FC-BB-6 Revision 1.2 Letter Ballot Comments Database (13-021v1)								
Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Cisco-11	T	108	7.9.3.2	12-019v1 was approved for incorporation in FC-BB-6 at the April 2012 FC-BB-6 meeting, however it has not been incorporated	Incorporate 12-019v1			
Cisco-02	T	1	table 1	More annexes are applicable to FC-BB_E	fix it			
EMC-043	T	8	3 - Definitions and conventions	There is no definition for FDF-MAC	Add a definition for FDF-MAC.			
Cisco-03	T	11	3	The definition of VE_Port should be harmonized with the one in FC-SW-5/6	fix it			
EMC-004	T	13	3.5.2 Controlling FCF Set definition	The words "up to two" limit the potential number of controlling FCFs to two and I believe we want to allow n.	Strike the words "up to two" from the definition.			
Juniper-003	T	13	3.5.2	remove 'up to two'				
EMC-139	T	14	3.5	N_Port_ID is undefined	Add a definition for N_Port_ID, even if it's just a reference to some other specification.			
EMC-006	T	27	4.3.4 FC-BB_E	The final sentence of this section is missing a reference to VA_Port to VA_Port virtual links.	Suggest replacing the final sentence of 4.3.4 with: "The FC-BB_E protocol provides mechanisms to create VN_Port to VF_Port virtual links, VE_Port to VE_Port virtual links, VN_Port to VN_Port virtual links and VA_Port to VA_Port virtual links."			
EMC-007	T	28	4.4.2.3 FC-BB_E	VA_Port references are missing.	Suggest replacing the first two sentences of 4.4.2.3 with: "Class 2, 3, and F Fibre Channel frames arriving from a VN_Port, a VF_Port, a VE_Port or a VA_Port shall be encapsulated in FCoE frames and transmitted to the appropriate FC-BB_E device.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Juniper-006	T	29	4.4.5	Does the in-order delivery preclude exchange based load balancing at Ethernet L2? FIP frames have no ordering requirements.				
Cisco-06	T	31	5	Make the VE_Port definition consistent with FC-SW-5/6	fix it			
EMC-008	T	87	7.2	VA_Port references are missing from the second paragraph up from the bottom of the page.	Suggest rewording the second sentence of the second paragraph up from the bottom of the page to include references to VA_Ports as follows: "Fibre Channel links connect PN_Ports to PF_Ports, PE_Ports to PE_Ports and PA_Ports to PA_Ports.			
EMC-009	T	87	7.2	VA_Port references are missing from the final paragraph on the page.	Suggest rewording the third sentence of the final paragraph on page 87 as follows:			
Juniper-008	T	87	7.2	On what boundary is sequential delivery required? Everything from one port to a different port? Within a PLOGI session?	Requiring in-order deliver is fine but need to state the scope of the in-order requirement better. Preferred			
Juniper-011	T	87	7.2	Pause based link level flow control schemes are only euqivalent to credit based schemes within the distance supported by the buffering availble to the port, priority at the receiveing Ethernet port. Within this boundary the	This clarification can be added to the statement or as a following statement.			
EMC-010	T	89	7.2	VN_Port causality dilemma in the second sentence of the final paragraph on page 89. The definition of a VN_Port requires a connection to an other VN_Port before the VN_Port can be instantiated? How is the first VN_Port instantiated?	Suggest rewording the second sentence of the final paragraph on page 89 as follows: "Each VN2VN ENode may instantiate one or more VN_Ports. Each of these VN_Ports may be connected to			
Juniper-013	T	90	Fgure 33	Need to explicitly point out that the VN2VN fabric/SAN and the FCF fabric/SAN shown in this diagram mus be different fabrics even if they share the same Ethernet VLAN/Network.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-012	T	91	7.2	VA_Port to VA_Port network configuration example needs to be added.	Please add a VA_Port to VA_Port network configuration example.			
EMC-013	T	91	7.3	The second sentence does not include an "FCoE entity" as a required component.	Add the FCoE Entity as a required component.			
EMC-014	T	91	Figure 35	Only the Lossless Ethernet MAC, Ethernet _Port, FCoE Controller, the left most FCoE Entity (and everything above it) are required. Everything else, including the ellipsis, are optional and should be enclosed in brackets.	Adjust the brackets to enclose all optional functional components.			
EMC-015	T	91	7.3	The a, b list started at the end of the page that defines the set of functions	Suggest adding VN2VN and PT2PT specific functions to this list			
EMC-019	T	92	7.3	The Final complete sentence on page 92 discusses how to handle buffer to buffer flow control parameters. The text states to ignore them and I believe this needs to be clarified especially for N_Port Virtualizers. N_Port Virtualizers that attach an FCoE ENode to an FC Fabric actually need to supply a BB_Credit value in the FC FDSIC sent to the FC Fabric in response to the FIP FLOGI or FIP NPIV FDISC received from the ENode. This has and will continue to cause problems to end users	We need to discuss the problem and determine if clarifying text is appropriate.			
EMC-021	T	93	7.4	The first sentence of the first paragraph states "A VN2VN ENode MAC has one or more VN_Port dedicated to.." and I believe VN_Port should have been VN2VN_Port.	Suggest rewording the first sentence of the first paragraph to something like: "A VN2VN ENode MAC has one or more VN_Ports dedicated to the instantiation of VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Links and one or more VN2VN_Ports dedicated to the			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-024	T	93	7.4	The first sentence of the final paragraph starts with "The FPMA used as VN_Port MAC address for a VN2VN_Port…" Should we be using the term FPMA since these MAC Addresses are not Fabric Provided?	Discuss comment..			
EMC-085	T	94	7.4	Second paragraph: Shouldn't the whole MAC address be checked? If only the low order 24 bits are checked, why have a VN2VN FC map?	make the test on the entire MAC			
EMC-027	T	95	7.5	In the first sentence under figure 37, it's unclear which Ethernet ports are being referred to.	Suggest rewording the first sentence under figure 37 to read: "When an FCF includes Lossless Ethernet bridging elements, an FCF-MAC address may be accessible via multiple externally facing Ethernet Ports on that FCF."			
EMC-028	T	95	7.5	What is the purpose of the third paragraph that starts with "MAC addresses used…" It seems unnecessary..	Suggest removing the third paragraph.			
EMC-029	T	95	Figure 37	There are no VA_Ports shown in the FCF functional model	VA_Ports should be added to the FCF Functional model as optional components.			
EMC-030	T	95	7.5	Missing VA_Port capable FCF MAC description.	Suggest inserting a paragraph between the existing 2nd and 3rd paragraphs that defines what a VA_Port capable FCF MAC is.			
EMC-031	T	96	7.5	Missing a section that describes the role of the FCoE Controller when controlling a VA_Port capable FCF MAC.	Suggest adding an a, b list similar to the ones provided for VF and VE_Port capable FCF-MACs on page			
EMC-032	T	96	7.5	The second sentence of the second to last paragraph on the page is very difficult to parse.	We should apply the same solution here as was done for EMC-16.			
EMC-086	T	96	7.5	The second to last paragraph on page 96 states that an E_Node may log in with multiple VF_Port capable FCF-MACs. The last paragraph describes an address	Editor to modify this paragraph to accommodate an E_Node logging into more than one VF_Port; or remove the statement that allows			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-034	T	97	7.5	The first sentence of the final paragraph should also make reference to A_Ports and VA_Ports.	Reword the first sentence of the final paragraph as follows: "The Fibre Channel Switching Element is the			
EMC-035	T	97	7.5	Missing a description of a VA_Port.	Add a paragraph that describes what a VA_Port is.			
EMC-087	T	97	7.5	The third paragraph (starting "For a VF_Port capable FCF-MAC…" the last sentence of the paragraph states that the VN_Port shall use a FPMA MAC. If the VN_Port is a BB-5 VN_Port, then it could attempt to use a SPMA MAC				
EMC-036	T	100	7.6	A description of figure 40 is missing	Add a paragraph that describes figure 40 as was done for figures 38,			
EMC-037	T	100	7.6	A description of figure 41 is missing	Add a paragraph that describes figure 41 as was done for figures 38, 39 and 42.			
EMC-038	T	101	7.6	A VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link example is missing	Add a VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link example.			
EMC-039	T	101	7.7	The second sentence of the first paragraph is out of date.	Consider rewording the second sentence of the first paragraph to			
EMC-040	T	101	7.7	The first sentence of the second paragraph states that "FPMAs are assigned by FCFs..." Depending on the outcome of EMC-24, if the term FPMA is still used to describe the MAC Addresses used in VN2VN environments, then the above statement is incorrect.	Depends on the outcome of EMC-24.			
EMC-041	T	101	7.7	The second sentence of the second paragraph states "A properly formed FPMA is one in which the 24 most significant bits equal the Fabric's FC-MAP value." Depending on the outcome of EMC-24 and EMC-40, the above statement may be incorrect.	Depends on the outcome of EMC-24.			
EMC-042	T	101	7.7	The final sentence of the second paragraph may need to be removed depending on the outcome of EMC-24.	Depends on the outcome of EMC-24.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-044	T	103	7.9.1	The 3rd paragraph from the bottom is missing a reference to FDF-MACs	A third sentence should be added to the 3rd paragraph from the bottom that states something like "On FDFs,			
EMC-045	T	103	7.9.1	The 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page is missing a description of what	Add a text to the 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page			
EMC-088	T	103	7.9.1	Fourth paragraph (starts "All FIP protocols are…), last sentence. This implies that a ENODE must use all available VLANs. See also 7.9.2.2 "The ENode MAC that received a FIP VLAN	change "shall" to "may"			
EMC-090	T	103	7.9.1	Section 7.9.1 describs MAC addressing for FIP, and describes ENODES, FCFs etc, but does not describe FDFs	Add paragraph(s) as appropriate to describe FDFs			
Juniper-014	T	103	7.9.1	Paragraph below list of protocols for which FIP frames are used could be worded a bit better. The last sentence of the paragraph refers to VLANs on which FC-BB_E services are present. Note that the VLAN does not provide the services. Note that for VN2VN most people will not think about LUID being called a service. Do we consider LUID/VN2VN a service in the broader sense?				
Juniper-015	T	103	7.9.1	This section needs to state that ENodes may optionally listen to the VN2VN and				
EMC-046	T	104	7.9.2.2	This clause should cover the case where the ENode is connected to an FDF and also how the FDF passes FIP frames along to the FCF. None of this has been documented yet.	Additional text needs to be added to 7.9.2.2 describing how an FDF operates in this configuration.			
EMC-047	T	104	Figure 43	Figure 43 does not have an (Informative) tag embedded in the title	Suggest adding an (Informative) tag to figure 43.			
EMC-048	T	105	7.9.2.2	The second paragraph on page 105 describes a case where the FCF may send an asynchronous unicast VLAN Notification upon a change in the VLANs	Suggest adding something like the following text after the last sentence in the second paragraph on page 105:			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-049	T	105	7.9.2.3	The fourth paragraph of 7.9.2.3 needs a modification similar to whatever was done to resolve EMC-48.	Define the action that an FCoE Controller of a VE_Port should take upon the reception of a FIP VLAN Notification that does not contain the VLAN that a VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Link has been instantiated on.			
