PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF BALLOT COMMENTS ON

IEEE *Draft P802.1ah/D3.00*

DRAFT IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks— Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks — Amendment 6: Provider Backbone Bridges

Task Force

LAN MAN Standards Committee of the IEEE Computer Society

Prepared by: **Paul Bottorff, Project Editor**

Paul Bottorff
Tel: 408-495-3365   Email: pbottorf@nortel.com

Commentary:

This Disposition of Ballot Comments has been prepared to document the ballot comments received in the task force ballot on P802.1ah/D3.00, and to record the resolutions of those ballot comments, agreed during the meeting of 802.1 held in Beijing, China, in May 2006. The document contains:

1)   A table of responses received.
2)   A listing of comments received, each accompanied by a disposition.

This document constitutes a record of the instructions to the Editor for the preparation of P802.1ah/D3.10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

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 ***Vote*** column indicates the vote cast; Y=Approve, N=Disapprove, T=Abstain due to lack of time, E=Abstain due to lack of expertise, O=Abstain for other reasons, C=Comments only.

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	Comments?
V	E	Alexei Beliaev	
V	E	Jean-Michel Bonnamy	
V		Mike Borza	
V	N	Paul Bottorff	Y
V	N	Rudolf Brandner	Y
V	E	Jim Burns	
V		Dirceu Cavendish	
V	E	Frank Chao	
N	C	Jaihyung Cho	Y
V	T	Paul Congdon	
V	T	Uri Cummings	
V	Y	Russell Dietz	
V	N	Linda Dunbar	Y
N		Anush Elangovan	
V	N	Hesham ElBakoury	Y
V	N	David Elie-Dit-Cosaque	Y
V	N	Don Fedyk	Y
V	E	Felix Feifei Feng	
V	T	Norman FInn	
V	Y	David Frattura	
V	E	John Fuller	
V	E	Geoffrey Garner	
V	N	Anoop Ghanwani	Y
V		Ken Grewal	
V	N	Stephen Haddock	Y
V	T	Romain Insler	
V		Ran Ish-Shalom	
V		Vipin Jain	
V	N	Tony Jeffree	Y
V		Michael Johas Teener	
V	T	Hal Keen	
V	T	Yongbum Kim	
V	E	Mike Ko	
V	E	Bruce Kwan	
V	N	Kari Laihonen	Y
V		Yannick LE GOFF	
V	N	David W. Martin	Y
	C	Alan McGuire	Y
V		John Messenger	
V		Dinesh Mohan	
V	E	Hiroshi Ohta	

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	Comments?
V		Don Pannell	
V	N	Glenn Parsons	Y
V	T	Ken Patton	
V	N	Haim Porat	Y
V	T	Ray Qiu	
V	C	Karen Randall	Y
V	N	Robert Roden	Y
V	N	Josef Roese	Y
V	E	Allyn Romanow	
V	N	Dan Romascanu	Y
V	N	Jessy V Rouyer	Y
V		Eric Ryu	
V	N	Ali Sajassi	Y
V	N	Panagiotis Saltsidis	Y
V		Sam Sambasivan	
V	N	John Sauer	Y
V	N	Mick Seaman	Y
V	T	Koichiro Seto	
V	N	Curtis Simonson	Y
V	N	Nurit Sprecher	Y
V	E	Kevin B Stanton	
N		Larry Stefani	
V	T	Bob Sultan	
V	N	Muneyoshi Suzuki	Y
V		Francois Tallet	
V	E	Michael Teener	
V	E	John Terry	
V		Pat Thaler	
N		Geoff Thompson	
N		John Viega	
V	E	Dennis Volpano	
V	Y	Manoj Wadekar	
V	N	Bert Wijnen	Y
V	N	Ludwig Winkel	Y
V	E	Michael D Wright	
N	C	Delei Yu	Y
TOTALS	**59**	**77**	30

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

Category	Total	Percentage
Yes	3	5.08%
No	28	47.46%
Abstain	28	47.46%
Voters responding	59	100.00%

2. Ballot Comments

Comment 1   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 112
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The MIB items for the information database items in sections 12.15.3-5 are not included in D3.00.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the MIB elements for information databasee items in sections 12.15.3-5 as in draft D3.01 posted on the IEEE WEB at http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ah.html .
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 1

1-Propose accept.

Comment 2   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 9.5, 9.8, 6.8, 6.9
PAGE: 53, 54, 32-38
LINE:
COMMENT START:
In 802.1ah/D2.4 we had a "multiprotocol I-TAG" format specified in clause 9.5 and 9.8. This tag format prevents adding 12 bytes of un-necessary overhead in the 802.1ah frame when using the PBBN for connecting between non-Ethernet networks such as PDH networks or PseudoWire networks. In addition, this short I-TAG format can be exploited for the implementation of a per service MEP at the Provider Instance Port. This format was removed from D3.0 based on the discussion in San Diego that it had the potential of producing incompatible operation when a 802.1ad network was placed in the path between the non-Ethernet network. The 'multiprotocol I-TAG" format should be included in 802.1ah because even though the "multiprotocol I-TAG" is incompatible with transit over a PBN attached at the edge of a PBBN (it will transit over the BCBs in the core of the PBBN) the application spaces of Pseudo Wire transport and PDH transport are both large enough and significant enough that service providers should be given the option to optimize their PBBNs for these applications.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Insert text in 9.5 for two I-TAG Frametypes one for the "Ethernet Encapsulating I-TAG" and one for the "Multiprotocol I-TAG". Restore the diagrams and text for the "Multiprotocol I-TAG" format in section 9.8. Remove the statements which say "with encapsulated Ethernet frame" from clauses 6.8 and 6.9.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 2

2-Propose Discuss.

Comment 3   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE:137
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Need to add a PICS
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 3

1-Propose Accept.

Comment 4   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 26.6
PAGE: 135
LINE: 38,40,42,43,44
COMMENT START:
The E-NNI port is formed over the Customer Backbone Port not the Provider Backbone Port.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Provider Backbone Port" with "Customer Backbone Port".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 4

1-Propose Accept

Comment 5   Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 26.8
PAGE: 136
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The operation of CFM at the Provider Instance Port needs to describe how a MEP is
formed to monitor a service identified by the I-SID. It is not clear if the CFM frame used
would have the 802.1ag type following the I-TAG or proceeding the I-TAG. One way to
do this is to add a TLV to CFM to carry the I-SID, while another possibility is to define a
CFM frame which may follow an I-TAG rather than a B-TAG. If the CFM frame includes
a special TLV then the Customer Backbone Port must have a special procedure for map-
ping the CFM frame into a B-VLAN based on the I-TAG TLV, while inserting CFM data
past the I-TAG will require a description of how CFM works for this case.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Describe how CFM operates when the CFM data is past the I-TAG.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 5

1-Propose accept in principle/discuss: Need to add text describing how to handle a CFM
frame with the CFM frame data past the I-TAG.

Comment 6   Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 117
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The I-TAG interface is now a subset of the S-TAG interface described in 25.4. They
should not have separate subclauses.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move the material of 25.3 under 25.4.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 6

3-Propose accept: From the clause numbers the author must mean the Transparent Interface in 25.3. The remedy is for this problem.

Comment 7   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)
CLAUSE: 25.8
PAGE: 123
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
The I-TAG interface also uses the I-DEI to determine the drop eligibility.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "I-PCP" to "I-PCP and I-DEI".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 7

3-Propose accept.

Comment 8   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 13.38
PAGE: 70
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Section 13.38 does not include extensions for hierarchal VLANs or the multiport I-component. This comment was made by Steve Haddock on draft D2.2, but has not yet been corrected.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Extend 13.38 for hierarchal VLANs on I-components.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 8

3-Propose accept in principle. Need to review the Mick Seaman paper on clause 13.38.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 9   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 5.7, 6.8
PAGE: 23
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The I-component is required to have only a single S-VLAN aware component, however the design where an I-Component has an S-VLAN aware component per Customer Instance Port all connected to a set of Provider Instance Ports through VIPs is a very useful configuration, especially for "transparent" service interfaces.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the first sentence of 5.7 from "one S-VLAN aware" to "one or more S-VLAN aware" and also change list item a) to "one or more S-VLAN aware". Also change figure 6-1 to reflect the structure with multiple S-VLAN aware relays.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 9

1-Propose ? need to discuss.

Comment 10   **Paul Bottorff**

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 8.8.1, 12.12.2, 12.12.3, 8.4
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Provider Backbone Transport is a feature of major importance to PBBNs. The basic features supporting PBT are small and should be added now so we don't have to wait for a new PAR cycle before we get any PBT support in the IEEE standard.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1)Add a static filtering entry type for "all unicast addresses for which no more specific static filtering entry exists" (change 8.8.1 bullet a)). This change allows unknown unicasts to be discarded since a discard static filter may match all unknown unicasts.

2) Create a method for allocating some VID space to PBT while allowing the rest for use by MSTP or SPB. This can be done by: Defining a special MSTID called the PBTID (use 0xFFE) which identifies PBT rather than a MSTI. An MSTID not in the MSTI list indi-

cates some protocol other than MSTP running in parallel to MSTP (802.1Q-2005 12.12.1 and 8.6.2). Allow the FID to MSTID Allocation Table (12.12.2) to allocate a FID to the PBTID. (i.e. FID=0xFFE to PBTID=0xFFE). Allow the MST Configuration Table (12.12.3) to allocate VIDs to the PBTID.The PBTID code of 0xFFE in the MST Configuration Table means "this B-VID is available to PBT for use as a route selector".

3) All VIDs allocated to PBT have a port state at each bridge port who's state is forced to forwarding=on and learning=off (change 8.4). The static forwarding state replaces the MSTP port states.

4)Add an Informative Annex explaining the use of PBT. This may be based on the PBT paper submitted for the May 2006 meeting.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 10

2-Propose ?: Need to discuss this comment.

Comment 11   **Rudolf Brandner**

NAME: Rudolf Brandner
COMMENT TYPE: < E >
CLAUSE: <5.71 >
PAGE: <23>
LINE: <52 >
COMMENT START:
<Shouldn't the maximum number of services be 4094 >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to 4094>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 12   **Rudolf Brandner**

NAME: Rudolf Brandner
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <6.4.1 >
PAGE: <28>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START:
<The defintion of the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier is missing. The use of the service_access_point_identifier is not clear. WHat is the different between this and the port-id?>
COMMENT END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
2   <Please clarify and add referances. >
3   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
4
5   ## *Disposition of Comment 12*
6
7
8   1-Propose accept in principle: These two fields are defined in 6.4.1, however the defini-
9   tion could be clearer. Part of this unclearity stems from the fact that these fields are not
10   used in a BEB, but are just being made available future use. I propose we resolve this
11   comment by adding a note indicating that these two fields are not used at present, but
12   included for future use.
13
14   ## *Comment 13   Jaihyung Cho*
15
16   NAME: Jaihyung Cho
17   COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)
18   CLAUSE:
19   PAGE:
20   LINE:
21   COMMENT START:
22   MAC Translation should be supported by the PBB B component relay rather than port.
23   COMMENT END:
24   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
25   << Recommended Text Deletion >>
26
27   delete clause 6.9, p35 line 6~8   ".. and may support the following parameters:
28   c) A MAC address translation table"
29
30   delete clause 6.9, p35 line 33~40 "The MAC address translation table ... "
31
32   delete clause 6.9.1, p36 line 19~23 " g) Otherwise, if the MAC address ..."
33   h) Otherwise the destination_address .."
34
35   delete clause 6.9.2, p37 line 16~22 "The source_address parameter is ...
36   c) If the MAC address translation ...
37   d) Otherwise the source_address ..."
38
39   delete clause 8.8, p42, after line 49,
40   "n) If MAC address translation is supported, the output destination_address and
41   source_address fields."
42
43   delete clause 8.8.1, p44, after line 38,
44   "d) Output MAC addresses that are to be given in the parameter fields of
45   EM_UNIT_Data.request when MAC address translation is supported."
46

<< Recommended Text Insertion >>

Add following new clause 8.8.12 after 8.8.11 in pager 55.

8.8.12 MAC Address Translation

Two PBBNs operated by different organizations can be interconnected via I-tagged service interfaces. It is B-type Backbone Edge Bridge consist of B-component that provides service necessary for protection and administrative isolation from other network. (23.5, 24.6). B-MAC encapsulated, untagged frames are delivered to peer BEBs via the I-tagged service interface.

When a MAC Address Translation is supported, the source and destination addresses of the B-MAC header may be changed at the BEB. This allows flexibility in B-MAC address allocation at each PBBN, and helps hiding information of local user from other network. It also minimizes propagation of configuration change in case of link or node failure. For example when a B-MAC tunnel is established across multiple PBBNs, a segment of B-MAC tunnel can be replaced to backup B-MAC tunnel locally in the PBBN that problem occurred, hence effectively confines the range of OAM signaling and restoration. In other use, multiple B-MAC tunnels can be aggregated to single B-MAC tunnel in order to improve scalability, if B-MAC addresses are translated at the merging point that includes B-component.

The translation of B-MAC address is performed in MAC relay of B-component. Additional source_address and destiantin_address fields must be included in Filtering Database if MAC Address Translation is supported. When an entry of FDB indicates address translation as a result of query, source_address, and destiantin_address fields in EM_UNITDATA.request is replaced to new destination and source addresses stored in the entry.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 13

3-Propose reject: The changes suggested do not seem to have any different external behavior from the current description which is in the port. Since the implementor may choose any implementation which conforms to the external behavior both the port base architectural description and the relay based architectural description are the same for implementations. Further the proposed new 8.8.12 does not provide normative language for how and where the B-MAC translation table is used or managed. Instead, the material provided is informative in nature and would therefore be more appropriately located in section 26.6.2. The editor recommends extracting the proposed text and using it to augement 26.6.2.

Comment 14 **Linda Dunbar**

NAME: Linda Dunbar

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   COMMENT TYPE: TR
2   CLAUSE: 6.4.1
3   PAGE: 28
4   LINE: 21~51
5   COMMENT START:
6   Not clear why two new parameters (service_access_point_identifier and
7   connection_identifier) are added to the M_UNITDATA.indication and M-UNIT-
8   DATA.request. Is "peer to peer" described in the document same as "point to point" con-
9   nection?
10
11   Line 28: "connection_identifier" can be ignored except as explicitly specified in sub-
12   sclause 6.5. But the subclause 6.5.of 801.Q2005 doesn't even have any description of the
13   "connection_identifier". So I don't quite understand how does subclause 6.5 describe the
14   use of this parameter.
15   COMMENT END:
16   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
17   Need more explanation on who creates those values and what they are for. Need to specify
18   if the "connection" used by the document is really end to end path connection. Since
19   bridged network is connection less network. Introducing a concept of "connection" needs
20   more justification.
21
22   Clause 8.8.11 has more description of connection identifier. But it is not clear who defines
23   the connection identifier.
24
25   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
26
27   ## *Disposition of Comment 14*
28
29
30   1-Propose accept in principle: See comment 12. The service_access_point_identifer and
31   connection_identifier declared in 6.4.1 are not used in an type of PBB, but have been
32   added to the text for architectural completeness. Since no use for them exists today in
33   802.1Q no text is provided to explain their use. I suggest we put a note in the text indicat-
34   ing that these fields are begin defined for a future, as yet undetermined use.
35
36   ## *Comment 15*   **Linda Dunbar**
37
38   NAME: Linda Dunbar
39   COMMENT TYPE: ER
40   CLAUSE: 6.8
41   PAGE: 32
42   LINE: 7
43   COMMENT START:
44   The Clause number 6.8 is used as "Protocol VLAN classification" in 802.1Q.2005.
45   COMMENT END:
46   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Should the "Support if the EISS for Provider Instance Ports" be part of Clause 6.7 of 802.1Q.2005 (Support of the EISS)?
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 15

1-Propose reject: The editing instruction on page 32 line 4 states to insert the new sub-clauses 6.8 and 6.9 after 6.7 and re-number the following subclaused. This will result in 802.1Q-2005 "Protocol VLAN classification" clause becoming subclause 6.10. Subclause 6.8 should not be included within 6.7 since 6.8 is substancially different from 6.7.

Comment 16   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 10
COMMENT START:
It is stated in the first sentence that the function specified in this subclause "replace" the function specified in 6.7. Why it has to be "replacing" 6.7? Multiple layers of EISS, some being S-Tag EISS layer and others being I-Tag EISS layer, should be allowed, making it possible to have virtual Provider Instance Port, i.e. without physical interface for the I-Tag service instance interface.

Line 11 stated that one instance of EISS is created for one I-SID and there could be multiple instances of those instances. When there are multiple of those I-SID instances, which one is for encapsulating or decapsulating B-MAC?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need description of how B-MAC is added and removed. Need description on cases where there is no physical LAN for the I-tag interface.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 16

1-Propose reject: The functions described in the EISS are the algorithms which implement the port not just the service interface which is defined in 6.6. The functions of a Provider Instance Port are substancially different from those of an enterprise VLAN bridge because the PIP performs all the 802.1ah encapsulation and service tag creation logic. Mixing these in the same clause would just confuse the description. As it stands the PIP may be internal or external as indicated in clause 5. All VIPs created on a PIP perform encapsulation/de-encapsulation. Subclauses 6.8.1 and 6.8.2 clearly and normatively specify how th

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

e B-MAC and I-TAG are added and removed from the frame as the frame passes between PIP ISS and EISS. Since the description is completely architectural it applies as well to internal as external ports.

Comment 17   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 48
COMMENT START:
"Admit Only Untagged and Priority tagged frames for 1-1 S-tagged interfaces". How to do 1-1 S-tagged service when the incoming frames are un-tagged?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need some explanation.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 17

3-Propose reject: The text seems clear and the author has provided no remedy.

Comment 18   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
What is the relationship between I-SID and VIP-SID? Aren't they the same? Based on the first paragraph of 6.8, VIP is one instance of Service instance. Therefore, one VIP should have one I-SID, isn't it?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need better explanation.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 18

3-Propose accept in principle: The VIP-SID is the I-SID associated with the VIP. This relationship is one-one-onto. We could replace VIP-SID with a phrase "the I-SID associated with the VIP" or "the VIP associated with the I-SID".

Comment 19   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: 18
COMMENT START:
Figure 6-2 is for B-Component Ports. So it should be about adding or stripping off B-VID. So I don't understand why MAC address translation table is processed here.

How is "Customer Backbone Port" different from "Customer Instance Port"? How to handle the case where I-Comp and B-Comp are on one bridge? Is there an EISS handling I-Comp and another EISS handling B-Comp? Is PVID same as I-SID?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need clarification.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 19

3-Propose reject: The text or 6.8 and 6.9 seem clear and the commentor has provided no remedy.

Comment 20   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 36
LINE: 2
COMMENT START:
"Port I-SID" and "Backbone I-SID" are discussed here. Are both values provisioned by operator? What is the difference between them?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need an explanation
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 20

3-Propose accept in principle: The I-SID value used on the backbone as delivered at the PBP may be different than the I-SID value entering the ISS of the CBP. This is because the CBP may support I-SID translation. At times the text needs to refer to these two possible I-SID values. The editor will add a few more words to explain these.

Comment 21   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 116
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Does "virtual Instance Port" only reside on "Provider Instance Port"? Does Customer Instance port have multiple instances? If yes, how to differentiate them?

This paragraph basically saying that Transparent Service Interface has to transport all frames to one "B-DA", is it correct?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need an explanation
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 21

3-Propose reject: The document seems clear and the commentor has provided no remedy.

Comment 22   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 117
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Figure 25-3 has been in the document for a long time. It always assumes that there is an I-Tagged Service interface between I-Comp and B-Comp. What if both I-Comp and B-Comp are handled by one bridge? Does it mean that I-Comp and B-Comp are just one EISS layer?

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

If my interpretation is correct, another figure is needed to show how I-Comp and B-Comp reside on one bridge.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 22

3-Propose reject: Figure 25-3 is completely architectural and does not indicate if the components are in a single equipment or multiple equipment. The interface is also logical and therefore may be internal or external. No additional diagrams are needed.

Comment 23   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
Question on the statement: "Each S-VID value maps to zero or one ISID value" How can S-VID map to ZERO ISID value?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Should say: "One or Multiple S-VID can be mapped to one ISID"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 23

3-Propose reject: The statement indicates that each S-VID is either not mapped to an I-SID or is mapped to a single I-SID. The commentors suggestion would change the purpose of the statement completely making the text less clear on the behavior.

Comment 24   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Type O: "create nfo"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Maybe "creation of"?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 24

3-Propose accept.

Comment 25   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 120
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
What do you mean by "mating I or B type backbone."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Do you mean "matching I or B"?
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 25

3-Propose accept in principle: Suggest striking the word mating.

Comment 26   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: Clause 25.5
PAGE: 120
LINE: 32
COMMENT START:
It is not clear if I-Tagged service interface allow any frames with B-VLAN added. If yes, does I-Tagged interface allow nested S-TAG/B-MAC/B-VLAN? If not, it will require two adjacent PBBN to strip off B-VLAN before passing frames to each other. Is it a lot of work?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need to clarify.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 26

1-Propose reject: The normative text of 6.8 and 6.9 seems clear that the interface requires an I-TAG as the outer most tag. The commentor has provided no further remeday.

