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Copyright © 2006 IEEE. All rights reserved.
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1. Ballot summary

The first 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 Status column indicates the voting status of the responder. V(oting) indicates 802.1 voting member at the start of the ballot period. N(on-voting) indicates a comment only response. L(iaison) indicates a voting liaison response. 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. The results of the ballot can be seen in the second table.

<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>Mike Borza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Paul Botoniff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Dircceu Cavendish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Frank Chao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Paul Congdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Anjan de Heer</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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Craig Easley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ansh Elangovan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Hesham Elbakour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>David Elie-Dit-Cosaque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Don Fedyk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Norm Finn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>David Frattura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Anoop Ghanwani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Ken Grewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Steve Haddock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Takashi Hasegawa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ran Ish-Shalom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Tony Jeffree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Michael Johas Teener</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Hal Keen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Yongbum Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Loren Larsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Yannick Le Goff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>David Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>John Messenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Dinesh Mohan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Bob Moskowitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Don O’Connor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Glenn Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Ken Patton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Ray Oli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Karen Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Allyn Romanow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Dan Romascanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Jassy Y Rouyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sajid Sajassi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Panagiotis Saltisidis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Sam Sambasivan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>John Sauer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Mick Seaman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Koichiro Seto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Curtis Simonson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Muneyoshi Suzuki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Yoshio Suzuki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Francois Tallet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Geoff Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>t</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>e</td>
<td>Karl Weber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Ludwig Winkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Michael D. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Voters</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters responding</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Ballot Comments

Comment 1  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: general
PAGE: 1
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
The current structure of the standard does not reflect the necessary changes to ensure the
manageability of the MRP capable Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks. The changes
mentioned in Clause 12, VLAN Bridge Management will lead to changes in the Bridge
MIB modules replacing the current SMIPv2 MIB interfaces still describing GVRP and
GMRP, and possibly adding a MRP station MIB module. The MIB management interface
needs to be synchronized with the changes introduced by this standard
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Add the clauses or changes to existing clauses in 802.1Q which will define the necessary
changes to allow the manageability of MRP capable bridges and end stations. In the inter-
mediate define at least the place-holders in a editorial note.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 1

See 3.1 “MIB” on page 28.

Comment 2  Dan Romascanu

NAME: Dan Romascanu
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.15.2.3
PAGE: 83
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
The text mentions the possibility of deleting the Permanent Database entry for forwarding
filtering without the option of defining another Permanent Database entry instead. As I
understand there always exists a Permanent Database entry for any instance
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace 'This Permanent Database entry may be deleted or updated...' by 'This Permanent
Database entry may be written initially and updated...'
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
**Disposition of Comment 2**

Reject - the text does indeed mean what it says. Permanent database entries are not necessarily “permanent” in the sense that they cannot be deleted. The distinction is more accurately static vs dynamic.

**Comment 3  Dan Romascanu**

NAME: Dan Romascanu  
COMMENT TYPE: TR  
CLAUSE: 12  
PAGE: 92  
LINE: 1  
COMMENT START:  
Although a note in 12.2 mentions the need to mark the objects that need to be persistent across re-boots and similar events, no such marking is defined yet for any objects in Clause 12  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Insert 'Persistent' marking for management objects wherever relevant  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 3**

Accept.

**Comment 4  Tony Jeffree**

NAME: Tony Jeffree  
COMMENT TYPE: E  
CLAUSE: A  
PAGE:  
LINE:  
COMMENT START:  
As indicated in the Editor's Note suggests, I will provide a re-structured PICS proforma for MRP along with text for an end station PICS proforma in the next draft.  
COMMENT END:  
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:  
Delete the Ed's Note and re-structure as suggested.  
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 4

Accept.

