

P802.3ad Draft 2.1 Working Group Recirculation Ballot Comment Database, Revision 1.1. This document includes all comments submitted during the WG Recirculation Ballot, along with the agreed resolution of each comment, as agreed during the 802.3ad meeting in Kauai, November '99.

All DISAPPROVE ballots that were cast in the D2.0 ballot are now either APPROVE or APPROVE WITH COMMENTS. In addition, one non-responder in the D2.0 ballot has now returned an APPROVE ballot. There are no new DISAPPROVE votes. The number of abstentions is unchanged from the results of D2.0.

Therefore, the Ballot Results for the D2.1 recirculation are as follows:

Qualified Voters (includes all 802.3 voting members plus those 802.1 members participating in this ballot): 174
Total Votes Received: 116 (66.7% of total, meets 50% minimum requirement)
Approval Votes: 84
Disapproval Votes: 0
Abstentions: 32
Approval ratio [Approvals/(Approval + Disapproval)]: 100% (meets 75% minimum requirement for approval)
Abstention ratio [Abstentions/Total Votes]: 27.6% (meets 30% maximum requirement for valid ballot)

Comment Summary:

Total comments received: 16
Editorial: 9
Editorial/Required: 0
Technical: 3
Technical/Required: 3
Procedural: 1

CommentID: 1
CommenterName: Tony Jeffree
CommenterEmail: tony@jeffree.co.uk
CommenterPhone: +44-161-973-4278
CommenterFax: +44-161-973-6534
CommenterCo: Independent Consultant
Clause: All
Subclause:
Page: All
Line:
CommentType: E
Comment:
Before issuing this document for Sponsor Ballot, there are a number of editorial things that need to be fixed:
- The title of the document should be made to match the PAR;
- Real values should be inserted for the slow protocols multicast & type;
- Real values should be inserted for the object identifiers in the GDMO version of the MIB;
- The DESCRIPTION fields in the SNMP MIB objects should be made to match the corresponding text in Clause 30, as stated in the Editor's Note at the start of 30C.6;
- There are numerous "Editor's Notes" throughout the document that could usefully be deleted at this point, having served their purpose.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:

- Change the title of the document to "Supplement to Information Technology
 - Local & Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 3: Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method & Physical Layer Specifications - Aggregation of Multiple Link Segments"
 - Add the address (acquire this from 802.1) and type (use one of 802.3's "hoard") definitions
 - Add the object identifiers
 - Add the DESCRIPTION text
 - Strip out the Editors' Notes.
- RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept. Additionally, we need the root object identifier value for the SNMP MIB to be allocated. Les Bell to arrange this to be allocated.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 2

CommenterName: Geoff Thompson

CommenterEmail: gthomps@nortelnetworks.com

CommenterPhone: +1 408 495 1339

CommenterCompany: Nortel Networks

Clause: DNA

Subclause: DNA

Page: DNA

Line: DNA

CommentType: Procedural

Comment:

Regarding the oft used phrase in the "Resolution of Comments" document:
"The commenter is enjoined to provide appropriate text."

This is not appropriate resolution text.

The definition of "enjoin" from the American Heritage Dictionary is

- 1) To direct or impose with authority and emphasis.
- 2) To prohibit or forbid.

(Confusing at best, more likely hostile.)

It is not appropriate for us to take such an attitude with those who have been kind enough to assist us in the review of the draft. Further the policy position it takes is not supported by your chair or the procedures of the IEEE, to wit:

IEEE Standards SA Operations Manual

5.4.3.1 Initial ballot

b) Do Not Approve (Negative). This vote shall be accompanied by one or more specific objections with proposed resolution in sufficient detail in a legible form so that the specific wording of the changes that will cause the negative voter to change his or her vote to "approve" can readily be determined.

I believe that each of my comments stated my critique "in sufficient detail ... so that the specific wording of the changes ... can readily be determined".

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

If the editor is truly at a loss for text which will remedy the objection then please ask the commentor to provide text otherwise just fix it.

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept – no change required to the draft.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 3

CommenterName: John Messenger

CommenterEmail: John.Messenger@8025.org

CommenterPhone: +44-1904-693409

CommenterFax: +44-1904-693067

CommenterCo: Madge.connect

Clause: 1

Subclause: 1.4

Page: 5

Line: 48

CommentType: Editorial

Comment:

Definition not identical to external reference as stated in note.

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Remove incorrect reference to IEEE 802.3 Clause 43.

