



Topology/Protection Comment Resolution Summary

Jason Fan, Section Editor (jason@luminous.com)

Jim Kao, Technical Editor (jkao@cisco.com)

802-17





Topology – Clause 10

- 26 comments
 - 20 technical (1 punted from Clause 6)
 - 6 editorial
- Adhoc group resolution (technicals)
 - 2 accepted/clarified
 - 7 accepted/modified
 - 3 accepted/duplicate
 - 4 superceded
 - 2 punted (Clause 6, Clause 9 punted back)
 - 2 deferred
- Editorial license requested





Summary of Resolutions

- 463, 475
 - Wrap capable bit added to protection message
 - Protection message to be used for discovery of station connectivity on ring; topology discovery message in D1.0 to be removed
 - Topology extended status message with flexible TLV fields to be added for reporting of non-time-critical station configuration information
- 461
 - Protection message will be generated on union of triggers for former topology discovery message and protection message





Summary of Resolutions cont.

- 466:
 - Former neighbor MAC information to be stored by local station so wait to restore time can be applied only upon link recovery when the neighbor station identity has not changed
- 215, 460, 462, 473, 480
 - Clarifications on:
 - SubclassA0 bandwidth
 - RPR header and control payload contents
 - Behavior when a station is looped back to itself
 - Meaning of jumbo frame capable





Summary of Punts and Deferrals

- 467: Punted to Clause 6
 - Topology frames with incorrect ringlet ID to be forwarded to control sublayer for detection of miscabling
- 478: Punted to Clause 9 and back
 - Add capability to send weight for each ringlet in topology extended status message (TLV)
- 477: Deferred
 - Topology bits for promiscuous mode proposal will be added if this proposal is accepted
- 484: Deferred
 - Additional review needed of DVJ's provisioning contribution





Topology Issues List for PAH

- Additional work on topology message triggers
- Additional work on documenting scenarios on interaction of topology and protection
- Additional work on topology state diagram
- Additional work on diagnostic support for determination of physical connectivity in multiple link failure scenarios
 - Known as control reachability in clause
- Specification of receive buffer requirements





Protection – Clause 11

- 51 comments
 - 27 technical
 - 24 editorial
- Adhoc group resolution (technicals)
 - 8 accepted
 - 2 accepted/clarified
 - 3 accepted/modified
 - 3 superceded
 - 3 rejected
 - 7 deferred to protection ad-hoc (PAH)
 - 1 punted to Clause 3
- Editorial license requested





Summary of Rejections

• 522

 For wrap due to a single link failure, wrapping station that did not detect a failure does not report WTR

• 3589

 The wrapping status code bit will be kept for diagnostic purposes as well as to ensure that there is no ambiguity elsewhere on the ring as to the wrapping status of a station

• 3595

 Steering and wrapping report link status independently of steering or wrapping actions that a station is taking





Summary of Resolutions

- 486
 - Text added back from editorial note describing TTL setting in protection scenarios, as not described in Clause 6
- 506, 507
 - Cleanup of steering state diagram
- 514, 517, 518, 520, 521
 - Cleanup of wrapping state diagram
- 3578
 - Bi-level periodic timer defined
- 3601
 - No wraps in steady state result from multiple signal degrades





Summary of Resolutions cont.

- 497, 499, 500
 - Clarifications on:
 - RPR header and control payload contents
 - Setting of wrap eligible bit and TTL for protection message
 - Incrementing of sequence number on change





Summary of Punts

- 500: Punted to Clause 3
 - Setting of reserved bits to defined values





Protection Issues List for PAH

- Additional work on scenarios to clarify protection behavior (491 – Def)
- Wrapping state diagram modification to address insertion of steering station into wrapping ring
- How uniform should steering and wrapping state diagrams be? (Def 513, Def 3596)
- How do non-revertive modes work for steering and wrapping? What are configuration options? (Def –504, Def 509, Def 510, Def 3594)
- How is variability of fairness advertisement interval handled as related to the loss of keep-alive trigger?