

IPv6 Benchmarking Methodology for Network Interconnect Devices

- Updates based on the BMWG last call feedback -

1. [Dan Romascanu] A sentence in the Abstract or Introduction section clarifying that IPv6 transition mechanisms are not within the scope could help, but I do not insist on it.

Resolution>>>Added to the abstract: “IPv6 transition mechanisms are outside the scope of this document.”

2. [Dan Romascanu] I believe that the title may be mis-leading as it talks about IPv6 benchmarking without making clear that it is a complementary document to RFC 2544 which deals with Benchmarking Methodology for Network Interconnect Devices. Folks who do search through an RFC repository may be led to believe that the document covers specific aspects of IPv6 like IPv6 transition mechanisms and devices for example. I suggest to change the title in something more explicit like ' Benchmarking Methodology for IPv6-capable Network Interconnect Devices' or even 'IPv6 Aspects of Benchmarking Methodology for Network Interconnect Devices' (or similar).

Resolution>>> Changed title to: “IPv6 Benchmarking Methodology for Network Interconnect Devices”

3. [Dan Romascanu] Section 4.1.1 - We should include here the conclusions of the parallel discussions that we had on the list concerning frame size. Those included to my best recollection the note proposed by Chip. Also I believe that mentioning jumbo frames should be made only in a similar note, with explicit text that makes clear that jumbo frames are currently out of the scope of the IEEE 802.3 standard.

Resolution>>>Include the text "Note: The recommended 1518 bytes frame size represents the maximum size of an untagged Ethernet frame. According to the IEEE 802.3as standard, the frame size can be increased up to 2048 bytes to accommodate frame tags."

4. [Dan Romascanu]The table in Appendix A.1 should include a row for length 2048 as per IEEE 802.3as

Resolution>>>Included

5. [Dan Romascanu]Add IEEE 802.3 - 2005 and IEEE 802.3as as Informative References.

Resolution >>>Added reference:

[12] LAN/MAN Standards Committee of the IEEE Computer Society, "IEEE Std 802.3as-2006, Part 3: Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) Access Method and Physical Layer Specifications, Amendment 3: Frame format extensions", November 2006.

6. Minimum frame size for SONET = 47

Resolution>>>Added the value in the appendix, made the update in the text and included the note:

“Packet over SONET (PoS) interfaces are commonly used for edge uplinks and high bandwidth core links. Evaluating the forwarding performance of PoS interfaces supported by the DUT is recommended. The following frame sizes SHOULD be used for this media type: 47, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 1280, 1518, 2048, 4096 bytes.

Note: The 47 bytes SONET frame has no practical use since it can carry only the 40 bytes header of an IPv6 packet and no upper layer protocol information. It represents however the smallest frame size for this media type.”

7. Edits proposed by Al Morton

Resolution>>>Integrated

8. Edits proposed by Bill Cherveney

Resolution>>>Integrated

9. Other edits

Resolution>>>Acknowledged the help provided by: David Newman, Dan Romascanu, Tom Alexander

10. idnits results:

idnits 2.04.14

```
tmp/draft-ietf-bmwg-ipv6-meth-03.txt:
tmp/draft-ietf-bmwg-ipv6-meth-03.txt(716): Found possible IPv4 address
'198.18.0.0' in position 4; this doesn't match RFC3330's suggested
192.0.2.0/24 address range.
<<Intentional reference of 198.18.0.0 address space reserved for BM>>
tmp/draft-ietf-bmwg-ipv6-meth-03.txt(864): Line has weird spacing: '...
Bytes pps...'
tmp/draft-ietf-bmwg-ipv6-meth-03.txt(914): Line has weird spacing: '...
Bytes fps ...'
<<Table formatting, not an issue>>
```

Checking boilerplate required by RFC 3978 and 3979, updated by RFC4748:

No issues found here.

Checking nits according to <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-guidelines.txt>:

== No 'Intended status' indicated for this document; assuming
Proposed Standard

Checking nits according to <http://www.ietf.org/ID-Checklist.html>:

== There are 1 instance of lines with non-RFC3330-compliant IPv4
addresses in the document. If these are example addresses, they should
be changed.

<<Intentional reference of 198.18.0.0 address space reserved for BM>>

Miscellaneous warnings:

No issues found here.

Checking references for intended status: Proposed Standard

(See RFC 3967 for information about using normative references to
lower-maturity documents in RFCs)

-- Looks like a reference, but probably isn't: 'SA' on line
446
'[permit|deny] [protocol] [SA] [DA]...'

-- Looks like a reference, but probably isn't: 'DA' on line
446
'[permit|deny] [protocol] [SA] [DA]...'

<<Not references>>

Summary: 0 errors (**), 2 warnings (==), 2 comments (--).