

Responses to comments on the IEEE P802.1Qcn PAR and CSD

DCB Task Group

July 2015

802.3 comment

- Spelling error in a) “IETF NVO3 WG to fulfil this need.”
- Yes, we will make the correction.

802.11 PAR comments

- 2.1 – why the “3” in the acronym?
- 2.1 Is it “Network Virtualization Overlays (NVO3)” or “Network Virtualization over Layer 3” (NVO3) (See RFC7365)
- We will add “over Layer 3” – in the published RFCs that is the expansion, but in the Working Group title and some drafts that is omitted but it is better to match the RFCs.
- 2.1 “extension” should be capitalized in title.
- Will capitalize

802.11 PAR comments (cont.)

- Why define NV03 in the title and then redefine it in 5.2b (all caps) and then again in 5.5 (all lower case) ?
- We will expand just in the first use
- For 5.5. use: “between the virtualized end device (end station) and the external network virtualization edge (e.g. bridge or router) in an NVO3 network.”
- VDP seems to be defined in the Title and then used as VDP in the rest of the PAR...this is different from the definition and use of the other TLAs defined in the Title.
- We will make the other acronyms consistent with the way VDP is handled (only expand first use).

IEEE 802.11 CSD comments

- CSD:

- In Distinct Identity it says that there is nothing like this, then in Technical feasibility it says that there is something similar (802.1Qbg)?
- Nothing provides this capability for carrying the information needed by NVO3 networks (e.g. layer 3 context such as IPv4 or IPv6 addresses) so Distinct identity is correct.
- The VDP protocol defined initially in IEEE 802.1Qbg carries similar context for layer 2, so it demonstrates technical feasibility. This project extends the protocol to carry layer 3 information.

- Technical Feasibility: the response to “a)” is not clear. Should be reworded at best.
- a) There are existing implementations of VDP. VDP carries layer 2 context between an end station and a bridge. The technology used by the current VDP protocol will be reused by project to add layer 3 context to the information carried. There isn't a significant difference in the technical feasibility of carrying layer 2 context versus layer 3 context
- b) Mechanisms similar to what is being proposed exist in VDP and have been shown to be reasonably testable.

- *Economic Feasibility*
 - This seems to imply that this is a possible amendment to 802.1Qbg?
- 802.1Qbg was an amendment to IEEE 802.1Q. You can't amend amendments. You do an additional amendment to the base standard. However, IEEE 802.1Qbg was rolled into the latest revision of IEEE 802.1Q so we should probably use the name of the feature rather than the project name for better clarity. Replace IEEE 802.1Qbg with VDP