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Page 9
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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alexei Beliaev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jean-Michel Bonnany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Paul Bottorff Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Rudolf Brandner Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jim Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dirceu Cavendish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Frank Chao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jaihyung Cho Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Paul Congdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Uri Cummings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Russell Dietz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Linda Dunbar Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anush Elangovan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hesham ElBakoury</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>David Elie-Dit-Cosaque Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Don Fedyk Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Felix Feifei Feng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Norman Finn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>David Frattura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>John Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Geoffrey Garner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Anoop Ghanwani Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Grewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Stephen Haddock Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Romain Insler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ran Ish-Shalom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vipin Jain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Tony Jeffree Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Johas Teener</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Hal Keen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Yongbum Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mike Ko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bruce Kwan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kari Laihonen Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yannick LE GOFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>David W. Martin Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Alan McGuire Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Messenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinesh Mohan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hiroshi Ohta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ballot can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Don Pannell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Glenn Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ken Patton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Haim Porat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ray Qiu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Karen Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Robert Roden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Josef Roese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Glenn Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dan Romascanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Jessy V Rouyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Eric Ryu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ali Sajassi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Panagiotis Saltidis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sam Sambasivan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>John Sauer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>John Seaman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Koichi Seto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Curtis Simonson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Nurit Sprecher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kevin B Stanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Larry Stefani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Bob Sultan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Muneyoshi Suzuki</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Francois Tallet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Michael Teener</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>John Terry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pat Thaler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Geoff Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>John Viega</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Dennis Volpano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Manoj Wadkar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bert Wijnen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ludwig Winkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Michael D Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Delei Yu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters responding</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Ballot Comments

Comment 1 Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 112
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The MIB items for the information database items in sections 12.15.3-5 are not included in D3.00.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the MIB elements for information databasee items in sections 12.15.3-5 as in draft D3.01 posted on the IEEE WEB at http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ah.html.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 1

1-Propose accept.

Comment 2 Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 9.5, 9.8, 6.8, 6.9
PAGE: 53, 54, 32-38
LINE:
COMMENT START:
In 802.1ah/D2.4 we had a "multiprotocol I-TAG" format specified in clause 9.5 and 9.8. This tag format prevents adding 12 bytes of un-necessary overhead in the 802.1ah frame when using the PBBN for connecting between non-Ethernet networks such as PDH networks or PseudoWire networks. In addition, this short I-TAG format can be exploited for the implementation of a per service MEP at the Provider Instance Port. This format was removed from D3.0 based on the discussion in San Diego that it had the potential of producing incompatible operation when a 802.1ad network was placed in the path between the non-Ethernet network. The 'multiprotocol I-TAG" format should be included in 802.1ah because even though the "multiprotocol I-TAG" is incompatible with transit over a PBN attached at the edge of a PBBN (it will transit over the BCBs in the core of the PBBN) the application spaces of Pseudo Wire transport and PDH transport are both large enough and significant enough that service providers should be given the option to opti-
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Insert text in 9.5 for two I-TAG Frametypes one for the "Ethernet Encapsulating I-TAG" and one for the "Multiprotocol I-TAG". Restore the diagrams and text for the "Multiprotocol I-TAG" format in section 9.8. Remove the statements which say "with encapsulated Ethernet frame" from clauses 6.8 and 6.9.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 2

2-Propose Discuss.

Comment 3 Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Need to add a PICS
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 3

1-Propose Accept.

Comment 4 Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 26.6
PAGE: 135
LINE: 38,40,42,43,44
COMMENT START:
The E-NNI port is formed over the Customer Backbone Port not the Provider Backbone Port.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Provider Backbone Port" with "Customer Backbone Port".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 4

1-Propose Accept

Comment 5 Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 26.8
PAGE: 136
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The operation of CFM at the Provider Instance Port needs to describe how a MEP is formed to monitor a service identified by the I-SID. It is not clear if the CFM frame used would have the 802.1ag type following the I-TAG or proceeding the I-TAG. One way to do this is to add a TLV to CFM to carry the I-SID, while another possibility is to define a CFM frame which may follow an I-TAG rather than a B-TAG. If the CFM frame includes a special TLV then the Customer Backbone Port must have a special procedure for mapping the CFM frame into a B-VLAN based on the I-TAG TLV, while inserting CFM data past the I-TAG will require a description of how CFM works for this case.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Describe how CFM operates when the CFM data is past the I-TAG.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 5

1-Propose accept in principle/discuss: Need to add text describing how to handle a CFM frame with the CFM frame data past the I-TAG.

Comment 6 Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 117
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The I-TAG interface is now a subset of the S-TAG interface described in 25.4. They should not have separate subclauses.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move the material of 25.3 under 25.4.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 6

3-Propose accept: From the clause numbers the author must mean the Transparent Interface in 25.3. The remedy is for this problem.

Comment 7       Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)
CLAUSE: 25.8
PAGE: 123
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
The I-TAG interface also uses the I-DEI to determine the drop eligibility.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "I-PCP" to "I-PCP and I-DEI".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 7

3-Propose accept.

Comment 8       Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 13.38
PAGE: 70
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Section 13.38 does not include extensions for hierarchal VLANs or the multiport I-component. This comment was made by Steve Haddock on draft D2.2, but has not yet been corrected.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Extend 13.38 for hierarchal VLANs on I-components.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 8

3-Propose accept in principle. Need to review the Mick Seaman paper on clause 13.38.
Comment 9  Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 5.7, 6.8
PAGE: 23
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The I-component is required to have only a single S-VLAN aware component, however
the design where an I-Component has an S-VLAN aware component per Customer
Instance Port all connected to a set of Provider Instance Ports through VIPs is a very use-
ful configuration, especially for "transparent" service interfaces.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the first sentence of 5.7 from "one S-VLAN aware" to "one or more S-VLAN
aware" and also change list item a) to "one or more S-VLAN aware". Also change figure
6-1 to reflect the structure with multiple S-VLAN aware relays.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 9

1-Propose ? need to discuss.

Comment 10  Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical, Required)
CLAUSE: 8.8.1, 12.12.2, 12.12.3, 8.4
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Provider Backbone Transport is a feature of major importance to PBBNs. The basic fea-
tures supporting PBT are small and should be added now so we don't have to wait for a
new PAR cycle before we get any PBT support in the IEEE standard.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
1) Add a static filtering entry type for "all unicast addresses for which no more specific
static filtering entry exists" (change 8.8.1 bullet a) ). This change allows unknown unicasts
to be discarded since a discard static filter may match all unknown unicasts.
2) Create a method for allocating some VID space to PBT while allowing the rest for use
by MSTP or SPB. This can be done by: Defining a special MSTID called the PBTID (use
0xFFE) which identifies PBT rather than a MSTI. An MSTID not in the MSTI list indi-
cates some protocol other than MSTP running in parallel to MSTP (802.1Q-2005 12.12.1 and 8.6.2). Allow the FID to MSTID Allocation Table (12.12.2) to allocate a FID to the PBTID. (i.e. FID=0xFFE to PBTID=0xFFE). Allow the MST Configuration Table (12.12.3) to allocate VIDs to the PBTID. The PBTID code of 0xFFE in the MST Configuration Table means "this B-VID is available to PBT for use as a route selector".

3) All VIDs allocated to PBT have a port state at each bridge port who's state is forced to forwarding=on and learning=off (change 8.4). The static forwarding state replaces the MSTP port states.

4) Add an Informative Annex explaining the use of PBT. This may be based on the PBT paper submitted for the May 2006 meeting.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 10

2-Propose ?: Need to discuss this comment.

Comment 11 Rudolf Brandner

NAME: Rudolf Brandner
COMMENT TYPE: < E >
CLAUSE: <5.71 >
PAGE: <23>
LINE: <52 >
COMMENT START:
<Shouldn't the maximum number of services be 4094 >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to 4094>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 12 Rudolf Brandner

NAME: Rudolf Brandner
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <6.4.1 >
PAGE: <28>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START:
<The definition of the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier is missing. The use of the service_access_point_identifier is not clear. What is the different between this and the port-id?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Please clarify and add references.>

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 12

1-Propose accept in principle: These two fields are defined in 6.4.1, however the definition could be clearer. Part of this unclarity stems from the fact that these fields are not used in a BEB, but are just being made available for future use. I propose we resolve this comment by adding a note indicating that these two fields are not used at present, but included for future use.

Comment 13 Jaihyung Cho

NAME: Jaihyung Cho
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical)
CLAUSE:
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
MAC Translation should be supported by the PBB B component relay rather than port.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

<< Recommended Text Deletion >>

delete clause 6.9, p35 line 6~8  ".. and may support the following parameters:
c) A MAC address translation table"

delete clause 6.9, p35 line 33~40  "The MAC address translation table ... "

delete clause 6.9.1, p36 line 19~23  "g) Otherwise, if the MAC address ..."

h) Otherwise the destination_address .."

delete clause 6.9.2, p37 line 16~22  "The source_address parameter is ...
c) If the MAC address translation ...
d) Otherwise the source_address ..."

delete clause 8.8, p42, after line 49,

"n) If MAC address translation is supported, the output destination_address and source_address fields."

delete clause 8.8.1, p44, after line 38,

"d) Output MAC addresses that are to be given in the parameter fields of EM_UNIT_Data.request when MAC address translation is supported."
Add following new clause 8.8.12 after 8.8.11 in pager 55.

8.8.12 MAC Address Translation

Two PBBNs operated by different organizations can be interconnected via I-tagged service interfaces. It is B-type Backbone Edge Bridge consist of B-component that provides service necessary for protection and administrative isolation from other network. (23.5, 24.6). B-MAC encapsulated, untagged frames are delivered to peer BEBs via the I-tagged service interface.

When a MAC Address Translation is supported, the source and destination addresses of the B-MAC header may be changed at the BEB. This allows flexibility in B-MAC address allocation at each PBBN, and helps hiding information of local user from other network. It also minimizes propagation of configuration change in case of link or node failure. For example when a B-MAC tunnel is established across multiple PBBNs, a segment of B-MAC tunnel can be replaced to backup B-MAC tunnel locally in the PBBN that problem occurred, hence effectively confines the range of OAM signaling and restoration. In other use, multiple B-MAC tunnels can be aggregated to single B-MAC tunnel in order to improve scalability, if B-MAC addresses are translated at the merging point that includes B-component.

The translation of B-MAC address is performed in MAC relay of B-component. Additional source_address and destination_address fields must be included in Filtering Database if MAC Address Translation is supported. When an entry of FDB indicates address translation as a result of query, source_address, and destination_address fields in EM_UNITDATA.request is replaced to new destination and source addresses stored in the entry.

Disposition of Comment 13

3-Propose reject: The changes suggested do not seem to have any different external behavior from the current description which is in the port. Since the implementor may choose any implementation which conforms to the external behavior both the port base architectural description and the relay based architectural description are the same for implementations. Further the proposed new 8.8.12 does not provide normative language for how and where the B-MAC translation table is used or managed. Instead, the material provided is informative in nature and would therefore be more appropriately located in section 26.6.2. The editor recommends extracting the proposed text and using it to augment 26.6.2.

Comment 14   Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.4.1
PAGE: 28
LINE: 21~51
COMMENT START:
Not clear why two new parameters (service_access_point_identifier and connection_identifier) are added to the M_UNITDATA.indication and M-UNITDATA.request. Is "peer to peer" described in the document same as "point to point" connection?

Line 28: "connection_identifier" can be ignored except as explicitly specified in subclause 6.5. But the subclause 6.5.of 801.Q2005 doesn't even have any description of the "connection_identifier". So I don't quite understand how does subclause 6.5 describe the use of this parameter.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need more explanation on who creates those values and what they are for. Need to specify if the "connection" used by the document is really end to end path connection. Since bridged network is connection less network. Introducing a concept of "connection" needs more justification.

Clause 8.8.11 has more description of connection identifier. But it is not clear who defines the connection identifier.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 14

1-Propose accept in principle: See comment 12. The service_access_point_identifier and connection_identifier declared in 6.4.1 are not used in an type of PBB, but have been added to the text for architectural completeness. Since no use for them exists today in 802.1Q no text is provided to explain their use. I suggest we put a note in the text indicating that these fields are begin defined for a future, as yet undetermined use.

Comment 15 Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
The Clause number 6.8 is used as "Protocol VLAN classification" in 802.1Q.2005.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Should the "Support if the EISS for Provider Instance Ports" be part of Clause 6.7 of 802.1Q.2005 (Support of the EISS)?

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 15**

1-Propose reject: The editing instruction on page 32 line 4 states to insert the new subclauses 6.8 and 6.9 after 6.7 and re-number the following subclauses. This will result in 802.1Q-2005 “Protocol VLAN classification” clause becoming subclause 6.10. Subclause 6.8 should not be included within 6.7 since 6.8 is substantially different from 6.7.

**Comment 16  Linda Dunbar**

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 10
COMMENT START:
It is stated in the first sentence that the function specified in this subclause "replace" the function specified in 6.7. Why it has to be "replacing" 6.7? Multiple layers of EISS, some being S-Tag EISS layer and others being I-Tag EISS layer, should be allowed, making it possible to have virtual Provider Instance Port, i.e. without physical interface for the I-Tag service instance interface.

Line 11 stated that one instance of EISS is created for one I-SID and there could be multiple instances of those instances. When there are multiple of those I-SID instances, which one is for encapsulating or decapsulating B-MAC?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need description of how B-MAC is added and removed. Need description on cases where there is no physical LAN for the I-tag interface.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 16**

1-Propose reject: The functions described in the EISS are the algorithms which implement the port not just the service interface which is defined in 6.6. The functions of a Provider Instance Port are substantially different from those of an enterprise VLAN bridge because the PIP performs all the 802.1ah encapsulation and service tag creation logic. Mixing these in the same clause would just confuse the description. As it stands the PIP may be internal or external as indicated in clause 5. All VIPs created on a PIP perform encapsulation/de-encapsulation. Subclauses 6.8.1 and 6.8.2 clearly and normatively specify how th
Comment 17  Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 48
COMMENT START:
"Admit Only Untagged and Priority tagged frames for 1-1 S-tagged interfaces". How to do
1-1 S-tagged service when the incoming frames are un-tagged?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need some explanation.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 17

3-Propose reject: The text seems clear and the author has provided no remedy.

Comment 18  Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
What is the relationship between I-SID and VIP-SID? Aren't they the same? Based on the
first paragraph of 6.8, VIP is one instance of Service instance. Therefore, one VIP should
have one I-SID, isn't it?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need better explanation.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Disposition of Comment 18**

3-Propose accept in principle: The VIP-SID is the I-SID associated with the VIP. This relationship is one-one-onto. We could replace VIP-SID with a phrase “the I-SID associated with the VIP” or “the VIP associated with the I-SID”.

**Comment 19  Linda Dunbar**

NAME: Linda Dunbar  
COMMENT TYPE: ER  
CLAUSE: 6.9  
PAGE: 35  
LINE: 18  
COMMENT START:  
Figure 6-2 is for B-Component Ports. So it should be about adding or stripping off B-VID. So I don't understand why MAC address translation table is processed here.  
How is "Customer Backbone Port" different from "Customer Instance Port"? How to handle the case where I-Comp and B-Comp are on one bridge? Is there an EISS handling I-Comp and another EISS handling B-Comp? Is PVID same as I-SID?  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Need clarification.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Disposition of Comment 19**

3-Propose reject: The text or 6.8 and 6.9 seem clear and the commentor has provided no remedy.

**Comment 20  Linda Dunbar**

NAME: Linda Dunbar  
COMMENT TYPE: ER  
CLAUSE: 6.9  
PAGE: 36  
LINE: 2  
COMMENT START:  
"Port I-SID" and "Backbone I-SID" are discussed here. Are both values provisioned by operator? What is the difference between them?  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Need an explanation  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 20

3-Propose accept in principle: The I-SID value used on the backbone as delivered at the PBP may be different than the I-SID value entering the ISS of the CBP. This is because the CBP may support I-SID translation. At times the text needs to refer to these two possible I-SID values. The editor will add a few more words to explain these.

Comment 21    Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 116
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Does "virtual Instance Port" only reside on "Provider Instance Port"? Does Customer Instance port have multiple instances? If yes, how to differentiate them?

This paragraph basically saying that Transparent Service Interface has to transport all frames to one "B-DA", is it correct?

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need an explanation
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 21

3-Propose reject: The document seems clear and the commentor has provided no remedy.

Comment 22    Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 117
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Figure 25-3 has been in the document for a long time. It always assumes that there is an I-Tagged Service interface between I-Comp and B-Comp. What if both I-Comp and B-Comp are handled by one bridge? Does it mean that I-Comp and B-Comp are just one EIIS layer?

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
If my interpretation is correct, another figure is needed to show how I-Comp and B-Comp reside on one bridge.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 22

3-Propose reject: Figure 25-3 is completely architectural and does not indicate if the components are in a single equipment or multiple equipment. The interface is also logical and therefore may be internal or external. No additional diagrams are needed.

Comment 23 Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
Question on the statement: "Each S-VID value maps to zero or one ISID value" How can S-VID map to ZERO ISID value?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Should say: "One or Multiple S-VID can be mapped to one ISID"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 23

3-Propose reject: The statement indicates that each S-VID is either not mapped to an I-SID or is mapped to a single I-SID. The commentors suggestion would change the purpose of the statement completely making the text less clear on the behavior.

