
802.1 consent agenda items for LMSC Closing Plenary

July 2024

(V3 – 802.1 version #)

Agenda

- PARs to NesCom
 - 802.1DD
 - 802.1ASed
 - 802.1DP - extension
 - 802.1AB-2016-rev
 - 802.1AC-2016-rev
 - 802.1Qdd withdrawal (48 hour rule)
- Drafts to SA Ballot
 - IEC/IEEE 60802
 - P802.1DG
- Drafts to RevCom
 - P802.1DC
 - P802.1ASdm
 - P802.1ASdn

Agenda

- Liaisons and external communications (ME)
 - Communication to ITU-T SG13
 - Approve responses to ballot comments received from SC6 on FDIS and CIB ballots
 - Approve liaison of drafts for information to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 under the PSDO agreement
 - Approve liaison of drafts for adoption to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 under the PSDO agreement
 - YANG blog post
- Liaisons and external communications (II)
 - Approve 802.1 communication to LNI 4.0
 - Approve 802.1 communication to Avnu Alliance
 - 7.028 – Approve 802.1 communication to Broadband Forum

802.1 Motions

2024-07

Consent Agenda

PARs to NesCom

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1DD PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/dd-PAR-0724-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/dd-CSD-0724-v01.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Don Pannell, Second: Craig Gunther
 - PAR (y/n/a): 32, 2, 4
 - CSD (y/n/a): 30, 2, 5
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1ASed PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/ed-PAR-0724-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/ed-CSD-0724-v01.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Silvana Rodrigues,
Second: János Farkas
 - PAR (y/n/a): 35, 0, 4
 - CSD (y/n/a): 34, 0, 5
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1DP PAR extension documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/dp-PAR-extension-0724-v01.pdf> to NesCom
- Approve (unmodified) CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/21/ec-21-0096-00-ACSD-p802-1dp.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Max Turner, Second: János Farkas
 - PAR (y/n/a): 39, 0, 2
 - CSD (y/n/a): 38, 0, 3
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y>,<n>,<a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1AB-2016-Rev PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/ab-draft-PAR-0524-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: Mark Hantel Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 35, 0, 5
- In the EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y> , <n> , <a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1AC-2016-Rev PAR documentation in <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/ac-draft-PAR-0524-v03.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: Mark Hantel Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 37, 0, 3
- In the EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y> , <n> , <a>

Motion

- Approve forwarding P802.1Qdd PAR withdrawal request to NesCom
- Reason for the withdrawal:
 - Other
- Explanation for withdrawal:
 - The project is being replaced by a project (IEEE P802.1DD) for a stand-alone standard instead of an amendment to IEEE Std 802.1Q.
- In the WG, Proposed: Don Pannell, Second: Craig Gunther
 - PAR (y/n/a): 37, 1, 2
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y>, <n>, <a>

802.1 Motions

2024-07

Consent Agenda

Drafts to SA Ballot

Motion

- Approve sending IEC/IEEE 60802 D3.0 to Standards Association ballot
- Confirm the CSD for IEC/IEEE 60802 in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/18/ec-18-0088-01-ACSD-p60802.pdf>
- IEC/IEEE 60802 D2.4 had 100% approval at the end of the last WG ballot
- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Stephan Kehrer
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 36, 0, 2
 - CSD (y/n/a): 37, 0, 2
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law

Supporting Information IEC/IEEE 60802

- WG ballot closed: 14 May 2024
- All WG ballot requirements are met
- The ballot resulted in
 - 0 Disapprove votes
 - 0 outstanding MBS comments
- Comment resolution available here:
<https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/60802-drafts/d2/60802-d2-4-dis-v01.pdf>

Ballot results:

CATEGORY	All Respondents	
	TOTAL	%
Yes	47	100.00%
No	0	0.00%
Voting Yes or No	47	100.00%
Abs. Time	3	4.55%
Abs. Expertise	11	16.67%
Abs. Other	0	0.00%
Respondents	66	
Voting members	61	
Non-voting	5	
No. of commenters	0	0.00%
No. of comments	0	

Motion

- Approve sending P802.1DG D4.0 to Standards Association ballot
- Confirm the CSD for P802.1DG in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/18/ec-18-0242-00-ACSD-p802-1dg.pdf>
- P802.1DG D3.2 had 97% approval at the end of the last WG ballot
- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Max Turner
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 36, 1, 3
 - CSD (y/n/a): 35, 1, 3
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law
 - (y/n/a): <y>, <n>, <a>

Supporting Information P802.1DG

- WG ballot closed: 11 July 2024
- All WG ballot requirements are met
- The ballot resulted in
 - 0 new Disapprove votes
 - 0 new Required comments
 - 1 Disapprove vote maintained from initial WG ballot associated with 10 outstanding MBS comments
- Comment resolution available here:
<https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/dg-drafts/d3/802-1DG-d3-2-dis-v01.pdf>

Ballot results:

CATEGORY	All respondents	
	TOTAL	%
Yes	36	97.3
No	1	2.7
Voting Yes or No	37	74.0
Abs. Time	2	4.0
Abs. Expertise	11	22.0
Abs. Other	0	0.0
Respondents	51	n/a
Voting members	50	75.8
Non-voting commenters	1	2.0
No. of commenters	2	4.0
No. of comments	10	100
TR	0	0.0
T	4	40.0
ER	0	0.0

Supporting Information P802.1DG

- Voter maintained Disapprove vote from initial WG ballot:
 - Johannes Specht
- MBS comments whose resolution the Disapprove voter is not satisfied with are on the following slides. These comments are from the [initial WG ballot](#) on [D3.0](#).

Supporting Information P802.1DG

CI 5 SC 5.8 P30 L19 # 19

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Clause heading for an empty clause.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete newline between 5.8 and 5.9.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 6 SC 6.2 P32 L36 # 21

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Term ISS is not introduced properly.

SuggestedRemedy
Introduce ISS properly.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add ISS to the abbreviations section and spell it out on the first occurrence.

CI 6 SC 6.16.2 P37 L10 # 23

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"The exact forwarding behavior of VLAN tagged Frames to Reserved Addresses is implementation specific." is basically stating nothing in terms of an IEEE 802.1 Std, but may (accidentally) override behavior standardized in IEEE Std 802.1Q

SuggestedRemedy
Remove any deviation from the behavior specified in IEEE Std 802.1Q ad other IEEE 802.1 Stds throughout entire clause 6. As an easy alternative direction, clause 6 may be simply deleted and replaced by proper references from clause 5 to avoid any potential override of behavior standardized in IEEE 802.1 Standards. Moreover, IEEE 802.1 Maintenance items may be submitted if clarification is desired for published IEEE 802.1 Stds.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove the second sentence lines 10 to 11 from 6.16.2 on page 37
make the first sentence a "NOTE:"

CI 8 SC 8.3 P44 L12 # 26

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Term "ATS Instance" is unclear, similar to "ATS algorithm", etc.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "ATS Instance" and all other terms throughout the document with proper terminology from IEEE Std 802.1Q or other respective 802.1 Std (dependent on the protocol under consideration).

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

replace "ATS Instance" by "ATS Scheduler Instance" in line 12 on page 44

replace "ATS algorithm" by "ATS ProcessFrame procedure" in line 24 on page 44

Add "NOTE:" to the beginning of line 24 on page 44.

