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1. Ballot summary

The following table indicates the status of each ballot response received. Where comments have been received without an accompanying ballot, this is indicated in the Comments column. The Status column indicates the voting status of the responder. \textit{V(oting)} indicates 802.1 voting member at the start of the ballot period. \textit{N(on-voting)} indicates a comment only response. \textit{L(iaison)} indicates a voting liaison response. The \textit{Vote} column indicates the vote cast; \textit{Y}=Approve, \textit{N}=Disapprove, \textit{T}=Abstain due to lack of time, \textit{E}=Abstain due to lack of expertise, \textit{O}=Abstain for other reasons, \textit{C}=Comments only.

The results of the ballot can be seen in the second table.

Both tables below have been updated to include responses from the original D3.2 Working Group ballot.

\begin{table}[!h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{STATUS} & \textbf{VOTE} & \textbf{FIRST NAME} & \textbf{SURNAME} & \textbf{Comments?} \\
\hline
V & E & Zehavit & Alon & N \\
V & & Jan & Bialkowski & \\
V & Y & Rob & Boatright & N \\
V & & Jean-Michel & Bonnamy & \\
V & & Paul & Bottruff & \\
V & E & Rudolf & Brandner & N \\
V & & Craig W. & Carlson & \\
V & & Weiyi & Cheng & \\
V & & Rao & Cherukuri & \\
V & & Jin-Seek & Choi & \\
V & & Paul & Congdon & \\
V & & Don & Connor & \\
V & & Diego & Crupnicoff & \\
V & E & Claudio & Desanti & N \\
V & E & Zhemin & Ding & N \\
V & & Linda & Dunbar & \\
V & & David & Elie-Dit-Cosaque & \\
V & E & Janos & Farkas & N \\
V & T & Don & Fedyk & N \\
V & & Norm & Finn & \\
V & Y & Bob & Frazier & N \\
V & N & John & Fuller & Y \\
V & T & Geoffrey & Garner & N \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
Table 1—Ballot responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>Comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Anoop</td>
<td>Ghanwani</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Franz</td>
<td>Goetz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yannick</td>
<td>Goff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Gunther</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Gusat</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asif</td>
<td>Hazarika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romain</td>
<td>Insler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Jeffree</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pankaj</td>
<td>Jha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Johas Teener</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abbhay</td>
<td>Karandikar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prakash</td>
<td>Kashyap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Keen</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keti</td>
<td>Kilcrease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doyeon</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yongbum</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Philippe</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Ko</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vinod</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Kwan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>Laihonen</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ashvin</td>
<td>Lakshmikantha</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lerer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Lipshteyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gael</td>
<td>Mace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Mack-Crane</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Menuchner</td>
<td>Menuchery</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Ballot responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>Comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Multanen</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Nolish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Pannell</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Pelissier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hayim</td>
<td>Porat</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Pritikin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Josef</td>
<td>Roese</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Rohde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Romascanu</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jessy V</td>
<td>Rouyer</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Sajassi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Salowey</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Panagiotis</td>
<td>Saltsidis</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satish</td>
<td>Sathe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Sauer</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Mick</td>
<td>Seaman</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koichiro</td>
<td>Seto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Himanshu</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Nurit</td>
<td>Sprecher</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Kevin B</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Sultan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Muneyoshi</td>
<td>Suzuki</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Thaler</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Thorp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manoj</td>
<td>Wadekar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Yuehua</td>
<td>Wei</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Weis</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1—Ballot responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>Comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bert</td>
<td>Wijnen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Michael D.</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Chien-Hsien</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Zorn</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2—Ballot results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Voters</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters responding</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Ballot Comments

2.1 Comments sorted by clause/page/line
IEEE P802.1Qat D4.1 Stream Reservation Procotol (SRP) comments

Tony Jeffree

Comment Type E Comment Status A
"e.g." should always be followed by a comma

SuggestedRemedy
Add one (and check other instances). If there are no other changes that would force a recirc, punt this for Sponsor ballot.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. Do a search of entire document.

Tony Jeffree

Comment Type E Comment Status A
A streamID is a 64-bit field that uniquely identifies a stream

SuggestedRemedy
Strike the word "will"

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. Use this text:
"A 64-bit field that uniquely identifies a stream."