EMC-091	T	105	7.9.2.2	Second to last paragraph. If the configuration of VLANs changes such that one or more of the VLANs that a VE_Port was using is no longer in the group, where are the actions that that VE_Port must take described?				
EMC-092	T	105	7.9.2.3	Second to last paragraph, last sentence "The unicast FIP VLAN Notification frame shall specify the revised list of VLAN IDs over which the originating VE_Port	Change the sentence to use one of the VLANs that a FIP ELP was sucessfully performed on			
EMC-095	T	107	Figure 44	Why is there a box for fabric operation when the title of this figure is VN2VN?				
EMC-096	T	107	Figure 44	the boxes with the a,b lists should say "in each of the selected VLAN(s)…"				
EMC-050	T	108	7.9.2.4	The second paragraph under Figure 44 may need a modification similar to whatever was done to resolve EMC-48 and EMC-49	See EMC-48 and EMC-49.			
EMC-051	T	108	7.9.3.2	The second paragraph of the clause is unclear and unimplementable. How does an implementation determine if a Discovery Advertisement is compatible or not? This needs to be clear because of the shall that follows..	Suggest removing the second paragraph of the clause or additional clarifying text be added.			
EMC-053	T	108	7.9.3	Clause 7.9.3 makes no mention of VA_Ports and how they are involved in the FIP discovery protocol	Suggest text be added throughout the clause that describes how VA_Ports are involved in the FIP			
EMC-098	T	108	7.9.2.4	First full paragraph: There may not have ever been a VLAN discovery request.	change the sentence to use one of the VLANs that a successful FLOGI or PLOGI has completed on			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-101	T	108	7.9.3.2	Last paragraph on page 108: "The FCoE Controller of an ENode MAC shall select selects for login a subset of the FCF-MACs in the FCF list having the 'Available for Login…"				
EMC-104	T	110	7.9.3.3	The second to last paragraph on page 110: "In order to perform a FIP ELP with an FCF-MAC in the FCF list with the 'Max FCoE Size Verified' bit set to zero,…" A FIP ELP may never be sent if the bit is zero, FULL STOP.	Change the sentence to "In order to get the Max FCoE Size Verified bet set to one (so that a FIP ELP may subsequently be performed) the FCoE Controller of a VE_Port capable FCF-MAC shall transmit a unicast			
EMC-052	T	112	7.9.3.3	The final paragraph of this clause states "Reception of Discovery Advertisements for more that one Fabric on the same	I believe this paragraph was added in an attempt to resolve the issue identified at UNH-IOL by Bill Martin.			
EMC-054	T	112	7.9.4.1	The final sentence of the third paragraph of the clause only partially describes how	Suggest rewording the final sentence of the third paragraph to read:			
EMC-055	T	112	7.9.4.1	The final sentence on the page only partially describes how the FCF shall return a properly formed FPMA.	Suggest rewording the final sentence on the page to read: "The MAC Address Descriptor			
EMC-056	T	113	7.9.4.2	The second sentence of the clause only	Suggest rewording the second			
EMC-057	T	113	7.9.4.3	The second paragraph of the clause states that a FIP FLOGI from a VN2VN port not in the VN2VN Neighbor set shall be rejected with reason code… but no mention of how a VN2VN_Port is added to the neighbor set.	Suggest adding a reference to the Claiming a Locally Unique N_Port_ID clause 7.9.6.2.2			
EMC-058	T	113	7.9.5.1	VA_Port references are missing	Suggest adding text the explicitly states VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links			
EMC-109	T	114	7.9.5.2	First paragraph of this section specifically states that VN_Ports perform an implicit logout when the physical link fails. Shouldn't it also say that a VF_Port shall do the same?				
EMC-062	T	115	7.9.5.2	First sentence of third paragraph under note 29 is missing the word "in".	Suggest adding the word "in" to the first sentence of the third paragraph under note 29 as follows: "On receiving a VN_Port FIP Keep Alive frame coming from a VN_Port			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-063	T	116	7.9.5	There is no clause that describes the VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link Maintenance protocol	Suggest adding a clause that describes the VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link Maintenance protocol.			
EMC-112	T	116	7.9.5.3	The section that describes how VE_Port capable FCF_MACs handle an updated FKA_ADV_PERIOD needs to have mores description on how to handle longer vs. shorter new values, like the description in 7.9.5.2				
DELL-2	T	117	7.9.6.1	Is the operation of VN2VN in multipoint-mode or point-to-point configured or				
EMC-116	T	119	7.9.6.2.2	The random delay should be subtracted from BEACON_PERIOD. If added, then the VN_Port could be waiting BEACON_PERIOD + 100ms, which would be a violation of the standard				
EMC-117	T	125	7.9.7.2	The a,b,c list at the end of this section: The text above the list says that the				
Juniper-018	T	132	7.9.7.3.15 & table 45 fields description	Need to state that the VLAN has either FCoE services or VN2VN discoverable ENodes or both.				
Juniper-019	T	133	7.9.7.3.17	N_Port_ID Claim Notification needs to indicate whether the responding endpoint wants the destination of the claim to attempt to establish a virtual link with him. The intent of such an indication is to provide control over the establishment of virtual links such that unnecessary links are not attempted. This indication should be backward compatible to the extent possible.	text needs to updated to explain additional use of the indication			
Juniper-020	T	137	table 52	FIP VLAN Notification Originator entry for this row only has FCF listed.	Change the Originator entry for this row to include VN2VN			
EMC-067	T	141	7.9.8.4.2	Related to EMC-19. The sentence	Depends on the outcome of EMC-19.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-118	T	141	7.9.8.4.2	The paragraph starting "The MAC address field in the MAC address descriptor…" It states "An ENode shall verify that a granted FPMA address is properly formed." but it never describes what to do if the verification fails.	State that the Enode shall send a LOGO if the verification fails			
EMC-121	T	144	7.9.8.6.1	First paragraph of this section: the list of Vx_Ports is also optional. This texts implies that at least one Vx_Port must be provided	Make last sentence "...one Name_Identifier descriptor (see 7.9.7.3.5), optionally a list of Vx_Port Identification descriptors (see 7.9.7.3.12), and optionally a FIP Clear…"			
EMC-122	T	144	7.9.8.6.1	This section says that the MAC address in a FIP Clear Virtual Link must be set to that of an FCF. FDFs can also send them (see 7.12.3).	This section needs to be updated to reflect that there are other entities (i.e. FDFs) that can originate some of these FIP operations			
EMC-123	T	144	7.9.8.6.1	First paragraph of the section: VA_Port capable MACs can also generate Clear Virtual Link to an Enode				
EMC-124	T	144	7.9.8.6.2	This section says that the MAC address in a FIP Clear Virtual Link must be set to that of an FCF. FDFs can also send them (see 7.12.3).	This section needs to be updated to reflect that there are other entities (i.e. FDFs) that can originate some of these FIP operations			
EMC-125	T	144	7.9.8.7	First paragraph of section: FDF-MACs can also generate a FIP VLAN request	Add FDF-MAC to the list of things that can generate a FIP VLAN request			
EMC-127	T	145	7.9.8.8	Similar comment as to EMC-129				
EMC-128	T	145	7.9.8.9	Similar comment as to EMC-129				
EMC-129	T	145	7.9.8.10	Second paragraph of the section, the parenthetic FPMA doesn't belong at the end of the sentence.				
Juniper-021	T	145	7.9.8.8	Use of the F bit in the response does not match the description and restrictions for the F bit as described on page 124.				
Juniper-022	T	146	7.9.8.13	N_Port_ID Claim Notification needs to indicate whether the responding endpoint wants the destination of the	A good place for such an indication is in the FIP FC-4 Attributes descriptor as a new field (1 bt) taken from the			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Juniper-025	T	151	7.12	In the distributed FCF overview, add a statement to the effect that multiple virtual domains are allowed by the protocol notwithstanding that all diagrams are drawn with only one virtual domain. Each additional virtual domain				
EMC-070	T	152	Figure 46	VA_Ports between the FDFs embedded in the controlling FCFs are missing from the diagram. This is an allowable configuration based on the first sentence on page 155.	Suggest adding VA_Ports to figure 46 that link the virtual Domains residing on the controlling FCFs.			
EMC-132	T	152	7.12.1	First paragraph under figure 46: We can not require two VE_Ports in order to have redundancy.	Change the sentence to read "The two Controlling FCFs in a redundant Distributed FCF instantiate one or more at least two Augmented			
EMC-071	T	153	7.12.1	The first sentence on page 153 should allow for one or more Domain ID per Virtual Domain	Suggest rewording the first sentence on page 153 to read: "…typically uses three or more			
Juniper-027	T	154	figure 48	The diagram shows a second set of optional VF, VE, and VA ports on an	Fix the picutre to precisely show what is and is not required and in			
EMC-072	T	155	7.12.2	The second paragraph on page 155 states that the FIP protocol is used to discover	Suggest that text is added to 7.9.8.4 that describes how the FIP protocol			
EMC-074	T	156	7.12.3	The fourth complete sentence of the first paragraph implies that an FDF must support VF_Ports.	Suggest rewording the fourth complete sentence of the first paragraph to something like: "An FDF supports the instantiation of			
EMC-135	T	156	7.12.3	In the text on the top of page 156 is states that a FDF can have native A_Ports and F_Ports. That means a native device	Get rid of this can of worms and prohibit native ports on a FDF. The connectivity between the ethernet			
EMC-076	T	158	7.12.5.1	The term "initialization exchanges" used in the second paragraph of clause	I suggest either adding text to FC-SW-6 defining exactly what initialization			
EMC-081	T	160	7.12.5.2	In regards to item c in the list, how does	Suggest adding a description of the			
Juniper-028	T	160	7.12.6	the term 'directly reachable' is not very precise becase the transport layer is not specified.	Since directly means over/across the same Ethernet L2 broadcast domain then could say layer 2 Ethernet connected/reachable or a similar statement.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-083	T	163	Annex C	The VN2VN protocol requires that some changes be made to Annex C. Of particular concern is the case where two VN2VN networks are joined and the same FPMAs are in use in both VN2VN networks.	Suggest adding a description of the problem to Annex C as well as a description of a solution.			
EMC-084	T	171	Annex D	The VN2VN protocol requires that some changes be made to Annex D. Of particular concern is the case where two VN2VN networks are joined and the same FPMAs are in use in both VN2VN networks.	Suggest adding specific recommended ACL entries to Annex D that will help prevent the problem from happening.			
EMC-147	T	100	Figure 41	In figure 41, the two links that touch ENode H1 have the same MAC address, namely "MAC VN_Port(1)". Ditto for Enode H2.	For the VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Link, show the VL Endpoint as the FCF-provided FPMA. For the VN_Port to VN_Port link, show the end-points as "MAC VN2VN_Port(1)" and "MAC VN2VN_Port(2)", which are the locally unique port IDs, concatenated with VN2VN-FC-MAP.			
