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Things to consider…

- **Priority Group TLV:**

  End station suggesting Assignment of Priorities to Priority Groups to a bridge is problematic

  Endstation does not know bridge’s priority to traffic class mapping, therefore, it has insufficient information to prevent conflicting assignments

  **Use case for negotiating group assignment bridge to bridge or endstation to bridge needs to be better understood**

  May wish to consider restricting the “willingness” of this for be from bridges to end stations

  **May wish to enable a bi-directional asymmetric assignment of bandwidth**

  Need to close on percent issue (see az-pelissier-percentproblem-0209).
Things to consider…

- Application Priority TLV:
  
  It is not clear that there is a valid use case to negotiate this from end station to bridge or bridge to bridge

  Some work on this is being done offline

  If a use case is not found, we may wish to consider restricting the negotiation of this to be from a bridge to an endstation
Things to consider…

- In az-pelissier-dcbx-simplified-0209v2, the use of the willing bit is described in multiple TLVs.

  If, once we get through the other considerations, it turns out that willing remains in multiple TLVs, we should consider reorganizing the document to give a general description of the use of the willing bit, instead of repeating it each time.
Thank You!