Tony Jeffree

Comment Type E Comment Status A
It is unlikely (though not impossible) that a single station would perform both types of pruning

SuggestedRemedy
Split c) into two bullets - one for talker pruning, the other for listener pruning. If there are no other changes that would force a recirc, punt this for Sponsor ballot.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT. New wording:
"c) Perform Talker pruning as described in 35.2.1.4.b, 35.2.3.1 and 35.2.4.3.1."
"d) Perform Listener pruning as described in 35.2.3.1."

Make sure to address this in the PICS as well.
IEEE P802.1Qat D4.1 Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP) comments

**Comment Type:** Comment Type

**Comment Status:** Comment Status

**Response:** Response

**Response Status:** Response Status

**Kevin Stanton Intel**

**Comment:**

"shall automatically enable outbound Port tagging..."

**Suggested Remedy:**

Is this "enabling" overridable? If not, then should the statement be more persistent rather than a one-time "automatically enable".

**Response:**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change wording to:

"Each egress port within an SRP domain that is not an SRP domain boundary port (i.e. SRPDomainBoundaryPort is FALSE) shall perform tagging on that outbound Port for those VIDs that are associated with an SRP reservation."

Also update NOTE-3 with the following sentence added after the first sentence:

"... for correct operation of the credit-base shaper algorithm defined in clause 34. This tagging will occur even if the Bridge is currently not configured to tag frames from that port."

**Comment:**

Note 4 is unnecessary, and in particular the choice of the word "promote" to describe the assignment of a priority tagged frame to the VLAN identified by the PVID is inappropriate. What the note describes is the normal operation of a VLAN bridge.

**Suggested Remedy:**

Delete note 4

**Response:**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This note was added in the D2.1 to D3.0 revision in May 2009 in response to comments from Don Pannell and others at the March 2009 Vancouver plenary meeting.

I agree that "promote" is the wrong word. Clause 15-7 uses the word "assigning". Replace the phrase "...promoted to..." with "...assigned to...".

**Comment:**

MRP is defined as a general protocol that can support a number of applications (e.g. MMRP, MVRP). MSRP introduces an "AttributeListLength" in the message format which provides some optimization for skipping to the next message in a MRPDU, at the expense of no longer having a common message format for all MRP applications.

**Suggested Remedy:**

Consider whether the optimization is worth sacrificing the common the message format.

**Response:**

REJECT. Stephen is referring to Clause 10.12.1.9 and 11.2.3.1.9 which state that the AttributeListLength field is not present in MMRP and MVRP frames.

This field was added in the D2.0 revision dated Jan 8, 2009 at the same time we added FourPackedEvents following the late night discussion at the September 2008 interim in Korea.

The intent of this field is to allow an MSRP V1 implementation to be able to receive an entire V2-based packet (which doesn’t exist yet) and be able to process the attributes it knows, while skipping over the attributes that are new to V2. The AttributeListLength is the only way to do this since each attribute in MSRP can have different FirstValue and Vector lengths.

I would propose future MRP applications support AttributeListLength for the possibility of easier product migration with future revisions of that same MRP application.
Comment Type E Comment Status A
Explain what to do when NumberOfValues=0

SuggestedRemedy
NOTE - If NumberOfValues is zero there will be no ThreePackedEvents encoded in the vector.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Comment Status A

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.
IEEE P802.1Qat D4.1 Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP) comments

Cl 17 SC 17.7.14 P29 L 50 # 35
Glenn Parsons Nortel

**Comment Type** E  **Comment Status** R
The TC's in this MIB module seem like overkill -- that is they only seemed to be used once.

**Suggested Remedy**
Remove TCs and put in attribute defn if it is used only once

**Response**  **Response Status** C
REJECT. I would entertain complete replacement text, but am reluctant to redraft the required text myself at this point in the project.

Cl 17 SC 17.7.14 P31 L 4 # 36
Glenn Parsons Nortel

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** R
The subtrees seem like overkill given there is only one object in most of them

**Suggested Remedy**
Remove the subtrees

**Response**  **Response Status** C
REJECT. I would entertain complete replacement text, but am reluctant to redraft the required text myself at this point in the project.

