

FC-BB-6 Revision 1.2 Letter Ballot Comments Database (13-021v4)								
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	Incorporate the modified 12-019v1, which is 13-077v0.	A	C
Cisco-02	T	1	table 1	More annexes are applicable to FC-BB_E	fix it	Editor to fix	A	
EMC-043	T	8	3 - Definitions and conventions	There is no definition for FDF-MAC	Add a definition for FDF-MAC.	FDF-MAC: A Lossless Ethernet MAC coupled with an FCoE Controller in an FDF.	A	
Cisco-03	T	11	3.2.24	The definition of VE_Port should be harmonized with the one in FC-SW-5/6	fix it	Change to: "An instance of the FC-2V sublevel of Fibre Channel that communicates with another VE_Port (see FC-SW-6)."	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
Juniper-003	T	13	3.5.2	remove 'up to two'		Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
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.	N_Port_ID: A topology unique address identifier of an Nx_Port (see FC-FS-4).	A	
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."	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.  FCoE frames received from a remote FC-BB_E device shall be de-encapsulated and sent to the appropriate VN_Port, VF_Port, VE_Port or VA_Port."	As suggested.	A	
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.		Replace with: FC-BB_E devices shall provide in-order delivery of FCoE frames on at least a per-Exchange basis within the Lossless Ethernet network. Also change "guarantee" to "provide" in the FCIP sentence.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Cisco-06	T	31	5	Make the VE_Port definition consistent with FC-SW-5/6	fix it	In 5.3.4.2.2, change "A VE_Port emulates an E_Port and interfaces with the FCIP_LEP component of the FCIP Entity. The term "Virtual" in VE_Port indicates the use of a non Fibre Channel link connecting the VE_Ports." with "A VE_Port interfaces with the FCIP_LEP component of the FCIP Entity."  Globally, replace "VE_Port_Name" with "E_Port_Name" and remove definition 3.2.25.	AinP	
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.	As suggested.	A	
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: "FCoE supports VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Links, VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Links, VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links, and VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links."	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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? Within an exchange? does the word 'provides' really mean 'shall' or is this statement more of a guideline?	Requiring in-order deliver is fine but need to state the scope of the in-order requirement better. Preferred scope is dependent on application and use by upper level protocol. Need to state that in-order applies at the exchange or sessions level as appropriate to deployment.	Remove the sentence: "The Lossless Ethernet layer provides sequential delivery of FCoE frames."	AinP	
Juniper-011	T	87	7.2	Pause based link level flow control schemes are only equivalent to credit based schemes within the distance supported by the buffering available to the port, priority at the receiveing Ethernet port. Within this boundary the two schemes are equivalent. Beyond the boundary, the behavior of the schemes is quite different. For credit based flow control once the bandwidth delay product exceeds the credit FC throughput drops proportional to the excess distance independent of congestion. For Paused based system the excess traffic is dropped (tail-drop). This affects several statments in the spec.	This clarification can be added to the statement or as a following statement.	Replace "(e.g., the PAUSE mechanism defined in IEEE 802.3-2008)" with "(see 4.4.6)"	AinP	
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 VN_Ports instantiated by other VN2VN ENodes through FCoE VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links."	As suggested. In addition remove "and is dynamically instantiated on successful completion of a FIP FLOGI or FIP NPIV FDISC Exchange." from 3.5.38.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Juniper-013	T	90	Figure 33	Need to explicitly point out that the VN2VN fabric/SAN and the FCF fabric/SAN shown in this diagram must be different fabrics even if they share the same Ethernet VLAN/Network.		Add before "Figure 34 shows..." the sentence "The operations of the VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links are independent from the operations of the VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Links."	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
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.	Fine as is.	R	C
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.	Fine as is.	R	C
EMC-015	T	91	7.3	The a, b list started at the end of the page that defines the set of functions performed by the FCoE Controller does not include any VN2VN or PT2PT protocol requirements.	Suggest adding VN2VN and PT2PT specific functions to this list including: n) optionally initiates the FIP VN2VN protocol and instantiates VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links.	Fine as is.	R	C
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 FDISC 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.	Discussed. Comment rejected.	R	C

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 instantiation of VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links."	The FCoE Controller of a VN2VN ENode MAC may instantiate VN2VN_Ports (i.e., VN_Ports able to support VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links).	AinP	
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..	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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	After the sentence of the check add: "The FCoE_LEP shall also 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."	A	
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."	As suggested.	A	
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.	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.	VA_Port are present in Controlling FCFs, not in "regular" FCFs. The Controlling FCF functional model in 7.12 includes them.	R	C
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.	VA_Port are present in Controlling FCFs, not in "regular" FCFs. The Controlling FCF functional model in 7.12 includes them.	R	C
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 96.	VA_Port are present in Controlling FCFs, not in "regular" FCFs. The Controlling FCF functional model in 7.12 includes them.	R	C
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.	Change to: "VN_Ports instantiated by the FCoE Controller of an ENode MAC on successful completion of FIP NPIV FDISC Exchanges with a VF_Port capable FCF-MAC are all associated with the same VF_Port. This VF_Port is instantiated by the FCoE Controller of that VF_Port capable FCF-MAC on successful completion of a FIP FLOGI Exchange."	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 verification "...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 an E_Node can log into multiple VF_Ports, there is no such thing as THE remote link end-point"	Editor to modify this paragraph to accommodate an E_Node logging into more than one VF_Port; or remove the statement that allows more than one login.	An ENode can log into more than one VF_Port, however the Virtual Links are at the VN_Port level.	R	C
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 functional entity performing Fibre Channel switching among E_Ports, F_Ports, A_Ports, VE_Ports, VF_Ports and VA_Ports."	VA_Port are present in Controlling FCFs, not in "regular" FCFs. The Controlling FCF functional model in 7.12 includes them.	R	C
EMC-035	T	97	7.5	Missing a description of a VA_Port.	Add a paragraph that describes what a VA_Port is.	VA_Port are present in Controlling FCFs, not in "regular" FCFs. The Controlling FCF functional model in 7.12 includes them.	R	C
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		No issue. For FC-BB-6 compliance you shall use FPMAs	R	C
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, 39 and 42.	Consider changing the sentence to: "The multipoint case shown in figure 32 is modeled by the functional model specified in 7.4 as shown in figure 40." Dave to further fix.	AinP	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.	see EMC-36.	AinP	
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.	see EMC-29.	R	C
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 read: "The FIP protocol is used to negotiate the VN_Port MAC addresses that are used between two ENodes or between an ENode and an FCF."	As suggested.	A	
EMC-040	T	101	7.7	The first sentence of the second paragraph states that "FPMA's 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.	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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, the FDF-MAC address shall be used for all FIP frames."	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-045	T	103	7.9.1	The 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page is missing a description of what group addresses an FDF-MAC should listen to.	Add a text to the 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page describing what group addresses an FDF-MAC should listen to.	Change to: "ENode MACs shall listen to the All-ENode-MACs group address and, if the Locally Unique N_Port_ID protocol is supported, also to the All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs and All-PT2PT-ENode-MACs group addresses. FCF-MACs and FDF-MACs shall listen to the All-FCF-MACs group address. ENode MACs, FCF-MACs, and FDF-MACs shall listen to the All-FCoE-MACs group address."	AinP	
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 Notification frame may enable one or more of these VLANs for subsequent operations."	change "shall" to "may"	Change the paragraph to: "FIP protocols shall be performed on a per-VLAN basis. It is recommended to use the FIP VLAN discovery protocol on the default VLAN (see IEEE 802.1Q-2005). All other FIP protocols shall be performed in the VLANs selected for FC-BB_E operations."	AinP	
