



Section 2 Comment Resolution Summary

Jim Mollenauer
Steve Wood



Summary

- Total of 309 comments
 - 90 Editorial
 - 219 Technicals
- 105 comments dealt with (resolved or forwarded to WG) (technical only)
 - 38 on the MAC Reference Model
 - 22 on ingress control
 - 12 on egress control
 - 8 on transit control
 - 25 on primitives
- Editorial license granted by group to handle editorial-only comments
- 114 comments outstanding (not looked at by comment resolution group) including all of clause 8 and annexes



Issues Covered – Part 1

- Clarification of terms (channel, service, class, type, etc., as well as CIR/BIR/EIR etc.) and consistency of usage
 - 570, 569, 429, 103, 571, 567, 9, 104, 426, 552, 298, 428, 109, 247
 - Reword to clarify proper and consistent usage of these terms
 - Update document w.r.t. medium priority class verbiage
 - Meaning of BETC and low-priority traffic class
 - EIR and BIR in the case of high-priority traffic (to be removed)
- Policing of reserved class not specified
 - 568, 427, 296, 116
 - Mapping diagram to be provided to clarify this issue
- Client layer issues – LLC as only client layer in diagram, text
 - 415
 - Modify diagram to allow for other client layers
- Specify when reserved bandwidth is available to other classes
 - 111, 419
 - Clarify and add forward references
 - Clarify the fairness-related accounting of medium priority traffic



Issues Covered – Part 2

- Assignment of packets to reserved service group
 - 449
 - Not necessary to recognize these packets on a packet-by-packet basis
- Clarification of bandwidth reservation and provisioning of per-class BW
 - 91, 106
 - Editors to clarify; OAM group requested to provide text for facilities to reserve BW
- Discussion of single and dual transit “buffers” implies buffering in MAC
 - 107
 - Discussion of single and dual transit “buffers” now changed to high-priority and low-priority transit “paths”, without constraining implementations
- Clarify marking of in-profile and out-of-profile medium priority traffic
 - 553
 - Editors to clarify in text
- Description of handling of control frames for the RPR MAC
 - 295
 - Clarify control as peer-to-peer
- Complaint that transit delay bounds too small
 - 10
 - Rejected, transit delay bounds are acceptable



Issues Covered – Part 3

- Contention that transit path is lossy (rejected)
 - 420
 - Established that transit scheduling for low priority is lossless
- Policing of control traffic desired
 - 300
 - Policing of control traffic rejected
- Text implies that buffering is done in MAC
 - 107, 120
 - Discussion of single and dual transit “buffers” now changed to high-priority and low-priority transit “paths”, without constraining implementations; should clarify buffering outside MAC
- Relevance of PHY and RS layer descriptions in Clause 5 questioned
 - 2
 - Rejected, as the descriptions/references are informative
- Needs reference model diagram showing interactions between MAC blocks
 - 113
 - Editors to modify current diagram to show paths between blocks
- Clause 11 inadvertently omitted in spite of motion passed in January
 - 400
 - To be included



Issues Covered – Part 4

- Figure 6-1 on page 46 need clarification
 - 422, 312, 313
 - Clarify boundary between MAC and client, show control add queue
 - Diagram to be corrected to represent right number of service classes and queues
- Figure 5-1 on page 42 needs clarification
 - 178, 179, 209, 115, 117
 - Replace data/type with “type”; add material from missing Clause 11
 - Editors to add text to clarify use of STOP_HI, etc.
- MAC ringlet selection independent of “trusted client”
 - 250
 - Client ringlet selection may be corrected by MAC if necessary
- Transmit and receive flowcharts on 48, 49 (Figure 6-1)
 - 28, 122, 146, 253, 316, 602, 603, 394, 395, 550, 89, 592, 123, 317, 31, 32, 396, 398, 423, 399, 318
 - Flowcharts will be reworked extensively to address numerous concerns in various comments
 - Text associated with flowcharts to be reworked to match behavior described in figure
- Promiscuous behavior
 - 551
 - Editors directed to describe promiscuous behavior



Issues Covered – Part 5

- 255 stations vs. 256 stations on ring possible
 - 319
 - 255 stations
- Reference to M_DATA primitives is not relevant to this standard
 - 572
 - Reference to be removed
- MA_DATA.req/ind parameters list issues
 - 236, 244, 245, 11, 108, 246, 12, 236, 238, 239, 240, 301, 246, 248, 303, 304
 - header param to be split, TTL optional, SA removed from REQ, SA added to IND
 - optional size parameter to be added
 - Ringlet ID parameter from client to be ignored in steering situations and such situations to be clarified
 - Rejected additional parameter for destination priority
 - Remove references to unicast and multicast in the descriptive text
 - Editor's note to be added to clarify reception_status
- MA_CONTROL.req/ind
 - 114, 15, 391,
 - Remove DA from REQ, remove header parameter from REQ.



Issues Covered – Part 6

- Delivery of broadcast packets within the originating station
 - 14
 - Frames where the DA does not equal “self” will not be passed to the client
 - Frames where the DA is equal to “self” will have to traverse the entire ring
- Requirement and use of “opcode” parameter in Control.req
 - 554
 - Opcode parameter will be specified as informative
 - table headings will be updated (editorial)



Pending Resolution

- Test for TB_LOW nearly full not adequate
 - 591
- Type 1 vs. Type 2 fairness messages, vs. figure errors
 - 397
 - Group to consider two different approaches proposed
- Traffic separation into reserved and non-reserved classes
 - 308, 251, 309
 - Tabled for group to consider



Action Items – Part 1

- Contribution requested explaining concept of only 2 classes of traffic, reserved and non-reserved
 - 296, 299
 - Assigned to John Lemon and David James
- Contribution requested covering the high-level specification of reserved service traffic
 - 116
 - Assigned to John Lemon and David James (as part of contrib for comment #296)
- Layer diagram contribution showing relationships between sublayers requested
 - 579
 - Assigned to Nader Vije
- Figure 6-1 page 45 needs to be reworked; contribution needed from group
 - 118, 549, 581, 422 , 575
 - Assigned to WG
- Description of methods for fair distribution of BW when low priority TB occupancy below threshold
 - 550
 - Assigned to WG
- Contribution to clarify usage of normal data packets vs. steering packets not clear when ring supports only steering protection
 - 30
 - Assigned to Leon Bruckman



Action Items – Part 2

- Contribution to specify precisely how text should be modified to remove distinction between single and dual transit buffers in all places where it is not relevant
 - 119
 - Assigned to Anoop Ghanwani
- Contribution to verify whether or not 802.17 resolution to comment 14 is consistent with other 802 MACs and FDDI
 - 14
 - Assigned to Peter Jones