

**IEEE 802.1Qbf Editor's Report
November 2009 Plenary Meeting
Atlanta, Georgia, USA**

Bob Sultan (bsultan@huawei.com)

802.1Qbf Draft 0.0 Task Group Ballot

Ballot Results

Approve	4
Disapprove	6
Abstain	37
Total	47
Commenters	7

Comments Submitted

	Required	Not Required	Total
Technical	29	3	32
Editorial	29	7	36
Total	58	10	68

Summary of Proposed Dispositions

- Comment 25: Scope statement proposed by Steve Haddock is modification of Qay scope (comment 25):
 - a) Enables construction of active topologies by an external agent that is responsible for setting up Ethernet Switched Paths (ESPs) by splitting the B-VID space between distributed spanning tree protocols and provisioned control.
 - b) Supports discard of frames with unknown destination addresses for B-VIDs under provisioned control.
 - c) Supports the operation of Continuity Check, Loopback, and Linktrace protocols on provisioned traffic engineered paths.
 - d) Supports 1:1 end-to-end protection switching capable of load sharing for Traffic Engineered service instances.
 - e) Supports localized protection of selected Traffic Engineered Service Instances (TESIs) traversing a common sequence of Provider Network Ports.
 - f) Provides required extension to SNMP management by SMIPv2 MIB modules.
 - Propose accepting 25, which would make the following comments 'accept in principle' as the subject text would be deleted: 43, 5, 8, 24, 69, 68;

Proposed dispositions

- Editorial comments with which the editor is in agreement: 5, 6, 10, 12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 43, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 66, 67, 94, 95, 105, 109, 110, 112;
- Comment 7: Panos suggests changing use of 'Bridge Relay' to 'Bridge'. Intended meaning was 'MAC Relay Entity' which is used in 802.1Q-2005. Objections?
- Comment 9, 108, 111: It is a list of TESIs, rather than a list of ESPs, that is associated with an IPG. Objections?
- Comment 70: The text does not make it clear that the definitions of SEB, SIB, SEP, and SIP are relative to a particular IPG. (see comment) Results in 'accept in principle' for comment 46, 98, 99, 2; everyone agree with wording?
- Comment 19 (propose 'accept in principle'): MIBs will be added when the text is more mature. Contributions are solicited. Where applicable will use Qay end-to-end protection as 'template';
- Comment 11: Use 'infrastructure segment' or 'segment' throughout text?
- Comment 1: Clarify meaning of 'connectivity failure';

Proposed dispositions

- Comment 97: The editor plans to follow this rule for acronyms: *If an acronym is used, it is used in all cases, except the first time it is used in the text. In this first use, the expansion appears, followed by the acronym in parentheses. The acronym will also appear in the acronym list.* The editor will revise the document to conform to this rule. Objections?
- Comment 4, 47, 48, 55, 101, 102: Wording issues;
- Comments 13, 14, 73: It is not clear how an IS MA is provisioned. Editor will supply text for this and related issues in next draft. Contributions are solicited.
- Comment 96, 100, 103 : Various rejections for review;
- Comment 18: Rejected; suggests that clause 26 is not normative;
- Comment 56, 3, 15: Protection behavior issues;
- Comment 17, 20, 26: Policy on 'reproducing' state machines;
- Comment 16: Clarification as to whether operation example is, or is not, needed.
- Comments 71 and 72: verify that this is just an editorial problem with the figure;
- Comment 106, 107, 50 (104): various requests to clarify text; editor agrees; objections?

Going Forward

- Expect to issue next draft in time for completion of task group ballot before January meeting;
- Next version to include state machines;
- Plan to ask for authorization at this meeting to go to WG ballot before March Plenary if there is consensus that draft is ready;