Subclause 8.6.5.1 states that "Support of PSFP requires implementation of the Stream identification function specified in Clause 6 of IEEE P802.1CB". The stream identification does not need to be bound to a specific reception port so regarding that there is no need to have a stream filter instance, stream gate instance and flow meter instance tables per a (reception) port - rather tables that are just associated with the stream identification function.

Furthermore, the same stream can be received through multiple reception ports (e.g., in a case of CB). Replicating the same information in multiple tables per port in a case of streams increases the size of data structures and poses unnecessary limits on the instance table entry numbers per port. Note that observation/counters can still be done on per port per stream basis.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the notions throughout the document that state these three tables are per port. For example in subclause 8.6.5.1.1 first paragraph would become:

"The Stream Filter Instance table consists of an ordered list of stream filters that determine the filtering and policing actions that are to be applied to frames received on a specific stream. Each stream filter contains the following elements:"
The text describing the in Qci subclause 8.6.5.1.3 with the note "NOTE--Envelope and Rank, as defined in MEF 10.3, are not used by this standard." effectively makes the MEF 10.3 algorithm the same as MEF 10.2 subclause 7.11.1 algorithm. The MEF 10.3 subclause 12.2 & Figure 28 algorithm description without Envelopes and Ranks is "equivalent" to MEF 10.2 algorithm. Both of these algorithm descriptions do not need or use CIRmax and/or EIRmax to function correctly. Parameters CIRmax and EIRmax are only needed when sharing (Envelopes and Ranks) are in use, which is not the case in Qci. There is also no reason to repeat parameters whose function/semantic is no different to what is described in MEF specifications.

Suggested Remedy

1) Remove all instances of CIRmax and EIRmax from the specification, since they serve no purpose and rather add confusion. This would affect subclauses: 8.6.5.1.3 (page 8), 12.31.4 (page 17), 17.2.24 (pages 20, 22), 17.4.24 (pages 41, 42, 47).
2) Move the note "NOTE--Envelope and Rank, as defined in MEF 10.3, are not used by this standard." into the introduction of subclause 8.6.5.1.3 where a reference to MEF 10.3 is mentioned.
3) Point out that the algorithm described in Qci is actually MEF 10.3 Bandwidth Profile without sharing as described in MEF 10.3 subclause 12.2.
4) Remove h) Coupling Flag (CF)
5) Remove d) CBS and g) EBS clarifications since MEF 10.3 already defines those as bytes/octets.

Response

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Implement 1) through 3) only. Change the NOTE as follows: "NOTE--Envelope and Rank, as defined in MEF 10.3, are not used for PSFP. I.e., PSFP uses the reduced functionality algorithm described in MEF 10.3 subclause 12.2."