EMC-090	T	103	7.9.1	Section 7.9.1 describes MAC addressing for FIP, and describes ENODES, FCFs etc, but does not describe FDFs	Add paragraph(s) as appropriate to describe FDFs	see EMC-45.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Editor	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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?		see EMC-88.	AinP	
Juniper-015	T	103	7.9.1	This section needs to state that ENodes may optionally listen to the VN2VN and PT2PT group addresses. The last sentence needs to allow for these addresses as well		see EMC-45	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
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.	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Editor	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 that offer FC-BB_E services. However, there is no text describing what an ENode should do when it receives one of these notifications.	Suggest adding something like the following text after the last sentence in the second paragraph on page 105: "Upon reception of an asynchronous FIP VLAN Notification, the ENode MAC may enable one or more of the VLANs for subsequent operations. If an ENode MAC has a VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Link over a VLAN and that VLAN is not listed in the FIP VLAN Notification and the FIP VLAN Notification was received from the FCF-MAC that the FIP FLOGI LS_ACC was received from, the FCoE Controller of the ENode should consider this to be an implicit Logout of that VN_Port.	Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
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?		Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 capable FCF-MAC offers FC-BB_E services and should be sent over the VLAN from which VLAN discovery requests were received." There may have never been a VLAN discovery request	Change the sentence to use one of the VLANs that a FIP ELP was successfully performed on	Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
EMC-095	T	107	Figure 44	Why is there a box for fabric operation when the title of this figure is VN2VN?		A VN2VN Enode supports also Fabric operations (see the functional model). Fine as is.	R	C
EMC-096	T	107	Figure 44	the boxes with the a,b lists should say "in each of the selected VLAN(s)..."		As suggested.	A	
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.	Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
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.	See Cisco-11.	AinP	C
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 discovery protocol.	Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
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	Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
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..."	replace "selects" with "shall select"	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 bit 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 Discovery Solicitation (see 7.9.8.2) to that FCF-MAC address and receive a solicited unicast Discovery Advertisement in response.	As suggested.	A	
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 VLAN should be reported by VE_Port capable FCF-MAC..." What about the case where two fabrics are being joined for the first time? This rule would prohibit the merge of two different fabrics via FCoE.	I believe this paragraph was added in an attempt to resolve the issue identified at UNH-IOL by Bill Martin. I don't believe this text resolves that issue..	Remove from that sentence: "and no subsequent VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Links should be instantiated."	AinP	
EMC-054	T	112	7.9.4.1	The final sentence of the third paragraph of the clause only partially describes how a VN_Port MAC Address is assigned to a VN_Port.	Suggest rewording the final sentence of the third paragraph to read: "The MAC address contained in the MAC Address descriptor of the FIP FLOGI LS_ACC or FIP NPIV FDISC LS_ACC that is returned by the FCF shall be used as the VN_Port MAC address (see 7.7)."	As suggested.	A	
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 contained in the FIP FLOGI LS_ACC or FIP NPIV FDISC LS_ACC that is returned by the FCF shall contain a properly formatted FPMA MAC address"	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-056	T	113	7.9.4.2	The second sentence of the clause only partially describes the method that FIP ELP uses to communicate MAC addresses.	Suggest rewording the second sentence of the clause to read: "In addition to providing ELP, the FIP ELP provides a method (i.e., the MAC Address descriptor) to communicate the MAC address for the VE_Port (see 7.9.8.4.4).	As suggested.	A	
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	Add "(see 7.9.6.2.2 and 7.9.6.3.1)" after the words "VN2VN Neighbor Set"	AinP	
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	Change the first sentence to: "VN_Port to VF_Port Virtual Links (see figure 30), VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Links (see figure 31), VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links (see figure 32), and VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links (see figure XXX) overlay over a Lossless Ethernet network."	AinP	
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?		Yes! It is written in the following sentence.	A	C
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 that is not logged in, ..."	As suggested.	A	
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.	Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 more description on how to handle longer vs. shorter new values, like the description in 7.9.5.2		Text is fine as is.	R	C
DELL-2	T	117	7.9.6.1	Is the operation of VN2VN in multipoint-mode or point-to-point configured or auto detect? Does E-Node send FIP frames on both VN2VN and PT2PT multi-cast addresses? There is a mention of "Enode enable reception of frames sent to both address", what about transmit?		Add at the end of the first paragraph: "A VN2VN ENode shall operate in either multipoint or point-to-point mode."	AinP	
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		Change the first two sentences to: "When ready to instantiate VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links, a VN2VN ENode MAC shall transmit a multicast N_Port_ID Beacon to All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs and shall continue to transmit multicast N_Port_ID Beacons periodically every BEACON_PERIOD milliseconds plus a random delay uniformly distributed between 0 and 100 ms to avoid synchronized bursts of multicast traffic within the Ethernet network."	AinP	
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 validations "The checks for proper formating include". The ones that are missing need to be added so that it can say "The checks for proper formatting are:"		Change "The checks for correct formatting include:" to "The minimum checks for correct formatting are:"	AinP	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.		Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
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	Add the "Login Avoidance Bit". Resolved by 13-250v0.	AinP	
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	Change "FCF" to "FCF or VN2VN ENode"	A	
EMC-067	T	141	7.9.8.4.2	Related to EMC-19. The sentence beginning with "A FIP FLOGI or..." describes how to handle flow control parameters and it may need to be updated based upon the discussion of EMC-19	Depends on the outcome of EMC-19.	No need to change. See EMC-019.	R	C
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	Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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..."	In the last sentence of the first paragraph, replace "a list of" with "zero or more". In the second paragraph, replace "The list of Vx_Port Identification descriptors contains either one descriptor for each VN_Port whose Virtual Link has to be de-instantiated or no descriptors." with "The list of Vx_Port Identification descriptors, if present, shall contain one descriptor for each VN_Port whose Virtual Link has to be de-instantiated."	AinP	
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	Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	
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		Incorrect. VA_Port capable FDF-MACs cannot generate CVLs to ENodes.	R	
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	Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	
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	Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	
EMC-127	T	145	7.9.8.8	Similar comment as to EMC-126		See EMC-122	AinP	
EMC-128	T	145	7.9.8.9	Similar comment as to EMC-126		See EMC-122	AinP	
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.		Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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.		Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 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.	A good place for such an indication is in the FIP FC-4 Attributes descriptor as a new field (1 bt) taken from the reserved field in word zero.	See Juniper-19	AinP	
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 requires an additional RDI using an additional switch name		Resolved by 13-141v1	R	C
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.	Resolved by 13-141v1	R	C
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 VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Links between themselves, where the term 'augmented' indicates that Virtual Link is used also for the redundancy protocol, in addition to normal VE_Port operation (see FC-SW-6)." A note could also be added, such as "NOTE: To improve redundancy, it is suggested that two or more VE_Port to VE_Port Links be configured between the primary and secondary FCF"	Resolved by 13-141v1	R	C

