

# Comparison of current SRP and “simplified” SRP proposal

- Current SRP
  - Pros:
    - Optimized registration message propagation.
    - Allows use of a higher layer stream ID to initiate registration.
  - Cons:
    - Involves defining 2 protocols: a new MRP application for registration, and a new reservation protocol.
    - Optimisation achieved on the registration side is too trivial to justify the need to define and support a new MRP application.
    - Allowing the option of using higher layer stream IDs will inevitably increase the complexity of SRP in ways that are inappropriate to the L2 functionality that we are attempting to define.
- Simplified SRP
  - Pros:
    - Removes the need to define a new registration protocol.
    - Because both registration and reservation only understand L2 stream IDs (MAC addresses), the operation of the reservation protocol is simpler and doesn't involve potentially complex interactions with higher layer mechanisms.
    - Allows the support of streams with or without reservations in a seamless manner.
  - Cons:
    - Doesn't allow the use of higher layer stream IDs (but on the other hand, this simplifies the protocol).
    - Doesn't offer optimized registration message propagation; however, the real advantage that this would offer is minimal.
- Both schemes:
  - There should be no practical difference between these two proposals with regard to the impact on the forwarding path mechanisms defined in P802.1Qav.