Cl 17 SC 17.7.14 P35 L 21 # 54
Glenn Parsons Nortel

**Comment Type** TR  **Comment Status** A
ieee8021SrpBridgePortMsrpFailedRegistrations
ieee8021SrpReservationDroppedStreamFrames  "This counter is not maintained across discontinuities." Why? Counters should support discontinuity

**Suggested Remedy**
Replace with this note: "Discontinuities in the value of the counter can occur at re-initialization of the management system, and at other times as indicated by the value of ifCounterDiscontinuityTime object of the associated interface (if any)."

**Response**  **Response Status** C
ACCEPT. Replace:
"This counter is not maintained across discontinuities."
with this paragraph:
"Discontinuities in the value of the counter can occur at re-initialization of the management system, and at other times as indicated by the value of ifCounterDiscontinuityTime object of the associated interface (if any)."

Cl 17 SC 17.7.14 P35 L 21 # 55
Dan Romascanu Avaya, Inc.

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** A
I am questioning why this counter and other counters in this MIB module are not maintained over reboots, neither is a continuity object defined for them. The consequence is that when computing delta values - which is the default mode of operating with counters in SNMP - care must be exercised in the management applications that a reboot did not happen between successive readings. It is also not clear if after reboot values of counters can be aleatory or the counters are expected to be zeroed.

**Suggested Remedy**
discuss again this issue. If the solution is left in place clarify at least whether the counters are zeroed at reboot or can be found at any value

**Response**  **Response Status** C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. (see #34). 802.1ap contains several examples of how counters and discontinuities are handled. I am making SRP counters consistent with 802.1ap.

Cl 35 SC 35 P45 L 19 # 35
Kevin Stanton Intel

Cl 35 SC 35 P45 L 20 # 35
Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type** E  **Comment Status** R
"Bridges will associate…" is future tense

**Suggested Remedy**
Strike the word "will"

**Response**  **Response Status** C
ACCEPT. Change wording to:
"Bridges associate…".
Cl 35 SC 35 P46 L11 # 21

Kevin Stanton Intel

Comment Type TR

Comment Status A

Incorrect use of "shall"--this standard can not force "all devices in a bridged network" to be compliant to this standard.

Suggested Remedy

Replace "shall" to "must"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Replace "shall" with "must".

Cl 35 SC 35.1 P45 L49 # 4

John Nels Fuller None entered

Comment Type T

Comment Status A

Calling out both unicast and multicast streams here may cause confusion with the the concept of unicast vs. multicast destination addresses.

Suggested Remedy

Add a footnote that says:
Here the terms unicast and multicast refer to whether there are one or many listeners to a stream, not to the type of destination address used for the stream. For restrictions on the destination addresses of streams see 35.2.2.8.3.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Change:
"… the reservation of resources for unicast and multicast streams…"
to:
"… the reservation of resources for streams, each destined for one or more Listeners, and…".

Cl 35 SC 35.1.1 P47 L10 # 22

Kevin Stanton Intel

Comment Type T

Comment Status A

"MSRP assumes that" should be prescriptive rather than assumptive

Suggested Remedy

Replace with "MSRP defines and requires the existence of"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT. Replace the first two lines with:
"MSRP defines and requires the existence of a Designated MSRP Node (DMN) on any shared medium. This DMN determines each station’s ability to receive the… "

Cl 35 SC 35.1.2.1 P47 L35 # 23

Kevin Stanton Intel

Comment Type E

Comment Status A

A listener receiving "Talker Advertise" is NOT a guarantee that they will receive the stream, since the resources are not yet locked down in the path, so another intervening request could steal the required bandwidth.

Suggested Remedy

Change to make the sentence finish: "are guaranteed that there was bandwidth and other resources available in each bridge at the time the Talker Advertise was propagated by that bridge

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change wording of second sentence to:
"Listeners that request attachment to this stream are likely to create a reservation with the described QoS. A Talker Advertise will continue to be declared as long as the resources continue to be available."