Comment 24 Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Type O: "create nfo"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Maybe "creation of"?
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 24

3-Propose accept.

Comment 25  Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 120
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
What do you mean by "mating I or B type backbone."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Do you mean "matching I or B"?
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 25

3-Propose accept in principle: Suggest striking the word mating.

Comment 26  Linda Dunbar

NAME: Linda Dunbar
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: Clause 25.5
PAGE: 120
LINE: 32
COMMENT START:
It is not clear if I-Tagged service interface allow any frames with B-VLAN added. If yes, does I-Tagged interface allow nested S-TAG/B-MAC/B-VLAN? If not, it will require two adjacent PBBN to strip off B-VLAN before passing frames to each other. Is it a lot of work?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Need to clarify.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 26

1-Propose reject: The normative text of 6.8 and 6.9 seems clear that the interface requires an I-TAG as the outer most tag. The commentor has provided no further remedy.

Comment 27  Hesham Eibakoury

NAME: Hesham ElBakoury
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 112
LINE: 
COMMENT START:
Version D3.0 does not have the the MIB items in sections 12.15.3-5.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the MIB items in sections 12.15.3-5 as defined in draft D3.01 posted at http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ah.html
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 27

3-Propose accept: See comment 1.

Comment 28  David Elie-Dit-Cosaque

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: multiple
PAGE: N/A
LINE: N/A
COMMENT START:
There are still many editor's notes that need to be addressed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove remaining editor's notes.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 28

3-Propose accept:
Comment 29  David Elie-Dit-Cosaque

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE:
PAGE: 1
LINE: 38
COMMENT START:
"VLAN Registration Protocol (MVRP)."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"VLAN Registration Protocol (MVRP)." -> "VLAN Registration Protocol (MVRP)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 30  David Elie-Dit-Cosaque

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.98
PAGE: 19
LINE: 31-32
COMMENT START:
"one instance of the EISS that can encapsulated/deencapsulate frames"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"one instance of the EISS that can encapsulated/deencapsulate frames" -> "one instance of the EISS that can encapsulate/de-encapsulate frames"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 31  David Elie-Dit-Cosaque

NAME: David ELIE-DIT-COSAQUE
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
"Provider Backbone Port which are idential to Provider Network Ports (15)."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Provider Backbone Port which are idential to Provider Network Ports
(15)." -> "Provider Backbone Port which are identical to Provider Network Ports (15)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 32  Don Fedyk

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Many
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
This draft has too many notes etc to be approved at this point.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Continue to refine the document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 32

3-Propose accept. All editor’s notes will be removed.

Comment 33  Don Fedyk

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE:
PAGE: 15
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Service Virtual VLANs was the original PAR term (should be Service VLAN?) and on this page should it not be equated with Service Instance? As I read it now Service Virtual VLAN does not make sense. Services instances are Sometimes 2^20 2^{24} or both superscripts.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Use Service VLAN every for the Original PAR (instead of Service Virtual VLAN) Service Instance is the new term used in the Draft text. Format should be the same. 2^20 2^{24} or both superscripts.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 33

3-Propose reject: In spite of the difficult wording we must either stay with the PAR wording for the initial clauses or amend the PAR. Since the latter is very high overhead I propose we stay with the PAR wording.

Comment 34  Don Fedyk

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.94
PAGE: 19
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Sometimes IB and sometimes I-B
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Should use I-B or IB everywhere.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 35  Don Fedyk

NAME: Don Fedyk
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Many 17, 25
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The draft refers to 802.1ad which is now merged with 802.1Q which is also mentioned several times.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Refer to 802.1ad in a way that will be consistent with the merged version of 802.1Q.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 36  Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 3.81
PAGE: 18
LINE: 22
COMMENT START:
It looks like each PIP can have its own MAC
address or they may all share the same one, so
it would be useful to clarify this in the definition
of Backbone MAC address.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Add the suggested clarification.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 36

1-Propose accept: The B-MAC address used by the PIP needs to be unique among all the
PIPs within a particular PBBN.

Comment 37  Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 3.92
PAGE: 19
LINE: 5

COMMENT START:
Does an I type BEB include exactly one I component,
or possibly more than one? There are conflicting
remarks in the document. For example, this definition
conflicts with the NOTE on page 23.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Clarify.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 37

2-Propose accept: See comment 9. We should go with the definition that allow an I-BEB
to have multiple I-components since there is no reason not to build this type of equipment.

Comment 38  Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3
PAGE: 19
LINE: 

COMMENT START:
We should probably add definitions for
service frame and backbone MAC frame which are
used in Clause 25 but not defined anywhere.

We may also need definitions for "bundled service"
and "1-1 service".

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add definition.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 39  Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T/ER
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 23
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Not clear why this is 4093 and not 4094.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add clarification
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 39

1-Propose accept in principle: The reason the text says 4093 is because a bundled service
must combine at least 2 S-VLANs into a single service instance. Assuming 4094 S-
VLANs can be supported by the S-VLAN relay of the I-component then if one bundled
service is supported with only 2 S-VLANs carried by a single I-SID then we could support
4092 1-1 mappings for a total of 4093 service instances. This logic is accurate, but not
very useful. We will consider how to re-word this to make it more obvious to determine
how many service instances can be supported.

Comment 40  Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 24
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
The opening line of a Provider Backbone Bridge is
proposed disposition of ballot comments on P802.ah/D3.00:

September 26, 2006

standard for local and metropolitan area networks -

1

This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.

Page 33

confusing.

Comment End:

Suggested Changes Start:
Replace with "There are 3 types of PBBs..." and explain that way.
Suggested Changes End:

Comment 41 Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 15, 16
Comment Start:
delete "is a"
"or a provider bridge" to "of a provider bridge".
Comment End:
Suggested Changes Start:
Make changes as suggested.
Suggested Changes End:

Comment 42 Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 53
Comment Start:
Remove 's' from components.
Comment End:
Suggested Changes Start:
Do as suggested.
Suggested Changes End:

Comment 43 Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 15
Comment Start:
Change "Backbone MAC address" to
"Backbone MAC address of the provider instance port".

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change as suggested to be more specific. There are
also other places in the doc where this should be stated.
Search of "Backbone MAC address". Alternatively, change
the definition of Backbone MAC address to say it’s the
address of a specific provider instance port which may
or may not be the same as that of the other provider instance
ports.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 43

1-Propose accept in principle: The Backbone MAC Address is specified in the second
paragraph of clause 6.8. A search of “Backbone MAC Address” shows that the term is
consistently used as specified (in particular as being a unicast address associated with a
PIP) except in the definition 3.81. Therefore the alternative suggested change should be
accepted, and modify the definition to:
“Backbone MAC Address: A unicast MAC address associated with a Provider Instance
Port and used in creating the MAC header of frames transmitted across a Provider Back-
bone Bridged Network.”

Comment 44 Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Reserved fields are usually ignore on receipt and
zero on transmit. If we are discarding on receipt,
it looks like this field is not reserved, rather it
has something to do with versioning. Would prefer
if it were just called a version number.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change res2 to be an "i-tag version number".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 44

3-Propose reject: The res field names were used rather than version because we did not want to specify the exact use, though we have specified the exact behavior. Changing the name to version will not make this clearer. If we have a neutral name to replace “res” we could use it.

Comment 45 Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE: 123
LINE: 2
COMMENT START:
"...B component validates I-tags and maps frames on to B-VLANs."
How does it do this mapping?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify, or put a clause as reference.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 45

Propose accept: Will add a reference to 6.9.1.

Comment 46 Anoop Ghanwani

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 126
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
When we talk about 802.1ad networks, we should be more specific. In this case it looks like we should be calling these "Provider Bridged S-tagged provider network ports".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Comment 47  Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 127
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
Why are C-SA and C-DA not shown in these pictures?
Title of figure has typo.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change typo and put in missing information or clarify why it's not there.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 48  Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.8
PAGE: 131
LINE: 6
COMMENT START:
This is a place where I got confused with the term "Customer Bridges". Is this reference to C-VLAN component bridges or to customer bridges as in customers of the PBBN?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
There are several places in the current spec where customer is used to describe the business relationship and yet the term is actually defined to be something other than that; i.e. something used in relation to the C-VLAN component. I think it should be possible to avoid using "customer" in the business sense anywhere in the document by simply talking about the specific kind of network/device we are talking about.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 49  Anoop Ghanwani**

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26  
PAGE: 138  
LINE: 31  
COMMENT START:  
"Principle" -> "Principal".  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Change as suggested.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Comment 50**  
Anoop Ghanwani  

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani  
COMMENT TYPE: T  
CLAUSE: 26.2  
PAGE: 141  
LINE: 33  
COMMENT START:  
This only talks about how we get the B-SA and B-DA. How do we get the B-VLAN?  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Provide explanation for how we get the B-VLAN.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Disposition of Comment 50**  

3-Propose accept: The editor will add a paragraph before the B-MAC paragraph indicating how B-VLANs are provisioned and how frames are mapped into them.

**Comment 51**  
Anoop Ghanwani  

NAME: Anoop Ghanwani  
COMMENT TYPE: ER  
CLAUSE: 26.3  
PAGE: 141  
LINE: 51  
COMMENT START:  
Subclause 7.1 is missing.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Correct the reference.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 51

3-Propose reject: Subclause 7.1 is part of 802.1Q-2005 and therefore part of the 802.1ah amendment.

Comment 52  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 23
LINE: 43
COMMENT START:
The first sentence is long and difficult to parse. It would be somewhat easier for the reader if it was phrased as similar as possible to the corresponding introductory sentences for C-VLAN components and S-VLAN components. As an S-VLAN component, the S-TAG is supported at each EISS. The EISS of Virtual Instance Ports additionally support I-TAGs. Everything after the first sentence is a description of behavior under specific configurations of the I-component, and are not actually conformance requirements. It is more appropriate for clause 25, and is already covered there except for the observation that an S-tagged service interface can support up to 4094 service instances.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first paragraph of 5.7 with: "An I-component comprises an S-VLAN component (5.6) with the EISS on each Customer Instance Port supported by the use of an S-VLAN tag (S-TAG)(6.7, 9.5), and the EISS for each Virtual Instance Port configured on a Provider Instance Port supported by the use of both a S-TAG and a Service Instance Tag (I-TAG)(6.8, 9.5)."
In the third paragraph of 25.4, replace the second sentence with: "The first variation supports up to 4094 backbone service instances by performing a one-to-one mapping between S-VIDs and I-SIDs."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 53  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 24
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
The I-component requirements should state that it is a conformant S-VLAN component with at least one PIP supporting I-TAGs. Bullet g) is normal operation of an EISS supporting S-TAGs (and the word "carry" would need more explanation if it were to stay). Bullets c), e), and f) are normal operation of a VIP. Bullet b) refers to use of the connection_identifier in the EISS and FDB. Bullet h) refers to the Layer-2 Gateway Port operation (I think) and should be moved to the options list (covered in a subsequent comment).

**Comment END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Replace the list of conformance requirements in 5.7 with:

*a) comprise a single conformant S-VLAN component; and

b) recognize and use Service Instance tags (I-TAGs) on one or more Provider Instance Ports (6.8);

c) support 1:1 mapping between S-VID values and I-SID values;

d) support the connection_identifier parameter on the EISS of each Virtual Instance Port (6.8) and in the Filtering Database (8.8.11)."

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Disposition of Comment 53**

1-Propose accept.

**Comment 54 Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 14

**COMMENT START:**

The I-component may support any of the S-VLAN component options (which in turn may support any of the VL an-aware bridge component options) in addition to those listed here. The enumeration of the list should start over at "a)". Bullet j) describes behavior that has been mentioned as desirable, but I don't think is currently supported in the specification. This needs further work. Bullet k) is normal operation of a Provider Instance Port and need not be listed as a distinct option. Bullet l) does not need to be listed as a separate option (it would be accomplished by configuring the option of bullet j) on all Virtual Instance Ports except one). Bullet m) is normal operation of a Provider Instance Port.

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Replace the text of 5.7.1 with: "A conformant I-component may implement any of the options specified for an S-VLAN component (5.6.1), and may

a) support many-to-one mapping from S-VID values to I-SID values; and

b) terminate PBN spanning tree by filtering spanning tree BPDUs delivered to the Provider Instance Ports from the EISS;"
c) detect loops and delete looping frames by filtering frames received at Provider Instance
Ports which contain the B-SA used by the Provider Instance Port.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 54**

1-Propose accept:

**Comment 55   Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 5.8  
PAGE: 24  
LINE: 30  
COMMENT START:  
Following the terminology used in 802.1ad to reduce redundancy and verbosity when referring to VLAN-aware bridge components, an "S-VLAN bridge component" should be called simply an "S-VLAN component". Technically the Provider Backbone Ports are supported by the use of S-TAGs -- the term B-TAG is only a convenience to distinguish S-TAGs in the PBBN core from S-TAGs in the PBN core. The use of the term B-TAG should be restricted to clauses 25 and 26 where it is necessary to make this distinction. Also suggest some minor rewording to make consistent with subclauses 5.5 and 5.6.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace the first sentence of 5.8 with: "A B-component comprises an S-VLAN component (5.6) with the EISS on each Provider Backbone Port supported by the use of an S-VLAN tag (S-TAG)(6.7, 9.5), and the EISS for each Customer Backbone Port configured on a Provider Instance Port supported by the use of a Service Instance Tag (I-TAG)(6.9, 9.5)."  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 55**

3-Propose accept:

**Comment 56   Stephen Haddock**

NAME: Stephen Haddock  
COMMENT TYPE: T  
CLAUSE: 5.8  
PAGE: 24  
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
The B-component requirements should state that it is a conformant S-VLAN component with at least one CBP supporting I-TAGs. Bullet e) is normal operation of an S-VLAN component. Bullets b), f), and g) are normal operation of a Customer Backbone Port. Bullet c) reflects normal operation of an S-VLAN component if the PVID is used to support a single default B-VID per CBP, and is a B-component option if a B-VID field is supported in the service instance table (adding this to the B-component option list is included in a subsequent comment).
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the list of conformance requirements in 5.8 with:
"a) comprise a single conformant S-VLAN component; and
b) recognize and use Service Instance tags (I-TAGs) on one or more Customer Backbone Ports (6.9);
c) terminate PBN spanning tree by filtering spanning tree BPDUs delivered to the Provider Instance Ports from the EISS.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 56

1-Propose accept:

Comment 57 Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.8.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
The I-component may support any of the S-VLAN component options (which in turn may support any of the VLAN-aware bridge component options) in addition to those listed here. The enumeration of the list should start over at "a)".
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the text of 5.8.1 with:
"A conformant B-component may implement any of the options specified for an S-VLAN component (5.6.1), and may
a) translate B-MAC addresses by supporting the MAC address translation table in Customer Backbone Ports;
and b) translate I-SID values by supporting the Port I-SID field in the service instance table in Customer Backbone Ports;
c) assign B-VID values based on I-SID values by supporting the B-VID field in the service instance table in Customer Backbone Ports;
d) use the default backbone MAC address field in the service instance table in Customer
Backbone Ports as the destination MAC address for any frames received with a broadcast
MAC address.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 57

1-Propose accept:

Comment 58    Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 24
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
Most of the contents of this subclause are redundant with the contents of 5.11.2, and are
most relevant to 5.11.2. Simplify this section
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the text of 5.11 with: "A Provider Backbone Bridge may be either a Backbone
Core Bridge or a Backbone Edge Bridge."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 58

1-Propose accept:

Comment 59    Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 25
COMMENT START:
typos
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Provider Backbone Port" to "Provider Backbone Ports".
Change "idential" to "identical".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 59

3-Propose accept:

Comment 60  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.11.2
PAGE: 25
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
The port types are specified in clause 25, not 26. The introduction of the concept of "components" in 802.1ad raised the need to distinguish between ports on components (which may be internal) and Ports on bridges (which are always physical). The capitalized word "Port" by itself was already used throughout the document to refer to bridge ports. The convention followed for referring to ports on components was to always use the full description of the port type (e.g. Provider Network Port). By this convention, the sentence beginning "Each Port configured as a Provider Backbone Port," is correct. The following sentence beginning "Each port configured as a Provider Backbone Port" is confusing and unnecessary. The last sentence also seems out of place. If the possible connectivity of the CBP is to be defined then the possible connectivity of PBPs, PIPs, and CIPs should also be defined, but I think it is better to leave this to clause 25 and 26.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Clause 26" to "Clause 25".
Delete the last two sentences of 5.11.2.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 60

3-Propose accept:

Comment 61  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
It doesn't make sense for an I-component in an IB type BEB to have more than one PIP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the second sentence of 5.11.2.3 with: "Each I-component of an IB-type Backbone Edge Bridge shall comprise one Provider Instance Port and one or more Customer Instance Ports. The Provider Instance Port shall be connected within the Backbone Edge Bridge, as specified in subclause 6.10, to a Customer Backbone Port on the B-component."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 61

2-Propose discuss: The use of more than one PIP within an IB-BEB could have use for redundant architectures.