EMC-148	T	101	7.7	The entire section applies only to fabric topologies.	Add paragraphs, preferably as subsections, describing how VN_Port MAC addresses are assigned in point-			
EMC-149	T	103	7.9.1	The protocol for point-to-point topology is omitted.	Add requirements for VN2VN ENode MACs. For instance, "VN2VN Enode MACs shall listen to the All-VN2VN-Enode-MACs group address." Also, say whther FCF-MACs are allowed, required to, or prohibited from listening to this address.			
DELL-1	T	104 & 107	fig 43 & 44	Since "default FCOE VLAN" is not defined, how does one differenciate between "Static FCOE VLAN configuraton" and "default FCOE VLAN" in the flow chart? Should standard define "default FCOE VLAN"?				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-151	T	107	Figure 44	The "No" path from the "Is there a static…" box has an unexplained branch.	Make the "No" path lead to a decision box, which contains the contents of "Note: an implementation…" and allows either or both discoveries to be performed.			
EMC-152	T	107	Figure 44	The box labeled "Select FCoE VLANs" requires multiple VLANs to be selected.	Change the label to "Select FCoE VLAN(s)".			
EMC-153	T	107	Figure 44	The paths exiting the two boxes labeled "Select FCoE VLANs" and "Use a default FCoE VLAN(s)" are unlabeled. It's not clear what causes a specific path to be chosen, or whether multiple paths are permitted.	Send each box's exit path into a series of two decision boxes, labeled "All VLANs have fabric topology" and "All VLANs have point-to-point or multipoint topology". Use Yes/No branches from those boxes to reach the three boxes on the lower right.			
EMC-102	T	108-109	7.9.3.2	Very last sentence on p 108, going onto p109 "In order to perform a FIP FLOGI with an FCF-MAC in the FCF Login Set with the 'Max FCoE Size Verified' bit set to zero…" An Enode shall not sent a FIP FLOGI if Max FCoE Size Verified is set to zero, FULL STOP. This description is not how to send a FLOGI, it is how to get the Max Size Verified bit turned on. This sentence, as writen, can be interpreted as after the Solicitation/Advertisement has completed, the ENode has completed a FLOGI, because of the way the begining of the sentence is worded.	Change the subject sentence to "In order to get the Max FCoE Size Verified bit set to one (so that a FIP FLOGI may subsequently be performed) the FCoE Controller of an ENode MAC shall transmit a unicast Discovery Solicitation (see 7.9.8.2) to that FCF-MAC address and receive a solicited unicast Discovery Advertisement in response.			
EMC-126	T	144-145	7.9.8.7	This section needs description of VA_Port MACs				
EMC-158	T	147	Table 54	The new constant "All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs" is missing.	add it			
EMC-159	T	147	Table 54	The new constant "VN2VN-FC-MAP" is missing.	add it			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
DELL-3	T	151, 152, 153	fig 45, 46, 47	Host connection to FDF shows direct connection to FDF only. Can the host connect to FDF via Lossless Ethernet Network? Should the diagram show Lossless Ethernet network between host and FDF to complete the topology?				
EMC-144	T	91	7.2	In the first paragraph, the last sentence says the fabric is reduced to a single link. What if links are established on multiple VLANs? I assume those aren't reduced to a single link.	Discuss comment.			
EMC-145	T	93	7.4	There's no wording that identifies the components of figure 36.	After the sentence starting with "Figure 36 shows", add a sentence saying what's in the figure, similar to the opening paragraph of 7.3. Say "A VN2VN ENode is composed of ...."			
Intel-1	T		7.9.8.8	The use of F bit in FIP header to identify if source of VLAN notification is from FCF or VN2VN endpoint is not backward compatible. In a mixed switch environment, older switches that would not be FC-BB-6 compliant would not be setting this bit. In order to be backward compatible would prefer is FIP sub codes for VLAN Notification be used to identify unique source of message.	Define a new code 0004h/03h to represent FIP VN2VN VLAN Notification, and keep 0004h/02h to be specifically FIP FCF VLAN Notification.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Intel-2	T		7.9.1	The statement is made that 'Support for multiple fabrics per VLAN is outside the scope of this standard'. We would like to see clarifying text that would define how SW could determine that this condition exists in order to manage the condition as suggested in 7.9.3.2.	Can it be defined as when an Enode receives more than one FCF generated Fabric Advertisements with FIP Fabric descriptors that do not have matching values for all of VF_ID, FC_MAP, and Fabric_Name? Or is it a subset? In essence this comment is asking for clarification in the FIP discovery section as appropriate and in section 3.5 adding a definition of what this specification considers as a Fabric.			
Intel-3	T		7.9.1	As part of the previous clarification as specified in Intel-2, can we also include if each VLAN used by VN2VN is considered as a Fabric, and if it can coexist with an FCF Fabric on the same VLAN given that they would each use unique FC_MAP value and so no FPMA address collision could exist.	Clarify the spec to allow VN2VN and FCF to be on the same VLAN. Current specification is vague in this respect.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Intel-4	T		7.9.8.13	We would like to propose adding a bit in the FIP Claim Response message FC-4 Attributes Descriptor. As presented at December 2012 T11 meeting (see T11/12-449v0), this bit is intended as a 'hint' to receiving node on the viability of establishing a virtual link with the sending node. We are flexible where this bit is actually defined, for example T11 group may determine it better to have bit in actual FIP Claim Response Header itself (or to extend use definition if header 'A' bit for this purpose?). But we feel the definition of the bit settings should be as indicated in the presentation to support backward compatibility. As presented, the importance of this change is to remove wasteful virtual link establishment attempts between nodes not intending to share resources, a condition that would normally be indicated via FC Directory/Name Service which is optional in VN2VN fabrics.				
Intel-5	T		7.9.8.13	As part of previous proposal as specified in Intel-4 we would like to add option that this message can be re-sent later in time between the same nodes if the condition of this bit changes. Ex. Sending node later would like to indicate to the receiving node that conditions are now good for virtual link establishment, or in the opposite case no further virtual link establishment requests should be attempted (but existing virtual links not impacted).				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Intel-8	T		7.9.5.4	VN2VN virtual link re-initialization after short time cable pull. The current behavior as specified in the spec relies on Beacon messages which are sent every 8 minutes. We need a mechanism at shorter granularity to tell the remote ports that there was a link disturbance happened on the local port. So that the remote ports can reinitiate the login if required (RPortWWN > local PortWWN) and re-establish the virtual links again.	Possible Solutions: Given that in VN2VN fabrics a re-connecting or re-initializing VN2VN_Port will start with LUID. Can/should we indicate that the reception of LUID discovery/Probe/Claim messages from a node that was believed to have an active virtual link could be used as trigger for implicit logout from the local VN2VN_Port?			
Intel-9	T		Appendix D	The spec should update the informative annex on ACLs (Appendix D) to include VN2VN edge case, specifically Network Joins when VN2VN is on the same VLAN	VN2VN FIP snooping in the switch needs to detect collisions and send CVL to end points so that end points can re-establish LUID discovery and the virtual link.			
EMC-002	E	4	Figure 4	Figure 4 does not include a VA_Port reference.	Update Figure 4 to include a VA_Port			
Juniper-001	E	7	2.6	Need to cross check the references for IEEE				
EMC-003	E	8	3 - Definitions	There is no definition for A_Port	Add a definition for A_Port.			
Juniper-002	E	8	3.1	Should FC-LS-2 references be changed to	I think we should do this update but			
Juniper-004	E	13	3.5.5	change "coupled with" to "coupled to"				
Juniper-005	E	13	3.5.4	Shouldn’t definition of "A Fiber Channel node (see FC-FS-3) that is able to				
Cisco-04	E	14	3.5.36	It should be VN_Port/FCoE_LEP	fix it			
Cisco-05	E	17	3.7.5	Add VA_Port	fix it			
EMC-005	E	23	4.2.5 FC-BB_E reference models	There is no VA_Port to VA_Port reference model.	Add a VA_Port to VA_Port reference model.			
Juniper-007	E	86	7.X	Where we talk about Lossless Ethernet Networks in terms of topology examples we should say something about VLANs. The examples discuss the idea of multiple connections and these connection can be on the same or different logical or virtual networks.				
Juniper-009	E	87	7.2	VA_Ports are also connected by FCoE	Add references to VA_Ports where FCoE connectivity is discussed.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Juniper-010	E	87	7.2	cross reference PFC (Qbb) here as well.				
EMC-011	E	90	7.2	Should the two paragraphs beneath Figure 33 be reorganized into an a, b list? The third sentence of the first paragraph states: "Each VN2VN ENode may instantiate multiple VN_Ports…" The usage of the first VN_Port is described but the usage of the second VN_Port is not provided until the next paragraph.	Suggest reorganizing the two paragraphs into an a, b list.			
Juniper-012	E	90	figure 33	Given the later text on separating VN2VN from VN2VF networks using VLANs shouldn't we show the example that way instead of overlapped as in the figure?				
Cisco-07	E	90	figure 33	"FCoE" in the caption is not bold	fix it			
EMC-016	E	92	7.3	The second sentence of the first paragraph after the a, b list is very difficult to parse.	Reword the second sentence to something like: "VN_Ports instantiated upon successful FIP FLOGI and subsequent FIP NPIV FDISC Exchanges are all associated with the same VF_Port."			
EMC-017	E	92	7.3	The first sentence of the second paragraph after the a, b list uses "in" instead of "during"	Suggest rewording the first sentence of the second paragraph after the a, b list as follows: "The FCoE_LEP is the functional entity performing the encapsulation of FC frames into FCoE frames during transmission and the decapsulation of FCoE frames into FC frames during reception."			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-018	E	92	7.3	The fifth sentence of the final paragraph does not specify how the fabric assigns the VN_Port address identifier	Suggest rewording the fifth sentence of the final paragraph on page 92 with something like the following: "A VN_Port is uniquely identified by an N_Port_Name Name_Identifier and is addressed by the address identifier the Fabric assigned to it in the FIP FLOGI LS_ACC or FIP NPIV FDISC LS_ACC"			
EMC-020	E	93	Figure 36	The middle "stack" is optional and should be enclosed in brackets.	Enclose the middle stack in brackets to indicate that it's optional.			
EMC-022	E	93	7.4	The second paragraph should be reworded for ease of use.	Suggest rewording the second paragraph as follows: "As shown in the VN_Port to VN_Port reference model (see figure 32), because there is no FCF that performs N_Port_ID selection, VN2VN ENode MACs shall select N_Port_IDs for themselves"			
EMC-023	E	93	7.4	The first sentence of the third paragraph uses the term "Lossless Ethernet network", is this term synonymous with VLAN or should we somehow explicitly state they are unique per VLAN, especially in light of the work being done on VLAN Discovery with VN2VN?	Discuss comment.			
EMC-025	E	93	7.4	The second paragraph of clause 7.4 makes reference to the need for each VN2VN ENode MAC to assign itself an N_Port_ID selection, but makes no reference to the process that allows this to be done.	Suggest adding a reference to the Locally Unique N_Port_IDs clause 7.9.6.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-026	E	94	7.4	The first sentence of the first paragraph should start with a description of what figure 33 is.	Suggest rewording the first sentence of the first paragraph to something like: "The FCoE point-to-point reference model (see figure 34)" shows that Locally Unique N_Port_IDs shall not conflict with and shall be independent from the N_Port_IDs assigned by a Fibre Channel Fabric.			
