

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 8
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

The draft is a bit rough, with lots of overly informal and unclear and/or ambiguous phrasing, to much to fix by commenting.

SuggestedRemedy

Have an IEEE tech editor scrub the draft. This would be in addition to the many problems noted in ballot comments.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

IEEE Tech editors did MEC review of this draft. Also many comment to the draft are related specifically to this topic and hopefully the next revision will be significantly improved.

CI 00 SC 0 P2 L4 # 153
Boatright, Robert Harman International In

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Modified PAR has been submitted that narrows the scope by referencing "IEC 61883" vs. "IEC 61883-1 through IEC 61883-7".

SuggestedRemedy

Make abstract match scope and purpose

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.
Same as comments #2,92,154,112,155

CI 00 SC 0 P6 L15 # 4
Busch, Alexander

Comment Type E Comment Status A

"Alexender" is spelled incorrectly

SuggestedRemedy

"Alexender" should be spelled "Alexander"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1 P L # 2
Messina, Don

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Scope and Purpose have been revised and submitted to NESCOM.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.
same as comment 153,92,154,112,155

CI 01 SC 1 P1 L1 # 168
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Imagine someone wanted to send Motion JPEG--how would they do it?

SuggestedRemedy

Define method for allocating other payload types with Registration Authority Committee, make it explicit in the 1722 draft how it is done

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is something that needs to be addressed and we intend to provide a method for registering subtypes, but this has no impact on the current draft.

The subtypes should be registerable from an authority like the RAC or IANA.

CI 01 SC 1.1 P1 L27 # 92
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

I find no connection management in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete ", connection management"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

New scope eliminates connection management.

Same comment as 2,153,154,112,115

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 01 SC 1.1 P12 L30 # 154
Boatright, Robert Harman International In

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Modified PAR has been submitted.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify Scope to match modified PAR submission

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Same as comment 153,2,92,145,112

CI 01 SC 1.2 P13 L3 # 112
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

Claims stream setup, control and teardown protocols are the purpose. These are not covered

SuggestedRemedy

Either write text covering these or remove them from the purpose.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

New scope eliminates connection management.

Same comment as 2,153,154,112,115

CI 01 SC 1.2 P13 L4 # 155
Boatright, Robert Harman International In

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Modified PAR has been submitted that removes reference to stream setup, control, and teardown.

SuggestedRemedy

Make Purpose match modified PAR submission

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

New scope eliminates connection management.

Same comment as 2,153,154,112,115

CI 01 SC 1.2 P2 L2 # 42
Jeffrey, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

"This standard will facilitate..."

Use of future tense is inappropriate - begs the question as to when in the future this will happen.

Surprised that NesCom let that one through.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "This standard facilitates..."

Unfortunately, this also needs a PAR change to make sure that the text matches, but should be possible to do this at the same time as submitting to RevCom if the timing goes that way.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P L # 3
Messina, Don

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

IEEE P802.1Qav D7.0, IEEE draft standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Virtual Bridged

20 Local Area Networks - Amendment 11: Forwarding and Queuing for Time-Sensitive Streams is an approved standard now . . . do you want this reference to be updated to the IEEE Std 802.1Qav

SuggestedRemedy

If yes, please update reference if there is another ballot; if not, staff will update.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P14 L # 90
Karocki, Piotr none

Comment Type G Comment Status A

At least 802.1as has newer draft (D7.0). Could this standard (1722) be "hold" for two weeks (or month) to reference another standard after changing it in balloting?

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

References have been updated in the draft. Whether we can "hold" to allow 802.1AS to complete will be a decision that is made when this standard, and 802.1AS get closer to completion.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 02 SC 2 P3 L # 43
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The references should appear in the correct collating sequence, i.e., all IEC refs before all IEEE refs, all 802.1 refs before 802.3 refs,...etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix it.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P3 L15 # 93
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

IEEE 802.1AS is now in sponsor ballot with draft 7.0.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "D6.2" to "D7.0"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P3 L17 # 94
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

IEEE 802.1Qat is now in sponsor ballot recirculation with draft 6.0 and is expected to be approved and published before or concurrent with this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "P802.1Qat D4.1, IEEE draft standard" to "Std 802.1Qat, IEEE Standard"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P3 L19 # 95
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

IEEE 802.1Qav has been approved and published (IEEE Std 802.1Qav-2009).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "P802.1Qav D7.0, IEEE draft standard" to "Std 802.1Qav, IEEE Standard"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P3 L29 # 9
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

IEC 61883-7 reference appears to have been mangled, or is incomplete.

SuggestedRemedy

Verify reference; fix as needed.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Reference was verified and is currently correct

Transmission of ITU-R BO.1294 System B

CI 02 SC 2 P4 L # 44
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

If you are using P802.1BA as a normative reference, then this may delay the project, as BA is not even at Sponsor ballot yet.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that you move BA to the bibliography (i.e., make it non-normative). Also refer to the current draft - D0.0 is long gone.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P4 L4 # 75
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

You cannot have normative references to draft standards. I think the other 802.1 standards listed here should be through RevCom so these can be fixed by the staff editor, but this one will not. 802.1BA is only in TG ballot -- and it was not mentioned in the PAR as being gating...

SuggestedRemedy

802.1BA appears to be fundamental to this document as it appears throughout. You can either delete it or move to a bibliography. The latter is probably the best choice.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 02 SC 2 P4 L6 # 10
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

What is the version and date of issue of this standard (MMA Payload Format Spec)?

SuggestedRemedy

Provide missing information.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This reference needs to be moved to the bibliography since it is non normative to this document. MMA Payload Format spec it not yet complete so no date or version exists yet.

CI 02 SC 2 P4 L9 # 78
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Any reason why not 802.3-2008?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 802.3-2008

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L # 89
Karocki, Piotr none

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Why use synonyms in standard? It is so simple, in new text (as this standard), to simply Find&Replace all occurrences of "byte" with "octet" (or vice versa, but use only one term, not two).
Similar in abbreviations - why not use only one abbreviation for "reserved"? Drop coin to choose between "res" and "reserved", but use only one.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Octet is used in IEEE standards, byte is used in IEC standards. We will use octet. Remove definition of byte and replace all uses of byte with octet.

Remove Rsv and Res from the definitions, Rsv is a field name used in 61883 so keep that, but remove Res from the document.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L18 # 113
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

AVB Bridge is too non-specific.

