

-----+  
| IEEE 802.1 REVISION REQUEST 0011 |  
-----+

DATE: September 14, 2011  
NAME: Christian Boiger  
COMPANY/AFFILIATION: Hochschule Deggendorf - University, Hirschmann  
Automation & Control  
E-MAIL: christian.boiger@fh-deggendorf.de

REQUESTED REVISION:  
STANDARD: 802.1Q-2011  
CLAUSE NUMBER: 1.5  
CLAUSE TITLE: Supporting the credit-based shaper algorithm

RATIONALE FOR REVISION:

Table 8-4 does not show "a set of recommended priority to traffic class mappings where the credit-based shaper algorithm (8.6.8.1) is supported by one or two of the available traffic classes". As correctly stated in 8.6.6 "Table 8-4 shows the recommended mapping for the number of classes implemented, in implementations that do not support the credit-based shaper transmission selection algorithm (8.6.8.2)".  
The mappings which support the credit-based shaper are shown in 34.5.

"the recommended mappings shown are intended for use where priority 5 is used to support SR class A and priority 4 is used to support SR class B"  
The recommended priorities are 3 (SR class A) and 2 (SR class B).

The reference to table G-3 is wrong. (Such a table does not exist.)

In the tables I-4 and I-5 the acronyms VO ("voice") and VI ("video") are used for the traffic types of the two SR classes. In table I-2 the traffic type "voice" is associated with priority 5 and "video" is associated with priority 4. This does not correspond with the recommended priorities for the SR classes.

Table I-4 "Credit-based shaper support of one SR class" shows the traffic types in the case that only SR class A is supported. "SR class B only" seems to be the more common case. (According to IEEE 802.1BA "All Bridges shall support SR class B".) Table I-4 should show the "SR class B only" case instead (in order to be consistent with table 34-2).

PROPOSED REVISION TEXT:

Change

"Table 8-4 defines a set of recommended priority to traffic class mappings where the credit-based shaper algorithm (8.6.8.1) is supported by one or two of the available traffic classes; the recommended mappings shown are intended for use where priority 5 is used to support SR class A and priority 4 is used to support SR class B."  
to

"The tables 34-1 and 34-2 define a set of recommended priority to traffic class mappings where the credit-based shaper algorithm (8.6.8.1) is supported by one or two of the available traffic classes; the

maint-0011.txt

recommended mappings shown are intended for use where priority 3 is used to support SR class A and priority 2 is used to support SR class B."

Change "table G-3" to "table I-3"

Change the traffic type - priority mapping concept so that it fits to AVB.

Change table I-4 to "SR class B only".

IMPACT ON EXISTING NETWORKS:

None, assuming every implementation is based on the normative text.

A bridge or an end station using the wrong priority would not be able to send a stream over a network or to an end station which uses the correct one.

Using the shaper with the wrong priority - traffic class mapping would lead to a higher and completely unpredictable latency for AVB streams.

-----  
+-----+  
Please attach supporting material, if any  
Submit to: - Tony Jeffree, Chair IEEE 802.1  
and copy: - Paul Congdon, Vice-Chair IEEE 802.1  
E-Mail: stds-802-1-maint-req@ieee.org

+----- For official 802.1 use -----+  
REV REQ NUMBER:  
DATE RECEIVED: 11/6/2011  
EDITORIAL  
ACCEPTED/DENIED  
BALLOT REQ'D YES/NO  
Status: R  
+-----+