

P802-1Qav-D7-0 Forwarding and queueing comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L # 1
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

Although there is nothing in the instructions as to which page numbering system to use, I will use the page number as shown on the PDF reader rather than the number printed on the page. I chose this because myBallot will not accept the non numerical pagination used on the printed draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Add specific ballot instructions as to which page numbering system to use during balloting - OR- (preferred) use a single page numbering system that is compatible with myBallot commenting. (thus my vote on D6.0 #54 stands)

Response Response Status U

REJECT. This is simply a re-statement of a previous comment by the commenter. As stated in the ballot resolution committee's response to the commenter's comment #67 on the D6.0 ballot, this approach (of numbering the pages as they will appear in the final printed standard, with Roman numerals used for the front matter) has been taken by the editor in response to ballot comments on other projects that complained that the page numbering changed radically between final draft and published text.

The comment #54 that the commenter refers to was submitted by another commenter (Tony Jeffree) and subsequently was withdrawn. So the commenter cannot maintain his Disapprove vote on the basis of D6.0 #54.

There is nothing at all to prevent the commenter from explicitly stating in his comments what page number he is referring to in the case of the early pages of the draft that use Roman numerals for page numbers. This is, for example, the way commenters make references to multiple pages or line number ranges, as myBallot currently does not permit any other solution. If the commenter dislikes the constraints imposed by the myBallot system then he is at liberty to make representations to the staff that maintain it; however, such representations are outside the scope of a Sponsor ballot.

Cl 00 SC 0 P 1 L 25 # 2
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Review to response to my ballot comment #63. Thank you for the change. The new text now makes it fully apparent that, in order to appropriately comment on this draft, I must have not only the base standard 802.1Q-2005 but also at least 8 amendments as reference documents in order to have the full text.

SuggestedRemedy

See next comment

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. This comment does not specify any change to the document.

Cl 00 SC 0 P 1 L 25 # 3
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

A base standard and 8 amendments is too many to reasonably compare against for an outside balloter. Also, it appears that this project violates the requirements of the SA-OM cl. 9.2 & 8.1.2 (there being no documentation provided to the contrary).

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the PAR to be a revision PAR to 802.1Q and fold the text of this and all previously approved amendments into the revision.

Response Response Status U

REJECT. The comment is out of scope of this recirculation ballot, as it is a comment on procedural issues rather than on the draft itself. It is also based on a false premise, and the suggested remedy is inappropriate.

The Standards Board meeting in December 2007 passed the following motion:

Mover - Malcolm Thaden for RevCom

Motion - Whereas 802.1Q-2005 revision is currently required to be completed by Dec. 2008; and whereas significant work remains; and whereas Ops Man 8.1.2 allows for a two-year extension, RevCom recommends that the SASB approve a two-year extension for the completion of a revision of 802.1Q (until December 2010).

Result - Unanimously approved

The commenter was a participant in that Standards Board meeting, and therefore can be assumed (a) to have approved this motion, and (b) to be fully aware of the consequences of the motion.

Given the above motion, the premise that the project is in violation of the SA operating rules is false, as those rules explicitly allow for the granting of a 2-year extension, and the rules do not require that supporting documentation be provided as part of the Sponsor ballot package.

The suggested remedy is not a course of action that can be taken under current procedures; myProject does not provide the option to modify an amendment PAR to change it into a revision PAR. There is, in any case, already an active revision PAR approved for Std. 802.1Q.

P802-1Qav-D7-0 Forwarding and queueing comments

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 4 [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status A
 Re: Thompson D6.0 Comment #62: the response to that comment that shows up in D7.0 is satisfactory
 SuggestedRemedy
 No further change required for that comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. No action required.

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 7 [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status A
 Re: Thompson D6.0 Comment #64: the response to that comment that shows up in D7.0 is satisfactory
 SuggestedRemedy
 No further change required for that comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. No action required.

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 5 [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status A
 Re: Thompson D6.0 Comment #66: the response to that comment that shows up in D7.0 is satisfactory
 SuggestedRemedy
 No further change required for that comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. No action required.

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 8 [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status A
 Re: Thompson D6.0 Comment #65: the response to that comment that shows up in D7.0 is satisfactory
 SuggestedRemedy
 No further change required for that comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. No action required.

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 6 [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual
 Comment Type G Comment Status A
 Re: Thompson D6.0 Comment #67: the response to that comment that shows up in D7.0 is satisfactory
 SuggestedRemedy
 No further change required for that comment
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT. No action required.

CI 00 SC 0 P 34 L 34 # 9 [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Geoffrey Individual
 Comment Type E Comment Status R
 I believe that the copyright notice does not meet the US legal requirements for a copyright notice in that it does not state the year in which the affirmative copyright notice is being asserted.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Refer to publications editor to check. Add year to notice.
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT. This comment is out of scope of this recirculation ballot - the referenced text has not changed from the previous draft, and was not the subject of a comment in the previous Sponsor ballot on draft 6.0.
 This comment addresses issues of grammar, punctuation, and style, and will be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. Section 5.4.3.2 of the IEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual states:
 "Comments addressing grammar, punctuation, and style, whether attached to an affirmative or a negative vote, may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

P802-1Qav-D7-0 Forwarding and queueing comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P 34 L 36 # 10
Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status R

802.1Q text is not a "draft"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read: "see the base standard itself for full legal notices."

Response Response Status C

REJECT. This comment is out of scope of this recirculation ballot - the referenced text has not changed from the previous draft, and was not the subject of a comment in the previous Sponsor ballot on draft 6.0.

This comment addresses issues of grammar, punctuation, and style, and will be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. Section 5.4.3.2 of the IEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual states:

"Comments addressing grammar, punctuation, and style, whether attached to an affirmative or a negative vote, may be referred to the publications editor for consideration during preparation for publication. It should be borne in mind that documents are professionally edited prior to publication."

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 11
Thompson, Geoffrey Individual

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

Regarding my comment #52, the negative remains. I recognize that the 802.1 WG can not do anything about the deficiencies of myBallot but if I remove my negative then my comment will never reach RevCom or staff.

SuggestedRemedy

Ask staff to raise the priority on making the myBallot error messages on comment upload be more relevant to the actual errors.

Response Response Status U

REJECT. This comment is out of scope of this recirculation ballot; it is a comment on the myBallot system, not on the draft being balloted.

The commenter is perfectly at liberty to take the action detailed in the Suggested Remedy for himself.