Make a similar change to Talker Failed description. Change "will not be" to "is not" in first sentence.
IEEE P802.1Qat D4.1 Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP) comments

---

**Cl 35 SC 35.2.1.4 P51 L3 # 51**

Pat Thaler

**Comment Type** TR  **Comment Status** A

The response to my comment 5 on at3-2 has not been implemented in the draft. My comment said that their needs to be a normative definition of how SRPdomainBoundaryPort gets its value. The description of it has been changed but there are no normative statements about it. Also, once one reservation has been received on the port, it will remain false as long as the port is in the active topology. It is possible that a change to the configuration of the link partner could cause a port to be on the domain boundary without the port being removed from the active topology.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Provide a normative definition for the behavior of SRPdomainBoundaryPort

**Response**  **Response Status** C

ACCEPT.

Remove bullet h) and NOTE 2. Replace with this:

"h) SRPdomainBoundaryPort: A per-port, per-SR class, boolean parameter that contains the value TRUE if the port is an SRP Domain Boundary Port, otherwise it contains the value FALSE. The parameter for a given SR class and Port shall be set to TRUE if either of the following conditions are met:
   1. The port is declaring at least one MSRP attribute for that SR class, and the port has no MSRP attribute registrations for that SR class, or;
   2. One or more ports which support that SR class are declaring one or more MSRP attributes for that SR class, and this port does not support that SR class.

In all other cases the parameter shall be set to FALSE.*

---

**Cl 35 SC 35.2.2.1 P51 L8 # 5**

John Nels Fuller

**Comment Type** TR  **Comment Status** A

How does a bridge that implements two SR classes determine if one of its ports is connected to a bridge that supports only one SR class? In this case it is a SRPdomainBoundaryPort for one class but not the other.

**SuggestedRemedy**

After discussion determine if any change is required.

**Response**  **Response Status** C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See #33 for part of the solution. Also add this paragraph to clause 35.2.4 MSRP Attribute Propagation, page 64, line 44:

"A port shall only forward MSRP declarations for SR classes it supports. This will eliminate unnecessary priority remapping for traffic related to unsupported SR classes."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.2.2.8.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None entered</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Accept in principle. Correct spelling error &quot;is&quot; -&gt; &quot;in&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.2.4.4.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None entered</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None entered</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Add statement requiring conformance to the mandatory SHALL statements of Clause Q if the link is CSN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEEE P802.1Qat D4.1 Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP) comments

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: R
Editors note indicates another reason to remove Q.3 until 802.11 makes more progress.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove Q.3 in order to progress to sponsor ballot.

Response
Response Status: C
REJECT. (See #8) EDCA-AC will be mandatory for use in Qat, HCCA will be optional.

Comment Type: G  Comment Status: A
Annex Z documents a number of issues that are still to be addressed in the draft. At least one of these (Z.2 o) has already been addressed.

SuggestedRemedy
Discuss Annex Z to determine if there are still outstanding issues preventing the draft from entering sponsor ballot.

Response
Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Annex Z is more of a history of where we have been than a requirements list. I have not attempted to maintain it as a living document since it will be removed as soon as WG balloting is complete. If anyone is interested in submitting an updated copy I would consider it for inclusion in the next recirc.

Z.1 and Z.2 should be deleted to remove confusion. The part of the Editor's Note from Z.5 that talks about updating the algorithm should be deleted as well.

TYPE: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  RESPONSE STATUS: O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line
Page 8 of 8  11/18/2009  6:10:09 PM
2.2 Comments sorted by comment number
I am questioning why this counter and other counters in this MIB module are not maintained over reboots, neither is a continuity object defined for them. The consequence is that when computing delta values - which is the default mode of operating with counters in SNMP - care must be exercised in the management applications that a reboot did not happen between successive readings. It is also not clear if after reboot values of counters can be aleatory or the counters are expected to be zeroed.

Suggested Remedy
Discuss again this issue. If the solution is left in place clarify at least whether the counters are zeroed at reboot or can be found at any value.

Response
Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. (see #34). 802.1ap contains several examples of how counters and discontinuities are handled. I am making SRP counters consistent with 802.1ap.