Comment 62  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
In items 1), 2), and 3) of bullet C), the phrases beginning "used for ..." should not be italicized (only the actual possible values of the parameter should be italicized). Actually I don't think these phrases should be here at all. This is not the only parameter that needs to be configured a certain way to implement a transparent, bundled, or 1:1 S-tagged interface, and I don't see why this one should be singled out in this clause. The appropriate place for this is clause 25.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the phrases beginning "used for ...
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 62

1-Propose accept:

Comment 63  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: E
.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
The Editor's Note is not appropriate. If this stays it should be a "NOTE", not an "Editor's note". However the appropriate place for tutorial-type descriptions of how to implement a particular type of service interface is in Clause 25. Same applies to the Editor's Note before the last paragraph of 6.8.2.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the Editor's Note in 6.8.1. Likewise delete the Editor's Note in 6.8.2.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 64  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 34
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
The sentence says the PIP "generates a B-MAC encapsulation". This is the Data Indication section so the PIP is removing the Service Instance TAG (and Service Instance tag header is the more specifically correct terminology).
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "generates a B-MAC encapsulation" with "removes the Service Instance tag header".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 64

3-Propose accept:

Comment 65  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
The second paragraph of 6.8.2 refers to a provisioned default destination address. No parameter has been specified for this. This was part of the resolution of a comment on draft 2.2 to allow a unicast or multicast address to be provisioned as the default backbone destination address of a VIP (i.e. default destination per I-SID). In 6.8.1 this address is also used to validate frames received from the backbone, which is fine if the default address is a multicast but not if it is a unicast.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
In 6.8 after item 3) of bullet c) add:
"     d) a Default Backbone Destination"

At the end of 6.8 (before 6.8.1) add a new paragraph: "The Default Backbone Destination parameter contains a MAC address to be used in the destination_address parameter of a M_UNITDATA.request when a backbone destination address cannot be derived from the connection_identifier parameter of the EM_UNITDATA.request. The default value for the Default Backbone Destination parameter is the broadcast address. This parameter may be configurable by management, and if so may be configured with a unicast or multicast MAC address."

In the second paragraph of 6.8.2 replace the last two sentences with: "Otherwise the value for the destination_address is the contents of the Default Backbone Destination parameter."
Replace bullet a) of 6.8.1 with:
"    a) The destination_address parameter of the received M_UNITDATA.indication primitive is not the broadcast address and does not match the Provider Instance Port's unicast Backbone MAC Address and does not match a multicast address in the Default Backbone Destination parameter;"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 65

1-Propose accept:

Comment 66    Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9.2
PAGE: 37
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
An M_UNITDATA.request primitive has a priority parameter but not a drop_eligible parameter.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete "and drop_eligible".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 66

3-Propose accept:

Comment 67  Stephen Haddock

NAME: Stephen Haddock
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9.4
PAGE: 38
LINE: 25
COMMENT START:
Frames received at a Customer Backbone Port without an I-TAG are discarded, so the first sentence of the second paragraph of 6.9.4 is irrelevant and misleading. The last sentence of the first paragraph of 6.9.4 is not technically correct since the table entries specify a regenerated priority value for a given value of "received priority". The purpose of the second paragraph was to explicitly specify how the received priority is determined.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete the second paragraph of 6.9.4. Replace the last sentence of the first paragraph with: "Each entry specifies, for the given value of received priority, the corresponding regenerated value. The priority signalled in the I-PCP field of the I-TAG is taken to be the received priority."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 67

1-Propose accept:

Comment 68  Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Each Provider Instance Port is required to have a unique MAC address; this makes sense for I-BEBs, perhaps not for IB-BEBs where an implementation can use multiple I-components sharing the same MAC - distinguishing various service instances using I-SIDs.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Require the mandate to have one unique MAC address per PIP only for I-BEBs.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 68

1-Propose discuss: See comment 9.

Comment 69    Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.8.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Though the MAC Address translation within B component could be useful sometimes, it can result into issues when the pre-translated MAC address is carried within the data of the frame. For example, if 802.1ag LTM frames issued by a I-BEB bridge port embeds its MAC within and it gets translated by the B-component and is not visible within PBB network. Later, when peer I-component responds with an LTR, which gets sent directly to the non translated MAC. Another example could be, if an I-component (via LLC) provides an IP service in an I-BEB, then ARPs running between two I-components could result into an issue.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Two options:
- Make a note of above mentioned (and similar) issues
- Remove the MAC translation option all together as a B component option
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 69

3-Propose accept first option: Add a note warning about translation of CFM addresses.

Comment 70    Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 59
LINE: 2
COMMENT START:
Clause 12.15, Page 59, Line 2 states that Provider Instance Ports, whether internal or external they are managed the same way. Whereas, Clause 12.15.3 Page 61, Line 49 mentions that PIP configuration managed object is applicable only to 'externally accessible' PIPs.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Keep them consistent and inline with clause 12.15.3.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 70

3-Propose accept in principle: The statement in clause 12.15.3 is incorrect. The PIP is configured the same for internal and external PIPs. Change 12.15.3 to be consistent with 12.15.

Comment 71  Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.8 (b)
PAGE: 24
LINE: 35
COMMENT START:
It says ‘validate frames based on their I-SID before delivering over Customer Backbone Ports. Clause 6.9, Page 35, Line 49 mentions that service instance table is used to filter frames that are received as well as transmitted.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change 5.8 (b) mentioning that validation may happen both ways.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 71

1-Propose accept: See comment 48.

Comment 72  Vipin Jain

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 26.8
PAGE: 136
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The paragraph on 802.1ag is not explaining some details, like:
- Where the MEPs or MIPs could reside in I-Component and B-Component shims architecturally?
COMMENT END:
- Can there be a MEP on a Virtual Instance Port, are they supposed to use 'Shared MAC Model' as described in 22-7 802.1ag. If there could be no MEP on VIP, how can CFM ever be done for individual service instance level?

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Above details with diagrams like in 802.1ag explaining the internal architecture of CFM entities within PBB ports (PIP, CIP, CBP, and PBP) would greatly help understand the use of 802.1ag with PBB.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Disposition of Comment 72**

1-Propose accept in principle: See comment 5.

**Comment 73  Vipin Jain**

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 57-68

**COMMENT START:**

Usually the 'Outputs' of any MIB operation is considering only a success situation. If there is a failure, the current definition of managed objects does not mention the resultant Operation Status, listing the set of disallowed operations.

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Adding the same would help the operation of various objects.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Disposition of Comment 73**

2-Propose ?: Need more review.

**Comment 74  Vipin Jain**

NAME: Vipin Jain
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Typos in the document
PAGE:

**COMMENT START:**

Page 19, Line 31: "that can encapsulated" -> "that can encapsulate"
Page 25, Line 14: "Port js a may" -> "Port may"
Page 25, Line 15: "or a Provider Bridge" -> "of a Provider Bridge"
Page 25, Line 53: "I Components (5.7)" -> "I Component (5.7)"
Page 32, Line 14: "Figure 6-2" -> "Figure 6-1"
Page 53, Line 44: "immediately by an Payload" -> "immediately by a Payload"
Page 57, Line 27: "CIB" is undefined term -> user appropriate intended term
Page 58, Line 20: "For an IB-BCB" -> "For an IB-BEB"
Page 58, Line 49: "identified by a an ordered" -> "identified by an ordered"
Page 68, Line 18: "a) Servive Name" -> "a) Service Name"
Page 68, Line 50: "a) Servive Name" -> "a) Service Name"

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change as suggested above
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 75  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: General
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Still way to many Editor's Notes for a WG ballot document.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Do what the Ed's Notes say & strip them out.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 75

3-Propose accept: Will remove all editor’s notes.

Comment 76  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 2
PAGE: 17
LINE: all
COMMENT START:
If there aren't any additions, remove the clause.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Do it.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 76**

3-Propose accept in principle: The MEF 4 is referenced in clause 26. This should be added to the reference list.

**Comment 77  Tony Jeffree**

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>

COMMENT TYPE: ER

CLAUSE: 3.76, 3.91

PAGE: 18

LINE: 6/7, 52

COMMENT START:

"B component" could benefit from hyphenation (B-component) to avoid constructs like "A B component" which are difficult to parse. Same applies to "I component" in 3.91.

As this is the first occurrence of Backbone Edge Bridge, add the acronym.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

"B component" -> "B-component" (global change)

"I component" -> "I-component" (global change)

"Backbone Edge Bridge" -> "Backbone Edge Bridge (BEB)"

Do a general search for terms that are listed in Clause 4 as acronyms and ensure that the acronym is introduced in the body of the text on its first occurrence.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 77**

3-Propose accept:
Comment 78  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 3.92, 3.93
PAGE: 19
LINE: 5/6, 8
COMMENT START:
Hyphenation
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"I type" -> "I-type" (global change)
"IB type" -> "IB-type" (global change)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 78

3-Propose accept.

Comment 79  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Figure 6-1
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 79

Propose accept: Should be Figure 6-2 (will be once merged with .1Q and .1ad). Likewise the figure in 6.9 should be Figure 6-3.

Comment 80  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.8
Disposition of Comment 80

3-Propose accept:

Comment 81    Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: 18
COMMENT START:
Typo. Also, this figure doesn't seem to be referenced at all in the text - shouldn't it be?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Bcomponent" -> "B-component" (similarly in the figure title.)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Add text to introduce the figure and relate it to the existing description.

Disposition of Comment 81

4-Propose accept in principle: The typo applies to the figure title in 6.8 as well. The figure was added for symmetry with 6.8. The “should it [be referenced] is a good question. Does it need to be? If so, a (gratuitous) reference to the figure will be added following the works “Customer Backbone Port” in the first paragraph of 6.8.

Comment 82    Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 8
PAGE: 39
LINE: 3-8
COMMENT START:
Editing instructions unclear & confusing. Ed's note doesn't help!
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the existing instructions and Ed's Note as follows:

"Change subclause 8.8 and its subclauses, and insert new subclause 8.8.11 following existing subclause 8.8.10, as indicated:

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 82

3-Propose accept:

Comment 83  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 17.1
PAGE: 73 onwards
LINE: 8/9 (and other examples)
COMMENT START:
The editing instructions shouldn't be erring to AG at all - by the time the AH project finishes, AG will be done, and the editing instructions in this document will need to be stated relative to the state of Q at that point, which is the logical merge of Q, AD, and AG. So all instructions of the form "No change from ag" and "Insert xxx from ag here" etc. need to be removed.

I know that this is a non-trivial problem, particularly with this section given that it is being simultaneously messed with by 3 projects, but...

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fix the editing instructions and changed/replacement text on the assumption that what is being changed is the merge of Q, AD, and AG.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 83

3-Propose accept:
Comment 84  Tony Jeffree

NAME: <Tony Jeffree>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: Annex B onwards
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:

No need for the many instances of "This Amendment makes no changes to..." - in fact they must be removed before this draft goes to Sponsor ballot.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Remove them.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 84

3-Propose accept:

Comment 85  Kari Laihonen

NAME: Kari Laihonen
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14-21
COMMENT START:
The declaration of the capabilities of the Ports is not straightforward. For example, Customer Instance Port appears in two paragraphs.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

Replace text starting from line 14 "A Customer Instance Port is may attach .." ending line 21 ".. or to a Customer Instance Port." with four new paragraphs declaring the capabilities of each Port. Correct the spelling error "is a may attach" by deleting "is a".

A Customer Instance Port may attach to a Customer Network Port (802.1ad), Provider Network Port (802.1ad) or to a Provider Backbone Port. (I think it is not necessary to mention Provider Bridge.)

A Provider Instance Port may only attach to a Customer Backbone Port.
A Customer Backbone Port may attach to either a Provider Instance Port or another Customer Backbone Port.

A Provider Backbone Port may attach to a Provider Network Port (802.1ad), Customer Instance Port or Provider Backbone Port.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 85

3-Propose accept:

Comment 86  Kari Laihonen

NAME: Kari Laihonen
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 132
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
When Provider Bridged Network is a part of Customer Equipment Provider Bridge MST BPDU's must not propagate over S LAN.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "A, P and S LANs but not over I or B LANs" into "A, C and P LANs but not over the I, B or S LANs".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 86

3-Propose accept in principle: MST BPDU’s must propagate over the S LAN to allow operation of subclause 13.39. The C LAN could have MST BPDU’s and could be included in the list. I propose changing to “A, P, C, and S LANs but not over I or B LANs”.

Comment 87  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 1.1
PAGE: 15
LINE: 50
COMMENT START:
No longer need double-letter listing

Copyright © 2006 IEEE. All rights reserved.
This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "aa" etc to
"a" etc
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 88  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 23
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "maximum of 4093" to
"maximum of 4094"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 89  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 24
LINE: 6
COMMENT START:
Specify S-PCP
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(e) maps between PCP values and I-PCP values;" to "(e) maps between S-PCP values and I-PCP values;"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 90  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 24
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
Specify S-DEI
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "f) maps between DEI values and I-DEI values;" to "f) maps between S-DEI values and I-DEI values;"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 91  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "supported by the use of an service instance tag" to "supported by the use of a service instance tag"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 92  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "A Customer Instance Port is a may attach to a Customer Network Port" to "A Customer Instance Port may attach to a Customer Network Port"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 93  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.1
PAGE: 25
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
Typo's
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Provider Backbone Port which are identical to Provider Network Ports" to "Provider Backbone Ports which are identical to Provider Network Ports"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 94  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.4.1
PAGE: 28
LINE: 36
COMMENT START:
Undetermined reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Find or define the appropriate reference for a "protocol shim"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 95  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "and does not match default backbone MAC address" to "and does not match the default backbone MAC address"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 95

Propose accept:
Comment 96  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "and prepended to the" to "and prepended to the"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 97  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: Figure 6-2, line 24
COMMENT START:
Swap the Customer/Provider labels from the right/left sides of the figure so it has the same orientation as Figure 6-1.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Swap the labels from the right/left "Customer Backbone Port"/"Provider Backbone Port"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 97

4-Propose accept:

Comment 98  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Instance Drop Eligible field" to "Instance Drop Eligible field"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 98

Propose accept:

Comment 99  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "recieved priority in 6.7.4." to "received priority in 6.7.4."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 99

4-Propose accept:

Comment 100  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.4
PAGE: 38
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "The table may be configured as described in 6.7.4." to "The table may be configured as described in 6.7.4."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 100

4-Propose accept:
Comment 101  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.5
PAGE: 53
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "a Service Instance TAGs (I-TAG)," to "a Service Instance TAG (I-TAG),"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 101

4-Propose accept:

Comment 102  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 53
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "followed immediately by a Payload Type" to "followed immediately by a Payload Type"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 103  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: Figure 9-3, line 6
COMMENT START:
State full "802.1ah"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Ethernet Encapsulating 802.1ah I-TAG TCI" to "Ethernet Encapsulating 802.1ah I-TAG TCI"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 104  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 9.8  
PAGE: 54  
LINE: 15  
COMMENT START:  
Typo  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Change "The I-TAG TCI encode the following fields:" to "The I-TAG TCI encodes the following fields:"  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 105  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 12.15  
PAGE: 58  
LINE: 49  
COMMENT START:  
Typo  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Change "are identified by a ordered pair" to "are identified by an ordered pair"  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 106  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 25  
PAGE: 114  
LINE: 17  
COMMENT START:  
Typo  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "the provider is a customers to the backbone provider" to "the provider is a customer to the backbone provider"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 107  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
Make consistent usage of the form "I-SID" not "ISID"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "ISID" instances (4) to "I-SID"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 108  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Typo's
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "against accidental creation of data loops, and prevents configuration of the I component" to "against accidental creation of data loops, and prevents configuration of the I component"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 109  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "over the ISS interface for ecapsuled Ethernet frames." to "over the ISS interface for encapsulated Ethernet frames."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 110  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 119
LINE: Figure 25-5, line 22
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Figure 25-5-Ecapsulated Ethernet Frames at ISS" to "Figure 25-5-Encapsulated Ethernet Frames at ISS"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 111  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 121
LINE: 46
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "The B component or the PBBN" to "The B component of the PBBN"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 112  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 121
LINE: 51
COMMENT START:
Typo's
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "indentified by an ISID," to "identified by an I-SID,"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 113  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 121
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
Rogue end quote
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "is forwarding at any given time."" to "is forwarding at any given time."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 114  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "which also under the control" to "which is also under the control"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 115  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "802.1ae" to "802.1AE"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 116  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9
PAGE: 123
LINE: 29
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "redundancy therefore will fail if any LAN or component fails" to "redundancy and therefore will fail if any LAN or component fails"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 117  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9
PAGE: 123
LINE: 35
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "These provide no node redundancy therefore will fail if any node fails." to "These provide no node redundancy and therefore will fail if any node fails."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 118  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.1
PAGE: 125
LINE: 37
COMMENT START:
Use official reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "using IEEE 802.3ad link aggregation. Using 802.3ad a single" to "using IEEE 802.3-2005 clause 43 link aggregation. Using link aggregation a single"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 119  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.1
PAGE: 125
LINE: 50
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "used for traffic over an multiple LANs" to "used for traffic over multiple LANs"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 120  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 4
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "too a primary and one or more" to "to a primary and one or more"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 121  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Punctuation and Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Comment 122  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Punctuation
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEBs," to "When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface, multiple Customer Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEBs,"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 123  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 22
COMMENT START:
Use name not project
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "executes 802.1ag at the physical level" to "executes CFM at the physical level"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 124  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
Typo

