DISPOSITION OF BALLOT COMMENTS ON

IEEE *Draft* P802.1Qat/D4.1

DRAFT IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks—Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks—Amendment XX: Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP)

Sponsor

LAN MAN Standards Committee of the IEEE Computer Society

Prepared by: **Craig Gunther, Project Editor**

Craig Gunther, 8760 S. Sandy Parkway, Sandy, Utah 84070-6405, USA
Tel: +1-801-568-7675   Fax: +1-801-352-2480   Email: craig.gunther@harman.com

Commentary:

This Disposition of Ballot Comments has been prepared to document the ballot comments received in the Working Group ballot on P802.1Qat/D3.2, and to record the resolutions of those ballot comments, agreed during the meeting of 802.1 held in Tuscany. Italy, in September 2009. The document contains:

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

This document constitutes a record of the Instructions to the Editor for the preparation of P802.1Qat/D3.3.

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

November 18, 2009

Disposition of Ballot Comments on P802.1Qat/D4.1:
Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks-Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks-Amendment XX: SRP

1. Ballot summary

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

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

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

Table 1—Ballot responses

STATUS	VOTE	FIRST NAME	SURNAME	Comments?
V	E	Zehavit	Alon	N
V		Jan	Bialkowski	
V	Y	Rob	Boatright	N
V		Jean-Michel	Bonnamy	
V		Paul	Bottorff	
V	E	Rudolf	Brandner	N
V		Craig W.	Carlson	
V		Weiying	Cheng	
V		Rao	Cherukuri	
V		Jin-Seek	Choi	
V		Paul	Congdon	
V		Don	Connor	
V		Diego	Crupnicoff	
V	E	Claudio	Desanti	N
V	E	Zhemin	Ding	N
V		Linda	Dunbar	
V		David	Elie-Dit-Cosaque	
V	E	Janos	Farkas	N
V	T	Don	Fedyk	N
V		Norm	Finn	
V	Y	Bob	Frazier	N
V	N	John	Fuller	Y
V	T	Geoffrey	Garner	N

Table 1—Ballot responses

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

Table 1—Ballot responses

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

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

Table 1—Ballot responses

STATUS	VOTE	FIRST NAME	SURNAME	Comments?
V		Martin	White	
V		Bert	Wijnen	
V	E	Michael D.	Wright	N
V	E	Chien-Hsien	Wu	N
V		Ken	Young	
V	T	Glen	Zorn	N

Table 2—Ballot results

Category	Total	Percentage
Yes	13	81.25%
No	3	18.75%
Abstain	38	70.37%
No. of Voters	99	100.00%
Voters responding	54	54.55%

November 18, 2009

Disposition of Ballot Comments on P802.1Qat/D4.1:
Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks-Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks-Amendment XX: SRP

2. Ballot Comments

2.1 Comments sorted by clause/page/line

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.4**   *P* **4**   *L* **14**   # 30

Tony Jeffree   None entered

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

"e.g." should always be followed by a comma

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT. Do a search of entire document.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.5**   *P* **4**   *L* **16**   # 11

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the word "will"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9.2**   *P* **7**   *L* **10**   # 29

Tony Jeffree   None entered

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

It is unlikely (though not impossible) that a single station would perform both types of pruning

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

Make sure to address this in the PICS as well.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9.2**   *P* **7**   *L* **12**   # 28

Tony Jeffree   None entered

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

The "It is recommended…" para and the subsequent NOTE do not belong here - they should be in Clause 35.

SuggestedRemedy

Move them to the appropriate bit of Clause 35. If there are no other changes that would force a recirc, punt this for Sponsor ballot.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The referenced paragraph and NOTE should both be removed. SRP utilizes MSRP to make reservations and MMRP to facilitate Talker Pruning. MMRP (see 5.9.1) already describes Source Pruning - which is what the editor was referencing here.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9.3**   *P* **7**   *L* **3**   # 12

Kevin Stanton   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **R**

Awkward phrase

SuggestedRemedy

Replace ", implemented" with "and"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.2.2**   *P* **9**   *L* **12**   # 14

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"NOTE--…shall use either"

SuggestedRemedy

"shall" is inappropriate here if the tagging behavior is already required elsewhere in the document

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT. Delete the word "shall".