SuggestedRemedy

Define an AVB Bridge as an 802.1Q bridge that conforms to the 802.1BA standard.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

We need to remove normative reference to P801.2BA, all normative references to P802.1BA will be removed from this definition.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L21 # 114
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Use of "Ethernet" is unnecessarily limiting

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Ethernet" with AVB Network. Also, a 1394 bus is not a network--replace "network" with "bus"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"Ethernet" is removed, replace bus with media.

New wording "between an AVB network and another type of media, for example an IEEE 1394 bus."

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L25 # 115
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The word "priority" shouldn't be used to distinguish Class A and Class B.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "higher priority"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definition removed and replaced with SR Class as per comment #50

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L25 # 116
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
Awkward wording: Latency doesn't "run" on a media

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the note

Response Response Status **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definition removed and replaced with SR Class as per comment #50

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L27 # 118
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**
Not true that Class B is less latency than best effort

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "ensures bounded worst-case latency"

Response Response Status **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definition removed and replaced with SR Class as per comment #50

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L29 # 119
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
"From the manufacturer" isn't a formal requirement

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the definition to avoid confusion unless similar standards define "default"

Response Response Status **C**
ACCEPT.

Remove definition

CI 03 SC 3.2 P17 L15 # 120
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
Odd definition of "packet"

SuggestedRemedy
Delete this definition

Response Response Status **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Agreed, a new term AVTPDU has been introduced, and packet has been redefined to refer to it's specific use in 61883 as used in CIP(common isochronous packet) and SPH (source packet header).

CI 03 SC 3.2 P17 L21 # 121
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**
Timeout definition is unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy
Remove it

Response Response Status **C**
ACCEPT.

A quick scan of several 802.1 standards show that timeout is used without a definition being needed.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P17 L4 # 117
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **R**
Need definition for PTP

SuggestedRemedy
Add definition of PTP

Response Response Status **C**
REJECT.

If we use the term PTP in the draft then it is wrong, we should be using the term gPTP as defined in 802.1AS. PTP refers to IEEE 1588.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L # 11
 Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon
Comment Type G Comment Status A
 At least eleven definitions are missing their ending periods.
SuggestedRemedy
 Provide missing periods.
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L1 # 79
 Parsons, Glenn Ericsson
Comment Type E Comment Status A
 Do not put the draft or date or title here -- just the standard name -- the rest is in the Referneces clause
SuggestedRemedy
 just use "defined by IEEE P802.1Qav"
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Comment is accepted except that since Qav is now finished wording will be "defined by IEEE Std 802.1Qav"

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L16 # 46
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva
Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 The protocol isn't (shouldn't be) specific to Bridges, so the "B" word shouldn't appear in the acronym. On line 21 you prove this by defining a gateway to a non-802 network.
SuggestedRemedy
 Call it the Audio/Video Transport Protocol (AVTP). Rolls off the tongue better too.
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L18 # 47
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva
Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 Need to expand all acronyms (AVB, SRP, FQTSS,...) on first occurence, as well as placing them in Clause 4.
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix.
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L19 # 48
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva
Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 Shouldn't tie this to a specific draft of BA.
SuggestedRemedy
 Lose the "draft 0.0".
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Reference to 802.1BA will be removed from this definition as per comment #76

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L19 # 76
 Parsons, Glenn Ericsson
Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 You cannot reference a draft in this definition
SuggestedRemedy
 delete "and IEEE 802.1BA draft 0.0."
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L23 # 49
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva
Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 All of the 802 standards use "octet" I believe.
SuggestedRemedy
 Lose this definition and use "octet" consistently in place of "byte".
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L24 # 50
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

In FQTSS we talk about "stream reservation class", "SR Class A" and "SR Class B". It would be good to keep the terminology consistent, and not re-define what Q already defines. In particular, you are effectively re-defining the meaning of "traffic class" here to mean "SR Class", which is a bad idea.

SuggestedRemedy

I believe all you need here is to replace the defs for class A and class B with a statement that this standard uses the definition of "stream reservation class", "SR Clas A" and "SR Class B" from Q, and use "SR Class <N>" in the rest of the document.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L25 # 12
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Lacks clarity. Too informal.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "Class A's latency is not guaranteed to be achieved on all 802 media."

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definition removed and replaced with SR Class as per comment #50

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L32 # 51
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

You can't define "Frame" to mean "Ethernet frame" unless you plan that this protocol only be used on Ethernet. Also, the definition as it is doesn't acknowledge the fact that there may be other stuff there too - VLAN tag headers etc..

SuggestedRemedy

At the very least, lose the "E" word.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L4 # 80
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Do not put the draft or date or title here -- just the standard name -- the rest is in the Refernces clause

SuggestedRemedy

just use "defined by IEEE P802.1AS"

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L7 # 82
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

IEEE 1394 is a standard and does not need to be defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Move IEEE 1394 to clause 2 References

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L1 # 52
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

This doesn't need to be a definition - just include FQTSS in Clause 4 with a reference to Q. Ditto gPTP.

SuggestedRemedy

Do it.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L13 # 56
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Might be better to use the term "AVTP node" rather than overloading the more generally understood term "node" with such a specific meaning.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "AVTP node"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Node is unused in the document except one instance that is a quote from 61883-8 so the definition is not needed.

Remove definition for node.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L15 # 57
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

"Packet" is more commonly used as a synonym for "Frame", and this definition sounds a lot like the definition of "Protocol data unit (PDU)". So this is potentially a source of much confusion.

SuggestedRemedy

Use "PDU" instead.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

New term "Audio Video Transport Protocol Data Unit (AVTPDU)" has been introduced and the term packet has been used only when referring specifically to the 61883 usage of the term as in common isochronous packet(CIP) or source packet header(SPH)

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L17 # 81
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Do not put the draft or date or title here -- just the standard name -- the rest is in the Referneces clause

SuggestedRemedy

just use "defined by IEEE P802.1Qat"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L17 # 58
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Don't need a definition for this as long as SRP is in Clause 4 with the right references.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L21 # 59
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

I don't think the "at least from the requester's perspective" adds anything useful to this definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definition for timeout removed as per comment #121. So this text is no longer in the draft.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L6 # 53
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

You don't need this as a definition - it is already in the references. Ditto IEEE 1394.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove them.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L8 # 54
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Use the same definition for Listener (and Talker) as appears in the 802 standards.