Copyright © 2006 IEEE. All rights reserved.
This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "nodes too a primary and one" to "nodes to a primary and one"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 125  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "is constantly moditored using either" to "is constantly monitored using either"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 126  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 42
COMMENT START:
Punctuation
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "When providing a class IV protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer Instance Ports are used" to "When providing a class IV protected S-tagged interface, multiple Customer Instance Ports are used"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 127  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 50
COMMENT START:
Punctuation
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "When providing a class IV protected I-tagged interface multiple Customer Backbone Ports are used" to "When providing a class IV protected I-tagged interface, multiple Customer Backbone Ports are used"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 128  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
Use name not project & typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "interface executes 802.1ag at the physical level to announce and detect failures." to "interface executes CFM at the physical level to announce and detect failures."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 129  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 128-129
LINE: n/a
COMMENT START:
Blank pages
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete blank pages
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 130  David Martin**

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26
PAGE: 130
LINE: 9
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "provides the context necessary to understand how the:" to "provides the context necessary to understand the:" 
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 131  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26
PAGE: 130
LINE: 29
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "and Backbone Core Bridge at the core of" to "and Backbone Core Bridges at the core of"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 132  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 132
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
Reword
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "onto a B-VLAN (tunnel) who's B-VID is contained in the B-TAG" to "onto a B-VLAN (tunnel) with its B-VID contained in the B-TAG"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 133  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133
LINE: 43
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "receives Backbone MAC frame" to "receives a Backbone MAC frame"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 134  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.6
PAGE: 135
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "For PBBNs deployments it is important" to "For PBBN deployments it is impor-
tant"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 135  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.6.1
PAGE: 135
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
Typo's
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "transports the S-VLAN as a instance of MAC service within B-VLAN generated
by" to "transports the S-VLAN as an instance of MAC service within B-VLANs generated
by"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 136  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.6.2
PAGE: 135
LINE: 36
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "to the an Ethernet Network" to "to the Ethernet Network"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 137  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.6.2
PAGE: 135
LINE: 39
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Frame delivered over the E-NNI" to "Frames delivered over the E-NNI"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 138  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.7
PAGE: 135
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "one management entity acting as a agent" to "one management entity acting as an agent"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 139  David Martin

NAME: David W. Martin
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE: 5
COMMENT START:
Must have the PICS filled in prior to going on to Sponsor ballot. Note this is the reason for my 'disapprove' vote.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fill in the PICS
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 139

3-Propose accept:

Comment 140   Alan McGuire

NAME: Alan McGuire
COMMENT TYPE: TR (Technical Required)
CLAUSE: 12.12.2, 12.12.3, 8.4, 8.8.1
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Support of PBT is an important feature for PBBNs. The basic changes for PBT support should be included directly in 802.1ah. The PBT PAR can then focus on CFM and protection switching.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the four changes suggested in the PBT PAR email thread to 802.1ah.
1) Create a method for allocating some VID space to PBT while allowing the rest for use by MSTP or SPB. This can be done by: Defining a special MSTID called the PBTID (use 0xFFE) which identifies PBT rather than a MSTI. An MSTID not in the MSTI list indicates some protocol other than MSTP running in parallel to MSTP (802.1Q-2005 12.12.1 and 8.6.2). Allow the FID to MSTID Allocation Table (12.12.2) to allocate a FID to the PBTID. (i.e. FID=0xFFE to PBTID=0xFFE). Allow the MST Configuration Table (12.12.3) to allocate VIDs to the PBTID. The PBTID code of 0xFFE in the MST Configuration Table means "this B-VID is available to PBT for use as a route selector".

2) All VIDs allocated to PBT have a port state at each bridge port who's state is forced to forwarding=on and learning=off (change 8.4). The static forwarding state replaces the MSTP port states.

3) Add a static filtering entry type for "all unicast addresses for which no more specific static filtering entry exists" (change 8.8.1 bullet a). This change allows unknown unicasts to be discarded since a discard static filter may match all unknown unicasts.

4) Add an Informative Annex explaining the use of PBT. This may be based on the PBT paper submitted for the May 2006 meeting.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 140

1-Propose ?: See comment 10. PBT is a vital carrier feature. We have discussion of a PAR for PBT circulating on the IEEE 802.1 email list. The comment proposes adding the basic changes for PBT to 802.1ah while opening a PAR for CFM, protection, and other PBT features. The advantage of including these modifications in the 802.1ah amendment is they will provide early guidance for implementors of PBT data relays without waiting for a new standards cycle. This in turn will allow box and chip vendors a clear immediate path for the PBT relay support.

Comment 141  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 17.2.2
PAGE: 74
LINE: 7
COMMENT START:
In addition to showing a high level structure of the MIB, this section should also contain a table that details the mapping of clause 12 variables to the MIB objects.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Insert new tables as appropriate.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 141

3-Propose accept:

Comment 142  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.3.2
PAGE: 74
LINE: 43
COMMENT START:
The relationship to the Q-BRIDGE-MIB in RFC 4363 and .1ap needs to be delineated in this section. That is, it needs to be explained that either that the imports are only from .1ap (assuming the re-indexed Q-BRIDGE-MIB is moved to .1ap as suggested in another of my comments) or that certain modules are imported from RFC 4363 and reindexed. Also, the relationships to the P-BRIDGE-MIB and BRIDGE-MIB should also be described.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Update this section accordingly.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 142

3-Propose accept:

Comment 143  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
It has been discussed as part of the proposed PBB-MIB that one simplifying option would be to re-index the Q-BRIDGE-MIB based on component ID (Dot1ahComponentIdentifier). This would allow there to be only one instance of the Q-BRIDGE-MIB base objects and not two to maintain. It would also mean that we would then have to document the re-indexed Q-BRIDGE-MIB in .1ap and describe the default case where the component ID is null. This would also provide a rationale to make a complete import/rework of the IETF written BRIDGE MIBs into .1ap instead of just amendments. Note that another option would be to invoke SNMPv3 contexts -- but this is not preferable to their non widespread usage.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove the re-indexed Q-BRIDGE-MIB objects from the PBB-MIB and instead move it to .1ap and reference it from the PBB-MIB.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 143

1-Propose accept: This needs to be decided jointly with 802.1ap since the 802.1ap MIB needs to be re-indexed with component ID to follow this route.
Comment 144  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
The REFERENCE items in the MIB are to a variety of documents past, current and future (i.e., .1Q consolidated). The references should be to either the current base (802.1Q-2005) or one of its amendments (.1ad, .1ag, .1ak or .1ah) as indicated in 17.2
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Update references as appropriate.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 144

3-Propose accept:

Comment 145  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
Not all the DESCRIPTION items in the MIB contain text.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Complete descriptions as appropriate.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 146  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
There is no Contact information
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Confirm the MIB editor and enter their details as contact information
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 147  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE: 114
LINE: 40
COMMENT START:
The text labels that is supposed to correlate to figure 25-2, does not.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add '(called a B-VLAN bridge)' towards the end of the sentence. And spell out 'Component' in figure 25-2 and others in this clause (e.g., 25-3, 25-6, 25-8,...).
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 148  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE:137
LINE:
COMMENT START:
There is no PICS in this document
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add a PICS based on the MUST/MAY statements before sponsor ballot...
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 148

3-Propose accept:

Comment 149  Haim Porat

NAME: Haim Porat
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 24
According to description, the I components itself generates B-MACS. It is not clarified how can a MAC address be generated by a nested tag.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**  
Add clear method of I tag Behavior  
**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

### Disposition of Comment 149

1-Propose reject: Clause 8 does not specify any tag manipulations -- the tag manipulations required by the new types of bridges are specified in the modifications to clause 6. Clause 8 specifies the filtering, forwarding, and learning functions -- the only changes to these functions required by the new types of bridges are to support the connection_identifier parameter and are specified in the modifications to clause 8.

### Comment 150  Haim Porat

**NAME:** Haim Porat  
**COMMENT TYPE:** TR  
**CLAUSE:** 8  
**PAGE:** 39  
**LINE:** 3  
**COMMENT START:**  
There are at least 3 new types of bridges, each with its own unique way of filtering and tag manipulation, yet none is detailed in clause 8, as it is in 802.1Q  
**COMMENT END:**  
**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**  
Add detailed bridge operation 8.1-8.8 for all types of bridges.  
**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

### Disposition of Comment 150

1-Propose reject: No further additions are needed to clauses 6 and 8 since the relay operation of both the I and B component is an S-VLAN component with the modifications already detailed. The commenter has not provided any remedy.

### Comment 151  Karen Randall

**NAME:** Karen Randall  
**COMMENT TYPE:** E  
**CLAUSE:** 17.4
Comment 152  Karen Randall

NAME: Karen Randall
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 17.4
PAGE: 75
LINE: 25

COMMENT START:
editorial: remove the "even then," in this line. Unnecessary.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Delete "even then,"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 153  Robert Roden

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 1.1
PAGE: 16
LINE: 19

COMMENT START:
It isn't obvious where the performance requirements, parameter ranges etc. cited in bullet ak) are defined.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add performance clause or delete bullet ak).
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 153

1-Propose accept: Delete item ak).
Comment 154  Robert Roden

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Incorrect reference to Customer Instance ports
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Customer Instance ports of the B component" with "Customer Backbone ports of the B component"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 155  Robert Roden

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
On the VIP why is the "Admit only VLAN-tagged frames" applicable to 1-1 S-tagged interfaces when 25.4 states that the S-tag is removed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify usage.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 155

2-Propose accept in principle: "Admit only VLAN-tagged frames" is not appropriate for a 1:1 S-tagged interface. The appropriate place to describe the configuration necessary to achieve a particular service interface is in clause 25. With respect to 6.8 this is resolved by comment 62.

Comment 156  Robert Roden

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
This editor's note seems like it would be useful in the final standard.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change to ordinary note and retain.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 157  Robert Roden

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 53

COMMENT START:
This editor's note seems like it would be useful in the final standard.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change to ordinary note and retain.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 158  Robert Roden

NAME: Robert Roden
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 35

COMMENT START:
The reference to "... a port based interface for 802.1ad bridge attachment" is a bit confusing in the use of the word "port" and the restriction to 802.1ad attachment".
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Either delete sentence or replace with "The all-to-one bundling S-tagged interface provides the transparent service interface".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 159  Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 3.91
PAGE: 18
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Clause 3.91 defines that an I component encapsulates/de-encapsulates Provider Bridge frames, i.e. S-tagged frames. However, the specification of the transparent service interface in clause 25.3 states that end stations, 802.1D and 802.1ad bridges could be connected to an Provider Backbone Bridge Network, i.e. to an I component.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clause 2.91 should state that an I component encapsulates/de-encapsulates untagged, C-tagged and S-tagged frames depending on the interface type.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 159

1-Propose accept:

Comment 160   Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The abbrevations ISID and I-SID are use for Service instance ID.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change ISID to I-SID in the whole document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 160

3-Propose accept:

Comment 161   Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
The word "is" is missing between which and also.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add the word is.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 161

4-Propose accept:

Comment 162 Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 25.6
PAGE: 122
LINE: 25
COMMENT START:
The reference to 802.1AE uses lower case letters.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace 802.1ae by 802.1AE.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 162

4-Propose accept:

Comment 163 Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 9
COMMENT START:
The expression CFM management contains the word management twice
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Use either CFM or CF management.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 164 Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 26.1
PAGE: 130
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
The expression "provider network" is used for Provider Backbone Bridge Network.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Use Provider Backbone Bridge Network or PBBN instead.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 164

4-Propose accept:

Comment 165  Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 131
LINE: 20, 46/47
COMMENT START:
Two terms "backbone service provider", "network provider" are used
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Use a single term.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 165

3-Propose accept: Use the term “backbone service provider”.

Comment 166  Josef Roese

NAME: <Josef Roese>
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 26.6.2
PAGE: 135
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The abbreviation E-NNI only appears in clause 26.6.2. The term is not defined in the document and it does not appear in the list of abbreviation.
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COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Define E-NNI or use a different term.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 166

3-Propose accept: Add a cross reference to the MEF 4 architecture document which uses the E-NNI terminology.

Comment 167  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 57
LINE: 51
COMMENT START:
There is no information in this section about who is the manager (service provider only or also customer) and if there are customer views of the management information who has access to them (for example who can see Customer Backbone Port information). The lack of this information impacts the Security Considerations and MIB sections.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify and define.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 167

1-Propose accept: Need some guidance on how to fill this in.

Comment 168  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
The MIB module does not compile and in general looks to be in initial design phase rather than in sync with the rest of the document. I am listing below the output of libsmi. Many of the warnings are due to the absence of DESCRIPTION and conformance clauses, but this shows a level of maturity that does not fit this stage of the document.
Your request has been processed by the command

smilint -s -e -l 6 mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt 2>report.txt

You can access any immediately created files, the processing report (which might be empty if no errors or warnings have been found), and output files (in case of a conversion request) for reading and download from a temporary server directory for approx. 24 hours.

While processing your request the following errors and/or warnings have been found:
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mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:42: [1] {object-identifier-unknown} unknown object identifier label 'experimental'
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2290: [5] {index-element-not-accessible} warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbBMacMappingEntry' must be accessible
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2360: [5] {index-element-not-accessible} warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbISidRegistrationEntry' must be accessible
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2419: [5] {index-element-not-accessible} warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbBVidRegistrationEntry' must be accessible
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2467: [5] {index-element-not-accessible} warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbISidTranslationEntry' must be accessible
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2537: [5] {index-element-not-accessible} warning: exactly one index element of row `dot1ahPbbBMacTranslationEntry' must be accessible
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2610: [5] {index-exceeds-too-large} warning: index of row `dot1ahPbbServiceEntry' can exceed OID size limit by 135 subidentifier(s)
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:119: [4] {group-membership} warning: node `dot1ahQBridgeVlanVersionNumber' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:132: [4] {group-membership} warning: node `dot1ahQBridgeMaxVlanId' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:143: [4] {group-membership} warning: node `dot1ahQBridgeMaxSupportedVlans' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:154: [4] {group-membership} warning: node `dot1ahQBridgeNumVlans' must be contained in at least one conformance group
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1 group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:165: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeGvrpStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:241: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeFdbDynamicCount' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:315: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeTpFdbPort' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:333: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeTpFdbStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:430: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeTpGroupEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:442: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeTpGroupLearnt' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:504: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeForwardAllPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:516: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeForwardAllStaticPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:539: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeForwardAllForbiddenPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:607: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeForwardUnregisteredPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:620: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeForwardUnregisteredStaticPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:642: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeForwardUnregisteredForbiddenPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:748: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeStaticUnicastAllowedToGoTo' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:771: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeStaticUnicastStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/802ah-d3-01-mib.txt:888: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeStaticMulticastStaticEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:906: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeStaticMulticastForbiddenEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:924: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeStaticMulticastStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:959: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanNumDeletes' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1039: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanFdbId' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1053: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanCurrentEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1064: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanCurrentUntaggedPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1075: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1100: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanCreationTime' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1158: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticName' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1169: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1187: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanForbiddenEgressPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1206: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticUntaggedPorts' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1225: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeVlanStaticRowStatus' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1266: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgeNextFreeLocalVlanIndex' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1351: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgePvid' must be contained in at least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1366: [4] {group-membership} warning: node 'dot1ahQBridgePortAcceptableFrameTypes' must be contained in at least
one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1393: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgePortIngressFiltering' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1414: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgePortGvrpStatus' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1436: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgePortGvrpFailedRegistrations' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1445: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgePortGvrpLastPduOrigin' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1454: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgePortRestrictedVlanRegistration' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1536: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1553: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortOutFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1567: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInDiscards' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1581: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInOverflowFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1592: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortOutOverflowFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1603: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortInOverflowDiscards' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1655: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortHcinFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1672: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortHCOutFrames' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1686: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeTpVlanPortHCInDiscards' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1767: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeConstraintType' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
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mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1785: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeConstraintStatus' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1831: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeLearningConstraintDefaultsSet' must be contained in at
least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1844: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeLearningConstraintDefaultsType' must be contained in at
least one conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:1951: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolGroupId' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
'dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolGroupRowStatus' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2023: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolPortGroupId' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2034: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahQBridgeVProtocolPortRowStatus' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2064: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahPbbBridgeAddress' must be contained in at least one conformance
group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2074: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahPbbBridgeName' must be contained in at least one conformance
group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2084: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahPbbNumberOfIFComponents' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2094: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahPbbNumberOfBComponents' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2104: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahPbbNumberOfExternalPbbPorts' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:2114: [4] {group-membership} warning: node
'dot1ahPbbNumberOfInternalPbbPorts' must be contained in at least one
conformance group
mibs/8021ah-d3-01-mib.txt:59: [5] {type-without-format} warning: type
'Dot1ahComponentIdentifier' has no format specification
'NOTIFICATION-TYPE' imported from module 'SNMPv2-SMI' is never used
'TimeStamp' imported from module 'SNMPv2-TC' is never used


'BridgeId' imported from module 'BRIDGE-MIB' is never used
'dot1dBridge' imported from module 'BRIDGE-MIB' is never used
'dot1dBasePortEntry' imported from module 'BRIDGE-MIB' is never used
'MODULE-COMPLIANCE' imported from module 'SNMPv2-CONF' is never used
'OBJECT-GROUP' imported from module 'SNMPv2-CONF' is never used
'NOTIFICATION-GROUP' imported from module 'SNMPv2-CONF' is never used

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include in the next version a MIB module that is fully synchronized in content, correct in
SYNTAX and includes all information needed to perform an appropriate MIB review.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 169  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.4.2
PAGE: 75
LINE: 38
COMMENT START:
This section is incomplete. There are many more objects in the MIB module with a MAX-
ACCESS clause of read-write or read-create that need to be explicitly listed and the spec-
ific security threats of every object or group of object shall be detailed
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Explicitly list all objects or groups of objects with a MAX-ACCESS clause of read-write
or read-create and detail the respective security threats.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 169

3-Propose accept:

Comment 170  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 17.4.2
Who is the manager who uses this MIB? Is it always a SP, or also managers in the enterprise (customer) space. If the later, I would expect this section to include some indication about what views will be accessible for management for managers belonging to the provider administrative domain relative to views accessible to managers in the enterprise (customers) domains.

