

# ***DISPOSITION OF BALLOT COMMENTS ON***

## **IEEE *Draft* P802.1ak/D4.0**

***DRAFT* IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area  
Networks—**

# **Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks — Amendment 07: Multiple Registration Protocol (MRP)**

## ***Sponsor***

**LAN MAN Standards Committee of the IEEE Computer Society**

Prepared by: **Tony Jeffree, Project Editor**

Tony Jeffree, 11a Poplar Grove, Sale, Cheshire, M33 3AX, UK  
Tel: +44-161-973-4278 Fax: +44-161-973-6534 Email: [tony@jeffree.co.uk](mailto:tony@jeffree.co.uk)

### *Commentary:*

This Disposition of Ballot Comments has been prepared to document the ballot comments received in the Working Group ballot on **P802.1ak/D4.0**, and to record the resolutions of those ballot comments, agreed during the meeting of 802.1 held in Vancouver, BC, in November 2005. 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 P802.1ak/D5.0.

1	1. Ballot summary .....	3
2		
3	2. Ballot Comments .....	5
4	Comment 1: Dan Romascanu .....	5
5	Comment 2: Dan Romascanu .....	5
6	Comment 3: Dan Romascanu .....	6
7	Comment 4: Tony Jeffree .....	6
8	Comment 5: Norm Finn.....	7
9	Comment 6: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	7
10	Comment 7: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	8
11	Comment 8: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	8
12	Comment 9: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	9
13	Comment 10: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	9
14	Comment 11: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	9
15	Comment 12: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	10
16	Comment 13: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	10
17	Comment 14: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	11
18	Comment 15: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	11
19	Comment 16: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	12
20	Comment 17: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	12
21	Comment 18: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	12
22	Comment 19: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	13
23	Comment 20: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	13
24	Comment 21: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	14
25	Comment 22: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	14
26	Comment 23: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	15
27	Comment 24: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	15
28	Comment 25: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	16
29	Comment 26: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	16
30	Comment 27: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	17
31	Comment 28: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	17
32	Comment 29: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	17
33	Comment 30: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	18
34	Comment 31: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	18
35	Comment 32: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	19
36	Comment 33: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	19
37	Comment 34: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	20
38	Comment 35: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	20
39	Comment 36: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	20
40	Comment 37: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	21
41	Comment 38: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	21
42	Comment 39: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	22
43	Comment 40: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	22
44	Comment 41: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	23
45	Comment 42: Panagiotis Saltsidis .....	23
46	Comment 43: Paul Bottorff .....	24
	Comment 44: Paul Bottorff .....	24
	Comment 45: Paul Congdon.....	25
	Comment 46: Paul Congdon.....	25
	Comment 47: Jessy V Rouyer .....	26
	Comment 48: Glenn Parsons .....	26
	3. Issues.....	28

# 1. Ballot summary

The first table indicates the status of each ballot response received. Where comments have been received without an accompanying ballot, this is indicated in the *Comments* column. The Status column indicates the voting status of the responder. *V(oting)* indicates 802.1 voting member at the start of the ballot period. *N(on-voting)* indicates a comment only response. *L(iaison)* indicates a voting liaison response. 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. The results of the ballot can be seen in the second table.

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	Comments?
v	e	Mike Borza	
v	n	Paul Bottorff	y
v	e	Jim Burns	
v	t	Dirceu Cavendish	
v	e	Frank Chao	
v	y	Paul Congdon	y
v		Arjan de Heer	
v	y	Russell Dietz	
v		Linda Dunbar	
v		Craig Easley	
v		Anush Elangovan	
v	y	Hesham Elbakoury	
v	y	David Elie-Dit-Cosaque	
v		Don Fedyk	
v	y	Norm Finn	y
v	y	David Frattura	
v	y	Anoop Ghanwani	
v	e	Ken Grewal	
v	y	Steve Haddock	
v		Takashi Hasegawa	
v		Ran Ish-Shalom	
v	y	Tony Jeffree	y
v	y	Michael Johas Teener	
v	y	Hal Keen	
v	y	Yongbum Kim	
v		Loren Larsen	
v	e	Yannick Le Goff	
v	e	David Martin	
v		John Messenger	
v	t	Dinesh Mohan	
v		Bob Moskowitz	
v		Don O'Connor	
v	n	Glenn Parsons	y
v	y	Ken Patton	
v	e	Ray Qiu	
v	e	Karen Randall	
v	e	Allyn Romanow	
v	n	Dan Romascanu	y
v	y	Jessy V Rouyer	y
v		Ali Sajassi	
v	n	Panagiotis Saltsidis	y
v		Sam Sambasivan	
v	e	John Sauer	
v	t	Mick Seaman	
v	t	Koichiro Seto	
v		Curtis Simonson	
v	e	Muneyoshi Suzuki	
v		Yoshihiro Suzuki	
v	e	Francois Tallet	
v	e	Geoff Thompson	
v		John Viega	
v	e	Dennis Volpano	
v	y	Manoj Wadekar	
v		Karl Weber	
v	e	Ludwig Winkel	
v	y	Michael D. Wright	