CI 8 SC 8.3 P44 L24 # 28

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"egress media-dependent overhead" is a technical deviation from 12.4.2.2 of IEEE Std 802.1Q and therefore violates the project scope. It is not in the project scope to change behavior standardized in IEEE Std 802.1Q.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove constraints beyond those from 802.1Q on positioning of Standardized mechanisms in stations throughout the document.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to read "includes the media-dependent overhead ([Q]:12.4.2.2)"

Supporting Information P802.1DG

CI 8 SC 8.5 P45 L8 # 31

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The underlying models of ATS (IEEE Std 802.1Q) and those from [B2] are too different for the intended comparison shown in this draft; the given technical statements are not equivalent to those indicated as citations of [B2].

SuggestedRemedy
Fix distortion of [B2].

Response Response Status W
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the references to [B2] in all of 8.5.

CI 8 SC 8.5 P45 L13 # 32

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Without at least a proper definition of "Application" this "If no Middleware is present and every Application generates Frames just for its own communication needs, an ATS Instance per Application can ensure proper egress behavior." statement appears incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove incorrect statement or correct it. Potentially add reference to 47.1 of IEEE Std 802.1Q

Response Response Status W
REJECT.

The terms are clear to the intended target audience and the statement is correct. Removing the statement would reduce the instructiveness of the proposed solution. [Q]:47.1 refers to a different communication stack setup, as it does not consider the Middleware/Application difference and hence does not apply here.

CI 10 SC 10.1 P48 L15 # 34

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Term TDMA is not introduced properly.

SuggestedRemedy
Introduce TDMA properly.

Response Response Status W
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the acronym to the list and spell out in first occurrence

CI 10 SC 10.6.3 P50 L22 # 35

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

There is no "(virtual) credit" in ATS.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace sentence by "ATS shaper instances are unaware of the transmission gate state."

Response Response Status W
ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 45

Specht, Johannes Self

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The title according to the meta-information of the PDF state "IEEE P802.1DG Draft 2.4", whereas the content indicates version 3.0.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix metadata.

Response Response Status W
ACCEPT.

802.1 Motions

2024-07

Consent Agenda

Drafts to RevCom


Motion

- Conditionally approve sending P802.1DC to RevCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/18/ec-18-0091-00-ACSD-802-1dc.pdf>
- P802.1DC D3.3 had 98% approval at the end of the last SA ballot

- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Jessy Rouyer
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 36, 1, 3
 - CSD (y/n/a): 33, 1, 6
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law

Supporting Information P802.1DC

- SA ballot closed: 1 July 2024
- All SA ballot requirements are met
- The ballot resulted in
 - 0 new Disapprove votes
 - 1 comment
 - 1 Disapprove votes maintained from former SA ballot, associated with 15 outstanding Must Be Satisfied (MBS) comments
- Comment resolution available here: <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/dc-drafts/d3/802-1DC-d3-3-dis-v03.pdf>
- Recirculation ballot will be conducted during July/August with comment resolution in the regularly scheduled TSN TG meetings. A possible final recirculation in September if required with comment resolution in the regularly scheduled TSN TG meetings.



Supporting Information P802.1DC

- Voter with Disapprove vote maintained from former SA ballot:
 - Benjamin Rolfe
- MBS comments associated with the Disapprove vote maintained from former SA ballot are on the following slides

Supporting Information P802.1DC

Cl A SC A P 56 L 6 # R2-1

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Incorrect use of "shall" in informative text. (a) this is specifying a behavior of the user of the annex, and user behavior is out of scope of this standard, and (b) the annex is informative (which is correct).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The supplier of an implementation that is claimed to conform to this standard completes the following protocol implementation conformance statement (PICS) proforma."

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Cl A SC A P 56 L 37 # R2-2

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

In the footnote, use of "may" (twice). Footnotes are informative. "may" is normative. Sign. This is intending to inform the user of the standard that they are granted permission to reproduce this part of the document. Also way more words than needed.

SuggestedRemedy

change to: Users of this standard are granted permission to freely reproduce the PICS proforma in this subclause and publish the completed PICS.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Cl A SC A.1.2 P 57 L 15 # R2-3

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"may" in informative text (sigh). Using "may" correctly in a standard is harder than it looks.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The supplier can provide further information, ..."

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Cl A SC A.1.2 P 57 L 23 # R2-4

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Another "may" in informative text.

SuggestedRemedy

Note that where an implementation is capable of being configured in more than one way, according to the items listed under Major Capabilities/Options, a single PICS can be used to describe all such configurations.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Supporting Information P802.1DC

Cl A SC A.1.3 P 57 L 34 # R2-5

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Another "may" in informative text. Two instances in one sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

change to: References to items of Additional Information can be entered next to any answer in the questionnaire, and included in items of Exception Information.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Cl A SC A.1.4 P 57 L 37 # R2-6

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Another "may" in informative text. And more words than needed.

SuggestedRemedy

change paragraph to: "If a supplier wishes to answer an item with mandatory or prohibited status in a way that conflicts with the indicated requirement, the supplier is required to write into the Support column an X<i> reference to an item of Exception Information, and to provide the appropriate rationale in the Exception item itself.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Cl A SC A.1.6.1 P 58 L 14 # R2-7

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Another "may" used incorrectly: (a) in an informative annex, and (b) in a note to a table, which is always informative.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "May" to "Can" in NOTE 2 in the table in A.1.6.1.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Cl 9 SC 9.6.3 P 50 L 20 # R2-8

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

" Transmission Selection Algorithm Tables may be managed, and allow the identification of vendor-specific transmission selection algorithms. " - where is the optional management of Transmission Selection Algorithm Tables specified? Is the management of these tables in scope of this standard?

SuggestedRemedy

Delete sentence or clarify where the optional management behavior within scope of this standard is specified.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. Sentence contains important information about vendor-specific algorithms. Comment is out-of-scope, as this text was present and not previously commented upon in the course of this SA ballot (D3.0 and D3.1).

Supporting Information P802.1DC

Cl 9 SC 9.6.1 P 45 L 41 # R2-9

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Incorrect use of may in a footnote (in a normative clause) as footnotes are informative. Sign. Also more words than are necessary. Permission is granted for the user of this standard to reproce the YANG modules - while we hope they do so for the purpose(s) we intend, that is outside the scope of this standard and this organization (though I can't imagine any other purpose that would inspire someone to reproduce these modules ;-).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Users of this standard are granted permission to freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this standard.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g, in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group. Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads:

"No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher."

Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in clause 9.6, the footnote: "Copyright release for YANG: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this standard so that they can be used for their intended purpose."

A copyright release has legal implications that the ballot resolution committee is not competent to address.

The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in other 802.1 standards (e.g., IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022 and each of its subsequently published amendments). Similar notes for MIBs and PICS occur in the base standard (IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 and each of its subsequently published amendment and corrigendum) and throughout 802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformant implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P 22 L 9 # R2-10

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"may" is not the word you need in this sentence (and it's not correct usage in an IEEE standard - see 1.4). It's an extraneous word in this sentence anyway ;-)

SuggestedRemedy

change to: "Transformations that frames undergo as they are forwarded due to forwarding decisions,"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl A SC A.1.6.1 P 58 L 14 # R2-11

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Note 3 in table contains "should" (a normative term). "should" is as hard to avoid misusing as "may". IN this case "should be interpreted appropriately" (even in plain English and not standards usage") seems strange yet obvious. The specification of "appropriately" is also missing. The urge to recommend against inappropriate things is strong, but not within the scope of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: The user of this PICS proforma completes "Name" and "Version" consistent with the suppliers terminology (e.g., Type, Series, Model).