EMC-033	E	96	7.5	The first sentence of the last paragraph uses "in" instead of "during"	Suggest rewording the first sentence of the last paragraph as follows: "The FCoE_LEP is the functional entity performing the encapsulation of FC frames into FCoE frames during transmission and the decapsulation of FCoE frames into FC frames during reception."			
EMC-089	E	103	7.9.1	Third to last paragraph "On ENodes, the ENode MAC address shall be used for all FIP frames". Used in what manner, as both source and destination?	Modify sentence to "…shall be used as the source MAC address for all FIP frames." Similar change to last sentence of said paragraph			
Juniper-016	E	104	figure 43 and section 7.9.2 in general	Consider using figure 44 from page 107 as the only diagram for secion 7.9.2 as it is a superset of figure 43. The description can then discuss where each area of the Figure 44 diagram applies to th various parts of the protocol.				
Cisco-09	E	104	figure 43	bitmap figure	the approved version was vectorial			
Juniper-017	E	105	7.9.2.4	section has no title				
EMC-094	E	106	7.9.2.4	First paragraph on page 106: All instances of "VLANs" should be just "VLAN"				
Cisco-10	E	107	figure 44	bitmap figure	the approved version was vectorial			
EMC-097	E	108	7.9.2.4	First full paragraph "If the configuration of VLANs on a VN2VN ENode configured to provide VLANs information to the other VN2VN ENodes changes"	second occurance of "VLANs" should be singular			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-099	E	108	7.9.2.4	Last paragraph before NOTE 19, the second "VLANs" should be singular				
EMC-103	E	109	7.9.3.2	The last two sentences of the large paragraph in the middle of the page				
EMC-105	E	112	7.9.3.3	Item "b" in the two a,b lists on page 112 are actually two items, and should be broken into b, and c				
EMC-106	E	113	7.9.4.3	First paragraph on page 113: NOTE: Here	Discuss with group			
EMC-107	E	113	7.9.4.3	Second paragraph in this section: "A FIP	A reference to section 7.9.6.2.2			
EMC-108	E	113	7.9.4.3	The last two paragraphs of this section should be combined into one. The way it is now, as two separate pargraphs, the first sentence of the second paragraph is awakward. The MAC address of what????				
EMC-059	E	114	7.9.5.2	Second sentence of the second paragraph has a word ordering issue.	Suggest rewording the second sentence of the second paragraph to read: "This behavior may be disabled by VF_Port capable FCF-MACs under administrative control by setting the D bit to one in the FKA_ADV_Period descriptor in Discovery Advertisements (see 7.9.7.3.13).			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-060	E	114	7.9.5.2	Reference to "That FCF-MAC" in the fifth sentence of the fifth paragraph is confusing.	Suggest that the third sentence of the 5th paragraph should be reworded and the fifth sentence of the paragraph should be removed. The rewording of the third sentence could be something like: "If unsolicited multicast Discovery Advertisements are not received within 2.5 * FKA_ADV_PERIOD, all the VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Links with that VF_Port shall be implicitly de-instantiated and the FCF-MAC associated with the VF_Port shall be removed from the FCF Login Set (see 7.9.3.2)."			
EMC-110	E	114	7.9.5.2	Where is the term ENode MAC defined (ie, without association with a Vx_Port)?	Put a sentence describing where the actual address comes from (eg the proper standardeze for the burned in MAC) or a reference to some IEEE document etc			
EMC-111	E	114	7.9.5.2	Paragraph 5 on page 114, last sentence: "A subsequent FIP Fabric Login may be	make the end of the sentence either "…as specified in 7.9.3.2" or "…FCF			
EMC-061	E	115	7.9.5.2	The wording of sentences 2 through 4 of	Suggest re-writing sentences 2 - 4 of			
Cisco-12	E	115	7.9.5.2	"CVL" is used only here	Replace it with "FIP Clear Virtual Links frame"			
EMC-064	E	117	7.9.6.2	The font used for the 7.9.6.2 clause title appears to be incorrect.	Suggest using a bold font.			
EMC-065	E	117	7.9.6.2.1	The word "verify" in the first sentence of the clause should be "determine".	Suggest replacing "verify" with "determine" in the first sentence of the clause.			
EMC-113	E	117	7.9.6.2.1	First paragraph of this section: The concept of a "recorded" locally unique N_Port ID has not yet been introduced.	Put a reference to 7.9.6.4			
Cisco-13	E	117	7.9.6.2	Not in bold	fix it			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-114	E	119	7.9.6.2.2.	In the third paragraph on the page, the definition of a Login Set is parenthetical. Shouldn't the definition be ouside parenthisis? The term "Login Set" is used in several other sections in this document.				
EMC-115	E	119	7.9.6.2.2	In the fourth paragraph "When Ready to	Prior to instantiating, VN_Port to			
EMC-066	E	124	7.9.7.2	Editor's note on page 124	Remove the editor's note.			
Cisco-14	E	124	7.9.7.2	Remove the editor note. Of course, if discovery solicitations and advertisements are ignored, then the involved entities are not discovered and no Virtual Links are established, which is the proper behavior.	fix it			
Cisco-15	E	131	7.9.7.3.14	Specify that the Vendor ID is the T10 Vendor ID	fix it			
Cisco-16	E	132	7.9.7.3.16	Specify that the Vendor ID is the T10 Vendor ID	fix it			
Cisco-17	E	137	Table 52	FIP VLAN Requests and FIP VLAN Notifications can be used also by VN2VN Enodes	fix it			
EMC-119	E	141	7.9.8.4.2	The a,b,c, list in the middle of the page has duplicate b) c) d)				
EMC-120	E	141	7.9.8.4.2	The a,b,c list at the bottom of the page has an AND that should be OR.				
Cisco-18	E	141	7.9.8.4.2	items b), c), and d) of the lettered list are double lettered	fix it			
Juniper-023	E	147	table 54	This table should have the VN2VN timers and constants or the title of the table should be changed to reflect the subset of values listed here.				
Juniper-024	E	149	7.11	Section number is repeated from page 148				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-068	E	151	7.12.1	Wording problem with the first sentence of the second paragraph up from the bottom.	Suggest rewording the first sentence of the second paragraph up from the bottom of the page to: "From an internal point of view (i.e., inside the dotted and dashed black line in figure 45), VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links enable the forwarding of FCoE frames between the Controlling FCF and FDFs, as well as between the FDFs."			
EMC-130	E	151	7.12.1	Last paragraph on page 151: All instances of N_Port should be VN_Port				
EMC-131	E	151	7.12.1	last paragraph on page 152: The term "FDF Set" has not been defined prior to the usage here.	Either define it, or put a reference to where it is defined			
Juniper-026	E	151	7.12.1	For forwarding the distributed switching protocols across an FDF (ie from one VA_Port to another VA_Port) in a cascaded FDF topology as shown in figure 47 name based forwarding is used. This should be explicitly pointed out as it is different from the way FCoE/FIP frames are forwarded	This in the nature of a clarification to help understanding and could be accomplished by way of example.			
EMC-069	E	152	7.12.1	Missing "a" in the sentence starting with "Figure 46..." under the second paragraph on page 152.	Suggest rewording the sentence under the second paragraph to read: "Figure 46 shows an example of a Distributed FCF including a redundant pair of Controlling FCFs."			
EMC-133	E	153	7.12.1	Last paragraph before Figure 47: The figure number is missing				
EMC-134	E	154	Figure 48	The multiple instances of VF_Ports, VE_Ports and VA_Ports are not in brackets, and therefore appear to be manditory	Either put the ones in the background in brackets, or since they have dotted lines around them, modify the text to say that the items in brackets or dotted lines are optional			
EMC-073	E	155	7.12.2	Same problem with the third to last paragraph as described in EMC-17	Apply the same fix to this paragraph as done to resolve EMC-17			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-136	E	156	Figure 49	Same problem as described in EMC-137	Same fix as suggested in EMC-137			
EMC-075	E	157	7.12.3	Same problem with the third to last paragraph as described in EMC-17	Apply the same fix to this paragraph as done to resolve EMC-17			
EMC-137	E	158	7.12.5.1	Second paragraph of the section: Missing parenthisis around the "see SW-6" reference				
EMC-077	E	159	7.12.5.2	Wording problem with the second and third sentences of the second paragraph.	Suggest rewording the second and third sentences of the second paragraph of 7.12.5.2 to read: "When set to one, this bit indicates that the originator of the FIP ELP Request or SW_ACC is a VA_Port/VE_Port capable FCF-MAC. When set to zero, this bit indicates..."			
EMC-078	E	159	7.12.5.2	Wording problem with the second and third sentences of the third paragraph.	Suggest rewording the second and third sentences of the third paragraph of 7.12.5.2 to read: "When set to one, this bit indicates that the originator of the FIP ELP Request or SW_ACC is a VA_Port capable FDF-MAC. When set to zero, this bit indicates..."			
EMC-079	E	159	7.12.5.2	Remove the Editor's note	Remove the Editor's note.			
EMC-080	E	159	7.12.5.2	Missing "have been" in the first sentence of the second to last paragraph on page 159	Suggest rewording the end of the first sentence of the second to last paragraph on page 159 to read: "…of the Distributed FCF's FDF Set and *have been* discovered by FIP discovery on the Lossless Ethernet network"			
Cisco-19	E	159	7.12.5.2	Remove the editor note. Of course, if the ELP Request and/or SW_ACC is ignored, then no Virtual Links are established, which is the proper behavior.	fix it			
EMC-082	E	160	7.12.5.3	Missing a cross reference to the VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Link maintenance clause.	Suggest adding a cross reference to the VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Link maintenance clause.			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Cisco-20	E	160	7.12.5.3	Add a reference "(see 7.9.5.3)" at the end of the sentence.	fix it			
Cisco-21	E	206	Table H.1	Replace the first "FIP" instance with "FCoE" in the second row	fix it			
EMC-150	E	105	7.9.2.4	There's no title.	Call this section "ENode/ENode discovery"			
EMC-154	E	113	7.9.4.3	The first sentence gives an ENode MAC too much power.	Replace "A VN2VN ENode MAC, operating" with "The FCoE Controller of a VN2VN ENode MAC, operating".			
EMC-155	E	113	7.9.4.3	The PLOGI process should be clearly distinguished from the FLOGI process.	Start a new paragraph with the sentence "As specified in FC-LS-2". Also, move this paragraph below the "A FIP FLOGI Request" paragraph, so all FLOGI issues are discussed before all PLOGI issues.			
EMC-156	E	113	7.9.4.3	The third paragraph gives a FIP LOGO too much power.	Re-use the wording from the paragraph at the top of the page: the ENode deinstantiates the link by performing a FIP LOGO and, if successful, deinstantiating the FCoE_LEP.			
EMC-157	E	115	7.9.5.2	In the paragraph beginning with "An event that causes", what's a CVL?	spell it out			
EMC-140	E	90	7.2	the paragraph starting "Each of the two", the second sentence starts "FCF A", but there's no FCF A in Figure 33, only a single FCF.	Replace "FCF A" with The FCF".			
