

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type G Comment Status X  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type G Comment Status D  
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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT. Same as comments #2,92,154,112,155

Cl 00 SC 0 P6 L15 # 4  
Busch, Alexander

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
"Alexender" is spelled incorrectly

SuggestedRemedy  
"Alexender" should be spelled "Alexander"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1 P L # 2  
Messina, Don

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
Scope and Purpose have been revised and submitted to NESCOM.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT. same as comment 153,92,154,112,155

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT. There is nothing within 61883 that we can turn over to the RAC because these numbers are controlled by IEC. The only item that could be allocated is the subtype. Is this really some thing that we can/want to turn over to the RAC?

A new subtype is not really enough to support a new media type. There is a large amount of definition that would have to surround the definition of a new subtype.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
I find no connection management in this document.

SuggestedRemedy  
Delete ", connection management"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

New scope eliminates connection management.

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

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

Comment Type G Comment Status D  
Modified PAR has been submitted.

SuggestedRemedy  
Modify Scope to match modified PAR submission

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
Same as comment 153,2,92,145,112

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 D

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

## SuggestedRemedy

Make Purpose match modified PAR submission

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

New scope eliminates connection management.

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

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 02 SC 2 P L # 3  
Messina, Don

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type G Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 02

SC 2

Page 2 of 27

5/10/2010 2:37:24

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
IEEE 802.1AS is now in sponsor ballot with draft 7.0.

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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
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"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
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"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **D**  
IEC 61883-7 reference appears to have been mangled, or is incomplete.

SuggestedRemedy  
Verify reference; fix as needed.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

Reference is 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 **D**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Propose remove normative reference to P802.1BA, would it be better to remove all references to P802.1BA or move it to the bibliography?

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 44.

Proposed remove any normative reference to P802.1BA

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Provide missing information.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 data exists

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Any reason why not 802.3-2008?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 802.3-2008

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type G Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Octet is not actually used in the document propose removal of octet definition. How do we define byte without using the term octet, or do we remove byte definition?

It looks like we can remove Rsv and Res from the document and use reserved everywhere.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

AVB Bridge is too non-specific.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

We need to remove normative reference to P801.2BA, reference 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 D

Use of "Ethernet" is unnecessarily limiting

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Work with Kevin on wording????

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "higher priority"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 03

SC 3.2

Page 4 of 27

5/10/2010 2:37:24

# 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 **D**  
 Awkward wording: Latency doesn't "run" on a media  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the note  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L27 # 118  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
 Not true that Class B is less latency than best effort  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "ensures bounded worst-case latency"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P16 L29 # 119  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
 "From the manufacturer" isn't a formal requirement  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the definition to avoid confusion unless similar standards define "default"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Remove definition

CI 03 SC 3.2 P17 L15 # 120  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **X**  
 Odd definition of "packet"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete this definition  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI 03 SC 3.2 P17 L21 # 121  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
 Timeout definition is unnecessary  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove it  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P17 L4 # 117  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
 Need definition for PTP  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add definition of PTP  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED 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

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

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L1 # 79  
 Parsons, Glenn Ericsson  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 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 P802.1Qav"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L16 # 46  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Check with group, but I like this idea

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

CI 03 SC 3.2 P5 L19 # 48  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Shouldn't tie this to a specific draft of BA.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Lose the "draft 0.0".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

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

# 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 D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type G Comment Status D

Lacks clarity. Too informal.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Move IEEE 1394 to clause 2 References

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Do it.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L15 # 57  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X  
 "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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L17 # 81  
 Parsons, Glenn Ericsson  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 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 P802.1Qat"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L17 # 58  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 Don't need a definition for this as long as SRP is in Clause 4 with the right references.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L21 # 59  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 I don't think the "at least from the requester's perspective" adds anything useful to this definition.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L6 # 53  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 You don't need this as a definition - it is already in the references. Ditto IEEE 1394.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove them.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L8 # 54  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 Use the same definition for Listener (and Talker) as appears in the 802 standards.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Do it.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 I agree with this but have not had a chance to look at the 802 definitions yet.

CI 03 SC 3.2 P6 L9 # 55  
 Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 MMA doesn't need a definition if it is included in the acronyms in Clause 4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.



# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
The last sentence isn't describing an implementation option ("may").

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D**  
Lacks clarity. Too informal.

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **D**  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
"0116" the trailing "16" should be in subscript.

## SuggestedRemedy

Make the trailing "16" a subscript.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
"000000012" the trailing "2" should be in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy  
Make the trailing "2" a subscript.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type G Comment Status X  
Too informal; also unclear.

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

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status X  
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..."

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

I agree with this comment, but have not yet reviewed the text from 802.1Q

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
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".

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"(81-0016" the trailing "16" should be in subscript.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the trailing "16" a subscript.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

1394TA appears in abbreviations, but is not used in the document

SuggestedRemedy

Remove it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We need to decide where we want to define these.

