P802.1Qdq/D1.0 WG Ballot Editor's Report

Hiroki Nakano
Red Orange Co. Ltd., CAHI Corporation

Ballot Result

CATEGORY	TOTAL	%
Yes	16	84%
No	3	16%
Voting Yes or No	19	29%
Abstain Expertise	14	21%
Abstain Time	1	2%
Abstain Other	0	0%
Respondents	34	52%
Voters	66	
Liaisons responding	0	
No. of commenters	5	
No. of comments	49	

Voter response rate: 52% (>50%)

Approval rate: 84% (>75%)

Note that one ”E” vote from a non-voter is excluded from this table.

Responses

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	COMMENTS
V	E	Silvana Rodrigues	N
V	Y	Satoko Itaya	N
V	Y	Atsushi Sato	N
V	E	Karen Randall	N
V	Y	Maximilian Riegel	N
V	E	Abhijit K. Choudhury	N
V	E	Geoffrey M. Garner	N
V	Y	Gavin Lai	Y
V	Y	Marcel KIESSLING	N
	~~Y~~	~~Ludwig WINKEL~~	~~N~~
V	Y	Anna Engelmann	Y
V	Y	Bao Huajie	N
V	Y	Takumi Nomura	N
V	Y	Dieter Proell	N
V	Y	Ramesh Sivakolundu	N
V	Y	Katsuyuki Akizuki	N
V	Y	Yoshihiro Ito	N
V	Y	Balazs Varga	N

STATUS	VOTE	NAME	COMMENTS
V	E	Leon Wessels	N
V	E	Ralf Assmann	N
V	Y	Nader Zein	N
V	E	Karim Traore	N
V	Y	Martin Mittelberger	N
V	E	Olaf Mater	N
V	N	Günter Steindl	Y
V	E	Takahiro Yamaura	N
V	E	Ludwig Winkel	N
	E	Woojung Huh	N
V	E	Paul Bottorff	N
V	N	Jessy Rouyer	Y
V	E	Don Fedyk	N
V	E	Michael Karl	N
V	T	Christophe Mangin	N
V	N	Mick Seaman	Y
V	E	Rudy Belliardi	N
V	Y	Marius Stanica	N

Comments Overview

	Non-R	R
E	15	17
T	0	17
G	0	0

- TR : ~~4, 7, 10, 14, 16, 20, 24, 29, 31, 32, 40,~~ 41, ~~43, 44, 46, 47, 48~~
- ER : ~~2, 5, 11, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 45~~
- E : ~~1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 49~~

Underlined items are prepared for discussion by the editor.
~~Greyed-out items~~ are responded by the previous sessions/teleconferences.

Comment #41 from Mick

- Comment

  The discussion in this clause (X.3) and the following clause (X.4) assumes that traffic shaping is an adequate method for supporting such traffic. However there could be a number of such bursty sources. To accommodate their burstiness while bounding latency, a shaper would have to allow a significant burst of frames to be in the network at any given time. Multiplying such a burst by a number of sources would similarly multiply the latency experienced. However if the traffic can be gated (the current description is not adequate to determine whether this would meet application requirements or constraints) at the application level, coordination of network loading by the burst sources can be used to support low latency for each burst. Determining feasibility of such an approach needs more information on application requirements, including whether the communication pattern is really one way.

- Suggested Remedy

  Consider the user of application level time gating to lower latency. If the burst are triggered by management requests from a single, or a few, management station(s) their behavior may suffice to provide the necessary coordination.

Response proposed by the editor

- Firstly, deterministically bounded latency is distinguished from low latency. Challenges of low latency is not the focus of this amendment.
- Secondly, this amendment is focused on 802 networks as autonomous distributed systems. In such environments, 802 networks are responsible for merging streams, that is, transmission selection, bridge's processing time, time for media access etc. For traffic with bounded latency, it is important for an application to know how the traffic transits 802 network and then the application can decide traffic pattern. Not only the application, that is Talker in 802.1Q network, emits traffic according to the planned traffic pattern, but also the intermediate bridges assure the same traffic pattern. This annex provides the guideline to build the settings of 802 network and its bridges.
- If an application implementer could control all the timings of traffic completely, there would be no need of 802.1Q's complex mechanism such as transmission selection. This case is out of scape in this annex.