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 Domain_IDs, one for each Controlling FCF, and one or more for the Virtual Domain_IDs."	Resolved by 13-141v1	R	C
Juniper-027	T	154	figure 48	The diagram shows a second set of optional VF, VE, and VA ports on an second optional bridge. The bracketing as drawn shows implies that at least one VA, one VE, and one VN port would be required but this is not quite correct in that the ports types can be included in any combination. VF and VN ports on the principal domain switching element are not specifically required but both could be present.	Fix the picutre to precisely show what is and is not required and in what combinations. Should be able to read the diagram and clearly understand which combinations of ports is required and allowed. I think this can be clarified some.	Resolved by 13-245v1.	AinP	
EMC-072	T	155	7.12.2	The second paragraph on page 155 states that the FIP protocol is used to discover VA_Ports and for the instantiation of VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links, but this information is missing from the FIP clause 7.9.8.4.	Suggest that text is added to 7.9.8.4 that describes how the FIP protocol is used with VA_Ports.	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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 VA_Ports and optionally VF_Ports over its FDF-MAC."	As suggested	A	
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 can FLOGI into an FDF. Consider what should a FDF do if it gets a clear virtual link addressed to the Native port? What if the native port aborts a FLOGI? There is no text in BB-6 that addresses these two tip of the iceberg issues.	Get rid of this can of worms and prohibit native ports on a FDF. The connectivity between the ethernet world and native world is through a FCF, not a FDF.	These issues are not present.	R	C

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-076	T	158	7.12.5.1	The term "initialization exchanges" used in the second paragraph of clause 7.12.5.1 is not defined in FC-SW-6 Rev 1,1,	I suggest either adding text to FC-SW-6 defining exactly what initialization exchanges consist of, or update the reference in this clause to point to something that exists in FC-SW-6.	Resolved by 13-141v1 and 13-153v0.	AinP	
EMC-081	T	160	7.12.5.2	In regards to item c in the list, how does an FDF determine if a discovered FDF-MAC belongs to an FDF in the Distributed FCF's FDF Set? In other words exactly which fields are checked and what should they contain?	Suggest adding a description of the process used by an FDF to determine if a discovered FDF-MAC belongs to an FDF is the Distributed FCF's FDF Set.	Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
Juniper-028	T	160	7.12.6	the term 'directly reachable' is not very precise because 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.	Remove "directly"	AinP	
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.	Commenter to research	W	C
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.	Commenter to research	W	C
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.	Resolved by 13-245v1.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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-to-point and multipoint topologies.	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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 whether FCF-MACs are allowed, required to, or prohibited from listening to this address.	See EMC-45	AinP	
DELL-1	T	104 & 107	fig 43 & 44	Since "default FCOE VLAN" is not defined, how does one differentiate between "Static FCOE VLAN configuraton" and "default FCOE VLAN" in the flow chart? Should standard define "default FCOE VLAN"?		Default FCoE VLAN is vendor specific. Standard should not define it.	R	C
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.	Fine as is. The note explains the meaning.	R	C
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)".	As suggested	A	
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.	Add labels to the lines	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 written, 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.	As suggested.	A	
EMC-126	T	144-145	7.9.8.7	This section needs description of VA_Port MACs		FDF-MACs. See EMC-122	AinP	
EMC-158	T	147	Table 54	The new constant "All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs" is missing.	add it	As suggested	A	
EMC-159	T	147	Table 54	The new constant "VN2VN-FC-MAP" is missing.	add it	As suggested	A	
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?		Resolved by 13-141v1	R	C
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.	Comment discussed. No change.	AinP	C

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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 ...."	Change the first sentence to: "Figure 36 shows the functional model of a VN2VN ENode, where the bracketed functional components are optional. A VN2VN ENode is functionally composed of at least one Lossless Ethernet MAC (i.e., the ENode MAC), and an FCoE Controller function for each ENode MAC."	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	
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.	See Cisco-11	AinP	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.	See Cisco-11.	AinP	
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.		See Juniper-19	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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).		See Juniper-19	AinP	
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?	Resolved in 13-246v1	AinP	
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.	Appendix D provides the functionality.	W	C
EMC-002	E	4	Figure 4	Figure 4 does not include a VA_Port reference.	Update Figure 4 to include a VA_Port	Resolved by 13-226v0	AinP	
Juniper-001	E	7	2.6	Need to cross check the references for IEEE		Editor to fix	AinP	
EMC-003	E	8	3 - Definitions and conventions	There is no definition for A_Port	Add a definition for A_Port.	Add to section 3.1: "A_Port: The combination of one PA_Port and one VA_Port operating together (see FC-SW-6)."	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Juniper-002	E	8	3.1	Should FC-LS-2 references be changed to FC-LS-3 references in the same way that FC-SW-5 are now FC-SW-6 references?	I think we should do this update but maybe there is some specific reason it was not done.	Editor to fix	AinP	
Juniper-004	E	13	3.5.5	change "coupled with" to "coupled to"		As suggested.	A	
Juniper-005	E	13	3.5.4	Shouldn't definition of "A Fiber Channel node (see FC-FS-3) that is able to transmit FCoE frames using one or more ENode MACs." add a statement to cover FIP Frames as well? FIP frames are explicitly defined separately from FCoE.		Change the definition of FCoE Controller to be: "FCoE Controller: A functional entity, coupled with a Lossless Ethernet MAC, instantiating and de-instantiating VE_Ports, VF_Ports, VN_Ports,, VA_Ports and/or FCoE_LEPs using the FCoE Initialization Protocol (FIP)."	AinP	
Cisco-04	E	14	3.5.36	It should be VN_Port/FCoE_LEP	fix it	As suggested.	A	
Cisco-05	E	17	3.7.5	Add VA_Port	fix it	As suggested.	A	
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.	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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.		??	W	C
Juniper-009	E	87	7.2	VA_Ports are also connected by FCoE	Add references to VA_Ports where FCoE connectivity is discussed.	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
Juniper-010	E	87	7.2	cross reference PFC (Qbb) here as well.		See Juniper-11	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.	Split the first paragraph in two, with the new paragraph beginning with: "Each VN2VN ENode may instantiate multiple VN_Ports..."	AinP	
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?		See Juniper-013.	AinP	
Cisco-07	E	90	figure 33	"FCoE" in the caption is not bold	fix it	As suggested.	A	
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."	Change to: "VN_Ports instantiated upon successful FIP FLOGI and subsequent FIP NPIV FDISC Exchanges are all associated with the same VF_Port that was instantiated on successful completion of the FIP FLOGI Exchange."	AinP	
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."	As suggested.	A	

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"	Specifying how the fabric behaves is not a business of FC-BB-6. The concept is covered in the subsequent sentence: "The VN_Port behavior shall be as specified in FC-LS-2 and FC-FS-3..."	R	
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.	Resolved by 13-245v1.	A	
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"	Change to: "As shown in figure 32, because there is no FCF that performs N_Port_ID selection, VN2VN ENode MACs shall select N_Port_IDs for themselves (see 7.9.6)."	AinP	
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.	??	W	C
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.	See EMC-022	A	

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.	Figure 33 is not a reference model, it is a supported network configuration.	R	C
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."	As suggested	A	
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	As suggested.	A	
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 section 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 the various parts of the protocol.		Figure 43 is much simpler for an implementation not supporting Locally Unique N_Port_IDs.	R	C
Cisco-09	E	104	figure 43	bitmap figure	the approved version was vectorial	Editor to fix	A	
Juniper-017	E	105	7.9.2.4	section has no title		See IBM-028	AinP	
EMC-094	E	106	7.9.2.4	First paragraph on page 106: All instances of "VLANs" should be just "VLAN"		As suggested.	A	
Cisco-10	E	107	figure 44	bitmap figure	the approved version was vectorial	Editor to fix	A	
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 occurrence of "VLANs" should be singular	As suggested.	A	

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		As suggested.	A	