SuggestedRemedy

Do it.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L9 # 55
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

MMA doesn't need a definition if it is included in the acronyms in Clause 4.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.3 P17 L23 # 122
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Unimplemented Locations is confusing--sounds like there's an address of the "location"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "locations" with "fields" or "parameters". Further in 3.3 it talks about "storage elements" for values. Remove this language as well.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #60

CI 03 SC 3.3 P6 L24 # 60
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

You should make it explicit as to what is being discussed here - is it fields in a PDU, or values in protocol parameters, or both? Or something else? I can't tell.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify. This applies to the whole of the subclause.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

There is no term "location" used in this document, remove all text related to locations and replace 3.3 with the following:

"3.3 Reserved fields

Any field within a data structure that is defined in this specification as reserved is reserved for future standardization. Implementations of this specification shall set these fields to zero on transmit and shall ignore these fields on receive."

CI 03 SC 3.3 P6 L28 # 61
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

The last sentence isn't describing an implementation option ("may").

SuggestedRemedy

Re-word: "Reserved fields are reserved for future standardization."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #60

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P7 L36 # 62
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Bear in mind that "first" and "last" are predicated on the assumption that the order of reading is left-to-right, which is not universal. Safer to use left-most and right-most.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the change as indicated.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P7 L36 # 13
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Lacks clarity. Too informal.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "as in Internet conventions, the actual ordering".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L11 # 98
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

There are four numbers in this paragraph that end with "16", in each case the "16" should be a subscript.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the trailing "16" to a subscript in each case.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L11 # 16
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

The paragraph starting on line 11 purports to describe Figure 3.2, but the text does not match this figure.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix cite to point to correct figure, giving actual figure number and title, not just above or below.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L3 # 96
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

"0116" the trailing "16" should be in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the trailing "16" a subscript.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L4 # 97
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

"000000012" the trailing "2" should be in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the trailing "2" a subscript.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L6 # 14
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Too informal; also unclear.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "always consist of an integral number".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The requirement that all data use an integral number of quadlets was removed several drafts ago. This line should have been removed then.

The line "This protocol ... shall always be using an integral number of 4 byte quadlets." will be removed

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L6 # 63
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

As quadlet is defined to be 4 bytes, "4 byte quadlets" is tautological, and this is compounded by the sentence that follows.

SuggestedRemedy

"...an integral number of quadlets (see <ref to Clause 3 def>. Within a quadlet..."

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove line containing "an integral number of quadlets" See comment #14

Fix the 4 byte quadlet and 8 byte octlet wording in Figures 3.3 and 3.4 since quadlet and octlet are already defined as 4 and 8 bytes

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L7 # 64
Jeffrey, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

NOOOOO!!! Earlier the text says that the order of storage, transmission etc, is layer specific (which is correct); here you state that there is a defined order of transmission. The ONLY thing you are entitled to say is how the octets are ordered within a PDU; how that PDU gets transmitted is NOT your problem! If I decide to design a MAC/PHY that transmits all even numbered octets first and then all odd numbered octets, your protocol MUST NOT be broken by that! Same bug appears on line 22.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix this before someone takes these words seriously. There is good text that you could filch from 802.1Q that will do the job.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.1 P8 L8 # 15
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

The correct figure is not the figure directly below (Figure 3.2), the correct figure is in fact Figure 3.3, which is after line 18.

SuggestedRemedy

In all places where a figure or table is cited as being "above" or "below", replace the imprecise cite with the figure or table number and title. Given the fragility of figure and table numbers, it's best if the title is manually entered into the text, and not as a live link.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.5.2 P9 L12 # 17
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

It is not true that the receiver's action on processing a field with a reserved value is unspecified. In all cases, the receiver is explicitly required to ignore such fields.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from "not specified" to "ignored".

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is redundant information, for the third time, and will be removed. However other places in the document will explicitly state that reserved fields are to be ignored on receive.

CI 03 SC 3.6 P9 L17 # 65
Jeffrey, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

You don't need this subclause; the first NOTE in the document will get a standard footnote added by the IEEE editor (if you don't get there first) that says what NOTEs mean.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the subclause. Add the standard footnote to the first real NOTE - see page 2 of IEEE Std 802.1Qav-2009 for an example of the way this is done.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 04 SC 4 P10 L28 # 99
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
"(81-0016" the trailing "16" should be in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy
Make the trailing "16" a subscript.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 04 SC 4 P21 L3 # 123
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
1394TA appears in abbreviations, but is not used in the document

SuggestedRemedy
Remove it.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

Cl 05 **SC 5.1.1** **P11** **L6** # **66**
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**

There's no point in defining Talker and Listener in Clause 3 if you are going to repeat the definition here.

SuggestedRemedy

Decide where you want the definitions; if you want it here, then lose the ones in Clause 3; if you want them in Clause 3 then point at them from here.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definitions have been removed from Clause 5

Cl 05 **SC 5.1.1** **P11** **L9** # **67**
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**

"An AVBTP stream is between one Talker and one or more Listeners." Between in what sense?

SuggestedRemedy

I think you mean "An AVBTP stream is transmitted by one Talker and received by one or more Listeners."

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

ACCEPT.

Cl 05 **SC 5.1.2** **P11** **L10** # **68**
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

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

Unless I am missing something, there is no sense in which AVTP "interoperates" with AV Bridges - i.e., there is no sense in which the content of AVTP frames is interpreted by Bridges & actions taken as a consequence, other than the normal Bridge operations of filtering and relay. 5.1.4 confirms this by saying that a Bridge need not be present for the protocol to work. I believe what you mean is that the standard assumes that the underlying network is "AV capable"; i.e., if there are Bridges present, then they meet the requirements for Bridges as stated in P802.1BA.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 5.1.2 and 5.1.4 and write a new subclause entitled "Requirements for the underlying network" or similar, and which states what you need the underlying network to do for you. It would help greatly if you had a real introduction in Clause 5 that described your assumed model of operation - i.e., that AVTP is basically just an encapsulation for stream data that identifies the stream content...yada yada. It would then be far more apparent that the only devices that give a damn about the protocol are Talkers and Listeners. Might also be worth explaining up front that this encapsulation is carried directly by an underlying MAC (802.3, 802.11, etc.) rather than the reader having to figure that out by inference from the fact that there is an Ethernet defined, and from the comment on P12 lines 11&12.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Subclause 5.1.1 - 5.1.4 have been completely rewritten and consolidated in to a single subclause titled "5.1.1 AVTP network requirements"

The introduction to subclause 5.1 has been rewritten and expanded to meet the requirements from the suggested remedy.