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Define and explain how the different management views will be available and accessed.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 170

1-Propose accept in principle: Need some discussion and guidance on this.

Comment 171  Dan Romascanu

This section is incomplete. I expect it to include a detailed description of the relationship between this MIB module and the MIB modules defined in the IETF Bridge MIB WG RFCs, as well as a migration strategy or strategies for customers in the enterprise and service providers environments, possibly with references to the MODULE-COMPLIANCE definition in the MIB modules.

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Edit accordingly.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 171

3-Propose accept:

Comment 172  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 76
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Contact information is missing
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fill in contact information
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 172

3-Propose accept:

Comment 173  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 77
LINE: 18
COMMENT START:
The Dot1ahComponentIdentifier TC is defined starting from value 0 and then is used as table index. In general using 0 as a index is discouraged, with the exception where specific semantics require. If such semantics do not exist in all tables where Dot1ahComponentIdentifier is used, it would be better to define it starting with value 1 and define a Dot1ahComponentIdentifierOrZero TC for cases where semantics will require it.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
If zero is not required, redefine the TC
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 173

1-Propose accept in principle: Need to decide the ranging for the component identifier.

Comment 174  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.6
PAGE: 95
If managers may belong to different administrative spaces, do we expect dot1adQBridgeVlanStaticName to have a global meaning, common for all managers?

**Disposition of Comment 174**

1-Propose accept in principle: The intention was that the service name be available to a single administrative domain, allowing different service names in different administrative domains. If this is not correct then some agreement needs to be included on how global names are selected.

**Comment 175  Jessy Rouyer**

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: General
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
There are many Editor's Notes in this WG ballot draft that should be addressed before it is ready for Sponsor ballot.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Address all Editor's Notes.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 175**

4-Propose accept:

**Comment 176  Jessy Rouyer**

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: General
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
There are several forms of the following terms used throughout the draft:
* encapsule/encapsulate,
* de-encapsule/deencapsule/de-encapsulate/deencapsulate,
* detagging/un-tagging.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Choose one form for each term and use it consistently.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 177  Jessy Rouyer

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: General
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Typos throughout the draft.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Claue" -> "Clause"
"preprended" -> "prepended"
"correspondance" -> "correspondence"
"external" -> "external"
"recieved" -> "received"
"signalled" -> "signaled"
"described" -> "described"
"Backone" -> "Backbone"
"identifier" -> "identifier"
"clasue" -> "clause"
"creatio nfo" -> "creation of"
"comonent" -> "component"
"ecapsuled" -> "encapsulated"
"Ecapsulated" -> "Encapsulated"
"indentified" -> "identified"
"moditored" -> "monitored"
"anounce" -> "announce"
"benefitting" -> "benefiting"
"Drop Eligibile" -> "Drop Eligible"
"EM_UNIDATA.request" -> "EM_UNITDATA.request"
"connection_identifer" -> "connection_identifier"
"inforInternal " -> "infoInternal"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 177

4-Propose accept:

Comment 178 Jessy Rouyer

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 6.4.1
PAGE: 28
LINE: 36-37
COMMENT START:
The reference is missing in "A protocol shim (ref-tbd)".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please provide the missing reference.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 179 Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
Bullet (i) refers to S-VLAN bundling and it should be a mandatory requirement given its
description in clause 25.4 (S-tagged Service Interface).
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move bullet (i) to section 5.7 right after bullet (d) that talks about 1:1 mapping between S-
VLAN and I-SID values.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 179

1-Propose ?: Should this be mandatory? It is reasonable to support only 1:1 mappings
since I-SID address space can be used rather than carrying the S-VID.

Comment 180 Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
This bullet talks about terminating PBN spanning tree by filtering BPDUs delivered to the Provider Instance Port. I assume "termination & filtering" in this context means not participating in PBN MSTP and discarding the BPDUs. Given that PBN interfaces at the Customer Instance Port, the filtering should be done at that port.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change bullet (j) to: terminate PBN spanning tree by filtering spanning tree PBUDs received from the Customer Instance Port by the EIIS.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 180

2-Propose accept in principle. BPUs were delivered to the VIPs of PIP to allow switching between backup VIPs using spanning tree. Since this operation requires more than BPDU filtering it may be just as effective to delete BPDUs at the CIP. We need more input on how the various spanning tree modes work. I believe we should look over the work in 13.39 before we decide how these options are formed.

Comment 181  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 12
COMMENT START:
There needs to be a bullet added to this clause that talks about participation of I-component in PBN BPUDs similar to participation of C-component in 802.1ad in .1Q BPUDs.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add a bullet to clause 5.7.1
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 181

1-Propose accept: There needs to be at least 3 distinct options for BPDU tunneling, discarding, and participation.
Comment 182  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
This bullet should describe BPDUs tunneling for PBN spanning tree on both Customer
Instance Ports and Provider Instance Ports.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the bullet (k) to say: "tunnel PBN spanning tree by treating the BPDUs as data
when received from Customer Instance Ports and encapsulating them when delivered to
Provider Instance Port again as though they were data frames"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 182

1-Propose accept in principle: It may be necessary to extend subclause 13.38 for these
extensions.

Comment 183  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 24
COMMENT START:
Change "delete" to "discard"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the change.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 184  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 36
COMMENT START:
Since B-component doesn't do mapping of B-VIDs, the bullet (c) should be changed as below:

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Bullet (c), change "maps B-VIDs for use ..." to "applies B-VIDs for use ..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 185  Ali Sajassi**

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.8.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
There should be no need for translating B-MAC addresses even for inter-provider scenario since these are provider provisioned MAC addresses and thus can be formatted to include AS number.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove bullet (h)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 185**

2-Propose reject: Though not all carriers need B-MAC translation at a inter-carrier interface, others do. If the B-MAC address spaces are locally administered then they can not be merged over the connecting NNI. The translation facility allows the carriers to agree on an address for the demarcation and then translate the address as needed internally.

**Comment 186  Ali Sajassi**

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 24
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
The first sentence doesn't read well.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "one or more conforming S-VLAN components (5.6), conforming I components (5.7), or(and) conforming B components" to "one or more conforming I components (5.7), or/and a single conforming B component (5.8)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 186

3-Propose accept:

Comment 187  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
Change "A Customer Instance Port is a may" to "A customer Instance Port may"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the above change
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 187

4-Propose accept:

Comment 188  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
A Provider Backbone Port should Not be attached to a Customer Instance Port. The only
scenarios that would be support such case would be carrier's carrier where one .1ah net-
work is itself tunneled over another one. Given that we avoided such stacking in .1ad, we
should also avoid it in here as well.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the last sentence to "A Provider Backbone Port may attach to another Provider
Backbone Port."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 188

Propose reject: The hierarchal stacking of .1ah is supported in the current draft and described in 26.6.1. The 802.1ad network was incapable of supporting this arrangement because 802.1ad relies on a new Ethertype for the S-TAG to differentiate the domains. For 802.1ah no such problem exists because the MAC encapsulation provide complete isolation. The IEEE specifications do not normally legislate against connections unless they produce technical problems.

Comment 189  Ali Sajassi

NAME: Ali Sajassi
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3
PAGE: 26
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Change "Customer Instance Ports" to "Customer Backbone Ports"
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the above change.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 189

Propose accept:

Comment 190  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: Throughout the document
PAGE:
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The links within the document are not active
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Fix the problem
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 190

3-Propose accept:

Comment 191  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E/T R
CLAUSE: 3.76
PAGE: 18
LINE: 9-11
COMMENT START:
The current definition as it stands does not differentiate a B component from a traditional S-VLAN Bridge. The differentiating factor is the additional functionalities that the Customer Backbone Port provides which are more than just inserting and deleting B-tags.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the last sentence by "It is composed of an S-VLAN aware bridge component where each Provider Backbone Port is supported by an instance of the EISS that can recognize backbone VLAN tags (B-TAGs) and where each Customer Backbone Port is supported by an EISS that can insert and delete B-TAGs, and can interpret I-TAGs."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 191

1-Propose accept:

Comment 192  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 3.77
PAGE: 18
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
A B-BEB can include one and only one B component
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence by
"A BEB which includes exactly one B component and no I components"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 192

4-Propose accept:

Comment 193  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.79
PAGE: 18
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "A S-VLAN..." with "An S-VLAN..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 194  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.92
PAGE: 19
LINE: 5
COMMENT START:
A more clear formulation would be better
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence by "A BEB, which includes at least one I component and no B components."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 195  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.93
PAGE: 19
LINE: 8-9
COMMENT START:
A more clear formulation would be better
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence by
"A BEB which includes at least one I component and exactly one B
component."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 196  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.94
PAGE: 19
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "an Provider" with "a Provider"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 197  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 3.97
PAGE: 19
LINE: 24-25
COMMENT START:
Cyclic definition
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence with
"A B component port on a Backbone Edge Bridge that can transmit and receive frames
from multiple customers to the ports of a Backbone Core Bridge."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 198  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: (E/T)R
CLAUSE: 3.98
PAGE: 19
LINE: 31-32
COMMENT START:
The EISS for Provider Instance Ports is supported by using both the I-TAG and the S-VLAN tag type.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the last sentence with
"A provider instance port is supported by one or more than one instance of the EISS that can recognize S-TAGs and encapsulate/de-encapsulate frames inside an Ethernet frame which uses Backbone MAC addresses and an I-TAG."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 198

3-Propose accept:

Comment 199  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5
PAGE: 13-26
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Spaces should be inserted between the referenced subclauses when more than one is mentioned.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
For example change the following:
C: 5.7 p:23 l:45 "(6.8,9.5,9.8)" -> "(6.8, 9.5, 9.8)"
C: 5.7 p:23 l:46 "(6.7,9.5)" -> "(6.7, 9.5)" etc.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 200  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: (E/T)R
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 23
LINE: 43-46
COMMENT START:
The EISS for Provider Instance Ports is supported by using both the I-TAG and the S-VLAN tag type.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence with
"An I component comprises one S-VLAN component (5.6) attached to one EISS of each
Virtual Instance Port supported by the use of a Service VLAN tag (S-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9.7)
and provisioned to support a service instance on a Provider Instance Port and supported by
the use of backbone MAC encapsulate/de-encapsulate (6.8, 9.5, 9.8), and with one EISS for
each Customer Instance Port supported by the use of a Service VLAN tag (S-TAG) (6.7,
9.5, 9.7)"

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 200

2-Propose accept:

Comment 201 Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.7
PAGE: 23
LINE: 49
COMMENT START:
Typo. Missing "the"s
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "When...all to one..." with
"When using the backbone transparent service or the all to one..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 202 Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 5.7.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 14-21
COMMENT START:
PBN spanning tree BPDUs cannot be delivered to the Provider Instance Port from the
EISS as they are always filtered by the frame relay.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Reformulate points j) to l)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 202

2-Propose accept: As the commentor points out BPDUs are filtered before entering the relay and must be re-injected by the “bridge brain” at each port, therefore it does not make sense to filter BPDUs delivered to the EISS. BPDUs would normally be generated for VIPs and injected into the ISS. What needs to be done is to optionally suppress generation of BPDUs for VIPs.

Comment 203   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 5.8
PAGE: 24
LINE: 29-32
COMMENT START:
The Customer Backbone Port is supported by using both the Service Instance Tag and the Service VLAN Tag
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence by:
"A B component comprises a single S-VLAN bridge component attached at an EISS for each Customer Backbone Port supported by the use of both an Service Instance tag (I-TAG) (6.7, 6.9, 9.5, 9.8) and a Service VLAN tag (S-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9.7) and with other EISSs on all Provider Backbone Ports supported by the use of a Backbone VLAN tag (B-TAG) (6.7, 9.5, 9.7)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 203

2-Propose accept:

Comment 204   Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "(5.8.1)" with "(5.10.1)"
Comment 205  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.11
PAGE: 25
LINE: 14-16

The paragraph below this sentence provides a more complete description of the allowed port connections.

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase the sentence "A Customer...of a Provider Bridge"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 205

4-Propose accept:

Comment 206  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E/T
CLAUSE: 5.11.2
PAGE: 25
LINE: 30-35

An I-BEB can comprise more than one I components

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first paragraph with:
"A Backbone Edge Bridge shall comprise zero, one or more I components and at most one B component. Three types of Backbone Edge Bridges are designated:
a) an I type Backbone Edge Bridge (5.11.2.1)
b) a B type Backbone Edge Bridge (5.11.2.2)
c) an IB type Backbone Edge Bridge (5.11.2.3)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 206

4-Propose accept:
**Comment 207**  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 5.11.2  
PAGE: 25  
LINE: 37-49  
COMMENT START:  
The allowed port configurations and connections have been already stated in 5.11  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Erase the text  
"Each Port...Backbone Port"  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 208**  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.1  
PAGE: 25  
LINE: 53  
COMMENT START:  
An I-BEB can comprise more than one I components  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace "...shall comprise single conformant I components..." with "...shall comprise one more conformant I components..."  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 209**  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: 5.11.2.3  
PAGE: 26  
LINE: 16  
COMMENT START:  
Reformulate  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Replace "...internally to internal..." with "...internally to..."  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 210  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.4
PAGE: 27
LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
The service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier are not part of the original MA_UNITDATA.request and MA_UNITDATA.indication primitives
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "The frame_check_sequence is added to list of parameters associated with the MA_UNITDATA.request and MA_UNITDATA.indication primitives." With "The frame_check_sequence, the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier are added to the list of parameters associated with the MA_UNITDATA.request and MA_UNITDATA.indication primitives."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 210

4-Propose accept:

Comment 211  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.4, 6.5
PAGE: 28, 31
LINE: 35(p28), 1(p31)
COMMENT START:
It should be the more generic peer entity that will receive a connection_identifier referenced (E)M_UNITDATA.indication.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "station" with "peer entity"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 211

4-Propose accept:
Comment 212  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8
PAGE: 32
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
The figure number on the referred figure (6-1) is different then the one given in the text (6-2)
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Update one of the numbers for consistency
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 212

4-Propose accept:

Comment 213  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8 to the end of the document
PAGE: 32
LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
Since there is only one type of Service Instance Tag, there is no reason of including "with encapsulated Ethernet tag type" in its name.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Service Instance Tag with encapsulated Ethernet tag type" with "Service Instance Tag" throughout the document.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 213

4-Propose accept in principle: Accept if comment 2 is rejected. If comment 2 is accepted then make sure all references to I-TAGs specify the correct tag type.

Comment 214  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 33
LINE: 14
COMMENT START:
In general each Provider Instance Port has its own Backbone MAC Address
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...Backbone MAC Address." with "...the Provider Instance Port's Backbone MAC Address."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 214

3-Propose reject: A Backbone MAC Address is always associated with a PIP, and is defined specifically so we don’t always need a verbose phrase for referring to the address. See comment 43.

Comment 215  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 6.8.1
PAGE: 34
LINE: 1-2
COMMENT START:
The values of the drop_eligible and priority parameters in the EM_UNITDATA.indication primitive depend on the type of the service interface
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the sentence to
"The value of the drop_eligible and priority parameters are determined as follows:
i) If the octets immediately following the service instance tag in the received mac_service_data_unit do not contain a valid Service VLAN tag header (9.5, 9.7), the drop_eligible and priority parameters take the values of I-DEI and I-PCP in the Service Instance tag header;
j) Otherwise, the drop_eligible and priority parameters take the values of S-DEI and S-PCP in the Service VLAN tag header."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 215

2-Propose reject: The comment suggests that when a frame is decapsulated at the PIP the priority and drop eligible fields in the S-TAG (if present) should take precedence over the priority and drop eligible fields in the I-TAG, whereas currently the I-TAG takes precedence. Currently section 6.8.2 says that when a frame is encapsulated at the PIP the priority and drop eligible fields in the S-TAG of the transmitted frame (if present) gets the same values in the priority and drop eligible fields as the I-TAG. Since the case where the priority and drop precedence fields of the S-TAG and I-TAG are different should never occur, and since it is not obvious which should take precedence in that scenario, always using the values from the I-TAG is simpler.