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

Category	Total	Percentage
Yes	16	80.00%
No	4	20.00%
Abstain	19	48.72%
No. of Voters	56	100.00%
Voters responding	39	69.64%

1 **2. Ballot Comments**

2  
3 **Comment 1 Dan Romascanu**

4  
5  
6 NAME: Dan Romascanu

7 COMMENT TYPE: TR

8 CLAUSE: general

9 PAGE: 1

10 LINE: 1

11 COMMENT START:

12 The current structure of the standard does not reflect the necessary changes to ensure the  
13 manageability of the MRP capable Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks. The changes  
14 mentioned in Clause 12, VLAN Bridge Management will lead to changes in the Bridge  
15 MIB modules replacing the current SMIV2 MIB interfaces still describing GVRP and  
16 GMRP, and possibly adding a MRP station MIB module. The MIB management interface  
17 needs to be synchronized with the changes introduced by this standard

18 COMMENT END:

19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

20 Add the clauses or changes to existing clauses in 802.1Q which will define the necessary  
21 changes to allow the manageability of MRP capable bridges and end stations. In the inter-  
22 mediate define at least the place-holders in a editorial note.

23 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

24  
25 **Disposition of Comment 1**

26  
27 See 3.1 “MIB” on page 28.

28  
29 **Comment 2 Dan Romascanu**

30  
31  
32 NAME: Dan Romascanu

33 COMMENT TYPE: E

34 CLAUSE: 10.15.2.3

35 PAGE: 83

36 LINE: 44

37 COMMENT START:

38 The text mentions the possibility of deleting the Permanent Database entry for forwarding  
39 filtering without the option of defining another Permanent Database entry instead. As I  
40 understand there always exists a Permanent Database entry for any instance

41 COMMENT END:

42 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

43 Replace 'This Permanent Database entry may be deleted or updated...' by 'This Permanent  
44 Database entry may be written initially and updated...'

45 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1       **Disposition of Comment 2**

2  
3       Reject - the text does indeed mean what it says. Permanent database entries are not neces-  
4       sarily “permanent” in the sense that they cannot be deleted. The distinction is more accu-  
5       rately static vs dynamic.  
6

7  
8       **Comment 3       Dan Romascanu**

9  
10       NAME: Dan Romascanu

11       COMMENT TYPE: TR

12       CLAUSE:12

13       PAGE: 92

14       LINE: 1

15       COMMENT START:

16       Although a note in 12.2 mentions the need to mark the objects that need to be persistent  
17       across re-boots and similar events, no such marking is defined yet for any objects in  
18       Clause 12

19       COMMENT END:

20       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

21       Insert 'Persistent' marking for management objects wherever relevant

22       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
23

24       **Disposition of Comment 3**

25  
26       Accept.  
27

28  
29       **Comment 4       Tony Jeffree**

30  
31       NAME: Tony Jeffree

32       COMMENT TYPE: E

33       CLAUSE: A

34       PAGE:

35       LINE:

36       COMMENT START:  
37

38       As indicated in the Editor's Note suggests, I will provide a re-structured PICS proforma  
39       for MRP along with text for an end station PICS proforma in the next draft.  
40

41       COMMENT END:

42       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

43  
44       Delete the Ed's Note and re-structure as suggested.  
45

46       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1       **Disposition of Comment 4**

2  
3       Accept.

4  
5       **Comment 5       Norm Finn**

6  
7  
8       NAME:       Norman Finn

9       COMMENT TYPE: E

10       CLAUSE:     6.12.1

11       PAGE:       24

12       LINE:       44

13       COMMENT START:

14       There is a nice section (6.12.1) that describes the purpose of MAC address filtering, in  
15       general. MMRP is clearly covered by this purpose statement. I can find no corresponding  
16       purpose subclause justifying VLAN filtering and MVRP.