Cl 05 **SC 5.1.3** **P22** **L16** # **124**
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

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

"This standard" specifies latency requirements?
 SRP is mentioned in relation to the StreamID. No need to repeat that here. Also, title of 5.1.3 describes bandwidth but the section describes latency requirements

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 5.1.3

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

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.1.4 P11 L19 # 18
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

The term "point-to-point fashion" is nowhere defined, but is used normatively.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a definition of "point-to-point fashion" that (by IEEE rules) does not include any of these words.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comments 68 and 124. Resolve with rewrite of section that does not use the term point to point.

CI 05 SC 5.1.4 P22 L19 # 125
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

To state "it shall run" doesn't tell the implementer what specifically to do.
This is a statement of what the standard intends to make true, not what an implementation must do

SuggestedRemedy

Remove 5.1.4

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.
See comments 18,68 and 124.

CI 05 SC 5.1.5 P11 L11 # 83
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Why has the Ethertype not been assigned yet?

SuggestedRemedy

Communicate with RAC and indicate Ethertype here

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.1.5 P11 L24 # 111
Olsen, David Harman International In

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Table 5.1 contains a placeholder rather than the real ethertype

SuggestedRemedy

Replace AVBTP Ethertype in table 5.1 with real ethertype value and remove the editors note on line 26-28.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

See comment 83

CI 05 SC 5.2 P23 L11 # 126
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This standard should not dictate how the frame structure of the next lower layer organizes its fields

SuggestedRemedy

Remove language about "after the Ethertype field".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.1 P12 L19 # 69
Jeffrey, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"Only AVBTP Talkers can set this field to zero (0) as only Talkers can send AVBTP stream data packets." Its an interesting philosophical point - what does a Bridge relay do? I think it sends whatever packets it needs to relay...including these ones.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest you re-word this sentence as: "The value of the cd bit is determined by the Talker and is not modified during the transmission of the PDU through the network to the receiving listener(s).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.2.1 P23 L18 # 127
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
"Only AVBTP Talkers can" is not proper standard language

SuggestedRemedy

State that listeners shall not set this field to zero.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.1 P23 L20 # 129
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
Cannot say "use the appropriate values" without stating what those values are

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the sentence containing the statement.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.2 P13 L3 # 74
Kicherer, Max BMW Group

Comment Type TR Comment Status R
Table 5.2
Currently 1722 is limited to formats defined in IEC 61883/IIDC or MIDI, this is a strong reduction from RTP and 1733. E.g. mjpeg and h264 are not included today.

SuggestedRemedy

Introduce new sub-type 02(16) called RTP_Mime_Type and allow RTP payload type (PT) in protocol_specific_packet_header of common stream data packet header to allow 1722 payload to be identical with RTP payload.

Response Response Status W
REJECT.

This would be a major new feature that would involve too many changes to be undertaken as part of sponsor ballot

CI 05 SC 5.2.2 P13 L5 # 19
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A
Clarity

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "of this document and the experimental subtype shall not be used in conforming products".

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.2 P23 L26 # 128
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Protocols don't "run over AVBTP"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "running over" with "being carried by AVBTP"

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.4 P24 L16 # 130
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
This version is the only version of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Say that the Version field shall be set to 0

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.5 P24 L20 # 131
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
If type_specific_data is defined later, add a reference. If not, add language specifying how to fill in, use this field.

SuggestedRemedy

Change as per comment

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.2.6 P14 L3 # 20
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

Which field is "this field", sv or stream_id?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "this field" with the name of the intended field.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.2.6 P25 L3 # 132
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Too many "shalls". Some are unnecessary

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "shall be used for stream identification" and the subsequent sentence (contradicts th 1st sentence)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "shall" to "is used"

Remove subsequent sentence that didn't say anything useful and was confusing.

CI 05 SC 5.3 P15 L11 # 21
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

In Figure 5.2 (and all like figures), what do the gray and white areas signify?

SuggestedRemedy

For each affected figure, provide a sentence nearby spelling out the meaning of the gray shading. See page 47 line 27 in Annex C for an example.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A note has been added to Figure 5.1 which is the first figure to feature the gray shading. This note states that this shading is used in all PDU diagrams in the document.

CI 05 SC 5.4.1 P16 L28 # 22
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

While it's always useful to know the intent, what the reader really needs to know is what is and is not required, so saying that the "change is not intended to be seamless" doesn't quite answer the mail.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "this kind of change need not be seamless".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.1 P17 L2 # 23
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Wrong word. To "insure" something is to buy an insurance policy, while what is intended is the toggle will make sure something happens.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "insure" to "ensure", wherever insure is found. This is a general comment.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.10 P18 L39 # 26
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

It is not made clear if ethernet jumbo frames are allowed or not. Jumbo frames are in fact not allowed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "within a single standard Ethernet frame", the word "standard" being new.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.4.10 P29 L39 # 138
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
Maximum MTU already defined. No need to limit to "ethernet" here.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the word "Ethernet"

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.11 P30 L5 # 139
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
"field is to carry"

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "field shall carry"

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.12 P30 L9 # 140
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
"0 to n bytes" What is "n"?