Comment 27   Hesham Eibakoury

NAME: Hesham ElBakoury
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 112
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Version D3.0 does not have the the MIB items in sections 12.15.3-5.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the MIB items in sections 12.15.3-5 as defined in draft D3.01
posted at http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ah.html
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 27

3-Propose accept: See comment 1.

Comment 28   David Elie-Dit-Cosaque

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: multiple
PAGE: N/A
LINE: N/A
COMMENT START:
There are still many editor's notes that need to be addressed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove remaining editor's notes.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 28

3-Propose accept:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 29   **David Elie-Dit-Cosaque**

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE:
PAGE: 1
LINE: 38
COMMENT START:
"VLAN Registration Protocolf (MVRP)."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"VLAN Registration Protocolf (MVRP)." -> "VLAN Registration Protocol (MVRP)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 30   **David Elie-Dit-Cosaque**

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.98
PAGE: 19
LINE: 31-32
COMMENT START:
"one instance of the EISS that can encapsulated/deencapsulate
frames"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"one instance of the EISS that can encapsulated/deencapsulate
frames" -> "one instance of the EISS that can encapsulate/de-encapsulate
frames"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 31   **David Elie-Dit-Cosaque**

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
"Provider Backbone Port which are idential to Provider Network Ports (15)."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Provider Backbone Port which are idential to Provider Network Ports

(15)." -> "Provider Backbone Port which are identical to Provider
Network Ports (15)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 32   Don Fedyk

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Many
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
This draft has too many notes etc to be approved at this point.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Continue to refine the document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 32

3-Propose accept. All editor's notes will be removed.

Comment 33   Don Fedyk

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE:
PAGE: 15
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Service Virtual VLANs was the original PAR term (should be Service VLAN?) and on
this page should it not be equated with Service Instance? As I read it now Service Virtual
VLAN does not make sense. Services instances are Sometimes 2^{20} 2 superscript 24
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Use Service VLAN every for the Original PAR (instead of Service Virtual VLAN) Ser-
vice Instance is the new term used in the Draft text. Format should be the same. 2^{20} 2^{24}
or both superscripts.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 33

3-Propose reject: In spite of the difficult wording we must either stay with the PAR word-
ing for the initial clauses or amend the PAR. Since the latter is very high overhead I pro-
pose we stay with the PAR wording.

Comment 34   **Don Fedyk**

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.94
PAGE: 19
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Sometimes IB and sometimes I-B
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Should use I-B or IB everywhere.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 35   **Don Fedyk**

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Many 17, 25
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The draft refers to 802.1ad which is now merged with 802.1Q which is also mentioned
several times.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Refer to 802.1ad in a way that will be consistent with the merged version of 802.1Q.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 36   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 3.81
PAGE: 18
LINE: 22
COMMENT START:
It looks like each PIP can have its own MAC

address or they may all share the same one, so
it would be useful to clarify this in the definition
of Backbone MAC address.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add the suggested clarification.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 36

1-Propose accept: The B-MAC address used by the PIP needs to be unique amoung all the PIPs within a particular PBBN.

Comment 37   Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 3.92
PAGE: 19
LINE: 5
COMMENT START:
Does an I type BEB include exactly one I component,
or possibly more than one? There are conflicting
remarks in the document. For example, this definition
conflicts with the NOTE on page 23.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 37

2-Propose accept: See comment 9. We should go with the definition that allow an I-BEB to have multiple I-components since there is no reason not to build this type of equipment.

Comment 38   Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3
PAGE: 19
LINE:
COMMENT START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 We should probably add definitions for
2 service frame and backbone MAC frame which are
3 used in Clause 25 but not defined anywhere.
4
5 We may also need definitions for "bundled service"
6 and "1-1 service".
7 COMMENT END:
8 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
9 Add definition.
10 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
11
12 ### *Comment 39   Anoop Ghanwani*
13
14
15 NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
16 COMMENT TYPE: T/ER
17 CLAUSE: 5.7.1
18 PAGE: 23
19 LINE: 53
20 COMMENT START:
21 Not clear why this is 4093 and not 4094.
22 COMMENT END:
23 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
24 Add clarification
25 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
26
27 ### *Disposition of Comment 39*
28
29 1-Propose accept in principle: The reason the text says 4093 is because a bundled service
30 must combine at least 2 S-VLANs into a single service instance. Assuming 4094 S-
31 VLANs can be supported by the S-VLAN relay of the I-component then if one bundled
32 service is supported with only 2 S-VLANs carried by a single I-SID then we could support
33 4092 1-1 mappings for a total of 4093 service instances. This logic is accurate, but not
34 very useful. We will consider how to re-word this to make it more obvious to determine
35 how many service instances can be supported.
36
37 ### *Comment 40   Anoop Ghanwani*
38
39
40 NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
41 COMMENT TYPE: E
42 CLAUSE: 5.11
43 PAGE: 24
44 LINE: 52
45 COMMENT START:
46 The opening line of a Provider Backbone Bridge is

confusing.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace with "There are 3 types of PBBs..." and
explain that way.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 41   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 15, 16
COMMENT START:
delete "is a"
"or a provider bridge" to "of a provider bridge".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make changes as suggested.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 42   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Remove 's' from components.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Do as suggested.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 43   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 15
COMMENT START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Change "Backbone MAC address" to
"Backbone MAC address of the provider instance port".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change as suggested to be more specific. There are
also other places in the doc where this should be stated.
Search of "Backbone MAC address". Alternatively, change
the definition of Backbone MAC address to say it's the
address of a specific provider instance port which may
or may not be the same as that of the other provider instance
ports.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 43

1-Propose accept in principle: The Backbone MAC Address is specified in the second paragraph of clause 6.8. A search of "Backbone MAC Address" shows that the term is consistently used as specified (in particular as being a unicast address associated with a PIP) except in the definition 3.81. Therefore the alternative suggested change should be accepted, and modify the definition to:
"Backbone MAC Address: A unicast MAC address associated with a Provider Instance Port and used in creating the MAC header of frames transmitted across a Provider Backbone Bridged Network."

Comment 44   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Reserved fields are usually ignore on receipt and
zero on transmit. If we are discarding on receipt,
it looks like this field is not reserved, rather it
has something to do with versioning. Would prefer
if it were just called a version number.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change res2 to be an "i-tag version number".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 44

3-Propose reject: The res field names were used rather than version because we did not want to specify the exact use, though we have specified the exact behavior. Changing the name to version will not make this clearer. If we have a nutral name to replace "res" we could use it.

Comment 45   Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE: 123
LINE: 2
COMMENT START:
"...B component validates I-tags and maps frames on to B-VLANs."
How does it do this mapping?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify, or put a clause as reference.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 45

Propose accept: Will add a reference to 6.9.1.

Comment 46   Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 126
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
When we talk about 802.1ad networks, we should
be more specific. In this case it looks like we
should be calling these "Provider Bridged S-tagged
provider network ports".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1
2
3

Comment 47   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 127
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
Why are C-SA and C-DA not shown in these pictures?
Title of figure has typo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change typo and put in missing information or clarify
why it's not there.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 48   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.8
PAGE: 131
LINE: 6
COMMENT START:
This is a place where I got confused with the term
"Customer Bridges". Is this reference to C-VLAN
component bridges or to customer bridges as in
customers of the PBBN?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
There are several places in the current spec where
customer is used to describe the business relationship
and yet the term is actually defined to be something
other than that; i.e. something used in relation to
the C-VLAN component. I think it should be possible
to avoid using "customer" in the business sense anywhere
in the document by simply talking about the specific
kind of network/device we are talking about.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 49   **Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 26
PAGE: 138
LINE: 31
COMMENT START:
"Principle" -> "Principal".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change as suggested.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 50   Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 141
LINE: 33
COMMENT START:
This only talks about how we get the B-SA and
B-DA. How do we get the B-VLAN?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Provide explanation for how we get the B-VLAN.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 50

3-Propose accept: The editor will add a paragraph before the B-MAC paragraph indicating
how B-VLANs are provisioned and how frames are mapped into them.

Comment 51   Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 26.3
PAGE: 141
LINE: 51
COMMENT START:
Subclause 7.1 is missing.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Correct the reference.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 51

3-Propose reject: Subclause 7.1 is part of 802.1Q-2005 and therefore part of the 802.1ah amendment.

Comment 52   Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 23
LINE: 43
COMMENT START:
The first sentence is long and difficult to parse. It would be somewhat easier for the reader if it was phrased as similar as possible to the corresponding introductory sentences for C-VLAN components and S-VLAN components. As an S-VLAN component, the S-TAG is supported at each EISS. The EISS of Virtual Instance Ports additionally support I-TAGs. Everything after the first sentence is a description of behavior under specific configurations of the I-component, and are not actually conformance requirements. It is more appropriate for clause 25, and is already covered there except for the observation that an S-tagged service interface can support up to 4094 service instances.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first paragraph of 5.7 with: "An I-component comprises an S-VLAN component (5.6) with the EISS on each Customer Instance Port supported by the use of an S-VLAN tag (S-TAG)(6.7, 9.5), and the EISS for each Virtual Instance Port configured on a Provider Instance Port supported by the use of both a S-TAG and a Service Instance Tag (I-TAG)(6.8, 9.5)."

In the third paragraph of 25.4, replace the second sentence with: "The first variation supports up to 4094 backbone service instances by performing a one-to-one mapping between S-VIDs and I-SIDs."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 53   Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 24
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:

The I-component requirements should state that it is a conformant S-VLAN component
with at least one PIP supporting I-TAGs. Bullet g) is normal operation of an EISS sup-
porting S-TAGs (and the word "carry" would need more explanation if it were to stay).
Bullets c), e), and f) are normal operation of a VIP. Bullet b) refers to use of the
connection_identifier in the EISS and FDB. Bullet h) refers to the Layer-2 Gateway Port
operation (I think) and should be moved to the options list (covered in a subsequent com-
ment).

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the list of comformance requirements in 5.7 with:

"a) comprise a single conformant S-VLAN component; and

b) recognize and use Service Instance tags (I-TAGs) on one or more Provider Instance
Ports (6.8);

c) support 1:1 mapping between S-VID values and I-SID values;

d) support the connection_identifier parameter on the EISS of each Virtual Instance Port
(6.8) and in the Filtering Database (8.8.11)."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 53

1-Propose accept.

Comment 54 **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: T

CLAUSE: 5.7.1

PAGE: 24

LINE: 14

COMMENT START:

The I-component may support any of the S-VLAN component options (which in turn may
support any of the VLAN-aware bridge component options) in addition to those listed
here. The enumeration of the list should start over at "a)". Bullet j) describes behavior
that has been mentioned as desirable, but I don't think is currently supported in the specifi-
cation. This needs further work. Bullet k) is normal operation of a Provider Instance Port
and need not be listed as a distinct option. Bullet l) does not need to be listed as a separate
option (it would be accomplished by configuring the option of bullet j) on all Virtual
Instance Ports except one). Bullet m) is normal operation of a Provider Instance Port.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the text of 5.7.1 with: "A conformant I-component may implement any of the
options specified for an S-VLAN component (5.6.1), and may

a) support many-to-one mapping from S-VID values to I-SID values; and

b) terminate PBN spanning tree by filtering spanning tree BPDUs delivered to the Pro-
vider Instance Ports from the EISS;

c) detect loops and delete looping frames by filtering frames received at Provider Instance
Ports which contain the B-SA used by the Provider Instance Port.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 54

1-Propose accept:

Comment 55   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
Following the terminology used in 802.1ad to reduce redundancy and verbosity when
referring to VLAN-aware bridge components, an "S-VLAN bridge component" should be
called simply an "S-VLAN component". Technically the Provider Backbone Ports are
supported by the use of S-TAGs -- the term B-TAG is only a convenience to distinguish S-
TAGs in the PBBN core from S-TAGs in the PBN core. The use of the term B-TAG
should be restricted to clauses 25 and 26 where it is necessary to make this distinction.
Also suggest some minor rewording to make consistent with subclauses 5.5 and 5.6.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence of 5.8 with: "A B-component comprises an S-VLAN compo-
nent (5.6) with the EISS on each Provider Backbone Port supported by the use of an S-
VLAN tag (S-TAG)(6.7, 9.5), and the EISS for each Customer Backbone Port configured
on a Provider Instance Port supported by the use of a Service Instance Tag (I-TAG)(6.9,
9.5)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 55

3-Propose accept:

Comment 56   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 34

COMMENT START:

The B-component requirements should state that it is a conformant S-VLAN component with at least one CBP supporting I-TAGs. Bullet e) is normal operation of an S-VLAN component. Bullets b), f), and g) are normal operation of a Customer Backbone Port. Bullet c) reflects normal operation of an S-VLAN component if the PVID is used to support a single default B-VID per CBP, and is a B-component option if a B-VID field is supported in the service instance table (adding this to the B-component option list is included in a subsequent comment).

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the list of comformance requirements in 5.8 with:

"a) comprise a single conformant S-VLAN component; and

b) recognize and use Service Instance tags (I-TAGs) on one or more Customer Backbone Ports (6.9);

c) terminate PBN spanning tree by filtering spanning tree BPDUs delivered to the Provider Instance Ports from the EISS.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 56

1-Propose accept:

Comment 57   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock

COMMENT TYPE: T

CLAUSE: 5.8.1

PAGE: 24

LINE: 45

COMMENT START:

The I-component may support any of the S-VLAN component options (which in turn may support any of the VLAN-aware bridge component options) in addition to those listed here. The enumeration of the list should start over at "a)".

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the text of 5.8.1 with:

"A conformant B-component may implement any of the options specified for an S-VLAN component (5.6.1), and may

a) translate B-MAC addresses by supporting the MAC address translation table in Customer Backbone Ports;

and b) translate I-SID values by supporting the Port I-SID field in the service instance table in Customer Backbone Ports;

c) assign B-VID values based on I-SID values by supporting the B-VID field in the service instance table in Customer Backbone Ports;

d) use the default backbone MAC address field in the service instance table in Customer
Backbone Ports as the destination MAC address for any frames received with a broadcast
MAC address.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 57

1-Propose accept:

Comment 58   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 24
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
Most of the contents of this subclause are redundant wih the contents of 5.11.2, and are
most relevant to 5.11.2. Simplify this section
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the text of 5.11 with: "A Provider Backbone Bridge may be either a Backbone
Core Bridge or a Backbone Edge Bridge."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 58

1-Propose accept:

Comment 59   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 25
COMMENT START:
typos
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Provider Backbone Port" to "Provider Backbone Ports".
Change "idential" to "identical".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 59

3-Propose accept:

Comment 60   Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.11.2
PAGE: 25
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
The port types are specified in clause 25, not 26. The introduction of the concept of "components" in 802.1ad raised the need to distinguish between ports on components (which may be internal) and Ports on bridges (which are always physical). The capitalized word "Port" by itself was already used throughout the document to refer to bridge ports. The convention followed for referring to ports on components was to always use the full description of the port type (e.g. Provider Network Port). By this convention, the sentence beginning "Each Port configured as a Provider Backbone Port," is correct. The following sentence beginning "Each port configured as a Provider Backbone Port" is confusing and unnecessary. The last sentence also seems out of place. If the possible connectivity of the CBP is to be defined then the possible connectivity of PBPs, PIPs, and CIPs should also be defined, but I think it is better to leave this to clause 25 and 26.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Clause 26" to "Clause 25".
Delete the last two sentences of 5.11.2.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 60

3-Propose accept:

Comment 61   Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
It doesn't make sense for an I-component in an IB type BEB to have more than one PIP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Replace the second sentence of 5.11.2.3 with: "Each I-component of an IB-type Back-
bone Edge Bridge shall comprise one Provider Instance Port and one or more Customer
Instance Ports. The Provider Instance Port shall be connected within the Backbone Edge
Bridge, as specified in subclause 6.10, to a Customer Backbone Port on the B-compo-
nent."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 61

2-Propose discuss: The use of more than one PIP within an IB-BEB could have use for
redundant architectures.

Comment 62   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
In items 1), 2), and 3) of bullet C), the phrases beginning "used for ..." should not be itali-
cized (only the actual possible values of the parameter should be italicized). Actually I
don't think these phrases should be here at all. This is not the only parameter that needs to
be configured a certain way to implement a transparent, bundled, or 1:1 S-tagged inter-
face, and I don't see why this one should be singled out in this clause. The appropriate
place for this is clause 25.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the phrases beginning "used for ..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 62

1-Propose accept:

Comment 63   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:

The Editor's Note is not appropriate. If this stays it should be a "NOTE", not an "Editor's note". However the appropriate place for tutorial-type descriptions of how to implement a particular type of service interface is in Clause 25. Same applies to the Editor's Note before the last paragraph of 6.8.2.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the Editor's Note in 6.8.1. Likewise delete the Editor's Note in 6.8.2.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 64   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
.8.1
PAGE: 34
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
The sentence says the PIP "generates a B-MAC encapsulation". This is the Data Indication section so the PIP is removing the Service Instance TAG (and Service Instance tag header is the more specifically correct terminology).
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "generates a B-MAC encapsulation" with "removes the Service Instance tag header".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 64

3-Propose accept:

Comment 65   **Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
The second paragraph of 6.8.2 refers to a provisioned default destination address. No parameter has been specified for this. This was part of the resolution of a comment on draft 2.2 to allow a unicast or multicast address to be provisioned as the default backbone destination address of a VIP (i.e. default destination per I-SID). In 6.8.1 this address is also used to validate frames received from the backbone, which is fine if the default address is a multicast but not if it is a unicast.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
In 6.8 after item 3) of bullet c) add:
"   d) a Default Backbone Destination"

At the end of 6.8 (before 6.8.1) add a new paragraph: "The Default Backbone Destination parameter contains a MAC address to be used in the destination_address parameter of a M_UNITDATA.request when a backbone destination address cannot be derived from the connection_identifier parameter of the EM_UNITDATA.request. The default value for the Default Backbone Destination parameter is the broadcast address. This parameter may be configurable by management, and if so may be configured with a unicast or multicast MAC address."

In the second paragraph of 6.8.2 replace the last two sentences with: "Otherwise the value for the destination_address is the contents of the Default Backbone Destination parameter."
Replace bullet a) of 6.8.1 with:
"   a) The destination_address parameter of the received M_UNITDATA.indication primitive is not the broadcast address and does not match the Provider Instance Port's unicast Backbone MAC Address and does not match a multicast address in the Default Backbone Destination parameter;"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 65

1-Propose accept:

Comment 66   Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9.2
PAGE: 37
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
An M_UNITDATA.request primitive has a priority parameter but not a drop_eligible parameter.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete "and drop_eligible" .
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 66

3-Propose accept:

Comment 67   Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9.4
PAGE: 38
LINE: 25
COMMENT START:
Frames received at a Customer Backbone Port without an I-TAG are discarded, so the first sentence of the second paragraph of 6.9.4 is irrelevant and misleading. The last sentence of the first paragraph of 6.9.4 is not technically correct since the table entries specify a regenerated priority value for a given value of "received priority". The purpose of the second paragraph was to explicitly specify how the received priority is determined.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the second paragraph of 6.9.4. Replace the last sentence of the first paragraph with: "Each entry specifies, for the given value of received prioirty, the corresponding regenerated value. The priority signalled in the I-PCP field of the I-TAG is taken to be the recieved priority."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 67

1-Propose accept:

Comment 68   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Each Provider Instance Port is required to have a unique MAC address; this makes sense for I-BEBs, perhaps not for IB-BEBs where an implementation can use multiple I-components sharing the same MAC - distinguishing various service instances using I-SIDs.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Require the mandate to have one unique MAC address per PIP only for I-BEBs.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 68

1-Propose discuss: See comment 9.

Comment 69   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.8.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Though the MAC Address translation within B component could be useful sometimes, it can result into issues when the pre-translated MAC address is carried within the data of the frame. For example, if 802.1ag LTM frames issued by a I-BEB bridge port embeds its MAC within and it gets translated by the B-component and is not visible within PBB net-work. Later, when peer I-component responds with an LTR, which gets sent directly to the non translated MAC. Another example could be, if an I-component (via LLC) provides an IP service in an I-BEB, then ARPs running between two I-components could result into an issue.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Two options:
- Make a note of above mentioned (and similar) issues
- Remove the MAC translation option all together as a B component option
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 69

3-Propose accept first option: Add a note warning about translation of CFM addresses.

Comment 70   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 59
LINE: 2
COMMENT START:
Clause 12.15, Page 59, Line 2 states that Provider Instance Ports, whether internal or external they are managed the same way. Whereas, Clause 12.15.3 Page 61, Line 49 men-tions that PIP configuration managed object is applicable only to 'externally accessible PIPs.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Keep them consistent and inline with clause 12.15.3.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 70

3-Propose accept in principle: The statement in clause 12.15.3 is incorrect. The PIP is configured the same for internal and external PIPs. Change 12.15.3 to be consistent with 12.15.

Comment 71   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.8 (b)
PAGE: 24
LINE: 35
COMMENT START:
It says 'validate frames based on their I-SID before delivering over Customer Backbone Ports. Clause 6.9, Page 35, Line 49 mentions that service instance table is used to filter frames that are received as well as transmitted.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change 5.8 (b) mentioning that validation may happen both ways.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 71

1-Propose accept: See comment 48.