EMC-103	E	109	7.9.3.2	The last two sentences of the large paragraph in the middle of the page seems very out of place. The paragraph is describing multicast requests and the unicast replies. Then out of the blue these two sentences talk about unicast requests		These are unicast responses, not unicast requests.	R	C
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		The FC-MAP value is different than zero only if the FP bit is set to one, this is why the items are worded in that way. Keep as is.	R	C
EMC-106	E	113	7.9.4.3	First paragraph on page 113: NOTE: Here it states that the VN2VN link is instantiated at FLOGI time, but in native FC, the point to point link is not established until PLOGI, as that's where the FC_IDs are assigned for both ports. Not sure if this difference is worth debating or not	Discuss with group	In native FC the point to point link is a physical link... established way before PLOGI. PLOGI is where N_Port_IDs are assigned. In the FCoE case, FIP FLOGI instantiates the Virtual Link, FCoE PLOGI assigns the N_Port_IDs using the values "suggested" by the FIP FLOGI.	R	C
EMC-107	E	113	7.9.4.3	Second paragraph in this section: "A FIP FLOGI Request in a point-to-point topology coming from a VN2VN_Port not listed in the VN2VN Neighbor Set shall..." The term "Neighbor Set" has not yet been defined up to this point in the document.	A reference to section 7.9.6.2.2 should be added	As suggested.	A	
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 paragraphs, the first sentence of the second paragraph is awkward. The MAC address of what????		As suggested. Combine the two paragraphs.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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).	As suggested.	A	
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)."	Change to: "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 that VF_Port shall be removed from the FCF Login Set (see 7.9.3.2)."	AinP	
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 standardize for the burned in MAC) or a reference to some IEEE document etc	Change 3.5.6 to: "ENode MAC Address: The assigned MAC address of an ENode MAC, used by the FCoE Controller of the ENode MAC for the FCoE Initialization Protocol (FIP)."	AinP	
EMC-111	E	114	7.9.5.2	Paragraph 5 on page 114, last sentence: "A subsequent FIP Fabric Login may be performed with an FCF-MAC in the current FCF Login Set as specified in see 7.9.3.2."	make the end of the sentence either "...as specified in 7.9.3.2" or "...FCF Login Set (see 7.9.3.2)"	Change to: "...as specified in 7.9.3.2"	A	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
EMC-061	E	115	7.9.5.2	The wording of sentences 2 through 4 of the first paragraph after Note 29, is a bit rough.	Suggest re-writing sentences 2 - 4 of the first paragraph to read as follows: "A FIP Clear Virtual Links frame may be transmitted by a VF_Port capable FCF-MAC to an ENode MAC if one or more Virtual Link(s) have been instantiated between the VF_Port capable FCF-MAC and an ENode MAC. The FIP Clear Virtual Links frame provides a list of zero or more VN_Ports to be de-instantiated. If the FIP Clear Virtual Links frame contains one or more VN_Ports, an ENode MAC shall de-instantiate the listed VN_Ports upon reception of the Clear Virtual Links frame. IF the FIP Clear Virtual Links frame contains zero VN_Ports, the ENode MAC shall de-instantiate all VN_Ports logged in with the originating FCF-MAC upon the reception of the Clear Virtual Links frame."	Change to: "A FIP Clear Virtual Links frame may be transmitted by a VF_Port capable FCF-MAC or FDF-MAC to an ENode MAC if one or more Virtual Link(s) have been instantiated between the VF_Port capable FCF-MAC or FDF-MAC and the ENode MAC. A FIP Clear Virtual Links frame provides a list of zero or more VN_Ports to be de-instantiated. If a FIP Clear Virtual Links frame provides a list of one or more VN_Ports, an ENode MAC shall de-instantiate the listed VN_Ports upon reception of the FIP frame. If a FIP Clear Virtual Links frame provides zero VN_Ports, an ENode MAC shall de-instantiate all VN_Ports logged in with the originating FCF-MAC or FDF-MAC upon reception of the FIP frame."	AinP	
Cisco-12	E	115	7.9.5.2	"CVL" is used only here	Replace it with "FIP Clear Virtual Links frame"	As suggested.	A	
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.	As suggested.	A	
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.	As suggested.	A	
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	As suggested.	A	
Cisco-13	E	117	7.9.6.2	Not in bold	fix it	See EMC-064	A	

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 outside parenthesis? The term "Login Set" is used in several other sections in this document.		What is defined here is the term 'VN2VN Login Set'. Add a reference to 7.9.6.2.2 after the first occurrence of 'VN2VN Login Set' in 7.9.5.4.	AinP	
EMC-115	E	119	7.9.6.2.2	In the fourth paragraph "When Ready to instantiate..." What is the definition of when a VN2VN_Port is ready?	Prior to instantiating, VN_Port to VN_Port virtual links, and continuing after instantiation, a VN2VN Enode MAC shall....	Resolved by 13-246v1.	AinP	
EMC-066	E	124	7.9.7.2	Editor's note on page 124	Remove the editor's note.	See Cisco-14	A	
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	Change the first sentence of the previous paragraph to: "If a FIP frame is received with the C bit set to one and the D bit set to one, then the FIP frame is invalid, shall be ignored and its reception should be reported in a vendor specific way."	AinP	
Cisco-15	E	131	7.9.7.3.14	Specify that the Vendor ID is the T10 Vendor ID	fix it	As suggested.	A	
Cisco-16	E	132	7.9.7.3.16	Specify that the Vendor ID is the T10 Vendor ID	fix it	As suggested.	A	
Cisco-17	E	137	Table 52	FIP VLAN Requests and FIP VLAN Notifications can be used also by VN2VN Enodes	fix it	Resolved by 13-225v1	AiP	
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)		See Cisco-18	A	
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.		As suggested.	A	
Cisco-18	E	141	7.9.8.4.2	items b), c), and d) of the lettered list are double lettered	fix it	As suggested.	A	
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.		See IBM-040	AinP	
Juniper-024	E	149	7.11	Section number is repeated from page 148		Editor to fix, it should be 7.12	A	

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."	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
EMC-130	E	151	7.12.1	Last paragraph on page 151: All instances of N_Port should be VN_Port		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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."	Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
EMC-133	E	153	7.12.1	Last paragraph before Figure 47: The figure number is missing		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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 mandatory	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	See Juniper-027	AinP	
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	As suggested.	A	

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	Add to the convention section: "In figures, dashed components or bracketed components are optional." Dave to do editorial fixing.	AinP	
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	As suggested.	A	
EMC-137	E	158	7.12.5.1	Second paragraph of the section: Missing parenthesis around the "see SW-6" reference		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
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..."	Remove the sentence	AinP	
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..."	Remove the sentence	AinP	
EMC-079	E	159	7.12.5.2	Remove the Editor's note	Remove the Editor's note.	See Cisco-19	A	
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"	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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	Specify to reject the FIP ELP if they are set to one in the FIP ELP Request and to de-instantiate the Virtual Link (through a FIP Clear Virtual Link) if they are set to one of the FIP SW_ACC. And report the situation.	AinP	
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.	See Cisco-20	A	
Cisco-20	E	160	7.12.5.3	Add a reference "(see 7.9.5.3)" at the end of the sentence.	fix it	As suggested.	A	
Cisco-21	E	206	Table H.1	Replace the first "FIP" instance with "FCoE" in the second row	fix it	As suggested.	A	
EMC-150	E	105	7.9.2.4	There's no title.	Call this section "ENode/ENode discovery"	See IBM-028	AinP	
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".	As suggested.	A	
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.	Start a new paragraph with the sentence "As specified in FC-LS-2".	AinP	
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.	Change the first sentence to: "Explicit VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Link de-instantiation is performed by a VN2VN ENode MAC by performing a FIP Fabric LOGO, that de-instantiates the FCoE_LEPs and performs a N_Port logout."	AinP	
EMC-157	E	115	7.9.5.2	In the paragraph beginning with "An event that causes", what's a CVL?	spell it out	See Cisco-12	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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".	As suggested. See Oracle-3	A	
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".	As suggested.	A	
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".	As suggested.	A	
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".	As suggested.	A	
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.	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
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.	Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
Oracle-1	E	p. 102	7.8 (first sentence)	"... contain an FCoE PDU (see table 21)" should be, "see table 22"		fix the reference.	A	
Oracle-5	E	p. 105	7.9.2.4	Missing heading, "VN2VN Enode Discovery"		Put a title	AinP	
Oracle-3	E	p. 90	paragraph below Figure 33	"FCF A has a single physical Ethernet ..." The FCF in figure 33 is not labeled FCF A, it is just labeled FCF.		Change the text to "The FCF"	AinP	
