802.1 Motions and supporting materials for EC - 11/2009
MOTION

802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1aj to RevCom.

- Proposed: Haddock   Second: Messenger
- For: 32   Against: 0   Abstain: 0
- EC proposed: Jeffree   Second:
P802.1aj supporting material

- The Sponsor ballot on Draft 4.0 closed on 19th August 2009. There were two Disapproval ballots, and a number of comments were submitted. The 802.1 Working Group considered the comments and generated a disposition of comments and instructions to the Editor to change the draft; Draft D4.2 was generated as a result, and was issued for a Recirculation ballot, the recirculation closing on 14th October 2009. The recirculation ballot closed with 100% approval, and no further comments were received. The draft submitted for approval is D4.2.
MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1Qav to RevCom.
- Proposed: Fuller Second: Garner
- For: 22 Against: 0 Abstain: 2
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
P802.1Qav has now undergone a full Sponsor Ballot and a subsequent recirculation ballot. The Sponsor ballot on Draft 6.0 closed on 19th August 2009. There were nine Disapproval ballots, and a number of comments were submitted. The 802.1 Working Group considered the comments and generated a disposition of comments and instructions to the Editor to change the draft; Draft D7.0 was generated as a result, and was issued for a Recirculation ballot, the recirculation closing on 20th October 2009. The recirculation ballot closed with 96% approval, one outstanding disapprove vote, and eleven additional comments from the remaining disapprove voter (Geoff Thompson). His comments were addressed by the ballot resolution committee as follows:

- Comment #1 was considered to be a re-statement of the commenter's comment #67 on the D6.0 ballot; as such there is no requirement for this comment to be recirculated.
- Comments #2, #4, #5, #6, #7, and #8 are statements that previous comments on D6.0 have been addressed satisfactorily and do not propose any changes to the draft; therefore there is no requirement for these comments to be recirculated.
- Comment #3 was considered to be out of scope of the recirculation ballot, as it addresses procedural issues rather than the draft itself. Therefore, in accordance with the IEEE-SA SB OpMan 5.4.3.2, this comment need not be addressed in the current ballot, and will not be recirculated.
- Comment #9 was considered to be out of scope of the recirculation, as it was a comment on text that was unchanged from the D6.0 ballot and was not the subject of any comments in that ballot. However, as proposed in the suggested remedy, and in accordance with the IEEE-SA SB OpMan 5.4.3.2, this comment will be referred to the publications editor, and the comment will not be recirculated.
- Comment #10 was considered to be out of scope of the recirculation, as it was a comment on text that was unchanged from the D6.0 ballot and was not the subject of any comments in that ballot. However, as the comment was considered to be entirely editorial in nature, and in accordance with the IEEE-SA SB OpMan 5.4.3.2, this comment will be referred to the publications editor, and the comment will not be recirculated.
- Comment #11 was considered to be out of scope of the recirculation ballot, as it addresses issues the commenter has with the way the myBallot system operates. Therefore, in accordance with the IEEE-SA SB OpMan 5.4.3.2, this comment need not be addressed in the current ballot, and will not be recirculated.

Given the above, and as no changes to the draft are being made as a result of these comments, the ballot resolution committee decided not to run a further recirculation ballot. Draft 7.0 is therefore the draft being submitted for approval.
P802.1Qav supporting material (2)

- Comments and rebuttals:
MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1AR to RevCom.
- Proposed: Seaman Second:
- For: 23 Against: 0 Abstain: 4
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
P802.1AR – supporting material:

- P802.1AR has now undergone a full Sponsor Ballot and a subsequent recirculation ballot.