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

Cl **08**
SC **8.2.2**

Page 1 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:05 PM

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.2.2**   *P* **9**   *L* **9**   # 13

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"shall automatically enable outbound Port tagging…"

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change wording to:
"Each egress port within an SRP domain that is not an SRP domain boundary port (i.e. SRPdomainBoundaryPort is FALSE) shall perform tagging on that outbound Port for those VIDs that are associated with an SRP reservation."

Also update NOTE-3 with the following sentence added after the first sentence:
"… for correct operation of the credit-base shaper algorithm defined in clause 34. This tagging will occur even if the Bridge is currently not configured to tag frames from that port."

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.8.2**   *P* **9**   *L* **16**   # 2

Stephen Haddock   None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note 4

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

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

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.7.9**   *P* **10**   *L* **16**   # 15

Kevin Stanton   Intel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **R**

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

SuggestedRemedy

Please clarify

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.8.1.2**   *P* **13**   *L* **14**   # 3

Stephen Haddock   None entered

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **R**

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

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

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

I would propose future MRP applications support AttributeListLength for the possibility of easier product migration with future revisions of that same MRP application.

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

Cl **10**
SC **10.8.1.2**

Page 2 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:08 PM

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.8.2.10.1**   *P* **17**   *L* **10**   # 25

Craig Gunther   Harman International

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

Explain what to do when NumberOfValues=0

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.8.2.10.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **42**   # 26

Craig Gunther   Harman International

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

Explain what to do when NumberOfValues=0

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.8.2.6**   *P* **15**   *L* **44**   # 16

Kevin Stanton   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **12**   *SC* **12.22.4**   *P* **22**   *L* **34**   # 18

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

StreamID is sometimes spelled with a space between Stream and ID

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **12**   *SC* **12.22.4**   *P* **22**   *L* **34**   # 17

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"Rows in the table can be created…"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "can be" with "are"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.2.1**   *P* **22**   *L* **22**   # 32

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

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

There is no need for this note. The TC module is for common TCs … if it is not common, then an individual module can define its own.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note or replace with a general statement

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Delete the note since the SRP TCs are not used by any other MIBs.

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

Cl **17**
SC **17.2.1**

Page 3 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:09 PM

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **29**   *L* **50**   # 35

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

The TC's in this MIB module seem like overkill -- that is they only seemed to be used once.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **31**   *L* **4**   # 36

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**

The subtrees seem like overkill given there is only one object in most of them

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the subtrees

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **35**   *L* **21**   # 34

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

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

ieee8021SrpBridgePortMsrpFailedRegistrations
ieee8021SrpReservationDroppedStreamFrames   "This counter is not maintained across discontinuities." Why? Counters should support discontinuity

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **35**   *L* **21**   # 1

Dan Romascanu   Avaya, Inc.

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35**   *P* **45**   *L*   # 19

Kevin Stanton   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Cl **35**   *SC* **35**   *P* **45**   *L* **20**   # 20

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"Bridges will associate…" is future tense

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the word "will"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

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

Cl **35**
SC **35**

Page 4 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:09 PM

Cl **35**   *SC* **35**   *P***46**   *L***11**   # 21

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "shall" to "must"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Replace "shall" with "must".

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.1**   *P***45**   *L***49**   # 4

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.1.1**   *P***47**   *L***10**   # 22

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"MSRP assumes that" should be prescriptive rather than assumptive

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "MSRP defines and requires the existance of"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.1.2.1**   *P***47**   *L***35**   # 23

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

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

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

Cl **35**
SC **35.1.2.1**

Page 5 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:09 PM

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.1.4**   *P* **51**   *L* **3**   # 31

Pat Thaler   Broadcom

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a normative definition for the behavior of SRPdomainBoundaryPort

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

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

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.1.4**   *P* **51**   *L* **8**   # 5

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

After discussion determine if any change is required.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.2.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **18**   # 6

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.2.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **19**   # 33

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

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

Refering to the name and then putting the MAC address in a NOTE is too cryptic. Especially since the NOTE appears to be a justification. And further does this only apply to C-VLANs? I hope not.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest a table with a single row, but indicating applicability across tables 8-1,2,3 (that is currently in 802.1aj)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. (See #6)
Reword as follows:
'…be the group MAC address for "Individual LAN Scope group address, Nearest Bridge group address" as specified in Table 8-1, 8-2 and 8-3 (C-VLAN, S-VLAN and TPMR component Reserved addresses, respectively).'