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 depicts a VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Link.		Change the text to "VN_Port to VN_Port"	AinP	
EMC-001	E	xxi	Table	The final entry (Table H.1) in the table list contains bold formatted characters.	Remove the bold format.	As suggested.	A	
Cisco-01	E	xxi		strange bold in table H.1	fix it	As suggested.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
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.		Already defined in the acronym list	R	C
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	Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	
Intel-7	E		7.9.8.4.2	Page 141, fix list that indicates 'b) b), and c) c), etc.		See Cisco-18	A	
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?		A VN2VN ENode is also an ENode and as such it can operate with FCFs. See figure 33.	W	C
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	Resolved by 13-141v1. See Brocade-188	AinP	
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 completed before BB-6(Distributed FCF) is closed/finalized. If not, there is a potential for Distributed FCF to be incorrect.		Resolved by 13-141v1. See Brocade-188	AinP	
Brocade-001		6		Delete blank pages.			A	
Brocade-002		10		Fix hyphenation globally.			A	
Brocade-003		13		Remove all bold text in the TOC.			A	
Brocade-004		15		Fix long sentence wrapping per ISO/IEC directives.			A	
Brocade-005		21		Remove bold.			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-006		25		Functional models in 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5 use Lossless Ethernet MAC and Ethernet_Port instead of IEEE 802.3//802.1 Lossless Ethernet.		Keep as is.	R	C
Brocade-007		25		Diagram has FC_BB_E (which is not defined anywhere), not FC-BB_E.		Fix it.	A	
Brocade-008		26		Insert space between lines.			A	
Brocade-009		26		Insert space between lines.			A	
Brocade-010		27		FC-SW-6		Remove SW-5	A	
Brocade-011		27		Obsoleted by RFC 5905 Errata		Change to RFC 5905.	AinP	
Brocade-012		27		Add references to FC-SW-6 and FC-LS-3, and remove FC-SW-5 and FC-LS-2.		As suggested.	A	
Brocade-013		29		The term VX_Port Identification is used but never defined. Should also define VX_Port.		Add a reference to 7.9.7.3.12 in the first instance of Vx_Port Identification descriptor. Change all `Vx_Port_Identification` to `Vx_Port Identification`.	AinP	
Brocade-014		29		Convert all definitions to ISO/IEC style.		Action to Dave.	AinP	
Brocade-015		32		This is not an FCoE Virtual Link. Should there be a generic term for virtual link defined to differentiate the one defined for FCoE.		Fine as is	R	C
Brocade-016		34		Change to deinstantiating - global			A	
Brocade-017		34		Grammar. Should be of up to two.		Definition removed by 13-141v1.	AinP	
Brocade-018		34		The Switch_Names the Controlling FCFs that are part of a Distributed Switch.		Definition removed by 13-141v1.	AinP	
Brocade-019		34		One or more FDF(s) ...		Fine as is	R	C
Brocade-020		35		Should this be FCoE Virtual Link as 7.6 describes. Also virtual link is used in the context of FCIP also (3.2.18).		Fine as is	R	C
Brocade-021		36		Add definition for VN2VN_Port.		See Brocade-024	A	
Brocade-022		36		Lower case (globally).			A	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-023		36		This text still bothers me as I don't see how a VN_Port is dynamically instantiated after a FLOGI. I think the VN_Port has to be instantiated just to be able to transmit a FLOGI and it is the FCoE_LEP and associated virtual link that is dynamically instantiated. Same for VF_Port and VE_Port definitions.		Accept to remove this text from the definition.	AinP	
Brocade-024		36		Should also have definitions for VN2VN ENode and VN2VN_Port		VN2VN_Port: A VN_Port dedicated to the instantiation of VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links. VN2VN ENode: an ENode supporting one or more VN2VN_Ports.	AinP	
Brocade-025		40		Missing figure 9 and 10 and probably the accompanying text		Resolved by 13-141v1. Remove the sentence "These reference models are shown in figure 5, figure 6, figure 7, and figure 8 respectively."	AinP	
Brocade-026		41		A_Port or VA_Port ?		Add A_Port.	AinP	
Brocade-027		44		Provide VA_Port to VA_Port reference model.		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
Brocade-028		46		Missing note about independent communicating pair.		As suggested.	A	
Brocade-029		48		Review all notes per ISO/IEC guidelines (e.g., no normative requirements).		Action to Dave.	AinP	
Brocade-030		48		Shouldn't this be capitalized		Yes	A	
Brocade-031		48		Shouldn't this be capitalized		Yes	A	
Brocade-032		48		virtual links - caps or not?		Caps	A	
Brocade-033		48		VA_Port to VA_Port virtual links,		Virtual Links	AinP	
Brocade-034		48		Shouldn't this be capitalized		Yes	A	
Brocade-035		49		VA_Port,			A	
Brocade-036		49		Having trouble parsing these paragraphs...?			W	C
Brocade-037		49		a VA_Port,			A	
Brocade-038		50		Delete extra space.			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-039		50		Replace with: `Lossless Ethernet may be implemented through the use of some Ethernet extensions. Suitable extensions include the PAUSE mechanism defined in IEEE 802.3-2008, or the Priority-based Flow Control (PFC) mechanism defined in IEEE 802.1Qbb; where FCoE frames shall use a lossless priority (see IEEE 802.1Qbb). The Precision Time Protocol (PTP) may be used to determine link latency (see IEEE 1588-2008 or IEEE 802.1AS).` Also add the acronyms to the acronym list.		Accept the edited comment.	A	
Brocade-040		82		Add line below item j).			A	
Brocade-041		86		Delete			A	
Brocade-042		89		Review all instances of when versus if.		Action to Dave.	A	
Brocade-043		108		VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Links,			A	
Brocade-044		108		Replace with description of proper implementation with a list of required characteristics. Example text: `...a proper implementation of appropriate Ethernet extension allows a full duplex Ethernet link to provide a lossless behavior equivalent to the one provided by the buffer-to-buffer credit mechanism (see FC-FS-3) provided the following extensions are utilized: - The PAUSE mechanism defined in IEEE 802.3-2008. - The Priority-based Flow Control (PFC) mechanism defined in IEEE 802.1Qbb; where, FCOE frames shall use a lossless priority (see IEEE 802.1Qbb). - The Precision Time Protocol (PTP) mechanism defined in IEEE 1588-2008; where, PTP is limited to determine link latency.`		See Juniper-011.	AinP	
Brocade-045		108		No text per a Distributed FCF provided.		See Cisco-Late-08	AinP	
Brocade-046		109		have		By an Italian!!!!	R	C
Brocade-047		109		Add outer line border to all figures.		Action to Dave.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-048		109		have		By an Italian!!!!	R	C
Brocade-049		110		dashed lines			A	
Brocade-050		110		have		By an Italian!!!!	R	C
Brocade-051		110		have		By an Italian!!!!	R	C
Brocade-052		111		have		By an Italian!!!!	R	C
Brocade-053		111		VN			A	
Brocade-054		111		Should be bold font.			A	
Brocade-055		111		dashed			A	
Brocade-056		111		There is no FCF A in the diagram. Only FCF.		See Oracle-3	AinP	
Brocade-057		112		have		By an Italian!!!!	R	C
Brocade-058		113		upon			A	
Brocade-059		113		upon			A	
Brocade-060		113		(see 7.7)			A	
Brocade-061		114		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.			A	
Brocade-062		114		address identifiers Use address identifier, not N_Port_ID, globally.		Change the few `address identifiers` to N_Port_ID.	R	
Brocade-063		114		The constant VN2VN-FC-MAP has the value 0EFD00h.		Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
Brocade-064		114		VN2VN-FC-MAP (see table 54). Add VN2VN-FC-MAP to table 54.		Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
Brocade-065		114		There are no other instances of Fabric FC-MAP.		Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
Brocade-066		115		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.		See IBM-020	AinP	
Brocade-067		115		either			A	
Brocade-068		115		Locally Unique N_Port_IDs shall be in the range 000001h to 00FFFEh, inclusive.			A	
Brocade-069		116		This sentence states the obvious and provide little value.		Remove the sentence.	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-070		116		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....		<p>Add: "Note 15: The set of FC Switching Element, VE_Ports, VF_Ports, E_Ports (if any), and F_Ports (if any) is referred to as the Fibre Channel component of an FCF. The set of FCoE_LEPs and FCoE Controllers is referred to as the FCoE component of an FCF. The set of Lossless Ethernet MACs and Lossless Ethernet Bridging Elements (if any) is referred to as the Ethernet component of an FCF.</p> <p>Note XX(FDF): The set of FCDF Switching Element, VA_Ports, VF_Ports, A_Ports (if any), and F_Ports (if any) is referred to as the Fibre Channel component of an FDF. The set of FCoE_LEPs and FCoE Controllers is referred to as the FCoE component of an FDF. The set of Lossless Ethernet MACs and Lossless Ethernet Bridging Elements (if any) is</p>	AinP	
Brocade-071		116		Review all instances of `when` and change to `if` if appropriate.		See Brocade-42	AinP	
Brocade-072		116		Should be if			A	
Brocade-073		117		transmits			A	
Brocade-074		117		upon			A	
Brocade-075		117		upon			A	
Brocade-076		117		in			A	
Brocade-077		117		transmits			A	
Brocade-078		117		initiates			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-079		117		decapsulation or de-encapsulation Pick one and be consistent.		Editor to pick `decapsulation` and be consistent.	A	
Brocade-080		118		Where/when does the VF_Port/FCoE_LEP verify the D_ID is correct?		This should be S_ID.	AinP	
Brocade-081		118		VA_Ports,			A	
Brocade-082		119		s			A	
Brocade-083		120		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-084		120		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-085		120		s			A	
Brocade-086		120		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-087		121		Acronym VL is not defined.		Define the acronym, VL: Virtual Link	AinP	