17       COMMENT END:

18       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

19       Sprinkle some references to filtering VLANs in 6.12, e.g. add point c) to 6.12.1.2:

20  
21       c) In Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks, reducing the extent of frames on specific  
22       VLANs, but not filtered by MAC address, to those parts of the network that contain end-  
23       stations that are legitimate recipients of that traffic.

24  
25       Perhaps a paragraph or subclause at the beginning of Clause 11 would be an appropriate  
26       place for a purpose statement for MVRP.

27       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

28  
29       **Disposition of Comment 5**

30  
31       Accept.

32  
33       **Comment 6       Panagiotis Saltsidis**

34  
35       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

36       COMMENT TYPE: E

37       CLAUSE: 5.4.1

38       PAGE: 21

39       LINE: 15

40       COMMENT START:

41       Wrong reference

42       COMMENT END:

43       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

44       Change "(IEEE Std 802.1D-2004 Clause 6.6.5)" to "(6.12.5)"

45       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1       ***Disposition of Comment 6***

2  
3       Accept.

4  
5       ***Comment 7***       **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

6  
7  
8       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

9       COMMENT TYPE: E

10       CLAUSE: 5.4.1.3

11       PAGE: 21

12       LINE: 22

13       COMMENT START:

14       Including the MVRP operation in a subclause on VLAN-aware options is confusing as  
15       MVRP is a required functionality.

16       COMMENT END:

17       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

18       Move subclause 5.4.1.3 out of the 5.4.1 and into 5.4 on the VLAN-aware bridge compo-  
19       nents requirements.

20       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

21  
22       ***Disposition of Comment 7***

23  
24       Accept in principle. Move it to a new 5.4.2 “MVRP Requirements”.

25  
26       ***Comment 8***       **Panagiotis Saltsidis**

27  
28  
29       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

30       COMMENT TYPE: E

31       CLAUSE: 5.9

32       PAGE: 22

33       LINE: 20

34       COMMENT START:

35       Wrong reference

36       COMMENT END:

37       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

38       Change "10.5.7" to "10.5.9"

39       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

40  
41       ***Disposition of Comment 8***

42  
43  
44       Accept.



1       **Comment 9       Panagiotis Saltsidis**

2  
3       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

4       COMMENT TYPE: E

5       CLAUSE: 5.9

6       PAGE: 22

7       LINE: 20-22

8       COMMENT START:

9       This statement contradicts a later statement on lines 47-48 that only those end stations that  
10       require the ability to perform Source Pruning are recommended to conform to the opera-  
11       tion of the Applicant state machine.

12       COMMENT END:

13       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

14       Change "...implement the Applicant state machine..." on line 21 to "...implement the  
15       Applicant Only state machine..."

16       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

17  
18       ***Disposition of Comment 9***

19  
20  
21       Accept.

22  
23       **Comment 10       Panagiotis Saltsidis**

24  
25       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

26       COMMENT TYPE: E

27       CLAUSE: 5.9.1

28       PAGE: 22

29       LINE: 52

30       COMMENT START:

31       Wrong reference

32       COMMENT END:

33       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

34       Change "(10.6.4)" to "(10.5.8)"

35       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

36  
37  
38       ***Disposition of Comment 10***

39  
40       Accept.

41  
42       **Comment 11       Panagiotis Saltsidis**

43  
44       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

45       COMMENT TYPE: E

1       CLAUSE: 5.9.2  
2       PAGE: 23  
3       LINE: 19  
4       COMMENT START:  
5       Wrong reference  
6       COMMENT END:  
7       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
8       Change "(12.7.1)" to "(10.6.1)"  
9       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

10

11       ***Disposition of Comment 11***

12

13

14

Accept.

15

16       ***Comment 12      Panagiotis Saltsidis***

17

18       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

19       COMMENT TYPE: E

20       CLAUSE: 5.9.2

21       PAGE: 23

22       LINE: 34

23       COMMENT START:

24       Wrong reference

25       COMMENT END:

26       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

27       Change "(10.6.4)" to "(10.5.8)"

28       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

29

30       ***Disposition of Comment 12***

31

32

33

Accept.