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.

Supporting Information P802.1DC

Cl 2 SC 2 P 23 L 10 # R2-12

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

IEEE Std 802 is not cited in normative text in this standard. I find it used once in an (informative) note and once in clause 3 (which can not contain requirements).

SuggestedRemedy

Move to bibliography

Response Response Status W

REJECT. To quote the IEEE SA Standards style manual:

"In an IEEE standard normative references are those documents that contain material that must be understood and used to implement the standard. Thus, normative references are indispensable when applying the standard."

The terms "end station" and "frame", imported in clause 3 from IEEE Std 802 certainly must be understood to implement the standard. IEEE Std 802 therefore belongs in clause 2 as a normative reference.

Cl 3 SC 3 P 24 L 26 # R2-13

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

This is a very wordy and not very clear definition of the term "forwarding system":
"forwarding system: A router, security appliance, address translation appliance, or any other device that forwards a frame from one port to another, such that the frame is, in some useful sense, identifiable to other systems as being the same frame" Leaves one wondering what a "useful sense" would be and "same frame" as what? (presuming as the received frame before forwarding - but this is a description of the forwarding process, not the term). Most of this text is about how forwarding works, and not appropriate to clause 3 which should define the term, not specify things about the operation to which the term refers. Such details belong in normative clauses where they are more likely to be found by implementers of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

change to: forwarding system: A router, security appliance, address translation appliance, or any other device that forwards a frame from one port to another.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT

Cl 3 SC 3 P 24 L 33 # R2-14

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

NOTE 4 contains a technical description of a system (functional unit) such as what it might be comprised of or physically packaged. Not stuff that should appear in clause 3.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete NOTE 4

Response Response Status W

REJECT. The term "system" is often used to mean "physical unit". The comment resolution group considers this note to be helpful.

Cl 5 SC 5.1 P 26 L 22 # R2-15

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"The supplier of an implementation that is claimed to conform to this standard shall " is specifying normatively actions well outside the scope of this standard (supplier behavior). I know we really want this to be done, but the scope of this standard is "specifies procedures and managed objects for Quality of Service (QoS) features specified in IEEE Std 802.1Q" not actions of human beings (or AI pretending to be human).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "The supplier of an implementation that is claimed to conform to this standard provides the information necessary to identify both the supplier and the implementation, and completes a PICS for the specific system using the PICS proforma provided in Annex A."

Response Response Status W

REJECT. While the use of the terms "shall", "should", and "may" is inconsistent with their use in other normative text, their use in the PICS (Annex A) and in references to the PICS is appropriate. This usage in the PCS is an important and well-established part of IEEE 802 standards. This same use of these terms can be seen in the PICS of more than a dozen current standards from IEEE 802.1, 802.3, 802.11, 802.15, and 802.21.


Motion

- Conditionally approve sending P802.1ASdm to RevCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0093-01-ACSD-p802-1asdm.pdf>
- P802.1ASdm D2.4 had 95% approval at the end of the last SA ballot

- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Silvana Rodrigues
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 35, 3, 2
 - CSD (y/n/a): 35, 2, 3
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

- SA ballot closed: 1 July 2024
- All SA ballot requirements are met
- The ballot resulted in
 - 0 new Disapprove votes
 - 1 comment
 - 3 Disapprove votes associated with 28 Must Be Satisfied (MBS) comments maintained from former SA ballots
 - 1 Disapprove vote without MBS comments maintained from former SA ballots
- Comment resolution available here:
<https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/asdm-drafts/d2/802-1ASdm-d2-4-dis-v00.pdf>
- Recirculation ballot closes on July 18 with comment resolution in the regularly scheduled TSN TG meetings. A possible final recirculation in August/September if required with comment resolution in the regularly scheduled TSN TG meetings.



Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

- Voters with Disapprove votes with MBS comments:
 - Rodney Cummings
 - Benjamin Rolfe
 - Johannes Specht
- MBS comments associated with the Disapprove votes are on the following slides. They are from the [initial SA ballot on D2.0](#) and from the [2nd SA recirculation ballot on D2.3](#).

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

CI 5 SC 5.4.3 P19 L36 # I-18

Cummings, Rodney Keysight Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This conformance text is unclear, in that it does not answer the simple question: Is this required or optional?

The Merriam-Webster definition of "default" (for "computer" context) provides clarity: "a selection automatically used by a program in the absence of a choice made by the user".

Use of analogous text will clarify. There is no need to describe what sort of organization is permitted to override the default, because that is outside of the scope of IEEE Std 802.1AS (as with any default).

SuggestedRemedy

- Add the following as the first paragraph of 5.4.3: "The specifications of this subclause are defaults, in that they required in the absence of specifications to the contrary. A specification that normatively references IEEE Std 802.1AS can explicitly specify that this subclause is optional, or prohibited."

- Delete the first two paragraphs of the existing draft.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The current text is clear and very specific. The suggested remedy would remove specific elements of the existing text, which make it very clear how potential changes to the defaults should be handled.

CI 5 SC 5.4.3 P20 L9 # I-19

Cummings, Rodney Keysight Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

As specified in 14.2.20 of IEEE Std 802.1AS-2022, domainNumber is read/write. This conformance text does not specify what happens if domainNumber 0 is changed to a non-zero value, or vice-versa. One simple solution is to prohibit such a change.

SuggestedRemedy

Add

"h) For the PTP Instance with domainNumber of 0, the data set member defaultDS.domainNumber is read-only (not read-write as specified in 14.2.20)."

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

P802.1ASds/D0.2 allows domains with domainNumber other than 0 to have the properties of domain 0. This means that the domainNumber of domain 0 can be changed to another domain number in P802.1ASds/D0.2.

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

Cl 3	SC 3.4	P14	L7	# 1-22
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	R	
Unnecessary and inappropriate definition. Meaning of "default" is sufficiently clear. And it already appears numerous times in the IEEE Standards Dictionary, with sufficiently similar meaning. It is poor practice to redefine common words.				
New terms and definitions should be examined in consideration of: subject matter; existing terms in the IEEE Standards Dictionary Online and general-usage dictionaries; usage within other IEEE societies/IEEE SA committees; comparable international terms; usage in relevant literature; etc.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Delete 3.4				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
REJECT. The IEEE online standards dictionary has 3 definitions of "default", as indicated below. In addition, a dictionary search produces many more definitions (over 10). None of these definitions references a profile standard, which is important in the definition used here.				
default				
The choice used when no specification is given.				
FOUND IN				
IEEE 488.2 IEC 60488-2 First edition 2004-05				
When applied to attribute values and options means the configuration of a Precision Time Protocol device as it is delivered from the manufacturer. (IEEE Std 1588-2008)				
FOUND IN				
IEEE Std C37.238-2017 (Revision of IEEE Std C37.238-2011)				
When applied to attribute values and options of a PTP Instance, "default" means the configuration of a PTP Instance as it is delivered from the manufacturer.				
FOUND IN				
IEEE Std 1588-2019 (Revision of IEEE Std 1588-2008)				

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

CI 3 SC 3.7 P14 L10 # I-23

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Do not re-define common English words (epoch). Especially when the term is not used in this draft other than in what is essentially a self referential definition in 3.33.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 3.7 and 3.33

Response Response Status W

REJECT. The word "epoch" does not have a single definition in English. In some usages it refers to a period of time; in other uses it refers to the origin of a timescale. Here, the latter definition is the one used. The definition of "timescale" in this standard is consistent with the definition used in Metrology, and also with IEEE Std 1588-2019.