Comment 216  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 29
COMMENT START:
In general each Provider Instance Port has its own Backbone MAC Address
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...Backbone MAC Address." with "...the Provider Instance Port's Backbone MAC Address."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 216

4-Propose reject: See comment 213.

Comment 217  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: 13-14
COMMENT START:
The Customer Backbone Port is supported by using both a Service Instance Tag and the Service VLAN Tag.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the sentence "The EISS shall...Clause 9.5" with "The EISS shall be supported by using both the Service Instance Tag and the Service VLAN tag type as specified in Clause 9.5."

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 217

3-Propose accept in principle: Change the sentence as suggested and add the following note:

“NOTE -- Although the Customer Backbone Port does not transmit or receive S-tagged frames, it supports the Service VLAN tag type in the sense that it is a port on an S-VLAN component and the vlan_identifier parameter contains a Service VLAN Identifier.”

Comment 218  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9
PAGE: 35
LINE: Figure 6-2
COMMENT START:
The provider side is depicted in all the other figures of the document to the left of the customer side
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Reverse the position of the CBPs and PBPs for consistency.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 218

4-Propose accept:

Comment 219  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "6.7.3" with "6.9.3"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 219

4-Propose accept:

Comment 220  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "6.7.4" with "6.9.4"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 220

4-Propose accept:

Comment 221  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.9.1
PAGE: 37
LINE: 24-27
COMMENT START:
The original FCS is always invalidated as there changes to the frame.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Either erase the generic NOTE-1 or replace it with content analogous to NOTE-1 on page 34.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Disposition of Comment 221**

3-Propose accept in principle: There may or may not be changes to the frame in the receive path of a Customer Backbone Port, so only the generic note is appropriate. There is no obvious reason why the note should be in sections 6.7.1, 6.8.1, and 6.9.1 but not in 6.7.2, 6.8.2, and 6.9.2. Putting the same note in all these subclauses is rather redundant. These notes will be deleted from sections 6.7.1, 6.8.1, and 6.9.1, and the following note added to 6.7.1 immediately following the sentence ending “and frame_check_sequence are as defined for the ISS”:

“NOTE -- Some of the functions supporting the E-ISS may result in changes to the mac_service_data_unit or other parameters used to construct a frame. The original FCS associated with a frame is invalidated if there are changes to any fields of the frame, if any fields are added or removed, or if bit ordering or other aspects of the frame encoding have changed. An invalid FCS is signalled in the E-ISS by an unspecified value in the frame_check_sequence parameter. This signals the need for the FCS to be regenerated according to normal procedures for the transmitting MAC. The options for regenerating the FCS under these circumstances are discussed in Annex F of IEEE Std 802.1D.”

**Comment 222 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 6.9.2
PAGE: 37
LINE: 53-54
COMMENT START:
The M_UNITDATA.request primitive does not have a drop_eligible parameter
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the last sentence on the page with "The priority carries the same value as the corresponding parameter in the EISS request."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 222**

4-Propose accept:

**Comment 223 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 8.8.11
PAGE: 52
LINE: 36-39
COMMENT START:
The proposed text does not fully solve the problem of contradicting connection_identifiers for static entries. The problem occurs if for example a frame is to be forwarded because there is static Filtering Entry for that VID and MAC address in the Filtering Database specifying a non null connection_identifier, and there is also a Static VLAN Registration Entry for that VID with a different connection_identifier. It is proposed that the connection_identifier associated with a static filtering entry takes precedence of the one associated with a static VLAN registration entry which in its turn takes precedence of the one associated with a dynamic filtering entry if contradicting entries exist.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the text "If the frame...EM_UNITDATA.request." with "If the frame is to be forwarded because there is a Static Filtering Entry or Dynamic Filtering Entry for that VID and MAC address in the Filtering Database, and there is also a Static VLAN Registration Entry for that VID, associated with a different connection_identifier than the one specified in the Static or Dynamic Filtering Entry, then the connection_identifier included in the EM_UNITDATA.request is always the first non null entry of the following ordered list
1) Connection_identifier associated with the Static Filtering Entry
2) Connection_identifier associated with the Static VLAN Registration Entry
3) Connection_identifier associated with the Dynamic Filtering Entry."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 223

2-Propose accept:

Comment 224  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9
PAGE: 53
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
Due to the introduction a new tag type some of the text is clause 9 has to be changed.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Insert the following text on line 3
"Change the fist sentence as follows:
This clause specifies the format of three types of tags,
a) Two VLAN tag types added to and removed from user data frames by the tag encoding and decoding functions that support the Enhanced Internal Sublayer Service (EISS, 6.6) and
b) A Service Instance tag reserved for use by Backbone Edge Bridges (6.8, 6.9).
Renumber the following items accordingly.


Change item e) as follows:
e) Describes the types of tag that can be used;
Change the first sentence in subclause 9.3 as follows:
Each tag comprises the following sequential information elements:

**Comment 225  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.5
PAGE: 53
LINE: 11-14
COMMENT START:
Wrong references
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Make the following changes
L11 "5.10.1" -> "5.10.2"
L12 "5.10" -> "5.10.1"
L13 "5.10.1" -> "5.10.2"
L14 "6.9" -> "6.11"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 226  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.5
PAGE: 53
LINE: 17
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "TAGs" with "TAG"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 227  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 53
There is one type of I-TAG which is 18 bytes long.

Comment 228  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "The res2 field..." with "The res1 field..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 229  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 9.8
PAGE: 54
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "The res1 field..." with "The res2 field..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 230  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.13.1.1.3
PAGE: 57
LINE: 27
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "CIBs" with "CIPs"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 231  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 57
LINE: 53-54
COMMENT START:
The second sentence in the paragraph is elusive.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Consider reformulating it as follows:
"Each of the SVLAN, I and (or) B components of Provider Backbone Bridges are managed using the managed objects defined in subclauses 12.4 through 12.14."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 232  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: 9
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "(12.4)" with "(12.4.2)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 233  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: 15
COMMENT START:
Wrong terminology
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Management" with "managed"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 234  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "IB-BCB" with "IB-BEB"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 235  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: 21
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...component MAC..." with "...component's MAC..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 236  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: Figure 12-1, line 29
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference. The component managed object description should point to 12.4
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "12.13" with "12.4"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 237  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: 49
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...by a an..." with "...by an..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 238  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.1.1
PAGE: 59-60
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The substructure of clause 12.15.1.1 needs to be changed. The managed objects, Read Provider Backbone Bridge Configuration and the optional Configure Provider Backbone Bridge Configuration should be presented in subclauses 12.15.1.1.1 and 12.15.1.1.2
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the substructure of 12.15.1.1 as described above.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 239  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.1.2.3
PAGE: 59-60
LINE: 53-2
COMMENT START:
The sentence is elusive
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Consider changing to
"Provider Backbone Bridge Address-the MAC Address for the PBB, the BCB, I-BEB, B-
BEB, or B component of the IB-BEB, from which the Bridge Identifiers used by Span-
ning Tree Algorithm and Protocol, the Rapid Spanning Tree Protocol, and the Multiple
Spanning Tree Protocol are derived (8.13.8, 13.23 of this standard; 17.17.2 of IEEE Std
802.1D)."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 240  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.1.2.3
PAGE: 60
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
There can be only one B component per PBB
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first line in point f) with
f) B component Address
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 241  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.1.2.3
PAGE: 60
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
There can be only one B component per PBB
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first line in point f) with
f) B component Address
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 242  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.2.1.3
PAGE: 61
LINE: 15-19
COMMENT START:
The information stated here is redundant. Status information can be displayed instead
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point a) with
a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
1) Operation rejected because the portlet is associated with a virtual port;
2) Operation accepted
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 243  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.2.2.3
PAGE: 61
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
Command operation status can be given at the output
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point "None" with
a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
1) Operation rejected because the portlet is associated with a virtual port;
2) Operation accepted
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 244  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3
PAGE: 61
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
There is no I-SID translation table available for external PIPs
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase point a)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 245  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3
PAGE: 62
LINE: 3-5
COMMENT START:
Point c) referring to a Provider Backbone Port in the description of the managed objects required for an external Provider Instance Port is misleading.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point c) with
"The Virtual Instance Port configuration parameters, which provide the subset of the Bridge VLAN Configuration managed object (12.10.1) that is relevant for the configuration of the service instance"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 246  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.1.2
PAGE: 62
LINE: 27
COMMENT START:
The I-SID is configured on the VIP by the VIP-ISID parameter.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point c) with
"c) VIP-ISID parameter: the I-SID associated with this Virtual Instance Port."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 246

3-Propose accept:

Comment 247  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.1.3
PAGE: 62
LINE: 31-40
COMMENT START:
1 Items b)-d) are redundant input parameters.
2 COMMENT END:
3 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
4 Replace the outputs text with
5  "a) Component Number: the number of the I component;
6  b) a PVID parameter for port-based S-VLAN classification;
7  c) an Acceptable Frame Types parameter with at least one of the following values:
8   1) Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames;
9   2) Admit Only Untagged and Priority-tagged frames;
10   3) Admit All frames."
11 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 248  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.2.2
PAGE: 62
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
1 The VIP-ISID parameter identifies the service instance ID. The Service instance ID infor-
2 mation is redundant
3 COMMENT END:
4 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
5 Erase point c)
6 SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 248

3-Propose accept:

Comment 249  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.2.3
PAGE: 63
LINE: 8
COMMENT START:
1 Command operation status can be given at the output
2 COMMENT END:
3 SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
4 Replace point "None" with
a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
1) Operation rejected because the portlet is configured as an external port;
2) Operation accepted"

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 250  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.3-12.15.3.4
PAGE: 63
LINE: 11-47
COMMENT START:
The operation of the configuration of VIP Mapping table should logically precede that of VIP configuration
COMMENT END:
**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**
Place the managed objects on Read and Configure VIP Mapping Table Entry in subclause 12.15.3.1 and 12.15.3.2. Move the corresponding ones for VIP configuration in 12.15.3.3 and 12.15.3.4
**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 251  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.3.3
PAGE: 63
LINE: 26-29
COMMENT START:
The information stated here is redundant. Status information can be displayed instead
COMMENT END:
**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**
Replace point a) with
a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
1) Operation rejected because the portlet is configured as an external port;
2) Operation accepted"
**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 252  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.4.2
Comment 253  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.4.3
PAGE: 63
LINE: 47
COMMENT START:
Command operation status can be given at the output
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace point "None" with
a) Operation status. This takes one of the following values:
1) Operation rejected because the portlet is configured as an external port;
2) Operation accepted"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 254  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.5-12.15.3.6
PAGE: 63-64
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The B-MAC Mapping table is irrelevant for external Provider Instance Ports
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move subclauses 12.15.3.5 and 12.15.3.6 to 12.15.4
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 254

3-Propose accept:
Comment 255  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4
PAGE: 64
LINE: 47-54
COMMENT START:
Wrong references
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
The references should point to subclauses of 12.15.4
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 256  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.1
PAGE: 65
LINE: 5-6
COMMENT START:
The managed object described is this section enables its operator to read the optional
translation entries related to a specific service instance as it enters the CBP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the first sentence with
"To read the service instance translation entries"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 257  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.1.3
PAGE: 65
LINE: 16-18
COMMENT START:
Items a) to c) are redundant, input parameters.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase items a) to c)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 258  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.2.1
PAGE: 65
LINE: 28-29
COMMENT START:
The managed object described in this section enables its operator to configure the optional translation entries related to a specific service instance as it enters the CBP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the paragraph as follows:
"To configure the service instance translation entries. This allows mapping of the customer associated parameters of the service instance to the backbone provider configured ones."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 259  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 12.15.4.5-12.15.4.8
PAGE: 66-68
LINE:
COMMENT START:
These managed objects are redundant. Their corresponding functionality is provided by managed objects 12.15.4.1 and 12.15.4.2
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the paragraph as follows:
Erase the corresponding subclauses.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 260  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 70-71
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The proposed changes affect specific text in previous subclauses of 13 (with the exception of the introductory text on the operation of the Layer Two Gateway which should be included in IEEE Std 802.1D-2004 17.3) and correspondingly should be moved to the specific referenced clauses.

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

Make the need changes on the specific referenced subclauses of the base document.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

---

**Comment 261  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 13.39.4
PAGE: 71
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**
Replace "12.26.23" with "13.26.23"

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

---

**Comment 262  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13.39.5
PAGE: 71
LINE: 53
COMMENT START:
Adding "&& !isL2gp" to the conditions for the transitions out of the Discard state in the Port Receive state machine of Figure 13-11 is sufficient to prevent BPDU reception on a Layer Two Gateway Port.

**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**
Replace the second paragraph with
"Preventing BPDU reception on a Layer Two Gateway Port is achieved by adding "&& !isL2gp" to the conditions for the transitions out of the Discard state in the Port Receive state machine of Figure 13-11."

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**
Disposition of Comment 262

Comment 263  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25
PAGE: 114
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Bridge" with "Bridged"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 264  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.2
PAGE: 116
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "S-VLAN Aware Component" with "S-VLAN aware component"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 265  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 116
LINE: 43-51
COMMENT START:
The given description of the transparent service interface as a special case of the bundling
S-tagged service interface, is applicable only in the case that the PBBN connects to a Provider Bridge. The transparent service interface in the case of the PBBN interfacing anything other than Provider Bridges can be differently implemented. For example more than one VIPs and CIPs can exist on a single I-component. In this case, each CIP is configured
to accept only untagged and priority tagged frames and to belong in the PVID member set which contains only one more member, a VIP configured with exactly the same parameters. In this case there is just one S-VID per I-SID.

Comment END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the description of a Transparent service which is implemented in this way.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 265

3-Propose reject/discuss: The current transparent interface may attach to any type of Ethernet bridge or end stations. The logic does require using the entire S-VID space of the I-Component S-VLAN relay. An interface as described would only be transparent to devices that did not generate S-TAG frames, though it has the advantage of allowing multiple interfaces on a single I-component.

Comment 266  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25.3, 25.4 and 25.5
PAGE: 117, 119, 121
LINE: Figure 25-4, Figure 25-6, Figure 25-8
COMMENT START:
In CBP and PIP the EISS is supported by using both the Service Instance Tag, I-TAG and the Service VLAN tag, S-TAG
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
In all these figures replace all the references to "9.5(c)" with references to "9.5(b and c)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 266

3-Propose accept:

Comment 267  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 118
LINE: 11
COMMENT START:
Typos
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace the line with
"...against accidental creation of data loops, and prevents configuration of the I component
to create a multi-point service..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 268  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 119
LINE: Figure 25-5
COMMENT START:
The lower part of the Figure 25-5 indicates an I-tagged service interface.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Split the figure in two and move the lower part in the next subclause
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 269  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.5
PAGE: 121
LINE: Figure 25-8, Figure 25-9
COMMENT START:
The customer controlled BEB in the case of an I-tagged service interface should be either
an I-BEB or a B-BEB.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Customer Controlled BEB" with "Customer Controlled I- or B-BEB" in both
figures.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 270  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133
LINE: 3-4, 19
COMMENT START:
The de-encapsulisation or not of a backbone frame depends on the type of BEB that it encounters.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "...they are de-encapsulated." by "...they might be de-encapsulated." (twice)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 271  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133
LINE: 5
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "a S-TAG" with "an S-TAG"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 272  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133
LINE: 13
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "a S LAN" with "an S LAN"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 273  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.2
PAGE: 133
LINE: 13-15
COMMENT START:
The insertion of B-TAG and the mapping to a B-VLAN is done by the same component in a BEB.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase "B-TAG" from line 14.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 274  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.3
PAGE: 134
LINE: 12
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference. The .1ak has already entered sponsor ballot and is expected to finish soon.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "(IEEE Std. 802.1D Table 12-1)" by "(Table 10.1)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 275  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 26.6.2
PAGE: 135
LINE: 35-45
COMMENT START:
The E-NNI is formed between two Customer Backbone Ports
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace "Provider Backbone Port" with "Customer Backbone Port" (5 times)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 276  Mick Seaman

NAME: Mick Seaman
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 70
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The format of the changes in this clause is not satisfactory, and in consequence not precise. An amendment specifies changes to a base standard. This clause specifies changes that specify changes the eventual reader has to apply to the base document.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Do it properly.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 276

3-Propose accept:

Comment 277  Mick Seaman

NAME: Mick Seaman
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 13
PAGE: 70
LINE:
COMMENT START:
The nature of these changes to MSTP is as a set of hacks and flags. This is not a satisfactory basis for understanding what is actually occurring. It is unclear what form of ESP is being used to substitute for the non-transmission of BPDUs across the Backbone. Moreover it is quite unnecessary to hack changes into procedures like updtPortRoles().

