CommentID: 1
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 30
Subclause: 30.4.3.1.4
Page: 30.2
Line: 15
CommentType: E
Comment:
Strange spacing in header.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Fix header.
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Allow IEEE Editor to correct paragraph styles (tab stops).

CommentID: 2
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 30
Subclause: 30.4.3.1.7
Page: 30.3
Line: 9
CommentType: E
Comment:
Strange spacing in header.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Fix header.
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Allow IEEE Editor to correct paragraph styles (tab stops).

CommentID: 3
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 3
Subclause: 3.5
Page: 03.3
Line: 32
CommentType: E
Comment:
Missing parentheses around "informative".
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Add parentheses.
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 4
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 3
Subclause: 3.5.2
Page: 03.4
Line: 1
CommentType: E
Comment:
Change heading to match IEEE Std. 802.3.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Change heading to read: "3.5.2 Start Frame Delimiter (SFD) field"
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 5
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 3
Subclause: 3.5.4
Page: 03.4
Line: 11
CommentType: E
Comment:
Change heading to match others in clause 3.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Change heading to read: "3.5.4 Length/Type field"
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 6
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 3
Subclause: 3.5.5
Page: 03.4
Line: 16
CommentType: E
Comment:
Change heading to match others in Clause 3.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Change heading to read: "3.5.5 Tag Control Information field
(informative)"
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 7
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 3
Subclause: 3.5.6
Page: 03.4
Line: 26
CommentType: E
Comment:
Change heading to match others in Clause 3.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Change heading to read: "3.5.6 MAC Client Length/Type field"
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 8
CommenterName: Brad Booth
CommenterEmail: bbooth@jatotech.com
CommenterPhone: (512)407-2135
CommenterFax: (512)452-5592
CommenterCo: Jato Technologies, Inc.
Clause: 3
Subclause: 3.5.8
Page: 03.4
Line: 37
CommentType: E
Comment:
Change heading to match IEEE Std. 802.3.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Change heading to read: "3.5.8 Frame Check Sequence (FCS) field"
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 9
CommenterName: Howard Frazier
CommenterEmail: hfrazier@cisco.com
CommenterPhone: 4085277607
CommenterFax: 4085278254
CommenterCo: Cisco Systems, Inc.
Clause: 4
Subclause: 4.2.7.1
Page: 4.2
Line: 49
CommentType: E
Comment:
missing units for qTagPrefixSize.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
add "in octets, " before "length".
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 10
CommenterName: Howard Frazier
CommenterEmail: hfrazier@cisco.com
CommenterPhone: 4085277607
CommenterFax: 4085278254
CommenterCo: Cisco Systems, Inc.
Clause: 30
Subclause: 30.4.3.1.6
Page: 30.2
Line: 49
CommentType: T
Comment:
As a result of this draft, the parameter maxFrameSize is no longer defined in 4.4.2. We just have maxUntaggedFrameSize and maxUntaggedFrameSize + QTagPrefixSize. Thus, the reference to "any value of maxFrameSize specified in 4.4.2" appears to be inaccurate.

Since this counter is qualified by the same condition which increments aFramesTooLong, it is not necessary to restate the permissible limits of the frame size. In fact, the whole note seems pointless.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Delete the note which appears at the end of 30.4.3.1.6.
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Accept.

CommentID: 11
CommenterName: Kristin Dittmann (via Geoff Thompson)
CommenterEmail: k.dittmann@ieee.org
CommenterPhone:
CommenterFax:
CommenterCo: IEEE
Clause:
Subclause:
Page:
Line:
CommentType: E
Comment:
Note that our requirements state that drafts must be "dated, readilyavailable, and retrievable" in order to be cited in standards. Thus we will require that the year and draft number of P802.1Q be specified in the reference, if the project is not approved by the time this supplement is approved.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Instruct the IEEE Editor to insert the most current year/draft-number (or approved standard reference) when the standard is published.

CommentID: 12
CommenterName: Kristin Dittmann (via Geoff Thompson)
CommenterEmail: k.dittmann@ieee.org
CommenterPhone:
CommenterFax:
CommenterCo:
Clause: 1
Subclause: 1.4
Page: 1.2
Line: 9
CommentType:
Comment:
In the definition of QTag Prefix, the word "Ethernet" is used. This is the first time I have seen it included in a definition. It seems to me that this particular use of the term is not adequately defined here. Please clarify.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy: (from Geoff Thompson)
It is included in the definition of (802.3x) full duplex The term also shows up in 30.6.1.1.8 so we have been sneaking it in. However, your point is well taken. According to the way the "rest of the book" is I would guess that we should have the definition read:
FROM:
QTag Prefix: The first four octets of an Ethernet-encoded Tag Header as defined in 802.1Q.
TO:
QTag Prefix: The first four octets of the Type-encoded Tag Header as defined in 802.1Q.
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:
Change to read:
  Qtag Prefix: The first four octets of an Ethernet-encoded Tag Header. The Ethernet-encoded Tag Header is
        defined in P802.1Q.