CI 3 SC 3.28 P14 L31 # I-24

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Clause 3 defines the term, not technical characteristics of the thing to which the term refers. Or other elaborative information. Definitions should not include references to other parts of the standard. Everything after the first period does not belong in the definition of the term.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete " (see 7.1.3 and 7.1.4 of IEEE Std 1588-2019). The value of 1 for the majorSdold is restricted to the PTP Profiles developed by the IEEE 802.1 Working Group (see 16.5 of IEEE Std 1588-2019)."

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the sentence:

"The value of 1 for the majorSdold is restricted to the PTP Profiles developed by the IEEE 802.1 Working Group (see 16.5 of IEEE Std 1588-2019)."

from 3.28.

CI 3 SC 3.33 P14 L37 # I-25

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This is terrible definition. The word "timescale" (or term "time scale") has a common, obvious meaning and this is not consistent with that - so it is going to cause confusion. Along with misusing the word "epoch" this only clouds, not clarifies. You should delete 3.33, and evaluate every use of "timescale" to determine if the use is consistent with what "time" and "scale" mean when combined.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete clause 3.33, remove "timescale" at every occurrence. Alternatively, withdraw the draft form balloting and withdraw the PAR.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. The definition of "timescale" is consistent with the definition of "timescale" used in Metrology, and also with IEEE Std 1588-2019. In addition, the word does not appear in the Dorset & Barber Webster's Unabridged Dictionary that the editor has, and Wikipedia gives 6 definitions (each for a different field). This indicates that "timescale", in fact, does not have a common obvious meaning that is universal; rather, its meaning depends on the particular field in which it is being used.

This standard and documents that refer to this standard benefit from the definition of timescale.

CI 4 SC 4 P15 L37 # I-26

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

Remove "QSDO", you don't need an acronym; after you fix 3.31 it will be used only once where the full term should be used.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete addition of QSDO

Response Response Status W

REJECT. QSDO is still used twice in 3.28. In addition, the current text is consistent with IEEE Std 1588-2019, clause 7.1.4.

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

CI 5	SC 5.4.1	P18	L34	# I-27
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status A		
It is not clear the need for Note 1. Enumerating what is not contained in this clause is of little help or usefulness. This clause does not contain puppies either, would we add a note for that? If the point is to help the reader find the GtpCapableIntervalSetting state machine, then we could just say that.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Change to "Note 1 - The GtpCapableIntervalSetting state machine is defined in 10.4.4)				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status W</i>		
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The note makes it clear to the reader that the omission of 10.4.4 was not a mistake; a reader might think this because 10.4.4 also describes a state machine that has "gPtpCapable" in its name.				
Replace NOTE 1 by:				
NOTE 1—5.4.1 h) does not include the GtpCapableIntervalSetting state machine (10.4.4), despite its name containing "GtpCapable."				

CI 7	SC 7.2.1	P21	L34	# I-28
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status A		
This seems like important information for implementers. As this states there are two such mechanisms, might we help by providing references to the clauses where those mechanisms are defined? Yes, the answer is yes, we can help. We could identify the mechanisms and provide cross references :-)				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Add cross references				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status W</i>		
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change the second sentence of this paragraph to read:				
"One of these time distribution mechanisms updates the distribution path in reaction to changes (see 10.3.1.2), whereas the other one relies on redundant PTP instances on top of the redundant network paths (see Clause 18)."				

CI 7	SC 7.2.3	P23	L42	# I-29
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	ER	Comment Status R		
I think you went the wrong way: rather than make this a NOTE it is better to delete this paragraph. What it was is not relevant; what it is is what it is.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Delete all of Note 2				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status W</i>		
REJECT. This note, and others like it, are for the convenience of readers of earlier versions of 802.1AS; the notes enable the reader to easily see what has changed in a figure. This can be very helpful in cases where the change to a figure relative to 802.1AS-2020, with the corrigendum, 802.1ASdr, and 802.1ASdn applied, is very minor.				

CI 8	SC 8.1	P30	L43	# I-30
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status A		
This is a very confusing statement but I think that there is a requirement implied which should be stated. This seems to define that a specific sdold value should be used by the PTP profile(s) specified in this standard. As is this is an information-free statement. If there is a requirement to use a particular sdold, so state, as a requirement (e.g. "The xyz value of ssdoid shall be used by the PTP profile specified in this standard"). Otherwise delete the sentence.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Delete sentence "Since the IEEE 802.1 Working Group has only one single unique sdold value, the PTP Profile specified in the present standard is isolated from other PTP Profiles (see 16.5.2 of IEEE Std 1588-2019)."				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status W</i>		
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
The normative requirements are contained in the two sentences on lines 25 and 26. However, the paragraph starting on line 43 would be more appropriately located right after line 26.				
Move the paragraph that reads:				
"Since the IEEE 802.1 Working Group has only one single unique sdold value, the PTP Profile specified in the present standard is isolated from other PTP Profiles (see 16.5.2 of IEEE Std 1588-2019)."				
which is currently on p.30, lines 43 and 44, to go right after line 26, as its own paragraph.				

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

Cl 10 SC 10.7.2.2 P82 L18 # 1-31

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The referenced text is present only because other unrelated text is added to the same subclause. The referenced text is not in scope for 802.1ASdm.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "A PTP Port may support any of the non-reserved values indicated in Table 10-17"

Response Response Status W

REJECT. The non-reserved values are those values not in the ranges [-127,-25] and [25,125]. However, the "other values" referred to on lines 18 - 19 refers to values other than 126 and 127, except for the values in the ranges [-127,-25] and [25,125]. However, it appears that there are no "shalls" for the values 126 and 127.

Also, it seems that this comment would apply to 11.5.2.2 (for the pdelay interval), 11.5.2.3 (for the Sync interval), 10.7.2.5 (for gPtpCapable message transmission interval. Given that all of this is base text and not part of what is being changed for 802.1ASdm, should this entire issue be deferred to the Revision?

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2.2 P115 L8 # 1-32

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"A port may support other values, except for the reserved values indicated in Table 10-15." is stating an optional requirement badly, or it is intending something else (stating a fact). I note this is in the base text but the group MAY fix it in an amendment and SHOULD fix it because it is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: A port may support any of the non-reserved values indicated in Table 10-15.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. The referenced text is present only because other unrelated text is added to the same subclause. The referenced text is not in scope for 802.1ASdm.

