

To: Members of the P802.1ag Sponsor Balloting Group
Copies to: Members of IEEE 802.1 Working Group.
From: Tony Jeffree, Working Group Chair
Subject: P802.1ag/D8.0 Sponsor Ballot
Date: Thursday, 22 March 2007

Colleagues-

This cover letter accompanies draft P802.1ag/D8.0, which is being issued for Sponsor ballot. The 802.1 Working Group ballot that preceded this recirculation closed with no outstanding Disapprove ballots, and a number of minor editorial and some technical comments that accompanied Approve ballots. The 802.1 working group has examined these comments; in the interests of progressing the work in a timely manner, the comments and the resolutions suggested by the working group will be submitted by the project editor as comments on the Sponsor ballot. The text of the technical comments and the working group's suggested dispositions are appended to this covering letter.

In Tables 21-1 and 21-2 on page 176 of draft D8, the value of the Ethertype used for the CFM protocol is represented as "XX-XX". This type value has now been assigned as 89-02; these tables will therefore be amended in the next draft to show the correct value and the Editor's note above Table 21-1 will be removed. Similarly, in Tables 8-9 and 8-10 on Page 18 of the draft, the range of 16 MAX addresses used by the CCM and Linktrace messages has now been assigned as 01-80-C2-00-00-30 through 01-80-C2-00-00-3F; the values currently shown as "01-80-C2-xx-xx-xy" in these tables will therefore be changed to "01-80-C2-00-00-3y" in the next draft.

Thank you very much for offering to take the time to review our document. We appreciate your valuable effort.

Sincerely,

Tony Jeffree, Chair, IEEE 802.1
Email: tony@jeffree.co.uk

3. Technical ballot comments on P802.1ag/D8

Comment 15 Bert Wijnen

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.5
PAGE: 86
LINE: 34
COMMENT START:
For:
dot1agCfmMepLbrBadMsdu OBJECT-TYPE
SYNTAX Counter32
MAX-ACCESS read-only
STATUS current
DESCRIPTION
"(optional) The total number of LBRs received whose
mac_service_data_unit did not match (except for the OpCode)
that of the corresponding LBM (20.2.3).
"
REFERENCE
"802.1ag clause 12.14.7.1.3:aa 20.2.3"
::= { dot1agCfmMepEntry 22 }

I think we should remove the "(optional)". I am not sure what it means here. Whether an object is optional or not is not supposed to be in the DESCRIPTION clause of an OBJECT-TYPE, but rather in the MODULE-COMPLIANCE statement. I do note that this object is currently included in the dot1agCfmMepGroup, and that group is listed as a MANDATORY-GROUP in the MODULE-COMPLIANCE. So the "(optional)" in the above DESCRIPTION clause conflicts with that.

COMMENT END:
SUGGESTED CHANGES:
Change line 34 on page 86 from
"(optional) The total number of LBRs received whose
into
"The total number of LBRs received whose
CHANGES END:

Disposition of comment 15

Accept in principle; Editor will submit this as a Sponsor Ballot comment, and also recommend that this comment be accepted at that time.

Proper resolution: Object becomes an optional object, not implemented if detection of the mismatch is not implemented.

Comment 16 Bert Wijnen

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.5
PAGE: 66
LINE: 22-41
For this object:
dot1agCfmDefaultMdDefIdPermission OBJECT-TYPE
SYNTAX Dot1agCfmIdPermission

```
1      MAX-ACCESS read-write
2      STATUS current
3      DESCRIPTION
4          "Enumerated value indicating what, if anything, is to be
5          included in the Sender ID TLV (21.5.3) transmitted by MHFs
6          created by the Default Maintenance Domain, for each
7          dot1agCfmDefaultMdEntry whose dot1agCfmDefaultMdIdPermission
8          object contains the value sendIdDefer. Since, in this
9          variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the
10         value sendIdDefer takes the meaning of sendIdChassisManage.
11         After this initialization, this object needs to be persistent
12         upon reboot or restart of a device.
13         "
14     REFERENCE
15         "802.1ag clause 12.14.3.1.3:e"
16     DEFVAL { sendIdNone }
17     ::= { dot1agCfmDefaultMd 3 }
18     it is probably better to just exclude sendIdDefer from the list of enumerations, so that is from the SYNTAX.
19     That way, the SYNTAX is in sync with the DESCRIPTION clause. At the same tim I would adjust the last
20     sentence in the DESCRIPTION that is s/this//
21     COMMENT END:
22     SUGGESTED CHANGES:
23     To fix it, replace lines 22-41 with:
24     dot1agCfmDefaultMdDefIdPermission OBJECT-TYPE
25     SYNTAX Dot1agCfmIdPermission {
26         sendIdNone (1),
27         sendIdChassis (2),
28         sendIdManage (3),
29         sendIdChassisManage (4)
30     }
31     MAX-ACCESS read-write
32     STATUS current
33     DESCRIPTION
34         "Enumerated value indicating what, if anything, is to be
35         included in the Sender ID TLV (21.5.3) transmitted by MHFs
36         created by the Default Maintenance Domain, for each
37         dot1agCfmDefaultMdEntry whose dot1agCfmDefaultMdIdPermission
38         object contains the value sendIdDefer. Since, in this
39         variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the
40         value sendIdDefer takes the meaning of sendIdChassisManage.
41         After initialization, this object needs to be persistent
42         upon reboot or restart of a device.
43         "
44     REFERENCE
45         "802.1ag clause 12.14.3.1.3:e"
46     DEFVAL { sendIdNone }
47     ::= { dot1agCfmDefaultMd 3 }
48     CHANGES END:
```