Comment 72   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 26.8
PAGE: 136
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The paragraph on 802.1ag is not explaining some details, like:
- Where the MEPs or MIPs could reside in I-Component and B-Component shims architecturally?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

- Can there be a MEP on a Virtual Instance Port, are they suppose to use 'Shared MAC Model' as described in 22-7 802.1ag. If there could be no MEP on VIP, how can CFM ever be done for individual service instance level?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Above details with diagrams like in 802.1ag explaining the internal architecture of CFM entities within PBB ports (PIP, CIP, CBP, and PBP) would greatly help understand the use of 802.1ag with PBB.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 72

1-Propose accept in principle: See comment 5.

Comment 73   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 57-68
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Usually the 'Outputs' of any MIB operation is considering only a success situation. If there is a failure, the current definition of managed objects does not mention the resultant Operation Status, listing the set of disallowed operations.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Adding the same would help the operation of various objects.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 73

2-Propose ?: Need more review.

Comment 74   Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Typos in the document
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Page 19, Line 31: "that can encapsulated" -> "that can encapsulate"

Page 25, Line 14: "Port js a may" -> "Port may"   1
Page 25, Line 15: "or a Provider Bridge" -> "of a Provider Bridge"   2
Page 25, Line 53: "I Components (5.7)" -> "I Component (5.7)"   3
Page 32, Line 14: "Figure 6-2" -> "Figure 6-1"   4
Page 53, Line 44: "immediately by an Payload" -> "immediately by a   5
Payload"   6
Page 57, Line 27: "CIB" is undefined term -> user appropriate intended   7
term   8
Page 58, Line 20: "For an IB-BCB" -> "For an IB-BEB"   9
Page 58, Line 49: "identified by a an ordered" -> "identified by an   10
ordered"   11
Page 68, Line 18: "a) Servive Name" -> "a) Service Name"   12
Page 68, Line 50: "a) Servive Name" -> "a) Service Name"   13
COMMENT END: 14
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 15
Change as suggested above   16
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 17
                                                                                         18
                                                                                         19
Comment 75   Tony Jeffree   20
                                                                                         21
NAME: <Tony Jeffree>   22
COMMENT TYPE: ER   23
CLAUSE: General   24
PAGE: 25
LINE: 26
COMMENT START: 27
Still way to many Editor's Notes for a WG ballot document.   28
COMMENT END: 29
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 30
Do what the Ed's Notes say & strip them out.   31
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 32
                                                                                         33
Disposition of Comment 75   34
                                                                                         35
                                                                                         36
3-Propose accept: Will remove all editor's notes.   37
                                                                                         38
Comment 76   Tony Jeffree   39
                                                                                         40
NAME: <Tony Jeffree>   41
COMMENT TYPE: ER   42
CLAUSE: 2   43
PAGE: 17   44
LINE: all   45
COMMENT START: 46

1   If there aren't any additions, remove the clause.
2   COMMENT END:
3   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
4   Do it.
5   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
6
7   ### *Disposition of Comment 76*
8
9
10 3-Propose accept in principle: The MEF 4 is referenced in clause 26. This should be added
11 to the reference list.
12
13 ### *Comment 77   Tony Jeffree*
14
15 NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
16 COMMENT TYPE: ER
17 CLAUSE: 3.76, 3.91
18 PAGE: 18
19 LINE: 6/7, 52
20 COMMENT START:
21 "B component" could benefit from hyphenation (B-component) to avoid constructs like
22 "A B component" which are difficult to parse. Same applies to "I component" in 3.91.
23
24 As this is the first occurrence of Backbone Edge Bridge, add the acronym.
25
26 COMMENT END:
27 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
28
29 "B component" -> "B-component" (global change)
30
31 "I component" -> "I-component" (global change)
32
33 "Backbone Edge Bridge" -> "Backbone Edge Bridge (BEB)"
34
35 Do a general search for terms that are listed in Clause 4 as acronyms and ensure that the
36 acronym is introduced in the body of the text on its first occurrence.
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
38
39 ### *Disposition of Comment 77*
40
41
42 3-Propose accept:
43
44
45
46

Comment 78   **Tony Jeffree**

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 3.92, 3.93
PAGE: 19
LINE: 5/6, 8
COMMENT START:
Hyphenation
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"I type" -> "I-type" (global change)
"IB type" -> "IB-type" (global change)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 78

3-Propose accept.

Comment 79   **Tony Jeffree**

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Figure 6-1
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 79

Propose accept: Should be Figure 6-2 (will be once merged with .1Q and .1ad). Likewise the figure in 6.9 should be Figure 6-3.

Comment 80   **Tony Jeffree**

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

PAGE: 32
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Terminology
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
unicast...MAC address -> individual...MAC address (global replace) (also multicast -> group, if necessary)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 80

3-Propose accept:

Comment 81   **Tony Jeffree**

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: 18
COMMENT START:
Typo. Also, this figure doesn't seem to be referenced at all in the text - shouldn't it be?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Bcomponent" -> "B-component" (similarly in the figure title.)

Add text to introduce the figure and relate it to the existing description.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 81

4-Propose accept in principle: The typo applies to the figure title in 6.8 as well. The figure was added for symmetry with 6.8. The "should it [be referenced] is a good question. Does it need to be? If so, a (gratuitous) reference to the figure will be added following the works "Customer Backbone Port" in the first paragraph of 6.8.

Comment 82   **Tony Jeffree**

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 8
PAGE: 39

LINE: 3-8   1
COMMENT START: 2
Editing instructions unclear & confusing. Ed's note doesn't help!   3
COMMENT END: 4
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 5
Replace the existing instructions and Ed's Note as follows: 6
                                                                                                 7
"Change subclause 8.8 and its subclauses, and insert new subclause 8.8.11   8
following existing subclause 8.8.10, as indicated:"   9
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 10
                                                                                                11

Disposition of Comment 82   12
                                                                                                13
                                                                                                14
3-Propose accept: 15
                                                                                                16

Comment 83   Tony Jeffree   17
                                                                                                18
                                                                                                19
NAME: <Tony Jeffree>   20
COMMENT TYPE: ER   21
CLAUSE: 17.1   22
PAGE: 73 onwards   23
LINE: 8/9 (and other examples)   24
COMMENT START: 25
The editing instructions shouldn't be erring to AG at all - by the time the AH project fin-   26
ishes, AG will be done, and the editing instructions in this document will need to be stated   27
relative to the state of Q at that point, which is the logical merge of Q, AD, and AG. So all   28
instructions of the form "No change from ag" and "Insert xxx from ag here" etc. need to be   29
removed.   30
                                                                                                31
I know that this is a non-trivial problem, particularly with this section given that it is being 32
simultaneously messed with by 3 projects, but...   33
                                                                                                34
COMMENT END: 35
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 36
                                                                                                37
Fix the editing instructions and changed/replacement text on the assumption that what is   38
being changed is the merge of Q, AD, and AG.   39
                                                                                                40
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 41
                                                                                                42

Disposition of Comment 83   43
                                                                                                44
                                                                                                45
3-Propose accept: 46

Comment 84   Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: Annex B onwards
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:

No need for the many instances of "This Amendment makes no changes to..." - in fact they must be removed before this draft goes to Sponsor ballot.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Remove them.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 84

3-Propose accept:

Comment 85   Kari Laihonen

NAME: Kari Laihonen
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14-21
COMMENT START:
The declaration of the capabilities of the Ports is not straightforward.For example, Customer Instance Port appears in two paragraphs.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace text starting from line 14 "A Customer Instance Port is may attach .." ending line 21 " .. or to a Customer Instance Port." with four new paragraphs declaring the capabilities of each Port. Correct the spelling error "is a may attach" by deleting "is a".

A Customer Instance Port may attach to a Customer Network Port (802.1ad), Provider Network Port (802.1ad) or to a Provider Backbone Port. (I think it is not necessary to mention Provider Bridge.)

A Provider Instance Port may only attach to a Customer Backbone Port.

A Customer Backbone Port may attach to either a Provider Instance Port or another Customer Backbone Port.

A Provider Backbone Port may attach to a Provider Network Port (802.1ad), Customer Instance Port or Provider Backbone Port.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 85

3-Propose accept:

Comment 86   Kari Laihonen

NAME: Kari Laihonen
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 132
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
When Provider Bridged Network is a part of Customer Equipment Provider Bridge MST BPDU's must not propagate over S LAN.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "A, P and S LANs but not over I or B LANs" into "A, C and P LANs but not over the I, B or S LANs".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 86

3-Propose accept in principle: MST BPDU's must propagate over the S LAN to allow operation of subclause 13.39. The C LAN could have MST BPDU's and could be included in the list. I propose changing to "A, P, C, and S LANs but not over I or B LANs".

Comment 87   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 1.1
PAGE: 15
LINE: 50
COMMENT START:
No longer need double-letter listing

1   COMMENT END:
2   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
3   Change "aa" etc to
4   "a" etc
5   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
6
7   ***Comment 88***   **David Martin**
8
9
10   NAME: David W. Martin
11   COMMENT TYPE: E
12   CLAUSE: 5.7
13   PAGE: 23
14   LINE: 52
15   COMMENT START:
16   Typo
17   COMMENT END:
18   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
19   Change "maximum of 4093" to
20   "maximum of 4094"
21   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
22
23   ***Comment 89***   **David Martin**
24
25   NAME: David W. Martin
26   COMMENT TYPE: E
27   CLAUSE: 5.7
28   PAGE: 24
29   LINE: 6
30   COMMENT START:
31   Specify S-PCP
32   COMMENT END:
33   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
34   Change "e) maps between PCP values and I-PCP values;" to "e) maps between S-PCP val-
35   ues and I-PCP values;"
36   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
37
38   ***Comment 90***   **David Martin**
39
40
41   NAME: David W. Martin
42   COMMENT TYPE: E
43   CLAUSE: 5.7
44   PAGE: 24
45   LINE: 7
46   COMMENT START:

Specify S-DEI

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Change "f) maps between DEI values and I-DEI values;" to "f) maps between S-DEI values and I-DEI values;"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 91   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 5.8

PAGE: 24

LINE: 30

COMMENT START:

Typo

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Change "supported by the use of an service instance tag" to "supported by the use of a service instance tag"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 92   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 5.11

PAGE: 25

LINE: 14

COMMENT START:

Typo

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Change "A Customer Instance Port is a may attach to a Customer Network Port" to "A Customer Instance Port may attach to a Customer Network Port"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 93   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 5.11.1

PAGE: 25

LINE: 26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 COMMENT START:
2 Typo's
3 COMMENT END:
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5 Change "Provider Backbone Port which are idential to Provider Network Ports" to "Pro-
6 vider Backbone Ports which are identical to Provider Network Ports"
7 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
8
9 ## *Comment 94*   **David Martin**
10
11
12 NAME: David W. Martin
13 COMMENT TYPE: E
14 CLAUSE: 6.4.1
15 PAGE: 28
16 LINE: 36
17 COMMENT START:
18 Undetermined reference
19 COMMENT END:
20 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
21 Find or define the appropriate reference for a "protocol shim"
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
23
24 ## *Comment 95*   **David Martin**
25
26 NAME: David W. Martin
27 COMMENT TYPE: E
28 CLAUSE: 6.8.1
29 PAGE: 33
30 LINE: 14
31 COMMENT START:
32 Typo
33 COMMENT END:
34 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
35 Change "and does not match default backbone MAC address" to "and does not match the
36 default backbone MAC address"
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
38
39 ## *Disposition of Comment 95*
40
41
42 Propose accept:
43
44
45
46

Comment 96 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "and preprended to the" to "and prepended to the"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 97 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: Figure 6-2, line 24
COMMENT START:
Swap the Customer/Provider labels from the right/left sides of the figure so it has the same
orientation as Figure 6-1.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Swap the labels from the right/left "Customer Backbone Port"/"Provider Backbone Port"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 97

4-Propose accept:

Comment 98 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Change "Instance Drop Eligibile field" to "Instance Drop Eligible field"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 98

Propose accept:

Comment 99   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "recieved priority in 6.7.4." to "received priority in 6.7.4."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 99

4-Propose accept:

Comment 100   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.4
PAGE: 38
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "The table may be configured as descrived in 6.7.4." to "The table may be config-
ured as described in 6.7.4."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 100

4-Propose accept:

Comment 101 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.5
PAGE: 53
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "a Service Instance TAGs (I-TAG)," to "a Service Instance TAG (I-TAG),"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 101

4-Propose accept:

Comment 102 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 53
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "followed immediately by an Payload Type" to "followed immediately by a Payload Type"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 103 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: Figure 9-3, line 6
COMMENT START:
State full "802.1ah"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   Change "Ethernet Encapsulating .1ah I-TAG TCI" to "Ethernet Encapsulating 802.1ah I-
2   TAG TCI"
3   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
4
5   ## *Comment 104*   **David Martin**
6
7
8   NAME: David W. Martin
9   COMMENT TYPE: E
10   CLAUSE: 9.8
11   PAGE: 54
12   LINE: 15
13   COMMENT START:
14   Typo
15   COMMENT END:
16   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
17   Change "The I-TAG TCI encode the following fields:" to "The I-TAG TCI encodes the
18   following fields:"
19   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
20
21   ## *Comment 105*   **David Martin**
22
23   NAME: David W. Martin
24   COMMENT TYPE: E
25   CLAUSE: 12.15
26   PAGE: 58
27   LINE: 49
28   COMMENT START:
29   Typo
30   COMMENT END:
31   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
32   Change "are identified by a an ordered pair" to "are identified by an ordered pair"
33   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
34
35   ## *Comment 106*   **David Martin**
36
37
38   NAME: David W. Martin
39   COMMENT TYPE: E
40   CLAUSE: 25
41   PAGE: 114
42   LINE: 17
43   COMMENT START:
44   Typo
45   COMMENT END:
46   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Change "the provider is a customers to the backbone provider" to "the provider is a customer to the backbone provider"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 107   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
Make consistent usage of the form "I-SID" not "ISID"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "ISID" instances (4) to "I-SID"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 108   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Typo's
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "against accidental creatio nfo data loops, and prevents configuration of the I comonent" to "against accidental creation of data loops, and prevents configuration of the I component"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 109   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
2   Change "over the ISS interface for ecapsuled Ethernet frames." to "over the ISS interface
3   for encapsuled Ethernet frames."
4   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
5
6   ## *Comment 110*   **David Martin**
7
8
9   NAME: David W. Martin
10   COMMENT TYPE: E
11   CLAUSE: 25.4
12   PAGE: 119
13   LINE: Figire 25-5, line 22
14   COMMENT START:
15   Typo
16   COMMENT END:
17   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
18   Change "Figure 25-5-Ecapsulated Ethernet Frames at ISS" to "Figure 25-5-Encapsulated
19   Ethernet Frames at ISS"
20   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
21
22   ## *Comment 111*   **David Martin**
23
24   NAME: David W. Martin
25   COMMENT TYPE: E
26   CLAUSE: 25.5
27   PAGE: 121
28   LINE: 46
29   COMMENT START:
30   Typo
31   COMMENT END:
32   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
33   Change "The B component or the PBBN" to "The B component of the PBBN"
34   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
35
36   ## *Comment 112*   **David Martin**
37
38
39   NAME: David W. Martin
40   COMMENT TYPE: E
41   CLAUSE: 25.5
42   PAGE: 121
43   LINE: 51
44   COMMENT START:
45   Typo's
46   COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Change "indentified by an ISID," to "identified by an I-SID,"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 113   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 121
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
Rogue end quote
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "is forwarding at any given time."" to "is forwarding at any given time."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 114   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "which also under the control" to "which is also under the control"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 115   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "802.1ae" to "802.1AE"

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
2
3 ### *Comment 116*   **David Martin**
4
5
6 NAME: David W. Martin
7 COMMENT TYPE: E
8 CLAUSE: 25.9
9 PAGE: 123
10 LINE: 29
11 COMMENT START:
12 Typo
13 COMMENT END:
14 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
15 Change "redundancy therefore will fail if any LAN or component fails" to "redundancy
16 and therefore will fail if any LAN or component fails"
17 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
18
19 ### *Comment 117*   **David Martin**
20
21 NAME: David W. Martin
22 COMMENT TYPE: E
23 CLAUSE: 25.9
24 PAGE: 123
25 LINE: 35
26 COMMENT START:
27 Typo
28 COMMENT END:
29 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
30 Change "These provide no node redundancy therefore will fail if any node fails." to
31 "These provide no node redundancy and therefore will fail if any node fails."
32 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
33
34 ### *Comment 118*   **David Martin**
35
36
37 NAME: David W. Martin
38 COMMENT TYPE: E
39 CLAUSE: 25.9.1
40 PAGE: 125
41 LINE: 37
42 COMMENT START:
43 Use official reference
44 COMMENT END:
45 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
46

Change "using IEEE 802.3ad link aggregation. Using 802.3ad a single" to "using IEEE 802.3-2005 clause 43 link aggregation. Using link aggregation a single"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 119   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.1
PAGE: 125
LINE: 50
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "used for traffic over an multiple LANs" to "used for traffic over multiple LANs"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 120   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "too a primary and one or more" to "to a primary and one or more"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 121   David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Punctuation and Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Change "When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEBs," to "When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface, multiple Customer Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEB,"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 122   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Punctuation
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "When providing a class III protected I-tagged interface multiple Customer Backbone Ports," to "When providing a class III protected I-tagged interface, multiple Customer Backbone Ports,"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 123   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 22
COMMENT START:
Use name not project
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "executes 802.1ag at the physical level" to "executes CFM at the physical level"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 124   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
Typo

COMMENT END: 1
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 2
Change "nodes too a primary and one" to "nodes to a primary and one" 3
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 4
5

Comment 125   David Martin 6
7
8
NAME: David W. Martin 9
COMMENT TYPE: E 10
CLAUSE: 25.9.3 11
PAGE: 126 12
LINE: 34 13
COMMENT START: 14
Typo 15
COMMENT END: 16
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 17
Change "is constantly moditored using either" to "is constantly monitored using either" 18
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 19
20
Comment 126   David Martin 21
22
23
NAME: David W. Martin 24
COMMENT TYPE: E 25
CLAUSE: 25.9.3 26
PAGE: 126 27
LINE: 42 28
COMMENT START: 29
Punctuation 30
COMMENT END: 31
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 32
Change "When providing a class IV protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer 33
Instance Ports are used" to "When providing a class IV protected S-tagged interface, mul- 34
tiple Customer Instance Ports are used" 35
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 36
37
Comment 127   David Martin 38
39
40
NAME: David W. Martin 41
COMMENT TYPE: E 42
CLAUSE: 25.9.3 43
PAGE: 126 44
LINE: 50 45
COMMENT START: 46
Punctuation

1 COMMENT END:
2 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
3 Change "When providing a class IV protected I-tagged interface multiple Customer Back-
4 bone Ports are used" to "When providing a class IV protected I-tagged interface, multiple
5 Customer Backbone Ports are used"
6 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
7
8 ## Comment 128   David Martin
9
10
11 NAME: David W. Martin
12 COMMENT TYPE: E
13 CLAUSE: 25.9.3
14 PAGE: 126
15 LINE: 54
16 COMMENT START:
17 Use name not project & typo
18 COMMENT END:
19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
20 Change "interface executes 802.1ag at the physical level to anounce and detect failures."
21 to "interface executes CFM at the physical level to announce and detect failures."
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
23
24 ## Comment 129   David Martin
25
26 NAME: David W. Martin
27 COMMENT TYPE: E
28 CLAUSE: 25.9.3
29 PAGE: 128-129
30 LINE: n/a
31 COMMENT START:
32 Blank pages
33 COMMENT END:
34 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
35 Delete blank pages
36 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
37
38
39 ## Comment 130   David Martin
40
41 NAME: David W. Martin
42 COMMENT TYPE: E
43 CLAUSE: 26
44 PAGE: 130
45 LINE: 9
46 COMMENT START:

Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "provides the context necessary to understand how the:" to "provides the context necessary to understand the:"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 131   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26
PAGE: 130
LINE: 29
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "and Backbone Core Bridge at the core of" to "and Backbone Core Bridges at the core of"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 132   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 132
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
Reword
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "onto a B-VLAN (tunnel) who's B-VID is contained in the B-TAG" to "onto a B-VLAN (tunnel) with its B-VID contained in the B-TAG"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 133   **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133
LINE: 43

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   COMMENT START:
2   Typo
3   COMMENT END:
4   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5   Change "receives Backbone MAC frame" to "receives a Backbone MAC frame"
6   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
7
8   ## *Comment 134*   **David Martin**
9
10
11 NAME: David W. Martin
12 COMMENT TYPE: E
13 CLAUSE: 26.6
14 PAGE: 135
15 LINE: 7
16 COMMENT START:
17 Typo
18 COMMENT END:
19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
20 Change "For PBBNs deployments it is important" to "For PBBN deployments it is impor-
21 tant"
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
23
24 ## *Comment 135*   **David Martin**
25
26 NAME: David W. Martin
27 COMMENT TYPE: E
28 CLAUSE: 26.6.1
29 PAGE: 135
30 LINE: 21
31 COMMENT START:
32 Typo's
33 COMMENT END:
34 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
35 Change "transports the S-VLAN as a instance of MAC service within B-VLAN generated
36 by" to "transports the S-VLAN as an instance of MAC service within B-VLANs generated
37 by"
38 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
39
40 ## *Comment 136*   **David Martin**
41
42
43 NAME: David W. Martin
44 COMMENT TYPE: E
45 CLAUSE: 26.6.2
46 PAGE: 135

LINE: 36
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "to the an Ethernet Network" to "to the Ethernet Network"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 137 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.6.2
PAGE: 135
LINE: 39
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Frame delivered over the E-NNI" to "Frames delivered over the E-NNI"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 138 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.7
PAGE: 135
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "one management entity acting as a agent" to "one management entity acting as an agent"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 139 **David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE: 5

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

COMMENT START:
Must have the PICS filled in prior to going on to Sponsor ballot. Note this is the reason for my 'disapprove' vote.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fill in the PICS
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 139

3-Propose accept:

Comment 140   **Alan McGuire**

NAME: Alan McGuire
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical Required)
CLAUSE: 12.12.2, 12.12.3, 8.4, 8.8.1
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Support of PBT is an important feature for PBBNs. The basic changes for PBT support should be included directly in 802.1ah. The PBT PAR can then focus on CFM and protection switching.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the four changes suggested in the PBT PAR email thread to 802.1ah.
1) Create a method for allocating some VID space to PBT while allowing the rest for use by MSTP or SPB. This can be done by: Defining a special MSTID called the PBTID (use 0xFFE) which identifies PBT rather than a MSTI. An MSTID not in the MSTI list indicates some protocol other than MSTP running in parallel to MSTP (802.1Q-2005 12.12.1 and 8.6.2). Allow the FID to MSTID Allocation Table (12.12.2) to allocate a FID to the PBTID. (i.e. FID=0xFFE to PBTID=0xFFE). Allow the MST Configuration Table (12.12.3) to allocate VIDs to the PBTID.The PBTID code of 0xFFE in the MST Configuration Table means "this B-VID is available to PBT for use as a route selector".