Brocade-088		121		lower case			A	
Brocade-089		122		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-090		122		Stating ENodes shall use FPMAs as VN_Port MAC addresses again is redundant (i.e., see first sentence in subclause).		Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
Brocade-091		122		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-092		122		s			A	
Brocade-093		122		shall			A	
Brocade-094		122		inclusive			A	
Brocade-095		123		22		Make it a link	A	
Brocade-096		123		set			A	
Brocade-097		125		manner			A	
Brocade-098		125		The diagram refers informatively to static VLAN configurations and default FCoE VLANs. Should the overview include this?		No need in the overview for this detail.	R	C
Brocade-099		125		the VLANs that provide FC-BB_E services		Change to VLANs where FC-BB_E is used.	AinP	
Brocade-100		125		example			A	
Brocade-101		126		What is `this`? Replace with ENode/FCF VLAN discovery?		Refers to periodic transmission of FIP VLAN Requests.	AinP	
Brocade-102		126		instantiate additional?		See EMC-048	AinP	
Brocade-103		126		then the			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-104		126		Not sure what this is trying to say. Are we not simply saying that to discover the FCF/FCF VLANs, discovery may take up to this much time?		See Brocade-109	AinP	
Brocade-105		126		What is `this`? Replace with FCF/FCF VLAN Discovery			A	
Brocade-106		126		then the			A	
Brocade-107		126		manner			A	
Brocade-108		126		then that ...			A	
Brocade-109		126		Not sure what this is trying to say. Are we not simply saying that to discover the Enode/FCF VLANs, discovery may take up to this much time?		Change to `physical network configuration changes`	AinP	
Brocade-110		126		then that ... Also do a global review			A	
Brocade-111		127		An			A	
Brocade-112		127		the specified		the provided	AinP	
Brocade-113		127		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-114		127		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-115		127		s			A	
Brocade-116		127		Should be VN2VN ENode MAC.			A	
Brocade-117		127		What happens when a VN2VN ENode is not configured to provide VLANs?		Such an ENode ignores the request.	AinP	
Brocade-118		127		Comment on 7.9.6 states that the definition is occurring 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.		See EMC-045	AinP	
Brocade-119		127		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-120		128						
Brocade-121		129		manner			A	
Brocade-122		129		VN2VN ENode Discovery		VN2VN ENode VLAN discovery	AinP	
Brocade-123		129		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?		See Brocade-109	AinP	
Brocade-124		129		FC-SW-6			A	
Brocade-125		129		then			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-126		129		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-127		129		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-128		129		then the VN2VN ENode whose configuration of VLANs changed		Fine as is	R	C
Brocade-129		131		manner			A	
Brocade-130		131		manner			A	
Brocade-131		133		Delete extra space.			A	
Brocade-132		133						
Brocade-133		133		manner			A	
Brocade-134		134		The			A	
Brocade-135		134		instantiation			A	
Brocade-136		134		address			A	
Brocade-137		134		provide a reference			A	
Brocade-138		136		instantiation			A	
Brocade-139		137		instantiation			A	
Brocade-140		138		Change to bold font.			A	
Brocade-141		138		This section to occur before 7.9.2.4 because that uses ALL-VN2VN-ENode-MACS.		See EMC-045	AinP	
Brocade-142		139		manner			A	
Brocade-143		139		An			A	
Brocade-144		140		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-145		140		,			A	
Brocade-146		142		manner			A	
Brocade-147		145		Resolved editor's note.		Add to the first sentence after `shall be ignored`, `and the event should be logged in a vendor specific manner.`	AinP	
Brocade-148		146		manner			A	
Brocade-149		150		a			A	
Brocade-150		150		,			A	
Brocade-151		150		a			A	
Brocade-152		150		,			A	
Brocade-153		151		,			A	
Brocade-154		151						
Brocade-155		151		,			A	
Brocade-156		153		.			A	
Brocade-157		155		Increase column size.			A	
Brocade-158		161		a			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-159		161		,			A	
Brocade-160		161						
Brocade-161		161		Review use of capitolization globally.i.e., do not use caps if not needed.		Action to Dave	A	
Brocade-162		161		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-163		162		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-164		162		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-165		162		,			A	
Brocade-166		162		STRIKE-OUT			A	
Brocade-167		162		a			A	
Brocade-168		162		,			A	
Brocade-169		162		a			A	
Brocade-170		162		Specify the behavior if the FPMA is not properly formed.		See EMC-118	AinP	
Brocade-171		163		,			A	
Brocade-172		163		,			A	
Brocade-173		163		,			A	
Brocade-174		164		,			A	
Brocade-175		164		,			A	
Brocade-176		164		,			A	
Brocade-177		165		What other name would it be set to?		Change to shall	AinP	
Brocade-178		166		What other name would it be set to?		Change to shall	AinP	
Brocade-179		166		,			A	
Brocade-180		166		,			A	
Brocade-181		167		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-182		167		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-183		167		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-184		168		i.e.,			A	
Brocade-185		168		,			A	
Brocade-186		169		Should be shall.		Remove `should respond with`	AinP	
Brocade-187		172		The Distributed FCF model currently does not support more than two Controlling FCFs. Implement changes per 13-017.		Resolved by 13-141v1.	R	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Brocade-188		172		The Distributed FCF text in FC-BB-6 is dependent on finalized FC-SW-6 Distributed Switch text. As such this draft standard must not be forwarded to public review until FC-SW-6 letter ballot comment resolution is complete.		With 13-141v1 FC-BB-6 is independent from any FC-SW-6 behavior.	O	
Brocade-189		173		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.		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
Brocade-190		173		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.		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
Brocade-191		181		the			A	
Brocade-192		181		the			A	
IBM-001		13		IBM-R1:E:: Change bar indicated here, but no change bars indicated in section 4.4.1. What was the change?		Ask FrameMaker... ;)	W	C
IBM-002		29		IBM-P1:E:: a port capable			A	
IBM-003		29		IBM-P2:E:: reference? definition? (for Transport Trail)		add (see 3.3.14)	AinP	
IBM-004		29		IBM-S1:E:: Update definitions to conform to style guide requirements for ISO certificaion		See Brocade-014	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-005		34		IBM-P3:T:: and VA_Ports and VN2VN_Ports Also add this list to FCoE Entity		As suggested	A	
IBM-006		34		IBM-P4:E:: Should FCDF also be defined or a reference to SW-6 added?		Fixed in 13-141v1	AinP	
IBM-007		35		IBM-p5:E:: The term `LCF` is not previously defined. Define or add (see FC-FS-3)		Add (see FC-FS-3), also for PF_Port and PE_Port.	AinP	
IBM-008		36		IBM-37:E::Add the following definitions: N_Port_ID P2P Claim Notification: a FIP N_Port_ID Claim Notification with the Rec/P2P bit set to 1. N_Port_ID P2P Claim Response: a FIP N_Port_ID Claim with the Rec/P2P bit set to 1.		As suggested	A	
IBM-009		40		and FDFs? or `including distributed FCFs`?		See Cisco-Late-03	AinP	
IBM-010		48		IBM-R3:T:: This statement needs to include VA_Port to VA_Port virtual links.		Dave to fix.	A	
IBM-011		49		IBM-R2:T:: VA_Port should be included in this list, and perhaps a reference to FC-SW-6		No need to reference FC-SW-6	A	
IBM-012		49		IBM-R2:E:: See IBM-R2			A	
IBM-013		50		IBM-H1:T:: What is the scope of this requirement? A strict interpretation would require that all frames between a given pair of endpoints arrive in the same order that they were sent. That would also preclude the use of exchange based hashing on aggregated ethernet links which, in turn, disallows the use of a significant load balancing mechanism.		See Juniper-006.	AinP	
IBM-014		51		IBM-p6:E:: `A proper implementation of Ethernet extensions....` - words in bold need to be added (consistent with wording in 4.3.4)		Change to `FC-BB_E devices rely on proper implementation of Ethernet extensions for flow control of FCoE frames.`	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-015		111		IBM-R14:E:: These are VN2VN_Ports		VN2VNPorts are VN_Ports, so the diagram is correct. Moreover, VN2VN_Ports are introduced later in the document, in section 7.4. Keep as is.	R	C
IBM-016		112		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).		Add `The point-to-point protocol enables faster initialization for the case of two VN2VN ENode MACs connected through a single cable or for the case of only two VN2VN ENode MACs visible to each other over a Lossless Ethernet network (i.e., N_Port_ID Probe Requests are not used).`	AinP	
IBM-017		113		IBM-R10:T:: Refer to FC-LS-3 and FC-FS-4 as there are behaviors there that are preferred fro FCoE VN_Ports (e.g. phy type identification in RNID)		Dave to update the references globally.	AinP	
IBM-018		114		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.		Better to keep as is.	R	C
IBM-019		114		IBM-R12:T:: This sentence only applies to multi-point mode. Change to: When operating in a multi-point mode, the FCoE Controller ...		Change to "When operating in multi-node mode, the FCoE Controller..."	AinP	
IBM-020		115		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 ...		As suggested	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-021		115		<p>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 .....</p>		<p>Add before the last paragraph: "For a VN2VN ENode's MAC, the FCoE Controller:  a) may participate in Fabric operations (see 7.3);  b) operates in either multi-node mode or point-to-point mode;  c) optionally initiates the FIP VLAN discovery protocol to discover FCoE VLANs (see 7.9.2.4);  d) selects a tentative Locally Unique N_Port_ID (see 7.9.6.1);  e) if operating in multi-node mode, then probes the network about the selected Locally Unique N_Port_ID (see 7.9.6.2.1);  f) claims the selected Locally Unique N_Port_ID (see 7.9.6.2.2 and 7.9.6.3.1)  g) instantiates VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links through FIP FLOGI Exchanges (see 7.9.4.3);  h) optionally de-instantiates</p>	AinP	