34

35       ***Comment 13      Panagiotis Saltsidis***

36

37       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

38       COMMENT TYPE: E

39       CLAUSE: 8.13.10

40       PAGE: 36

41       LINE: 16 & 18

42       COMMENT START:

43       The bullets are wrong

44       COMMENT END:

45       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

46

1 Change "c)" to "b)" and "d)" to "c)"  
2 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

3  
4 ***Disposition of Comment 13***

5  
6  
7 Accept.

8  
9 ***Comment 14 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

10  
11 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
12 COMMENT TYPE: E  
13 CLAUSE: 10.1  
14 PAGE: 37  
15 LINE: 35 & 41  
16 COMMENT START:  
17 Wrong reference  
18 COMMENT END:  
19 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
20 Change "7.4" to "8.4" (twice)  
21 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

22  
23 ***Disposition of Comment 14***

24  
25  
26 Accept.

27  
28 ***Comment 15 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

29  
30 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
31 COMMENT TYPE: E  
32 CLAUSE: 10.1  
33 PAGE: 39  
34 LINE: 31  
35 COMMENT START:  
36 Wrong reference  
37 COMMENT END:  
38 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
39 Change "(8.1.3.9)" to "(8.13.9)"  
40 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

41  
42 ***Disposition of Comment 15***

43  
44  
45 Accept.

1       **Comment 16     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

2  
3       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

4       COMMENT TYPE: E

5       CLAUSE: 10.2.3

6       PAGE: 42

7       LINE: 45

8       COMMENT START:

9       The sentence is elusive

10      COMMENT END:

11      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

12      Consider changing "...that any other Port has also registered..." to

13      "...that one other Port in the set has also registered..."

14      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

15  
16      ***Disposition of Comment 16***

17  
18  
19      Accept.

20  
21      **Comment 17     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

22  
23      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

24      COMMENT TYPE: E

25      CLAUSE: 10.4

26      PAGE: 43

27      LINE: 50

28      COMMENT START:

29      Typo

30      COMMENT END:

31      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

32      Change "T o" to "To"

33      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

34  
35      ***Disposition of Comment 17***

36  
37  
38      Accept.

39  
40      **Comment 18     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

41  
42      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

43      COMMENT TYPE: E

44      CLAUSE: 10.5.2

45      PAGE: 47

1 LINE: 31  
2 COMMENT START:  
3 The statement is elusive since the Null message has not been defined for the general case.  
4 COMMENT END:  
5 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
6 Include the Null message type presentation in the general description of the previous page  
7 - possibly after point f)- and state that the Null is not necessary for correct protocol opera-  
8 tion but only for a possible optimal encoding  
9 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

10

11 ***Disposition of Comment 18***

12

13

14 Accept.

15

16 ***Comment 19 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

17

18 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

19 COMMENT TYPE: E

20 CLAUSE: 10.5.11

21 PAGE: 52

22 LINE: 30

23 COMMENT START:

24 It is better to refer to the Table by number

25 COMMENT END:

26 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

27 Change "The following table" to "Table 10-5"

28 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

29

30 ***Disposition of Comment 19***

31

32

33 Accept.

34

35 ***Comment 20 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

36

37 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

38 COMMENT TYPE: TR

39 CLAUSE: 10.6.1

40 PAGE: 57

41 LINE: 44-47

42 COMMENT START:

43 According to previous statements when a Leave or LeaveAll message is received, a state  
44 becomes Very anxious. The corresponding cells in the applicant state table are contradict-  
45 ing this statement for the p2p case.  
46

1 COMMENT END:  
2 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
3 Either update the state table to reflect previous statements on Leave message reception or  
4 include a note to explain why the p2p cases behave differently.  
5 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
6

7 ***Disposition of Comment 20***  
8

9  
10 Accept.

11  
12 ***Comment 21 Panagiotis Saltsidis***  
13

14 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
15 COMMENT TYPE: E  
16 CLAUSE: 10.6.1  
17 PAGE: 57  
18 LINE: 46  
19 COMMENT START:  
20 Typo  
21 COMMENT END:  
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
23 Change "rLm!" to "rLM!"  
24 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
25

26 ***Disposition of Comment 21***  
27

28  
29 Accept.