EMC-141	E	90	7.2	In the paragraph starting "Each of the two", the third sentence refers to "the FCFs", but there's only a single FCF in Figure 33.	Replace "FCFs" with "FCF".			
EMC-142	E	90	7.2	In the paragraph starting "Each VN2VN ENode", the second sentence refers to "a possible VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Link", but the link is actually "VN_Port to VN_Port".	Replace "VF_Port" with "VN_Port".			

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-143	E	91	7.2	In the first paragraph, the phrase "reduced by FCoE to point-to-point" is idiomatically incorrect.	Change "to point-to-point" to "to a point-to-point".			
EMC-146	E	93	7.4	In the bottom paragraph, each VN2VN_Port seems to have an FPMA, but there's no F(abric) to P(rovide) it.	Don't call the VN_Port MAC address an FPMA. Not unless you're prepared to fix section 7.7,which says nothing about multipoint and point-to-point topologies.			
Cisco-08	E	multiple	multiple	Check the usage of the term "FPMA" in the context of VN2VN	"MAC address" could be a more proper term.			
Oracle-1	E	p. 102	7.8 (first sentence)	"… contain an FCoE PDU (see table 21)" should be, "see table 22"				
Oracle-5	E	p. 105	7.9.2.4	Missing heading, “VN2VN Enode Discovery”				
Oracle-3	E	p. 90	paragraph below Figure 33	"FCF A has a single physical Ethernet …" The FCF in figure 33 is not labled FCF A, it is just labled FCF.				
Oracle-4	E	p. 90	2nd paragraph below Figure 33	"The green dotted line in figure 33 depicts a possible VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Link." No, it depects a VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Link.				
EMC-001	E	xxi	Table	The final entry (Table H.1) in the table list contains bold formatted characters.	Remove the bold format.			
Cisco-01	E	xxi		strange bold in table H.1	fix it			
Oracle-2	E			Missing FIP definition in the definitions section (e.g., "FIP - FCoE Initialization Protocol) there are other similar definitions, like B_Port, VN_Port, etc.				
Intel-6	E		7.9.7.2	If use of ‘F’ bit in FIP header holds as defined for FIP VLAN Response, need to add this message type to list outlined in text describing this bit. FIP VLAN Request is indicated but not FIP VLAN Response.	Need to add VLAN notification response in the definition of 'F' bit in section 7.9.7.2			
Intel-7	E		7.9.8.4.2	Page 141, fix list that indicates ‘b) b), and c) c), etc.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-138	?			EMC is very concerned that the distributed FCF (i.e. Section 7.12) is so dependant SW-6, and that SW-6 is still open to technical input. It is possible that changes to the current SW-6 could make the text in this version of BB-6 wrong or obsolete.	Discuss with group			
QLogic-001		1		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.83,7.98 to 6.80,8.17 952-687-2431				
QLogic-002		3		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.66,8.13 to 7.26,8.33 various				
Brocade-001		6		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.04,1.02 to 1.29,1.27 Delete blank pages.				
QLogic-003		9		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.93,1.30 to 7.55,1.50 various				
QLogic-004		9		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.05,1.97 to 5.50,2.16 2012				
Brocade-002		10		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,0.78 to 7.22,1.14 Fix hyphenation globally.				
Brocade-003		13		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.91,0.94 to 1.16,1.19 Remove all bold text in the TOC.				
IBM-001		13		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.87,8.95 to 4.11,9.14 IBM-R1:E::				
Brocade-004		15		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.09,0.64 to 2.34,0.89 Fix long sentence wrapping per ISO/IEC directives.				
Brocade-005		21		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.40,1.95 to 7.55,2.15 Remove bold.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-006		25		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.42,5.80 to 5.75,6.00 Functional models in 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5				
Brocade-007		25		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.09,9.30 to 5.80,9.50 Diagram has FC_BB_E (which is not defined anywhere), not FC-BB_E.				
Brocade-008		26		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.86,4.37 to 1.11,4.62 Insert space between lines.				
Brocade-009		26		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.96,7.02 to 1.21,7.27 Insert space between lines.				
QLogic-005		26		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.22,9.13 to 5.54,9.33 FC-SP-2				
Brocade-010		27		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.27,2.86 to 6.52,3.11 Add references to FC-SW-6 and FC-LS-3,				
Brocade-011		27		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.83,0.78 to 5.51,0.98 FC-SW-6				
Brocade-012		27		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.56,6.97 to 2.31,7.16 Obsoleted by RFC 5905 Errata				
QLogic-006		27		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.56,2.80 to 6.23,3.00 FC-FS-4, FC-SW-6, FC-LS-3				
QLogic-007		27		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.29,1.22 to 5.54,1.47 FC-FS-3 as approved reference				
QLogic-008		28		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.23,3.63 to 4.45,3.83 802.1Q-2011				
Brocade-013		29		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.03,1.16 to 3.28,1.41 Convert all definitions to ISO/IEC				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-014		29		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.61,1.13 to 3.06,1.34 The term VX_Port Identification is used				
IBM-002		29		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.44,7.97 to 3.58,8.16 IBM-P1:E::				
IBM-003		29		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.35,8.47 to 5.45,8.66 IBM-P2:E::				
IBM-004		29		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.53,0.77 to 3.69,1.00 IBM-S1:E::				
QLogic-009		30		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.48,4.13 to 5.41,4.33 What is a "FC-4 channel"?				
Brocade-015		32		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.36,1.97 to 3.08,2.16 This is not an FCoE Virtual Link.				
Brocade-016		34		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.22,6.63 to 2.26,6.83 Change to deinstantiating - global				
Brocade-017		34		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.03,1.63 to 5.08,1.83 Grammar. Should be of up to two.				
Brocade-018		34		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,2.13 to 7.22,2.50 One or more FDF(s) ...				
Brocade-019		34		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,1.63 to 7.22,2.00 The Switch_Names the Controlling FCFs				
IBM-005		34		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.11,6.32 to 7.39,6.57 IBM-P3:T::				
IBM-006		34		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.02,9.30 to 5.67,9.50 IBM-P4:E::				
Brocade-020		35		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.81,9.63 to 2.71,9.84 Should tjis be FCoE Virtual Link as 7.6				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-007		35		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.05,3.64 to 4.33,3.89 IBM-p5:E::				
Brocade-021		36		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.87,2.30 to 2.82,2.50 Lower case (globally).				
Brocade-022		36		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,0.95 to 7.21,1.31 This text still bothers me as I don't				
Brocade-023		36		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.55,1.81 to 0.80,2.06 Add definition for VN2VN_Port.				
Brocade-024		36		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,1.46 to 1.47,1.67 Should also have definitions for VN2VN				
IBM-008		36		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.86,1.99 to 1.14,2.24 IBM-37:E::Add the following				
Brocade-025		40		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,7.97 to 7.21,8.33 Missing figure 9 and 10 and probably				
IBM-009		40		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.95,6.39 to 7.23,6.64 and FDFs? or "including distributed FCFs"?				
Brocade-026		41		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.90,2.76 to 7.15,3.01 A_Port or VA_Port ?				
Brocade-027		44		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.27,0.89 to 3.52,1.14 Provide VA_Port to VA_Port reference model.				
QLogic-010		45		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.83,1.13 to 2.87,1.33 What is this "i.e." trying to say?				
Brocade-028		46		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.25,6.95 to 4.52,7.20 Missing note about independent communicating pair.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-029		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.25,7.21 to 2.40,7.34 VA_Port to VA_Port virtual links,				
Brocade-030		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.08,9.14 to 1.52,9.31 Review all notes per ISO/IEC guidelines (e.g., no normative requirements).				
Brocade-031		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.63,6.97 to 6.46,7.16 virtual links - caps or not?				
Brocade-032		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.51,7.13 to 2.29,7.33 Shouldn't this be capitalized				
Brocade-033		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.63,6.97 to 6.46,7.16 Shouldn't this be capitalized				
Brocade-034		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.82,7.13 to 4.61,7.33 Shouldn't this be capitalized				
IBM-010		48		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.97 to 7.22,7.33 IBM-R3:T::				
Brocade-035		49		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.19,7.71 to 3.34,7.83 VA_Port,				
Brocade-036		49		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.08,7.04 to 6.23,7.16 a VA_Port,				
Brocade-037		49		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.09,7.13 to 1.34,7.38 Having trouble parsing these				
IBM-011		49		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.77,6.97 to 7.01,7.16 IBM-R2:T:: VA_Port should be included in this list, and perhaps a reference to				
IBM-012		49		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.03,7.63 to 4.03,7.83 IBM-R2:E::				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-038		50		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.35,0.78 to 1.61,0.98 Delete extra space.				
Brocade-039		50		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,4.97 to 7.22,5.83 Replace with description of Lossless				
IBM-013		50		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,7.97 to 7.21,8.33 IBM-H1:T:: What is the scope of this requirement? A strict interpretation would require				
QLogic-011		50		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,1.80 to 7.22,2.16 What is "best practice"? Need a				
IBM-014		51		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.87,2.00 to 4.20,2.20 IBM-p6:E:: "A proper implementation of Ethernet				
Brocade-040		82		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.76,3.18 to 4.01,3.43 Add line below item j).				
Brocade-041		86		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.18,7.37 to 4.31,7.55 Delete				
Brocade-042		89		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.67,1.80 to 7.10,2.00 Review all instances of when versus if.				
EMC-093		105	7.9.2.4	First sentence of the section. 7.9.2.2 describes how to discover VLANs when there is a FCF present. How does that apply to VN2VN?				
Brocade-043		108		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.09,7.76 to 7.34,8.01 No text per a Distributed FCF provided.				
Brocade-044		108		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.60,8.38 to 4.75,8.50 VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links,				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-045		108		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,5.63 to 7.21,6.33 Replace with description of proper				
Brocade-046		109		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.76,4.97 to 5.08,5.16 have				
Brocade-047		109		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.58,5.13 to 5.90,5.33 have				
Brocade-048		109		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.97,1.83 to 1.22,2.08 Add outer line border to all figures.				
Brocade-049		110		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.43,0.78 to 4.75,0.98 have				
Brocade-050		110		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.73,7.80 to 6.06,8.00 have				
Brocade-051		110		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.62,8.30 to 3.43,8.50 dashed lines				
Brocade-052		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.51,4.97 to 5.84,5.16 have				
Brocade-053		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.25,6.63 to 3.53,6.83 VN				
Brocade-054		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.33,4.63 to 3.78,4.83 Should be bold font.				
Brocade-055		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.08,5.13 to 4.58,5.33 There is no FCF A in the diagram. Only				
Brocade-056		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.06,5.47 to 7.55,5.66 dashed				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-015		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.10,1.91 to 2.38,2.16 IBM-R14:E:: These are VN2VN_Ports				
QLogic-012		111		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.08,5.13 to 4.58,5.33 There is no "FCF A" in Figure 33.				