IBM-022		118		<p>IBM-R16:E:: The distributed switch content should be integrated with the similar concepts in this document. e.g. The cFCF and FDF functional models should be here.</p>		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
IBM-023		122		<p>IBM-R16:E:: The distributed switch content should be integrated with the similar concepts in this document. e.g. The VA_Port to VA_Port virtual links should be here. (from 7.12.4)</p>		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-024		122		IBM-R18:T:: Need to add in text for VN2VN_Port MAC addresses or insert a 7.8 section. They use FPMAs. They are not used with FCFs. They don't come from FCFs They use a different FC-MAP.		Resolved by 13-138v2	AinP	
IBM-025		122		IBM-R17:E:: This is redundant to the first sentence in this section. Strike it.		Editor to fix.	AinP	
IBM-026		124		IBM-R19:T:: There is no protocol use defined for this address. Remove this and the address from table 54. If left in, for whatever reason, the next sentence contradicts this one.		Remove the sentence: "An ENode MAC shall discard a FIP message destined to an address other than its ENode MAC address or the All-ENode-MACs address."	AinP	
IBM-027		124		IBM-20:T:: This and the previous sentence need to be updated to include VN2VN MAC addresses All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs and All-P2P-ENode-MACs		See EMC-45	AinP	
IBM-028		126		IBM-R21:E:: Missing title		Add the title that was in the approved proposal	AinP	
IBM-029		128		IBM:R23:E:: may determine		As suggested	A	
IBM-030		129		IBM:22:T:: one or more			A	
IBM-031		129		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).		See EMC-48.	AinP	
IBM-032		133		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?			W	C
IBM-033		134		IBM-R25:E:: add (see 7.9.6)			A	
IBM-034		136		IBM-P7:E:: ...not logged in...			A	
IBM-035		138		IBM-R26:E:: change per to from (there is only one)			A	
IBM-036		138		IBM:R-27:E:: Make bold.			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-037		138		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.`		See EMC-45. Remove "shall enable reception of frames sent to both MAC addresses, All-VN2VN-ENode-MACs and All-PT2PT-ENode-MACs," from the sentence.	AinP	
IBM-038		141		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.		Change to `are received from different VN2VN ENode MACs`	AinP	
IBM-039		141		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) ?		Resolved by 13-246v1.	AinP	
IBM-040		142		IBM-R28:E:: Move this to 7.10 Timers and Constants.			A	
IBM-041		143		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`)		Dave to look at it.	O	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-042		145		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`		Change the definition in 3.9.7 to require receivers to not check reserved bits (see Cisco-Late-02).	AinP	
IBM-043		146		IBM-R30:E:: Describe this bit more fully, including when it is the REC(ordered) bit (in Probes) and when it is a P2P bit (in Claims, Claim Response, and Beacon). Reserved otherwise?		See Craig's comment on defining these two terms.	AinP	
IBM-044		146		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		No action.	AinP	
IBM-045		150		IBM-R4:E:: All occurrences of `FLOGI` in this paragraph should be FDISC instead.			A	
IBM-046		152		IBM-R5:T:: This definition should be more descriptive. Is this an OUI value? What makes it unique?		T10 Vendor_ID value. See Cisco-15	AinP	
IBM-047		155		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?)		Add to the table: "05h, FIP Keep Alive received when no Virtual Link is instantiated, and 06h, Implicit Logout"	AinP	
IBM-048		155		IBM-R7:T:: Add code for Implicit Logout (the case we added in Virtual Link Maintenance)		See IBM-047	AinP	
IBM-049		157		IBM-R31:E:: Add or FCF and put the footnote on FCF. It is allowed, therefore it should be here.			A	
IBM-050		157		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.			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-051		162		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		Now specified in FC-LS-3.	R	C
IBM-052		162		IBM-R33:E:: Remove extra b), c), d)			A	
IBM-053		162		IBM-34:T:T change to MAC Address field of the MAC address descriptor not set to zero.			A	
IBM-054		163		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		Now specified in FC-LS-3.	R	C
IBM-055		163		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)		Keep the wording as is.	R	C
IBM-056		165		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.		The behavior is already specified in 7.9.5.2.	R	C
IBM-057		165		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.		Resolved by 13-225v1.	AinP	
IBM-058		166		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.			A	
IBM-059		168		See prior comment. There is no protocol associated with this address, certainly not in 7.9.1 - remove.		See EMC-45.	R	C
IBM-060		174		IBM-P10:E:: Figure 47		Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-061		174		IBM-P1:E:: at least one switch name		Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
IBM-062		174		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.		Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
IBM-063		175		IBM-R39:T:: Should the configuration also include the switch name used for the virtual domain?		Resolved by 13-141v1	AinP	
IBM-064		176		IBM:40:E:: This text is repeated 4 times in this document, in each of the functional models. Define the FCoE_LEP behavior in one place and refer to it.		Dave to do what he likes more	AinP	
IBM-065		177		IBM-H3:T:: FDF VA_Port Capable MACs do not participate in VLAN discovery, per discussion initiated by 12-199.		Resolved by 13-224v0.	AinP	
IBM-066		179		IBM-H1:T::FC-LS-2, version 2.21, table 33 documents an RSCN event qualifier value to change the fabric name. How does this interact with the BB-5 and BB-6 discovery advertisements? Consider BB-5 with a VF-Port capable MAC sending discovery advertisements to All-ENode-MACs. If the fabric name is changed via this RSCN, at what point does the advertised fabric name get updated? This change was introduced by <a href="http://www.t11.org/ftp/t11/pub/fc/ls-2/10-030v1.pdf">http://www.t11.org/ftp/t11/pub/fc/ls-2/10-030v1.pdf</a> .		The RSCN does not change the Fabric_Name, RSCN is used to communicate a change in the Fabric_Name to logged in Nodes that registers to receive this information. FIP Advertisements and this RSCN processing are independent. When the Fabric_Name change, the change is automatically reflected in the Advertisements, given that Advertisements are periodic.	O	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-067		180		IBM-P2:T:: If (as in later paragraphs) ELPs received with other invalid bit combos results in a REJ with Reason Code=Protocol Error and Reason Code Explanation='Invalid Request', why is this case unique and ignored? 'Ignored' leads to unnecessary timeouts.		See Cisco-19	AinP	
IBM-068		180		IBM-R42:E:: Normal ELP rules in SW-6 do not say anything about establishment of virtual links. I think this statement is redundant to the paragraph above this one. Strike this sentence and move the paragraph above this one to here.		Remove the sentence.	AinP	
IBM-069		180		IBM-R43:T:: We need a better statement of when `operational`. We can't rely on a particular numbered state in a separate standard that has not yet been ratified. Suggest changing this to something more general such as when the the controlling switch has the distributed switch configuration, has obtained the Virtual Domain ID and the primary/secondary are in sync....		Resolved by 13-141v1.	AinP	
IBM-070		180		IBM-R44:T:: How does a VA_Port Capable FDF-MAC know that the other MAC is VA?_Port/VE_Port capable? Because it is a controlling switch. So, instead of beating around the bush, just state that: ....with a FCF MAC belonging to a controlling switch.		Replace "with a VA_Port/VE_Port capable FCF-MAC." with "with a FCF-MAC belonging to a Controlling FCF."	AinP	
IBM-071		181		IBM-R45:T:: This only applies after the cFCF set is received in DFMD. Up until then it has to accept any ELPs from controlling switches that could be it's primary.		Remove the entire paragraph.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-072		186		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 <u>only be one annex to describe ACLs.</u>		Create a section C.9 titled "Access Control Lists in a Locally Unique N_Port_ID configuration". Add the following text to this section: When security threats exist in a Locally Unique N_Port_ID configuration, it is important to protect the FCoE traffic with appropriate FCoE ACLs.". Then copy the text from D.2 through D.4 as subsections C.9.1 through C.9.3.	AinP	
IBM-073		188		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.		As suggested	A	
IBM-074		191		IBM-R52:T:: or a FIB Fabric LOGO LS_ACC		Add: "or a FIP Fabric LOGO LS_ACC"	AinP	
IBM-075		191		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.		Delete the offending sentence and add "A similar vulnerability exists in Fibre Channel in that a rouge device can advertise itself as a Fibre Channel Switch. Therefore, preventing a rogue host from advertising itself as an FCF is beyond the scope of this annex."	AinP	
IBM-076		192		IBM-R54:E:: Make one paragraph, or split last sentence into its own paragraph, since it applies to the whole thing.		Combine the first three sentences into one paragraph and move the last sentence at the beginning of the paragraph.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-077		192		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		Add the following ACE as the second entry in the ACL where the comment is and as the third entry in the following ACL: "SA = src VN2VN_Port MAC, DA = All-PT2PT-ENode-MACs, Type = FIP_TYPE, permit;"	AinP	