2) All VIDs allocated to PBT have a port state at each bridge port who's state is forced to forwarding=on and learning=off (change 8.4). The static forwarding state replaces the MSTP port states.

3)Add a static filtering entry type for "all unicast addresses for which no more specific static filtering entry exists" (change 8.8.1 bullet a)). This change allows unknown unicasts to be discarded since a discard static filter may match all unknown unicasts.

4)Add an Informative Annex explaining the use of PBT. This may be based on the PBT paper submitted for the May 2006 meeting.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 140

1-Propose ?: See comment 10. PBT is a vital carrier feature. We have discussion of a PAR for PBT circulating on the IEEE 802.1 email list. The comment proposes adding the basic changes for PBT to 802.1ah while opening a PAR for CFM, protection, and other PBT features. The advantage of including these modifications in the 802.1ah amendment is they will provide early guidance for implementors of PBT data relays without waiting for a new standards cycle. This in turn will allow box and chip vendors a clear immediate path for the PBT relay support.

Comment 141   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 17.2.2
PAGE: 74
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
In addiiton to showing a high level structure of the MIB, this section should also contain a table that details the mapping of clause 12 variables to the MIB objects.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Insert new tables as appropriate.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 141

3-Propose accept:

Comment 142   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.3.2
PAGE: 74
LINE: 43
COMMENT START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

The relationship to the Q-BRIDGE-MIB in RFC 4363 and .1ap needs to be delineated in this section. That is, it needs to be explained that either that the imports are only from .1ap (assuming the re-indexed Q-BRIDGE-MIB is moved to .1ap as suggested in another of my comments) or that certain modules are imported from RFC 4363 and reindexed. Also, the relationships to the P-BRIDGE-MIB and BRIDGE-MIB should also be described.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Update this section accordingly.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 142

3-Propose accept:

Comment 143   Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
It has been discussed as part of the proposed PBB-MIB that one simplifying option would be to re-index the Q-BRIDGE-MIB based on component ID (Dot1ahComponentIdentifier). This would allow there to be only one instance of the Q-BRIDGE-MIB base objects and not two to maintain. It would also mean that we would then have to document the re-indexed Q-BRIDGE-MIB in .1ap and describe the default case where the component ID is null. This would also provide a rationale to make a complete import/rework of the IETF written BRIDGE MIBs into .1ap instead of just amendments. Note that another option would be to invoke SNMPv3 contexts -- but this is not preferable to their non widespread usage.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove the re-indexed Q-BRIDGE-MIB objects from the PBB-MIB and instead move it to .1ap and reference it from the PBB-MIB.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 143

1-Propose accept: This needs to be decided jointly with 802.1ap since the 802.1ap MIB needs to be re-indexed with component ID to follow this route.

Comment 144   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
The REFERENCE items in the MIB are to a variety of documents past, current and future (i.e., .1Q consolidated). The references should be to either the current base (802.1Q-2005) or one of its amendments (.1ad, .1ag, .1ak or .1ah) as indicated in 17.2
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Update references as appropriate.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 144

3-Propose accept:

Comment 145   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
Not all the DESCRIPTION items in the MIB contain text.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Complete descriptions as appropriate.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 146   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
There is no Contact information
COMMENT END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Confirm the MIB editor and enter their details as contact information
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 147   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE: 114
LINE: 40
COMMENT START:
The text labels that is supposed to correlate to figure 25-2, does not.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add '(called a B-VLAN bridge)' towards the end of the sentence. And spell out 'Component' in figure 25-2 and others in this clause (e.g., 25-3, 25-6, 25-8,...).
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 148   **Glenn Parsons**

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE:137
LINE:
COMMENT START:
There is no PICS in this document
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add a PICS based on the MUST/MAY statements before sponsor ballot...
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 148

3-Propose accept:

Comment 149   **Haim Porat**

NAME: Haim Porat
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 24

LINE: 3
COMMENT START:
According to description, the I components itself generates B-MACS. It is not clarified how can a MAC address be generated by a nested tag.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add clear method of I tag Behavior
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 149

1-Propose reject: Clause 8 does not specify any tag manipulations -- the tag manipulations required by the new types of bridges are specified in the modifications to clause 6. Clause 8 specifies the filtering, forwarding, and learning functions -- the only changes to these functions required by the new types of bridges are to support the connection_identifier parameter and are specified in the modifications to clause 8.

Comment 150   **Haim Porat**

NAME: Haim Porat
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 8
PAGE:39
LINE: 3
COMMENT START:
There are at least 3 new types of bridges, each with its own uniue way of filtering and tag manipulation, yet none is detailed in clause 8, as it is in 802.1Q
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add detield bridge operation 8.1-8.8 for all types of bridges.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 150

1-Propose reject: No further additions are needed to clauses 6 and 8 since the relay operation of both the I and B component is an S-VLAN component with the modifications already detailed. The commentor has not provided any remedy.

Comment 151   **Karen Randall**

NAME: Karen Randall
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.4

1   PAGE: 75
2   LINE: 17
3   COMMENT START:
4   editorial: remove the "even then," in this line. Unnecessary.
5   COMMENT END:
6   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
7   Delete "even then,"
8   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
9
10   ## Comment 152   Karen Randall
11
12
13   NAME: Karen Randall
14   COMMENT TYPE: E
15   CLAUSE: 17.4
16   PAGE: 75
17   LINE: 25
18   COMMENT START:
19   editorial: remove the "even then," in this line. Unnecessary.
20   COMMENT END:
21   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
22   Delete "even then,"
23   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
24
25   ## Comment 153   Robert Roden
26
27   NAME: Robert Roden
28   COMMENT TYPE: T
29   CLAUSE: 1.1
30   PAGE: 16
31   LINE: 19
32   COMMENT START:
33   It isn't obvious where the performance requirements, parameter ranges etc. cited in bullet
34   ak) are defined.
35   COMMENT END:
36   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
37   Add performance clause or delete bullet ak).
38   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
39
40   ## Disposition of Comment 153
41
42
43   1-Propose accept: Delete item ak).
44
45
46

Comment 154   **Robert Roden**

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Incorrect reference to Customer Instance ports
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Customer Instance ports of the B component" with "Customer Backbone ports of the B component"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 155   **Robert Roden**

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
On the VIP why is the "Admit only VLAN-tagged frames" applicable to 1-1 S-tagged interfaces when 25.4 states that the S-tag is removed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify usage.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 155

2-Propose accept in principle: "Admit only VLAN-tagged frames" is not appropriate for a 1:1 S-tagged interface. The appropriate place to describe the configuration necessary to achieve a particular service interface is in clause 25. With respect to 6.8 this is resolved by comment 62.

Comment 156   **Robert Roden**

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 53

1 COMMENT START:
2 This editor's note seems like it would be useful in the final standard.
3 COMMENT END:
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5 Change to ordinary note and retain.
6 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
7
8 ## *Comment 157*   **Robert Roden**
9
10
11 NAME: Robert Roden
12 COMMENT TYPE: E
13 CLAUSE: 6.8.2
14 PAGE: 34
15 LINE: 53
16 COMMENT START:
17 This editor's note seems like it would be useful in the final standard.
18 COMMENT END:
19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
20 Change to ordinary note and retain.
21 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
22
23 ## *Comment 158*   **Robert Roden**
24
25 NAME: Robert Roden
26 COMMENT TYPE: E
27 CLAUSE: 25.4
28 PAGE: 118
29 LINE: 35
30 COMMENT START:
31 The reference to "... a port based interface for 802.1ad bridge attachment" is a bit confus-
32 ing in the use of the word "port" and the restriction to 802.1ad attachment".
33 COMMENT END:
34 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
35 Either delete sentence or replace with "The all-to-one bundling S-tagged interface pro-
36 vides the transparent service interface".
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
38
39 ## *Comment 159*   **Josef Roese**
40
41
42 NAME: <Josef Roese>
43 COMMENT TYPE: TR
44 CLAUSE: 3.91
45 PAGE: 18
46 LINE: 53

COMMENT START:

Clause 3.91 defines that an I component encapsulates/de-encapsulates Provider Bridge frames, ie. S-tagged frames. However, the specification of the transparent service interface in clause 25.3 states that end stations, 802.1D and 802.1ad bridges could be connected to an Provider Backbone Bridge Network, i.e. to an I component.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Claus 2.91 should state that an I component encapsulates/de-encapsulates untagged, C-tagged and S-tagged frames depending on the interface type.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 159

1-Propose accept:

Comment 160   Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The abbrevations ISID and I-SID are use for Service instance ID.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change ISID to I-SID in the whole document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 160

3-Propose accept:

Comment 161   Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
The word "is" is missing between which and also.
COMMENT END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
2   Add the word is.
3   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
4
5   ### *Disposition of Comment 161*
6
7
8   4-Propose accept:
9
10 ### *Comment 162   Josef Roese*
11
12 NAME: <Josef Roese>
13 COMMENT TYPE: ER
14 CLAUSE: 25.6
15 PAGE: 122
16 LINE: 25
17 COMMENT START:
18 The reference to 802.1AE uses lower case letters.
19 COMMENT END:
20 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
21 Replace 802.1ae by 802.1AE.
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
23
24 ### *Disposition of Comment 162*
25
26
27 4-Propose accept:
28
29 ### *Comment 163   Josef Roese*
30
31
32 NAME: <Josef Roese>
33 COMMENT TYPE: E
34 CLAUSE: 25.9.2
35 PAGE: 126
36 LINE: 9
37 COMMENT START:
38 The expression CFM management contains the word management twice
39 COMMENT END:
40 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
41 Use either CFM or CF management.
42 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
43
44 ### *Comment 164   Josef Roese*
45
46 NAME: <Josef Roese>

COMMENT TYPE: ER

CLAUSE: 26.1

PAGE: 130

LINE: 54

COMMENT START:

The expression "provider network" is use for Provider Backbone Bridge Network.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Use Provider Backbone Bridge Network or PBBN instead.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 164

4-Propose accept:

Comment 165   Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>

COMMENT TYPE: ER

CLAUSE: 26.2

PAGE: 131

LINE: 20, 46/47

COMMENT START:

Two terms "backbone service provider", "network provider" are used

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Use a single term.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 165

3-Propose accept: Use the term "backbone service provider".

Comment 166   Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>

COMMENT TYPE: ER

CLAUSE: 26.6.2

PAGE: 135

LINE:

COMMENT START:

The abbreviation E-NNI only appears in clause 26.6.2. The term is not defined in the document and it does not appear in the list of abbreviation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 COMMENT END:
2 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
3 Define E-NNI or use a different term.
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
5
6 ### *Disposition of Comment 166*
7
8
9 3-Propose accept: Add a cross reference to the MEF 4 architecture document which uses
10 the E-NNI terminology.
11
12 ### *Comment 167   Dan Romascanu*
13
14 NAME: Dan Romascanu
15 COMMENT TYPE: TR
16 CLAUSE: 12.15
17 PAGE: 57
18 LINE: 51
19 COMMENT START:
20 There is no information in this section about who is the manager (service provider only or
21 also customer) and if there are customer views of the management information who has
22 access to them (for example who can see Customer Backbone Port information). The lack
23 of this information impacts the Security Considerations and MIB sections.
24 COMMENT END:
25 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
26 Clarify and define.
27 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
28
29
30 ### *Disposition of Comment 167*
31
32 1-Propose accept: Need some guidance on how to fill this in.
33
34 ### *Comment 168   Dan Romascanu*
35
36
37 NAME: Dan Romascanu
38 COMMENT TYPE: TR
39 CLAUSE: 17.6
40 PAGE: 76
41 LINE: 16
42 COMMENT START:
43 The MIB module does not compile and in general looks to be in initial design phase rather
44 than in sync with the rest of the document. I am listing below the output of libsmi. Many
45 of the warnings are due to the absence of DESCRIPTION and conformance clauses, but
46 this shows a level of maturity that does not fit this stage of the document.

1

Your request has been processed by the command 2

3

smilint -s -e -l 6 mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt 2>report.txt You can access any intermedi- 4
ately created files, the processing report (which might be empty if no errors or warnings 5
have been found), and output files (in case of a conversion request) for reading and down- 6
load from a temporary server directory for approx. 24 hours. 7

8

While processing your request the following errors and/or warnings have been found: 9

10

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:37: [5] {empty-description} warning: 11
zero-length description string 12
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:41: [5] {empty-description} warning: 13
zero-length description string 14
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:62: [5] {empty-description} warning: 15
zero-length description string 16
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:63: [5] {integer-misuse} warning: use 17
Integer32 instead of INTEGER in SMIv2 18
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:89: [5] {empty-description} warning: 19
zero-length description string 20
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:116: [5] {empty-description} warning: 21
zero-length description string 22
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:230: [5] {empty-description} warning: 23
zero-length description string 24
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:303: [5] {empty-description} warning: 25
zero-length description string 26
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:418: [5] {empty-description} warning: 27
zero-length description string 28
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:501: [5] {empty-description} warning: 29
zero-length description string 30
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:604: [5] {empty-description} warning: 31
zero-length description string 32
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:723: [5] {empty-description} warning: 33
zero-length description string 34
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:863: [5] {empty-description} warning: 35
zero-length description string 36
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1019: [5] {empty-description} warning: 37
zero-length description string 38
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1155: [5] {empty-description} warning: 39
zero-length description string 40
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1238: [5] {empty-description} warning: 41
zero-length description string 42
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1246: [5] {empty-description} warning: 43
zero-length description string 44
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1263: [5] {empty-description} warning: 45
zero-length description string 46

1	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1340: [5] {empty-description} warning:
2	zero-length description string
3	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1348: [5] {empty-description} warning:
4	zero-length description string
5	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1533: [5] {empty-description} warning:
6	zero-length description string
7	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1652: [5] {empty-description} warning:
8	zero-length description string
9	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1745: [5] {empty-description} warning:
10	zero-length description string
11	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1828: [5] {empty-description} warning:
12	zero-length description string
13	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1908: [5] {empty-description} warning:
14	zero-length description string
15	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2009: [5] {empty-description} warning:
16	zero-length description string
17	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2069: [5] {empty-description} warning:
18	zero-length description string
19	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2079: [5] {empty-description} warning:
20	zero-length description string
21	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2089: [5] {empty-description} warning:
22	zero-length description string
23	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2099: [5] {empty-description} warning:
24	zero-length description string
25	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2109: [5] {empty-description} warning:
26	zero-length description string
27	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2119: [5] {empty-description} warning:
28	zero-length description string
29	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2133: [5] {empty-description} warning:
30	zero-length description string
31	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2170: [5] {empty-description} warning:
32	zero-length description string
33	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2178: [5] {empty-description} warning:
34	zero-length description string
35	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2186: [5] {empty-description} warning:
36	zero-length description string
37	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2194: [5] {empty-description} warning:
38	zero-length description string
39	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2202: [5] {empty-description} warning:
40	zero-length description string
41	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2214: [5] {empty-description} warning:
42	zero-length description string
43	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2226: [5] {empty-description} warning:
44	zero-length description string
45	mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2257: [5] {empty-description} warning:
46	zero-length description string

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2265: [5] {empty-description} warning:	1
zero-length description string	2
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2273: [5] {empty-description} warning:	3
zero-length description string	4
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2285: [5] {empty-description} warning:	5
zero-length description string	6
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2319: [5] {empty-description} warning:	7
zero-length description string	8
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2327: [5] {empty-description} warning:	9
zero-length description string	10
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2335: [5] {empty-description} warning:	11
zero-length description string	12
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2343: [5] {empty-description} warning:	13
zero-length description string	14
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2355: [5] {empty-description} warning:	15
zero-length description string	16
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2386: [5] {empty-description} warning:	17
zero-length description string	18
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2394: [5] {empty-description} warning:	19
zero-length description string	20
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2402: [5] {empty-description} warning:	21
zero-length description string	22
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2414: [5] {empty-description} warning:	23
zero-length description string	24
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2442: [5] {empty-description} warning:	25
zero-length description string	26
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2450: [5] {empty-description} warning:	27
zero-length description string	28
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2462: [5] {empty-description} warning:	29
zero-length description string	30
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2496: [5] {empty-description} warning:	31
zero-length description string	32
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2504: [5] {empty-description} warning:	33
zero-length description string	34
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2512: [5] {empty-description} warning:	35
zero-length description string	36
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2520: [5] {empty-description} warning:	37
zero-length description string	38
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2532: [5] {empty-description} warning:	39
zero-length description string	40
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2566: [5] {empty-description} warning:	41
zero-length description string	42
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2574: [5] {empty-description} warning:	43
zero-length description string	44
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2582: [5] {empty-description} warning:	45
zero-length description string	46

1   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2590: [5] {empty-description} warning:
2   zero-length description string
3   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2605: [5] {empty-description} warning:
4   zero-length description string
5   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2636: [5] {empty-description} warning:
6   zero-length description string
7   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2644: [5] {empty-description} warning:
8   zero-length description string
9   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2652: [5] {empty-description} warning:
10   zero-length description string
11   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2663: [5] {empty-description} warning:
12   zero-length description string
13   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:42: [1] {object-identifier-unknown} unknown
14   object identifier label `experimental'
15   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2231: [5] {index-element-not-accessible}
16   warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbVipMappingEntry'
17   must be accessible
18   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2290: [5] {index-element-not-accessible}
19   warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbBMacMappingEntry'
20   must be accessible
21   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2360: [5] {index-element-not-accessible}
22   warning: exactly one index element of row
23   `dot1ahPbbISidRegistrationEntry' must be accessible
24   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2419: [5] {index-element-not-accessible}
25   warning: exactly one index element of row
26   `dot1ahPbbBVidRegistrationEntry' must be accessible
27   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2467: [5] {index-element-not-accessible}
28   warning: exactly one index element of row
29   `dot1ahPbbISidTranslationEntry' must be accessible
30   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2537: [5] {index-element-not-accessible}
31   warning: exactly one index element of row
32   `dot1ahPbbBMacTranslationEntry' must be accessible
33   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2610: [5] {index-exceeds-too-large} warning:
34   index of row `dot1ahPbbServiceEntry' can exceed OID size limit by 135
35   subidentifier(s)
36   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:119: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
37   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanVersionNumber' must be contained in at least one
38   conformance group
39   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:132: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
40   `dot1ahQBridgeMaxVlanId' must be contained in at least one conformance
41   group
42   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:143: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
43   `dot1ahQBridgeMaxSupportedVlans' must be contained in at least one
44   conformance group
45   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:154: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
46   `dot1ahQBridgeNumVlans' must be contained in at least one conformance

group 1

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:165: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 2
`dot1ahQBridgeGvrpStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance 3
group 4

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:241: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 5
`dot1ahQBridgeFdbDynamicCount' must be contained in at least one 6
conformance group 7

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:315: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 8
`dot1ahQBridgeTpFdbPort' must be contained in at least one conformance 9
group 10

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:333: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 11
`dot1ahQBridgeTpFdbStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance 12
group 13

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:430: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 14
`dot1ahQBridgeTpGroupEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one 15
conformance group 16

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:442: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 17
`dot1ahQBridgeTpGroupLearnt' must be contained in at least one 18
conformance group 19