SuggestedRemedy
Remove "0 to n bytes of"

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.3 P17 L9 # 100
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
This standard does not define the behavior of an AVBTP gateway. Therefore, the text of this section should merely reserve this bit for use by AVBTP gateways.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace the section text with:
The gateway_info field valid (gv) field is reserved for use by AVBTP gateways which are not defined by this standard.
AVBTP end stations that do not have an AVBTP gateway function shall set this field to zero (0) on transmit and ignore this field on receive.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.4 P17 L24 # 24
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A
The timestamp field always contains data, but the data may or may not be valid.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to read "contains no valid data and therefore shall be ignored", the word "valid" being new.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.5 P17 L30 # 70
Jeffrey, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
"may" -> "can"

SuggestedRemedy
Make the change as indicated.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 **SC 5.4.5** **P17** **L33** # 71
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 Clumsy wording
SuggestedRemedy
 "The value of this field is determined by the Talker. Listeners can use the sequence number to detect PDUs lost in transmission."
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

CI 05 **SC 5.4.5** **P17** **L33** # 25
 Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon
Comment Type **GR** **Comment Status** **A**
 What exactly is meant by "properly inserted"? The word "properly" is nowhere defined. Nor is it clear that the word is needed.
SuggestedRemedy
 Drop the word "properly", so it reads "shall be inserted by Talkers".
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #71. Use wording suggested in that comment which also drops the word "properly"

CI 05 **SC 5.4.5** **P28** **L30** # 133
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 "it is to be" is not normative
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "shall"
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

CI 05 **SC 5.4.5** **P28** **L33** # 134
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
 "shall be _properly_ inserted" isn't helpful
SuggestedRemedy
 Define what "properly is, or remove the word
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #71. Use wording suggested in that comment which also drops the word "properly"

CI 05 **SC 5.4.8** **P29** **L12** # 135
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
 Normative statement that the timestamp field _shall_ contain the avbtp presentation time. This is not helpful to the implementer
SuggestedRemedy
 Please state what the _behavior_ is, rather than call it the avbtp presentation time
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove "shall contain" and replace with "contains"
 Add reference to 5.5.2 where avbtp presentation time is defined.

CI 05 **SC 5.4.8** **P29** **L25** # 136
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
 The reference to IEC 61883-6:2008 is not useful, unless it specifically uses the term "avbtp_timestamp"
SuggestedRemedy
 Explain in 1722 how the timestamp is used, or refer to normative statements of another standard and specify the mapping from avbtp_timestamp to something relevant
Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Paragraph removed since it adds no useful information and is misleading

The timestamp usage is described in 5.5 cross reference to the relevant clause has been added in comment #135

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.4.9 P18 L29 # 101
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This standard does not define the behavior of an AVBTP gateway. Therefore, the text of this section should merely reserve this field for use by AVBTP gateways.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the section text with:
The 32-bit gateway_info field is reserved for use by AVBTP gateways which are not defined by this standard.
AVBTP end stations that do not have an AVBTP gateway function shall set this field to zero (0) on transmit and ignore this field on receive.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.9 P29 L32 # 137
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Understood that non-gateways do nothing with the gateway_info field, but what do _gateways_ do with the field?

SuggestedRemedy

Describe what gateways do with the field -- how it is set and how it is translated, unless such behavior is specifically out of scope of 1722.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #101

CI 05 SC 5.5.1 P20 L8 # 27
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A
Clarity.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "of a stream to be presented", the phrase "to be" being new.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.5.1 P20 L9 # 28
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A
Clarity

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "audio/video types, the exact usage", the comma being new.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.5.1 P31 L6 # 141
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

when presented "to the AVBTP client". No definition (or any other use of) "AVBTP client"

SuggestedRemedy

Either define AVBTP client or refer to proper definition of the upper layer above 1722

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change wording to "be available to the AVTP Listener(s)." removing client.

Make this statement as specific as possible and consistent with 5.5.4. Add an appropriate reference to 5.5.4

CI 05 SC 5.5.2 P20 L17 # 29
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

This is written as if 1722 can somehow govern network latency; in fact, 1722 must accept what the network provides.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "network latency assumed for a given configuration", the word "assumed" being new.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.5.2 P31 L17 # 142
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

If "it is possible for a . . . to determine the _smallest_ Max Trnsit Time", then say how. (is it a true statement?) If not, delete sentence

SuggestedRemedy

Delete sentence

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A note has been added to point the user to Qav for how to calculate the minimum max transit time

SRP provides a latency figure in the listener spec. Add reference to 35.2.1.4 or 35.2.2.8.6

CI 05 SC 5.5.2 P31 L31 # 143
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The timestamp "may be used to synchronize multiple Talkers & Listeners". This statement merely gives permission ("may"). Is this a result of implementing the standard, or allowing something extra to be done?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"may" is wrong and should be replaced with "can".

CI 05 SC 5.5.3 P32 L7 # 144
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"it is required to set timestamp_uncertain". Is this requirement observable? It appears not to be testable

SuggestedRemedy

Say "should" set the "timestamp_uncertain" field, or define precisely what conditions require setting the field to '1'. Otherwise the "shall" is not meaningful. Same with line 10, when the field is reset to zero

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Line 7 Change "required" to should

Line 10 Change "shall" to should

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P22 L4 # 30
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

In lines 4 and 7, there are two periods after "e.g.".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete superfluous periods.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P32 L21 # 145
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"SFD at the MDI pins" is inappropriate language in 1722. Refer to timestamp reference planes of gPTP instead

SuggestedRemedy

Make change suggested in comment

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P32 L22 # 146
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Use of "must" is inappropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

If normative requirement, replace with "shall"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to "Packet is transferred"

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P32 L22 # 147
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"buffer size must be". 1722 must not mandate an exact size

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "shall be at least"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P32 L22 # 148
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This figure should NOT be illustrative, not normative

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all normative statements in this figure (shall, must, may, should)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

After discussion with the commentor it was decided that this comment really was a question as to whether the figure should be considered normative or informative. The consensus is the figure should be considered normative and therefore all wording in the figure should be modified to reflect this.

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L1 # 149
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Problematic statement: "The AVBTP presentation time is the gPTP time by which the 1722 packet data will be available in the Listener to be. . ." Is this a behavioral requirement placed on the Listener or Talker or a statement of fact?

SuggestedRemedy

Make statement descriptive rather than prescriptive

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The 1722 packet data is available in the Listener to be read...

Make statement of fact not redefinition of presentation time.

Remove gptp time reference and change will be to is.

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L25 # 152
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

"shall be large enough to absorb a stream" requires knowing Max Transit Time, but we only know the "default" value

SuggestedRemedy

Specify the maximum value of Max Transit Time

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to a fact rather than shall.

The buffering required in a listener is used to absorb a stream specified by ... If a listener does not have..

Also a note has been added with a pointer to 802.1Qat that refers to the calculation for Max Transit Time.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L38 # 156
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
"conversion time required" is outside scope of 1722. This means that if a video codec requires 81us and an audio codec requires 1us, then the A/V sync will be off by 80us. If 1722 doesn't address this, where is it addressed

SuggestedRemedy

Add note describing where D/A and/or codec delays are addressed

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use the word decoder and codec rather than DAC/ADC. Try to reword without the word "conversion time" Possible add a NOTE if needed. This is all outside the scope the standard and make sure that this is stated.