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 4

CommenterName: John Messenger

CommenterEmail: John.Messenger@8025.org

CommenterPhone: +44-1904-693409

CommenterFax: +44-1904-693067

CommenterCo: Madge.connect

Clause: 1

Subclause: 1.4

Page: 5

Line: 51

CommentType: Editorial

Comment:

The word "compose" is wrong here. "where all of the MAC frames compose an ordered sequence".

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Suggest "comprise", preferably as follows: "in which the MAC frames comprise an ordered sequence".

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Tony's recommendation: Accept.

Rich's recommendation: Actually, the text is correct as it stands. The rule of compose-and-comprise is, "The whole comprises its parts; the parts compose the whole."

What we have here is an ordered sequence of MAC frames, i.e., the sequence is the higher-order construct, COMPOSED of MAC frames.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept in principle. Use "form" in place of "compose".

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 5

CommenterName: Brad Booth

CommenterEmail: bbooth@level1.com

CommenterPhone: (512) 407-2135

CommenterFax: (512) 452-5592

CommenterCo: Intel

Clause: Annex 30B

Subclause: 30B.2

Page: 68

Line: 12

CommentType: E

Comment:

"waiting (2), -- WAITING" has incorrect value

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Change to be "waiting (1), -- WAITING"

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept. This is already correct in the "clean" version of D2.1; the error appears only in the change barred text.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 6

CommenterName: John Messenger

CommenterEmail: John.Messenger@8025.org

CommenterPhone: +44-1904-693409

CommenterFax: +44-1904-693067

CommenterCo: Madge.connect

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.1.2

Page: 102
Line: 6
CommentType: Editorial
Comment:
"Multipoint Aggregations" should be emboldened.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Embolden it.
RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 7
CommenterName: John Messenger
CommenterEmail: John.Messenger@8025.org
CommenterPhone: +44-1904-693409
CommenterFax: +44-1904-693067
CommenterCo: Madge.connect
Clause: 43
Subclause: 43.1.3
Page: 102
Line: 42
CommentType: Editorial
Comment:
"compose" not right here.
"Sublayer" should not be capitalised.
CommentEnd:
SuggestedRemedy:
Use "comprise" and "sublayer".
RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept "sublayer".

See comment 4 re "compose" vs "comprise".

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Ed's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 8
CommenterName: John Messenger
CommenterEmail: John.Messenger@8025.org
CommenterPhone: +44-1904-693409
CommenterFax: +44-1904-693067

CommenterCo: Madge.connect

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.1.3

Page: 102

Line: 48

CommentType: Technical

Comment:

"None of the requirements of this clause apply to ports for which the Link Aggregation sublayer has not been implemented." I wonder if you could find a better way to phrase this important non-conformance statement. In my view, questions of implementation are not the subject of standardisation. This sentence is trying to say that the link aggregation sublayer need not apply to all ports in an implementation claiming to conform to this standard. (Interestingly that means that perhaps I can claim conformance even when none of my ports are aggregatable.) I think this statement needs work along with the corresponding PICS items.

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

"A conforming implementation is not required to be able to apply the Link Aggregation sublayer to every port."

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept, substituting "conformant" for "conforming" in the suggested remedy.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation. We consider this to be an editorial change.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 9

CommenterName: Brad Booth

CommenterEmail: bbooth@level1.com

CommenterPhone: (512) 407-2135

CommenterFax: (512) 452-5592

CommenterCo: Intel

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.4.2.2

Page: 123-126

Line:

CommentType: E

Comment:

a) to ai) bullets are not sequential

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Update to make them sequential

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept in principle. In the marked up text, the presence of "struck out" bullets makes gaps in the numbering sequence. The clean version of the D2.1 text has already fixed the bullet numbering in this subclause. No further action is needed here.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 10

CommenterName: Brad Booth

CommenterEmail: bbooth@level1.com

CommenterPhone: (512) 407-2135

CommenterFax: (512) 452-5592

CommenterCo: Intel

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.4.15

Page: 145

Line: 28

CommentType: E

Comment:

Missing a space

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Insert a space between "instantaneously," and "this"

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 11

CommenterName: Shlomo Dayan

CommenterEmail: shlomo.dayan@intel.com

CommenterPhone: 972-2-5892503

CommenterFax: 972-2-5892601

CommenterCo: Intel - NCGJ

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.4.15

Page: 107

Line: 1-31

CommentType: TR

Comment:

1. DETACHED state: Functions Disable_Distributing and Disable_Collecting concern the independent control only. In the coupled control, Disable_Collecting_Distributing should be used.
2. Exit from ATTACHED state: The transition to DETACHED state should occur when Selected=UNSELECTED or Selected=STANDBY (and not as specified). This concerns both independent control and coupled control.
3. Exit from COLLECTING_DISTRIBUTING State: There is a missing operator between Selected=STANDBY and Partner.Sync=FALSE (should be '+'). This concerns both independent control and coupled control.