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

CI 05 SC 5.1.2 P11 L10 # 68  
Jeffrey, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 Ethertype defined, and from the comment on P12 lines 11&12.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Possibly resolve with comment 68 in a new discussion of AVTP underlying network issues

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comments 68 and 124. Resolve with rewrite of sectio that does not use this term.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comments 18,68 and 124. Resolve with rewrite of sectio that does not use this term.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
Why has the Ethertype not been assigned yet?

SuggestedRemedy  
Communicate with RAC and indicate Ethertype here

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add new ethertype of 22F0 that has now been assigned

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Table 5.1 contains a placeholder rather than the real ethernet

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace AVBTP Ethernet in table 5.1 with real ethernet value and remove the editors note on line 26-28.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment 83

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

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 This standard should not dictate how the frame structure of the next lower layer organizes its fields

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove language about "after the Ethernet field".

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 05**    **SC 5.2.1**    **P12**    **L19**    # 69  
 Jeffree, Anthony    Broadcom/HP/Adva

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 "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)."

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

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

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 State that listeners shall not set this field to zero.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 69

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

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

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove the sentence containing the statement.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**  
 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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

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

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
Clarity

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

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

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

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

## SuggestedRemedy

Say that the Version field shall be set to 0

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
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

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
Which field is "this field", sv or stream\_id?

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
Too many "shalls". Some are unnecessary

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We need to define somewhere in the document what the shading means or remove it. I propose a note under the first diagram that using shading and mention that is applies to all further diagrams

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type G Comment Status D

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

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

Maximum MTU already defined. No need to limit to "ethernet" here.

## SuggestedRemedy

Remove the word "Ethernet"

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"field is to carry"

## SuggestedRemedy

Change to "field shall carry"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"0 to n bytes" What is "n"?

## SuggestedRemedy

Remove "0 to n bytes of"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"may" -> "can"

## SuggestedRemedy

Make the change as indicated.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.5 P17 L33 # 71  
Jeffree, Anthony Broadcom/HP/Adva

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.5 P17 L33 # 25  
Gwinn, Joseph Raytheon

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

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".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.5 P28 L30 # 133  
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"it is to be" is not normative

## SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "shall"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 05 SC 5.4.5 P28 L33 # 134  
Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status X

"shall be properly inserted" isn't helpful

## SuggestedRemedy

Define what "properly" is, or remove the word

Proposed Response Response Status O



# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.4.8**      **P29**      **L12**      # 135

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.4.8**      **P29**      **L25**      # 136

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.4.9**      **P18**      **L29**      # 101

Fuller, John      John Nels Fuller

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.4.9**      **P29**      **L32**      # 137

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.1**      **P20**      **L8**      # 27

Gwinn, Joseph      Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **G**      **Comment Status**    **X**

Clarity.

**SuggestedRemedy**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.1**      **P20**      **L9**      # 28

Gwinn, Joseph      Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **G**      **Comment Status**    **X**

Clarity

**SuggestedRemedy**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.1**      **P31**      **L6**      # 141

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.2**      **P20**      **L17**      # 29

Gwinn, Joseph      Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **GR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.2**      **P31**      **L17**      # 142

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.2**      **P31**      **L31**      # 143

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.3**      **P32**      **L7**      # 144

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

"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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.4**      **P22**      **L4**      # 30

Gwinn, Joseph      Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **G**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete superfluous periods.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

**Cl 05**      **SC 5.5.4**      **P32**      **L21**      # 145

Stanton, Kevin B      Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**      **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**SuggestedRemedy**

Make change suggested in comment

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status**    **O**

# 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 X  
 Use of "must" is inappropriate.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 If normative requirement, replace with "shall"  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P32 L22 # 147  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 "buffer size must be". 1722 must not mandate an exact size  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "shall be at least"  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P32 L22 # 148  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 This figure should NOT be illustrative, not normative  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove all normative statements in this figure (shall, must, may, should)  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L1 # 149  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L25 # 152  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 "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  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L38 # 156  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 "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  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 05 SC 5.5.4 P33 L4 # 150  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 "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"  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
"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

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
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)

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
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:"

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
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

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
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.

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type ER Comment Status X  
Typo

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status O

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 \_\_\_."

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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"

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

"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"

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status X

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".

Proposed Response Response Status O

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

Comment Type GR Comment Status X

We need to exclude jumbo frames.

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status O

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

**CI 06**    **SC 6.6.1**    **P32**    **L26**    # **33**

Gwinn, Joseph    Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **GR**    **Comment Status**    **X**

Ambiguous reference.