Comment 5  Norm Finn

NAME: Norman Finn
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 6.12.1
PAGE: 24
LINE: 44
COMMENT START:
There is a nice section (6.12.1) that describes the purpose of MAC address filtering, in
general. MMRP is clearly covered by this purpose statement. I can find no corresponding
purpose subclause justifying VLAN filtering and MVRP.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Sprinkle some references to filtering VIDs in 6.12, e.g. add point c) to 6.12.1.2:
c) In Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks, reducing the extent of frames on specific
VLANs, but not filtered by MAC address, to those parts of the network that contain end-
stations that are legitimate recipients of that traffic.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 5

Accept.

Comment 6  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.4.1
PAGE: 21
LINE: 15
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(IEEE Std 802.1D-2004 Clause 6.6.5)" to "(6.12.5)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 6

Accept.

Comment 7  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.4.1.3
PAGE: 21
LINE: 22
COMMENT START:
Including the MVRP operation in a subclause on VLAN-aware options is confusing as
MVRP is a required functionality.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Move subclause 5.4.1.3 out of the 5.4.1 and into 5.4 on the VLAN-aware bridge compo-
nents requirements.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 7

Accept in principle. Move it to a new 5.4.2 “MVRP Requirements”.

Comment 8  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.9
PAGE: 22
LINE: 20
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "10.5.7" to "10.5.9"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 8

Accept.
Comment 9  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.9
PAGE: 22
LINE: 20-22
COMMENT START:
This statement contradicts a later statement on lines 47-48 that only those end stations that require the ability to perform Source Pruning are recommended to conform to the operation of the Applicant state machine.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "...implement the Applicant state machine..." on line 21 to "...implement the Applicant Only state machine..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 9

Accept.

Comment 10  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.9.1
PAGE: 22
LINE: 52
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(10.6.4)" to "(10.5.8)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 10

Accept.

Comment 11  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
DISPOSITION OF BALLOT COMMENTS ON P802.1ak/D4.0:
VIRTUAL BRIDGED LOCAL AREA NETWORKS — AMENDMENT 07: MULTIPLE REGISTRATION PROTOCOL (MRP)
JANUARY 24, 2006

CLAUSE: 5.9.2
PAGE: 23
LINE: 19
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(12.7.1)" to "(10.6.1)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 11

Accept.

Comment 12  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 5.9.2
PAGE: 23
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(10.6.4)" to "(10.5.8)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 12

Accept.

Comment 13  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 8.13.10
PAGE: 36
LINE: 16 & 18
COMMENT START:
The bullets are wrong
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "c)" to "b)" and "d)" to "c)"

**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

## Disposition of Comment 13

### Accept.

### Comment 14 — Panagiotis Saltsidis

**NAME:** Panagiotis Saltsidis  
**COMMENT TYPE:** E  
**CLAUSE:** 10.1  
**PAGE:** 37  
**LINE:** 35 & 41  
**COMMENT START:**  
Wrong reference  
**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**  
Change "7.4" to "8.4" (twice)  
**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

## Disposition of Comment 14

### Accept.

### Comment 15 — Panagiotis Saltsidis

**NAME:** Panagiotis Saltsidis  
**COMMENT TYPE:** E  
**CLAUSE:** 10.1  
**PAGE:** 39  
**LINE:** 31  
**COMMENT START:**  
Wrong reference  
**COMMENT END:**

**SUGGESTED CHANGES START:**  
Change "(8.1.3.9)" to "(8.13.9)"  
**SUGGESTED CHANGES END:**

## Disposition of Comment 15

### Accept.
Comment 16  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.2.3
PAGE: 42
LINE: 45
COMMENT START:
The sentence is elusive
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Consider changing "...that any other Port has also registered..." to
"...that one other Port in the set has also registered..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 16

Accept.

Comment 17  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.4
PAGE: 43
LINE: 50
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "T o" to "To"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 17

Accept.