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L4 # 150
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
"may be used to know when to start processing" seems too lax--it SHALL be used

SuggestedRemedy

Change "may" to "shall", remove the "or" leaving "and it shall be used to recover the stream's media clock"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to a statement of fact using "is" rather than "shall"

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L6 # 151
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
"properly set the presentation time" isn't helpful. This entire section reads like a whitepaper. Removal of significant text will remove confusion and ambiguity. E.g. "it is imperative"--is it a "shall" or not?

SuggestedRemedy

State exactly what the behavior shall be, without reference to what "proper" is. Remove incorrect use of "may" in the following paragraph

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P34 L1 # 157
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R
Max Timing Uncertainty is 125us for ClassA, 1000us for ClassB. I see no fundamental reason for the difference--we're not talking about any media-dependent effect (this value is measured ABOVE the MAC). How were these numbers selected?

SuggestedRemedy

Please provide rationale for the numbers in Table 5.4, or lump them into the uncertainty that is out of scope of 1722 (see previous comment on 5.5.4, line 38)

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

After discussion with the commentor and with the 1722 working group the consensus was that no changes should be made at this time to the Max Timing Uncertainty values or definition.

CI 05 SC 5.5.5 P23 L6 # 77
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
802.1BA is a draft, you cannot make normative statements using it.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword to "All AVBTP end stations may include mandatory support of the following and other standards:"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.5.5 P23 L6 # 45
Olsen, David Harman International Inc

Comment Type TR Comment Status A
Remove reference to 802.1BA since we don't want to be held up until BA is finally done. Also remove editorial references to 802.1BA in 3.2, 2, and Keywords

SuggestedRemedy

Change from shall support 802.1BA to shall support AS,at,av

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 **SC 5.5.5** **P34** **L6** # 158
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
It is inappropriate to specify what ANOTHER standard "may" or may not do.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the word "may", say "802.1BA requires support of", if it's true.

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This reference to BA will be removed see comment 45

CI 06 **SC 6.1** **P24** **L5** # 102
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
Typo

SuggestedRemedy
Change "the changes need to work" to "the changes needed to work"

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

CI 06 **SC 6.1** **P35** **L3** # 159
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
6.1 describes "changes" required to adapt 61883 to 802. It's great that the payload formats are being reused. However, the protocol dependencies carried over from 61883 have proven subtle and easily confused.

SuggestedRemedy
Please be specific about what a listener SHALL do (from a protocol perspective) in order to be compliant with 1722. For example: If AVBTP subtype equals 0x00, it SHALL be compliant with IEC 61883/IIDC and additionally shall ___ and ___ and ___. OR, instead of "additionally" say "shall instead of ___ shall do ___, and instead of ___ shall do ___".

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The individual sections already include changes to any protocol or formats that are required to implement 1722.

CI 06 **SC 6.2.2** **P26** **L7** # 103
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
The text says that this 6-bit field has four possible combinations.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Of the four possible combinations for this field, the" to "The"

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

CI 06 **SC 6.3** **P38** **L2** # 160
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
The intro text to 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 are confusing--are 6.3 and 6.4 subclauses of 6.2? If not, what's the relationship?

SuggestedRemedy
Make 6.3 and 6.4 sub-clauses of 6.2

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

CI 06 **SC 6.4.13** **P41** **L28** # 161
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **A**
"avbtp_timestamp field which consists of presentation time as expressed as the least significant 32 bits of". The text must NOT redefine the avbtp_timestamp field--risk doing so in way that's interpreted differently from the prior formal definition of avbtp_timestamp

SuggestedRemedy
Remove redefinition of avbtp_timestamp on line 27 of 6.4.13. Also, clarify or remove the last parenthetical phrase beginning "the source packet header is used instead of the avbtp_timestamp field"

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 06 SC 6.6.1 P32 L22 # 31
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

Clarity and grammar. To what does "this standard" refer? By English, it actually refers to a standard ethernet frame. Next choice would be IEEE 1394 (assuming that one knows that this is in fact a standard), but that isn't what's intended either. What is intended is IEEE 1722. So, we have a doubly ambiguous reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "IEEE 1722 does not", "this standard" being replaced with "IEEE 1722".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 06 SC 6.6.1 P32 L24 # 32
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

We need to exclude jumbo frames.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "can fit into a standard Ethernet frame", "an" being replaced with "a standard"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 06 SC 6.6.1 P32 L26 # 33
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status A

Ambiguous reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "IEEE 1722 does not", "this standard" being replaced with "IEEE 1722".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 06 SC 6.6.1 P43 L3 # 162
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

The first 10 lines of 6.6.1, if explanatory only, is OK, but if meant to be normative, is far too fluffy

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "is generally accomplished", "main difference", "is generally consistent with", and "the main differences are"

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

After review with the commentor it was agreed to reject this comment as we were unable to come up with better language at this point. The introductory language described by this comment is intended to be generic and vague since more details are given later.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 06 SC 6.6.1 P43 L32 # 163
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

1394 assumes a 125us cycle time. However, AVBTP does not restrict the number of frames per 125us. Specifically, there is no 1722 requirement to synchronize sending of AVBTP frames to a 125us interval.

SuggestedRemedy

Add statement to the bullet list: -- This standard does not require a Talker to synchronize transmission to 125us. For example, a 1722 talker may send a single 1722 packet every 125us, or may send a 1722 packet every 159us, or every 12.5us, or ever 100us, provided it secures an appropriate MSRP reservation. A 1722 talker may chose to send a single audio sample at a time, ensuring the extra overhead is accounted for in the MSRP reservation.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add a note with with the examples. Also the note should specify that use of intervals of the msrp observation interval are most efficient.

Add # of packets per class observation interval to the example.

Enhance note to include possible examples since there has been so much confusion over this issue.

Possibly include examples In class A with an class measurement interval of 125us give an example for 44.1khz stream sending a frame every 125us and 44.1khz stream sending exactly 6 samples per packet both of which are legal. Also include examples of multiple packets per 125us cycle. Do we want to include a class B examples?