30  
31 ***Comment 22 Panagiotis Saltsidis***  
32

33 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
34 COMMENT TYPE: E  
35 CLAUSE: 10.6.1  
36 PAGE: 58  
37 LINE: 5  
38 COMMENT START:  
39 Typo  
40 COMMENT END:  
41 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
42 Change "Q" to "QA"  
43 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
44  
45  
46

1       **Disposition of Comment 22**

2  
3       Accept.

4  
5       **Comment 23     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

6  
7  
8       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

9       COMMENT TYPE: T

10      CLAUSE: Table 10-10

11      PAGE: 59

12      LINE: 23

13      COMMENT START:

14      The txLA! event affects the registrar state machine indirectly by giving rise to rLA!  
15      events.

16      COMMENT END:

17      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

18      Erase txLA! from the table

19      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

20  
21      **Disposition of Comment 23**

22  
23      Discuss - I believe it is needed because the station sending does not itself receive LA from  
24      the message sent. See 3.2 "State machine issues" on page 28.

25  
26      **Comment 24     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

27  
28  
29      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

30      COMMENT TYPE: T

31      CLAUSE: Table 10-11

32      PAGE: 59

33      LINE: 38 & 41

34      COMMENT START:

35      The transmit opportunities that cause the sLM or sLA actions are txLM! and txLA!  
36      respectively

37      COMMENT END:

38      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

39      Change "tx! && p2p" to "txLM!" and "tx! && !p2p" to "txLA!"

40      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

1       **Disposition of Comment 24**

2  
3       Discuss. I believe that the LA state table is correctly described. The txLA! and txLM!  
4       events refer only to the Applicant state table, and take account of whether sLA or sLM has  
5       been generated by the LA state table. See 3.2 “State machine issues” on page 28.  
6

7  
8       **Comment 25     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

9  
10       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
11       COMMENT TYPE: E  
12       CLAUSE: 10.8.2.1  
13       PAGE: 61  
14       LINE: 29  
15       COMMENT START:  
16       Typo  
17       COMMENT END:  
18       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
19       Change "transmitPDU!" to "tx!"  
20       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
21

22       **Disposition of Comment 25**

23  
24       Accept.  
25

26  
27       **Comment 26     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

28  
29       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
30       COMMENT TYPE: TR  
31       CLAUSE: 10.8.3.3  
32       PAGE: 62  
33       LINE: 9-14  
34       COMMENT START:  
35       How does MAD distinguishes if a new or a join event has occurred if the MAD Service  
36       User uses the same request primitive to initiate both of them?  
37       COMMENT END:  
38       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
39       Explain how the reception of a MAD\_Join.request service primitive indicates a New! and  
40       not a Join! Event.  
41       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
42

43       **Disposition of Comment 26**

44  
45       Discuss. See 3.3 “MAD” on page 28.  
46



1       **Comment 27     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

2  
3       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

4       COMMENT TYPE: E

5       CLAUSE: 10.8.3.23 and 10.8.3.24

6       PAGE: 64

7       LINE: 47 and 52

8       COMMENT START:

9       The "combined Applicant/Registrar" state machine is not presented.

10      COMMENT END:

11      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

12      Change the reference to combined Applicant/Registrar state machine to  
13      Applicant state machine and Registrar state machine.

14      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

15  
16      ***Disposition of Comment 27***

17  
18  
19      Accept.

20  
21      **Comment 28     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

22  
23      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

24      COMMENT TYPE: E

25      CLAUSE: 10.9.1.2

26      PAGE: 69

27      LINE: 38

28      COMMENT START:

29      The values of New and Join for the AttributeEvent are superfluous as these are included in  
30      the CompactAttributeEvent values

31      COMMENT END:

32      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

33      Erase the values New and Join. The total number of the remaining values is a consistent 7.

34      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

35  
36      ***Disposition of Comment 28***

37  
38  
39      Accept.

40  
41      **Comment 29     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

42  
43      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

44      COMMENT TYPE: E

45      CLAUSE: 10.9.2.2

1 PAGE: 71  
2 LINE: 14  
3 COMMENT START:  
4 The term OrdinaryAttribute has not appeared before in the text and is not appearing again.  
5 COMMENT END:  
6 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
7 Consider erasing it.  
8 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
9

10 ***Disposition of Comment 29***

11  
12 Accept.

13  
14  
15 **Comment 30 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

16  
17 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
18 COMMENT TYPE: E  
19 CLAUSE: 10.9.2.2  
20 PAGE: 73  
21 LINE: 34  
22 COMMENT START:  
23 Typo  
24 COMMENT END:  
25 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
26 Change "tthese" to "these"  
27 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
28

29 ***Disposition of Comment 30***

30  
31  
32 Accept.

