

IEEE 802.1Qbf Editor's Report  
July 2011 Plenary Meeting  
San Francisco, CA, USA

Bob Sultan (bsultan@huawei.com)

# Draft 1.3 Sponsor Ballot

## Ballot Results

Approve	52
Disapprove	1
Abstain	3
Total	56
Commenters	5

## Comments Submitted

	Required	Not Required	Total
Technical	1	23	24
Editorial	6	17	23
Total	7	40	47

# Comment Summary

The editor does not plan detailed review of the following comments: 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 38, 39, 41. If you would like to have any of these items discussed, please notify the editor. Groups of comments to be explicitly discussed during comment review are listed below:

- Comment #1 is the revised material for the Editor's Note at the beginning of the document reflecting that IEEE Std 802.1Q-2011 is now the base.
- Comment #2 started with a straightforward observation from Ao Ting that the text does not take into account the possibility that the MEP associated with a MEP Mismatch State Machine is an Infrastructure Segment MEP. This is correct and the fix will be made. However, in the course of investigating this problem, it became clear that some text related to 802.1Qay was corrupted when it was integrated into 802.1Q. Panos and Steve contributed material describing the fixes needed to correct the base text <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2011/bf-sultan-ting-comment-0711-v01.pdf>.

# Comment Summary

- Comment #4 points out that that some portions of the text need to be retargeted to the IEEE Std 802.1Q-2011 base text. I have the FM source for Q-2011 and will make sure that this is used as the base. I will also make sure that this resolves all of the specific items contained in a markup of the document that Ben provided.
- Comments #6, 8 (Mack-Crane) suggest removing subclause 12.13 and related text in clause 17. This text should have been removed from an earlier version and will be removed now.
- Comment #17 (Mack-Crane) suggests removing “!p.SFH &&” from predicate in transition from SEGMENT\_OK to PS\_ASSIGNED of Protection Segment Selection state machine; seems reasonable but this should be reviewed.
- Comment #18 suggests changing British spelling ‘ageing’ to American spelling ‘aging’ in existing text. Editor thinks there is no problem making such changes... any other thoughts?

# Comment Summary

- Comment #19, 20, 22, 23, 35, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47 (Hunter) these comments suggest that text in subclauses is required to be in the form of complete sentences. Clause 12 often violates this style by having the subject of the first sentence in the subclause be specified within the subclause heading or by listing items in the subclause such that they don't form a sentence. It isn't clear from reading the style guide whether this is required, but the style guide does generally follow this rule. Making this change only in the text added by Qbf would cause clause 12 to use inconsistent styles. Making the change throughout clause 12 would create a large number of changes in the document. It is proposed that the comment be rejected (although the editor would not object to either of the above solutions if people preferred them). In the case of comments #19,20 the issue is moot since the offending text is removed by comment #6

# Comment Summary

- Comment #24 questions the use of the word “model” in “The IPS managed objects model operations that....”. “Model” is used in existing clause 12 and seems clear, so it is proposed that the comment be rejected.
- Comments #25 - 34 suggest that “is” be replaced with “shall be”, “can” with “may”, etc. Some (not all) of these are rejected as the intention is explanatory and existing text does not use these keywords.
- Comment #42 suggests that “requires” cannot be used in a NOTE. Rejected as in the context of this NOTE “requires” does not apply to the standard, but to the operator and that “requires” is not a keyword like “shall” or “may”.
- Comment #46 raises an interesting question about an existing “NOTE” in Qay.
- Comment #48 is a suggestion that just showing editorial ‘instructions’ for change, rather than complete new text is confusing. This is proposed since the text follows the method described by the style manual.