Brocade-057		112		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.18,0.78 to 5.51,0.98 have				
IBM-016		112		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.63,2.91 to 0.91,3.16 IBM-R46:T:: Replace this statement (modified from it's original text): Although it will function with only two VN2VN ENode MACs visible to each other over a Lossless Ethernet network, the point-to-point protocol is intended for the case of two VN2VN ENode MACs connected through a single cable so that certain assumptions can be made for faster initialization (e.g. elimination of Probe Requests and associated delays).				
QLogic-013		112		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,3.63 to 7.22,4.00 I don't see any "bracketed" components.				
Brocade-058		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,5.30 to 1.49,5.50 upon				
Brocade-059		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.72,5.30 to 5.92,5.50 upon				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-060		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.58,7.38 to 5.73,7.50 (see 7.7)				
IBM-017		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.74,8.80 to 7.26,9.00 IBM-R10:T:: Refer to FC-LS-3 and FC-FS-4 as there are behaviors there that are prefered fro FCoE VN_Ports (e.g. phy type identification in RNID)				
QLogic-014		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.07,3.01 to 5.32,3.26 This item should be written take into account VN2VN connections. There are no VF_Ports to monitor in that case.				
QLogic-015		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.56,7.30 to 6.91,7.50 Even in the case of VN2VN topology?				
QLogic-016		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,8.63 to 7.55,9.00 What about VN2VN?				
QLogic-017		113		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.85,8.97 to 7.27,9.16 What about VN2VN?				
Brocade-061		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.63 to 7.21,7.00 A VN2VN ENode MAC has one or more VN_Port(s), called VN2VN_Port(s), dedicated to the instantiation of VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links.				
Brocade-062		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.47,7.63 to 5.29,7.83 address identifiers Use address identifier, not N_Port_ID, globally.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-063		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.58,9.13 to 4.72,9.33 VN2VN-FC-MAP (see table 54). Add VN2VN-FC-MAP to table 54.				
Brocade-064		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.94,9.13 to 7.22,9.50 StrikeOut: The constant VN2VN-FC-MAP has the value 0EFD00h.				
Brocade-065		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.42,9.63 to 4.48,9.83 There are no other instances of Fabric FC-MAP.				
IBM-018		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.46,4.22 to 0.74,4.47 IBM-R11:T:: The 2 stacks on the left should be shown as optional with brackets. A VN2VN Enode does not have to also provide FC_BB_E Fabric connectivity.				
IBM-019		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.78,6.80 to 5.22,7.00 IBM-R12:T:: This sentence only applies to multi-point mode. Change to: When operating in a multi-point mode, the FCoE Controller ...				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-018		114		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.80 to 7.22,7.33 This seem unclearƒ Is the FIP FLOGI used during point-to-multi-point operation? Or, just during point-to-point operation? Also, need a statement someplace that the point-to-point operation proceeds as the point-to-point opertion if FC-LS-3.				
Brocade-066		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,0.78 to 7.55,1.14 Don't see how figure 33 shows that Locally Unique N_Port_IDs shall not conflict with and shall be independent from the N_Port_IDs assigned by a Fibre Channel Fabric.				
Brocade-067		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.01,1.11 to 6.72,1.31 Locally Unique N_Port_IDs shall be in the range 000001h to 00FFFEh, inclusive.				
Brocade-068		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.20,2.97 to 5.52,3.16 either				
IBM-020		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,0.78 to 2.43,0.98 IBM-R13:E:: Figure 33 does not show anything about N_Port IDs. Say: Figure 33 shows a mixed FCoE network consisting of both VN_Port to VF_Port virtual links and VN_Port to VN_Port virtual links. In such a configuration, Locally Unique N_Port_IDs ...				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-021		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.66,2.86 to 0.94,3.11 IBM-R15:T:: At the end of 7.4 VN2VN ENode functional model, add the section that summarizes the responsibilities of the FCoE Controller as is provided in the other functional models. e.g.; For a VN2VN ENode's MAC, the FCoE Controller: a) makes up a LUID b) Probes (if multi-point) c) Claims d) Beacons e) instantiates VN_Port to VN_Port virtual links f) deinstantiates (implicit and explicit using LOGO) g) monitors the status of VN_Port to VN_Port virtual links				
QLogic-019		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.00,3.11 to 3.25,3.36 Add text equivalent to the paragraph in 7.5 regarding FCoE_LEP (last paragraph on page 96). Especially the sentence: When decapsulating FC frames from FCoE frames, the FCoE_LEP shall verify that the destination address of the received FCoE frame is equal to the MAC address of the local link end-point and shall verify that the source address of the received FCoE frame is equal to the MAC address of the remote link end-...point. If				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-020		115		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.53,3.14 to 3.78,3.39 If either check fails the FCoE frame shall be discarded.				
Brocade-069		116		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.08,6.64 to 7.21,6.97 The Lossless Ethernet bridging element does not belong in the model. No issue with stating "Each FCF-MAC may be coupled with a Lossless Ethernet bridging element (see IEEE 802....				
Brocade-070		116		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,7.13 to 1.41,7.33 Review all instances of "when" and change to "if" if appropriate.				
Brocade-071		116		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.80 to 7.22,9.16 This sentence states the obvious and provide little value.				
Brocade-072		116		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,7.13 to 1.41,7.33 Should be If				
Brocade-073		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.65,2.30 to 2.22,2.50 transmits				
Brocade-074		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.65,5.63 to 2.22,5.83 initiates				
Brocade-075		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.65,5.63 to 2.22,5.83 transmits				
Brocade-076		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.79,8.63 to 3.76,8.83 decapsulation or de-encapsulation				
Brocade-077		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,8.63 to 1.49,8.83 upon				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-078		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.72,8.63 to 5.92,8.83 in				
Brocade-079		117		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.72,8.63 to 5.92,8.83 upon				
Brocade-080		118		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.71,6.96 to 4.09,7.13 Where/when does the VF_Port/FCoE_LEP verify the D_ID is correct?				
Brocade-081		118		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.22,7.54 to 3.37,7.67 VA_Ports,				
IBM-022		118		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.58,8.58 to 0.85,8.83 IBM-R16:E::				
Brocade-082		119		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.05,6.46 to 7.23,6.67 StrikeOut:				
Brocade-083		120		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.57,4.71 to 3.71,4.83 i.e.,				
Brocade-084		120		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.57,5.38 to 3.71,5.50 i.e.,				
Brocade-085		120		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.49,6.04 to 4.64,6.16 i.e.,				
Brocade-086		120		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.00,6.63 to 3.18,6.83 StrikeOut:				
Brocade-087		121		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.76,3.85 to 2.01,4.10 Acronymm VL is not defined.				
Brocade-088		121		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.30,4.88 to 6.68,5.09 lower case				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-089		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.83,5.71 to 3.98,5.84 i.e.,				
Brocade-090		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.21,5.71 to 4.37,5.84 s				
Brocade-091		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.20,6.38 to 4.35,6.50 i.e.,				
Brocade-092		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.66,8.47 to 2.17,8.66 shall				
Brocade-093		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.43,8.54 to 4.58,8.66 inclusive				
Brocade-094		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.80 to 5.09,9.00 Stating ENodes shall use FPMAs as VN_Port MAC addresses again is redundant (i.e., see first sentence in subclause).				
IBM-023		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.58,5.65 to 0.85,5.90 IBM-R16:E::				
IBM-024		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,5.96 to 3.01,6.17 IBM-R18:T::				
IBM-025		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.80 to 5.05,9.00 IBM-R17:E:: This is redundant to the first sentence in this section. Strike it.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-021		122		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,5.30 to 7.22,5.66 What happens in the case of point-to-multipoint? Are FLOGI's sent? If not, then we need to state that. IF so, then 7.9.4.3 (or some other clase), needs to state rules for point-to-multipoint FLOGIs.				
Brocade-095		123		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.63,0.78 to 4.88,0.98 22				
Brocade-096		123		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.78,5.21 to 1.92,5.33 set				
IBM-026		124		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.80 to 7.22,9.16 IBM-R19:T::				
IBM-027		124		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,9.30 to 7.22,9.66 IBM-20:T::				
QLogic-022		124		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.81,8.22 to 7.06,8.47 N_Port_ID Beacons also use VN_Port MAC address rather than E_Node MAC Address. As this is an FIP overview section VN2VN ENodes should be included in this description.				
Brocade-097		125		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.82,2.13 to 4.73,2.33 the VLANs that provide FC-BB_E services				
Brocade-098		125		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.10,8.88 to 5.26,9.01 example				
Brocade-099		125		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.25,9.47 to 2.59,9.66 manner				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-100		125		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.73,0.78 to 3.75,0.98 The diagram refers informatively to static VLAN configurations and default FCoE VLANs. Should the overview include this?				
Brocade-101		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.57,6.71 to 1.72,6.83 then that Ä Also do a global review				
Brocade-102		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.55,1.55 to 1.70,1.67 then that ...				
Brocade-103		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.45,5.63 to 1.80,5.83 manner				
Brocade-104		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.47,2.47 to 3.05,2.66 instantiate additional?				
Brocade-105		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.64,3.46 to 2.93,3.63 What is "this"? Replace with ENode/FCF				
Brocade-106		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.64,8.62 to 2.93,8.80 What is "this"? Replace with FCF/FCF				
Brocade-107		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.54,3.30 to 6.98,3.48 Not sure what this is trying to say.				
Brocade-108		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.54,8.47 to 6.98,8.65 Not sure what this is trying to say.				
Brocade-109		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.57,1.47 to 1.91,1.66 then the				
Brocade-110		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.59,6.63 to 1.93,6.83 then the				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-028		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.96 to 1.48,9.17 IBM-R21:E:: Missing title				
QLogic-023		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.96 to 1.48,9.17 No title?				
QLogic-024		126		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.52,8.91 to 1.77,9.16 Heading missing.				
Brocade-111		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.37,0.77 to 7.55,0.98 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
Brocade-112		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.97,1.27 to 4.15,1.48 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
Brocade-113		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.24,1.94 to 6.42,2.15 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
Brocade-114		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,1.78 to 1.63,1.98 An				
Brocade-115		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.17,1.77 to 3.36,1.98 s				
Brocade-116		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.10,1.78 to 7.55,1.98 the specified				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-117		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.24,1.11 to 3.72,1.31 Comment on 7.9.6 states that the definition is occuring after the use of All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs. Otherwise some reference to the section 7.9.6 which defines All_VN2VN-ENode-MACS should be here.				
Brocade-118		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.58,1.78 to 2.47,1.98 Should be VN2VN ENode MAC.				
Brocade-119		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,1.28 to 4.14,1.48 What happens when a VN2VN ENode is not configured to provide VLANs?				
QLogic-025		127		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.07,3.20 to 1.32,3.45 No mechanism to discover VLAN for P2P				
Brocade-120		128		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.74,9.30 to 3.91,9.50 Empty Comment				
IBM-029		128		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.55,0.78 to 5.33,0.98 IBM:R23:E:: may determine				
Brocade-121		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.22,1.29 to 6.40,1.50 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
Brocade-122		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.32,1.55 to 3.47,1.67 then				
Brocade-123		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.53,2.63 to 3.71,2.83 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-124		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.50,0.78 to 5.85,0.98 manner				
Brocade-125		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.55,6.47 to 6.23,6.66 FC-SW-6				
Brocade-126		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.98,3.62 to 3.26,3.80 VN2VN ENode Discovery				
Brocade-127		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.87,3.47 to 7.32,3.65 Not sure what this is trying to say. Are we not simply saying that to discover the VN2VN Enode VLANs, discovery may take up to this much time?				