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:504: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 20
`dot1ahQBridgeForwardAllPorts' must be contained in at least one 21
conformance group 22

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:516: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 23
`dot1ahQBridgeForwardAllStaticPorts' must be contained in at least one 24
conformance group 25

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:539: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 26
`dot1ahQBridgeForwardAllForbiddenPorts' must be contained in at least 27
one conformance group 28

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:607: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 29
`dot1ahQBridgeForwardUnregisteredPorts' must be contained in at least 30
one conformance group 31

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:620: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 32
`dot1ahQBridgeForwardUnregisteredStaticPorts' must be contained in at 33
least one conformance group 34

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:642: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 35
`dot1ahQBridgeForwardUnregisteredForbiddenPorts' must be contained in at 36
least one conformance group 37

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:748: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 38
`dot1ahQBridgeStaticUnicastAllowedToGoTo' must be contained in at least 39
one conformance group 40

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:771: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 41
`dot1ahQBridgeStaticUnicastStatus' must be contained in at least one 42
conformance group 43

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:888: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 44
`dot1ahQBridgeStaticMulticastStaticEgressPorts' must be contained in at 45
least one conformance group 46

```
1    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:906: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
2    `dot1ahQBridgeStaticMulticastForbiddenEgressPorts' must be contained in
3    at least one conformance group
4    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:924: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
5    `dot1ahQBridgeStaticMulticastStatus' must be contained in at least one
6    conformance group
7    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:959: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
8    `dot1ahQBridgeVlanNumDeletes' must be contained in at least one
9    conformance group
10   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1039: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
11   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanFdbId' must be contained in at least one conformance
12   group
13   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1053: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
14   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanCurrentEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one
15   conformance group
16   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1064: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
17   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanCurrentUntaggedPorts' must be contained in at least
18   one conformance group
19   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1075: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
20   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance
21   group
22   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1100: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
23   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanCreationTime' must be contained in at least one
24   conformance group
25   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1158: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
26   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticName' must be contained in at least one
27   conformance group
28   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1169: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
29   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one
30   conformance group
31   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1187: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
32   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanForbiddenEgressPorts' must be contained in at least
33   one conformance group
34   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1206: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
35   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticUntaggedPorts' must be contained in at least one
36   conformance group
37   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1225: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
38   `dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticRowStatus' must be contained in at least one
39   conformance group
40   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1266: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
41   `dot1ahQBridgeNextFreeLocalVlanIndex' must be contained in at least one
42   conformance group
43   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1351: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
44   `dot1ahQBridgePvid' must be contained in at least one conformance group
45   mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1366: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
46   `dot1ahQBridgePortAcceptableFrameTypes' must be contained in at least
```

one conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1393: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgePortIngressFiltering' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1414: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgePortGvrpStatus' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1436: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgePortGvrpFailedRegistrations' must be contained in at least
one conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1445: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgePortGvrpLastPduOrigin' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1454: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgePortRestrictedVlanRegistration' must be contained in at
least one conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1536: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1553: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortOutFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1567: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInDiscards' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1581: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInOverflowFrames' must be contained in at least
one conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1592: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortOutOverflowFrames' must be contained in at least
one conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1603: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInOverflowDiscards' must be contained in at
least one conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1655: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortHCInFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1672: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortHCOutFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1686: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortHCInDiscards' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1767: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
`dot1ahQBridgeConstraintType' must be contained in at least one
conformance group

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28
	29
	30
	31
	32
	33
	34
	35
	36
	37
	38
	39
	40
	41
	42
	43
	44
	45
	46

```
1     mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1785: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
2     `dot1ahQBridgeConstraintStatus' must be contained in at least one
3     conformance group
4     mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1831: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
5     `dot1ahQBridgeLearningConstraintDefaultsSet' must be contained in at
6     least one conformance group
7     mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1844: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
8     `dot1ahQBridgeLearningConstraintDefaultsType' must be contained in at
9     least one conformance group
10    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1951: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
11    `dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolGroupId' must be contained in at least one
12    conformance group
13    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1962: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
14    `dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolGroupRowStatus' must be contained in at least one
15    conformance group
16    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2023: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
17    `dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolPortGroupVid' must be contained in at least one
18    conformance group
19    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2034: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
20    `dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolPortRowStatus' must be contained in at least one
21    conformance group
22    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2064: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
23    `dot1ahPbbBridgeAddress' must be contained in at least one conformance
24    group
25    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2074: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
26    `dot1ahPbbBridgeName' must be contained in at least one conformance
27    group
28    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2084: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
29    `dot1ahPbbNumberOfIComponents' must be contained in at least one
30    conformance group
31    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2094: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
32    `dot1ahPbbNumberOfBComponents' must be contained in at least one
33    conformance group
34    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2104: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
35    `dot1ahPbbNumberOfExternalPbbPorts' must be contained in at least one
36    conformance group
37    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2114: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
38    `dot1ahPbbNumberOfInternalPbbPorts' must be contained in at least one
39    conformance group
40    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:59: [5] {type-without-format} warning: type
41    `Dot1ahComponentIdentifier' has no format specification
42    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:4: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier
43    `NOTIFICATION-TYPE' imported from module `SNMPv2-SMI' is never used
44    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:7: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier
45    `TimeStamp' imported from module `SNMPv2-TC' is never used
46    mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:13: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier
```

`BridgeId' imported from module `BRIDGE-MIB' is never used   1

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:13: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier   2

`dot1dBridge' imported from module `BRIDGE-MIB' is never used   3

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:13: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier   4

`dot1dBasePortEntry' imported from module `BRIDGE-MIB' is never used   5

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:19: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier   6

`MODULE-COMPLIANCE' imported from module `SNMPv2-CONF' is never used   7

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:19: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier   8

`OBJECT-GROUP' imported from module `SNMPv2-CONF' is never used   9

mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:19: [5] {import-unused} warning: identifier   10

`NOTIFICATION-GROUP' imported from module `SNMPv2-CONF' is never used   11

                                                                                                  12

COMMENT END: 13

SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 14

Include in the next version a MIB module that is fully synchronized in content, correct in   15

SYNTAX and includes all information needed to perform an appropriate MIB review.   16

SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 17

                                                                                                  18

                                                                                                  19

Comment 169   **Dan Romascanu**

                                                                                                  20

                                                                                                  21

NAME: Dan Romascanu   22

COMMENT TYPE: TR   23

CLAUSE: 17.4.2   24

PAGE: 75   25

LINE: 38   26

COMMENT START: 27

This section is incomplete. There are many more objects in the MIB module with a MAX-   28

ACCESS clause of read-write or read-create that need to be explicitly listed and the spe-   29

cific security threats of every object or group of object shall be detailed   30

COMMENT END: 31

SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 32

Explicitly list all objects or groups of objects with a MAX-ACCESS clause of read-write   33

or read-create and detail the respective security threats.   34

SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 35

                                                                                                  36

Disposition of Comment 169

                                                                                                  37

                                                                                                  38

                                                                                                  39

3-Propose accept: 40

                                                                                                  41

Comment 170   **Dan Romascanu**

                                                                                                  42

                                                                                                  43

NAME: Dan Romascanu   44

COMMENT TYPE: TR   45

CLAUSE: 17.4.2   46

PAGE: 75
LINE: 38
COMMENT START:
Who is the manager who uses this MIB? Is it always a SP, or also managers in the enterprise (customer) space. If the later, I would expect this section to include some indication about what views will be accessible for management for managers belonging to the provider administrative domain relative to views accessible to managers in the enterprise (customers) domains.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Define and explain how the different management views will be available and accessed.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 170

1-Propose accept in principle: Need some discussion and guidance on this.

Comment 171   Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.3
PAGE: 74
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
This section is incomplete. I expect it to include a detailed description of the relationship between this MIB module and the MIB modules defined in the IETF Bridge MIB WG RFCs, as well as a migration strategy or strategies for customers in the enterprise and service providers environments, possibly with references to the MODULE-COMPLIANCE definition in the MIB modules.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Edit accordingly.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 171

3-Propose accept:

Comment 172   Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: ER

CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Contact information is missing
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fill in contact information
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 172

3-Propose accept:

Comment 173   **Dan Romascanu**

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 77
LINE: 18
COMMENT START:
The Dot1ahComponentIdentifier TC is defined starting from value 0 and then is used as table index. In general using 0 as a index is discouraged, with the exception where specific semantics require. If such semantics do not exist in all tables where Dot1ahComponentIdentifier is used, it would be better to define it starting with value 1 and define a Dot1ahComponentIdentifierOrZero TC for cases where semantics will require it.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
If zero is not required, redefine the TC
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 173

1-Propose accept in principle: Need to decide the ranging for the component identifier.

Comment 174   **Dan Romascanu**

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 95

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
If managers may belong to different administrative spaces, do we expect
dot1adQBridgeVlanStaticName to have a global meaning, common for all managers?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify and explain
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 174

1-Propose accept in principle: The intention was that the service name be available to a
single administrative domain, allowing different service names in different adminstrative
domains. If this is not correct then some agreement needs to be included on how global
names are selected.

Comment 175   Jessy Rouyer

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: General
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
There are many Editor's Notes in this WG ballot draft that should be addressed before it is
ready for Sponsor ballot.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Address all Editor's Notes.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 175

4-Propose accept:

Comment 176   Jessy Rouyer

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: General
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:

There are several forms of the following terms used throughout the draft: 1
   * encapsule/encapsulate,   2
   * de-encapsule/deencapsule/de-encapsulate/deencapsulate,   3
   * detagging/un-tagging.   4
COMMENT END: 5
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 6
Choose one form for each term and use it consistently.   7
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 8
   9

Comment 177   **Jessy Rouyer**

   10
   11
   12
NAME: Jessy V Rouyer   13
COMMENT TYPE: ER   14
CLAUSE: General   15
PAGE: 16
LINE: 17
COMMENT START: 18
Typos throughout the draft.   19
COMMENT END: 20
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 21
"Claue" -> "Clause"   22
"preprended" -> "prepended"   23
"correspondance" -> "correspondence"   24
"exterrnal" -> "external"   25
"recieved" -> "received"   26
"signalled" -> "signaled"   27
"descrived" -> "described"   28
"Backone" -> "Backbone"   29
"identfier" -> "identifier"   30
"clasue" -> "clause"   31
"creatio nfo" -> "creation of"   32
"comonent" -> "component"   33
"ecapsuled" -> "encapsulated"   34
"Ecapsulated" -> "Encapsulated"   35
"indentified" -> "identified"   36
"moditored" -> "monitored"   37
"anounce" -> "announce"   38
"benefitting" -> "benefiting"   39
   40
"Drop Eligibile" -> "Drop Eligible"   41
"EM_UNIDATA.request" -> "EM_UNITDATA.request"   42
"connection_indentifier" -> "connection_identifier"   43
"inforInternal " -> "infoInternal"   44
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 45
   46

Disposition of Comment 177

4-Propose accept:

Comment 178   Jessy Rouyer

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.4.1
PAGE: 28
LINE: 36-37
COMMENT START:
The reference is missing in "A protocol shim (ref-tbd)".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please provide the missing reference.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 179   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
Bullet (i) refers to S-VLAN bundling and it should be a mandatory requirement given its
description in clause 25.4 (S-tagged Service Interface).
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move bullet (i) to section 5.7 right after bullet (d) that talks about 1:1 mapping between S-
VLAN and I-SID values.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 179

1-Propose ?: Should this be manditory? It is reasonable to support only 1:1 mappings
since I-SID address space can be used rather than carrying the S-VID.

Comment 180   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE:T

CLAUSE: 5.7.1

PAGE: 24

LINE: 14

COMMENT START:

This bullet talks about terminating PBN spanning tree by filtering BPDUs delivered to the Provider Instance Port. I assume "termination & filtering" in this context means not participating in PBN MSTP and discarding the BPDUs. Given that PBN interfaces at the Customer Instance Port, the filtering should be done at that port.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Change bullet (j) to : terminate PBN spanning tree by filtering spanning tree PBUDs received from the Customer Instance Port by the EISS;

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 180

2-Propose accept in principle. BPUs were delivered to the VIPs of PIP to allow switching between backup VIPs using spanning tree. Since this operation requires more than BPDU filtering it may be just as effective to delete BPDUs at the CIP. We need more input on how the various spanning tree modes work. I believe we should look over the work in 13.39 before we decide how these options are formed.

Comment 181   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi

COMMENT TYPE:TR

CLAUSE: 5.7.1

PAGE: 24

LINE: 12

COMMENT START:

There needs to be a bullet added to this clause that talks about participation of I-component in PBN BPDUs similar to participation of C-component in 802.1ad in .1Q BPDUs.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Add a bullet to clause 5.7.1

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 181

1-Propose accept: There needs to be at least 3 distinct options for BPDU tunneling, discarding, and participation.

Comment 182   **Ali Sajassi**

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
This bullet should describe BPDUs tunneling for PBN spanning tree on both Customer Instance Ports and Provider Instance Ports.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the bullet (k) to say: "tunnel PBN spanning tree by treating the BPDUs as data when received from Customer Instance Ports and encapsulating them when delivered to Provider Instance Port again as though they were data frames"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 182

1-Propose accept in principle: It may be necessary to extend subclause 13.38 for these extensions.

Comment 183   **Ali Sajassi**

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 24
COMMENT START:
Change "delete" to "discard"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the change.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 184   **Ali Sajassi**

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 36
COMMENT START:

Since B-component doesn't do mapping of B-VIDs, the bullet (c) should be changed as below:
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Bullet (c), change "maps B-VIDs for use ..." to "applies B-VIDs for use ..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 185   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.8.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
There should be no need for translating B-MAC addresses even for inter-provider scenario since these are provider provisioned MAC addresses and thus can be formatted to include AS number.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove bullet (h)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 185

2-Propose reject: Though not all carriers need B-MAC translation at a inter-carrier interface, others do. If the B-MAC address spaces are locally adminstered then they can not be merged over the connecting NNI. The translation facility allows the carriers to agree on an address for the demarcation and then translate the address as needed internally.

Comment 186   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 24
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
The first sentence doesn't read well.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "one or more conforming S-VLAN components (5.6), conforming I components (5.7), or(and) conforming B components" to "one or more conforming I components (5.7), or/and a single conforming B component (5.8)"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 186

3-Propose accept:

Comment 187   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Change "A Customer Instance Port is a may" to "A customer Instance Port may"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the above change
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 187

4-Propose accept:

Comment 188   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
A Provider Backbone Port should Not be attached to a Customer Instance Port. The only
scenarios that would be support such case would be carrier's carrier where one .1ah net-
work is itself tunneled over another one. Given that we avoided such stacking in .1ad, we
should also avoid it in here as well.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the last sentence to "A Provider Backbone Port may attach to another Provider
Backbone Port."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 188

1-Propose reject: The hierarchal stacking of .1ah is supported in the current draft and described in 26.6.1. The 802.1ad network was incapable of supporting this arrangement because 802.1ad relies on a new Ethertype for the S-TAG to differentiate the domains. For 802.1ah no such problem exists because the MAC encapsulation provide complete isolation. The IEEE specifications do not normally legislate against connections unless they produce technical problems.

Comment 189   Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Change "Customer Instance Ports" to "Customer Backbone Ports"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the above change.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 189

3-Propose accept:

Comment 190   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: Throughout the document
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The links within the document are not active
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fix the problem
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 190

3-Propose accept:

Comment 191   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E/T R
CLAUSE: 3.76
PAGE: 18
LINE: 9-11
COMMENT START:
The current definition as it stands does not differentiate a B component from a traditional S-VLAN Bridge. The differentiating factor is the additional functionalities that the Customer Backbone Port provides which are more than just inserting and deleting B-tags.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the last sentence by "It is composed of an S-VLAN aware bridge component where each Provider Backbone Port is supported by an instance of the EISS that can recognize backbone VLAN tags (B-TAGs) and where each Customer Backbone Port is supported by an EISS that can insert and delete B-TAGs, and can interpret I-TAGs."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 191

1-Propose accept:

Comment 192   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 3.77
PAGE: 18
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
A B-BEB can include one and only one B component
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence by
"A BEB which includes exactly one B component and no I components"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 192

4-Propose accept:

Comment 193   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.79
PAGE: 18
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "A S-VLAN..." with "An S-VLAN..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 194   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.92
PAGE: 19
LINE: 5
COMMENT START:
A more clear formulation would be better
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence by "A BEB, which includes at least one I component and no B components."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 195   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.93
PAGE: 19
LINE: 8-9
COMMENT START:
A more clear formulation would be better
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   Change the sentence by
2   "A BEB which includes at least one I component and exactly one B
3   component."
4   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
5
6   ## *Comment 196*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
7
8
9   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
10   COMMENT TYPE: E
11   CLAUSE: 3.94
12   PAGE: 19
13   LINE: 11
14   COMMENT START:
15   Typo
16   COMMENT END:
17   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
18   Replace "an Provider" with "a Provider"
19   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
20
21   ## *Comment 197*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
22
23   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
24   COMMENT TYPE: E
25   CLAUSE: 3.97
26   PAGE: 19
27   LINE: 24-25
28   COMMENT START:
29   Cyclic definition
30   COMMENT END:
31   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
32   Replace the first sentence with
33   "A B component port on a Backbone Edge Bridge that can transmit and receive frames
34   from multiple customers to the ports of a Backbone Core Bridge."
35   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
36
37   ## *Comment 198*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
38
39
40   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
41   COMMENT TYPE: (E/T)R
42   CLAUSE: 3.98
43   PAGE: 19
44   LINE: 31-32
45   COMMENT START:
46

The EISS for Provider Instance Ports is supported by using both the I-TAG and the S-VLAN tag type.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the last sentence with

"A provider instance port is supported by one or more than one instance of the EISS that can recognize S-TAGs and encapsulate/de-encapsulate frames inside an Ethernet frame which uses Backbone MAC addresses and an I-TAG."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 198

3-Propose accept:

Comment 199   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 5

PAGE: 13-26

LINE:

COMMENT START:

Spaces should be inserted between the referenced subclauses when more than one is mentioned.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

For example change the following:

C: 5.7 p:23 l:45 "(6.8,9.5,9.8)" -> "(6.8, 9.5, 9.8)"

C: 5.7 p:23 l:46 "(6.7,9.5)" -> "(6.7, 9.5)" etc.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 200   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: (E/T)R

CLAUSE: 5.7

PAGE: 23

LINE: 43-46

COMMENT START:

The EISS for Provider Instance Ports is supported by using both the I-TAG and the S-VLAN tag type.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the first sentence with

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

"An I component comprises one S-VLAN component (5.6) attached to one EISS of each Virtual Instance Port supported by the use of a Service VLAN tag (S-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9.7) and provisioned to support a service instance on a Provider Instance Port and supported by the use of backbone MAC encapsule/de-encapsule (6.8, 9.5, 9.8), and with one EISS for each Customer Instance Port supported by the use of a Service VLAN tag (S-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9,7)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 200

2-Propose accept:

Comment 201   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 23
LINE: 49
COMMENT START:
Typo. Missing "the"s
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "When...all to one..." with
"When using the backbone transparent service or the all to one..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 202   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 14-21
COMMENT START:
PBN spanning tree BPDUs cannot be delivered to the Provider Instance Port from the EISS as they are always filtered by the frame relay.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Reformulate points j) to l)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 202

2-Propose accept: As the commentor points out BPDUs are filtered before entering the relay and must be re-injected by the "bridge brain" at each port, therefore it does not make sense to filter BPDUs delivered to the EISS. BPDUs would normally be generated for VIPs and injected into the ISS. What needs to be done is to optionally supress generation of BPDUs for VIPs.

Comment 203   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 29-32
COMMENT START:
The Customer Backbone Port is supported by using both the Service Instance Tag and the Service VLAN Tag
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence by:
"A B component comprises a single S-VLAN bridge component attached at an EISS for each Customer Backbone Port supported by the use of both an Service Instance tag (I-TAG) (6.7, 6.9, 9.5, 9.8) and a Service VLAN tag (S-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9.7) and with other EISSs on all Provider Backbone Ports supported by the use of a Backbone VLAN tag (B-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9.7)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 203

2-Propose accept:

Comment 204   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "(5.8.1)" with "(5.10.1)"

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 205   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14-16
COMMENT START:
The paragraph below this sentence provides a more complete description of the allowed
port connections.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase the sentence "A Customer...of a Provider Bridge"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 205

4-Propose accept:

Comment 206   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E/T
CLAUSE: 5.11.2
PAGE: 25
LINE: 30-35
COMMENT START:
An I-BEB can comprise more than one I components
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first paragraph with:
"A Backbone Edge Bridge shall comprise zero, one or more I components and at most one
B component. Three types of Backbone Edge Bridges are designated:
a) an I type Backbone Edge Bridge (5.11.2.1)
b) a B type Backbone Edge Bridge (5.11.2.2)
c) an IB type Backbone Edge Bridge (5.11.2.3)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 206

4-Propose accept:

Comment 207   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2
PAGE: 25
LINE: 37-49
COMMENT START:
The allowed port configurations and connections have been already stated in 5.11
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase the text
"Each Port...Backbone Port"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 208   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
An I-BEB can comprise more than one I components
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...shall comprise single conformant I components..." with "...shall comprise one
more conformant I components..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 209   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Reformulate
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...internally to internal..." with "...internally to..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 210   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.4
PAGE: 27
LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
The service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier are not part of the original MA_UNITDATA.request and MA_UNITDATA.indication primitives
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace
"The frame_check_sequence is added to list of parameters associated with the MA_UNITDATA.request and MA_UNITDATA.indication primitives." With "The frame_check_sequence, the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier are added to the list of parameters associated with the MA_UNITDATA.request and MA_UNITDATA.indication primitives."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 210

4-Propose accept:

Comment 211   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.4, 6.5
PAGE: 28, 31
LINE: 35(p28), 1(p31)
COMMENT START:
It should be the more generic peer entity that will receive a connection_identifier referenced (E)M_UNITDATA.indication.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "station" with "peer entity"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 211

4-Propose accept:

Comment 212 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
The figure number on the referred figure (6-1) is different then the one given in the text (6-2)
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Update one of the numbers for consistency
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 212

4-Propose accept:

Comment 213 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8 to the end of the document
PAGE: 32
LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
Since there is only one type of Service Instance Tag, there is no reason of including "with encapsulated Ethernet tag type" in its name.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Service Instance Tag with encapsulated Ethernet tag type" with "Service Instance Tag" throughout the document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 213

4-Propose accept in principle: Accept if comment 2 is rejected. If comment 2 is accepted then make sure all references to I-TAGs specify the correct tag type.