Cl 17 SC 17.6.2 P139 L51 # 1-33

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"Copyright release for YANG modules: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this subclause so that they can be used for their intended purpose" uses normative language "may" in a footnote which are informative. The intent seems clear that this is a statement of fact (permission is granted). [see footnote on page 13]

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

Copyright release for YANG modules: Users of this standard are granted permission to freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this subclause so that they can be used for their intended purpose

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g., in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group.

Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads:

"No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher."

Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in clause 17.6, the footnote:

"Copyright release for YANG: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this standard so that they can be used for their intended purpose."

The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in 802.1 base standards, e.g., IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022, and each of their subsequently published amendments. Similar notes for MIBs and PICS occur throughout 802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformance implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements. Footnote 9 in Clause 3 of the base standard reiterates this point: "Notes in text, tables, and figures are given for information only and do not contain requirements needed to implement the

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

CI 18	SC 18.5.1.1	P153	L23	# 1-34
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status A		
Item (d): this seems like it is stating a fact, not a requirement, so "may" is not the right word. "can" is a statement of fact.				
SuggestedRemedy				
Change "may" to "can"				
Response	Response Status W			
ACCEPT.				

CI A	SC A	P160	L53	# 1-35
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status R		

"Copyright release for PICS proformas: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the PICS proforma in this annex so that it can be used for its intended purpose and may further publish the completed PICS." is incorrect use of "may" (optional requirement) as (a) the intent is to grant copyright permission not state a requirement within scope of this standard, and (b) the user of this standard is out of scope of the requirements defined in this standard :-).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
Copyright release for PICS proformas: Users of this standard are granted permission to freely reproduce the PICS proforma in this annex so that it can be used for its intended purpose, and are granted permission to publish the completed PICS.

Response Response Status W

REJECT. Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g., in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group.

Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads:

"No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher."

Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in Annex A, the footnote:

"Copyright release for PICS proformas: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the PICS proforma in this annex so that it can be used for its intended purpose and may further publish the completed PICS."

The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in 802.1 base standards, e.g., IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022, and each of their subsequently published amendments. Similar notes for MIBs and PICS occur throughout 802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformant implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements. Footnote 9 in Clause 3 of the base standard reiterates this point: "Notes in text, tables, and figures are given for information only and do not contain requirements needed to implement the standard."

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

Cl 5 SC 5.4.3 P19 L44 # I-36

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

" should be identified in the PICS for that profile standard. Changes to defaults by pre-configuration of parameter values by the supplier of a protocol implementation should be identified by Additional Information (see A.3.1) in a completed PICS for this standard." is (sigh) incorrect use of should (normative recommendation). Which is very common, but still wrong. This is stating a desired action of the user of the standard who's behavior is out of scope of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "should" to "is expected to" (2 places in paragraph)

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities.

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.

Cl 18 SC 18.5.3 P174 L23 # I-37

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type ER Comment Status R

"Nevertheless," is extraneous and poor grammar.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Nevertheless,"

Response Response Status W

REJECT. This comment actually applies to p. 157, line 23. The use of "Nevertheless" here is grammatically correct. It is used to indicate that the action described subsequently in the sentence should be done even though the condition described in the previous sentence (i.e., that time synchronization performance is not required to meet the respective application or profile standard requirements) applies.

The use of "nevertheless" is explained (with examples) in the Merriam-Webster dictionary, which is the dictionary used by the IEEE for pre-publication of IEEE standards.

Cl A SC A P160 L3 # I-38

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

How can a "pro forma" be normative? It doesn't define requirements, it is simply a list of requirements defined elsewhere in the standard - it is a list of crossreferences and notations. Since it contains no normative requirements it is informative. Very useful and informative.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Informative

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Completion of the PICS is a normative requirement for claiming conformance to the standard, so the PICS is normative.



Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

Cl 10 SC 10.2.9.2.1 P44 L43 # I-39

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"NOTE 2—currentTime (10.2.4.19) and localTime (10.2.4.19) may not always be equal, " is an incorrect use of "may" in a note (notes are informative, "may" is normative language). If this is stating an optional requirement it can not be in a note. If this is a statement of fact, "may" is the wrong word.

SuggestedRemedy

Change first part of the sentence to "NOTE 2—it is possible that currentTime (10.2.4.19) and localTime (10.2.4.19) are not equal, "

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 17 SC 17.2 P132 L49 # I-40

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

" It should be noted" is an instruction to the reader (user of the standard) and not a normative requirement (recommendation) and thus misuse of "should". This is clearly informative text (and probably unneeded as it is stating an intention of the authors of the standard). Could delete the sentence with no harm done.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "It should be noted that the " to "This" and it's no longer wrong.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2 P19 L21 # I-103

Specht, Johannes Self Employed

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The base standard (IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020) denotes acronym "gPTP" when referring to IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020, and "PTP" when referring to IEEE Std 1588[-2019] at major places at very high level.

- Clause 4
- 7.1
- 7.2
- 7.3
- 7.5
- 8.1

The name of the YANG model corresponding to the base standard (802.1AS) is likewise a high level indication, but it suggests that the module is from IEEE1588, not IEEE 802.1AS, because it ends with "ptp" instead of "gptp". Therefore, the module for 802.1ASdn should be renamed, and a similar comment has already been made against P802.1ASdn/D2.0. This comment against P802.1ASdm is on changing references from the P802.1ASdm to P802.1ASdn within P802.1ASdm accordingly.

SuggestedRemedy

a) Change module name "ieee802-dot1as-ptp" to "ieee802-dot1as-gptp" (i.e., gptp instead of ptp), and change all associated "ptp" strings in identifiers to "gptp" when 802.1AS is meant throughout the YANG file and the document, including figures.

Particular instances for changing "ieee802-dot1as-ptp" :

- line 21 on page 19
- line 11 on page 132
- line 13 on page 132
- line 27 on page 132
- line 9 on page 133
- line 5 on page 134
- line 21 on page 138
- line 33 on page 139
- line 22 on page 164

Instances for changing "dot1as-ptp" to "gptp":

- line 34 on page 139
- line 38 on page 144
- line 25 on page 146
- line 35 on page 146

b) Change "ieee802-dot1as-ptp.yang" to "ieee802-dot1as-hs.yang" in line 36 on page 138

c) Regenerate the tree shown in 17.2.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

a) Change "ieee802-dot1as-ptp" to "ieee802-dot1as-gptp" :

- line 21 on page 19
- line 11 on page 132
- line 13 on page 132
- line 27 on page 132
- line 9 on page 133
- line 5 on page 134
- line 21 on page 138
- line 33 on page 139
- line 22 on page 164

b) Change "dot1as-ptp" to "dot1as-gptp":

- line 34 on page 139
- line 38 on page 144
- line 25 on page 146
- line 35 on page 146

c) Change "ieee802-dot1as-ptp.yang" to "ieee802-dot1as-hs.yang" in line 36 on page 138

d) Regenerate the tree shown in 17.2.

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

CI 3	SC 3.14	P17	L15	# R2-7
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	R	
This note is describing a technical characteristic of the Grandmaster PTP Instance (what isn't a Grandmaster PTP instance) which does not belong in the definitions clause.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Delete note.				
Response		Response Status	W	
REJECT.				
This amendment follows the practice in the base standard, which has notes to multiple definitions.				