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

1. Use Disable_Collecting_Distributing instead of Disable_Collecting and Enable_Collecting.
2. Exit when Selected=UNSELECTED or Selected=STANDBY (towards the DETACHED state).
3. Exit when Selected=STANDBY or Partner.Sync=FALSE (towards the ATTACHED state).

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept. This is the result of imperfect transcription from the resolutions recorded in the comment database. Comments 2 and 3 also apply to the Independent state machine; also, the order of the operations in the DETACHED state in the Coupled machine does not line up with what was in the resolution.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept in principle. The Editor's recommendation identifies correctly the necessary changes to fix these state machines; however, in order to expedite the processing of the Sponsor ballot for this project, the draft will not be changed prior to issuing the ballot. A covering letter will be included in the sponsor ballot package, providing corrected state diagrams and stating that these corrections to the diagrams will be the subject of ballot responses from the Chair and Editors for .3ad.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 12

CommenterName: Hadriel Kaplan

CommenterEmail: hkaplan@nortelnetworks.com

CommenterPhone: 978-288-6160

CommenterFax: 978-288-4837

CommenterCo: Nortel Networks

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.4.15

Page: 147

Line: 28-30

CommentType: T

Comment:

The exit condition for Collecting to Attached is missing the connective in the argument "(Selected = UNSELECTED) + (Selected = STANDBY (Partner.Sync = FALSE))".

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

I believe it should be:

"(Selected = UNSELECTED) + (Selected = STANDBY) + (Partner.Sync = FALSE)"

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

See Comment 11.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 13
CommenterName: Hadriel Kaplan
CommenterEmail: hkaplan@nortelnetworks.com
CommenterPhone: 978-288-6160
CommenterFax: 978-288-4837
CommenterCo: Nortel Networks

Clause: 43
Subclause: 43.4.15
Page: 149
Line: 28-30
CommentType: T

Comment:
The exit condition for COLLECTING_DISTRIBUTING to ATTACHED is missing the connective in the argument "(Selected = UNSELECTED) + (Selected = STANDBY (Partner.Sync = FALSE))".

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

I believe it should be:

"(Selected = UNSELECTED) + (Selected = STANDBY) + (Partner.Sync = FALSE)"

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

See Comment 11.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 14
CommenterName: Hadriel Kaplan
CommenterEmail: hkaplan@nortelnetworks.com
CommenterPhone: 978-288-6160
CommenterFax: 978-288-4837
CommenterCo: Nortel Networks

Clause: 43
Subclause: 43.4.15
Page: 147
Line: 15-18
CommentType: TR

Comment:
Both exit conditions from ATTACHED can be true at the same time - if Selected=SELECTED and Partner.Sync=TRUE then both exit conditions are met. (I think it's just an editorial error - see remedy)

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

I think the exit condition to go back to DETACHED should be

"(Selected=UNSELECTED) + (Selected=STANDBY)"

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

See Comment 11.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 15

CommenterName: Hadriel Kaplan

CommenterEmail: hkaplan@nortelnetworks.com

CommenterPhone: 978-288-6160

CommenterFax: 978-288-4837

CommenterCo: Nortel Networks

Clause: 43

Subclause: 43.4.15

Page: 149

Line: 15-18

CommentType: TR

Comment:

Both exit conditions from ATTACHED can be true at the same time - if Selected=SELECTED and Partner.Sync=TRUE then both exit conditions are met. (I think it's just an editorial error - see remedy)

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

I think the exit condition to go back to DETACHED should be "(Selected=UNSELECTED) + (Selected=STANDBY)"

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

See Comment 11.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

ResolutionEnd

CommentID: 16

CommenterName: Brad Booth

CommenterEmail: bbooth@level1.com

CommenterPhone: (512) 407-2135

CommenterFax: (512) 452-5592

CommenterCo: Intel

Clause: Annex 43B

Subclause: 43B.2

Page: 176

Line: 43

CommentType: E

Comment:

Octet range is incorrect

CommentEnd:

SuggestedRemedy:

Change "... frame; i.e., in the range 46-1500 octets." to read "... frame, as specified in 4.4.2."

RemedyEnd:

Editor'sRecommendationStart

Accept.

Editor'sRecommendationEnd

ResolutionStart

Accept Editor's recommendation.

We believe that the range specified is currently correct; however, as this has been a recurring comment from a number of sources, the proposed change is accepted.

ResolutionEnd