

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 3
 Turner, Michelle Editorial Coordination

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 1
 Turner, Michelle Editorial Coordination

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The editorial instructions indicate that this is an amendment to 802.1Q-2005. Isn't this an amendment to the soon to be approved P802.1Q?

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace the text of page 9, lines 19-25 as follows:
 This amendment specifies changes to IEEE Std 802.1Q-2011 that support localized protection of selected Traffic Engineered Service Instances (TESIs) traversing a common sequence of Provider Network Ports. Changes are applied to the base text of IEEE Std 802.1Q-2011 as amended by IEEE P802.1Qaz, IEEE P802.1Qbb, IEEE P802.1Qbc, and IEEE P802.1Qbe.

Cl 01 SC 1 P1 L1 # 2
 Byrd, William Individual

Comment Type G Comment Status R

This is an extremely confusing way to present these changes. The IEEE Standards group should re-evaluate this type of presentation. It is intended only for those who have been involved in the changes, and not for the general voters.

It was impossible to follow all the changes and work arounds in this Standard.

Next time: Present the entire document as a whole, then show where the changes have been made specifically. Not just throw up a bunch of BS and expect everyone to know where it came from.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The amendment conforms to the requirements of section 21.2 of the IEEE-SA style manual: <https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/draft/styleman.pdf>
 Comments on the required style should be brought to the attention the executive committee.

Cl 01 SC 1.1 P9 L39 # 4
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The text and editing instructions for this amendment need to be aligned with the base text for 802.1Q-2011 as amended by 802.1Qaz, 802.1Qbb, 802.1Qbc, and 802.1Qbe.

SuggestedRemedy

Align the amendment with the appropriate base text. Detailed review notes will be provided to the editor to assist in this process.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The changes described by this amendment will be retargeted to 802.1Q-2011 as amended by 802.1Qaz, 802.1Qbb, 802.1Qbc, and 802.1Qbe.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 06 SC 6.2 P15 L 50 # 5
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Clause 6.6.2 is a better reference for MAC_Operational.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the reference from 6.8.2 to 6.6.2.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 08 SC 8.8 P17 L 42 # 18
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status R
 "aging" is the preferred spelling in American English (and IEEE standards are written in American English). Yes, this is not part of the previously changed text, but the subject is relevant to the changed text.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "ageing" with "aging".

Response Response Status C
 REJECT.

"ageing" is used throughout 802.1Q. In particular, it is used in the state machines. While "aging" may be the preferred spelling, it would be disruptive to change a variable name that is deployed in implementations.

Cl 12 SC 12.13 P19 L 13 # 6
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The management object described here seems unnecessary and is not included in the MIB.

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the editing instruction and text for clause 12.13.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

This comment was accepted in D1.0 comment resolution and was never implemented:

Cl 17 SC 17.7 P 40 L 34 # 52
 Comment Type TR
 The clause 12.3 modifications suggests a modification to the PB MIB module. You will need to update the PB MIB to add this managed object.

SuggestedRemedy
 And content to this clause in the next draft
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Editor assumes commenter means 12.13 (rather than 12.3).

All the material in 12.13 should be removed as it is not needed. 12.13 describes a managed object that allows an Infrastructure Segment to be associated with a PNP. Since the Infrastructure Segment is a type of MA, such an object is not needed as the method of associating the MA with a port is described by the existing 12.14.5.3 and 12.14.6.3. Like 12.20.3 (see comment 14), the material in subclause 12.13 should be removed from the Qbf draft. No change to the PB MIB is needed.

Cl 12 SC 12.13.4.2 P19 L 30 # 19
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Contents of subclauses need to be sentences.

SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "Inputs shall consist of:" on line 29.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The referenced text is removed by comment #6.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 12 SC 12.13.4.3 P19 L36 # 20
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Isn't this a requirement that is set by this standard? In addition, contents of subclauses need to be sentences.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "a) Operation status--this takes" with "Operation status shall take"

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The referenced text is removed by comment #6.

Cl 12 SC 12.14.2.1.2 P20 L5 # 21
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Since the subject of 0 is separate from the first clause, surround "or 0" with commas (as was done in the previous version).

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "MP or 0 in" with "MP, or 0, in".

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 12 SC 12.14.4.1.1 P20 L21 # 22
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Contents of subclauses need to be sentences.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "To" with "The Read Configuration Error List is used to".

