| Date: 2013-07-16 | Document: **PAR** | Project: 802-3br |

Who	Clause	Type[1]	Comments or Proposed change	Comment resolution
.11	2.1	Ed	**Change to:** Standard for Ethernet Amendment Specification and Management Parameters for Interspers**ed** Express Traffic.	**Rejected**: According to native speakers' advice, the SG DMLT decided explicitly to use the verbal form INETERSPERSING in the title and in the scope to use "to add a support for INTERSPERSED express traffic."! Rationale: the project will be describing how to intersperse express traffic.
.11	5.2.b	Te	Clarify the scope regarding whether the project will add only Qos parameters or also a management protocol.	**Rejected:** The Scope shall not include solutions. The objectives are giving boundaries for the Task Force. As said in the tutorial, more than one solution is possible, see http://www.ieee802.org/3/DMLT/public/Jul13/Winkel_00_0713_DMLT_SG_Tutorial_v04.pdf. IEEE 802.3 already has a management protocol. There is no intent to change the management protocol. IEEE 802.1 projects cover the QoS aspects. This project is to augment the data path capabilities of 802.3 to support interspersing express traffic. As typically for 802.3 the project will specify the management parameters for the new capability. The title of this Amendment mentions "… Management Parameters …".
.11	5.2.b	Ed	Change "The scope of this project is to specify" to "This amendment specifies"	**Rejected:** The wording is typical for IEEE 802.3 PARs. The scope of an amendment will not be in included in the body of the amendment.
.11	5.3	Te	Is there any dependency between 802.1Qbu and 802.3br?	**Noted:** No dependency for 802.3br known. This Amendment can be used by several 802.1 projects.
.11	5.2.b	Te	Please explain what "interspersed express traffic" is. Could the term be described in either 5.2 or 8.1?	**AiP:** The tutorial provided an explanation, see http://www.ieee802.org/3/DMLT/public/Jul13/Winkel_00_0713_DMLT_SG_Tutorial_v04.pdf. Any more detailed explanations would vary depending on the solution adopted. No further explanation in the PAR is appropriate. No changes needed.
.11	5.5	Te	the last sentence does not seem to be appropriate.	**Rejected:** Because the alternative to interspersing express traffic would be to run express traffic on a separate physical link and this point out the need for the single physical link.
.11	5.5	Ed	replace ", including but not limited to," with "such as"	**Accepted**
.11	5.6	Ed	Delete "stakeholders included to date include but are not limited to:"	**Accepted**
.11	5C	Te	Distinct Identity (slide 5) What does close to zero delay on converged networks mean?	**AiP:** Delay substantially less than a max frame transmission time. See the tutorial for more explanations, see http://www.ieee802.org/3/DMLT/public/Jul13/Winkel_00_0713_DMLT_SG_Tutorial_v04.pdf. No changes needed.

1 **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial