
802.1 consent agenda items for LMSC Closing Plenary

March 2023

(V3 – 802.1 version #)

Agenda

- PARs to NesCom
 - 5.05? – P802.1ASdm
 - 5.05? – P802.1Qdt
 - 5.05? – P802.1Qdx
 - 5.05? – P802.1DU
 - 5.05? – P802.1CS/cor1
 - 5.05? – P802.1Q-REV (48 hour)
 - 5.05? – P802.1AS-REV (48 hour)
- Drafts to SA Ballot
 - 5.05? – P802.1CS/cor1 conditional
- Drafts to RevCom
 - 5.05? – P802.1Qcz
 - 5.05? – P802.1AEdk

Agenda

- Liaisons and external communications (ME)
 - 7.07? – Approve liaison of drafts for information to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 under the PSDO agreement
 - 7.07? – Approve liaison of drafts for adoption to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 under the PSDO agreement
- Liaisons and external communications (II)
 - 7.07? – Approve 802.1 communication to ITU-T SG13
 - 7.07? – Approve 802.1 communication to ITU-T SG15
 - 7.07? – Approve 802.1 communication with IETF
 - 7.07? – Approve 802.1 communication with LNI 4.0
 - 7.07? – Approve 802.1 communication with 802.11
 - 7.07? – Approve 802.1 communication with BBF

802.1 Motions

2023-03

Consent Agenda

PARs to NesCom

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1ASdm PAR modification documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dm-PAR-modification-0323-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve CSD modification documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dm-CSD-modification-0323-v01.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: David McCall, Second: Ludwig Winkel
 - PAR (y/n/a): 44, 0, 2
 - CSD (y/n/a): 42, 0, 3
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1Qdt PAR modification documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dt-PAR-modification-0323-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve CSD modification documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dt-CSD-modification-0323-v01.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon, Second: János Farkas
 - PAR (y/n/a): 40, 2, 7
 - CSD (y/n/a): 40, 2, 7
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1Qdx PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dx-PAR-0323-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/dx-CSD-0323-v01.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Jordon Woods, Second: János Farkas
 - PAR (y/n/a): 42, 1, 7
 - CSD (y/n/a): 41, 1, 7
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1DU PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/du-PAR-0323-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/du-CSD-0323-v01.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Johannes Specht,
Second: Paul Congdon
 - PAR (y/n/a): 38, 6, 6
 - CSD (y/n/a): 37, 4, 8
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1CS-2020/Cor1 PAR modification documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/cs-2020-cor1-PAR-modification-0323-v01.pdf> to NesCom

Note: there is no CSD statement since this maintenance project is not intended to provide any new functionality

- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon,
Second: Stephan Kehrer
 - PAR (y/n/a): 42, 0, 7
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1Q-2022-Rev PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/q-rev-draft-PAR-0323-v01.pdf> to NesCom

Note: there is no CSD statement since this maintenance project is not intended to provide any new functionality

- In the WG, Proposed: Mick Seaman Second: Paul Congdon
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 45 , 0 , 4
- In the EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y> , <n> , <a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1AS-2020-Rev PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/as2020-rev-PAR-0323-v02.pdf> to NesCom

Note: there is no CSD statement since this maintenance project is not intended to provide any new functionality

- In the WG, Proposed: Geoff Garner Second: Paul Congdon
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 48 , 0 , 1
- In the EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y> , <n> , <a>

802.1 Motions

2023-03

Consent Agenda

Drafts to SA Ballot

Motion

- Conditionally approve sending P802.1CS-2020/Cor1 D2.0 to Standards Association ballot
 - Note: there is no CSD statement since this maintenance project is not intended to provide any new functionality
 - P802.1CS-2020/Cor1 had 97% approval at the end of the last Working Group Recirculation ballot
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon Second: János Farkas
(y/n/a): 44, 0 , 5
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
– (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Supporting information P802.1CS-2020/Cor1

- WG ballot closed: 27 February 2023
- All WG ballot requirements are met
- The ballot resulted in
 - 0 outstanding Disapprove vote
 - 0 outstanding Must Be satisfied comments
- Comment resolution available here:
<https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/cs-2020-cor-1-drafts/d1/802-1CS-2020-Cor1-d1-1-dis.pdf>
- Recirculation ballot will be conducted during April with comment resolution on Maintenance TG calls and during the May 802.1 interim if required. A possible final recirculation in May/June if required with comment resolution in Maintenance TG meetings.