CI 3	SC 3.23	P17	L19	# R2-8
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	A	
The second sentence and the NOTE in this definition are information about the thing to which the term refers, and not part of the definition of the term.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Delete "The peer-to-peer delay mechanism is designed to measure the propagation time over such a link." and "NOTE—A PTP Link between PTP Ports of PTP Instances is also a gPTP Ccommunication Ppath (see 3.11)."				
Response		Response Status	W	
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
Remove the change being made by this amendment to 3.23 of the base standard.				

CI 3	SC 3.28	P17	L31	# R2-9
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	R	
Way to much information for the definition of a term, references to the standard, and other inappropriate information for clause 3 definitions of the term.				
Each definition should be a brief, self-contained description of the term in question and shall not contain any other information, such as requirements or elaborative text. The term should not be used in its own definition. Definitions should not include references to other par				

<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Replace with: "3.28 sdold: An attribute that is the primary mechanism for providing isolation of PTP Instances operating under a PTP Profile."				
Response		Response Status	W	
REJECT.				
Text that had been part of this definition, in D2.0, was moved to 8.1, with some editing there. The sentence currently reads:				
"sdold: An attribute that is the primary mechanism for providing isolation of PTP Instances operating under a PTP Profile specified by one Qualified Standards Development Organization (QSDO) from PTP Instances operating under a PTP Profile specified by a different QSDO (see 7.1.3 and 7.1.4 of IEEE Std 1588-2019)."				
The proposal is to remove the final part of the sentence so that the text would read:				
"sdold: An attribute that is the primary mechanism for providing isolation of PTP Instances operating under a PTP Profile."				
However, the text that would be removed is essential to the definition, as it restricts what type of isolation is being talked about. The isolation is not just any isolation; it is specifically isolation of the profile from another profile specified by a different QSDO (and not, for example, isolation from another profile specified by the same QSDO).				

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

Cl 17 SC 17 P149 L52 # **R2-10**

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type GR Comment Status R

Use of "may" in a footnote. "May" defines an optional requirement within the scope of this standard. This is granting the user of the standard a permission. "May" is the wrong word in the context of a standard. Also extra words.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: Users of this standard are granted permission to reproduce the YANG models contained in this subclause.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g., in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group.

Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads:

"No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher."

Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in clause 17.6, the footnote:

"Copyright release for YANG: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this standard so that they can be used for their intended purpose."

The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in 802.1 base standards, e.g., IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022, and each of their subsequently published amendments. Similar notes for MIBs and PICS occur throughout 802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformant implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements. Footnote 9 in Clause 3 of the base standard reiterates this point: "Notes in text, tables, and figures are given for information only and do not contain requirements needed to implement the standard."

Cl A SC A P169 L53 # **R2-11**

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"May" in a footnote (use of normative language in an informative statement).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Users of this standard are granted permission to reproduce this PICS proforma and publish completed PICS based on this proforma."

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g., in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group.

Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads:

"No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher."

Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in Annex A, the footnote:

"Copyright release for PICS proformas: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the PICS proforma in this annex so that it can be used for its intended purpose and may further publish the completed PICS."

The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in 802.1 base standards, e.g., IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022, and each of their subsequently published amendments. Similar notes for MIBs and PICS occur throughout 802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformant implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements. Footnote 9 in Clause 3 of the base standard reiterates this point: "Notes in text, tables, and figures are given for information only and do not contain requirements needed to implement the standard."

Supporting Information P802.1ASdm

CI A SC A P169 L3 # R2-12

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This annex is a proforma - a blank form to be used by an implementer of this standard. It cannot contain requirements, it is a form to be completed. It is informative.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "normative" to "informative"

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities.

This Annex is normative because it specifies the requirement that a supplier of an implementation *shall* complete a PICS to make a claim of conformance to this standard. A normative PICS is an important and well established part of IEEE 802 standards and their adoption by ISO going back (at least) to IEEE Std 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 normative 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.


Motion

- Approve sending P802.1ASdn to RevCom
- Approve CSD documentation in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/20/ec-20-0202-00-ACSD-p802-1asdn.pdf>
- P802.1ASdn D2.2 had 94% approval at the end of the last SA ballot

- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Johannes Specht
 - Sending draft (y/n/a): 37, 2, 1
 - CSD (y/n/a): 34, 1, 3
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

- SA ballot closed: 5 July 2024
- All SA ballot requirements are met
- The ballot resulted in
 - 0 comments
 - 0 new Disapprove votes
 - 3 Disapprove votes maintained from former SA ballot, associated with 17 Must Be Satisfied (MBS) comments
- Comment resolution available here:
<https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/asdn-drafts/d2/802-1ASdn-d2-2-dis-v01.pdf>



Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

- Voters with Disapprove votes with MBS comments:
 - Benjamin Rolfe
 - Glenn Parsons
 - Johannes Specht
- MBS comments associated with the Disapprove votes are on the following slides. They are from the [initial SA ballot](#) on [D2.0](#) and from the [1st SA recirculation ballot](#) on [D2.1](#).

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

Cl 2 SC 2 P18 L3 # I-5

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

802d does not appear to be properly cited in text (in either amendment or in base standard).

SuggestedRemedy
Delete from clause 2 and move to bibliography

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add the following to line 29 of page 22:

"The YANG framework applies hierarchy in the following areas:
a) The uniform resource name (URN), as specified in IEEE Std 802d-2017.
b) The YANG objects form a hierarchy of configuration and operational data structures that define the YANG model."

Cl 2 SC 2 P18 L8 # I-6

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

RFC 7950 is not a normative reference. It is not cited in normative context in this standard. It is already listed (correctly) in the bibliography

SuggestedRemedy
Remove from Clause 2.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
a) Remove item B45 in Annex H.

Cl 4 SC 4 P19 L1 # I-7

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Neither NETCONF nor UML are expanded at first use. NETCONF is being used as a proper name (referring to the specific protocol defined in (IETF RFC 6241) and thus is not an acronym nor abbreviation in this standard.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove NETFONC from clause 4; Use full term at first use of UML.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
a)Change "Examples of YANG-based remote network management protocols include NETCONF (IETF RFC 6241 [B41]) and RESTCONF (IETF RFC 8040 [B46])." in line 8f. On page 22 to "YANG-based remote network management protocols include the Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF) [B41] and RESTCONF [B46]."
b)Change item b) on page 22 to read "Provides an overview of the hierarchy of the data models using a representation similar to the Unified Modeling Language (UML) (17.2)"

Cl 17 SC 17.1.1 P22 L47 # I-8

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

" This import makes existing and new IEEE Std 1588 YANG capabilities not specifically addressed by the present standard available to its implementors without delay, without the need to revise or amend IEEE Std 802.1AS." is confusing and perhaps technically incorrect.

In 17.1 it states "Clause 14 specifies the information model for management of this standard" strongly suggesting that the features/components/functions of the YANG models are tied directly to the features/components/functions for management of this standard defined clause 14 of this standard. Now here we say that stuff will just appear when 1588 changes without any new features/components/functions being added to 802.1AS. How does that actually work? Does this "import" make new stuff magically appear in IEEE Std 802.1AS, completely outside of the 802 and IEEE-SA standards development process?