Note 4 is unnecessary, and in particular the choice of the word "promote" to describe the assignment of a priority tagged frame to the VLAN identified by the PVID is inappropriate. What the note describes is the normal operation of a VLAN bridge.

Suggested Remedy
Delete note 4

Response
Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This note was added in the D2.1 to D3.0 revision in May 2009 in response to comments from Don Pannell and others at the March 2009 Vancouver plenary meeting.

I agree that "promote" is the wrong word. Clause 15-7 uses the word "assigning". Replace the phrase "...promoted to..." with "...assigned to...".

Calling out both unicast and multicast streams here may cause confusion with the concept of unicast vs. multicast destination addresses.

Suggested Remedy
Add a footnote that says:
Here the terms unicast and multicast refer to whether there are one or many listeners to a stream, not to the type of destination address used for the stream. For restrictions on the destination addresses of streams set 35.2.2.8.3.

Response
Response Status C
ACCEPT. Change:
"... the reservation of resources for unicast and multicast streams..."
to:
"... the reservation of resources for streams, each destined for one or more Listeners, and...".
Comment Type: T  Comment Status: A
How does a bridge that implements two SR classes determine if one of its ports is connected to a bridge that supports only one SR class? In this case it is a SRPdomainBoundaryPort for one class but not the other.

SuggestedRemedy
After discussion determine if any change is required.

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See #33 for part of the solution. Also add this paragraph to clause 35.2.4 MSRP Attribute Propagation, page 64, line 44:
“A port shall only forward MSRP declarations for SR classes it supports. This will eliminate unnecessary priority remapping for traffic related to unsupported SR classes.”

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: A
Looking through the 801.1Q 2008 edition, I do not find an entry in table 8-1 called “Individual LAN Scope group address, Nearest Bridge group address.” Note 2 specifies an address that is assigned to LLDP, but this specification should not be in a note.

SuggestedRemedy
Verify the actual MAC address desired and then refer to it by an appropriate name (not value). Delete the value reference from the note. Also delete from the note the references to the forwarding behavior of different addresses.

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. (See #33)
This comment has two parts:
1) Refer to the latest draft on 802.1aj (http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/aj-drafts/d4/802-1aj-d4-2.pdf) Table 8-1 on page 15 for the definition of the address used.
2) Reword note as follows:
"NOTE - Using this address will guarantee that only MSRP aware Bridges will forward MSRPDUs.".

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: R
Editors note indicates another reason to remove Q.3 until 802.11 makes more progress.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove Q.3 in order to progress to sponsor ballot.

Response  Response Status: C
REJECT. (See #8) EDCA-AC will be mandatory for use in Qat, HCCA will be optional.
Annex Z documents a number of issues that are still to be addressed in the draft. At least one of these (Z.2.o) has already been addressed.

**Suggested Remedy**
Discuss Annex Z to determine if there are still outstanding issues preventing the draft from entering sponsor ballot.

**Response**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Annex Z is more of a history of where we have been than a requirements list. I have not attempted to maintain it as a living document since it will be removed as soon as WG balloting is complete. If anyone is interested in submitting an updated copy I would consider it for inclusion in the next recirc.

Z.1 and Z.2 should be deleted to remove confusion. The part of the Editor’s Note from Z.5 that talks about updating the algorithm should be deleted as well.

---

A streamID is a 64-bit field that uniquely identifies a stream

**Suggested Remedy**
Strike the word "will"

**Response**
ACCEPT. Use this text: "A 64-bit field that uniquely identifies a stream."

---

**Comment**
NW-1265: A streamID is a 64-bit that uniquely identifies a stream

**Comment Status** A

**Response**
C

**Response**
Accept.

---

**Comment**
NW-1218: A streamID is a 64-bit that uniquely identifies a stream

**Comment Status** A

**Response**
C

**Response**
Accept.

---

Awkward phrase

**Suggested Remedy**
Replace ", implemented" with "and"

**Response**
C

**Response**
Reject. This wording was taken verbatim from MMRP Clause 5.9.1(b) and MVRP Clause 5.9.2(b). It is referring to the MRP state machines that the application chooses to implement.
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---

**Comment ID # 15**

**Cl 10 SC 10.7.9 P 10 L 16**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status R**

Note 1 of table 10-5 is unclear. Does "Request opportunity" mean to imply a mandate, that the machine implementing this table shall request an opportunity to transmit? What does an opportunity to transmit mean?