CATEGORY	All Respondents	
	TOTAL	%
Yes	32	100%
No	0	0%
Voting Yes or No	32	64%
Abs. Time	0	0%
Abs. Expertise	18	36%
Abs. Other	0	0%
Respondents	50	68%
Voting members	73	
Non-voting	0	
No. of commenters	4	8%
No. of comments	13	

802.1 Motions

2023-03

Consent Agenda

Drafts to RevCom

Motion

- Approve sending P802.1Qcz to RevCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/18/ec-18-0160-00-ACSD-802-1qcz.pdf>
- P802.1Qcz D2.7 had 100% approval at the end of the last SA ballot
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon Second: János Farkas
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 40, 1, 7
 - CSD (y/n/a): 38, 0, 9
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>, <n>, <a>

Supporting information P802.1Qcz

Sponsor ballot closed:

13 March 2023

- All SA ballot requirements met

Ballot result after comment resolution:

- 0 outstanding Disapprove votes
- 0 outstanding Must Be Satisfied (MBS) comments
- Disposition is available here: <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/cz-drafts/d2/802-1Qcz-d2-7-dis-v01.pdf>

Ballot Summary																	
Open Date: 03 Mar 2023	Close Date: 13 Mar 2023																
Draft Number: 2.7	Status: Closed																
Meets Editorial Requirements: Yes																	
Ballot Group Members: 70 Minimum should be 10	Ballot Stage: Recirculation 5																
Return Ballots: (62) 88%	Minimum return rate is 75%																
Abstentions: (3) 4%	Abstention must be below 30%																
Approval Rate: 100%	Approval rate must be at least 75%																
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th colspan="2">Votes counted in approval rate</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Approve</td><td>59</td></tr><tr><td>Disapprove With MBS Comment(s)</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>59</td></tr></tbody></table>	Votes counted in approval rate		Approve	59	Disapprove With MBS Comment(s)	0	Total	59	<table border="1"><thead><tr><th colspan="2">Votes not counted in approval rate</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Disapprove Without MBS Comment(s)</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Abstentions</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>3</td></tr></tbody></table>	Votes not counted in approval rate		Disapprove Without MBS Comment(s)	0	Abstentions	3	Total	3
Votes counted in approval rate																	
Approve	59																
Disapprove With MBS Comment(s)	0																
Total	59																
Votes not counted in approval rate																	
Disapprove Without MBS Comment(s)	0																
Abstentions	3																
Total	3																
Total Votes	62																
Total Comments	0																

The vote tally for "Disapprove With MBS Comment(s)" = current Disapprove votes for which an MBS (Must Be Satisfied) comment existed in any round of balloting.

Motion

- Approve sending P802.1AEdk to RevCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/19/ec-19-0218-00-ACSD-p802-1aedk.pdf>
- P802.1AEdk/D2.2 had 97% approval at the end of the last Standards Association recirculation ballot
- In the WG, Proposed: Mick Seaman, Second: Don Fedyk
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 42, 0, 8
 - CSD (y/n/a): 42, 0, 8
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>


Supporting information P802.1AEdk

SA ballot closed:

13 November 2022

- All SA ballot requirements met
- Ballot result after comment resolution:

- 1 outstanding Disapprove votes
 - 0 outstanding Must Be Satisfied (MBS) comments
- All comments accompanying the Disapprove vote were WITHDRAWN by commenter
- Disposition is available here:
https://www.ieee802.org/1/file_s/private/dk-drafts/d2/802-1AEdk-d2-2-sa-recirc-dis3.pdf



Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 1 –Disapprove comments withdrawn – email from commenter

From Benjamin Rolfe <ben@blindcreek.com>

Reply Forward Archive Junk Delete More

To Me <mickseaman@gmail.com>

1/30/23, 2:54 PM

Subject **Re: Your vote on the SA Recirculation ballot of P802.1AEdk MAC Security : Amendment MAC Privacy protection**

Tags **To Do**

Thanks Mick, I will consider it.

Ben

From: Mick Seaman <mickseaman@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 27, 2023 12:41 PM

To: Benjamin Rolfe <ben@blindcreek.com>

Cc: Glenn Parsons <glenn.parsons@ericsson.com>; Jessy V Rouyer <jessy.rouyer@nokia.com>; Karen Randall <karen@RANDALL-CONSULTING.COM>

Subject: Re: Your vote on the SA Recirculation ballot of P802.1AEdk MAC Security : Amendment MAC Privacy protection

Hi Ben,
Just to follow up on this ballot. I have uploaded the resolution of comments to IEEE myProject. myProject, while requiring a Disapprove vote to be accompanied with a Must Be Satisfied comment does not take into account WITHDRAWN comments – so you now formally have a Disapprove with no outstanding Must Be Satisfied comments.

While the D2.2 Recirculation Ballot is closed (no further comments accepted), you can (if you wish) login to myProject and change your vote to Abstain or Approve.

That would save time in the processing steps, and avoid the need to go over the vote/withdrawal/myProject scenario with the EC and RevCom.

Thank you for your help in this process.

Mick Seaman

Chair, IEEE 802.1 Security Task Group

On 1/19/2023 7:37 PM, Mick Seaman wrote:

Ben, thank you, that makes progression simple.

Mick

On Jan 19, 2023, at 5:30 PM, Benjamin Rolfe <ben@blindcreek.com> wrote:

You may resolve these as "rejected: comment withdrawn by voter"

Ben



Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 2— Disapprove comments withdrawn – email from commenter cont.

On Jan 19, 2023, at 5:30 PM, Benjamin Rolfe <ben@blindcreek.com> wrote:

You may resolve these as "rejected: comment withdrawn by voter"

Ben

From: Mick Seaman <mickseaman@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 3:30 PM

To: Benjamin Rolfe <ben@BLINDCREEK.COM>

Cc: Glenn Parsons <glenn.parsons@ericsson.com>; Jessy V Rouyer <jessy.rouyer@nokia.com>

Subject: Your vote on the SA Recirculation ballot of P802.1AEdk MAC Security : Amendment MAC Privacy protection

Hi Ben,

I was hoping to catch up with you in person in the 802.1/802.15 Joint Meeting (which is happening just now).

You had a number of Must Be Satisfied comments on the 1st Recirculation SA Ballot of P802.1AEdk.

I think you had not noticed that this was a Recirculation Ballot. We had very few changes on the Initial SA Ballot, with only one Disapprove with one MBS Comment. This comment required the inclusion of the EtherType to be assigned at SA Ballot time in the draft. This was done prior to Draft 2.2 which was the subject of the Recirculation Ballot.

The comments you had made on the ballot were thus formally Out of Scope.

However we have considered all the comments, and the CRG consensus is that we should not change the draft further. You did have a number of comments about the text in NOTES, but all this text is properly Informative – while it may appear substantive all the statements made (for the purpose of drawing the reader's attention to the normative

Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 3 – Withdrawn comments

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 6 # R1-1
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type TR Comment Status D
The NOTE is completely inappropriate in the definition clause. It is not about the term "access priority" but about the technical concept of access priority. Technical content belongs in appropriate normative clauses, not in clause 3.
SuggestedRemedy
Remove NOTE
Proposed Response Response Status Z
REJECT.
This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 21 # R1-2
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type GR Comment Status D
This note seems to add confusion, not clarity. Whatever the point, it is better made when describing the behaviors associated with express frames, not in clause 3.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete note.
Proposed Response Response Status Z
REJECT.
This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 25 # R1-3
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type GR Comment Status D
Really? You think you need to define "traffic"? Totally unneeded, the concept is clearly defined in the standards. Cluttering up the standards, and the IEEE dictionary, with yet another definition of a word is silly and adds not clarity.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete definition
Proposed Response Response Status Z
REJECT.
This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 28 # R1-4
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type TR Comment Status D
The NOTE contains technical content regarding how the feature "preemption" is used. It belongs somewhere else, not clause 3. Here you should provide only a definition of the term not specifics as to the thing to which the term refers, in this case, a feature.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete note.
Proposed Response Response Status Z
REJECT.
This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 35 # R1-5
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type TR Comment Status D
This note belongs somewhere else. Not associated with the definition of the term "Privacy channel". I suggest an appropriate normative clause regarding fragmentation.
SuggestedRemedy
Delete note
Proposed Response Response Status Z
REJECT.
This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 4 – Withdrawn comments cont.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 41 # R1-6
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Another inappropriate note. This one describing a technical characteristic, even a requirement, on "shim" and how it is used. Technical content appropriate to a normative clause. Also, the definition seems not very helpful. This sent me searching for a technical definition of "shim" which I did not find. though I know what it means where it is used from the context, which is sufficient. So really, you don't need it here. If you think someone wont know what shim means in this standard, add a technical description of what a shim provides and perhaps requirements for what constitutes a shim in an appropriate normative clause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove definition and note.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 5 SC 5.2 P 32 L 28 # R1-8
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This is specifying (as is the entire clause) behaviors of entities outside the scope of this standard. i.e. suppliers of implementations of the standard.
 It is way past time to remove "shalls" that describe behavior of implementers and suppliers, rather than of the conforming implementation, from this clause and the PICS. "Shall", "may" and "should" properly behaviors within the scope of this standards.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "shall provide" to "provides". and "shall complete" to "completes". At least in the new text. Don't make it worse.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

CI 4 SC 4 P 30 L 0 # R1-7
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 All acronyms should be expanded at the first use. I notice that the first three I checked are not.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Check that all acronyms are properly used prior to sending it to the publication editors.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 5 – Withdrawn comments – initial CRG resolution

Cl 3 SC 3 P 29 L 6 # R1-1

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The NOTE is completely inappropriate in the definition clause. It is not about the term "access priority" but about the technical concept of access priority. Technical content belongs in appropriate normative clauses, not in clause 3.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove NOTE

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The Note does not add any normative provision (which would have been indicated by the use of "shall", "may", or "should" as per 5.1 Requirements Terminology, but draws the readers' attention to normative provisions of this amendment's base standard that can be useful in appreciating the definition and its use in this standard. See IEEE Std 802.1AE-2018 6.10, 10.5 f), 10.7 e), 10.7.17. See also IEEE Std 802.1Q 6.13 (referenced by 11.7 of IEEE Std 802.1AE-2018).

Cl 3 SC 3 P 29 L 21 # R1-2

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

This note seems to add confusion, not clarity. Whatever the point, it is better made when describing the behaviors associated with express frames, not in clause 3.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The fact that a frame that will be (or has been) treated as an 'express frame' need not carry a marker explicitly identifying it as an express frame has proved to be useful to some readers.

Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 6 – Withdrawn comments cont. – initial CRG resolution

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 25 # R1-3

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

Really? You think you need to define "traffic"? Totally unneeded, the concept is clearly defined in the standards. Cluttering up the standards, and the IEEE dictionary, with yet another definition of a word is silly and adds not clarity.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete definition

Response Response Status W

REJECT.
This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The question of the possible loose definition of "traffic" has arisen in the discussion of related standards and an explicit definition was added to satisfactorily conclude potentially long running discussions. The notions of traffic types, traffic classes, traffic engineering, TSN traffic, AV traffic are important in related standards (notably IEEE Std 802.1Q) and it is useful for this standard (which provides services that can be used by those standards) to consider 'traffic' as a sequence of frames.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 28 # R1-4

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The NOTE contains technical content regarding how the feature "preemption" is used. It belongs somewhere else, not clause 3. Here you should provide only a definition of the term not specifics as to the thing to which the term refers, in this case, a feature.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.
This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The Note does not add any normative provision (which would have been indicated by the use of "shall", "may", or "should" as per 5.1 Requirements Terminology, but draws the readers' attention to normative provisions of this amendment's base standard that can be useful in appreciating the definition.

Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 7 – Withdrawn comments cont. – initial CRG resolution

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 35 # R1-5
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This note belongs somewhere else. Not associated with the definition of the term "Privacy channel". I suggest an appropriate normative clause regarding fragmentation.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. There is normative material concerning fragments and fragmentation in throughout this amendment (notably but not exclusively in 17.3.3, 17.4, 18.1, 18.4, and Clauses 19 and 20) and reminding the reader of the information in this note at all points would be tedious, and not necessarily successful in making the point that throughout this standard we are not considering IP fragmentation. This point is relevant to Privacy Channels because their use involves fragmentation but also extends to the immediately following definition of Privacy Frame.

CI 3 SC 3 P 29 L 41 # R1-6
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Another inappropriate note. This one describing a technical characteristic, even a requirement, on "shim" and how it is used. Technical content appropriate to a normative clause. Also, the definition seems not very helpful. This sent me searching for a technical definition of "shim" which I did not find. though I know what it means where it is used from the context, which is sufficient. So really, you don't need it here. If you think someone wont know what shim means in this standard, add a technical description of what a shim provides and perhaps requirements for what constitutes a shim in an appropriate normative clause.

SuggestedRemedy

remove definition and note.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The Note does not add any normative provision (which would have been indicated by the use of "shall", "may", or "should" as per 5.1 Requirements Terminology. The term "shim" is used 20 times in this amendment, and including its definition is believed to be useful. A reference to IEEE Std 802.1AC is provided (20.1, page 101 line 12) where more information is provided on shims (7.5 in Clause 7 "Basic architectural concepts and terms" in IEEE Stds 802.1AC-2016 Media Access Control (MAC) Service Definition". The term is also used in IEEE Std 802.1Q, which has the same definition (but a different NOTE since that standard also defines EISS shims), and in IEEE Std 802.1AX Link Aggregation.

Supporting information P802.1AEdk – 8 – Withdrawn comments cont. – initial CRG resolution

CI 4 SC 4 P 30 L 0 # R1-7

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

All acronyms should be expanded at the first use. I notice that the first three I checked are not.

SuggestedRemedy

Check that all acronyms are properly used prior to sending it to the publication editors.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.
This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The comment does not identify the acronyms that were checked. The expansion of the first 8 acronyms used in this amendment (MAC, LAN, MACsec, SecY, MIB, PrY, MPPDU, EDE) are all expanded on first use in pages 23 through 36. Note also that this draft standard is an amendment and that the base standard 802.1AE-2018 also expands acronyms and may use those acronyms in text prior to the text added or amended by this draft.

CI 5 SC 5.2 P 32 L 28 # R1-8

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This is specifying (as is the entire clause) behaviors of entities outside the scope of this standard. i.e. suppliers of implementations of the standard.
It is way past time to remove "shalls" that describe behavior of implementers and suppliers, rather than of the conforming implementation, from this clause and the PICS. "Shall", "may" and "should" properly behaviors within the scope of this standards.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "shall provide" to "provides". and "shall complete" to "completes". At least in the new text. Don't make it worse.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.
This comment is Out Of Scope of this Recirculation ballot. The ballot cover letter noted that as per the IEEE-SA Standards Board Manual 5.4.3, once 75% approval is achieved subsequent ballots shall be based only on changed portions, portions affected by changes, or portions that are subject of Unresolved comments associated with Do Not Approve votes. Only one Do Not Approve vote was received on the Initial SA Ballot (requiring EtherType assignment) and the only subsequent changes to the draft were the inclusion of the assigned EtherType, the MIB OID assignment suggested in the cover letter for the initial ballot, the minor editorials suggested in that cover letter, correction of a URL reference (comment I-2) and one change from "integral" to "integer" (comment I-7).