SuggestedRemedy
Delete sentence from note.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete "This import makes existing and new IEEE Std 1588 YANG capabilities not specifically addressed by the present standard available to its implementors without delay, without the need to revise or amend

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

CI 17 SC 17.3 P28 L42 # L-9
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type GR Comment Status A

The footnote on page 28 is confusing. Firstly it appears to be a footnote to Table 17-1 (which then means it is normative, and it contains no normative information so that's one thing). The actual message is OK, but to what does it actually apply? It doesn't seem to have anything to do with Table 17-1 nor to the structure of the YANG models (clause 17.3). Table 17-1 identifies only one amendment to an IEEE Standard (1588e) which is cited, explicitly by dated reference, as a normative reference (and since date is given as 20xx we conclude this is a current amendment not yet completed). So the content of the footnote doesn't help with clarifying Table 17-1 at all. Perhaps this was intended to apply somewhere else? Perhaps to the YANG module defined in 17.6? Ah but the only reference given here is to IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020. The only other amendment mentioned is 802.1ASdr (which is identified as amended by this amendment so not really relevant to this footnote). So the footnote appears to be promising something that is not delivered.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the footnote. Alternately, find the a standard to which it applies and move it there.

Response Response Status W
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the footnote.

CI 17 SC 17.4 P30 L14 # L-10
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type ER Comment Status A

"The Network Configuration Access Control Model (NACM) " The acronym NACM does not appear anywhere else in this standard and so is not necessary nor helpful.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove (NACM)

Response Response Status W
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change
"Network Configuration Access Control Model (NACM) ([B43])" to
"Network Configuration Access Control Model [B43]"

CI 17 SC 17.4 P30 L29 # L-11
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
Comment Type GR Comment Status R

"Write operations (e.g., edit-config) to these data nodes without proper protection can have a negative effect on network operations. Specifically, an inappropriate configuration of them may adversely impact a PTP synchronization network. For example, loss of synchronization on a clock, accuracy degradation on a set of clocks, or even break down of a whole synchronization network."

While stating the obvious - writing the wrong configuration values might break the network - this provides only raises questions. What is "proper protection"? Earlier in this clause it clearly states whatever it is, it is not defined in this standard. Is the intention of listing some but not all writable data nodes to indicate these are the most susceptible to causing catastrophic failure? To provide guidance to a malicious actor on how best to disrupt the network? Does that mean write operations to other nodes need not have "proper protection" - would no protection (or improper protection) be acceptable in all other cases? Seems unlikely.

It appears this clause in int's entirety only says security is important and this standard doesn't address how to provide security, which could be one sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace text in this clause with: "This standard does not address security of the protocols and management systems that use the YANG module specified in this standard."

Response Response Status W

REJECT.
Security considerations similar to these are found in other IEEE 802.1 Standards.

Purpose of 17.4 is to encourage implementers and users of this standard to consider security matters, rather than specifying mechanism available to enforce them/mechanisms that are not part of this standard.

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

CI 17	SC 17.6	P33	L3	# I-12
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
<i>Comment Type</i>	TR	<i>Comment Status</i> A		
<p>"Although not formally specified by this standard, the YANG module specified by IEEE Std 1588e (ieee1588-ptp.yang) serves as the foundation of the YANG module specified in this clause."</p> <p>But it kind of is formally specified in this standard, several places, that parts of IEEE Std 1588e are included as normative content.</p> <p>Also what does "formally specified" mean? Are there requirements that are informally specified? I find no such differentiation in the IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual.</p>				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Delete "Although not formally specified by this standard"				
<i>Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i> W			
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change "Although not formally specified by this standard, the" to "The".				

CI 17	SC 17.6	P33	L1	# I-13
Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates		
<i>Comment Type</i>	TR	<i>Comment Status</i> R		
<p>Footnote 1: incorrect use of "may" in an IEEE standard. May defines an optional requirement within the scope of this standard. This direction is clearly out of scope of this standard.</p>				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Replace "may freely" with "is free to"				
<i>Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i> W			
REJECT. Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g. in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group. Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads: "No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher." Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in clause 17.6, the footnote: "Copyright release for YANG: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the YANG modules contained in this standard so that they can be used for their intended purpose." A copyright release has legal implications that the ballot resolution committee is not competent to address. The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in other 802.1 standards (e.g., IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022 and each of its subsequently published amendments). Similar notes for MIBs and PICS occur in the base standard (IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 and each of its subsequently published amendment and corrigendum) and throughout 802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformant implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements.				

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

CI Annex A SC ex A P57 L3 # [REDACTED]

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

How can a PICS proforma be normative? It does not (can not) define requirements. By definition it contains only a list of requirements defined elsewhere in the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Admit that the PICS proforma is informative

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Per the 2021 IEEE SA Standards Style Manual, normative text is information that is required to implement the standard and is therefore necessary to determine conformance with the standard. Informative text is provided for information only and is therefore not necessary to determine conformance with the standard.

The BRC interprets this as indication that Annex A is normative, which similarly holds for PICS annexes of other 802.1 Standards, including the base Standard.

CI Annex A SC ex A P57 L53 # [REDACTED]

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

Footnote: Improper use of normative language, "may", which defines optional requirements within the scope of this standard. This statement applies to users of this standard (well outside the scope). What is meant is to grant permissions, not define a requirement

SuggestedRemedy

Change "may freely" to "is free to" or "is granted permission to" and delete "may further".

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

Each IEEE 802 standard properly contains (in addition to the mandatory, optional, and recommended requirements for implementations for which conformance to the standard is to be claimed) requirements on the use of the standard and related activities. The terms "shall", "may", and "should" are also used in these additional requirements, e.g. in the frontmatter of each standard, following the heading "Important Notices and Disclaimers concerning the use of IEEE Standards." This frontmatter and preceding text common to all IEEE Standards is not within the scope of this ballot and cannot be changed by the Comment Resolution Group. Of particular relevance to the present comment is the footnote text on the title page reverse, which reads:

"No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher."

Accordingly this proposed standard includes, in Annex A, the footnote:

"Copyright release for PICS proformas: Users of this standard may freely reproduce the PICS proforma in this annex so that it can be used for its intended purpose and may further publish the completed PICS.."
A copyright release has legal implications that the ballot resolution committee is not competent to address.

The text of this footnote has been previously agreed with "the publisher", i.e. in this case the IEEE, and is exactly as it appears in the base standard (IEEE Std 802.1AS-2020 and each of its subsequently published amendment and corrigendum). A copyright release has legal implications that the ballot resolution committee is not competent to address. Similar notes for YANG, MIBs and PICS occur throughout

802.1 and other IEEE 802 Standards including 802.3. In each case "may" is used to match the use of "may" in the footnote on the title page reverse. Since this text is in a footnote it is clearly distinguished from requirements for conformant implementations, because footnotes do not contain such requirements.

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

CI 17 SC 17.4 P30 L30 # L-17

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR *Comment Status* A

Incorrect use of normative language, "may". This is stating a possibility, not an optional requirement defined in this standard. This is either "can" or "will" depending on the certainty. Since it is possible that an implementation protects from misconfiguration, this should be "can" (it can happen but is not assured to happen).

SuggestedRemedy
Change "may" to "can".

Response *Response Status* W

ACCEPT.

CI 17 SC 17.2 P23 L28 # L-18

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR *Comment Status* A

Incorrect use of normative language: "should". Should is a normative word to describe recommend behaviors or actions defined in this standard. Not what is meant here. This is an informative comment drawing attention to something. The "it should be noted that" is extraneous and incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "It should be noted that".

