Comments on P802.1CS PAR modification

13 Nov 2019

Comments from 802.11

5.2 – Scope – the new sentence is missing a space before the start.

8.1 need to add the clause number for the change explanation. Add "#5.2" prior to the sentence in 8.1.

RESPONSE

Accept 5.2 change. Will add "#5.2" to 8.1.

Scope typo

This standard specifies protocols, procedures, and managed objects for a Link-local Registration Protocol (LRP) to replicate a registration database from one end to the other of a point-to-point link and to replicate changes to parts of that database. A facility is provided to purge the replicated database if the source becomes **unresponsive. Prov**ision is made for a proxy system to operate LRP on behalf of a controlled system. LRP is optimized for databases on the order of 1 Mbyte.

(missing space highlighted)

Comments from 802.3 on PAR

4.2 (initial Sponsor Ballot) — Assuming the PAR is recent output of myProject, the PAR form hasn't been updated to use new names (Standards Committee Ballot). Nothing you can do about that rather than complain via the 802 Task Force. The date though may not be realistic or will require special attention on the ballot. With the SASB meeting before 802 this year, it is unlikely that the PAR modification will be approved by January 2020.

RESPONSE

PAR dates

4.2 EXPECTED DATE OF SUBMISSION OF DRAFT TO THE IEEE-SA FOR INITIAL SPONSOR BALLOT: January 2020

CHANGE TO: March 2020

4.3 PROJECTED COMPLETION DATE FOR SUBMITTAL TO REVCOM NOTE: USUAL MINIMUM TIME BETWEEN INITIAL SPONSOR BALLOT AND SUBMISSION TO REVCOM IS 6 MONTHS.: August 2020

CHANGE TO: October 2020

Comments from 802.3 on PAR

5.2 (scope) — missing space after full stop at end of third from last sentence.

8.1 (additional explanation) — The note should reference a specific PAR item, in this case #5.2.

RESPONSE:

Accept.

(See above slide, Scope typo.)

Comments from 802.3 on CSD

General — There is no to be sure the right CSD is being looked at (until a long way down where LPR is finally mentioned). Please add project identification in the title area..

RESPONSE

Reject. There was no change to the contents of the CSD. 802.1 apologizes for failing to put the document designation in the original CSD, but we feel that leaving the document intact is the best way to indicate that it did not change.

Comments from 802.3 on CSD

General — There is no way within the document to determine what in the CSD is being modified.

RESPONSE

There is no change to the CSD.

Thank you