**SuggestedRemedy**

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

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

**CI 06**    **SC 6.6.1**    **P43**    **L3**    # **162**

Stanton, Kevin B    Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **X**

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"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

**CI 06**    **SC 6.6.1**    **P43**    **L32**    # **163**

Stanton, Kevin B    Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **X**

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

**CI 06**    **SC 6.6.2**    **P45**    **L9**    # **164**

Stanton, Kevin B    Intel Corporation

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **X**

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

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

**CI 06**    **SC 6.6.3**    **P34**    **L7**    # **34**

Gwinn, Joseph    Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **G**    **Comment Status**    **X**

Unclear.

**SuggestedRemedy**

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

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

**CI 06**    **SC 6.6.7**    **P36**    **L16**    # **35**

Gwinn, Joseph    Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **G**    **Comment Status**    **X**

Terminal full colon is missing.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Provide missing colon.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

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

Gwinn, Joseph    Raytheon

**Comment Type**    **G**    **Comment Status**    **X**

Clarity and grammar.

**SuggestedRemedy**

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

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **O**

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

**Cl 06**      **SC 6.6.7**      **P38**      **L1**      # **104**  
Fuller, John      John Nels Fuller

**Comment Type ER**      **Comment Status X**

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

**SuggestedRemedy**

Make the trailing "2" a subscript.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status O**

**Cl B**      **SC B**      **P41**      **L**      # **73**  
Jeffree, Anthony      Broadcom/HP/Adva

**Comment Type TR**      **Comment Status X**

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.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status O**

**Cl B**      **SC B.1**      **P41**      **L11**      # **72**  
Jeffree, Anthony      Broadcom/HP/Adva

**Comment Type ER**      **Comment Status X**

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.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status O**

**Cl B**      **SC B.1**      **P41**      **L2**      # **37**  
Gwinn, Joseph      Raytheon

**Comment Type GR**      **Comment Status X**

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.

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status O**

**Cl B**      **SC B.1**      **P41**      **L25**      # **105**  
Fuller, John      John Nels Fuller

**Comment Type TR**      **Comment Status X**

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."

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status O**

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

**Comment Type G**      **Comment Status X**

Wrong word used.

**SuggestedRemedy**

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

**Proposed Response**      **Response Status O**

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

<i>Cl</i> <b>B</b>	<i>SC</i> <b>B.1</b>	<i>P</i> <b>41</b>	<i>L</i> <b>6</b>	<i>#</i> <b>84</b>
Parsons, Glenn		Ericsson		
<i>Comment Type</i>	<b>TR</b>	<i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b>		
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.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Please indicate rationale for requiring an entire OUI block of reserved multicast addresses.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>		

<i>Cl</i> <b>B</b>	<i>SC</i> <b>B.2.12</b>	<i>P</i> <b>44</b>	<i>L</i> <b>2</b>	<i>#</i> <b>40</b>
Gwinn, Joseph		Raytheon		
<i>Comment Type</i>	<b>GR</b>	<i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b>		
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.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
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.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>		

<i>Cl</i> <b>B</b>	<i>SC</i> <b>B.2.6</b>	<i>P</i> <b>43</b>	<i>L</i> <b>8</b>	<i>#</i> <b>39</b>
Gwinn, Joseph		Raytheon		
<i>Comment Type</i>	<b>GR</b>	<i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b>		
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.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
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.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>		

<i>Cl</i> <b>B</b>	<i>SC</i> <b>B.5</b>	<i>P</i> <b>46</b>	<i>L</i> <b>10</b>	<i>#</i> <b>41</b>
Gwinn, Joseph		Raytheon		
<i>Comment Type</i>	<b>GR</b>	<i>Comment Status</i> <b>X</b>		
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?				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
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.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> <b>O</b>		



# 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 **X**

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 addesses 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.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**

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.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **X**

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

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **GR** Comment Status **X**

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

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

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

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

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."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI **C**

SC **C**

Page 25 of 27

5/10/2010 2:37:25

# 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 **X**

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

SuggestedRemedy

Change "simplify" to "aid in"

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

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.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

item b needs clarification

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **X**

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.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**

Missing word in sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

"It is not \_to\_ be used for any..."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

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

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**

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 managment has assigned to them."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

# IEEE P1722 Layer 2 Transport for AVB comments

Cl C SC C.2.3.2 P49 L32 # 87  
 Gunther, Craig Harman International In  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 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."  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl C SC C.2.3.2 P49 L40 # 88  
 Gunther, Craig Harman International In  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 As of SRP D6.0, VID=000 is no longer valid.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "...VID of 000..." with "...VID of SR\_PVID...".  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl C SC C.2.3.2 P60 L14 # 166  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 This section needs to be updated based on recent changes to 802.1Qat  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make the changes  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl C SC C.2.3.4 P50 L9 # 110  
 Fuller, John John Nels Fuller  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl C SC C.2.3.5 P61 L19 # 167  
 Stanton, Kevin B Intel Corporation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X  
 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/  
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Particip SC Participants P6 L21 # 1  
 Henneberg, Joern  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status O