I don't want to include a table because my intent is to have MSRP "feel like" MMRP (10.12.1.3) and MVRP (11.2.3.1.3) as much as possible, and they don't use a table format.

Comment #6 addresses the NOTE.

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

Cl **35**
SC **35.2.2.1**

Page 6 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:09 PM

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.2.8.7**   *P***60**   *L***23**   # 7

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

I don't understand when this error code is used or what it means. I find no reference to it.

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete it or describe it or add a reference to the clause where it is described.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Correct spelling error "is" -> "in".

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.4.4.3**   *P***69**   *L***20**   # 27

Craig Gunther   Harman International

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

Extra "d)".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **A**   *SC* **A**   *P***76**   *L***1**   # 24

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

No mention of the optional, but normative CSN clause

SuggestedRemedy

Add statement requiring conformance to the mandatory SHALL statements of Clause Q if the link is CSN.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **H**   *SC* **H**   *P***1**   *L***1**   # 37

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

The MoCA Alliance agreed to submit the document http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/at-kstanton-clq-from-moca-091113.rtf as input to 802.1Qat

SuggestedRemedy

See document

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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

Cl **Q**   *SC* **Q**   *P***1**   *L***1**   # 38

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

The MoCA Alliance agreed to submit the document http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/at-kstanton-clq-from-moca-091113.rtf as input to 802.1Qat

SuggestedRemedy

See document

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **Q**   *SC* **Q.3.1**   *P***89**   *L***1**   # 8

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

The editors note refers to 802.11aa. What is the status of that project, are the parts of it that we will need to interface with stabalized? Do we need to remove clause Q.3 in order to proceed to sponsor ballot and then initiate a PAR to put Q.3 back in?

SuggestedRemedy

Determine the status of P802.11aa and then decide the appropriate path for completing clause Q.3.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Ganesh Venkatesan will draft text to define the new primitives that are not currently defined in 802.11aa. That text will be included in the Qat recirc and then later, be removed during a Sponsor recirc when it has been included in 802.11aa. A new Figure Q-9 will also be provided. The goal is for completion by 11/27.

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

Cl **Q**   Page 7 of 8
SC **Q.3.1**   11/18/2009 6:10:09 PM

Cl **Q**   *SC* **Q.3.3**   *P* **89**   *L* **54**   # 9

John Nels Fuller   None entered

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **R**

    Editors note indicates another reason to remove Q.3 until 802.11 makes more progress.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

Cl **Z**   *SC* **Z**   *P*   *L*   # 10

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

    Annex Z documents a number of issues that are still to be addressed in the draft. At lease
    one of these (Z.2 o) has already been addressed.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

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

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **Z**
SC **Z**

Page 8 of 8
11/18/2009 6:10:09 PM

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

Cl **17**　　　*SC* **17.7.14**　　　*P* **35**　　　*L* **21**　　　# 1
Dan Romascanu　　　　　　　　Avaya, Inc.

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **08**　　　*SC* **8.8.2**　　　*P* **9**　　　*L* **16**　　　# 2
Stephen Haddock　　　　　　　　None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note 4

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

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

Cl **10**　　　*SC* **10.8.1.2**　　　*P* **13**　　　*L* **14**　　　# 3
Stephen Haddock　　　　　　　　None entered

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **R**

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

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

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

I would propose future MRP applications support AttributeListLength for the possibility of easier product migration with future revisions of that same MRP application.

Cl **35**　　　*SC* **35.1**　　　*P* **45**　　　*L* **49**　　　# 4
John Nels Fuller　　　　　　　　None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 1 of 8

Comment ID # **4**　　　11/18/2009 6:11:25 PM

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.1.4**   *P* **51**   *L* **8**   # 5
John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

After discussion determine if any change is required.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.2.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **18**   # 6
John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.2.8.7**   *P* **60**   *L* **23**   # 7
John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

I don't understand when this error code is used or what it means. I find no reference to it.