Comment 18  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.5.2
PAGE: 47
LINE: 31
COMMENT START:
The statement is elusive since the Null message has not been defined for the general case.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include the Null message type presentation in the general description of the previous page - possibly after point f)- and state that the Null is not necessary for correct protocol operation but only for a possible optimal encoding
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 18
Accept.

Comment 19 Panagiotis Saltsidis
NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.5.11
PAGE: 52
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
It is better to refer to the Table by number
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "The following table" to "Table 10-5"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 19
Accept.

Comment 20 Panagiotis Saltsidis
NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 10.6.1
PAGE: 57
LINE: 44-47
COMMENT START:
According to previous statements when a Leave or LeaveAll message is received, a state becomes Very anxious. The corresponding cells in the applicant state table are contradicting this statement for the p2p case.
COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Either update the state table to reflect previous statements on Leave message reception or include a note to explain why the p2p cases behave differently.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 20

Accept.

Comment 21  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.6.1
PAGE: 57
LINE: 46
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "rLm!" to "rLM!"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 21

Accept.

Comment 22  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.6.1
PAGE: 58
LINE: 5
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Q" to "QA"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 22

Accept.

Comment 23  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: Table 10-10
PAGE: 59
LINE: 23
COMMENT START:
The txLA! event affects the registrar state machine indirectly by giving rise to rLA! events.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase txLA! from the table
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 23

Discuss - I believe it is needed because the station sending does not itself receive LA from the message sent. See 3.2 “State machine issues” on page 28.

Comment 24  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: Table 10-11
PAGE: 59
LINE: 38 & 41
COMMENT START:
The transmit opportunities that cause the sLM or sLA actions are txLM! and txLA! respectively
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "tx! && p2p" to "txLM!" and "tx! && !p2p" to "txLA!"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 24

Discuss. I believe that the LA state table is correctly described. The txLA! and txLM! events refer only to the Applicant state table, and take account of whether sLA or sLM has been generated by the LA state table. See 3.2 “State machine issues” on page 28.

Comment 25  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.8.2.1
PAGE: 61
LINE: 29
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "transmitPDU!" to "tx!"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 25

Accept.

Comment 26  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 10.8.3.3
PAGE: 62
LINE: 9-14
COMMENT START:
How does MAD distinguishes if a new or a join event has occurred if the MAD Service User uses the same request primitive to initiate both of them?
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Explain how the reception of a MAD_Join.request service primitive indicates a New! and not a Join! Event.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 26

Discuss. See 3.3 “MAD” on page 28.
Comment 27  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.8.3.23 and 10.8.3.24
PAGE: 64
LINE: 47 and 52
COMMENT START:
The "combined Applicant/Registrar" state machine is not presented.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change the reference to combined Applicant/Registrar state machine to Applicant state machine and Registrar state machine.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 27

Accept.

Comment 28  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.9.1.2
PAGE: 69
LINE: 38
COMMENT START:
The values of New and Join for the AttributeEvent are superfluous as these are included in the CompactAttributeEvent values
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Erase the values New and Join. The total number of the remaining values is a consistent 7.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 28

Accept.

Comment 29  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.9.2.2
COMMENT START:
The term OrdinaryAttribute has not appeared before in the text and is not appearing again.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Consider erasing it.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 29

Accept.

Comment 30    Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.9.2.2
PAGE: 73
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "these" to "these"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 30

Accept.

Comment 31    Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 10.12
PAGE: 76
LINE: 41
COMMENT START:
The Group Registration Entries contain also the VID of the VLAN in which the dynamic filtering information was registered.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "...to indicate the Port(s) on which..." to "...to indicate the Port(s) and VID(s) of the VLAN(s) on which"

**Disposition of Comment 31**

Accept.

**Comment 32  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.13
PAGE: 77
LINE: 18-19
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "6.6.5 and 6.6.7 of IEEE Std 802.1D." to "6.12.5 and 6.12.7"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 32**

Accept.