Comment 214 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
In general each Provider Instance Port has its own Backbone MAC Address
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...Backbone MAC Address." with "...the Provider Instance Port's Backbone MAC Address."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 214

3-Propose reject: A Backbone MAC Address is always associated with a PIP, and is defined specifically so we don't always need a verbose phrase for referring to the address. See comment 43.

Comment 215   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 34
LINE: 1-2
COMMENT START:
The values of the drop_eligible and priority parameters in the EM_UNITDATA.indication primitive depend on the type of the service interface
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence to
"The value of the drop_eligible and priority parameters are determined as follows:
i) If the octets immediately following the service instance tag in the received mac_service_data_unit do not contain a valid Service VLAN tag header (9.5, 9.7), the drop_eligible and priority parameters take the values of I-DEI and I-PCP in the Service Instance tag header;
j) Otherwise, the drop_eligible and priority parameters take the values of S-DEI and S-PCP in the Service VLAN tag header."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 215

2-Propose reject: The comment suggests that when a frame is decapsulated at the PIP the priority and drop eligible fields in the S-TAG (if present) should take precedence over the priority and drop eligible fields in the I-TAG, whereas currently the I-TAG takes precedence. Currently section 6.8.2 says that when a frame is encapsulated at the PIP the priority and drop eligible fields in the S-TAG of the transmitted frame (if present) gets the same values in the priority and drop eligible fields as the I-TAG. Since the case where the priority and drop precedence fields of the S-TAG and I-TAG are different should never occur, and since it is not obvious which should take precedence in that scenario, always using the values from the I-TAG is simpler.

Comment 216   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 29
COMMENT START:
In general each Provider Instance Port has its own Backbone MAC Address
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...Backbone MAC Address." with "...the Provider Instance Port's Backbone MAC Address."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 216

4-Propose reject: See comment 213.

Comment 217   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: 13-14
COMMENT START:
The Customer Backbone Port is supported by using both a Service Instance Tag and the Service VLAN Tag.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the sentence "The EISS shall...Clause 9.5" with "The EISS shall be supported by using both the Service Instance Tag and the Service VLAN tag type as specified in Clause 9.5."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 217

3-Propose accept in principle: Change the sentence as suggested and add the following note:
"NOTE -- Although the Customer Backbone Port does not transmit or receive S-tagged frames, it supports the Service VLAN tag type in the sense that it is a port on an S-VLAN component and the vlan_identifier parameter contains a Service VLAN Identifer."

Comment 218   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: Figure 6-2
COMMENT START:
The provider side is depicted in all the other figures of the document to the left of the customer side
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Reverse the position of the CBPs and PBPs for consistency.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 218

4-Propose accept:

Comment 219   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace "6.7.3" with "6.9.3"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 219

4-Propose accept:

Comment 220   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "6.7.4" with "6.9.4"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 220

4-Propose accept:

Comment 221   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 24-27
COMMENT START:
The original FCS is always invalidated as there changes to the frame.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Either erase the generic NOTE-1 or replace it with content analogous to NOTE-1 on page 34.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 221

3-Propose accept in principle: There may or may not be changes to the frame in the recieve path of a Customer Backbone Port, so only the generic note is appropriate. There is no obvious reason why the note should be in sections 6.7.1, 6.8.1, and 6.9.1 but not in 6.7.2, 6.8.2, and 6.9.2. Putting the same note in all these subclauses is rather redundant. These notes will be deleted from sections 6.7.1, 6.8.1, and 6.9.1, and the following note added to 6.7.1 immediately following the sentence ending "and frame_check_sequence are as defined for the ISS":

"NOTE -- Some of the functions supporting the E-ISS may result in changes to the mac_service_data_unit or other parameters used to construct a frame. The original FCS associated with a frame is invalidated if there are changes to any fields of the frame, if any fields are added or removed, or if bit ordering or other aspects of the frame encoding have changed. An invalid FCS is signalled in the E-ISS by an unspecified value in the frame_check_sequence parameter. this signals the need for the FCS to be regenerated according to normal procedures for the transmitting MAC. The options for regenerating the FCS under these circumstances are discussed in Annex F of IEEE Std 802.1D."

Comment 222   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9.2
PAGE: 37
LINE: 53-54
COMMENT START:
The M_UNITDATA.request primitive does not have a drop_eligible parameter
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the last sentence on the page with "The priority carries the same value as the corresponding parameter in the EISS request."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 222

4-Propose accept:

Comment 223   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 8.8.11
PAGE: 52
LINE: 36-39

COMMENT START:

The proposed text does not fully solve the problem of contradicting connection_identifiers for static entries. The problem occurs if for example a frame is to be forwarded because there is static Filtering Entry for that VID and MAC address in the Filtering Database specifying a non null connection_identifier, and there is also a Static VLAN Registration Entry for that VID with a different connection_identifier. It is proposed that the connection_identifier associated with a static filtering entry takes precedence of the one associated with a static VLAN registration entry which in its turn takes precedence of the one associated with a dynamic filtering entry if contradicting entries exist

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the text "If the frame...EM_UNITDATA.request." with "If the frame is to be forwarded because there is a Static Filtering Entry or Dynamic Filtering Entry for that VID and MAC address in the Filtering Database, and there is also a Static VLAN Registration Entry for that VID, associated with a different connection_identifier than the one specified in the Static or Dynamic Filtering Entry, then the connection_identifier included in the EM_UNITDATA.request is always the first non null entry of the following ordered list

1) Connection_identifier associated with the Static Filtering Entry

2) Connection_identifier associated with the Static VLAN Registration Entry

3) Connection_identifier associated with the Dynamic Filtering Entry."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 223

2-Propose accept:

Comment 224 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 9

PAGE: 53

LINE: 1

COMMENT START:

Due to the introduction a new tag type some of the text is clause 9 has to be changed.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Insert the following text on line 3

"Change the fist sentence as follows:

This clause specifies the format of three types of tags,

a) Two VLAN tag types added to and removed from user data frames by the tag encoding and decoding functions that support the Enhanced Internal Sublayer Service (EISS, 6.6) and

b) A Service Instance tag reserved for use by Backbone Edge Bridges (6.8, 6.9).

Renumber the following items accordingly.

1   Change item e) as follows:
2   e) Describes the types of tag that can be used;
3   Change the first sentence in subclause 9.3 as follows:
4   Each tag comprises the following sequential information elements:"
5   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
6
7   ***Comment 225***   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
8
9
10   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
11   COMMENT TYPE: E
12   CLAUSE: 9.5
13   PAGE: 53
14   LINE: 11-14
15   COMMENT START:
16   Wrong references
17   COMMENT END:
18   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
19   Make the following changes
20   L11 "5.10.1" -> "5.10.2"
21   L12 "5.10" -> "5.10.1"
22   L13 "5.10.1" -> "5.10.2"
23   L14 "6.9" -> "6.11"
24   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
25
26   ***Comment 226***   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
27
28   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
29   COMMENT TYPE: E
30   CLAUSE: 9.5
31   PAGE: 53
32   LINE: 17
33   COMMENT START:
34   Typo
35   COMMENT END:
36   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
37   Replace "TAGs" with "TAG"
38   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
39
40   ***Comment 227***   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
41
42
43   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
44   COMMENT TYPE: E
45   CLAUSE: 9.8
46   PAGE: 53

LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
There is one type of I-TAG which is 18 bytes long.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence with
"The I-TAG TCI field is 16 bytes long making the total I-TAG length 18 bytes."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 228 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "The res2 field..." with "The res1 field..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 229 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "The res1 field..." with "The res2 field..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 230 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.13.1.1.3
PAGE: 57
LINE: 27

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   COMMENT START:
2   Typo
3   COMMENT END:
4   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5   Replace "CIBs" with "CIPs"
6   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
7
8   ## *Comment 231*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
9
10
11 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
12 COMMENT TYPE: E
13 CLAUSE: 12.15
14 PAGE: 57
15 LINE: 53-54
16 COMMENT START:
17 The second sentence in the paragraph is elusive.
18 COMMENT END:
19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
20 Consider reformulating it as follows:
21 "Each of the SVLAN, I and (or) B components of Provider Backbone Bridges are man-
22 aged using the managed objects defined in subclauses 12.4 through 12.14."
23 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
24
25 ## *Comment 232*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
26
27 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
28 COMMENT TYPE: E
29 CLAUSE: 12.15
30 PAGE: 58
31 LINE: 9
32 COMMENT START:
33 Wrong reference
34 COMMENT END:
35 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
36 Replace "(12.4)" with "(12.4.2)"
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
38
39
40 ## *Comment 233*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
41
42 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
43 COMMENT TYPE: E
44 CLAUSE: 12.15
45 PAGE: 58
46 LINE: 15

COMMENT START: 1
Wrong terminology   2
COMMENT END: 3
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 4
Replace "Management" with "managed"   5
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 6
    7

Comment 234 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

    8
    9
    10
NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis   11
COMMENT TYPE: E   12
CLAUSE: 12.15   13
PAGE: 58   14
LINE: 20   15
COMMENT START: 16
Typo   17
COMMENT END: 18
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 19
Replace "IB-BCB" with "IB-BEB"   20
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 21
    22

Comment 235 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

    23
    24
NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis   25
COMMENT TYPE: E   26
CLAUSE: 12.15   27
PAGE: 58   28
LINE: 21   29
COMMENT START: 30
Typo   31
COMMENT END: 32
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 33
Replace "...component MAC..." with "...component's MAC..."   34
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 35
    36
    37

Comment 236 **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

    38
    39
NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis   40
COMMENT TYPE: E   41
CLAUSE: 12.15   42
PAGE: 58   43
LINE: Figure 12-1, line 29   44
COMMENT START: 45
Wrong reference. The component managed object description should point to 12.4   46

1 COMMENT END:
2 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
3 Replace "12.13" with "12.4"
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
5
6
7 ## *Comment 237*　**Panagiotis Saltsidis**
8
9 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
10 COMMENT TYPE: E
11 CLAUSE: 12.15
12 PAGE: 58
13 LINE: 49
14 COMMENT START:
15 Typo
16 COMMENT END:
17 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
18 Replace "...by a an..." with "...by an..."
19 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
20
21 ## *Comment 238*　**Panagiotis Saltsidis**
22
23 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
24 COMMENT TYPE: E
25 CLAUSE: 12.15.1.1
26 PAGE: 59-60
27 LINE:
28 COMMENT START:
29 The substructure of clause 12.15.1.1 needs to be changed. The managed objects, Read
30 Provider Backbone Bridge Configuration and the optional Configure Provider Backbone
31 Bridge Configuration should be presented in subclauses 12.15.1.1.1 and 12.15.1.1.2
32 COMMENT END:
33 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
34 Change the substructure of 12.15.1.1. as described above.
35 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
36
37
38 ## *Comment 239*　**Panagiotis Saltsidis**
39
40 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
41 COMMENT TYPE: E
42 CLAUSE: 12.15.1.2.3
43 PAGE: 59-60
44 LINE: 53-2
45 COMMENT START:
46 The sentence is elusive

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Consider changing to

"Provider Backbone Bridge Address-the MAC Address for the PBB, the BCB, I-BEB, B-BEB, or B component of the IB-BEB, from which the Bridge Identifiers used by Spanning Tree Algorithm and Protocol, the Rapid Spanning Tree Protocol, and the Multiple Spanning Tree Protocol are derived (8.13.8, 13.23 of this standard; 17.17.2 of IEEE Std 802.1D)."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 240   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 12.15.1.2.3

PAGE: 60

LINE: 13

COMMENT START:

There can be only one B component per PBB

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the first line in point f) with

f) B component Address

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 241   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 12.15.1.2.3

PAGE: 60

LINE: 13

COMMENT START:

There can be only one B component per PBB

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace the first line in point f) with

f) B component Address

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 242   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

1   CLAUSE: 12.15.2.1.3
2   PAGE: 61
3   LINE: 15-19
4   COMMENT START:
5   The information stated here is redundant. Status information can be displayed instead
6   COMMENT END:
7   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
8   Replace point a) with
9   a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
10   1) Operation rejected because the portlet is associated with a virtual port;
11   2) Operation accepted"
12   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
13
14   ## Comment 243   Panagiotis Saltsidis
15
16
17   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
18   COMMENT TYPE: E
19   CLAUSE: 12.15.2.2.3
20   PAGE: 61
21   LINE: 45
22   COMMENT START:
23   Command operation status can be given at the output
24   COMMENT END:
25   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
26   Replace point "None" with
27   a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
28   1) Operation rejected because the portlet is associated with a virtual port;
29   2) Operation accepted"
30   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
31
32   ## Comment 244   Panagiotis Saltsidis
33
34   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
35   COMMENT TYPE: E
36   CLAUSE: 12.15.3
37   PAGE: 61
38   LINE: 54
39   COMMENT START:
40   There is no I-SID translation table available for external PIPs
41   COMMENT END:
42   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
43   Erase point a)
44   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
45
46

Comment 245   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3
PAGE: 62
LINE: 3-5
COMMENT START:
Point c) referring to a Provider Backbone Port in the description of the managed objects
required for an external Provider Instance Port is misleading.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point c) with
"The Virtual Instance Port configuration parameters, which provide the subset of the
Bridge VLAN Configuration managed object (12.10.1) that is relevant for the configura-
tion of the service instance"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 246   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.1.2
PAGE: 62
LINE: 27
COMMENT START:
The I-SID is configured on the VIP by the VIP-ISID parameter.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point c) with
"c) VIP-ISID parameter: the I-SID associated with this Virtual Instance Port."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 246

3-Propose accept:

Comment 247   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.1.3
PAGE: 62
LINE: 31-40

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   COMMENT START:
2   Items b)-d) are redundant input parameters.
3   COMMENT END:
4   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5   Replace the outputs text with
6   "a) Component Number: the number of the I component;
7   b) a PVID parameter for port-based S-VLAN classification;
8   c) an Acceptable Frame Types parameter with at least one of the following values:
9   1) Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames;
10   2) Admit Only Untagged and Priority-tagged frames;
11   3) Admit All frames."
12   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
13
14   ## *Comment 248*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
15
16
17   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
18   COMMENT TYPE: T
19   CLAUSE: 12.15.3.2.2
20   PAGE: 62
21   LINE: 52
22   COMMENT START:
23   The VIP-ISID parameter identifies the service instance ID. The Service instance ID infor-
24   mation is redundant
25   COMMENT END:
26   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
27   Erase point c)
28   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
29
30   ## *Disposition of Comment 248*
31
32   3-Propose accept:
33
34   ## *Comment 249*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
35
36
37   NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
38   COMMENT TYPE: E
39   CLAUSE: 12.15.3.2.3
40   PAGE: 63
41   LINE: 8
42   COMMENT START:
43   Command operation status can be given at the output
44   COMMENT END:
45   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
46   Replace point "None" with

a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:

1) Operation rejected because the portlet is configured as an external port;

2) Operation accepted"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 250   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.3-12.15.3.4
PAGE: 63
LINE: 11-47
COMMENT START:
The operation of the configuration of VIP Mapping table should logically precede that of VIP configuration
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Place the managed objects on Read and Configure VIP Mapping Table Entry in subclause 12.15.3.1 and 12.15.3.2. Move the corresponding ones for VIP configuration in 12.15.3.3 and 12.15.3.4
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 251   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.3.3
PAGE: 63
LINE: 26-29
COMMENT START:
The information stated here is redundant. Status information can be displayed instead
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point a) with
a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
1) Operation rejected because the portlet is configured as an external port;
2) Operation accepted"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 252   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.4.2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   PAGE: 63
2   LINE: 43
3   COMMENT START:
4   Typo
5   COMMENT END:
6   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
7   Replace "Customer Backbone Port" with "Provider Instance Port"
8   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
9
10 ## *Comment 253   Panagiotis Saltsidis*
11
12
13 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
14 COMMENT TYPE: E
15 CLAUSE: 12.15.3.4.3
16 PAGE: 63
17 LINE: 47
18 COMMENT START:
19 Command operation status can be given at the output
20 COMMENT END:
21 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
22 Replace point "None" with
23 a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
24 1) Operation rejected because the portlet is configured as an external port;
25 2) Operation accepted"
26 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
27
28 ## *Comment 254   Panagiotis Saltsidis*
29
30 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
31 COMMENT TYPE: T
32 CLAUSE: 12.15.3.5-12.15.3.6
33 PAGE: 63-64
34 LINE:
35 COMMENT START:
36 The B-MAC Mapping table is irrelevant for external Provider Instance Ports
37 COMMENT END:
38 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
39 Move subclauses 12.15.3.5 and 12.15.3.6 to 12.15.4
40 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
41
42
43 ## *Disposition of Comment 254*
44
45 3-Propose accept:
46

Comment 255   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4
PAGE: 64
LINE: 47-54
COMMENT START:
Wrong references
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
The references should point to subclauses of 12.15.4
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 256   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.1
PAGE: 65
LINE: 5-6
COMMENT START:
The managed object described is this section enables its operator to read the optional translation entries related to a specific service instance as it enters the CBP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence with
"To read the service instance translation entries"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 257   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.1.3
PAGE: 65
LINE: 16-18
COMMENT START:
Items a) to c) are redundant, input parameters.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase items a) to c)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 258   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.2.1
PAGE: 65
LINE: 28-29
COMMENT START:
The managed object described is this section enables its operator to configure the optional translation entries related to a specific service instance as it enters the CBP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the paragraph as follows:
"To configure the service instance translation entries. This allows mapping of the customer associated parameters of the service instance to the backbone provider configured ones."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 259   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.5-12.15.4.8
PAGE: 66-68
LINE:
COMMENT START:
These managed objects are redundant. Their corresponding functionality is provided by managed objects 12.15.4.1 and 12.15.4.2
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the paragraph as follows:
Erase the corresponding subclauses.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 260   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 70-71
LINE:
COMMENT START:

The proposed changes affect specific text in previous subclauses of 13 (with the exception of the introductory text on the operation of the Layer Two Gateway which should be included in IEEE Std 802.1D-2004 17.3) and correspondingly should be moved to the specific referenced clauses.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the need changes on the specific referenced subclauses of the base document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 261   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.39.4
PAGE: 71
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "12.26.23" with "13.26.23"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 262   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.39.5
PAGE: 71
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Adding "&& !isL2gp" to the conditions for the transitions out of the Discard state in the Port Receive state machine of Figure 13-11 is sufficient to prevent BPDU reception on a Layer Two Gateway Port.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the second paragraph with
"Preventing BPDU reception on a Layer Two Gateway Port is achieved by adding "&& !isL2gp" to the conditions for the transitions out of the Discard state in the Port Receive state machine of Figure 13-11."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Disposition of Comment 262

Comment 263   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE: 114
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Bridge" with "Bridged"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 264   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.2
PAGE: 116
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "S-VLAN Aware Component" with "S-VLAN aware component"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 265   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 116
LINE: 43-51
COMMENT START:
The given description of the transparent service interface as a special case of the bundling
S-tagged service interface, is applicable only in the case that the PBBN connects to a Pro-
vider Bridge. The transparent service interface in the case of the PBBN interfacing any-
thing other than Provider Bridges can be differently implemented. For example more than
one VIPs and CIPs can exist on a single I-component. In this case, each CIP is configured

to accept only untagged and priority tagged frames and to belong in the PVID member set
which contains only one more member, a VIP configured with exactly the same parame-
ters. In this case there is just one S-VID per I-SID
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the description of a Transparent service which is implemented in this way.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 265

3-Propose reject/discuss: The current transparent interface may attach to any type of
Ethernet bridge or end stations. The logic does require using the entire S-VID space of the
I-Component S-VLAN relay. An interface as described would only be transparent to
devices that did not generate S-TAG frames, though it has the advantage of allowing mul-
tiple interfaces on a single I-component.