CI 06 SC 6.6.2 P45 L9 # 164
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Definition of packet_arrival_time_L is confusing--where is the packet arriving from? From the AVB network? What does anyone when it arrives over the network?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify definition of "arrived at the receiver", also for other uses of packet_arrival_time_L

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Definitions for packet_arrival_time_L and _F should match between lines 6-9 and 25-28, replace "cycle time" with gPTP time in 25-28

The entire definition of packet_arrival_time_L and _F are taken directly from 61883-2. The only change is to replace cycle time with gPTP time.

Line 38 61883-3 should be changed to 61883-2 to not be in conflict with lines 34-35

CI 06 SC 6.6.3 P34 L7 # 34
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Unclear.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "a constant offset", "some" being replaced by "a constant".

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 06 SC 6.6.7 P36 L16 # 35
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G Comment Status A

Terminal full colon is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide missing colon.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

Actually line 18

Overview of transmission with:

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

Cl 06 **SC 6.6.7** **P37** **L13** # 36

Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type G **Comment Status A**

Clarity and grammar.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "VDSPC satisfies the following", "solve" being replaced with "satisfies".

Response **Response Status C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 06 **SC 6.6.7** **P38** **L1** # 104

Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type ER **Comment Status A**

The number "12" in this line should have the 2 in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the trailing "2" a subscript.

Response **Response Status C**

ACCEPT.

Cl B **SC B** **P41** **L** # 73

Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR **Comment Status A**

From the verbal description of this protocol it is pretty hard to see whether it works, and what the role of the Announce message is (nowhere does the description say what you do with an Announce when you receive one; it is left as an exercise to the reader to figure out). It would be very helpful, both for the reader and to ensure correct protocol operation, if there was a state machine description that showed the steps in (a) acquiring a range of addresses, (b) defending them, (c) announcing them, and (d) what you do with received announces. It would also be helpful in terms of the overall efficiency of the protocol if the specification called for the protocol entity to maintain a local map of addresses that it thinks are in use by others, so that doesn't request ranges where it knows there is going to be a conflict (this isn't entirely straightforward of course, as you have to consider garbage collection of stale/outdated data).

SuggestedRemedy

Add state machine definitions as indicated in the comment.

Response **Response Status C**

ACCEPT.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P41** **L11** # 72

Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER **Comment Status A**

Terminology. Line 11 talks about request, announce, and defend, but in the rest of the description and in the protocol definition, it talks about probe, announce, and defend.

SuggestedRemedy

Pick one and stick to it.

Response **Response Status C**

ACCEPT.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P41** **L2** # 37

Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR **Comment Status A**

Overview needs work, as it fails to summarize the whole protocol. The protocol also needs work. In particular, the notion of race conditions and how they will be dealt with is not addressed, and yet this is critical to success in the real world. For instance, what should a node do if it receives a delayed or false defend packet, or if two nodes defer to each other because of a network glitch? Nor are all possible memory block overlap patterns covered.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite Overview to summarize the protocol described in Annex B. A state machine described in a table of actions by events and current state would be useful. Also see other comments on Annex B.

Response **Response Status C**

ACCEPT.

This section has been extensively rewritten with a new overview section and a protocol state machine added.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P41** **L25** # 105

Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type TR **Comment Status A**

The "not" near the end of this line is inappropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "to indicate the address is not in use." to "to indicate the address is in use."

Response **Response Status C**

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI **B** SC **B.1** P41 L25 # 38
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **A**

Wrong word used.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "the address is now in use", the word "not" being replaced with "now".

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **B** SC **B.1** P41 L6 # 84
Parsons, Glenn Ericsson

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Are that many really needed? Or can't you just have some additional ones assigned from 802.1Q? It appears 91-E0-F0 has been assigned.

SuggestedRemedy

Please indicate rationale for requiring an entire OUI block of reserved multicast addresses.

Response Response Status **W**

REJECT.

An entire OUI is not reserved for MAAP. Only 65,546 address are reserved for MAAP. The committee asked for guidance as to how to allocate these addresses from 802.1 and the RAC and the decision was to allocate an OUI to 1722

CI **B** SC **B.2.12** P44 L2 # 40
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **A**

The approach given in B.2.11 and B.2.12 assumes only one of the four possible ways two contiguous blocks can overlap, which will cause trouble. Nor are overlaps between more than two blocks covered.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from start and length to start and stop addresses, and say that if there is more than one overlap region, a separate defend message will be sent for each overlap region. Or some other solution, but provide a solution that covers all possible patterns of overlap between any number of blocks.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The start/stop addresses was discussed previously by the work group and the preferred solution was start address/count.

With the new MAAP state machine (see comments #37 and #73) it becomes clear that a separate MAAP_DEFEND should be sent for each conflicting range.

CI **B** SC **B.2.6** P43 L8 # 39
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **A**

Ignoring a MAAP packet from an unknown version sounds like a dangerous thing to do, as older equipment will of necessity encounter packets following newer standards, because most practical systems will be of mixed heritage. Said another way, not supporting mixed networks will sharply restrict use of IEEE 1722.

SuggestedRemedy

There should be a core part to all MAAP packets that is guaranteed to be the same for all past and future versions of the MAAP protocol. This core part would include the maap_version field and the function type (by table B.1), so that a receiver will always know what has been received, even if it exceeds the receiver's capabilities. In many cases, it should be possible to respond with a packet following an earlier version. If some such provision for backwards compatibility is not made, then all 1722 systems will have to be of a single version, which may be difficult to achieve in practice, crimping acceptance of 1722. If the intent is to require that all 1722 systems must be of the same version, this should be clearly stated, along with the consequence of this policy.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

The following text will replace the ignore text.

"In order to ensure compatibility with current protocol versions, while allowing the protocol to be extended in the future, the following requirements shall be met by the implementation:

- a) ☐ MAAP PDUs that carry a protocol version equal to or higher than the protocol version implemented shall be interpreted according to the definition corresponding to the protocol version implemented.
- b) ☐ Where the MAAP PDU carries a higher protocol version than the version implemented and the Message Type is not recognized, then that PDU is discarded."

CI **B** SC **B.5** P46 L10 # 41
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **A**

A single network disruption or glitch could cause both entities to defer to one another, forever. How will such race conditions be handled? More generally, how will *all* such race conditions be handled?