33  
34 **Comment 31 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

35  
36 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
37 COMMENT TYPE: T  
38 CLAUSE: 10.12  
39 PAGE: 76  
40 LINE: 41  
41 COMMENT START:  
42 The Group Registration Entries contain also the VID of the VLAN in which the dynamic  
43 filtering information was registered.  
44 COMMENT END:  
45 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
46

1 Change "...to indicate the Port(s) on which..." to "...to indicate the  
2 Port(s) and VID(s) of the VLAN(s) on which"  
3 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
4

5 ***Disposition of Comment 31***  
6

7  
8 Accept.  
9

10 ***Comment 32 Panagiotis Saltsidis***  
11

12 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
13 COMMENT TYPE: E  
14 CLAUSE: 10.13  
15 PAGE: 77  
16 LINE: 18-19  
17 COMMENT START:  
18 Wrong reference  
19 COMMENT END:  
20 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
21 Change "6.6.5 and 6.6.7 of IEEE Std 802.1D." to "6.12.5 and 6.12.7"  
22 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
23

24 ***Disposition of Comment 32***  
25

26  
27 Accept.  
28

29 ***Comment 33 Panagiotis Saltsidis***  
30

31 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
32 COMMENT TYPE: E  
33 CLAUSE: Figure 10-1  
34 PAGE: 78  
35 LINE:  
36 COMMENT START:  
37 Wrong figure index  
38 COMMENT END:  
39 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
40 Change "Figure 10-1" to "Figure 10-8"  
41 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
42

43 ***Disposition of Comment 33***  
44

45  
46 Accept.

1       **Comment 34     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

2  
3       NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
4       COMMENT TYPE: E  
5       CLAUSE: 10.14  
6       PAGE: 79  
7       LINE: 39  
8       COMMENT START:  
9       Typo  
10      COMMENT END:  
11      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
12      Change "...(Either..." to "...(either..."  
13      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

14  
15  
16      ***Disposition of Comment 34***

17  
18      Accept.

19  
20      **Comment 35     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

21  
22      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
23      COMMENT TYPE: E  
24      CLAUSE: Figure 10-2  
25      PAGE: 80  
26      LINE:  
27      COMMENT START:  
28      Wrong figure index  
29      COMMENT END:  
30      SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
31      Change "Figure 10-2" to "Figure 10-9"  
32      SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

33  
34  
35      ***Disposition of Comment 35***

36  
37      Accept.

38  
39      **Comment 36     Panagiotis Saltsidis**

40  
41      NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
42      COMMENT TYPE: E  
43      CLAUSE: 10.15.2.1  
44      PAGE: 82  
45      LINE: 36

1 COMMENT START:  
2 Wrong reference  
3 COMMENT END:  
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
5 Change "IEEE Std 802.1D 6.6.7.1" to "6.12.7.1"  
6 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
7

### 8 ***Disposition of Comment 36***

9  
10 Accept.

### 11 12 ***Comment 37 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

13  
14  
15 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
16 COMMENT TYPE: T  
17 CLAUSE: 10.15.2.1  
18 PAGE: 82  
19 LINE: 39

20 COMMENT START:  
21 There are two different Group Attribute Types and no such information is signalled by the  
22 REGISTER\_GROUP\_MEMBER. The MMRP participant has to choose one of them  
23 when it issues a MAD\_Join.request  
24 COMMENT END:

25 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
26 Give a Note explaining how the MMRP participant decides which Group Attribute Type is  
27 carried by the MAD\_Join.request. The same applies also to what follows the receipt of a  
28 DEREGISTER\_GROUP\_MEMBER service primitive.  
29 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
30

### 31 ***Disposition of Comment 37***

32  
33  
34 Accept.

### 35 36 ***Comment 38 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

37  
38 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
39 COMMENT TYPE: T  
40 CLAUSE: 10.15.2.2  
41 PAGE: 83  
42 LINE: 9-13

43 COMMENT START:  
44 The Group registration Entry includes also the corresponding VID number  
45 COMMENT END:  
46

1 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

2 Include a reference to the VID number by noting that there is one MMRP Participant per  
3 VLAN.

4 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

5  
6 ***Disposition of Comment 38***

7  
8 Accept.

