

James Gilb's comments on P802.1Qbp draft PAR:

Section 5.2

"It is anticipated that a new Tag will be defined possibly including a Time to Live (TTL) field."

Delete this sentence as it will not look right in the published standard. Furthermore, this is an implementation detail, I think that the scope is sufficient without it.

Response from 802.1: This is an amendment; the Scope is the scope of the project, and not intended to be written into the standard. Therefore, the text is appropriate as it stands.

Section 5.3

My assumption is that 802.1aq is not broken without the addition of the new project, but rather the new project enhances the capabilities provided in 802.1aq and that 802.1aq has advanced through a significant part of the process.

If both these are true, then this subsection should include that information. If my assumption is not true, then it would be better to include this as part of the 802.1aq project.

Response from 802.1: Change the text to say: "This standard is dependent upon the completion of 802.1aq, Shortest Path Bridging (SPB), as ECMP is an extension of the capabilities of SPB. Including ECMP in the existing P802.1aq project would unnecessarily delay the completion of P802.1aq, which will soon be submitted for Sponsor ballot."

Section 5.4

Because the purpose will go into the draft unmodified, remove references to 802.1aq and simply reference the features of 802.1aq. For example, in the first sentence, change it to say "... equal cost paths than the Equal Cost Tree (ECT) mechanism ..."

Also do not use "would be used", rather say "This standard is used with the 802.1 control plane and uses specific ..."

Delete "This standard may ... the new Tag formats".

In the third paragraph, change to "Both ECT and ECMP can be used at the same time ..."

Response from 802.1: This is an amendment; the Purpose is the purpose of the project, and not intended to be written into the standard. Therefore, the text is appropriate as it stands.

John Rosdahl's comments on P802.1Qbp draft PAR:

802.1Qbp amendment for equal cost multiple paths (ECMP), PAR and 5C

5.2 Scope: "It is anticipate" is not present tense sentence. Please change sentence for present tense..

Response from 802.1: This is an amendment; the Scope is the scope of the project, and not intended to be written into the standard. Therefore, the text is appropriate as it stands. Actually "It is anticipated..." is present tense anyway.

2.1 Title: says Multiple path, but the Scope seems to say a single path. There was some confusion on whether the scope single path is not supposed to be a multi-path statement.

Response from 802.1: The scope indicates that a particular data flow will take a single path, from among multiple possible paths. Different data flows within the same service instance can take multiple paths. Add the following sentence at the end of the second para: "Frames belonging to other flows can take other paths."

5.2 Scope: We have difficulty in reading the following sentence: would this suggested change to the sentence be correct?

Suggested change to sentence: "The standard will ensure that Connectivity Fault Management (CFM) can be used to proactively monitor and diagnose the paths that data takes through the network." to "The standard defines Connectivity Fault Management (CFM) enhancements that can be used to..".

Response from 802.1: We will make the proposed change.

PAR: "802.1aq" : Check this number should it be 802.1Qaq? Seems typo in several places in the PAR.

Response from 802.1: The uses of "802.1aq" are not typos.

5.4 Purpose Statement: Present tense sentence rather than future vision of "proposed" or "envisioned" should be used.

Response from 802.1: This is an amendment; the Purpose is the purpose of the project, and not intended to be written into the standard. Therefore, the text is appropriate as it stands.

5.4 Proposed Change: " It is expected that both the current 802.1aq ECT and ECMP would be used at the same time in the same network ..." to "Both ECT and ECMP may be used at the same time in the same network.."

Response from 802.1: This is an amendment; the Purpose is the purpose of the project, and not intended to be written into the standard. Therefore, the text is appropriate as it stands.

Feature Creep in Scope/Purpose/[need.is](#) the last feature listed in each section the same thing? FCM vs OA&M

Response from 802.1: OA&M is a set of management functions; CFM provides this functionality in the context of 802.1Q.

8.1 add item number to descriptions.

Response from 802.1: There were no descriptions to add item numbers to.