SuggestedRemedy

The standard approach to answering such questions is to define the actual state machine using a table giving how each and every combination of event and the current state of the entity will be handled, no matter how unimportant or unlikely the combination seems. The vast majority of event-state combinations will occur only rarely, but if the combination isn't addressed the protocol will likely crash or stall when this case happens, which users will perceive as a hang. Timeouts must also be included, so that control is *always* recovered.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI B **SC B.6** **P46** **L27** # **106**
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

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

This table reserves addresses for Audio and Video clocks but does not explain how a device is permitted to be the source of one or both of these clocks. Should the device use the regular MAAP mechanism to PROBE/DEFEND/ANNOUNCE these addresses? Also for the MAAP Protocol addreses you need to specifiy that no device shall ever PROBE this address or alternately that every device must DEFEND it.

SuggestedRemedy

Add text explaining the behavior of MAAP participants for each of these reserved addresses.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 91

Since we do not explain these here they should just be removed.

CI B **SC B.6** **P46** **L27** # **91**
Mora, Matthew Apple

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **A**

This table included a multi-cast address for a default audio and video clock. I thought the idea of this was not fully discussed and postponed for later work on a the next version of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Include these two addresses in the reserved address range and remove them from the table.

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

ACCEPT.

CI B **SC Table B.4** **P46** **L21** # **6**
Olsen, David Harman International In

Comment Type **GR** **Comment Status** **A**

Fill in table B.4 with the proper Multicast addresses

SuggestedRemedy

line 1 - 91:E0:F0:00:00:00 - 91:E0:F0:00:FE:FF
line 2 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:00 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:7F
line 3 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:80 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:FF

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

ACCEPT.

CI B **SC Table B.5** **P46** **L27** # **7**
Olsen, David Harman International In

Comment Type **GR** **Comment Status** **A**

Replace placeholders in table with real values

SuggestedRemedy

row 1 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:00
row 2 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:01 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:0F
row 3 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:10
row 4 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:11
row 5 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:12 - 91:E0:F0:00:FF:FF

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

ACCEPT.

CI B1 **SC B1** **P41** **L6** # **5**
Olsen, David Harman International In

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

Replace placeholders with real MAC address range

SuggestedRemedy

Replace xx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xx and yy-yy-yy-yy-yy-yy with 91-E0-F0-00-00-00 and 91-E0-F0-00-FF-FF

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

ACCEPT.

CI C **SC C** **P58** **L3** # **169**
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

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

Great that encapsulation for Ethernet is specified. Make it clear that 1722 does not disallow other encapsulation types (like 802.11 or MoCA or Homeplug or G.hn, etc.)

SuggestedRemedy

Add sentence to C.1 introduction: "Note that, while details of encapsulation for 802.3 are included here, other encpaulations are not excluded."

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

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI **C** SC **C.1** P47 L11 # 107
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **A**

The purpose of this annex is to simplify the understanding. . .I think not.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "simplify" to "aid in"

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **C** SC **C.2.1** P48 L17 # 108
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

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

There are issues involved with the administration of locally administered unicast addresses that are simply not addressed in this document, to suggest that MAAP can be used to assign these addresses without explaining what else has to be done to do this properly is irresponsible. At the very least, each MAAP participant would have to have a set of management registers to enable and define the address range that the local network administrator has chosen.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the reference to using MAAP to administer locally administered unicast addresses.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **C** SC **C.2.3** P59 L3 # 165
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

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

item b needs clarification

SuggestedRemedy

Add "but does not use the Class B or class B PCP values

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Some AVTP frames require an 802.1Q header as described in the following rules;

In a) strike "AVB data"

strike b) because it adds no information.

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.2** P49 L14 # 109
Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

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

Recent changes to 802.1Qat make this section is out of date and in need of revision as now some level of VLAN awareness is required of all AVB end stations.

SuggestedRemedy

I don't have time to suggest new text before this ballot ends, but I will be happy to work with the editor to generate that new text.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #86,87,88

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.2** P49 L15 # 85
Gunther, Craig Harman International In

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**

Missing word in sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

"It is not _to_ be used for any..."

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.2** P49 L22 # 86
Gunther, Craig Harman International In

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**

As of SRP D6.0, VID=000 is no longer valid. Lines 22-30 should be replaced.

SuggestedRemedy

"If an AVBTP Talker is not VLAN aware it transmits all stream data frames with a VID of SRclassVID (802.1Q, clause 35.2.2.9.4) which it learns via the MSRP Domain attribute. If a Talker is directly connected to a Listener it may use a VID of SR_PVID (802.1Q, clause 35.2.1.4).
If an AVBTP Talker is VLAN aware it transmits stream data frames with the VID VLAN managmenet has assigned to them."

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.2** P49 L32 # 87
 Gunther, Craig Harman International In

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**

As of SRP D6.0, VID=000 is no longer valid. Replace lines 32-36.

SuggestedRemedy

"In order to receive stream data frames all AVBTP Listeners must request membership in the Talker's VLAN. A Listener does not to be VLAN aware to do this, it simply needs to issue an MVRP membership request for the VID contained in the Talker Advertise."

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.2** P49 L40 # 88
 Gunther, Craig Harman International In

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **A**

As of SRP D6.0, VID=000 is no longer valid.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "...VID of 000..." with "...VID of SR_PVID...".

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.2** P60 L14 # 166
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

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

This section needs to be updated based on recent changes to 802.1Qat

SuggestedRemedy

Make the changes

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #86,87,88

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.4** P50 L9 # 110
 Fuller, John John Nels Fuller

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

Recent changes to 802.1Qat change the way that end stations discover the proper PCP for each AVB class. This section is out of date and in need of revision.

SuggestedRemedy

I don't have time to suggest new text before this ballot ends, but I will be happy to work with the editor to generate that new text.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.

CI **C** SC **C.2.3.5** P61 L19 # 167
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

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

It's bad to duplicate SOME information. Include reference to 802.1BA rather than duplicate only SOME Of the requirements of an AVB system

SuggestedRemedy

Delete C.2.3.5, or make a very clear statement that this is not a complete list, refer to 802.1B/

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Rework section to include a reference to BA and state explicitly that these are some, not all, possible issues.

CI **Particip** SC **Participants** P6 L21 # 1
 Henneberg, J+rn

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **A**

Joern Henneberg's name was inadvertently omitted from the participant list. He has regularly attended our face-to-face meetings and has made significant contributions to the development of the P1722 standard. - Robert Boatright, Chair P1722

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Joern Henneberg" to participant list.

Response Response Status **C**

ACCEPT.