Disposition of comment 16

Accept in principle; Editor will submit this as a Sponsor Ballot comment, and also recommend that this comment be accepted at that time. The words, "takes the meaning of sendIdChassisManage" will be replaced by, "is not allowed" in the suggested changes for this comment.

Comment 17 Bert Wijnen

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.5
PAGE: 68
LINE: 29-45
COMMENT START:

For this object:

```
dot1agCfmDefaultMdDefMhfCreation OBJECT-TYPE
  SYNTAX Dot1agCfmMhfCreation
  MAX-ACCESS read-write
  STATUS current
  DESCRIPTION
    "A value indicating if the Management entity can create MHFs
    (MIP Half Function) for the VID, for each
    dot1agCfmDefaultMdEntry whose dot1agCfmDefaultMdMhfCreation
    object contains the value defMHFdefer. Since, in this
    variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the
    value defMHFdefer takes the meaning of defMHFnone.
    After this initialization, this object needs to be persistent
    upon reboot or restart of a device.
```

```
"
REFERENCE
  "802.1ag clause 12.14.3.1.3:d"
DEFVAL {defMHFnone}
 ::= { dot1agCfmDefaultMd 2 }
```

I would exclude the defMHFdefer label from the SYNTAX. At the same time I would remove "this" from the last sentence.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES:

replace lines 29-45 with:

```
dot1agCfmDefaultMdDefMhfCreation OBJECT-TYPE
  SYNTAX Dot1agCfmMhfCreation {
    defMHFnone (1),
    defMHFdefault (2),
    defMHFexplicit (3)
  }
  MAX-ACCESS read-write
  STATUS current
  DESCRIPTION
    "A value indicating if the Management entity can create MHFs
    (MIP Half Function) for the VID, for each
    dot1agCfmDefaultMdEntry whose dot1agCfmDefaultMdMhfCreation
    object contains the value defMHFdefer. Since, in this
    variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the
    value defMHFdefer is not allowed.
    After initialization, this object needs to be persistent
    upon reboot or restart of a device.
```

```
"
REFERENCE
  "802.1ag clause 12.14.3.1.3:d"
DEFVAL {defMHFnone}
 ::= { dot1agCfmDefaultMd 2 }
```

CHANGES END:

Disposition of comment 17

Accept in principle; Editor will submit this as a Sponsor Ballot comment, and also recommend that this comment be accepted at that time.

Comment 18 Bert Wijnen

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.5
PAGE: 73
LINE: 4-15

COMMENT START:

I think that here defMHFdefer also makes no sense:

```
dot1agCfmMdMhfCreation OBJECT-TYPE
```

```
SYNTAX Dot1agCfmMhfCreation
```

```
MAX-ACCESS read-create
```

```
STATUS current
```

```
DESCRIPTION
```

```
"Enumerated value indicating whether the management entity can  
create MHFs (MIP Half Function) for this Maintenance Domain.
```

```
"
```

```
REFERENCE
```

```
"802.1ag clause 12.14.5.1.3:c"
```

```
DEFVAL { defMHFnone }
```

```
::= { dot1agCfmMdEntry 5 }
```

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES:

replace lines 4-15 with:

```
dot1agCfmMdMhfCreation OBJECT-TYPE
```

```
SYNTAX Dot1agCfmMhfCreation {
```

```
    defMHFnone (1),
```

```
    defMHFdefault (2),
```

```
    defMHFexplicit (3)
```

```
}
```

```
MAX-ACCESS read-create
```

```
STATUS current
```

```
DESCRIPTION
```

```
"Enumerated value indicating whether the management entity can  
create MHFs (MIP Half Function) for this Maintenance Domain.
```

```
Since, in this variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance
```

```
Domain, the value defMHFdefer is not allowed.
```

```
"
```

```
REFERENCE
```

```
"802.1ag clause 12.14.5.1.3:c"
```

```
DEFVAL { defMHFnone }
```

```
::= { dot1agCfmMdEntry 5 }
```

CHANGES END:

Disposition of comment 18

Accept in principle; Editor will submit this as a Sponsor Ballot comment, and also recommend that this comment be accepted at that time.