Comment 266   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25.3, 25.4 and 25.5
PAGE: 117, 119, 121
LINE: Figure 25-4, Figure 25-6, Figure 25-8
COMMENT START:
In CBP and PIP the EISS is supported by using both the Service Instance Tag, I-TAG and
the Service VLAN tag, S-TAG
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
In all these figures replace all the references to "9.5(c)" with references to "9.5(b and c)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 266

3-Propose accept:

Comment 267   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Typos
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the line with
"...against accidental creation of data loops, and prevents configuration of the I component
to create a multi-point service..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 268   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 119
LINE: Figure 25-5
COMMENT START:
The lower part of the Figure 25-5 indicates an I-tagged service interface.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Split the figure in two and move the lower part in the next subclause
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 269   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 121
LINE: Figure 25-8, Figure 25-9
COMMENT START:
The customer controlled BEB in the case of an I-tagged service interface should be either
an I-BEB or a B-BEB.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Customer Controlled BEB" with "Customer Controlled I- or B-BEB" in both
figures.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 270   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133

LINE: 3-4, 19

COMMENT START:

The de-encapsulisation or not of a backbone frame depends on the type of BEB that it encounters.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace "...they are de-encapsulated." by "...they might be de-encapsulated." (twice)

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 271   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 26.2

PAGE: 133

LINE: 5

COMMENT START:

Typo

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace "a S-TAG" with "an S-TAG"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 272   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 26.2

PAGE: 133

LINE: 13

COMMENT START:

Typo

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace "a S LAN" with "an S LAN"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 273   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

COMMENT TYPE: E

CLAUSE: 26.2

PAGE: 133

LINE: 13-15

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   COMMENT START:
2   The insertion of B-TAG and the mapping to a B-VLAN is done by the same component in
3   a BEB.
4   COMMENT END:
5   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
6   Erase "B-TAG" from line 14.
7   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
8
9   ## *Comment 274*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
10
11
12 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
13 COMMENT TYPE: E
14 CLAUSE: 26.3
15 PAGE: 134
16 LINE: 12
17 COMMENT START:
18 Wrong reference. The .1ak has already entered sponsor ballot and is expected to finish
19 soon.
20 COMMENT END:
21 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
22 Replace "(IEEE Std. 802.1D Table 12-1)" by "(Table 10.1)"
23 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
24
25 ## *Comment 275*   **Panagiotis Saltsidis**
26
27 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
28 COMMENT TYPE: E
29 CLAUSE: 26.6.2
30 PAGE: 135
31 LINE: 35-45
32 COMMENT START:
33 The E-NNI is formed between two Customer Backbone Ports
34 COMMENT END:
35 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
36 Replace "Provider Backbone Port" with "Customer Backbone Port" (5 times)
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
38
39 ## *Comment 276*   **Mick Seaman**
40
41
42 NAME: Mick Seaman
43 COMMENT TYPE: T
44 CLAUSE: 13
45 PAGE: 70
46 LINE:

COMMENT START:

The format of the changes in this clause is not satisfactory, and in consequence not precise. An amendment specifies changes to a base standard. This clause specifies changes that specify changes the eventual reader has to apply to the base document.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Do it properly.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 276

3-Propose accept:

Comment 277   Mick Seaman

NAME: Mick Seaman
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 70
LINE:
COMMENT START:

The nature of these changes to MSTP is as a set of hacks and flags. This is not a satisfactory basis for understanding what is actually occurring. It is unclear what form of ESP is being used to substitute for the non-transmission of BPDUs across the Backbone. Moreover it is quite unnecessary to hack changes into procedures like updtPortRoles().

So far as I can tell what is occurring is that a given port has been configured with the BPDU information that would otherwise be transmitted across the backbone and that this information is deemed to remain true so long as the port is operation (MAC_Operational true). It is unclear to me how we would know that the information would remain true if the port transitioned operUp operDown operUp (i.e. MAC_Operational TRUE FALSE TRUE), or indeed if that is considered possible or has been considered at all. It is possible that the information should be supplied when the Port first becomes operUp and that may be a condition of that transition. In any event when we know how operation should proceed we should be able to design the necessary changes.

It is further not currently clear to me what should happen if the pseudo-information changes.

A more appropriate set of changes would seem to be to define that, for such an administratively or otherwise controlled for, that rcvXstMsg is set whenever the information for the port changes, or the port is enabled (possibly), and the information is to be read from a management variable instead of from a received BPDU. Then we defeat the operation of the rcvdInfoWhile time in the PORT INFORMATION MACHINE (PIM) by adding the supporting flag to the transition out of PIM:CURRENT. I think that is all that is necessary

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

on the receive side which is all that the current text discusses, and it should not be difficult to fully integrate such changes into the base text - once the desired functionality has been confirmed - since explaining that is 98% of the job.

What should happen if there is a root on the LAN of higher priority that the configured l2gpRootID and an attempt to propagate a 'cut' through the L2 Gateway Port occurs is less easy to guess and needs discussion.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 277

2-Propose ?accept in principle? need to discuss this:

Comment 278   Curtis Simonson

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
PICS proforma is not completed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Complete PISC proforma
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 278

4-Propose accept:

Comment 279   Curtis Simonson

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 3-4
COMMENT START:
"A class III interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or

more secondary customer nodes too a primary and one or more secondary
BEBs."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"A class III interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or
more secondary customer nodes to a primary and one or more secondary
BEBs." (change "too" to "to")
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 280   **Curtis Simonson**

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
"When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer
Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEBs, are used to create a single
S-tagged interface."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer
Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEB, are used to create a single
S-tagged interface." (change "IB-BEBs" to "IB-BEB")
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 281   **Curtis Simonson**

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2, 25.9.3
PAGE: 126-127
LINE: multiple
COMMENT START:
25.9.2 and 25.9.3 use the terms "layer two gateway protocol" and "L2
gateway protocol".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Suggest using consistent terminology. If ""L2 gateway protocol" is used,
suggest adding "L2" to clause 4 Abbreviations.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 282   Curtis Simonson

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 29-30
COMMENT START:
"A class IV interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or
more secondary customer nodes too a primary and one or more secondary
BEBs."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"A class IV interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or
more secondary customer nodes to a primary and one or more secondary
BEBs." (change "too" to "to")
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 283   John Sauer

NAME: John Sauer
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Annex A needs to be filled in from main body.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Complete Annex for PICS checklist.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 284   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
 CLAUSE: <3.91>
 PAGE: <18>
 LINE: <53>
 COMMENT START:
 <It is written that the I component encapsulates and decapsulates Provide Bridge frames.
I think is that (at least) the decapuslation is for the Provider Backbone Frames>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Clarify that the Provide Bridge frames are encapsulated with Provider Backbone information and Provider Backbone frames are decapuslted from the Provide backbone information.>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 284

3-Propose accept in principle: The I-component decapsulates Provider Bridge frames from Provider Backbone Bridge frames. The editor will try to make this a little clearer.

Comment 285   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
 CLAUSE: <3.97 >
 PAGE: <19 >
 LINE: <25 >
 COMMENT START:
 <It is specified that a provider backbone port resides on a backbone edge bridge, so how can it transmits/receives frame to/from a provider backbone port of a backbone core bridge? Please note this appear all over the document>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <define a new terminology to the port on the backbone core bridge (something like Provider Network Port?)>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 285

2-Propose accept in principle: A PBP is equivalent to a PNP and is equated in 5.11.1. The definition states that the PBP is a port of a BEB, when it should state that it is a port of a BEB or BCB. We will correct the definition.

Comment 286   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: < E >
 CLAUSE: <5.71 >
 PAGE: <23>
 LINE: <46 >
 COMMENT START:
 <written "an I component my" >
 COMMENT END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to may>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 287   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < E >
CLAUSE: <5.71 >
PAGE: <23>
LINE: <52 >
COMMENT START:
<the maximum number of services should be 4094 >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to 4094>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 288   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <5.8>
PAGE: <24>
LINE: <37>
COMMENT START:
 < If the B component must filter PBBN STP BPDU, then how can I component filter
PBBN STP BPDUs as well (line 21)?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<I guess this relates to PNN STP BPDUs>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 288

3-Propose reject: The I-component may be in a different adminstration from the B-compo-
nent and therefore can not count on the B-component operating properly. For this reason
the I-component must filter any PBBN BPDUs which are recieved at the the PIP.

Comment 289   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>

CLAUSE: <5.11>

PAGE: <25>

LINE: <14>

COMMENT START:

<Type: "A Customer Instance Port is a may…">

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Change to may>

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 290   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher

COMMENT TYPE: <ER>

CLAUSE: <5.11>

PAGE: <25>

LINE: <18>

COMMENT START:

<It is specified that a CIP may attach to… after some of the options are specified in line 14. Please integrate the possible attachments together for each kind of port to avoid confusions regarding the splitting of the information in paragraph starting at line 12 and paragraph starting at line 18. The same for the PBP.>

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<A CIP may attach to a Customer network port, provider network port or to a PBP. A PBP may attach to a provider network port, to another PBP or to a CIP. >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 290

4-Propose accept:

Comment 291   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher

COMMENT TYPE: <ER>

CLAUSE: <5.11>

PAGE: <25>

LINE: <19>

COMMENT START:

<When talking about a CIP attached to a PBP, I can understand that we are talking about PBB hierarchies. Please specify it and add a referance to the relevant section>

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   <Add a reference to clause 26.6.1.>
2   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
3
4   ## *Disposition of Comment 291*
5
6
7   3-Propose accept:
8
9   ## *Comment 292   Nurit Sprecher*
10
11   NAME: Nurit Sprecher
12   COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
13   CLAUSE: <5.11>
14   PAGE: <25>
15   LINE: <21>
16   COMMENT START:
17   <Please add a reference to such models, PBP to PBP (is it peer to peer?) (can we connect
18   two PBBNs via a PBP to PBP connection? and PBP to CIP (PBBNs Hierarchies?)>
19   COMMENT END:
20   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
21   <Add references>
22   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
23
24   ## *Disposition of Comment 292*
25
26
27   3-Propose accept:
28
29   ## *Comment 293   Nurit Sprecher*
30
31   NAME: Nurit Sprecher
32   COMMENT TYPE: <E >
33   CLAUSE: <5.11.1>
34   PAGE: <25>
35   LINE: <26>
36   COMMENT START:
37   <In the definition section it is written that Provider Backbone port resides on the Provider
38   Backbone edge bridge, so how can they be the ports of the core bridge. There is confusion.
39   Please note that this happens all over the document>
40   COMMENT END:
41   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
42   <Define new terminology to the core bridge ports>
43   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
44
45
46

Comment 294 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: < E>
 CLAUSE: <6.4.1 >
 PAGE: <27>
 LINE: <30, 31, 40, 41 >
 COMMENT START:
 <comma is missing>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Add a comma>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 295 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
 CLAUSE: <6.4.1 >
 PAGE: <28>
 LINE: <26>
 COMMENT START:
 <The defintion of the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier is missing. Nothing indicates why these extensions are needed for 802.1ah. what is the motiviation. At least add a referance to where in the document it is defined/described. Specifically the use of the service_access_point_identifier is not specified and explained.>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify and add referances. >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 295

2-Propose accept in principle: See comment 14:

Comment 296 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: < ER >
 CLAUSE: <6.7>
 PAGE: <31>
 LINE: <45>
 COMMENT START:
 <The tag types are missing. So is for the B-mac and I-tag translation tables.>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Extend clause 6.7 and explain that the functionality of the EISS depends on the type of the port and write a clause on the support of the EISS for each kind of port: Provider network port, provider customer port, provider instance port, etc.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 296

3-Propose reject: No modifications to 6.7 are required for port descriptions. The current text of 802.1ad supports the 802.1ad port types. The new extensions for the PIP and CBP are included in section 6.8 and 6.9 and do not need to be included in 6.7.

Comment 297   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <6.8>
PAGE: <32>
LINE: <40>
COMMENT START:
<Can we say that in an IB-BEB an I-Component exists per PBN / PBBN that is attached to the IB-BEB?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please refer to it, since it is not defined explciitly. >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 297

3-Propose reject: Subclause 6.8 refers to EISS for PIP not IB-BEBs. No reference to conforming equipment is appropriate in the interface sections of clause 6. An I-component may attach to multiple PBNs or to a single PBN so no statement should restrict this attachment.

Comment 298   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <6.81>
PAGE: <33>
LINE: <43>
COMMENT START:

<The connection_identifier is ignored but it may be upated in the FIB in as a result of the learning process (1.Q clauses 8.7). Isn't?>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Update the learning process accordinlgy.>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 299 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
 CLAUSE: <6.81>
 PAGE: <33>
 LINE: <53>
 COMMENT START:
 <Is it always true for 1-1 map between S-VID and I-SID that the S-TAG is regenerated from the PVID or just when a port based vlan is supported? ARen't there cases where the s-TAG is regenerated from the I-SID?>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 < Please clarify>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 300 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
 CLAUSE: <6.8>
 PAGE: <33>
 LINE: <6>
 COMMENT START:
 <A reference to the I-SID translation table is missing>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Add a reference to the I-SID translation table with an explanation on its functionality>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 301 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <9.8>
 PAGE: <53>
 LINE: <42>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

COMMENT START:
<What is the TCI for other encapsulations than EThernet? Is the backbone limited for transmitting Ethernet traffic services only?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<EIther specify that there is support for EThernet traffic only, or define other types of encapsulations.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 301

3-Propose reject: See comment 2. All Ethernet frames support multiple protocol traffic. The Ethernet encapsulation I-TAG is just a two level Ethernet wrapper which may then carry any multiprotocol information. The proposed "multiprotocol format" simply reduces the overhead for carrying multiprotocol traffic to a single level for applications where the secondary network is mapped directly onto the PBBN.

Comment 302   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <9.8>
PAGE: <54>
LINE: <30>
COMMENT START:
<TCI for encapsulations other than EThernet is missing. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add or limit PBBNs for transmiting Ethernet services only>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 302

3-Propose reject: None of the Ethernet formats are limited to Ethernet only carriage including the "Ethernet Encapsulation" I-TAG format.

Comment 303   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <12.13.1.1.1>
PAGE: <57>
LINE: <17>

COMMENT START:
 <This the first time a portlet is mentioned. Definition is missing. Why is it needed in addition to the ports?. >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Add a definition and a motivation why it is needed.>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 303

2-Propose accept in principle: We do need a definition for portlet and should add one to clause 3. The portlet is needed to ease the information database description which otherwise must talk about virtualized or logical bridge ports which are physical in existing Q bridge MIBs.

Comment 304   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <E >
 CLAUSE: <12.15>
 PAGE: <58>
 LINE: <17>
 COMMENT START:
 <why should an IB-BEB have more than one I component. Is it one per PBN that is attached to the PBBN? >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 305   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <E >
 CLAUSE: <12.15>
 PAGE: <58>
 LINE: <20>
 COMMENT START:
 <I think that BCB does not have I and B components. >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please correct >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 306   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
  CLAUSE: <12.15>
  PAGE: <58>
  LINE: <32>
  COMMENT START:
   <why do we need portlets in addition to the ports? In addition, is the portlet number unique per component or per PBB?>
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify >
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 306

3-Propose reject: The current text of 12.15 provides an introduction to these concepts. The editor is open to suggestions for improved text for the introduction to 12.15 however the commentor has not provided any. The configuration of a PBB requires configuring each PBB component as though it was an entire .1ad bridge S-VLAN component. The ports of these components are then logical ports which are re-indexed by the double of (component number,port number) refered to in 12.15 as a portlet.

Comment 307   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <E >
  CLAUSE: <12.15>
  PAGE: <49>
  LINE: <17>
  COMMENT START:
  <typo: it is written "by a an.. ">
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please correct to "by an" >
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 308   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
  CLAUSE: <12.15>
  PAGE: <59>

LINE: <14>
COMMENT START:
<Why do we need a string to identify a service? What are the other parameters included in the string?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please identify it by the parameters: Port, I-SID, etc. >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 308

1-Propose reject: The service name is used to allow an easy key which may be used to perform service provisioning within a PBBN rather than having to set all the variables of each individual port for each service. The other alternative is to use the I-SID as the key, however this is more cryptic and could be changed over some NNI types.

Comment 309   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
 CLAUSE: <12.15.1.2.3>
 PAGE: <60>
 LINE: <13>
 COMMENT START:
 <A PBB may have up to one B-Component. Why do we need a list for each
B-component? >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please correct >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 309

3-Propose accept:

Comment 310   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <E >
 CLAUSE: <12.15.2.1.3>
 PAGE: <61>
 LINE: <15>
 COMMENT START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

<"this may specify any combination" - how can a port be capable of more than
one option? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 311   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <E >
  CLAUSE: <12.15.3>
  PAGE: <61>
  LINE: <49>
  COMMENT START:
  <What is the meaning of "externally accessible" – does it relate to I-BEB? >
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify >
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 312   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
  CLAUSE: <12.15.2.2.3>
  PAGE: <61>
  LINE: <54>
  COMMENT START:
  <A reference to the I-SID translation table is missing. The same for b and c.>
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please add references >
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 312

3-Propose accept:

Comment 313   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <E >

CLAUSE: <12.15.2.2.3>   1
PAGE: <62>   2
LINE: <3>   3
COMMENT START: 4
<How does the provider backbone port configuration relate to this section on PIP config-   5
uration? >   6
COMMENT END: 7
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 8
<Please clarify >   9
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 10
                                                                                               11
Comment 314   **Nurit Sprecher**   12
                                                                                               13
                                                                                               14
NAME: Nurit Sprecher   15
 COMMENT TYPE: <E >   16
CLAUSE: <12.15.2.2.3>   17
PAGE: <62>   18
LINE: <9>   19
COMMENT START: 20
<How the operations in a-f relate to the objects above? >   21
COMMENT END: 22
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 23
<Please clarify >   24
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 25
                                                                                               26
Comment 315   **Nurit Sprecher**   27
                                                                                               28
NAME: Nurit Sprecher   29
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >   30
CLAUSE: <12.15.3.1.3>   31
PAGE: <62>   32
LINE: <35>   33
COMMENT START: 34
<output e is not clear. Can we expect port based vlan classification on a VIP? >   35
COMMENT END: 36
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 37
<Please clarify >   38
SUGGESTED CHANGES END: 39
                                                                                               40
                                                                                               41
Comment 316   **Nurit Sprecher**   42
                                                                                               43
NAME: Nurit Sprecher   44
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >   45
CLAUSE: <12.15.3.3>   46

PAGE: <63>
LINE: <15>
COMMENT START:
 <What is the relationship between the VIP mapping table and the I-SID translation table?>
COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify. In general, a description on the intention and use of each table is missing. Please add. >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 317   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <12.15.3.5.2>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <6>
COMMENT START:
 <Is there a default value per entry? Does it require a dedicated field? In a corresponding MIB, this can be a DefVal>
COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 318   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <35>
COMMENT START:
 <What does "externally accessible customer backbone port" mean? Does it refer to B-BEB?
COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 319   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher

COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <38, 39>
COMMENT START:
<References to the tables are missing >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add references >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 320 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <47-54>
COMMENT START:
<How the operations in a-h relate to the objects above? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 321 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4.1.3>
PAGE: <65>
LINE: <20>
COMMENT START:
<Typo: "1 24 bit">
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please correct to "24 bit" >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 322 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4.1>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

PAGE: <65>

LINE: <5>

COMMENT START:

<The difference between mapping, registration and translation tables is not clear. Specifically this table is not clear. >

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Please clarify. Please note that n all kinds of mapping tables, it is required to have two tables to allow efficient mapping on two ways. I think that there is a need for an overview of the different tables supported with a description on their intention. In addition we need to see the relationship between these tables. It is hard to follow. >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 323   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher

COMMENT TYPE: <ER >

CLAUSE: <12.15.4.7.1>

PAGE: <67>

LINE: <24>

COMMENT START:

<what is it a translation between B-DA and B-SA and how is it supported by the input/output below?>

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Please clarify. >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 324   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher

COMMENT TYPE: <TR >

CLAUSE: <12.15.4.7.2>

PAGE: <67>

LINE: <31>

COMMENT START:

<The Can a customer backbone port have multiple mac addresses? Why a list is required?. >

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Please clarify. >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 325   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <12.15.5.1.2>
 PAGE: <68>
 LINE: <18>
 COMMENT START:
 <Is the service name string used as a key to table? >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please change the key to multiple keys: port, I-SID, etc.>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 326   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <12.15.5.1.2>
 PAGE: <68>
 LINE: <19>
 COMMENT START:
 <Does it say implicitly that the I-SID is unique per PBB (since the only key is the service name string)? >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 327   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <12.15.5.1.2>
 PAGE: <68>
 LINE: <24>
 COMMENT START:
 <Should we expect s-vid per I component? >
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Comment 328   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
  CLAUSE: <13.39>
  PAGE: <70>
  LINE: <15>
  COMMENT START:
  <The description of the operation is not clear enough. A figure could help. In addition, I think that we need to specify that in order for it to work, there is a need for a physical connection between the L2GP in the other administrative domain.>
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please add a figure. Please specify the conditions for the desired operation.>
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 329   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <17>
PAGE: <73>
LINE: <3>
COMMENT START:
<the managed objects described in clause 12 are not described by the MIBs. In addition it is hard to review the MIBs. A referance model could help in understanding which managed objects are deifned for what purposes and what is the relationship between this objects. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please add MIB tables for all managed objects defined in clause 12. Please defined the architecture/referance model for the managed objcts.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 329

4-Propose accept: All 12.15 information objects are included in D3.01 available on the 802.1 WEB.