**Comment 33  Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Figure 10-1
PAGE: 78
LINE:
COMMENT START:
Wrong figure index
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "Figure 10-1" to "Figure 10-8"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 33**

Accept.
Comment 34  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.14
PAGE: 79
LINE: 39
COMMENT START:
  Typo
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  Change "...(Either..." to "...(either..."
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 34

Accept.

Comment 35  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: Figure 10-2
PAGE: 80
LINE:
COMMENT START:
  Wrong figure index
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
  Change "Figure 10-2" to "Figure 10-9"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 35

Accept.

Comment 36  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.15.2.1
PAGE: 82
LINE: 36
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "IEEE Std 802.1D 6.6.7.1" to "6.12.7.1"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 36

Accept.

Comment 37  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 10.15.2.1
PAGE: 82
LINE: 39
COMMENT START:
There are two different Group Attribute Types and no such information is signalled by the
REGISTER_GROUP_MEMBER. The MMRP participant has to choose one of them
when it issues a MAD_Join.request
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Give a Note explaining how the MMRP participant decides which Group Attribute Type is
carried by the MAD_Join.request. The same applies also to what follows the receipt of a
DEREGISTER_GROUP_MEMBER service primitive.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 37

Accept.

Comment 38  Panagiotis Saltsidis

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 10.15.2.2
PAGE: 83
LINE: 9-13
COMMENT START:
The Group registration Entry includes also the corresponding VID number
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Include a reference to the VID number by noting that there is one MMRP Participant per
VLAN.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 38**

Accept.

**Comment 39 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 10.15.2.3
PAGE: 83
LINE: 54
COMMENT START:
Wrong reference
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change "(10.7)" to "(10.7.2)"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 39**

Accept.

**Comment 40 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 11.2.3.2 & 11.2.3.3
PAGE: 89
LINE: 39 & 44
COMMENT START:
The subclause structure is wrong. The MVRP application EtherType and MVRP Protocol-
Version should be at the same subclause level as the MVRP application address and
MVRP AttributeType Definitions.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Decrease the subclause level of the 11.2.3.2 and 11.2.3.3 subclauses. As a consequence
Change "11.2.3.2 MVRP application EtherType" to "11.2.3.1.4 MVRP application Ether-
Type"
Change "11.2.3.3 MVRP ProtocolVersion" to "11.2.3.1.5 MVRP ProtocolVersion"

Keep the subclause level of the remaining subclauses. (as a result 11.2.3.3.1 would be
11.2.3.1.6 and so on)

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 40**

Accept.

**Comment 41 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 11.2.3.4.1
PAGE: 90
LINE: 21

COMMENT START:
There are two different VID vector Attribute Types and no such information is signalled by the ES_REGISTER_VLAN_MEMBER. The MVRP participant has to choose one of them when it issues a MAD_Join.request

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Give a Note explaining how the MVRP participant decides which VID vector Attribute Type is carried by the MAD_Join.request. The same applies also to what follows the receipt of a ES_DEREGISTER_VLAN_MEMBER service primitive.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

**Disposition of Comment 41**

Accept.

**Comment 42 Panagiotis Saltsidis**

NAME: Panagiotis Saltsidis
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: 11.2.3.4.2
PAGE: 90
LINE: 47

COMMENT START:
The description on what happens on receipt of a MAD_Leave.indication is missing

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Provide such description for consistency
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 42

Accept.

Comment 43  Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T (Technical
CLAUSE: 10.5.1
PAGE: 44
LINE: 46
COMMENT START:
Loss larger than 1 message may happen in networks as a result of buffer overload. The
protocol should behave stability even if multiple frames are lost. In addition it is desirable
to support both confirmed and unconfirmed registration services. Unconfirmed services
are acceptable where the application can recover from a registration failure other services
will require guarantees from the registration services.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
The protocol should either assure consistency of periodic state updates which will eventu-
ally propagate all registrations or offer a confirmed service.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 43

Discuss. See 3.4 “Reliability” on page 28.