Brocade-128		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.34,1.47 to 4.68,1.66 then the VN2VN ENode whose configuration of VLANs changed				
IBM-030		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.77,4.63 to 3.35,4.83 IBM:22:T:: one or more				
IBM-031		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,1.47 to 7.55,2.00 IBM-R24:T:: What if the vlan on which the virtual link is established is removed from the configuration? CVL? (Same question applies to fabric case).				
QLogic-026		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.41,3.47 to 7.54,3.80 Why isn't this normative?				
QLogic-027		129		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.29,6.47 to 6.23,6.66 reference FC-SW-6				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-129		131		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.25,3.13 to 2.59,3.33 manner				
Brocade-130		131		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.79,3.80 to 2.13,4.00 manner				
Brocade-131		133		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.79,5.63 to 2.13,5.83 manner				
Brocade-132		133		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.60,7.80 to 5.74,8.00 Empty Comment				
Brocade-133		133		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.60,7.80 to 5.74,8.00 Delete extra space.				
IBM-032		133		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.65,1.63 to 7.55,2.00 IBM-H2:T:: Can we relax this restriction for adverts/solicitations between the cFCF and FDF so we can allow the FC-MAP to be distributed to the FDFs?				
Brocade-134		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.92,0.78 to 4.80,0.98 instantiation				
Brocade-135		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.60,4.80 to 7.21,5.00 address				
Brocade-136		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.43,5.30 to 6.81,5.50 The				
Brocade-137		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.47 to 2.42,6.66 provide a reference				
IBM-033		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.69,4.47 to 6.84,4.66 IBM-R25:E:: add (see 7.9.6)				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-028		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.04,4.05 to 4.29,4.30 This clause seems to describe point-to-point FLOGI behavior only. What happens in point-to-multipoint? Does an ENode in a point-to-multipoint topology FLOGI to all other peer VN2VN Enodes? If so, we need to state that here.				
QLogic-029		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.40,4.30 to 6.64,4.50 I think the term "point-to-point" is being overused here. This could be read to mean the point-to-point topology as described in FC-LS-2, or the point-to-point topology as described in FC-BB-6. Both create completed diffferent meanins for this clause. We need to clarify the language used here. One interpretation of this sentence is that this cluase only really applies to FC-BB-6 point-to-point toplogy, not point-to-multipoint. Thus only FC-BB-6 point-to-point topology uses FIP FLOGI. I'm not sureif this is the right interpretation.				
QLogic-030		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.24,6.83 to 6.49,7.08 Add Fabric as there is no FIP LOGO request defined in specification - only FIP Fabric LOGO. Subtle difference here from FCoE LOGO. FIP LOGO de-instantiates the link FCoE LOGO does not, correct?				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-031		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.78,7.87 to 3.03,8.12 Fabric				
QLogic-032		134		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.83,8.99 to 4.08,9.24 Add VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links (see figures 32 and 34).				
Brocade-138		136		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.66,2.13 to 4.48,2.33 instantiation				
IBM-034		136		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.22,4.33 to 6.50,4.58 IBM-P7:E:: ...not logged in…				
QLogic-033		136		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.47 to 7.22,7.00 Craig we may object to this statement.				
Brocade-139		137		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.09,5.97 to 4.93,6.16 instantiation				
Brocade-140		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.63 to 2.76,6.83 Change to bold font.				
Brocade-141		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,2.46 to 3.27,2.67 This section to occur before 7.9.2.4 because that uses ALL-VN2VN-ENode-MACS.				
IBM-035		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.85,0.95 to 6.15,1.14 IBM-R26:E:: change per to from (there is only one)				
IBM-036		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.63 to 2.76,6.83 IBM:R-27:E:: Make bold.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-037		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.01,4.63 to 5.51,4.83 IBM-47:T:: ALL_ENODE_MACS must also be enabled to detect the presence of an FCF (advertisements). This at least needs to be stated as an option. (see 7.9..3.1 - "At any time, upon receiving a N_Port_ID Probe Request, a N_Port_ID Claim Notification, a N_Port_ID Beacon, or a FIP Advertisement, a VN2VN ENode MAC operating in point-to-point mode shall cease the point-to-point operations."				
QLogic-034		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.40,2.46 to 3.27,2.67 A glossary entry for this term would be useful.				
QLogic-035		138		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.30,6.34 to 2.55,6.59 Disagree with statement that no requirement to enable All-ENode-MACs for VN2VN. At least for P2P mode. See last paragraph of 7.9.6.3.1 implication that FIP Advertisement detection is performed.				
Brocade-142		139		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,5.63 to 1.63,5.83 manner				
Brocade-143		139		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.72,9.30 to 2.91,9.50 An				
Brocade-144		140		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.04,7.88 to 3.19,8.00 ,				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-145		140		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.39,7.96 to 3.54,8.17 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
IBM-038		141		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,5.97 to 7.55,6.33 IBM-R48:T:: Clarify that this means that the more than one Claim Responses are from different VN2VN_Ports in response to a single claim request.				
IBM-039		141		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,6.97 to 7.55,7.66 IBM-R49:T:: Note regarding QLogic comment from 12-129v1 that was dropped. Should there be interlock with other VN2VN before FLOGI (i.e received BEACON) ?				
Brocade-146		142		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.90,4.13 to 6.25,4.33 manner				
IBM-040		142		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,4.63 to 4.69,4.84 IBM-R28:E:: Move this to 7.10 Timers and Constants.				
QLogic-036		142		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.40,1.94 to 3.65,2.19 Disagree with CDS that FIP Advertisement = All-ENode-MACs. Optimization don't need to parse frame just MAC address. Also more generic.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-041		143		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.77,5.63 to 7.50,6.03 IBM-R29:E:: One and two character bit names are lame. Make this a FIP Flags field and define in text in a more traditional way with full length bit names and bit numbers. The description of the bits below is in a random order and inconsistent with other bit definitions in this document. State the bit name in bold and state word and bit numbers in definition. (case in point, there are two "D" bits in this spec. I dare you to search for the uses of "D")				
Brocade-147		145		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.34,7.97 to 7.42,8.16 Resolved editor's note.				
IBM-042		145		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.54,8.80 to 6.82,9.05 IBM-p8:T:: So what if these bits are set on other FIP ops? Per pg. 17, "receipt of reserved code values in defined fields shall be reported as an error." This is a value in a defined field that in invalid in the context of 'all other FIP operations"				
Brocade-148		146		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.83,3.80 to 7.18,4.00 manner				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-043		146		ln Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,1.63 to 7.22,2.00 IBM-R30:E:: Describe this bit more fully, including when it is the REC(orded) bit (in Probes) and when it is a P2P bit (in Claims, Claim Response, and Beacon). Reserved otherwise?				
IBM-044		146		ln Rectangle (over,down) 1.09,5.47 to 4.33,5.66 IBM-p9:T:: For item 'e' below in at least one case use of an invalid value for MAC addresses is not reported in a vendor specific way...in a FLOGI invalid MAC) values are reported via LS_RJT per page 142 section 7.9.8.4.2				
QLogic-037		146		ln Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,1.63 to 1.95,1.83 Not consistent with other bit listings in this cluase. For consistency add "(RP)" Bit 3 of word 1 (RP)				
QLogic-038		146		ln Rectangle (over,down) 3.15,1.88 to 3.30,2.00 10?				
QLogic-039		146		ln Rectangle (over,down) 3.54,1.82 to 3.79,2.07 Should list the FIP operations that this bit applies to to be consistent with other bit definitions! N_Port_ID Probe Request, N_Port_ID Claim Notification, N_Port_ID Claim Response, N_Port_ID Beacon. The REC/P2P bit is reserved for all other operations.				
Brocade-149		150		ln Rectangle (over,down) 5.74,3.30 to 5.99,3.50 a				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-150		150		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.94,6.97 to 6.20,7.16 a				
Brocade-151		150		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.08,7.05 to 4.23,7.17 ,				
Brocade-152		150		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.81,3.38 to 3.96,3.50 ,				
IBM-045		150		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,6.63 to 7.22,7.33 IBM-R4:E:: All occurrences of "FLOGI" in this paragraph should be FDISC instead.				
Brocade-153		151		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.88,0.57 to 4.01,0.68 Empty Comment				
Brocade-154		151		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.48,1.55 to 3.63,1.67 ,				
Brocade-155		151		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.73,5.04 to 3.88,5.16 ,				
IBM-046		152		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.80 to 3.70,9.00 IBM-R5:T:: This definition should be more descriptive. Is this an OUI value? What makes it unique?				
Brocade-156		153		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.20,0.86 to 5.35,0.98 .				
Brocade-157		155		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.51,2.44 to 5.76,2.69 Increase column size.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-047		155		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.38,1.25 to 6.49,1.46 IBM-R6:T:: Add FIP Keep Alive received when not logged in. (Need both VN_Port and E_Node flavors as done for timeouts above?)				
IBM-048		155		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.08,3.75 to 3.41,3.95 IBM-R7:T:: Add code for Implicit Logout (the case we added in Virtual Link Maintenance)				
IBM-049		157		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.71,3.68 to 5.31,3.90 IBM-R31:E:: Add or FCF and put the footnote on FCF. It is allowed, therefore it should be here.				
IBM-050		157		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.71,4.05 to 5.30,4.64 IBM-R32:E:: This should be FCF or ENode (not just VN2VN ENode) because it is allowed for a ENode to receive FIP LOGO. Put the footnote on the ENode. Same with next row.				
Brocade-158		161		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.70,3.13 to 5.24,3.34 Review use of capitolization globallyi.e., do not use caps if not needed.				
Brocade-159		161		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.52,3.79 to 5.70,4.00 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
Brocade-160		161		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.57,3.88 to 5.72,4.00 Empty Comment				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-161		161		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.72,9.04 to 6.87,9.17 ,				
Brocade-162		161		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.92,8.97 to 2.17,9.16 a				
QLogic-040		161		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.90,3.46 to 5.99,3.67 There is no description of VN2VN in this section. Most of the text is ENode to FCF specific. This comment is from 12-129v2				
Brocade-163		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.61,0.95 to 1.87,1.14 a				
Brocade-164		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.83,1.03 to 6.98,1.15 ,				
Brocade-165		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.59,1.80 to 1.84,2.00 a				
Brocade-166		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.39,1.88 to 6.53,2.00 ,				
Brocade-167		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,3.30 to 7.21,3.66 Specify the behavior if the FPMA is not properly formed.				