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Clause 12 is currently inconsistent in its use of complete sentences. The 802.1 chair suggests using wording that creates the greatest local consistency.

Cl 12 SC 12.14.4.1.2 P20 L28 # 23
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Contents of subclauses need to be sentences.

SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "Inputs shall consist of:" on line 28. In addition, add similar content to each of the remaining clauses that do not contain lists without the material to make them components of a sentence.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The editor will create complete sentences in cases where local consistency can be maintained (see comment 22). In cases where noun phrases are listed, each such noun phrase will terminate with a period without an introductory paragraph.

SHALL will not be specified here but the item is covered by higher-level SHALLs in clause 5 and PICS items as follows:

subclause 5.6.2 (S-VLAN component requirements for PBB-TE) inserted list item: Support Infrastructure Protection Switching as specified in 26.11.

subclause 5.8.2 (B-component requirements for PBB-TE) inserted list item: Support Infrastructure Protection Switching as specified in 26.11.

PICS IPS and IPS-1 (annex A)

Cl 12 SC 12.2 P22 L36 # 24
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status R
 What is the use of a managed object creating something similar to those operations? Otherwise, where is "model" defined to mean something other than "create similar"?

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "model" with "provide".

Response Response Status C
 REJECT.

The term "model" is used throughout Clause 12 and is widely understood to mean that the material in this clause specifies a model for an implementation rather than specifying a specific implementation. Thus the meaning is as intended.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 12 SC 12.20.1 P22 L46 # 25
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Isn't this statement supposed to express a requirement?
 SuggestedRemedy
 On line 46 replace "is" with "shall be".
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 SHALL is not specified here but the item is covered by higher-level SHALLs in clause 5 and PICS items as follows:
 subclause 5.6.2 (S-VLAN component requirements for PBB-TE) inserted list item: Support Infrastructure Protection Switching as specified in 26.11.
 subclause 5.8.2 (B-component requirements for PBB-TE) inserted list item: Support Infrastructure Protection Switching as specified in 26.11.
 PICS IPS and IPS-1 (annex A)

Cl 12 SC 12.20.1 P22 L49 # 26
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Is this "can" a permission that is being granted by this standard? It doesn't seem to be a statement of physical possibility.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "can" with "may".
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 The specific meaning of "can" in this document is specified in subclause 5.1 and that is what is intended in this instance.

Cl 12 SC 12.20.2 P24 L21 # 27
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Is this "can" a permission that is being granted by this standard? It doesn't seem to be a statement of physical possibility.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "can" with "may".
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #26.

Cl 12 SC 12.20.2 P24 L23 # 28
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Is this "can" a permission that is being granted by this standard? It doesn't seem to be a statement of physical possibility.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "can" with "may".
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 See comment #26.

Cl 17 SC 17.2 P29 L13 # 7
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Add a reference for the TEIPS-MIB.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "26.11" in the reference column.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 17 SC 17.2.11 P30 L 52 # 8
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

This paragraph referring to IEEE8021TeipsSegTable and IEEE8021TeipsSegid seems unnecessary and the referenced objects are not included in the MIB.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the paragraph.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

This paragraph should have been removed consistent with comment #30 D1.0

CI 12 SC 12 P 34 L 38 # 30

Comment Type TR

Why do we need this " Infrastructure Segment List managed object"? I do not recall we have any discussion of adding this managed object

SuggestedRemedy

Please clarify. Can we get all the information from IPG List managed object? Or the intention is to also manage PNPs in the SIB?

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The Infrastructure Segment List managed object will be removed, consistent with the proposed resolution of comment #14.

CI 12 SC 12.20.3 P 34 L 37 # 14

Comment Type TR

These managed objects are redundant. The specified operation is already covered by the previously defined managed objects (for example, 12.14.5, 12.14.2, 12.20.1)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete subclause 12.20.3

ACCEPT.

Comment Status A

Response Status C

Cl 17 SC 17.4.11 P32 L 12 # 9
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The title refers to "IEEE8021-PBBTE MIB" but should refer to "IEEE8021-TEIPS MIB"

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 17 SC 17.7.1 P32 L 37 # 10
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The TC MIB was changed by 802.1Qbc and that version should be used as base text. Furthermore, I think the current convention is to include full MIB text in amendment clauses 17.1.x rather than detailed editing instructions and diff-marked text.