Comment 44  Paul Bottorff

NAME: Paul Bottorff
COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 10.10.2
PAGE: 75
LINE: 24
COMMENT START:
The join timer setting greatly affects the convergence time. For rapid convergence it
should be possible to set the join timer to a value of 1 centisecond which will require a
timer granularity of 1 centisecond or less.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Change to indicate a 1 centisecond granularity for the JoinTime. Leaving the LeaveTime and LeaveAllTime at 5 centiseconds is acceptable.

SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 44

Discuss. See 3.5 “Legacy issues” on page 28.

Comment 45  Paul Congdon

NAME: Paul Congdon
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 5.9
PAGE: 22
LINE: 16
COMMENT START:
The resolution of D3.0 comments indicated that a PICs would be developed for end-sta-
tions. I have noted in the comment that a PICs is under development, so this comment is just a reminder
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Insert end-station PICs per previous discussion and per proposal in other ballot comment.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 45

Accept.

Comment 46  Paul Congdon

NAME: Paul Congdon
COMMENT TYPE: E
CLAUSE: A.19
PAGE: 103
LINE: 30
COMMENT START:
A couple more MRP PDUs that need to be changed to MRPDUs.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Keep things consistent
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 46

Accept.

Comment 47  Jessy V Rouyer

NAME: Jessy V Rouyer
COMMENT TYPE: ER
CLAUSE: 10.6
PAGE: 53
LINE: 41-45
COMMENT START:
"New In", "New Empty", "Join In", "Join Empty" are not defined
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
Replace with defined terms "NewIn", "NewEmpty", "JoinIn", "JoinEmpty"
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:

Disposition of Comment 47

Accept.

Comment 48  Glenn Parsons

NAME: Glenn Parsons
COMMENT TYPE: TR
CLAUSE: 12
PAGE: 92
LINE: 1
COMMENT START:
Does 802.1ak come before 802.1ap? That is will .1ak define its own MIB amendment? Will .1ap define a MIB that includes GARP, GMRP & GVRP, or MRP? The current text which is a simple replacement of old terms with new terms does not given any indication of the direction. Since there are a lot of details that will be impacted in the MIB with the change to MRP, these should be delineated in this clause and covered by this project.
COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES START:
.1ak should propose its own MIB amendment, this should be added to this clause (or as appropriate in coordination with .1ap, perhaps clause 17?). .1ap should focus on MIBs for .1Q-2005 & .1ad-2005.
SUGGESTED CHANGES END:
Disposition of Comment 48

Discuss. See 3.1 “MIB” on page 28.
3. Issues

3.1 MIB

Fix the Bridge MIB for MRP changes
Comment 1 Dan Romascanu on page 5
Comment 48 Glenn Parsons on page 26
The changes to the Q MIB will be made as part of the P802.1ap project.

3.2 State machine issues

txLA! not needed in the Registrar machine
Comment 23 Panagiotis Saltsidis on page 15
Reject. This is needed in order to ensure that the sender re-registers the attributes that it is interested in.

tx! incorrect in LA state machine
Comment 24 Panagiotis Saltsidis on page 15
Add a note to the definition of tx! that explains the fact that the tx! gets modified by LA or LM by the LA state machine.

3.3 MAD

How does MAD distinguish if a new or a join event has occurred
Comment 26 Panagiotis Saltsidis on page 16
Need to add a New primitive for request and indication.

3.4 Reliability

Loss larger than 1 message may happen in networks as a result of buffer overload.
Comment 43 Paul Bottorff on page 24
We should include an acknowledgment mechanism for the P2P case. To be processed offline.
Note: need to fix wording of the encoding of event values.

3.5 Legacy issues

It should be possible to set the join timer to a value of 1 centisecond.
Comment 44 Paul Bottorff on page 24
In the P2P case the jointimer should not apply. Make sure the text reflects this.