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete it or describe it or add a reference to the clause where it is described.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Correct spelling error "is" -> "in".

Cl **Q**   *SC* **Q.3.1**   *P* **89**   *L* **1**   # 8
John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

The editors note refers to 802.11aa. What is the status of that project, are the parts of it that we will need to interface with stabalized? Do we need to remove clause Q.3 in order to proceed to sponsor ballot and then initiate a PAR to put Q.3 back in?

SuggestedRemedy

Determine the status of P802.11aa and then decide the appropriate path for completing clause Q.3.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Ganesh Venkatesan will draft text to define the new primitives that are not currently defined in 802.11aa. That text will be included in the Qat recirc and then later, be removed during a Sponsor recirc when it has been included in 802.11aa. A new Figure Q-9 will also be provided. The goal is for completion by 11/27.

Cl **Q**   *SC* **Q.3.3**   *P* **89**   *L* **54**   # 9
John Nels Fuller   None entered

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **R**

Editors note indicates another reason to remove Q.3 until 802.11 makes more progress.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 2 of 8

Comment ID # **9**   11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM

Cl **Z**   *SC* **Z**   *P*   *L*   # 10

John Nels Fuller   None entered

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

Annex Z documents a number of issues that are still to be addressed in the draft. At lease one of these (Z.2 o) has already been addressed.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

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

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.5**   *P* **4**   *L* **16**   # 11

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the word "will"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9.3**   *P* **7**   *L* **3**   # 12

Kevin Stanton   Intel

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

Awkward phrase

SuggestedRemedy

Replace ", implemented" with "and"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.2.2**   *P* **9**   *L* **9**   # 13

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"shall automatically enable outbound Port tagging…"

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change wording to:
"Each egress port within an SRP domain that is not an SRP domain boundary port (i.e. SRPdomainBoundaryPort is FALSE) shall perform tagging on that outbound Port for those VIDs that are associated with an SRP reservation."

Also update NOTE-3 with the following sentence added after the first sentence:
"… for correct operation of the credit-base shaper algorithm defined in clause 34. This tagging will occur even if the Bridge is currently not configured to tag frames from that port."

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.2.2**   *P* **9**   *L* **12**   # 14

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"NOTE--…shall use either"

SuggestedRemedy

"shall" is inappropriate here if the tagging behavior is already required elsewhere in the document

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Delete the word "shall".

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 3 of 8

Comment ID # **14**   11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM

Cl **10**　　*SC* **10.7.9**　　　　　*P* **10**　　*L* **16**　　# 15
Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **R**

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

SuggestedRemedy

Please clarify

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **10**　　*SC* **10.8.2.6**　　　　*P* **15**　　*L* **44**　　# 16
Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **R**

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **12**　　*SC* **12.22.4**　　　　*P* **22**　　*L* **34**　　# 17
Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

"Rows in the table can be created…"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "can be" with "are"

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **12**　　*SC* **12.22.4**　　　　*P* **22**　　*L* **34**　　# 18
Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

StreamID is sometimes spelled with a space between Stream and ID

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**　　*SC* **35**　　　　　　*P* **45**　　*L*　　# 19
Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　　Intel

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **R**

SuggestedRemedy

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Cl **35**　　*SC* **35**　　　　　　*P* **45**　　*L* **20**　　# 20
Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

"Bridges will associate…" is future tense

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the word "will"

Response　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 4 of 8

Comment ID # **20**　　11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM

Cl **35**   *SC* **35**   *P* **46**   *L* **11**   # 21

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "shall" to "must"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Replace "shall" with "must".