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT.

Cl 17 SC 17.7.13 P36 L 14 # 11
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The current convention is to include postal information, etc. for the IEEE 802.1 working group rather than for the individual contact.

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 17 SC 17.7.13 P36 L 27 # 12
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The description should be changed to indicate 802.1Q-2011 as amended by 802.1Qaz, 802.1Qbb, 802.1Qbc, and 802.1Qbe.

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 17 **SC 17.7.13** **P36** **L43** # **13**
Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
The MIB should be ieee802dot1mibs 24 (rather than 57). Also the comment "-- Bogus OID value to get past smilint" should be removed.
SuggestedRemedy
As noted.
Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 17 **SC 17.7.13** **P36** **L53** # **14**
Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
Add table comment blocks as in other 802.1 MIBs for readability.
SuggestedRemedy
As noted.
Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 19 **SC 19.2.1** **P53** **L11** # **29**
Hunter, David Individual
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **R**
Isn't this statement supposed to express a requirement?
SuggestedRemedy
Replace "is" with "shall be".
Response **Response Status** **C**
REJECT.

This text is not within the scope of the amendment.

'is' is a logical consequence of the SHALLs.

Corresponding SHALLs for this item are specified by 5.4.1.4 Connectivity Fault Management

Cl 19 **SC 19.2.1** **P53** **L39** # **30**
Hunter, David Individual
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **R**
Is this "can" a permission that is being granted by this standard? It doesn't seem to be a statement of physical possibility.
SuggestedRemedy
Replace "can" with "may".
Response **Response Status** **C**
REJECT.

The referenced line is not modified by this amendment and is therefore outside the scope of this ballot.

See also comment #26.

Cl 20 **SC 20.9.10** **P55** **L18** # **31**
Hunter, David Individual
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **R**
Isn't this statement supposed to express a requirement?
SuggestedRemedy
On line 19 replace "is" with "shall be".
Response **Response Status** **C**
REJECT.

See comment #25 (regarding SHALLs)

This paragraph is based on (i.e., uses as a template) existing subclause 20.9.8 (see below). Making the suggested change would cause the added text to be inconsistent with the style of the existing text.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 26 SC 26.10.3.3.5 P65 L51 # 35
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status R

This is not a statement.

SuggestedRemedy

If this is intended to be a definition, replace "A Boolean" with "FS is a boolean".

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The comment is related to existing text (i.e., not to the amendment), although other text within the sentence is modified. Making this change would cause the sentence to become stylistically inconsistent with other subclauses in Clause 26 (for example 26.10.3.3.3, 26.10.3.3.4, and 26.10.3.3.5).

See also comment #22 regarding consistency.

Cl 26 SC 26.10.3.3.6 P66 L6 # 36
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status R

This is not a statement.

SuggestedRemedy

If this is intended to be a definition, replace "A Boolean" with "MStoProtection is a boolean".

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

See comment #35.

Cl 26 SC 26.10.3.3.7 P66 L16 # 37
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status R

This is not a statement.

SuggestedRemedy

If this is intended to be a definition, replace "A Boolean" with "MStoWorking is a boolean".

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

See comment #35.

Cl 26 SC 26.10.3.4 P66 L54 # 38
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Need a comma before "respectively".

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a comma after "26.11.4.1.2".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 26 SC 26.11 P67 L15 # 15
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The editing instruction should also state that the existing clause 26.11 is renumbered as 26.12.

SuggestedRemedy

As noted.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Cl 26 SC 26.11 P67 L30 # 39
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A

The use of the term "should" for any but normative use is deprecated in IEEE standards; see the IEEE Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "As a caution it should be noted that" with "The".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 26 SC 26.11.1 P69 L1 # 40
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The verb of this statement is split ba a comma. In addition, normative statements are not allowed in "NOTE--" paragraphs; see the IEEE Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Proper operation of the network requires that each SMP" with "For proper network operation each SMP," (note the comma after "SMP"), replace "be" with "is", and on line 4 replace "requires" with "includes".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 26 SC 26.11.2.1 P70 L1 # 41
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Normative statements are not allowed in "NOTE--" paragraphs; see the IEEE Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 On both lines 1 and 3 replace "may" with "can".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 26 SC 26.11.2.1 P70 L36 # 42
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status R
 Normative statements are not allowed in "NOTE--" paragraphs; see the IEEE Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "requires" with "involves".
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 "requires" is not a reserved word like "shall", "may", or "should". In the context of the sentence the word "requires" is not prohibited and expresses the intended meaning.

