The procedure described in D3.2 will not work, due to following reasons:
1) rMt! Is an event which is meaningless to MRP Registrar and will be ignored;
2) rLv! Will change Registrar state to LV and consequently will be changed to IN by origianl rJoinIn! or rJoinMt!, but this transition process will not lead to Lv action which issues MAD_Leave.indication and will not lead to Join action which issues MAD_Join.indication;
3) The peer MRP Applicant may send JoinIn and JoinMt for various reasons, such as by its own state machine, by rLv! or rLa!, or by periodic! or redecacle!;
4) For exactly same attribute, the procedure stated in 35.2.6 must be avoided. Otherwise state machine flip-flop or unnecessary network transaction will occur;

SuggestedRemedy
The proposed modification to the fist paragraph of section 35.2.6 is as follows:

If an MSRP message is received from a Port with an event value (35.2.6) specifying the JoinIn or JoinMt message, and if the StreamID (35.2.2.8.2), and Direction (35.2.1.2) all match those of an attribute already registered on that Port, and if either AttributeType (35.2.2.4), or MSPR FourPackedEvents (35.2.2.7.2) is different with that message, and if there are any other such discrepancies determined by specific implementation, then an Flush! event is generated for the MAD in the Received MSRP Attribute Declarations before the rJoinIn! or rJoinMt! event for attribute in the received message is processed.

DISCUSS.

The proposed Flush! State machine is as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush!</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to space limitation, the *1 is as below:

Stop leavetimer
Lv
MT

DISCUSS. This is really an MRP issue, but we have addressed other MRP issues (e.g. Table 10-5) within MSRP. This is definitely outside the scope of MSRP but could be addressed if agreed to by the WG.
The only valid values for Data Frame Priority are those associated with an SR class. Thus this value specifies the SR class of the stream. Note that if the ingress port remaps priorities into the SR priorities they must also be remapped here (before checking for the valid values).

Suggested Remedy
Add note to this effect.

Proposed Response
DISCUSS. What could be said here? SRP reserves by Priority Code Point (0-7) not SR Class (A,B).

We need to discuss your comment about remapping on ingress. Currently SR Class A & B are defaulted to 5 & 4 with no override capabilities defined at this time (FYI: during Interim MJT noted that we need to default to 3 & 2). Or, perhaps you are referring to the concept of the bridge that is joining two SRP domains that use different Traffic Classes for the same SR class?

Comment Type
TR
Comment Status
D

Supported protocols (e.g. MACSec) also affect perFrameOverhead.

Suggested Remedy
Add text to this effect.

Proposed Response
DISCUSS. Don Pannell suggested that we put the final formula from Qav Annex L here, then refer to Annex L (which is informative) for those who want to understand its derivation.

portTcMaxLatency seems to be a number that could be put on a data sheet. In reality a better (smaller) number can be calculated knowing the amount of bandwidth reserved for the described stream, both at the talker and at each bridge hop. Refer to av-fuller-queue-delay-calculation-0809-v02.pdf for a start at these calculations.

Suggested Remedy
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