Cl **00**	*SC* **0**	*P*	*L*	# 18
Dan Romascanu	None entered

Comment Type **ER**	*Comment Status* **A**

The majority of the pages in the PDF version of this document do not have line numbering. This makes commenting very difficult, even this XLS form cannot be filled in the Line # column

SuggestedRemedy

Format next version as all IEEE 802.1 drafts - with page numbering

Response	*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **05**	*SC* **5.2.10.2**	*P* **8**	*L*	# 2
Anoop Ghanwani	None entered

Comment Type **TR**	*Comment Status* **R**

This allows link aggregation to run at multiple levels but does not address how we detect "full-duplex" nature. Link aggregation can only be supported between full-duplex links. If I have link aggregation frames going to "nearest customer bridge" over a provider network, then, if that service is a multipoint service, I will be receiving LACP frames from multiple peers.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the LACP state machine to detect the multiple LACP peers configuration. This will require changes to the LACP state machine and the associated discussion (5.4.12 in 802.1AX-2008). In this version of the spec, the non-full-duplex condition is handled by the MAC and that won't work for aggregations that go through bridges.

Response	*Response Status* **C**

REJECT. Bullet (n) in 5.1.2 points out that aggregation between more than two systems is not supported. Also, note that the comment would need to specify the changes to the state machines.

Cl **C6**	*SC* **C6**	*P* **19**	*L*	# 19
Dan Romascanu	None entered

Comment Type **TR**	*Comment Status* **A**

The ASCII file at http://www.ieee802.org/3/publication/ has non-standard characters for the quotes in the DESCRIPTION clauses. As a result I could not compile it on standard SNMP verification tools.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the ASCII formating of the file sent to ballot

Response	*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **C6**	*SC* **C6**	*P* **20**	*L*	# 21
Dan Romascanu	None entered

Comment Type **TR**	*Comment Status* **A**

Missing VERSION clause. Although this clause is not mandatory, I believe that it would be very useful to add it now that the MIB module will have more than one standard version, so that users can identify the version of the MIB module

SuggestedRemedy

Add VERSION clause

Response	*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Text required.

Cl **C6**	*SC* **C6**	*P* **20**	*L*	# 20
Dan Romascanu	None entered

Comment Type **TR**	*Comment Status* **A**

The LAST-UPDATED clause on the PDF is different than the one in the ASCII file. Which one is to be used? In any case I would expect a 2011 date here.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the LAST-UPDATE clause

Response	*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. There was no ASCII MIB file included in the ballot.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **C6**
SC **C6**

Page 1 of 1
22/07/2011 11:45:25