IBM-078		193		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.		Add a semicolon to the end of "Type = FCoE_TYPE deny" and add the following to the end of this ACL: Type=FIP_TYPE, deny  Do the same for the following ACL.	AinP	
IBM-079		193		IBM-R56:E:: redundant. milliseconds already in the definition of BEACON_PERIOD Fix all occurrences.		Remove "milliseconds". Check all occurrences in the document.	AinP	
IBM-080		193		IBM-R57:T:: Add Type=FIP_TYPE, permit at the end to allow Probes, Claims, FLOGI, etc.		Add: "Type=FIP_TYPE, permit" at the end of the ACL. Add the needed semicolumn at the end of the previous ACE.	AinP	
IBM-081		221		IBM-R58:E:: Is this part of the example or part of the documentation? Needs either code comment /* */ or document font.		This is part of the documentation, change the font.	AinP	
IBM-082		221		IBM-59:E:: Remove this. Provides no relevant information		As suggested.	A	
IBM-083		221		IBM-R60:T:: These are uninitialized variables. Show initialization placeholders		Separate these statements from the previous code fragment with a blank line, ellipsis, "n_port_name and enode_mac are initialized here", ellipsis, blank line. All as a C comment.	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-084		222		IBM-R61:E:: Help!		Editor to fix the sentence	AinP	
IBM-085		227		IBM-R61:E:: This is all nice, but are we going to make any recommendation?		This is an informative annex, the standard does not make any specific recommendation. Vendors choose what makes sense for their environment.	AinP	
IBM-086		227		IBM-R62:T:: FCoE		As suggested.	A	
QLogic-001		1		952-687-2431			A	
QLogic-002		3		various			A	
QLogic-003		9		various			A	
QLogic-004		9		2012			A	
QLogic-005		26		FC-SP-2			A	
QLogic-006		27		FC-FS-4, FC-SW-6, FC-LS-3			A	
QLogic-007		27		FC-FS-3 as approved reference			A	
QLogic-008		28		802.1Q-2011			A	
QLogic-009		30		What is a `FC-4 channel`?		Remove `channel`	AinP	
QLogic-010		45		What is this `i.e.` trying to say?		Remove it.	AinP	
QLogic-011		50		What is `best practice`? Need a reference, or change this to a note.		Remove `according to the best practice...`. Also change the reference to 802.1Q-2011.	AinP	
QLogic-012		111		There is no `FCF A` in Figure 33.		See Oracle-3	AinP	
QLogic-013		112		I don't see any `bracketed` components.		Look better... ;)	R	C
QLogic-014		113		This item should be written take into account VN2VN connections. There are no VF_Ports to monitor in that case.		No VN2VN here. They are in the following section.	R	C
QLogic-015		113		What about VN2VN?		No VN2VN here.	R	C
QLogic-016		113		What about VN2VN?		No VN2VN here.	R	C
QLogic-017		113		Even in the case of VN2VN topology?		No VN2VN here.	R	C
QLogic-018		114		This seem unclear... 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 operation if FC-LS-3.		Resolved by 13-247v0.	AinP	
QLogic-019		115		If either check fails the FCoE frame shall be discarded.		See Brocade-067	A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-020		115		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		Change the last paragraph to be: "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. An FCoE_LEP operates according to the MAC address of the local link end-point and the MAC address of the remote link end-point. When encapsulating FC frames into FCoE frames, the MAC address of the local link end-point shall be used as source address and the MAC address of the remote link end-point shall be used as destination address of the generated FCoE frame. 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	AinP	
QLogic-021		122		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 clause), needs to state rules for point-to-multipoint FLOGIs.		See Qlogic-18	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-022		124		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.		Add "and N_Port_ID Beacons (see 7.9.8.14)" after "(see 7.9.8.5)"	A	
QLogic-023		126		Heading missing.		See IBM-028	AinP	
QLogic-024		126		No title?		See IBM-028	AinP	
QLogic-025		127		No mechanism to discover VLAN for P2P mode. P2P may traverse a lossless ethernet network. All-PT2PT_ENode_MACs allowed here? PT2PT mode is part of an VN2VN Enode.		No need for this on a point-to-point topology	R	C
QLogic-026		129		reference FC-SW-6			A	
QLogic-027		129		Why isn't this normative?		change to `a possible period value'.	AinP	
QLogic-028		134		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.		See Qlogic-18	AinP	
QLogic-029		134		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 completely different meanings for this clause. We need to clarify the language used here. One interpretation of this sentence is that this clause only really applies to FC-BB-6 point-to-point topology, not point-to-multipoint. Thus only FC-BB-6 point-to-point topology uses FIP FLOGI. I'm not sure if this is the right interpretation.		See Qlogic-18	AinP	
QLogic-030		134		Fabric			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-031		134		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?		FIP Fabric LOGO.	AinP	
QLogic-032		134		Add VN_Port to VN_Port Virtual Links (see figures 32 and 34).		to the first sentence.	AinP	
QLogic-033		136		Craig we may object to this statement.		Replace the sentence with "If the event that caused implicit logout was reception of a FIP FLOGI request, the FIP Clear Virtual Link frame shall not be sent."	O	
QLogic-034		138		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.		See EMC-45	AinP	
QLogic-035		138		A glossary entry for this term would be useful.			A	
QLogic-036		142		Disagree with CDS that FIP Advertisement = All-ENode-MACs. Optimization don't need to parse frame just MAC address. Also more generic.		No action.	R	C
QLogic-037		146		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.		Add: "The REC/P2P bit is meaningful in FIP N_Port_ID Probe Requests, FIP N_Port_ID Claim Notifications, FIP N_Port_ID Claim Responses, FIP N_Port_ID Beacons. The REC/P2P bit is reserved for all other FIP operations."	AinP	
QLogic-038		146		Not consistent with other bit listings in this clause. For consistency add `(RP)` Bit 3 of word 1 (RP)			A	



Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
QLogic-039		146		10?			A	
QLogic-040		161		There is no description of VN2VN in this section. Most of the text is ENode to FCF specific. This comment is from 12-129v2		Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	
QLogic-041		166		Why zero and not just reserved?		Fine as is. No action.	R	C
QLogic-042		167		STRIKE-OUT		This should be Response.	AinP	
QLogic-043		167		This should be a glossary entry.			A	
QLogic-044		167		Response		See Qlogic-042	AinP	
QLogic-045		167		This should be a glossary term as well.			A	
QLogic-046		168		This should be a glossary entry.			A	
QLogic-047		180		Remove editor's note.		See Cisco-19	AinP	
QLogic-048		221		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]		No note of this kind can be added.	R	C
Cisco-Late-01		11		William R. Martin, Vice-Chair			A	
Cisco-Late-02		38		shall not			A	
Cisco-Late-03		40		FC-BB_E defines end devices (i.e., ENodes) and Fabric devices (i.e., FCFs and FDFs). ENodes are Fibre Channel nodes (see FC-FS-3) that are able to transport Fibre Channel over Lossless Ethernet. FCFs and FDFs are Fibre Channel Switching Elements (see FC-SW-6) that are able to transport Fibre Channel over Lossless Ethernet.			A	
Cisco-Late-04		41		The FC-BB_E reference model supports the operation of VN_Ports (see FC-FS-3) in ENodes, VF_Ports and VE_Ports (see FC-SW-6) in FCFs, VF_Ports, VE_Ports, and VA_Ports (see FC-SW-6) in Controlling FCFs, and VF_Ports and VA_Ports (see FC-SW-6) in FDFs.			A	
Cisco-Late-05		41		Put the headings in bold.			A	
Cisco-Late-06		45		Add arrows and make the link dashed.			A	
Cisco-Late-07		48		capitalize Virtual Links.			A	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
Cisco-Late-08		108		In Fibre Channel over Ethernet, FCoE Nodes (ENodes), FCoE Forwarders (FCFs), and FCoE Data-Plane Forwarders (FDFs) communicate through Ethernet ports over a Lossless Ethernet network.			A	
Cisco-Late-09		132		of traffic		remove "multicast"	A	
Cisco-Late-10		154		VE_Port, VF_Port, or VA_Port changed state		Replace "Vx_port state change" with the proposed text.	A	
Cisco-Late-11	T		7.9.7.2	Clarify that the C and D bits are not set in Advertisements to ENodes		Resolved by 13-225v1	AinP	

Company number	Tech/Edit	Page	Sec/table/fig	Comment	Proposed Solution	Resolution	Key	Status
IBM-Late-01				Resolve the issue documented in 13-118v0		<p>As specified in 13-141v1, add the section "VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link maintenance protocol" after the current 7.9.5.4, with the following text:  "VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link maintenance is performed as for VE_Port to VE_Port Virtual Links, with VA_Port capable FDF-MACs operating as VE_Port capable FCF-MACs and VA_Port/VE_Port capable FCF-MACs operating as VE_Port capable FCF-MACs (see 7.9.5.3).</p> <p>In particular, the FCoE Controller for a VA_Port capable FDF-MAC or of a VA_Port/VE_Port capable FCF-MAC shall monitor the status of a VA_Port to VA_Port Virtual Link by verifying the reception of unsolicited multicast Discovery Advertisements. Unsolicited multicast</p>	AinP	
<b>Color Key:</b>								
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								
Green - complete								
					<b>Keys:</b>			
<b>Summary</b>			562	All	O	Open: An action has been identified and is not complete		
			4	All Open	A	Accepted: The issue has been resolved and the resolution indicates any necessary changes		
			257	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		
			61	All Rejected	W	Withdrawn: The commenter has withdrawn the comment.		
			9	All Withdrawn		Not considered yet		
			226	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				
			124	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				