Comment 330   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
  CLAUSE: <17>

PAGE: <73>
LINE: <3>
COMMENT START:
<The structure of the MIB and the relationship between the MIB objects are not clear. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please add an overview on the MIB structure and the relationship between the managed objects>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 331   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <17>
PAGE: <77>
LINE: <53>
COMMENT START:
<The description does not look to do much with the columns of the table>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please correct>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 332   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <17.6>
PAGE: <78>
LINE: <31>
COMMENT START:
<Does the maxvlanid refer to s_vid or B-vid?. The same for p.79, line 5>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 333   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <17.6>
PAGE: <80>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1 LINE: <34>
2 COMMENT START:
3 <the meaning of " 802.1Q transparent devices is not clear. >
4 COMMENT END:
5 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
6 <Please clarify>
7 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
8
9
10
Comment 334   Nurit Sprecher
11
12 NAME: Nurit Sprecher
13 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
14 CLAUSE: <17.5>
15 PAGE: <84>
16 LINE: <26>
17 COMMENT START:
18 < why the component id is required as a key? Isn't the vlan unique per network?. >
19 COMMENT END:
20 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
21 <Please add MIB tables for all managed objects defined in clause 12>
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
23
24
Comment 335   Nurit Sprecher
25
26 NAME: Nurit Sprecher
27 COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
28 CLAUSE: <25>
29 PAGE: <115>
30 LINE: <29>
31 COMMENT START:
32 <the list of aspects discussed in this document should be updated. For example, there is
33 no discussion on service protection. >
34 COMMENT END:
35 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
36 <Please update>
37 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
38
39
40
Comment 336   Nurit Sprecher
41
42 NAME: Nurit Sprecher
43 COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
44 CLAUSE: <25.2>
45 PAGE: <116>
46 LINE: <26>

COMMENT START: 1
<A reference to the authentication and authorization process is missing >   2
COMMENT END: 3
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 4
<Please add a reference>   5
SUGGESTED CHANGES END   6
                                                                              7
                                                                              8
Comment 337   **Nurit Sprecher**   9
                                                                              10
NAME: Nurit Sprecher   11
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >   12
 CLAUSE: <25.4>   13
 PAGE: <118>   14
 LINE: <6>   15
 COMMENT START: 16
 <What is the case that there is no mapping between S-vid and i-sid? Do we have a case   17
where there is no I-SID? >   18
 COMMENT END: 19
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 20
 <Please clarify>   21
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END   22
                                                                              23
Comment 338   **Nurit Sprecher**   24
                                                                              25
NAME: Nurit Sprecher   26
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >   27
 CLAUSE: <25>   28
 PAGE: <115>   29
 LINE: <29>   30
 COMMENT START: 31
 <the list of aspects discussed in this document should be updated. For example, there is   32
no discussion on service protection. >   33
 COMMENT END: 34
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START: 35
 <Please update>   36
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END   37
                                                                              38
                                                                              39
Comment 339   **Nurit Sprecher**   40
                                                                              41
NAME: Nurit Sprecher   42
 COMMENT TYPE: <E >   43
 CLAUSE: <25.4>   44
 PAGE: <118>   45
 LINE: <29>   46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

COMMENT START:
<typo: "creation nfo" >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please correct to "creation of" >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 340   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
  CLAUSE: <28>
  PAGE: <118>
  LINE: <28>
  COMMENT START:
  <I think that S-VID bundling is not required when a new TAG is defined. An I-SID may bundle/aggregate many S-services and in such a case the original S-TAGs should be preserved in the backbone frame. This is a 'multiple tunneling architecture'. A B tunnel 'contains' I tunnels, each which contains 's' tunnels (of c-tags).
  (1)I don't really understand the benefit of this bundling. It is done any way at the edges. The only benefit that I can see is having a larger range of services. If this is really needed, could not it be taken into consideration when (already) defining the new I-TAG. The I-TAG could have been defined in an efficient way, allowing hierarchies to be defined.
  (2)I think that it increases the potential number of (functional) flows that
  have to be supported, and the number of encapsulations that can be found. This complicates the implementations.
COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
   <Please reconsider the definition of the I-TAG to include service bundling in efficient way>
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 341   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
  CLAUSE: <25.5>
  PAGE: <120>
  LINE: <45>
  COMMENT START:
   <What is the applicable of such a scenario? What is the network scenario that is described? Can this is a real scenario that can happen? >
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify" >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 342   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <E >
  CLAUSE: <25.9.2>
  PAGE: <126>
  LINE: <4, 9>
  COMMENT START:
  <typo: 4: "too" instead of '"to"; 9: ""moditored" instead of "monitor">
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please correct >
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 343   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
  CLAUSE: <25.9.2>
  PAGE: <126>
  LINE: <14>
  COMMENT START:
  <In clause 13.39, P. 70, L. 10, it is defined "without sending or receiving BPDUs across the connections", so how can BPDUs from the customer network be delivered over the LAN interface to the CIP?>
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify and explain the operation. >
  SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 344   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
  COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
  CLAUSE: <25.9.2>
  PAGE: <126>
  LINE: <18>
  COMMENT START:
   <I think there is implicit requirement that there should be a physical connectivity between the L@ gateway ports in the other domain. >
  COMMENT END:
  SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   <Please clarify and explain the operation. >
2   SUGGESTED CHANGES END
3

4 ### *Comment 345*   **Nurit Sprecher**
5

6

7 NAME: Nurit Sprecher
8   COMMENT TYPE: <E >
9   CLAUSE: <25.9.3>
10   PAGE: <126>
11   LINE: <33, 34>
12   COMMENT START:
13   <typo: 30: "too" instead of "'to"; 34: ""moditored" instead of "monitor">
14   COMMENT END:
15   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
16   <Please correct >
17   SUGGESTED CHANGES END
18

19 ### *Comment 346*   **Nurit Sprecher**
20

21 NAME: Nurit Sprecher
22   COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
23   CLAUSE: <26.1>
24   PAGE: <131>
25   LINE: <4>
26   COMMENT START:
27   <which resources are considered (vids?), etc.)
28   COMMENT END:
29   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
30   <Please specify >
31   SUGGESTED CHANGES END
32

33
34 ### *Comment 347*   **Nurit Sprecher**
35

36 NAME: Nurit Sprecher
37   COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
38   CLAUSE: <26.2>
39   PAGE: <131>
40   LINE: <24>
41   COMMENT START:
42   <what is the definition of a fully connected network – that there is a path between each
43 edge nodes at the network?)
44   COMMENT END:
45   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
46   <Please define >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 348   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <26.2>
 PAGE: <133>
 LINE: <36>
 COMMENT START:
 <Referring to unknown B-MAC address, how can the encapsulated frames use a unicast address? Unknown frames should be flooded isn't it?>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please specify >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 349   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <E >
 CLAUSE: <26.2>
 PAGE: <133>
 LINE: <45>
 COMMENT START:
 <Typo: "may us" should be "may use">
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please correct >
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 350   **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <26.6.1>
 PAGE: <135>
 LINE: <27>
 COMMENT START:
 < From a network point of view this is pretty complicated to handle and manage hierarchical PBBNs. How can the edges be coordinated and how can we ensure that frame is ultimately handled correctly? It is basically a matter of the right network configuration,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

but it pretty hard to handle. Especially when talking about 5 level of PBBN hierar-
chies…..;in addition, by supporting multiple hierarchies, there is no clear definition any
more, to which layer the frame belong….)
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <We need to restrict the use in hierarchies…..>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 351 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <26.6.2>
 PAGE: <135>
 LINE: <39>
 COMMENT START:
 < In which table this information reside? A reference is missing..>
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please add a reference>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 352 **Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
 COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
 CLAUSE: <26.6.2>
 PAGE: <135>
 LINE: <45>
 COMMENT START:
 <Is the B-BEB to B-BE interface considered peer PBBNs? If yes, there are B-TAGs over
the E-NNI.
 COMMENT END:
 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
 <Please clarify>
 SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 353 **Muneyoshi Suzuki**

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 6.8 bullet c)
PAGE: 32
LINE: 47-48

COMMENT START:

1-1 S-tagged service IF removes S-TAG, so Provider Instance Port never receives VLAN tagged nor Priority tagged frames.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

(Option 1) Change as following:

  1) Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames used for bundled S-tagged interface;

  2) Admit Only Untagged frames used for 1-1 S-tagged interfaces;

(Option 2) Otherwise, change Clause 25.4, pp.118, ll.22-25 as following:

  This interface variation maps each S-VID of the 802.1ad interface to a single I-SID for use over the PBBN and "can remove" the S-TAG from the frame on ingress to the PBBN and regenerates an S-TAG on egress from the PBBN. (removes -> can remove)

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 353

Propose ?: I guess the commentor wants an option to retain S-TAG when doing 1-1 mapping interface.

Comment 354   Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:

Scope of "provisioned default destination address" is unclear. It may be per-Virtual Instance Port, per-Provider Instance Port, or per-I-componet value. Obviously, this impacts on table organization.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Clarify.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 354

Propose accept: The scope is per Provider Instance Port. The editor will clearify this.

Comment 355   Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR

CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
Provisioned default destination address in I-componet is redundant with default backbone
MAC address of service instance table in B-component. We don't need two address trans-
lation processes for the same purposes.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove default destination address from I-componet. (Also from Clause 25.3 pp.116,
ll.50). Otherwise, difference between them should be clarified.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 356 **Muneyoshi Suzuki**

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 116
LINE: 28
COMMENT START:
(1) Bundling S-tagged IF requires that both edges of the PBBN must agree to use the same
S-VID values. That is, ad islands interconnected with bundling S-tagged IFs must use the
same S-VID spaces. This is completely unrealistic scenario, because if such configuration
is feasible, we can also interconnect ad islands directly, so ah PBBN is not necessary. That
is, bundling S-tagged IF does not practically make sense.
(2) Bundling S-tagged IF maps multiple S-VIDs to a single I-SID, so whose
capability is inferior to 1-1 S-tagged IF. For example, customers can designate multicast
traffic with C-VID value, C-tagged service IF of 802.1ad Bridge maps the C-VID to a S-
VID, then 1-1 S-tagged IF of I-component maps the S-VID to an I-SID and B-component
maps the I-SID to a B-DA, so Backbone core Bridges can prune C-VID based customer-
multicast traffic. However, Bundling S-tagged IF maps multiple S-VIDs to a single I-SID,
so it can't provide this capability.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Bundling S-tagged IF increases implementation complex but it does not practically make
sense and it is inferior to 1-1 S-tagged IF, so remove Bundling S-tagged IF from 802.1ah.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 357 **Muneyoshi Suzuki**

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:ER
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35

LINE: Figure 6-2

COMMENT START:

To align with Figures 25-3, 25-4, 25-6, 25-7, 25-8, and 25-9, Provider Backbone/Instance Ports should be left side and Customer Backbone/Instance Ports should be right side.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Flip the Figure left side to right.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 358   **Muneyoshi Suzuki**

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:ER
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
... described in IEEE 802.1ad clause
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
... described in IEEE 802.1ad clauses
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 359   **Muneyoshi Suzuki**

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:ER
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 119
LINE: Figure 25-5
COMMENT START:
To align with Figures 25-3, 25-4, 25-6, 25-7, 25-8, and 25-9, Provider Backbone/Instance Ports should be left side and Customer Backbone/Instance Ports should be right side.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Flip the Figure left side to right.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 360   **Muneyoshi Suzuki**

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:ER
CLAUSE: many
PAGE: many

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

LINE: many
COMMENT START:
Too many ISID
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace to "I-SID"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 361   **Bert Wijnen**

NAME: Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 21-25
COMMENT START:
- Mix-up of "res1" and "res2" in description of reserved fields.
- Further I think that both fields are to be ifnored receipt, not matter what the value is, no?
The res2 field seems to say that the frame is discarded if one/two/any bit is set on receipt.
But how would they be set if they are always zero on transmit? Is it not better to just
"ignore" the field on receipt?

Current text states:

  c) res1 - This 2 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res2 field is zero on
transmit and is ignored on receipt.
  d) res2 - This 2 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res1 field is zero on
transmit and if set on reception the frame is discarded.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change text as follows:

  c) res1 - This 1 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res1 field is zero on
transmit and is ignored on receipt.
  d) res2 - This 1 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res2 field is zero on
transmit and is ignored on receipt.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 362   **Bert Wijnen**

NAME: Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17
PAGE: 73 and following
LINE: various

COMMENT START:

I'd like to propose that we use proper language. There is ONE MIB, which is composed of one or more MIB modules. So the CFM-MIB is in fact a MIB module. So is the MIB module in this document. SO pls change "MIB" into "MIB Module" at all places where you indeed speak of a part of the whole MIB, namely a MIB module.

For example:

   17.2 Structure of the MIB

   17.3 Relationship to other MIBs

Note that a MIB module name like "BRIDGE-MIB" are fine when it refers to the name of the MIB module.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Example would become:
   17.2 Structure of the MIB Module

   17.3 Relationship to other MIB Modules
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 363 **Bert Wijnen**

NAME: Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.3
PAGE: 74
LINE: 26-32
COMMENT START:
When I read the following:

  A system implementing the 802.1Q MIB shall also implement (at least) the "interfaces" group defined in RFC 2863.

  The "interfaces" group defines a portion of the Management Information Base (MIB) for use with network management protocols in the Internet community. In particular, it describes managed objects used for managing Network Interfaces.

Then I always wonder: what exactly needs to be implemented? The document (RFC2863) as a whole speaks of "The Interfaces Group MIB". But there is no "group" (i.e. an OBJECT-GROUP, or even anotehr "group concept") that I can thinks of as "The Interfaces Group". Do you mean all tables in the IF_MIB? Or only some tables?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1   Clarify which tables of the IF-MIB must be implemented. If you mean the whole IF_MIB
2   module, then it migth be best to state that the system muct implement the IF-MIB to be
3   compliant with ifCompliance3 as defined in teh IF-MIB module (page 55 in RFC2863).
4   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
5
6   ## *Comment 364*   **Bert Wijnen**
7
8
9   NAME: Bert Wijnen
10   COMMENT TYPE: E
11   CLAUSE: 17.4
12   PAGE: 75
13   LINE: 18
14   COMMENT START:
15   Proper spelling for IPsec is "IPsec" and not "IPSec"
16   COMMENT END:
17   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
18   change IPSec" into "IPsec".
19   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
20
21   ## *Comment 365*   **Bert Wijnen**
22
23   NAME: Bert Wijnen
24   COMMENT TYPE: TR
25   CLAUSE: 17.6
26   PAGE: 76-112
27   LINE: all
28   COMMENT START:
29   The MIB module (I reviewed the ASCII version posted by Paul at http://
30   www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ah.html):
31   - has SYNTAX errors, as reported to this mailinglist/exploder both smilint and smicng
32   reported errors
33   - has incorrect REFERENCE clauses, so it is difficult or impossible to check/lookup back-
34   ground info,
35   - is missing a lot of DESCRIPTION clauses,
36   - is missing MODULE-COMPLIANCE section
37   - has a lot of other issues/questions as reported below
38   COMMENT END:
39   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
40   Make changes as required. I have volunteered to help.
41   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
42
43   ## *Comment 366*   **Bert Wijnen**
44
45
46   NAME: Bert Wijnen

COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76-112
LINE: all
COMMENT START:
We should consider if this MIB module should completely replace/obsolete the Q-BRIDGE-MIB in RFC4363. It has so many things in common that it otgherwise seems complete duplication.

I wonder if we can assign special componentID 1 if there is only 1 component on a bridge (i.e. if the bridge is at the Q-BRIDGE-MIB level).

Dependiing on the outcome of this discussion our review of the MIB module will be different.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Discuss and decide.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 367   **Ludwig Winkel**

NAME: Ludwig Winkel
COMMENT TYPE: < E >
CLAUSE: <5.71 >
PAGE: <23>
LINE: <52 >
COMMENT START:
<The maximum number of services should be 4094 >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to 4094>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 368   **Ludwig Winkel**

NAME: Ludwig Winkel
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <6.4.1 >
PAGE: <28>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START:
<The defintion of the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier is missing. The use of the service_access_point_identifier is not clear. What is the different between this and the port-id?>
COMMENT END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Please clarify and add references. >

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 369   **Ludwig Winkel**

NAME: Ludwig Winkel

COMMENT TYPE: <TR >

CLAUSE: <17>

PAGE: <73>

LINE: <3>

COMMENT START:

<the managed objects described in clause 12 are not described by the MIBs. A referance model could help to understand which managed objects are deifned for what purposes and what is the relationship between this objects.>

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<Please add MIB tables for all managed objects defined in clause 12. Please define the architecture/referance model for the managed objcts.>

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 370   **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu

COMMENT TYPE:T

CLAUSE: 1.1 bullet ag)

PAGE: 16

LINE: 11

COMMENT START:

According this line and clause 6.7, an 802.1 reader may regard port-based interface and transparent interface as the same. And on the customer-faced side, I Component completely uses S-VLAN Component to provide customer interface just as 802.1ad. But according to clause 25.3 of 802.1ah and clause 15.3 of 802.1ad, there are still some differences between port-based interface and transparent interface. An 802.1ad port-based interface has to be configured with Admit Only Untagged frames, only 802.1d/q frames are accepted. An 802.1ah transparent interface has to be configured with Admit All frames, 802.1d/q/ad frames are accepted. I believe the problem is very clear and easy to solve, but I don't know why so many comments on it£¬ from D1.52 to D2.2, I believe there have been more than 10 related comments.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

This is a basic concept issue. I suggest to separate S-VLAN Component from I Component, named the left I' Component, to provide transparent to 802.1d/q/ad.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 371   **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 3 and 4
PAGE: 17-21
LINE:
COMMENT START:
There is no definition about "I" of "I Component". Instance? Or interworking?
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please clearly define it.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 372   **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
From D2.0, defines a Backbone MAC Address not has to be on each PIP, and an I Component B-MAC Address could be defined. But in this line, the text is unclear. What does the "the" of "the Backbone MAC address" point to? I believe each PIP has to be ASSOCI-ATED with a B-MAC Address (this Address may be one of I Component's B-MAC Address). And if goes far, an EISS may be associated with a B-MAC Address, too.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Something like:
"the Backbone MAC Address" -> "the Backbone MAC Address associated with this EISS". Use the word "associated".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 373   **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 6.9.4
PAGE: 38
LINE: 25
COMMENT START:
B Component Customer Network Port has been defined only connect to I Component Provider Instance Port, so it's impossible for Customer Backbone Port to receive a frame without an I-TAG.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1   Remove this sentence.
2   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
3
4   ## *Comment 374*   **Delei Yu**
5
6
7   NAME: Delei Yu
8   COMMENT TYPE:E
9   CLAUSE: 12.15
10   PAGE: 58
11   LINE: 20
12   COMMENT START:
13   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
14   "IB-BCB"->"IB-BEB"
15   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
16
17   ## *Comment 375*   **Delei Yu**
18
19   NAME: Delei Yu
20   COMMENT TYPE:T
21   CLAUSE: 12.15.3.3 - 12.15.3.4
22   PAGE: 63
23   LINE: 11-47
24   COMMENT START:
25   Not clear with VIP mapping table, which is not defined anywhere in the draft. According
26   12.15.3.3, Is the entry is a mapping between Service ID on PIP and Service ID on CBP?
27   And the index is Component Number + Portlet Number? If so, in 12.15.3.4, the inputs of
28   configuration are not complete.
29   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
30   Please clarify this.
31   SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
32
33   ## *Comment 376*   **Delei Yu**
34
35
36   NAME: Delei Yu
37   COMMENT TYPE:T
38   CLAUSE: 12.15.5
39   PAGE: 68-69
40   LINE: All the clause
41   COMMENT START:
42   The Service Entry can't be operated independently. Ports VLAN and PIP/VIP configura-
43   tion will basically determine the profile of the Service Entry. Whether a Service bundled
44   or not really dependents on the member set of VLANs and PVID value of a VIP.
45   SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
46

For "configuration read, 12.15.5.2", keep it untouched.For "configuration set, 12.15.5.3", only Service Name can be configured, remove the other items.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 377 **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 116
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Supporting Transparent Service Interface does not require SINGLE VIP on the PIP. Several VIPs may be supported on the PIP. Every service instance may associate a Destination B-MAC Address. But we have to keep one-to-one mapping between VIP and CIP.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please consider what I said above.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 378 **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 120
LINE: 27-30
COMMENT START:
It's not to place an 802.1ad bridge in front of the 802.1ah bridge to support a C-Tagged interface, but place a C-VLAN component into an 802.1ah bridge in front of I component.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please consider what I said above.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 379 **Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
First word "too" -> "to".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46