Response *Response Status* W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "It should be noted that the" to "The".

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

Cl 17	SC 17.6.1	P33	L6	# I-23
Specht, Johannes		Self		
<i>Comment Type</i>	TR	<i>Comment Status</i>	A	
Change module name to "ieee802-dot1as-gptp" (i.e., gptp instead of ptp), and change all associated "ptp" strings in identifiers to "gptp" when 802.1AS is meant throughout the YANG file and the document, including the figures.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Per comment.				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i>	U	
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
a) Change string "ieee802-dot1as-tp" to "ieee802-dot1as-gptp" throughout the document.				
b) Change "dot1as-tp" in line 11 on page 33 to "dot1as-gptp".				

Cl 17	SC 17.6.1	P33	L15	# I-24
Parsons, Glenn		Ericsson AB		
<i>Comment Type</i>	TR	<i>Comment Status</i>	A	
There is no ieee1588-tp YANG module. It is ieee1588-tp-tt or ieee1588-tp-ms				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Change to the desired one to import from, presumably ieee1588-tp-tt and ensure augments are still correct.				
<i>Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i>	W	
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
a) Change "ieee1588-tp" to "ieee1588-tp-tt" at the following locations (15 overall):				
- page 22, line 46				
- page 23, line 5				
- page 23, line 40				
- page 23, line 53				
- page 24, line 2				
- page 24, line 4				
- page 24, line 11				
- page 25, line 4				
- page 29, line 7				
- page 33, line 4				
- page 33, line 15				
- page 38, line 52				
- page 39, line 4				
- page 39, line 11				
- page 51, line 23				
b) Delete NOTE 4 on page 26				
c) In Figure 17-1, replace "acceptable-master-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-ds", and replace "acceptable-master-port-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-port-ds".				
D) In Figure 17-2, replace "offset-from-master" with "offset-from-time-transmitter", and replace "acceptable-master-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-ds".				
E) In Figure 17-3, replace "acceptable-master-port-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-port-ds".				
F) In 17.4, replace "acceptable-master-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-ds", and replace "acceptable-master-port-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-port-ds".				

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

Cl 17	SC 17.1.1	P22	L46	#	[-25]
Parsons, Glenn		Ericsson AB			
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status A			
There is no ieee1588-p2p YANG module. In P1588e D1.4 it is ieee1588-ntp-ms.yang and ieee1588-ntp-tt.yang					
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>					
Change ieee1588-ntp to ieee1588-ntp-tt					
Optionally add some background indicating that there are two modules in P1588e					
Also update the multiple instances in this clause to the correct YANG model reference					
Response	Response Status W				
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.					
a) Change "ieee1588-ntp" to "ieee1588-ntp-tt" at the following locations (15 overall):					
- page 22, line 46					
- page 23, line 5					
- page 23, line 40					
- page 23, line 53					
- page 24, line 2					
- page 24, line 4					
- page 24, line 11					
- page 25, line 4					
- page 29, line 7					
- page 33, line 4					
- page 33, line 15					
- page 38, line 52					
- page 39, line 4					
- page 39, line 11					
- page 51, line 23					
b) Delete NOTE 4 on page 26					
c) In Figure 17-1, replace "acceptable-master-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-ds", and replace "acceptable-master-port-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-port-ds".					
D) In Figure 17-2, replace "offset-from-master" with "offset-from-time-transmitter", and replace "acceptable-master-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-ds".					
E) In Figure 17-3, replace "acceptable-master-port-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-port-ds".					
F) In 17.4, replace "acceptable-master-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-ds", and replace "acceptable-master-port-ds" with "acceptable-time-transmitter-port-ds".					

Supporting Information P802.1ASdn

Cl 17 SC 17.6.1 P53 L53 # R1-2

Parsons, Glenn Ericsson AB

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

There is no ASCII version of IEEE Std 1588

SuggestedRemedy

Change footnote 3 to:

An ASCII version of IEEE Std 1588 YANG module can be obtained from
<https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/main/standard/ieee/published/1588>

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

a) Change footnote 3 on page 33 to: "An ASCII version of the IEEE Std 1588 YANG module can be obtained from
<https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/main/standard/ieee/published/1588>."

b) Change the first sentence on page 33 line 3 to read "The ieee1588-ptp-tt.yang YANG module3 specified by IEEE Std 1588e serves as the foundation of the YANG module specified in this clause.", where "3" is the attachment point of footnote 3.

802.1 Motions 2024-07

Consent Agenda

Liaisons and external
communications (ME)

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/liaison-response-itu-t-SG13-LS156-DetermNetwrking-0724-v01.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 “Procedure for public statements to government bodies”
- In the WG, Proposed: János Farkas, Second: Jessy Rouyer
- (y/n/a): 34, 0, 3
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons, Second: David Law

Motion

- Approve submission of the comment responses to SC6 for ballot comments received on IEEE Std 802.1Q-2022 and IEEE Std 802f-2023
 - <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/liaison-randall-SC6CommentResponse8021Q-0724.pdf>
 - <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/liaison-randall-SC6CommentResponse802f-0724.pdf>
- In the WG, Proposed: Mark Hantel Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending responses (y/n/a): 34, 0, 4
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: David Law

Motion

- Approve submission of the following drafts when SA ballot starts to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 for information:
 - IEEE P802.1Qdy, IEEE P802.1DG
- In the WG, Proposed: Mark Hantel Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending drafts (y/n/a): 37, 0, 1
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: David Law

Motion

- Approve submission of the following drafts when published to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 for adoption under the PSDO agreement:
 - IEEE 802.1DC, IEEE 802.1ASdm, IEEE 802.1ASdn
- In the WG, Proposed: Mark Hantel Second: Karen Randall
 - Sending drafts (y/n/a): 38, 0, 1
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: David Law

Motion

- Approve the YANG blog post in <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/new-blogpost-IEEESA-YANG-blog-0724.pdf>, to be released with editorial changes as deemed necessary.
- In the WG, Proposed: Stephan Kehrer, Second: Karen Randall
 - (y/n/a): 32, 2, 6
- In EC, mover: Glenn Parsons Second: David Law

802.1 Motions

2024-03

Consent Agenda

Liaisons and external communications (II)

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/liaison-response-LNI40-access-to-drafts-0724-v01.pdf> as communication to Lab Network Industrie 4.0 (LNI 4.0), granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
- Proposed: János Farkas
- Second: Marcel Kiessling
- In the WG (y/n/a): 32, 0, 5
- In the EC, for information (or motion to block)

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/liaison-response-RAP-MSRP-backwards-compatibility-AvnuAlliance-0724-v01.pdf> as communication to Avnu Alliance, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
- Proposed: János Farkas
- Second: Don Pannell
- In the WG (y/n/a): 36, 0, 3
- In the EC, for information (or motion to block)

Motion

- Approve <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2024/liaison-response-BroadbandForum-YANG-0724-v01.pdf> as communication to Broadband Forum, granting the IEEE 802.1 WG chair (or his delegate) editorial license.
- Proposed: Stephan Kehrer
- Second: Jessy Rouyer
- In the WG (y/n/a): 36, 0, 3
- In the EC, for information (or motion to block)