CommentID: 13

CommenterName: Andy Luque

CommenterEmail:

CommenterPhone:

CommenterFax:

CommenterCo:

Clause: General

Subclause:

Page:

Line:

CommentType: Technical/Procedural Required

Comment:

The recirculation ballot on draft 2.2 of 802.3ac is incomplete and therefore invalid. My comment regarding figure 3-3, #27 from Comment Database 2.1, was not included. Both the web and mailed version of draft 2.2 do not include this Technical Required Comment

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Conduct a recirculate ballot that includes ALL Negative ballots or adopt my comment regarding figure 3-3. A detailed compromised solution was presented at the closing plenary in Irvine.

RemedyEnd:

Disposition:

The chair of 802.3 shall write a rebuttal letter, noting that the original comment was submitted as "Technical" (not Technical/Required), and that furthermore, it was submitted after the close of the ballot. The commenter had sufficient opportunity to submit this comment as a TR on the earlier ballot, and it is not appropriate to "raise it" to TR at this time. Nevertheless, the comment will be attached to the Sponsor Ballot as an unresolved negative comment, as a courtesy to the commenter.

CommentID: 14

CommenterName: Andy Luque

CommenterEmail:

CommenterPhone:

CommenterFax:

CommenterCo:

Clause: General

Subclause:

Page:

Line:

CommentType: Technical/Procedural Required

Comment:

The ballot does not contain change bars to identify what was modified from draft 2.1 to draft 2.2. It is thus, very difficult to determine if any significant changes have occurred. The brief list and the disclaimer in the cover letter are not sufficient.

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Add change bars to identify ALL changes made from draft 2.1 to draft 2.2.

RemedyEnd:

Disposition:

Reject. There is no requirement to provide change bars for each draft relative to the immediately previous draft. The change bars provided are with respect to the base document (as noted in the Editorial notes). The "brief" list of changes at the beginning of each clause is actually the complete list of changes. In addition, this comment must be construed as editorial and not technical, as the resolution of the comment would not create a technical change to the document.

CommentID: 15
CommenterName: Andy Luque
CommenterEmail:
CommenterPhone:
CommenterFax:
CommenterCo:
Clause: 4
Subclause: 4.4
Page:
Line:
CommentType: Technical Required
Comment:

Changing "maxFrameSize" to "maxUntaggedFrameSize" is not acceptable. The existing standard should not be affected by the work of IEEE 802.3ac. It is very confusing and completely unnecessary to change "maxFrameSize" for the purposes of this project. At the same time, a new "maxtaggedFrameSize" parameter should be tables. These Table have all the key parameters and should not omitted the new maxTaggedFrameSize. A reference to qTagPrefixSize would be part of this definition.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:

None provided.
RemedyEnd:
Disposition:

Reject. This is the same as comment 23 from Draft 2.1, which the Task Force has already rejected. The Task Force has reconsidered the comment and reaffirms its rejection.

CommentID: 16
CommenterName: Andy Luque
CommenterEmail:
CommenterPhone:
CommenterFax:
CommenterCo:
Clause: 3
Subclause: Figure 3-3, line 11 and 3.5.1 line 32
Page:
Line:
CommentType: Technical Required
Comment:

Remove the detailed description of the Tag Control Information field. There is no need to deal with User Priority, CFI, or VLAN identifiers. This information is not needed to have an 802.3ac standard. This info should be transparent to what we do. The definition is provided in 802.1Q and should not be repeated here.

Labelling these fields as "informative" does not resolve potential confusion. There is no need for this level of detail. It is not possible to implement 802.3ac without using 802.1Q and they seem to be making pretty good progress. This proposal also eliminates the need to deal with the different conventions used to described the most significant bit in 802.3ac and 802.1Q. It avoids the need for the confusing Note in line 27.

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

RemedyEnd:

Disposition:

Reject. This is the same as comment 27 from Draft 2.1, which the Task Force has already rejected. The comment is also "unresponsive" in that it is a comment on material that has not changed between Draft 2.1 and 2.2. As this is a recirculation ballot, comments may only be made to those portions of the draft that have changed since the last ballot. Even so, as a courtesy to the commenter, the comment will be referred to the 802 ExCom to determine if it should be included with a Sponsor Ballot.