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Forwarder

Forwarder introduced at request of PPVPN
PSN Stacks

• Should the PSN stack diagrams Fig 10 and Fig 11 be retained in the text, or should they be relegated to appendices (follows from question to list)?

• Is the MPLS CW sufficiently generic for this text (it hails from Martini, but does not specify bit allocations or sizes)?
**IP PSN**

Do we need to retain GRE and IPSEC as tunnel types? Is anyone using/planning to use them for PW? Can they be dropped from the PW design? (Note that L2TP and GRE/MPLS could run over IPSec with no impact on the PW)
MPLS PSN

Is the CW sufficiently generic?
Fragmentation

Fragmentation section will be updated to harmonise with
<draft-malis-pwe3-fragmentation-00.txt>
TDM and Cell

• Payload Type section (3.3) could use some help from the TDM, SONET and Cell teams. (TDM Requirements?)

• Document could also do with some oversight by an MPEG/DVB expert.
Many of the PWE3 documents include a terminology section, and none of them agree on terms. Options:

One of the architecture docs contains the master copy and other docs only define terms that are unique to their scope PWE3.

A separate terminology draft is written and all other documents remove non-unique terms.

What should we do?
Framework

There is a high degree of overlap between the framework document and the protocol layering document.

Options:

1) Framework folded into PLD.

2) Framework references PLD and deletes overlapping text unless needed to clarify a point.