9  
10  
11 ***Comment 39 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

12  
13 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

14 COMMENT TYPE: E

15 CLAUSE: 10.15.2.3

16 PAGE: 83

17 LINE: 54

18 COMMENT START:

19 Wrong reference

20 COMMENT END:

21 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

22 Change "(10.7)" to "(10.7.2)"

23 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

24  
25 ***Disposition of Comment 39***

26  
27  
28 Accept.

29  
30 ***Comment 40 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

31  
32 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

33 COMMENT TYPE: E

34 CLAUSE: 11.2.3.2 & 11.2.3.3

35 PAGE: 89

36 LINE: 39 & 44

37 COMMENT START:

38 The subclause structure is wrong. The MVRP application EtherType and MVRP Protocol-  
39 Version should be at the same subclause level as the MVRP application address and  
40 MVRP AttributeType Definitions.

41 COMMENT END:

42 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

43 Decrease the subclause level of the 11.2.3.2 and 11.2.3.3 subclauses. As a consequence  
44 Change "11.2.3.2 MVRP application EtherType" to "11.2.3.1.4 MVRP application Ether-  
45 Type"  
46

1 Change "11.2.3.3 MVRP ProtocolVersion" to "11.2.3.1.5 MVRP ProtocolVersion"  
2 Keep the subclause level of the remaining subclauses. (as a result 11.2.3.3.1 would be  
3 11.2.3.1.6 and so on)  
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
5

### 6 ***Disposition of Comment 40***

7  
8 Accept.  
9

### 10 ***Comment 41 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

11  
12  
13 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

14 COMMENT TYPE: T

15 CLAUSE: 11.2.3.4.1

16 PAGE: 90

17 LINE: 21

18 COMMENT START:

19 There are two different VID vector Attribute Types and no such information is signalled  
20 by the ES\_REGISTER\_VLAN\_MEMBER. The MVRP participant has to choose one of  
21 them when it issues a MAD\_Join.request

22 COMMENT END:

23 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

24 Give a Note explaining how the MVRP participant decides which VID vector Attribute  
25 Type is carried by the MAD\_Join.request. The same applies also to what follows the  
26 receipt of a ES\_DEREGISTER\_VLAN\_MEMBER service primitive.

27 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
28

### 29 ***Disposition of Comment 41***

30  
31  
32 Accept.  
33

### 34 ***Comment 42 Panagiotis Saltsidis***

35  
36 NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis

37 COMMENT TYPE: E

38 CLAUSE: 11.2.3.4.2

39 PAGE: 90

40 LINE: 47

41 COMMENT START:

42 The description on what happens on receipt of a MAD\_Leave.indication is missing

43 COMMENT END:

44 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

45 Provide such description for consistency  
46

1 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
2

3 ***Disposition of Comment 42***  
4

5 Accept.  
6

7  
8 ***Comment 43 Paul Bottorff***  
9

10 NAME: Paul Bottorff

11 COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)

12 CLAUSE: 10.5.1

13 PAGE: 44

14 LINE: 46

15 COMMENT START:

16 Loss larger than 1 message may happen in networks as a result of buffer overload. The  
17 protocol should behave stability even if multiple frames are lost. In addition it is desirable  
18 to support both confirmed and unconfirmed registration services. Unconfirmed services  
19 are acceptable where the application can recover from a registration failure other services  
20 will require guarantees from the registration services.

21 COMMENT END:

22 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

23 The protocol should either assure consistency of periodic state updates which will eventu-  
24 ally propagate all registrations or offer a confirmed service.

25 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
26

27 ***Disposition of Comment 43***  
28

29 Discuss. See 3.4 “Reliability” on page 28.  
30

31  
32 ***Comment 44 Paul Bottorff***  
33

34 NAME: Paul Bottorff

35 COMMENT TYPE: T

36 CLAUSE: 10.10.2

37 PAGE: 75

38 LINE: 24

39 COMMENT START:

40 The join timer setting greatly affects the convergence time. For rapid convergence it  
41 should be possible to set the join timer to a value of 1 centisecond which will require a  
42 timer granularity of 1 centisecond or less.

43 COMMENT END:

44 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
45  
46



1 Change to indicate a 1 centisecond granularity for the JoinTime. Leaving the LeaveTime  
2 and LeaveAllTime at 5 centiseconds is acceptable.