**Suggested Remedy**

Please clarify

**Response**

REJECT. This is the same "language" that is used in 802.1ak Table 10-3, Note 6. It makes more sense when read in the context of 802.1ak. In summary, .1ak likes to group MRP declarations together. It does this by using a transmit timer (initiated by a "request opportunity to transmit") to allow multiple declarations within a 200ms period to be combined in a single frame that is sent at the end of that period.

---

**Comment ID # 16**

**Cl 10 SC 10.8.2.6 P 15 L 44**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status R**

"Receipt of this value does not cause any event to be applied to any state machine"

**Suggested Remedy**

"Does not" should be replaced with "shall not"

**Response**

REJECT. These clauses come directly from 802.1ak. SRP is simply incrementing the clause numbering in order to insert clause 10.8.2.4.

---

**Comment ID # 17**

**Cl 12 SC 12.22.4 P 22 L 34**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status A**

StreamID is sometimes spelled with a space between Stream and ID

**Suggested Remedy**

Make consistent throughout, to ease searching. Same for other field names of tables

**Response**

ACCEPT. Replace "Stream ID" by "StreamID" throughout the document.

---

**Comment ID # 18**

**Cl 12 SC 12.22.4 P 22 L 34**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status A**

"Rows in the table can be created…"

**Suggested Remedy**

Replace "can be" with "are"

**Response**

ACCEPT. Change wording to: "Rows in the table are created and removed…".

---

**Comment ID # 19**

**Cl 12 SC 12.22.4 P 22 L 34**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status R**

"Bridges will associate…” is future tense

**Suggested Remedy**

Strike the word "will"

**Response**

ACCEPT. Change wording to: "Bridges associate…”.

---

**Comment ID # 20**

**Cl 12 SC 12.22.4 P 22 L 34**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status A**

StreamID is sometimes spelled with a space between Stream and ID

**Suggested Remedy**

Make consistent throughout, to ease searching. Same for other field names of tables

**Response**

ACCEPT. Replace "Stream ID" by "StreamID" throughout the document.

---

**Comment ID # 20**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status R**

"Bridges will associate…” is future tense

**Suggested Remedy**

Strike the word "will"

**Response**

ACCEPT. Change wording to: "Bridges associate…”.

---

**Comment ID # 20**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status R**

"Bridges will associate…” is future tense

**Suggested Remedy**

Strike the word "will"

**Response**

ACCEPT. Change wording to: "Bridges associate…”.

---

**Comment ID # 20**

Kevin Stanton Intel

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status R**

"Bridges will associate…” is future tense

**Suggested Remedy**

Strike the word "will"

**Response**

ACCEPT. Change wording to: "Bridges associate…”.

---
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IEEE P802.1Qat D4.1 Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP) comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Incorrect use of &quot;shall&quot;--this standard can not force &quot;all devices in a bridged network&quot; to be compliant to this standard.</td>
<td>Replace &quot;shall&quot; to &quot;must&quot;</td>
<td>ACCEPT. Replace &quot;shall&quot; with &quot;must&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;MSRP assumes that&quot; should be prescriptive rather than assumptive</td>
<td>Replace with &quot;MSRP defines and requires the existence of&quot;</td>
<td>ACCEPT. Replace the first two lines with: &quot;MSRP defines and requires the existence of a Designated MSRP Node (DMN) on any shared medium. This DMN determines each station’s ability to receive the...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.8.2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A listener receiving &quot;Talker Advertise&quot; is NOT a guarantee that they will receive the stream, since the resources are not yet locked down in the path, so another intervening request could steal the required bandwidth.</td>
<td>NOTE - If NumberOfValues is zero there will be no ThreePackedEvents encoded in the vector.</td>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.8.2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Explain what to do when NumberOfValues=0</td>
<td>NOTE - If NumberOfValues is zero there will be no FourPackedEvents encoded in the vector.</td>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kevin Stanton Intel

Craig Gunther Harman International

Philippe Klein will draft PICS Proforma statements with help from Yong Kim. This will be included in the next draft.