Brocade-168		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.31,4.96 to 1.61,5.17 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
Brocade-169		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.31,5.29 to 1.59,5.50 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-170		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.31,5.63 to 1.58,5.83 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
IBM-051		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.20,5.34 to 0.48,5.59 We've never fully worked out the recovery scenarios regarding exposures of not fully cleaning up prior operations before new ones are initiated if no ABTS is used				
IBM-052		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.32,4.97 to 1.54,5.16 IBM-R33:E:: Remove extra b), c), d)				
IBM-053		162		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.62,7.80 to 7.18,8.00 IBM-34:T:T change to MAC Address field of the MAC address descriptor not set to zero.				
Brocade-171		163		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.88,6.88 to 5.03,7.00 ,				
Brocade-172		163		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.89,7.38 to 5.04,7.50 ,				
Brocade-173		163		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.87,7.88 to 5.02,8.00 ,				
IBM-054		163		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.41,9.16 to 0.69,9.41 We've never fully worked out the recovery scenarios regarding exposures of not fully cleaning up prior operations before new ones are initiated if no ABTS is used				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-055		163		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,9.30 to 7.55,9.66 IBM-R35:T:: This wording needs the same treatment as was given for FLOGI (although the arguments for the S_ID = 0 on FLOGI don't apply here or in FDISC)				
Brocade-174		164		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.11,3.88 to 6.26,4.00 ,				
Brocade-175		164		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.09,4.38 to 4.24,4.50 ,				
Brocade-176		164		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.07,4.88 to 4.22,5.00 ,				
Brocade-177		165		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,9.13 to 4.94,9.33 What other name would it be set to?				
IBM-056		165		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,3.47 to 7.55,3.83 IBM-R8:T:: State the behavior for receiving a CVL with an empty list. After this sentence, add the following: The FCoE Controller of a receiving ENode MAC shall de-instantiate all existing virtual links with the originating FCF-MAC when no Vx_Port Identification descriptors are specified.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-057		165		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,6.47 to 7.55,6.83 IBM-R9:T:: Need to add the case for de-instantiate of a VA_Port to VA_Port virtual link. (i.e. using FFFFFAh and A_Port_Name). Suggest duplication of these 2 paragraphs and changing the terms appropriately.				
Brocade-178		166		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,0.78 to 7.22,1.14 What other name would it be set to?				
Brocade-179		166		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.56,8.71 to 2.71,8.83 ,				
Brocade-180		166		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.56,5.88 to 2.71,6.00 ,				
IBM-058		166		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.83,6.80 to 4.43,7.00 IBM-R36:E:: originating ENode (as was done in 7.9.8.7). Also fix in sections 7.9.8.11, 7.9.8.12, 7.9.8.13.				
QLogic-041		166		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.05,8.77 to 5.30,9.02 Why zero and not just reserved?				
Brocade-181		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.05,1.03 to 5.20,1.15 i.e.,				
Brocade-182		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.22,3.71 to 4.37,3.83 i.e.,				
Brocade-183		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.05,7.38 to 5.20,7.50 i.e.,				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-042		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,5.13 to 3.45,5.33 This should be a glossary term as well.				
QLogic-043		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.41,8.97 to 7.51,9.16 This should be a glossary entry.				
QLogic-044		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.02,8.79 to 6.82,9.00 StrikeOut: Empty Comment				
QLogic-045		167		In Rectangle (over,down) 6.74,8.87 to 6.88,8.99 Response				
Brocade-184		168		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.71,2.54 to 4.86,2.66 i.e.,				
Brocade-185		168		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.56,1.38 to 2.71,1.50 ,				
IBM-059		168		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.04,7.02 to 6.64,7.38 See prior comment. There is no protocol associated with this address, certainly not in 7.9.1 - remove.				
QLogic-046		168		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.90,3.30 to 6.46,3.50 This should be a glossary entry.				
Brocade-186		169		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,6.80 to 1.79,7.00 Should be shall.				
Brocade-187		172		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.61,0.71 to 2.86,0.96 The Distributed FCF model currently				
Brocade-188		172		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.09,0.71 to 3.34,0.96 The Distributed FCF text in FC-BB-6 is dependent on finalized FC-SW-6				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-189		173		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,0.95 to 7.55,1.48 I don't think we resolved the relationship between Switch_Name and virtual domain. The implication in this statement is that a Controlling FCF can use one Switch_Name for more than one Domain_ID; however, I thought it was determined that a one to one relationship between Switch_Name and Domain_ID was necessary.				
Brocade-190		173		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,7.97 to 7.55,8.33 The statement that at least two Augmented VE_Port to VE_Port virtual links is ambiguous and should be removed. A single VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Link is all that is needed to support the redundancy protocol. Furthermore, the model supports multiple VE_Ports over a single physical Lossless Ethernet connection. Both the diagram and the text imply, but do not designate, that the two Augmented links are two physically separate links.				
IBM-060		174		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.15,2.70 to 1.42,2.95 IBM-P10:E:: Figure 47				
IBM-061		174		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,0.95 to 7.21,1.31 IBM-P1:E::				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-062		174		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.59,1.11 to 4.60,1.31 IBM-38:T:: Add a statement that says that the primary and secondary controlling switches shall use the same switch name(s) that is associated with the Virtual Domain ID(s) used for the distributed switch.				
IBM-063		175		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.56,1.11 to 5.05,1.31 IBM-R39:T:: Should the configuration also include the switch name used for the virtual domain?				
IBM-064		176		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,5.30 to 7.22,7.00 IBM:40:E::				
IBM-065		177		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.42,8.63 to 6.54,8.83 IBM-H3:T::				
IBM-066		179		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.75,9.30 to 4.69,9.50 IBM-H1:T::FC-LS-2, version 2.21, table				
IBM-067		180		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.07,3.80 to 7.09,4.16 IBM-P2:T:: If (as in later paragraphs) ELPs				
IBM-068		180		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,5.80 to 7.19,6.00 IBM-R42:E::				
IBM-069		180		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,7.13 to 7.21,7.50 IBM-R43:T::				
IBM-070		180		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,8.80 to 3.47,9.00 IBM-R44:T::				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-047		180		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.07,3.80 to 7.09,4.16 Remove editor's note.				
Brocade-191		181		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.53,4.38 to 3.68,4.50 the				
Brocade-192		181		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.45,4.38 to 5.60,4.50 the				
IBM-071		181		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.28,4.63 to 7.55,5.16 IBM-R45:T:: This only applies after the cFCF set is received in DFMD. Up until then it has to accept any ELPs from controling switches that could be it's primary.				
IBM-072		186		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.42,5.96 to 4.00,6.17 IBM-R50:E:: Annex D was added as a separate annex to cover the VN2VN configurations. That annex does not contain all the background and ACL nomenclature that exists above in C.1-C.2, and therefore, does not stand on its own. Either a) words need to be added to this C.3 that indicate this section applies to fabric configurations and does not apply to VN2VN configurations with a reference to Annex D; or b) The Annexes should be combined and properly structured with Fabric and VN2VN topology sections. My preference is for option b). There should only be one annex to describe ACLs.				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-073		188		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.99,5.17 to 1.27,5.42 IBM-R51:T:: Insert: For each successful FIP Fabric LOGO or Clear Virtual Links associated with this VN_Port MAC address, the above ACE should be removed.				
IBM-074		191		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.99,4.47 to 3.86,4.66 IBM-R52:T:: or a FIB Fabric LOGO LS_ACC				
IBM-075		191		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.52,1.63 to 7.08,1.83 IBM-R53:E:: I am pretty sure that rogue hosts cannot advertise themselves as FCFs in Fibre Channel. Please be specific in what this means.				
IBM-076		192		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,5.63 to 7.22,6.83 IBM-R54:E:: Make one paragraph, or split last sentence into its own paragraph, since it applies to the whole thing.				
IBM-077		192		In Rectangle (over,down) 3.23,7.47 to 4.89,7.66 IBM-R55:T:: Need to include another ACE for All-PT2PT-ENode-MACs to cover the point to point case. Or; alternatively enable one or the other based on P2P bit in the claim. Fix here and in next ACL				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-078		193		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.42,3.13 to 3.52,3.50 IBM-R56:T:: Is FIP allowed or denied by default? Should have a Type = FIP_TYPE, denyat the end to block probes, claims and FLOGIs during the join. Also add to next section so they continue to be not allowed while probes are flowing.				
IBM-079		193		In Rectangle (over,down) 5.64,5.79 to 6.57,6.00 StrikeOut: IBM-R56:E:: redundant. milliseconds already in the definition of BEACON_PERIOD Fix all occurrences.				
IBM-080		193		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.42,6.80 to 4.95,7.33 IBM-R57:T:: Add Type=FIP_TYPE, permit at the end to allow Probes, Claims, FLOGI, etc.				
IBM-081		221		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.27,6.30 to 6.40,6.55 IBM-R58:E:: Is this part of the example or part of the documentation? Needs either code comment /* */ or document font.				
IBM-082		221		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.41,1.64 to 7.55,2.12 IBM-59:E:: Remove this. Provides no relevant information				

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-083		221		In Rectangle (over,down) 1.60,7.13 to 4.98,7.55 IBM-R60:T:: These are uninitialized variables. Show initialization placeholders				
QLogic-048		221		In Rectangle (over,down) 7.66,0.95 to 7.91,1.20 Can a note be added to indicate that the algorithms are in the public domain and may be used without infringing any patents. [Or some equivalent text]				
IBM-084		222		In Rectangle (over,down) 0.95,2.97 to 7.22,3.33 IBM-R61:E:: Help!				
IBM-085		227		In Rectangle (over,down) 2.70,0.77 to 6.85,1.00 IBM-R61:E:: This is all nice, but are we going to make any recommendation?				
IBM-086		227		In Rectangle (over,down) 4.19,3.24 to 4.50,3.44 IBM-R62:T:: FCoE				
DELL-4			7.12	Since BB-6(Distributed FCF, 7.12) is closely dependent on SW-6, BB-6 should closely track SW-6. We believe SW-6 should be comepleted before BB-6(Distributed FCF) is closed/finalized. If not, there is a potential for Distributed FCF to be incorrect.				
Color Key:								
Red - editor to research or working group needs								

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Yellow - working group action								
Pink - editor to incorporate								
Purple - complete								
					Keys:			
Summary			550	All	O	Open: An action has been identified and is not complete		
			0	All Open	A	Accepted: The issue has been resolved and the resolution indicates any necessary changes		
			0	All Accepted	R	Rejected: The issue has been rejected, and the resolution indicates the reason. The resolution may also indicate changes found useful to improve the readability of the standard		
			0	All Rejected	W	Withdrawn: The commenter has withdrawn the comment.		
			0	All Withdrawn		Not considered yet		
			0	All Accepted in Principle	AinP	Accepted in Principle: The comment issue has been accepted in principle and the resolution indicates any necessary changes		
			#REF!	All Not Processed				
			123	All Technical				
			#REF!	All Open Technical				
			#REF!	All Accepted Technical				
			#REF!	All Rejected Technical				
			#REF!	All Withdrawn Technical				
			#REF!	All Not Processed Technical				
			98	All Editorial				
			#REF!	All Open Editorial				
			#REF!	All Accepted Editorial				
			#REF!	All Rejected Editorial				
			#REF!	All Withdrawn Editorial				
			#REF!	All Not Processed Editorial				