Note that this comment would have been rejected even if in Scope. The requirement that a supplier of implementation *shall* complete a PICS to make a claim of conformance to this standard is an important and well established part of IEEE 802 standards and their adoption by ISO going back (at least) to IEEE 802.1D-1990. The referenced text "The supplier ... implementation that is claimed to conform ... shall complete ... the PICS proforma" is used in the base standard (802.1AE-2018), in IEEE Stds 802.1Q, 802.1AR, 802.1AS, 802.1AX, 802.1BA, 802.1CB, 802.1CM, and 802.1X. The requirement (with "shall") is also stated for all the capabilities standardized in IEEE Std 802.3-2022 with 179 instances of "supplier ... shall complete", for IEEE Std 802.11-2020 ("supplier of a protocol implementation that is claimed to comply with IEEE Std 802.11-2020 shall complete the ...PICS..."), in the PICS annexes for IEEE Stds 802.15.1-2002, 802.15.3.2003, and 802.15.4-2015, and in 802.21-2009.
In all cases it is important have a definitive statement of implemented provisions in a given implementation when a supplier claims conformance.



802.1 Motions

2023-03

Consent Agenda

Liaisons and external
communications (ME)

Motion

- Approve submission of the following draft(s) to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 for information under the PSDO agreement, once SA balloting begins.
 - IEEE P802.1CS-2020/Cor1
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 40, 1, 6
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>, <n>, <a>

Motion

- Approve submission of the following draft(s) to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 for adoption under the PSDO agreement, once approved and published.
 - IEEE P802.1AEdk
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 41, 1, 8
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: Roger Marks
 - (y/n/a): <y>, <n>, <a>

802.1 Motions

2023-03

Consent Agenda

Liaisons and external communications (II)

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/liaison-response-itu-t-sg15-otnt-swp-0323.pdf> as communication to ITU-T SG15 on LS15: OTNT Standardization Work Plan Issue 31, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
 - This approval is under LMSC OM “IEEE 802 LMSC subgroup public statements to government bodies”
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending liaison (y/n/a): 40, 1, 5
- In EC, for information (or motion to block)

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/liaison-response-itu-t-SG13-DeterminCommunicSvcsandNetworking-0323.pdf> as communication to ITU-T SG13 granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
 - This approval is under LMSC OM “IEEE 802 LMSC subgroup public statements to government bodies”
- In the WG (y/n/a): 42, 1, 5
 - Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Karen Randall
- In EC, for information (or motion to block)

Motion

- Approve
<https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/liaison-IETF-RFC7042bis-0323.pdf> as communication to IETF regarding review of <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-eastlake-rfc7042bis/09/>, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license and incorporation of additional RAC approved comments.
- In the WG, Proposed: Paul Congdon Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 40, 1, 5
- In EC, for information

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/liaison-response-LNI40-WhitepaperandIEEESAlogorequest-0323.pdf> as communication to LNI 4.0, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas Second: Karen Randall
- (y/n/a): 40, 2, 5
- In the EC, for information

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/liaison-response-80211-TSNsupport-0323.pdf> as communication to the IEEE 802.11 WG, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
- Proposed: János Farkas
- Second: Karen Randall
- In the WG (y/n/a): 43, 2, 3
- In the EC, for information

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2023/liaison-response-BBF-1XandYANG-0323.pdf> as communication to BBF, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
- Proposed: Mick Seaman
- Second: Karen Randall
- In the WG (y/n/a): 41, 1, 7
- In the EC, for information