So far as I can tell what is occurring is that a given port has been configured with the BPDU information that would otherwise be transmitted across the backbone and that this information is deemed to remain true so long as the port is operation (MAC_Operational true). It is unclear to me how we would know that the information would remain true if the port transitioned operUp operDown operUp (i.e. MAC_Operational TRUE FALSE TRUE), or indeed if that is considered possible or has been considered at all. It is possible that the information should be supplied when the Port first becomes operUp and that may be a condition of that transition. In any event when we know how operation should proceed we should be able to design the necessary changes.

It is further not currently clear to me what should happen if the pseudo-information changes.

A more appropriate set of changes would seem to be to define that, for such an administratively or otherwise controlled for, that rcvXstMsg is set whenever the information for the port changes, or the port is enabled (possibly), and the information is to be read from a management variable instead of from a received BPDU. Then we defeat the operation of the rcvdInfoWhile time in the PORT INFORMATION MACHINE (PIM) by adding the supporting flag to the transition out of PIM:CURRENT. I think that is all that is necessary.
on the receive side which is all that the current text discusses, and it should not be difficult
to fully integrate such changes into the base text - once the desired functionality has been
confirmed - since explaining that is 98% of the job.

What should happen if there is a root on the LAN of higher priority that the configured
l2gpRootID and an attempt to propagate a 'cut' through the L2 Gateway Port occurs is less
easy to guess and needs discussion.

**Disposition of Comment 277**

2-Propose ?accept in principle? need to discuss this:

**Comment 278  Curtis Simonson**

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE: 1

**Disposition of Comment 278**

4-Propose accept:

**Comment 279  Curtis Simonson**

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 3-4

"A class III interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or
more secondary customer nodes too a primary and one or more secondary BEBs."

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"A class III interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or more secondary customer nodes to a primary and one or more secondary BEBs." (change "too" to "to")
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 280  Curtis Simonson

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 14-15
COMMENT START:
"When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEBs, are used to create a single S-tagged interface."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"When providing a class III protected S-tagged interface multiple Customer Instance Ports, each on a different IB-BEB, are used to create a single S-tagged interface." (change "IB-BEBs" to "IB-BEB")
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 281  Curtis Simonson

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2, 25.9.3
PAGE: 126-127
LINE: multiple
COMMENT START:
25.9.2 and 25.9.3 use the terms "layer two gateway protocol" and "L2 gateway protocol".
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Suggest using consistent terminology. If "'L2 gateway protocol" is used, suggest adding "L2" to clause 4 Abbreviations.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 282  Curtis Simonson

NAME: Curtis Simonson
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.3
PAGE: 126
LINE: 29-30
COMMENT START:
"A class IV interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or more secondary customer nodes too a primary and one or more secondary BEBs."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"A class IV interface uses redundant LANs to connect a primary and one or more secondary customer nodes to a primary and one or more secondary BEBs." (change "too" to "to")
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 283  John Sauer

NAME: John Sauer
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Annex A
PAGE: 137
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Annex A needs to be filled in from main body.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Complete Annex for PICS checklist.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 284  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <3.91>
PAGE: <18>
LINE: <53>
COMMENT START:
<It is written that the I component encapsulates and decapsulates Provide Bridge frames. I think is that (at least) the decapsulation is for the Provider Backbone Frames> 
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Clarify that the Provide Bridge frames are encapsulated with Provider Backbone information and Provider Backbone frames are decapsulated from the Provide backbone information.>

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 284

3-Propose accept in principle: The I-component decapsulates Provider Bridge frames from Provider Backbone Bridge frames. The editor will try to make this a little clearer.

Comment 285  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <3.97 >
PAGE: <19 >
LINE: <25 >
COMMENT START:
<It is specified that a provider backbone port resides on a backbone edge bridge, so how can it transmits/receives frame to/from a provider backbone port of a backbone core bridge? Please note this appear all over the document>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<define a new terminology to the port on the backbone core bridge (something like Provider Network Port?)>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 285

2-Propose accept in principle: A PBP is equivalent to a PNP and is equated in 5.11.1. The definition states that the PBP is a port of a BEB, when it should state that it is a port of a BEB or BCB. We will correct the definition.

Comment 286  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < E >
CLAUSE: <5.71 >
PAGE: <23 >
LINE: <46 >
COMMENT START:
<written "an I component my" >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to may>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 287 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <5.71>
PAGE: <23>
LINE: <52>
COMMENT START:
<the maximum number of services should be 4094>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to 4094>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 288 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <5.8>
PAGE: <24>
LINE: <37>
COMMENT START:
< If the B component must filter PBBN STP BPDU, then how can I component filter
PBBN STP BPDU as well (line 21)?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<I guess this relates to PNN STP BPDU>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 288

3-Propose reject: The I-component may be in a different adminstration from the B-compo-
ment and therefore can not count on the B-component operating properly. For this reason
the I-component must filter any PBBN BPDU which are received at the the PIP.

Comment 289 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <5.11>
PAGE: <25>
LINE: <14>
COMMENT START:
<Type: "A Customer Instance Port is a may…”>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Change to may>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 290  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <5.11>
PAGE: <25>
LINE: <18>
COMMENT START:
<It is specified that a CIP may attach to… after some of the options are specified in line
14. Please integrate the possible attachments together for each kind of port to avoid confu-
sions regarding the splitting of the information in paragraph starting at line 12 and para-
graph starting at line 18. The same for the PBP.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<A CIP may attach to a Customer network port, provider network port or to a PBP. A
PBP may attach to a provider network port, to another PBP or to a CIP.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 290

4-Propose accept:

Comment 291  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <5.11>
PAGE: <25>
LINE: <19>
COMMENT START:
<When talking about a CIP attached to a PBP, I can understand that we are talking about
PBB hierarchies. Please specify it and add a referance to the relevant section>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add a reference to clause 26.6.1.>

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 291

3-Propose accept:

Comment 292  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <5.11>
PAGE: <25>
LINE: <21>
COMMENT START:
>Please add a reference to such models, PBP to PBP (is it peer to peer?) (can we connect two PBBNs via a PBP to PBP connection? and PBP to CIP (PBBNs Hierarchies?)>

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add references>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 292

3-Propose accept:

Comment 293  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <5.11.1>
PAGE: <25>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START:
>In the definition section it is written that Provider Backbone port resides on the Provider Backbone edge bridge, so how can they be the ports of the core bridge. There is confusion. Please note that this happens all over the document>

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Define new terminology to the core bridge ports>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 294  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <6.4.1>
PAGE: <27>
LINE: <30, 31, 40, 41>
COMMENT START: <comma is missing>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: <Add a comma>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 295  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <6.4.1>
PAGE: <28>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START: <The definition of the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier is missing. Nothing indicates why these extensions are needed for 802.1ah. what is the motivation. At least add a referance to where in the document it is defined/described. Specifically the use of the service_access_point_identifier is not specified and explained.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START: <Please clarify and add references.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 295

2-Propose accept in principle: See comment 14:

Comment 296  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <6.7>
PAGE: <31>
LINE: <45>
COMMENT START: <The tag types are missing. So is for the B-mac and I-tag translation tables.>

Copyright © 2006 IEEE. All rights reserved.
This is an unapproved IEEE/ISO/IEC Standards Draft, subject to change.
Page 151
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Extend clause 6.7 and explain that the functionality of the EISS depends on the type of
the port and write a clause on the support of the EISS for each kind of port: Provider net-
work port, provider customer port, provider instance port, etc.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 296

3-Propose reject: No modifications to 6.7 are required for port descriptions. The current
text of 802.1ad supports the 802.1ad port types. The new extensions for the PIP and CBP
are included in section 6.8 and 6.9 and do not need to be included in 6.7.

Comment 297 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <6.8>
PAGE: <32>
LINE: <40>
COMMENT START:
<Can we say that in an IB-BEB an I-Component exists per PBN / PBBN that is attached
to the IB-BEB?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please refer to it, since it is not defined expliciitly. >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 297

3-Propose reject: Subclause 6.8 refers to EISS for PIP not IB-BEBs. No reference to con-
forming equipment is appropriate in the interface sections of clause 6. An I-component
may attach to multiple PBNs or to a single PBN so no statement should restrict this attach-
ment.

Comment 298 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <6.81>
PAGE: <33>
LINE: <43>
COMMENT START:
<The connection identifier is ignored but it may be updated in the FIB in as a result of the learning process (1.Q clauses 8.7). Isn't?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Update the learning process accordingly.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 299  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: < TR >
CLAUSE: <6.81>
PAGE: <33>
LINE: <53>
COMMENT START:
:Is it always true for 1-1 map between S-VID and I-SID that the S-TAG is regenerated from the PVID or just when a port based vlan is supported? Aren't there cases where the s-TAG is regenerated from the I-SID?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
< Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 300  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <6.8>
PAGE: <33>
LINE: <6>
COMMENT START:
:A reference to the I-SID translation table is missing>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add a reference to the I-SID translation table with an explanation on its functionality>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 301  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <9.8>
PAGE: <53>
LINE: <42>
COMMENT START:
<What is the TCI for other encapsulations than ETHERnet? Is the backbone limited for transmitting Ethernet traffic services only?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Either specify that there is support for ETHERnet traffic only, or define other types of encapsulations.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 301

3-Propose reject: See comment 2. All Ethernet frames support multiple protocol traffic. The Ethernet encapsulation I-TAG is just a two level Ethernet wrapper which may then carry any multiprotocol information. The proposed “multiprotocol format” simply reduces the overhead for carrying multiprotocol traffic to a single level for applications where the secondary network is mapped directly onto the PBBN.

Comment 302 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <9.8>
PAGE: <54>
LINE: <30>
COMMENT START:
<TCI for encapsulations other than ETHERnet is missing.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add or limit PBBNs for transmitting Ethernet services only>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 302

3-Propose reject: None of the Ethernet formats are limited to Ethernet only carriage including the “Ethernet Encapsulation” I-TAG format.

Comment 303 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.13.1.1.1>
PAGE: <57>
LINE: <17>
COMMENT START:
<This the first time a portlet is mentioned. Definition is missing. Why is it needed in
addition to the ports?.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
/Add a definition and a motivation why it is needed./
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 303

2-Propose accept in principle: We do need a definition for portlet and should add one to
clause 3. The portlet is needed to ease the information database description which other-
wise must talk about virtualized or logical bridge ports which are physical in existing Q
bridge MIBs.

Comment 304 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <12.15>
PAGE: <58>
LINE: <17>
COMMENT START:
<why should an IB-BEB have more than one I component. Is it one per PBN that is
attached to the PBBN?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 305 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <12.15>
PAGE: <58>
LINE: <20>
COMMENT START:
<I think that BCB does not have I and B components.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please correct>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Comment 306**  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15>
PAGE: <58>
LINE: <32>
COMMENT START:
<why do we need portlets in addition to the ports? In addition, is the portlet number unique per component or per PBB?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 306**

3-Propose reject: The current text of 12.15 provides an introduction to these concepts. The editor is open to suggestions for improved text for the introduction to 12.15 however the commentor has not provided any. The configuration of a PBB requires configuring each PBB component as though it was an entire .1ad bridge S-VLAN component. The ports of these components are then logical ports which are re-indexed by the double of (component number, port number) refered to in 12.15 as a portlet.

**Comment 307**  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E >
CLAUSE: <12.15>
PAGE: <49>
LINE: <17>
COMMENT START:
<typo: it is written "by a an.. ">
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please correct to "by an" >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 308**  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15>
PAGE: <59>
LINE: <14>  
COMMENT START:  
<Why do we need a string to identify a service? What are the other parameters included in the string?>  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
<Please identify it by the parameters: Port, I-SID, etc. >  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Disposition of Comment 308**

1-Propose reject: The service name is used to allow an easy key which may be used to perform service provisioning within a PBBN rather than having to set all the variables of each individual port for each service. The other alternative is to use the I-SID as the key, however this is more cryptic and could be changed over some NNI types.

**Comment 309 Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher  
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>  
CLAUSE: <12.15.1.2.3>  
PAGE: <60>  
LINE: <13>  
COMMENT START:  
<A PBB may have up to one B-Component. Why do we need a list for each B-component? >  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
<Please correct >  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Disposition of Comment 309**

3-Propose accept:

**Comment 310 Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher  
COMMENT TYPE: <E>  
CLAUSE: <12.15.2.1.3>  
PAGE: <61>  
LINE: <15>  
COMMENT START:
"this may specify any combination" - how can a port be capable of more than
one option?

**Comment 311** Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E >
CLAUSE: <12.15.3>
PAGE: <61>
LINE: <49>
COMMENT START:
<What is the meaning of "externally accessible" – does it relate to I-BEB? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 312** Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <12.15.2.2.3>
PAGE: <61>
LINE: <54>
COMMENT START:
<A reference to the I-SID translation table is missing. The same for b and c.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please add references >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 312**

3-Propose accept:

**Comment 313** Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E >
Comment 314  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <12.15.2.2.3>
PAGE: <62>
LINE: <9>
COMMENT START:
<How the operations in a-f relate to the objects above? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 315  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.3.1.3>
PAGE: <62>
LINE: <35>
COMMENT START:
<output e is not clear. Can we expect port based vlan classification on a VIP? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 316  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.3.3>
PAGE: <63>
LINE: <15>
COMMENT START:
  <What is the relationship between the VIP mapping table and the I-SID translation
  table?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify. In general, a description on the intention and use of each table is missing.
  Please add.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 317  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.3.5.2>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <6>
COMMENT START:
  <Is there a default value per entry? Does it require a dedicated field? In a corresponding
  MIB, this can be a DefVal>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 318  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.4>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <35>
COMMENT START:
  <What does "externally accessible customer backbone port" mean? Does it refer to B-
  BEB?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  <Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 319  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <38, 39>
COMMENT START:
<References to the tables are missing >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Add references >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 320   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4>
PAGE: <64>
LINE: <47-54>
COMMENT START:
<How the operations in a-h relate to the objects above? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 321   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4.1.3>
PAGE: <65>
LINE: <20>
COMMENT START:
<Typo: "1 24 bit"> 
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please correct to "24 bit" >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 322   Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <12.15.4.1>
Comment 323  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <12.15.4.7.1>
PAGE: <67>
LINE: <24>
COMMENT START:
<what is it a translation between B-DA and B-SA and how is it supported by the input/output below?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 324  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.4.7.2>
PAGE: <67>
LINE: <31>
COMMENT START:
<The Can a customer backbone port have multiple mac addresses? Why a list is required?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 325  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.5.1.2>
PAGE: <68>
LINE: <18>
COMMENT START:
<Is the service name string used as a key to table? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please change the key to multiple keys: port, I-SID, etc.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 326  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.5.1.2>
PAGE: <68>
LINE: <19>
COMMENT START:
<Does it say implicitly that the I-SID is unique per PBB (since the only key is the service name string)? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 327  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <12.15.5.1.2>
PAGE: <68>
LINE: <24>
COMMENT START:
<Should we expect s-vid per I component? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Comment 328  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <13.39>
PAGE: <70>
LINE: <15>
COMMENT START:
"The description of the operation is not clear enough. A figure could help. In addition, I think that we need to specify that in order for it to work, there is a need for a physical connection between the L2GP in the other administrative domain."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Please add a figure. Please specify the conditions for the desired operation."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 329  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <17>
PAGE: <73>
LINE: <3>
COMMENT START:
"the managed objects described in clause 12 are not described by the MIBs. In addition it is hard to review the MIBs. A referance model could help in understanding which managed objects are defined for what purposes and what is the relationship between this objects."
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"Please add MIB tables for all managed objects defined in clause 12. Please defined the architecture/referance model for the managed objects."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 329

4-Propose accept: All 12.15 information objects are included in D3.01 available on the 802.1 WEB.

Comment 330  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <17>
Comment 331  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <17>
PAGE: <77>
LINE: <53>
COMMENT START:
<The description does not look to do much with the columns of the table>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please correct>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 332  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <17.6>
PAGE: <78>
LINE: <31>
COMMENT START:
<Does the maxvlanid refer to s_vid or B-vid?. The same for p.79, line 5>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 333  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <17.6>
PAGE: <80>
LINE: <34>
COMMENT START:
<the meaning of " 802.1Q transparent devices is not clear. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 334  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <17.5>
PAGE: <84>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START:
< why the component id is required as a key? Isn't the vlan unique per network?. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please add MIB tables for all managed objects defined in clause 12>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 335  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <25>
PAGE: <115>
LINE: <29>
COMMENT START:
<the list of aspects discussed in this document should be updated. For example, there is
no discussion on service protection. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please update>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 336  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER >
CLAUSE: <25.2>
PAGE: <116>
LINE: <26>
COMMENT START:
<A reference to the authentication and authorization process is missing >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please add a reference>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

**Comment 337  Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <25.4>
PAGE: <118>
LINE: <6>
COMMENT START:
<What is the case that there is no mapping between S-vid and i-sid? Do we have a case where there is no I-SID? >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

**Comment 338  Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <25>
PAGE: <115>
LINE: <29>
COMMENT START:
<the list of aspects discussed in this document should be updated. For example, there is no discussion on service protection. >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please update>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

**Comment 339  Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E >
CLAUSE: <25.4>
PAGE: <118>
LINE: <29>
Comment 340  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <28>
PAGE: <118>
LINE: <28>
COMMENT START:

1. I think that S-VID bundling is not required when a new TAG is defined. An I-SID may bundle/aggregate many S-services and in such a case the original S-TAGs should be preserved in the backbone frame. This is a 'multiple tunneling architecture'. A B tunnel 'contains' 1 tunnels, each which contains 's' tunnels (of c-tags).

