Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 13

Pat Thaler None entered

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The draft has no line numbers

SuggestedRemedy

Please use them in the next draft to make it easier to indicate the location whree a comment applies.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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 **00** *SC* **0** *P* **33** *L* # 8

Glenn Parsons None entered

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

You can't simply insert this here… and further the way to do it depends on the decision in 6.2.5 of optional vs mandatory.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss. The options are: a new table that AUGMENTS dot3adAggPortTable (optional), a new table ieee801AXAggPortTable and deprecating the old (optional/mandatory) or rerooted (mandatory)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Choose first option. See comment #17.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **v** *L* # 16

Pat Thaler None entered

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Participants - Steve's last name is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Add it

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.10** *P* **7** *L* # 5

Glenn Parsons None entered

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

I struggle with the requirement for the aggregator address to be globally-unique. The only requirement on addressing here is that the aggregator can have a distinct address or assume the address of one of the addresses in the LAG

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss. But I would tend to remove "globally-unique"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Remove the text "globally-unique" in the first and second sentences of the last paragraph on page 7. Check the rest of the standard for consistency with this change and change as necessary.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.10** *P* **7** *L* # 14

Pat Thaler None entered

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

There is no need for the aggregator address to be globally-unique. In some environments, it might be useful to allow a locally-unique address value such as if Nearest customer LAGs are used to aggregate links operating over pairs of port mapping S-components (as in 802.1Qbg) .

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "globally-unique" here and in 5.3.3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. See comment #5.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.10.1** *P* **8** *L* # 22

Rakesh Sharma None entered

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

per PAR, update allows use by the other 802.1 - missing explanation

SuggestedRemedy

Add explanation on use in other 802.1 specs

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. In 5.2.10.2, add text from 802.1AB-2009 section 7.1 introduction and bullets a-c, changing references to the 0E-address (nearest bridge) to 02-address (Slow protocols multicast).

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 **05** *SC* **5.2.10.2** *P* **8** *L* # 1

Jessy Rouyer None entered

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

In the first paragraph, "Table" is used instead of "Table 5-2".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Table" with "Table 5-2".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.10.2** *P* **8** *L* # 23

Rakesh Sharma None entered

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

per PAR, update allows use by the other 802.1 - missing explanation

SuggestedRemedy

Add explanation on use in other 802.1 specs

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment #22

Cl **05** *SC* **5.2.7.1.2** *P* **3** *L* # 12

Pat Thaler None entered

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

Protocol_DA definition is different Aggregator Parser state diagram from that in the Control Parser state diagram - it seems that it should be the same - that it should only be the DA selected by aAggPortProtocolDA. A customer LAG might be operating over links that are provider LAGs. If it the Aggregator Parser captured packets with any DA from Table 5-2, a marker sent by a customer LAG port could be captured by a provider LAG port instead of going end-to-end across the LAG.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the definition of Protocol_DA the same as that for the Control Parser.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Change Protocol_DA description in 5.2.7.1.2 to match that in 5.2.9.1.2.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.4.2.2** *P* **9** *L* # 15

Pat Thaler None entered

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

This seems an indirect way to specify what address to use. The text in 5.2.9.1.2 is more direct and ensures that all these use the same address. There is no need to specify a default here since that would be determined by the default value of aAggPortProtocolDA.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace from "The default DA" to the end of paragraph with The DA shall be the address specified by the setting of the aAggPortProtocolDA managed object (6.3.2.1.25).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. See comment #6 (move default to 5.2.7.1.2 and 5.2.9.1.2). Add reference to 6.3.2.1.25.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.4.2.2** *P* **9** *L* # 6

Glenn Parsons None entered

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

A default is needed. But this is an obscure place.

SuggestedRemedy

Move "default DA" from here to 5.2.10.2 -- and also in the MIB itself of course…

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment #15. Put the default value explicitly in the description of the object in the MIB.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.2.5** *P* **15** *L* # 7

Glenn Parsons None entered

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

I cannot understand how this could be optional. How could you not have a DA set? Unless the default is the old mechanism? If that is the case it needs to be explained as such.

SuggestedRemedy

This is fundamental. Is this being added as an option such that the current behaviour is maintained when the optional MO is not used? Or is this the new way to determine the DA for all cases and therefore must be mandatory? The decision will affect how to code this in the MIB and how to describe it.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change table 6-1 to move aAggPortProtocolDA into the Mandatory Package.

Cl **C** *SC* **C** *P* **17** *L* # 17

Pat Thaler None entered

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Regarding the Editor's note - since the arc wasn't changed when the standard was moved to 802.1, it seems rather disruptive to change it now to add one object.

SuggestedRemedy

If 802.3 is willing to give us a value for the new object, I suggest leaving the MIB under the 802.3 arc.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. We have chosen to make the object mandatory. This makes it a significant change. However if we use the AUGMENT approach, leaving the existing objects in the old arc, we avoid the pressure to implment both an old and a new MIB.

AUGMENT the existing MIB in the old arc (us.ieee802dot3.snmpmibs.link-agg) augmenting the dot3adAggPortTable with the new variable. Update the MODULE COMPLIANCE. The dot3adAggPortProtocolDA object would be in a new table attached parallel to the existing table.

Make the variable read-write not read-only.

Cl **C** *SC* **C** *P* **17** *L* # 10

Glenn Parsons None entered

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

Changing the arc is a debatable point. It is under the 'old' 802.3 arc. For cleanness it should be under the current 802.1 arc. But such a change would be disruptive to all existing implementations and should only by done to signify a significant change. We re-rooted all of 802.1Q as a result of the need to re-index most objects with the ISID. The new root then became an identification of carrier Etherent bridging -- and the old MIBs could be still used for older enterprise bridging. In this case, is changing the DA from a static to a variable significant?

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss. But I am tending towards to it being significant.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment #17.

Cl **C** *SC* **C** *P* **17** *L* # 9

Glenn Parsons None entered

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

Are there "security condiserations"?

SuggestedRemedy

If not they need to be added, if so the new object needs to be added with an explanation of the risk of setting this incorrectly…

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is an existing section for this. Commentor to supply text to update it.

Cl **C** *SC* **C** *P* **17** *L* # 3

Tony Jeffree None entered

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

In response to the Editor's Note: Yes, as we are fixing the MIB we should root it under the 802.1 arc.

SuggestedRemedy

Do it.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. See resolution of comment #17.

Cl **C** *SC* **C** *P* **19** *L* # 4

Tony Jeffree None entered

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

In response to the Editor's Note: In other standards we have pointed at the 802.1 MIBs page

SuggestedRemedy

Change this to a footnote & refer readers to http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/MIBS.html

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

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* # 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.

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* # 11

Glenn Parsons None entered

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

The LAST-UPDATED clause is worng, we need a VERSION, and so forth...

SuggestedRemedy

Update the headers

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT. Editor will work with commentor on the details.