of Comment 69***

38
39
40 Accept.

41
42 **Comment 70 Mick Seaman**

43
44 COMMENT TYPE: T

45 CLAUSE: 13.26.6, Editor's note

PAGE: 196, 197 1
 LINE: 2
 COMMENT START: 3
 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". 4
 COMMENT END: 5
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 6
 Change the existing text as follows: 7
 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) 8
 Add sub-bullet 2) to read: "infoIs is Received". 9
 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 ...". 10
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 11

Disposition of Comment 70

Accept.

Comment 71 Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: E 22
 CLAUSE: 13.26.6 23
 PAGE: 196 24
 LINE: 47 25
 COMMENT START: 26
 Both the priority vector and timer values must be the same to indicated RepeatedDesignatedInfo. 27
 COMMENT END: 28
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 29
 Replace "port priority vector or timer values" with "port priority vector and timer values". 30
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 31

Disposition of Comment 71

Accept.

Comment 72 Francois Tallet

COMMENT TYPE: T 32
 CLAUSE: 13.26.8 33

1 PAGE: 198
2 LINE: 23
3 COMMENT START:
4 The definition of recordDispute() is not clear as to whether the one way communication is
5 detected independently by each instance or by the CIST only (I guess that recordDispute()
6 always consider the "RST or MST BPDU" received by the CIST, even when invoked in
7 the context of an MST Instance). Either way, there may be an issue when receiving infe-
8 rior designated information that is not internal to the region, as the MST Instances will not
9 have their disputed variable set.

10 COMMENT END:
11 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
12 Here is a possible solution, assuming that only the CIST is driving the unidirectional link
13 failure detection:
14 RecordDisputeCist()
15 For the CIST on the given Port, if an RST or MST BPDU with the learning flag set was
16 received, for all MST Instances on this port:
17 a) the disputed variable is set; and
18 b) the agreed variable is cleared.

19
20 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

21
22 ***Disposition of Comment 72***

23
24 Accept in principle. Francois to supply text.

25
26
27 ***Comment 73 Mick Seaman***

28
29 COMMENT TYPE: E
30 CLAUSE: 13.26.16 Editor's note
31 PAGE: 199
32 LINE: 49
33 COMMENT START:
34 The phrase "in the CST message" is used as a cliché for "for the CIST in the received
35 BPDU".
36 COMMENT END:
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
38 Replace the 5 instances of "in the CST message" with "for the CIST in the received
39 BPDU".
40 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

41
42 ***Disposition of Comment 73***

43
44 Accept.

45
46

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 "updateRolesCist()" and "updateRolesMsti()" 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:".

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

1 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
2

3 ***Disposition of Comment 75***
4

5 Accept.
6

7
8 ***Comment 76*** **Jessy V Rouyer**
9

10 COMMENT TYPE: TR

11 CLAUSE: 13.26.22

12 PAGE: 201

13 LINE: 38-39

14 COMMENT START:

15 The text " (this second condition applying only when calculating the Bridge's root priority
16 vector in the CIST)" was added to match one of the changes to Clause 13 found in
17 P802.1ad/D3.0 (more specifically, the change proposed to subclause 13.26.26 on page 84).
18 However, it appears that the text "and whose Port's restrictedRole parameter is FALSE" is
19 missing after the last "; and" in the change to bullet b) proposed for subclause 13.26.26 on
20 page 84 of P802.1ad/D3.0. The text " (this second condition applying only when calculat-
21 ing the Bridge's root priority vector in the CIST)" should consequently be deleted.
22

22 COMMENT END:

23 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

24 Delete " (this second condition applying only when calculating the Bridge's root priority
25 vector in the CIST)".

26 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
27

28 ***Disposition of Comment 76***
29

30 Accept.
31

32
33 ***Comment 77*** **Mick Seaman**
34

35 COMMENT TYPE: E

36 CLAUSE: 13.26.23 Editor's note

37 PAGE: 202

38 LINE: 41-

39 COMMENT START:

40 The editor's note has served its purpose.

41 COMMENT END:

42 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

43 Remove the editors note and update the figure to remove the change indications. They are
44 too complex in origin to serve any purpose during sponsor ballot.

45 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
46

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:

The reference to Clause 17 of IEEE Std 802.1D, 1998 Edition does not exist.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Correct the reference to refer to clause 17.24 of IEEE Std 802.1D, 2004 Edition.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 79

Accept.

Comment 80 Les Bell

COMMENT TYPE: TR

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

1 CLAUSE: 13.32
2 PAGE: 206
3 LINE: 31
4 COMMENT START:
5 The UPDATE state should not set synced = FALSE. It subsequently, correctly,
6 sets synced = synced && agreed.
7 COMMENT END:
8 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
9 Delete the statement "synced = FALSE;".
10 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
11

Disposition of Comment 80

14 Accept.

Comment 81 Les Bell

19 COMMENT TYPE: E
20 CLAUSE: 13.34
21 PAGE: 207
22 LINE: 22-24
23 COMMENT START:
24 This paragraph lists 5 figures, then refers to them as "both" and "either".
25 COMMENT END:
26 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
27 Replace "both" with "all of these". Replace "either" with "any".
28 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
29

Disposition of Comment 81

33 Accept.

Comment 82 Steve Haddock

37 COMMENT TYPE: E
38 CLAUSE: A.21
39 PAGE: 247
40 LINE: 7
41 COMMENT START:
42 Incorrect reference: Transmitting frames tagged/untagged now in 6.7.2.
43 COMMENT END:
44 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
45 Change "(8.6.5)" to "(6.7.2)".
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 82

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