2. I don't really understand the benefit of this bundling. It is done any way at the edges. The only benefit that I can see is having a larger range of services. If this is really needed, could not it be taken into consideration when (already) defining the new I-TAG. The I-TAG could have been defined in an efficient way, allowing hierarchies to be defined.

(2) I think that it increases the potential number of (functional) flows that have to be supported, and the number of encapsulations that can be found. This complicates the implementations.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1. Please reconsider the definition of the I-TAG to include service bundling in efficient way.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 341  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <25.5>
PAGE: <120>
LINE: <45>
COMMENT START:

1. What is the applicable of such a scenario? What is the network scenario that is described? Can this be a real scenario that can happen?

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:

1. Please clarify

SUGGESTED CHANGES END
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 342 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <25.9.2>
PAGE: <126>
LINE: <4, 9>
COMMENT START:
<typo: 4: "too" instead of "to"; 9: ""moditored" instead of "monitor">
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please correct>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 343 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <25.9.2>
PAGE: <126>
LINE: <14>
COMMENT START:
>In clause 13.39, P. 70, L. 10, it is defined "without sending or receiving BPDUs across the connections", so how can BPDUs from the customer network be delivered over the LAN interface to the CIP?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify and explain the operation.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 344 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <25.9.2>
PAGE: <126>
LINE: <18>
COMMENT START:
>I think there is implicit requirement that there should be a physical connectivity between the L@ gateway ports in the other domain.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify and explain the operation.>

**Comment 345  Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <E>
CLAUSE: <25.9.3>
PAGE: <126>
LINE: <33, 34>
COMMENT START:
<typo: 30: "too" instead of "to"; 34: "moditored" instead of "monitor">
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please correct>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

**Comment 346  Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <26.1>
PAGE: <131>
LINE: <4>
COMMENT START:
<which resources are considered (vids?), etc.)
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please specify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

**Comment 347  Nurit Sprecher**

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <ER>
CLAUSE: <26.2>
PAGE: <131>
LINE: <24>
COMMENT START:
<what is the definition of a fully connected network – that there is a path between each
dge nodes at the network?)
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please define>
Comment 348 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher  
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>  
CLAUSE: <26.2>  
PAGE: <133>  
LINE: <36>  
COMMENT START:  
<Referring to unknown B-MAC address, how can the encapsulated frames use a unicast address? Unknown frames should be flooded isn't it?>  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
>Please specify >  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 349 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher  
COMMENT TYPE: <E>  
CLAUSE: <26.2>  
PAGE: <133>  
LINE: <45>  
COMMENT START:  
<Typo: "may us" should be "may use">  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
>Please correct >  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 350 Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher  
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>  
CLAUSE: <26.6.1>  
PAGE: <135>  
LINE: <27>  
COMMENT START:  
<From a network point of view this is pretty complicated to handle and manage hierarchical PBBNs. How can the edges be coordinated and how can we ensure that frame is ultimately handled correctly? It is basically a matter of the right network configuration,
but it pretty hard to handle. Especially when talking about 5 level of PBBN hierarchies......in addition, by supporting multiple hierarchies, there is no clear definition any more, to which layer the frame belong....)

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<We need to restrict the use in hierarchies.....>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 351  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <26.6.2>
PAGE: <135>
LINE: <39>
COMMENT START:
< In which table this information reside? A reference is missing..> 
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please add a reference>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 352  Nurit Sprecher

NAME: Nurit Sprecher
COMMENT TYPE: <TR >
CLAUSE: <26.6.2>
PAGE: <135>
LINE: <45>
COMMENT START:
<Is the B-BEB to B-BE interface considered peer PBBNs? If yes, there are B-TAGs over the E-NNI. 
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Please clarify>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END

Comment 353  Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 6.8 bullet c)
PAGE: 32
LINE: 47-48
COMMENT START:
1-1 S-tagged service IF removes S-TAG, so Provider Instance Port never receives VLAN tagged nor Priority tagged frames.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
(Option 1) Change as following:
  1) Admit Only VLAN-tagged frames used for bundled S-tagged interface;
  2) Admit Only Untagged frames used for 1-1 S-tagged interfaces;
(Option 2) Otherwise, change Clause 25.4, pp.118, ll.22-25 as following:
    This interface variation maps each S-VID of the 802.1ad interface to a single I-SID for use over the PBBN and "can remove" the S-TAG from the frame on ingress to the PBBN and regenerates an S-TAG on egress from the PBBN. (removes -> can remove)
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 353

Propose ?: I guess the commentor wants an option to retain S-TAG when doing 1-1 mapping interface.

Comment 354  Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 6.8.2
PAGE: 34
LINE: 26
COMMENT START:
Scope of "provisioned default destination address" is unclear. It may be per-Virtual Instance Port, per-Provider Instance Port, or per-I-componet value. Obviously, this impacts on table organization.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 354

Propose accept: The scope is per Provider Instance Port. The editor will clarify this.

Comment 355  Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE:TR
CLAUSE: 6.8.2  
PAGE: 34  
LINE: 26  
COMMENT START:  
Provisioned default destination address in I-component is redundant with default backbone  
MAC address of service instance table in B-component. We don't need two address trans-  
lation processes for the same purposes.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Remove default destination address from I-component. (Also from Clause 25.3 pp.116,  
ll.50). Otherwise, difference between them should be clarified.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Comment 356  Muneyoshi Suzuki  

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki  
COMMENT TYPE:TR  
CLAUSE: 25.4  
PAGE: 116  
LINE: 28  
COMMENT START:  
(1) Bundling S-tagged IF requires that both edges of the PBBN must agree to use the same  
S-VID values. That is, ad islands interconnected with bundling S-tagged IFs must use the  
same S-VID spaces. This is completely unrealistic scenario, because if such configuration  
is feasible, we can also interconnect ad islands directly, so ah PBBN is not necessary. That  
is, bundling S-tagged IF does not practically make sense.  
(2) Bundling S-tagged IF maps multiple S-VIDs to a single I-SID, so whose  
capability is inferior to 1-1 S-tagged IF. For example, customers can designate multicast  
traffic with C-VID value, C-tagged service IF of 802.1ad Bridge maps the C-VID to a S-  
VID, then 1-1 S-tagged IF of I-component maps the S-VID to an I-SID and B-component  
maps the I-SID to a B-DA, so Backbone core Bridges can prune C-VID based customer-  
multicast traffic. However, Bundling S-tagged IF maps multiple S-VIDs to a single I-SID,  
so it can't provide this capability.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Bundling S-tagged IF increases implementation complex but it does not practically make  
sense and it is inferior to 1-1 S-tagged IF, so remove Bundling S-tagged IF from 802.1ah.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

Comment 357  Muneyoshi Suzuki  

NAME: Muneyoshi Suzuki  
COMMENT TYPE:ER  
CLAUSE: 6.9  
PAGE: 35
To align with Figures 25-3, 25-4, 25-6, 25-7, 25-8, and 25-9, Provider Backbone/Instance Ports should be left side and Customer Backbone/Instance Ports should be right side.

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Flip the Figure left side to right.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 358  Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME:  Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE:  25.4
PAGE:  118
LINE:  19
COMMENT START:
... described in IEEE 802.1ad clause
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
... described in IEEE 802.1ad clauses
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 359  Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME:  Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE:  25.4
PAGE:  119
LINE:  Figure 25-5
COMMENT START:
To align with Figures 25-3, 25-4, 25-6, 25-7, 25-8, and 25-9, Provider Backbone/Instance Ports should be left side and Customer Backbone/Instance Ports should be right side.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Flip the Figure left side to right.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 360  Muneyoshi Suzuki

NAME:  Muneyoshi Suzuki
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE:  many
PAGE:  many
LINE: many
COMMENT START:
Too many ISID
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace to "I-SID"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 361  Bert Wijnen

NAME:          Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:        9.8
PAGE:          54
LINE:          21-25
COMMENT START:
- Mix-up of "res1" and "res2" in description of reserved fields.
- Further I think that both fields are to be ignored receipt, not matter what the value is, no?
The res2 field seems to say that the frame is discarded if one/two/any bit is set on receipt.
But how would they be set if they are always zero on transmit? Is it not better to just "ignore" the field on receipt?

Current text states:

c) res1 - This 2 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res2 field is zero on transmit and is ignored on receipt.
d) res2 - This 2 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res1 field is zero on transmit and if set on reception the frame is discarded.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change text as follows:

  c) res1 - This 1 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res1 field is zero on transmit and is ignored on receipt.
  d) res2 - This 1 bit field is used for any future format variations. The res2 field is zero on transmit and is ignored on receipt.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 362  Bert Wijnen

NAME:          Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:        17
PAGE:          73 and following
LINE:          various
COMMENT START:
I'd like to propose that we use proper language. There is ONE MIB, which is composed of one or more MIB modules. So the CFM-MIB is in fact a MIB module. So is the MIB module in this document. So pls change "MIB" into "MIB Module" at all places where you indeed speak of a part of the whole MIB, namely a MIB module.

For example:
17.2 Structure of the MIB
17.3 Relationship to other MIBs

Note that a MIB module name like "BRIDGE-MIB" are fine when it refers to the name of the MIB module.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Example would become:
17.2 Structure of the MIB Module
17.3 Relationship to other MIB Modules

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 363    Bert Wijnen

NAME:          Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE:  E
CLAUSE:        17.3
PAGE:          74
LINE:          26-32
COMMENT START:
When I read the following:
A system implementing the 802.1Q MIB shall also implement (at least) the "interfaces" group defined in RFC 2863.

    The "interfaces" group defines a portion of the Management Information Base (MIB) for use with network management protocols in the Internet community. In particular, it describes managed objects used for managing Network Interfaces.

Then I always wonder: what exactly needs to be implemented? The document (RFC2863) as a whole speaks of "The Interfaces Group MIB". But there is no "group" (i.e. an OBJECT-GROUP, or even another "group concept") that I can thinks of as "The Interfaces Group". Do you mean all tables in the IF_MIB? Or only some tables?

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Clarify which tables of the IF-MIB must be implemented. If you mean the whole IF_MIB module, then it might be best to state that the system must implement the IF-MIB to be compliant with ifCompliance3 as defined in the IF-MIB module (page 55 in RFC2863).

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 364  Bert Wijnen**

NAME:          Bert Wijnen  
COMMENT TYPE:  E  
CLAUSE:        17.4  
PAGE:          75  
LINE:          18  
COMMENT START: 
Proper spelling for IPsec is "IPsec" and not "IPSec"  
COMMENT END: 
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
change IPSec" into "IPsec".  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Comment 365  Bert Wijnen**

NAME:          Bert Wijnen  
COMMENT TYPE:  TR  
CLAUSE:        17.6  
PAGE:          76-112  
LINE:          all  
COMMENT START: 
The MIB module (I reviewed the ASCII version posted by Paul at http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ah.html):  
- has SYNTAX errors, as reported to this mailinglist/exploder both smilint and smicng reported errors  
- has incorrect REFERENCE clauses, so it is difficult or impossible to check/lookup background info,  
- is missing a lot of DESCRIPTION clauses,  
- is missing MODULE-COMPLIANCE section  
- has a lot of other issues/questions as reported below  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Make changes as required. I have volunteered to help.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:  

**Comment 366  Bert Wijnen**

NAME:          Bert Wijnen
COMMENT TYPE:  TR
CLAUSE:    17.6               
PAGE:      76-112              
LINE:      all                 
COMMENT START:
We should consider if this MIB module should completely replace/obsolete the Q-
BRIDGE-MIB in RFC4363. It has so many things in common that it otherwise seems
complete duplication.

I wonder if we can assign special componentID 1 if there is only 1 component on a bridge
(i.e. if the bridge is at the Q-BRIDGE-MIB level).

Depending on the outcome of this discussion our review of the MIB module will be dif-
ferent.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Discuss and decide.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 367  Ludwig Winkel

NAME: Ludwig Winkel
COMMENT TYPE: < E >               
CLAUSE: <5.71 >                 
PAGE: <23>                    
LINE: <52 >                  
COMMENT START:
<The maximum number of services should be 4094 >
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
<Correct to 4094>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 368  Ludwig Winkel

NAME: Ludwig Winkel
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>             
CLAUSE: <6.4.1 >               
PAGE: <28>                    
LINE: <26>                    
COMMENT START:
<The definition of the service_access_point_identifier and the connection_identifier is
missing. The use of the service_access_point_identifier is not clear. What is the different
between this and the port-id?>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please clarify and add references. >
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 369  Ludwig Winkel

NAME: Ludwig Winkel
COMMENT TYPE: <TR>
CLAUSE: <17>
PAGE: <73>
LINE: <3>
COMMENT START:
<the managed objects described in clause 12 are not described by the MIBs. A referance
model could help to understand which managed objects are deifned for what purposes and
what is the relationship between this objects.>
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
>Please add MIB tables for al l managed objects defined in clause 12. Please define the
architecture/referance model for the managed objects.>
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Comment 370  Delei Yu

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE:  1.1 bullet ag)
PAGE:  16
LINE:  11
COMMENT START:
According this line and clause 6.7, an 802.1 reader may regard port-based interface and
transparent interface as the same. And on the customer-faced side, I Component com-
pletely uses S-VLAN Component to provide customer interface just as 802.1ad. But
according to clause 25.3 of 802.1ah and clause 15.3 of 802.1ad, there are still some differ-
ences between port-based interface and transparent interface. An 802.1ad port-based inter-
face has to be configured with Admit Only Untagged frames, only 802.1d/q frames are
accepted. An 802.1ah transparent interface has to be configured with Admit All frames,
802.1d/q/ad frames are accepted. I believe the problem is very clear and easy to solve, but
I don't know why so many comments on it£¬ from D1.52 to D2.2, I believe there have
been more than 10 related comments.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
This is a basic concept issu e. I suggest to separate S-VLAN Component from I Compo-
nent, named the left I' Component, to provide transparent to 802.1d/q/ad.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Comment 371  Delei Yu**

NAME:  Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE:  3 and 4
PAGE:  17-21
LINE:  
COMMENT START:
There is no definition about "I" of "I Component". Instance? Or interworking?
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please clearly define it.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 372  Delei Yu**

NAME:  Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE:  6.8.1
PAGE:  33
LINE:  14
COMMENT START:
From D2.0, defines a Backbone MAC Address not has to be on each PIP, and an I Component B-MAC Address could be defined. But in this line, the text is unclear. What does the "the" of "the Backbone MAC address" point to? I believe each PIP has to be ASSOCIATED with a B-MAC Address (this Address may be one of I Component's B-MAC Address). And if goes far, an EISS may be associated with a B-MAC Address, too.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Something like:
"the Backbone MAC Address" -> "the Backbone MAC Address associated with this EISS". Use the word "associated".
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 373  Delei Yu**

NAME:  Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE:  6.9.4
PAGE:  38
LINE:  25
COMMENT START:
B Component Customer Network Port has been defined only connect to I Component Provider Instance Port, so it's impossible for Customer Backbone Port to receive a frame without an I-TAG.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Remove this sentence.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 374 Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:E
CLAUSE: 12.15
PAGE: 58
LINE: 20

COMMENT START:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
"IB-BCB"->"IB-BEB"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 375 Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 12.15.3.3 - 12.15.3.4
PAGE: 63
LINE: 11-47

COMMENT START:
Not clear with VIP mapping table, which is not defined anywhere in the draft. According 12.15.3.3, Is the entry is a mapping between Service ID on PIP and Service ID on CBP? And the index is Component Number + Portlet Number? If so, in 12.15.3.4, the inputs of configuration are not complete.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Please clarify this.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Comment 376 Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE:T
CLAUSE: 12.15.5
PAGE: 68-69
LINE: All the clause

COMMENT START:
The Service Entry can't be operated independently. Ports VLAN and PIP/VIP configuration will basically determine the profile of the Service Entry. Whether a Service bundled or not really dependents on the member set of VLANs and PVID value of a VIP.
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
For "configuration read, 12.15.5.2", keep it untouched. For "configuration set, 12.15.5.3", only Service Name can be configured, remove the other items.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 377  Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25.3
PAGE: 116
LINE: 45

**COMMENT START:**
Supporting Transparent Service Interface does not require SINGLE VIP on the PIP. Several VIPs may be supported on the PIP. Every service instance may associate a Destination B-MAC Address. But we have to keep one-to-one mapping between VIP and CIP.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**
Please consider what I said above.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 378  Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 25.4
PAGE: 120
LINE: 27-30

**COMMENT START:**
It's not to place an 802.1ad bridge in front of the 802.1ah bridge to support a C-Tagged interface, but place a C-VLAN component into an 802.1ah bridge in front of I component.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**
Please consider what I said above.

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

**Comment 379  Delei Yu**

NAME: Delei Yu
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 25.9.2
PAGE: 126
LINE: 4

**COMMENT START:**
First word "too" -> "to".

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**