- The Sponsor ballot on Draft D2.1 closed on 19th August 2009. There were three Disapproval ballots, and a number of comments were submitted. The 802.1 Working Group considered the comments and generated a disposition of comments and instructions to the Editor to change the draft; Draft D2.3 was generated as a result, and was issued for a Recirculation ballot, the recirculation closing on 20th October 2009. The recirculation ballot closed with 100% approval, and three comments from the Editorial staff, one of which was a duplicate comment, so there were effectively only 2 comments to address. In both cases, the comments referred to the use of “shall” in the text of informative NOTES; as can be seen from the dispositions of these comments as posted in the myBallot database, the text of these NOTES was intended to draw attention to identical normative text elsewhere in the document, and not to create additional normative requirements. The ballot resolution committee considers that, in both cases, replacement of “shall” with “is” could be made without having any effect on the technical content of the document. We have therefore proposed that these comments, and their proposed resolutions, should be passed to the Staff Editor assigned to the project for consideration rather than holding up the submission process for a further recirculation. I have discussed this course of action with Michelle Turner, and from her response I believe that this will be acceptable to the Editorial staff.

- Comments and dispositions are here:
MOTION

- 802.1 requests approval of the EC to forward P802.1X-REV to RevCom.
- Proposed: Seaman Second: congdon
- For: 24 Against: 0 Abstain: 2
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
P802.1X-Rev – Supporting material:

- P802.1X Revision has now undergone a full Sponsor Ballot and a subsequent recirculation ballot.
- The Sponsor ballot on Draft 4.0 closed on 23rd August 2009. There were eight Dis approval ballots, and a number of comments were submitted. The 802.1 Working Group considered the comments and generated a disposition of comments and instructions to the Editor to change the draft; Draft D4.5 was generated as a result, and was issued for a Recirculation ballot, the recirculation closing on 20th October 2009. The recirculation ballot closed with 96% approval, three outstanding disapprove votes, and six additional comments from two of the disapprove voters. The ballot resolution committee considered these six comments to be editorial in nature, and in the case of two of the comments that referred to supposed ambiguity in the text, the BRC referred the comments to a member of the editorial staff who confirmed the BRC view that there was no ambiguity. The BRC has therefore referred all six comments to the editorial staff for their consideration during final editing of the document before publication rather than running a further recirculation ballot.
- The comments and rebuttals are here:
MOTION

- 802.1 requests conditional approval of the EC to forward P802.1Qat to Sponsor ballot.
- Proposed: Fuller Second: Garner
- For: 21 Against: 0 Abstain: 9
- EC proposed: Jeffree Second:
P802.1Qat supporting material:

- WG Recirculation ballot closed
- Approve 13 (81.25%)
- Disapprove 3 (18.75%)
- Abstain 38 (70.37%)
- No. of Voters 99
- Voters responding 54 (54.55%)
- One “No” voter has indicated that his vote is now Approve, so 2 outstanding “No” votes and 87.5% approval
- Pat Thaler has one outstanding comment (#31) and Glenn Parsons 2 outstanding comments (#33, #34) – comments are here:
MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward the draft PAR for 802.1Qbg Edge Virtual Bridging to NesCom. The PAR text and 5C text are:


- Proposed: thaler
- Second: gray
  - For: 26
  - Against: 0
  - Abstain: 3
MOTION

- 802.1 requests EC approval to forward the draft PAR for 802.1Qbh Bridge Port Extension to NesCom. The PAR text and 5C text are:


- Proposed: thaler
- Second: congdon
  - For: 17
  - Against: 0
  - Abstain: 3
MOTION

802.1 requests EC approval to forward the PAR modification for 802.1Qaz Enhanced Transmission Selection to NesCom


(There were no changes to the 5C)

- Proposed: thaler
- Second: gray
  - For: 20
  - Against: 0
  - Abstain: 4
Motions

- 802.1 approves the response to the interpretation request on Loopback Response error reporting.
  

- Proposed: Haddock  Second:  Finn
- For: 20  Against: 0  Abstain: 8

- EC approves forwarding of this response
- Proposed: Jeffree Second:
Motions

- 802.1 approves the response to the interpretation request on Linktrace Message reception, forwarding and replying.
  

- Proposed: Haddock  Second:  Finn
- For: 20   Against:  0   Abstain:  12

- EC approves forwarding of this response
  Proposed:  Jeffree Second:
MOTION

- 802.1 approves the liaison letter to the MEF regarding MA name formats:

- Proposed: Haddock    Second: Messenger
- For: 28    Against: 0    Abstain: 7
Motion

- Proposed: Fuller    Second: Garner
- For: 17    Against: 0    Abstain: 7