

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**

Ballot Number: **3**

Comment Da

Comment # **9**

Comment submitted by: **David**

**James**

**Member**

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>114</b>	Starting Line # <b>25</b>	Fig/Table#	Clause <b>7.3.1</b>
---------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------	---------------------

Incomplete specification:

How the actual split of classA into subclassA1 and subclassA0 is done is an implementation decision. If the decision does not follow Equation 7.11, it is possible that the bandwidth, delay, and jitter of classA is not guaranteed.

**Suggested Remedy**

==>

How the actual split of classA into subclassA1 and subclassA0 is done is an implementation decision. If the **value of responseTime is estimated incorrectly** or the decision does not follow Equation 7.11, it is possible that the bandwidth, delay, and jitter of classA is not guaranteed.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the information provided is both correct and sufficient.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non change-bar text). Additionally, the information provided is both correct and sufficient.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**Ballot Number: **3**

Comment Da

Comment # **10**

Comment submitted by: David

James

Member

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	114	Starting Line #	25	Fig/Table#	Clause	7.3.1
---------	------	--------------------	-----------------	-----	-----------------	----	------------	--------	-------

Inaccurate specification:

Relevant text:

"ClassB service provides an allocated, guaranteed data rate, and bounded end-to-end delay and jitter for the traffic within the allocated rate, bounded on the order of a ring round trip time (RRTT)."

This text relies on a correct estimate of the *responseTime* value, which no one on the committee (much less an inexperienced reader of this standard) is capable of performing, particularly when the conservative fairless is used.

If the *responseTime* value is estimated too low, then the *hiLimitB* threshold of the shaper will be exceeded, which implies the classB bandwidth guarantee will be broken. If the *responseTime* is estimated too high (or perhaps even correctly), the resposne time will be much larger than the RRTT.

As such, there is really no viable way of ensuring that the classB bandwidth is guaranteed, so this claim should not be made.

#### Suggested Remedy

==>

"The coding space for ClassB service is provided for future revisions of this standard, which are intended to be developed through the maintenance cycle. When properly revised, the classB service is intended to provide an allocated, guaranteed data rate, and bounded end-to-end delay and jitter for the traffic within the allocated rate, bounded on the order of a ring round trip time (RRTT). "

#### Proposed Resolution

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the guarantee claim is believed to be correct.

#### Reason for Recommendation

#### Resolution of Group

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

The clause and line numbers are incorrect and should be 7.3.2 and 40. In any event, this text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar text) Additionally. the guarantee claim is believed to be correct.

**2004/04/21**

**1**

Additionally, the guarantee claim is believed to be correct.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

**Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**Ballot Number: **3**

Comment Da

Comment # **25**Comment submitted by: **David****James****Member**

Comment	Type <b>Technical, Binding</b>	Starting Page # <b>237</b>	Starting Line # <b>7</b>	Fig/Table#	Clause <b>9.2.2.7</b>
---------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	------------	-----------------------

Unclear implications:

"9.2.2.7 hec: A 16-bit (header error check) field that is a checksum of the header (see E.1). The hec is computed over the ttl, baseControl, da, sa, ttlBase, and extendedControl fields."

**Suggested Remedy**

Add the following note:==&gt;

NOTE--Because the hec field is half of the fcs field width, the undetected error rate associated with long burst errors is approximately 4,000 greater for the header than for an RPR payload and/or an Ethernet frame. If the RPR payload is further protected (for example, with an IP checksum), then this number increases to approximately 100,000. Implementers should consider the potential effects of this reduced error coverage when computing distances between repeaters or the possibility of enabling other physical-layer dependent error coverage (such as 8/10 coding checks or optional forward error correction).

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the implications are believed to be clear.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, the implications are believed to be clear.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** |) none needed

**2004/04/21**

**1**

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**

Ballot Number: **3**

Comment Da

Comment # **30**

Comment submitted by: **David**

**James**

**Member**

Comment Type **Technical, Binding** Starting Page # **338** Starting Line # **5** Fig/Table# Clause **11.4.8**

The use of this small of an identifier has consequences that have not been mentioned.

**Suggested Remedy**

Do (1,2) or (3):

1) Note that the IAB (a range of 48-bit identifiers, based on the OUI) cannot be used in this application.

AND

2) Provide a rationalization for why a more readily available EUI-48 or EUI-64 was not used (more efficient transfers is the most likely rationale, although this is hardly defensible).

OR

3) Extend this to be an EUI-48 or EUI-64 based identifier.

**Proposed Resolution**

Recommendation: **Rejected**

Recommendation by

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation. Additionally, there is no need to mention every possible consequence of every identifier length.

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

Decision of Group: **Rejected**

This text is not being reviewed in this recirculation (non changebar text). Additionally, there is no need to mention every possible consequence of every identifier length.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**

**Editor's Notes**

Editor's Actions |) none needed

**Editor's Questions and Concerns**

**Editor's Action Items**

Document under Review: **P802.17 D3.2**Ballot Number: **3**

Comment Da

Comment # **52**Comment submitted by: **David****James****Member**

Comment	Type	Technical, Binding	Starting Page #	428	Starting Line #	5	Fig/Table#	Clause	13.2.3.2
Inconsistent wording.									

**Suggested Remedy**

Either:

1) Change the left column heading to "Name", and use the actual variable names (not the nearly-the-same English).

or

2) Add another column, so that "Name" and "Description" are both provided.

**Proposed Resolution****Recommendation: Rejected****Recommendation by**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

**Reason for Recommendation****Resolution of Group****Decision of Group: Rejected**

The proposed editorial change may increase the readability of the document. However, it solves no technical issues, any change introduces risk of breaking existing working text, the text has existed for many revisions without such a comment, and we are obligated to finish the standard quickly now that we have passed sponsor ballot (three times in a row) with substantial approval. Therefore, this change will not be entertained at this time. The commenter is invited to suggest such editorial modifications for a future maintenance revision of the standard.

Unanimous: Commentor not present

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution****Group's Notes****Group's Action Items****Editor's Notes****Editor's Actions** 1) none needed**Editor's Questions and Concerns****Editor's Action Items**