Cl 26 SC 26.11.2.2 P70 L41 # 43
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Is this "can" a permission that is being granted by this standard? It doesn't seem to be a statement of physical possibility.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "can" with "may".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Neither "can" nor "may" expresses the intended meaning. Propose changing "can transit" to "transits".

Cl 26 SC 26.11.2.2 P71 L5 # 44
 Hunter, David Individual
 Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Normative statements are not allowed in "NOTE--" paragraphs; in addition, "must" is deprecated in IEEE standards; see the IEEE Style Manual
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Proper operation of the network requires that" with "For proper network operation"; replace "identify" with "identifies"; and on line 5 replace "must be" with "is" and " may" with "might".
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The use of "requires" in this context is not prohibited and does express the intended meaning. The editor prefers the wording below to the simple replacement of "may" with "might".
 Change to:
 NOTE—Proper operation of the network requires that the FDB entry provisioned in a SIB to forward traffic along an Infrastructure Segment associated with the IPG identifies only a single outbound Port. That is, the portion of a TESI transiting an IPG is provisioned as point-to-point, without regard to whether the TESI is point-to-point or point-to-multipoint from an end-to-end perspective

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 26 SC 26.11.2.4 P71 L31 # 45
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 "must" is deprecated in IEEE standards; see the IEEE Style Manual

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "must" with "shall", or state the (apparent) requirement more clearly.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

To express what was intended, change "must be provisioned to operate" to "operates". A SHALL is not intended here (see comment #25).

Cl 26 SC 26.11.5 P74 L5 # 16
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The reference to the "Wait-to-restore timer" should be to the "MWTR timer".

SuggestedRemedy
 As noted.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 26 SC 26.11.5.4.2 P75 L53 # 46
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Normative statements are not allowed in "NOTE--" paragraphs; see the IEEE Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "may" with "might".

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The NOTE will be deleted.

Cl 26 SC 26.11.5.4.3 P76 L4 # 47
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The use of the term "will" as indicating a requirement is deprecated in IEEE standards; see the IEEE Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy
 If a requirement is being stated in this paragraph, replace "will" with "shall". Otherwise replace "will be" with "is".

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace "will be" with "is" (second alternative suggested by commenter).

Cl 26 SC 26.11.5.7 P78 L28 # 17
 Mack-Crane, Thomas Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 The predicate "!p.SFH && (pri[n] >= pri[cntPs] || MWTRTime == 0) || SFH[n]" does not seem to require the first element "!p.SFH && " since the previous state is entered only if "!SFH[cntPs]" which would indicate that "!p.SFH" would be true.

SuggestedRemedy
 If there is no need for the first element of the predicate, remove it.

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If there is truly no need for the first element but it causes no harm, then we will leave it alone. Ben Mack-Crane and Panos have volunteered to verify.

Cl 26 SC 26.9.10 P62 L51 # 34
 Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A
 Use of "will" as indicating a requirement, as in "will need" in this paragraph, is deprecated in IEEE standards; see the IEEE Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy
 If requirements are being stated in this paragraph, use "shall" in each case. Otherwise replace "will need to have" with "have" and "will have to be" with "are".

Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Choose second alternative suggested by commenter.

IEEE P802.1Qbf D1.3 PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection comments

Cl 26 SC 26.9.8 P62 L5 # 32
Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A

"must" is deprecated in IEEE standards; see the IEEE Style Manual

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "must" with "shall", or state the (apparent) requirement more clearly.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The text will be clarified as follows:

Delete the sentence "It must be possible to distinguish Infrastructure Segments that are associated with such SMPs."

Also, change "may" to "can" in the sentence "Thus, independent Infrastructure Segments can be associated with SMPs having identical values of SMP-DA and SMP-VID."

Cl 26 SC 26.9.9 P62 L36 # 33
Hunter, David Individual

Comment Type T Comment Status A

Is this "can" a permission that is being granted by this standard? It doesn't seem to be a statement of physical possibility.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "can" with "may".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The correct change is to replace "can only be placed on" with "are placed only on".