Comment 19 Bert Wijnen

COMMENT TYPE: T
CLAUSE: 17.5
PAGE: 73
LINE: 17-31
COMMENT START:

For this object:

dot1agCfmMdMhfIdPermission OBJECT-TYPE

SYNTAX Dot1agCfmIdPermission
MAX-ACCESS read-create
STATUS current
DESCRIPTION

"Enumerated value indicating what, if anything, is to be included in the Sender ID TLV (21.5.3) transmitted by MPs configured in this Maintenance Domain. Since, in this variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the value sendIdDefer takes the meaning of sendIdChassisManage.
"

REFERENCE

"802.1ag clause 12.14.5.1.3:d"

DEFVAL { sendIdNone }
::= { dot1agCfmMdEntry 6 }

The last sentence of the DESCRIPTION clause is clear I think. However, thinking some more about it, it seems it would be clearer if the dis-allowed sendIdDefer and forced the NM station to be specific if it intends sendIdChassisManage. The easy (and also machine readable form) way of doing this would be:

dot1agCfmMdMhfIdPermission OBJECT-TYPE

SYNTAX Dot1agCfmIdPermission {
 sendIdNone (1),
 sendIdChassis (2),
 sendIdManage (3),
 sendIdChassisManage (4)
}

MAX-ACCESS read-create

STATUS current

DESCRIPTION

"Enumerated value indicating what, if anything, is to be included in the Sender ID TLV (21.5.3) transmitted by MPs configured in this Maintenance Domain. Since, in this variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the value sendIdDefer makes no sense and so is not allowed.
"

REFERENCE

"802.1ag clause 12.14.5.1.3:d"

DEFVAL { sendIdNone }
::= { dot1agCfmMdEntry 6 }

If needed, we could add another sentence to state that sendIdChassisManage is a betetr value in that case, but I personally would leave that out. But do not make the value sendIdDefer take two different meanings depending on the context.

COMMENT END:

SUGGESTED CHANGES:

replace lines 17-31 with:

dot1agCfmMdMhfIdPermission OBJECT-TYPE

SYNTAX Dot1agCfmIdPermission {

```
1         sendIdNone      (1),
2         sendIdChassis   (2),
3         sendIdManage    (3),
4         sendIdChassisManage (4)
5     }
6     MAX-ACCESS read-create
7     STATUS current
8     DESCRIPTION
9         "Enumerated value indicating what, if anything, is to be
10        included in the Sender ID TLV (21.5.3) transmitted by MPs
11        configured in this Maintenance Domain. Since, in this
12        variable, there is no encompassing Maintenance Domain, the
13        value sendIdDefer makes no sense and so is not allowed.
14        "
15     REFERENCE
16         "802.1ag clause 12.14.5.1.3:d"
17     DEFVAL { sendIdNone }
18     ::= { dot1agCfmMdEntry 6 }
19     CHANGES END:
```

Disposition of comment 19

Accept in principle; Editor will submit this as a Sponsor Ballot comment, and also recommend that this comment be accepted at that time.

Comment 20 **Glenn Parsons**

```
28     COMMENT TYPE:      T
29     CLAUSE:             17.5
30     PAGE:               61
31     LINE:               41
32     COMMENT START:
33     802.1ah has created a component ID and it has been decided that to simplify the MIBs that we would re-in-
34     dex the IEEE Q-BRIDGE-MIB, in 802.1ap, based on component ID. As a result, to avoid re-indexing (and
35     re-issuing) the CFM MIB (since it uses aspects of the Q-BRIDGE-MIB) shortly after it is approved, it would
36     make sense to make the appropriate re-indexing change in the CFM-MIB at this time.
37     COMMENT END:
38     SUGGESTED CHANGES:
39     Move the component identifier TC into the CFM MIB (IEEE8021PbbComponentIdentifier).
40     Prefix the indexing of all MIB tables (starting with dot1agCfmStackEntry) with the component identifier.
41     The editor is encouraged to study the validity of reindexing all the tables (i.e., reindexing a subset may be
42     appropriate).
43     CHANGES END:
```

Disposition of comment 20

Accept in principle; Editor will submit this as a Sponsor Ballot comment, and also recommend that this comment be accepted at that time. See "Technical Issue from Draft 7" on page 21.

4. Technical Issue from Draft 7

A comment from Glenn Parsons on Draft 7, repeated here as Comment 20 on page 20, has not been correctly addressed in subsequent drafts. The issue is the need expressed in IEEE P802.1ah Draft 3.3 Provider Backbone Bridges for a “Component ID” in the Bridge MIBs. This is required so that the various components of a Provider Backbone Bridge, each of them being an 802.1 Bridge, can be managed using the standard Bridge MIBs. Although this draft standard is not yet finished, it is the consensus of IEEE 802.1 that incorporating the Component ID into the 802.1ag MIB is preferable to revising that MIB in 802.1ah, because the latter standard is expected to be completed soon after 802.1ag.

Therefore, the Editor proposes to offer a Sponsor Ballot comment on P802.1ag to modify the MIB to incorporate a Component ID, so that CFM elements can be configured on the various components of a Provider Backbone Bridge.