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.1.1**   *P* **47**   *L* **10**   # 22

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

"MSRP assumes that" should be prescriptive rather than assumptive

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "MSRP defines and requires the existance of"

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.1.2.1**   *P* **47**   *L* **35**   # 23

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

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

Cl **A**   *SC* **A**   *P* **76**   *L* **1**   # 24

Kevin Stanton   Intel

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

No mention of the optional, but normative CSN clause

SuggestedRemedy

Add statement requiring conformance to the mandatory SHALL statements of Clause Q if the link is CSN.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.8.2.10.1**   *P* **17**   *L* **10**   # 25

Craig Gunther   Harman International

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

Explain what to do when NumberOfValues=0

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10**   *SC* **10.8.2.10.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **42**   # 26

Craig Gunther   Harman International

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

Explain what to do when NumberOfValues=0

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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: Comment ID

Page 5 of 8

Comment ID # **26**   11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.4.4.3**   *P* **69**   *L* **20**   # 27

Craig Gunther   Harman International

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

Extra "d)".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9.2**   *P* **7**   *L* **12**   # 28

Tony Jeffree   None entered

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

The "It is recommended…" para and the subsequent NOTE do not belong here - they should be in Clause 35.

SuggestedRemedy

Move them to the appropriate bit of Clause 35. If there are no other changes that would force a recirc, punt this for Sponsor ballot.

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The referenced paragraph and NOTE should both be removed. SRP utilizes MSRP to make reservations and MMRP to facilitate Talker Pruning. MMRP (see 5.9.1) already describes Source Pruning - which is what the editor was referencing here.

Cl **05**   *SC* **5.9.2**   *P* **7**   *L* **10**   # 29

Tony Jeffree   None entered

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

It is unlikely (though not impossible) that a single station would perform both types of pruning

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Make sure to address this in the PICS as well.

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.4**   *P* **4**   *L* **14**   # 30

Tony Jeffree   None entered

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

"e.g." should always be followed by a comma

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Do a search of entire document.

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.1.4**   *P* **51**   *L* **3**   # 31

Pat Thaler   Broadcom

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

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

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a normative definition for the behavior of SRPdomainBoundaryPort

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

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

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 6 of 8

Comment ID # **31**   11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.2.1**   *P* **22**   *L* **22**   # 32

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

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

There is no need for this note. The TC module is for common TCs … if it is not common, then an individual module can define its own.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete note or replace with a general statement

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Delete the note since the SRP TCs are not used by any other MIBs.

Cl **35**   *SC* **35.2.2.1**   *P* **51**   *L* **19**   # 33

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

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

Refering to the name and then putting the MAC address in a NOTE is too cryptic. Especially since the NOTE appears to be a justification. And further does this only apply to C-VLANs? I hope not.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest a table with a single row, but indicating applicability across tables 8-1,2,3 (that is currently in 802.1aj)

Response   *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. (See #6)
Reword as follows:
'…be the group MAC address for "Individual LAN Scope group address, Nearest Bridge group address" as specified in Table 8-1, 8-2 and 8-3 (C-VLAN, S-VLAN and TPMR component Reserved addresses, respectively).'

I don't want to include a table because my intent is to have MSRP "feel like" MMRP (10.12.1.3) and MVRP (11.2.3.1.3) as much as possible, and they don't use a table format.

Comment #6 addresses the NOTE.

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **35**   *L* **21**   # 34

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

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

ieee8021SrpBridgePortMsrpFailedRegistrations
ieee8021SrpReservationDroppedStreamFrames   "This counter is not maintained across discontinuities." Why? Counters should support discontinuity

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **29**   *L* **50**   # 35

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **R**

The TC's in this MIB module seem like overkill -- that is they only seemed to be used once.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

Cl **17**   *SC* **17.7.14**   *P* **31**   *L* **4**   # 36

Glenn Parsons   Nortel

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status* **R**

The subtrees seem like overkill given there is only one object in most of them

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the subtrees

Response   *Response Status* **C**

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 7 of 8

Comment ID # **36**   11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM

Cl **H**　　　*SC* **H**　　　　　　*P* **1**　　*L* **1**　　　# 37

Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

The MoCA Alliance agreed to submit the document
http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/at-kstanton-clq-from-moca-091113.rtf as
input to 802.1Qat

SuggestedRemedy

See document

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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

Cl **Q**　　　*SC* **Q**　　　　　　*P* **1**　　*L* **1**　　　# 38

Kevin Stanton　　　　　　　　　Intel

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

The MoCA Alliance agreed to submit the document
http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2009/at-kstanton-clq-from-moca-091113.rtf as
input to 802.1Qat

SuggestedRemedy

See document

Response　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

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: Comment ID

Page 8 of 8

Comment ID # **38**　　11/18/2009 6:11:26 PM