Craig Gunther Harman International

Make a similar change to Talker Failed description. Change "will not be" to "is not" in first sentence.

Kevin Stanton Intel

Type: TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general
Comment Status: D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  Response Status: O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
Sort Order: Comment ID

Comment ID # 26 11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM
Comment Type: E
Comment Status: A
Comment: Extra "d)".
Suggested Remedy: Remove
Response: ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.9.2 P7 L12 # 28
Tony Jeffree None entered
Comment Type: E
Comment Status: A
Comment: The "It is recommended..." para and the subsequent NOTE do not belong here - they should be in Clause 35.
Suggested Remedy: Move them to the appropriate bit of Clause 35. If there are no other changes that would force a recirc, punt this for Sponsor ballot.
Response: ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The referenced paragraph and NOTE should both be removed. SRP utilizes MSRP to make reservations and MMRP to facilitate Talker Pruning. MMRP (see 5.9.1) already describes Source Pruning - which is what the editor was referencing here.

CI 05 SC 5.9.2 P7 L10 # 29
Tony Jeffree None entered
Comment Type: E
Comment Status: A
Comment: It is unlikely (though not impossible) that a single station would perform both types of pruning
Suggested Remedy: Split c) into two bullets - one for talker pruning, the other for listener pruning. If there are no other changes that would force a recirc, punt this for Sponsor ballot.
Response: ACCEPT. New wording:
"c) Perform Talker pruning as described in 35.2.1.4.b, 35.2.3.1 and 35.2.4.3.1."
"d) Perform Listener pruning as described in 35.2.3.1."
Make sure to address this in the PICS as well.

CI 35 SC 35.2.1.4 P51 L3 # 51
Pat Thaler Broadcom
Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: A
Comment: The response to my comment 5 on at3-2 has not been implemented in the draft. My comment said that their needs to be a normative definition of how SRPdomainBoundaryPort gets its value. The the description of it has been changed but there are no normative statements about it. Also, once one reservation has been received on the port, it will remain false as long as the port is in the active topology. It is possible that a change to the configuration of the link partner could cause a port to be on the domain boundary without the port being removed from the active topology.
Suggested Remedy: Provide a normative definition for the behavior of SRPdomainBoundaryPort
Response: ACCEPT.
Remove bullet h) and NOTE 2. Replace with this:
"h) SRPdomainBoundaryPort: A per-port, per-SR class, boolean parameter that contains the value TRUE if the port is an SRP Domain Boundary Port, otherwise it contains the value FALSE. The parameter for a given SR class and Port shall be set to TRUE if either of the following conditions are met:
1. The port is declaring at least one MSRP attribute for that SR class, and the port has no MSRP attribute registrations for that SR class, or;
2. One or more ports which support that SR class are declaring one or more MSRP attributes for that SR class, and this port does not support that SR class.

In all other cases the parameter shall be set to FALSE."
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** A  
**Response:** Response Status C  
**Suggested Remedy:**  
There is no need for this note. The TC module is for common TCs ... if it is not common, then an individual module can define its own.

**Comment ID #33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.2.2.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** A  
**Response:** Response Status C  
**Suggested Remedy:**  
Refering to the name and then putting the MAC address in a NOTE is too cryptic. Especially since the NOTE appears to be a justification. And further does this only apply to C-VLANs? I hope not.

**Comment #6 addresses the NOTE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.7.14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** TR  
**Comment Status:** A  
**Response:** Response Status C  
**Suggested Remedy:**  
"This counter is not maintained across discontinuities." Why? Counters should support discontinuity

**Comment ID #36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.7.14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** T  
**Response:** Response Status C  
**Suggested Remedy:**  
"The subtrees seem like overkill given there is only one object in most of them"  
Remove the subtrees
The MoCA Alliance agreed to submit the document http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/at-kstanton-clq-from-moca-091113.rtf as input to 802.1Qat

Suggested Remedy
See document

Response
ACCEPT.

Note: I used the document with *-kstanton-clh-* instead of the clq version mentioned in the comment. I believe this was a simple cut-and-paste error on the commentors part.