3 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
4

#### 5 ***Disposition of Comment 44***

6  
7 Discuss. See 3.5 “Legacy issues” on page 28.  
8

#### 9 ***Comment 45 Paul Congdon***

10  
11  
12 NAME: Paul Congdon

13 COMMENT TYPE: ER

14 CLAUSE: 5.9

15 PAGE: 22

16 LINE: 16

17 COMMENT START:

18 The resolution of D3.0 comments indicated that a PICs would be developed for end-sta-  
19 tions. I have noted in the comment that a PICs is under development, so this comment is  
20 just a reminder

21 COMMENT END:

22 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

23 Insert end-station PICs per previous discussion and per proposal in other ballot comment.

24 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
25

#### 26 ***Disposition of Comment 45***

27  
28  
29 Accept.  
30

#### 31 ***Comment 46 Paul Congdon***

32  
33 NAME: Paul Congdon

34 COMMENT TYPE: E

35 CLAUSE: A.19

36 PAGE: 103

37 LINE: 30

38 COMMENT START:

39 A couple more MRP PDUs that need to be changed to MRPDUs.

40 COMMENT END:

41 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

42 Keep things consistent

43 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  
44  
45  
46

1       **Disposition of Comment 46**

2  
3       Accept.

4  
5       **Comment 47     Jessy V Rouyer**

6  
7  
8       NAME: Jessy V Rouyer

9       COMMENT TYPE: ER

10       CLAUSE: 10.6

11       PAGE: 53

12       LINE: 41-45

13       COMMENT START:

14       "New In", "New Empty", "Join In", "Join Empty" are not defined

15       COMMENT END:

16       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

17       Replace with defined terms "NewIn", "NewEmpty", "JoinIn", "JoinEmpty"

18       SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

19  
20       **Disposition of Comment 47**

21  
22       Accept.

23  
24       **Comment 48     Glenn Parsons**

25  
26  
27       NAME: Glenn Parsons

28       COMMENT TYPE: TR

29       CLAUSE: 12

30       PAGE: 92

31       LINE: 1

32       COMMENT START:

33       Does 802.1ak come before 802.1ap? That is will .1ak define its own MIB amendment?

34       Will .1ap define a MIB that includes GARP, GMRP & GVRP, or MRP? The current text  
35       which is a simple replacement of old terms with new terms does not given any indication  
36       of the direction. Since there are a lot of details that will be impacted in the MIB with the  
37       change to MRP, these should be delineated in this clause and covered by this project.

38       COMMENT END:

39       SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

40       .1ak should propose its own MIB amendment, this should be added to this clause (or as  
41       appropriate in coordination with .1ap, perhaps clause 17?).

42       .1ap should focus on MIBs for .1Q-2005 & .1ad-2005.

43       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 48***

Discuss. See 3.1 “MIB” on page 28.

1 **3. Issues**

2  
3 **3.1 MIB**

4  
5 *Fix the Bridge MIB for MRP changes*

6 Comment 1 Dan Romascanu on page 5

7 Comment 48 Glenn Parsons on page 26

8 The changes to the Q MIB will be made as part of the P802.1ap project.  
9

10 **3.2 State machine issues**

11  
12 *txLA! not needed in the Registrar machine*

13 Comment 23 Panagiotis Saltsidis on page 15

14 Reject. This is needed in order to ensure that the sender re-registers the attributes that it is  
15 interested in.

16 *tx! incorrect in LA state machine*

17 Comment 24 Panagiotis Saltsidis on page 15

18 Add a note to the definition of tx! that explains the fact that the tx! gets modified by LA or  
19 LM by the LA state machine.  
20

21 **3.3 MAD**

22  
23 *How does MAD distinguish if a new or a join event has occurred*

24 Comment 26 Panagiotis Saltsidis on page 16

25 Need to add a New primitive for request and indication.  
26  
27

28 **3.4 Reliability**

29  
30 *Loss larger than 1 message may happen in networks as a result of buffer overload.*

31 Comment 43 Paul Botorff on page 24

32 We should include an acknowledgment mechanism for the P2P case. To be processed  
33 offline.

34 Note: need to fix wording of the encoding of event values.  
35

36 **3.5 Legacy issues**

37  
38 *It should be possible to set the join timer to a value of 1 centisecond.*

39 Comment 44 Paul Botorff on page 24

40 In the P2P case the jointimer should not apply. Make sure the text reflects this.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46