Cl **11**	*SC* **11.5.2**	*P* **97**	*L* **7**	*#* 1

Wijnen None entered

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

I see that you accepted my comment #28 in the sense that you added some clarifying text. So you added the 2nd para to the below DESCRIPTION clause.

lldpV2ManAddrConfigLocManAddrSubtype OBJECT-TYPE
   SYNTAX   AddressFamilyNumbers
   MAX-ACCESS not-accessible
   STATUS   current
   DESCRIPTION
      "The type of management address identifier encoding used in
      the associated 'lldpLocManagmentAddr' object.

      It should be noted that only a subset of the possible
      address encodings enumerated in AddressFamilyNumbers
      are appropriate for use as a LLDP management
      address, either because some are just not apliccable or
      because the maximum size of a LldpV2ManAddress octet string
      would prevent the use of some address identifier encodings."
   REFERENCE
      "8.5.9.3"
   ::= { lldpV2ManAddrConfigTxPortsEntry 3 }

That is great and addresses my concern.
However there are 2 more occurences in the MIB module where you use the AddressFamilyNumbers. It would be good to add the same para to the DESCRIPTION clauses of those OBJECTS. They are:

 lldpV2LocManAddrSubtype (page 97)
 lldpV2RemManAddrSubtype (page 104)

SuggestedRemedy

Pls add similar paragraph to DESCRIPTION claues of

 lldpV2LocManAddrSubtype (page 97)
 lldpV2RemManAddrSubtype (page 104)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This change should be made; however, it would be procedurally more efficient to make the change at Sponsor ballot. The comment should be included in the cover letter for the Sponsor ballot and re-submitted at that time.

Cl **09**	*SC* **9.2.9**	*P* **54**	*L* **16**	*#* 12

Thaler None entered

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

According to the definition of rxInfoAge, it indicates that rxInfoTTL associated with a particular MSAP has expired. If that is the case, how can it be set False by the state machine? If the rxInfoTTL is still expired it will be true.

Why is the indirection of rxInfoAge needed rather than testing rxInfoTTL directly.

There is an instance or rxInfoTTL for each entry in the LLDP remote systems MIB, but the definition of rxInfoAge indicates that it is for the "rxInfoTTL timing counter associated with a particular MSAP" - which of the potentially multiple timers for MIB entries for the MSAP is the one used for rxInfoAge?

SuggestedRemedy

Please clarify the operation of the variable

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. The point is that the rxInfoAge Boolean converts the level (rxInfoTTL is 0) to a transient (rxInfoTTL transitioned from <>0 to =0). While clarification would be helpful, this comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to defer this comment to Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

Cl **09**	*SC* **9.2.2**	*P* **40**	*L* **34**	*#* 13

Thaler None entered

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

Why are only receive timers in this section? Do the transmit timers obey the same rules

SuggestedRemedy

Put all timers in the timer section. There is no reason to treat transmit timers differently.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT. This comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't changed text or a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to re-submit this comment at Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

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: Comment ID

Page 1 of 3

Comment ID # **13**   13/03/2009 06:54:53

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.2.10**   *P* **55**   *L* **24**   # `14`

Thaler   None entered

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

Once txFTTR equals zero and txFast=0, the second exit condition from Tx_Timer_IDLE will always be true because txFTTR has counted down to zero and no longer gets a new value assigned.

SuggestedRemedy

There is no need to have separate count down timers for fast and slow cycles. Remove txFTTR and use only txTTR. In TX_TIMER_EXPIRES, assign msgFastTx to txTTR if ((txFast>0). Otherwise, assign msgTxInterval to it.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT. This comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't changed text or a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to re-submit this comment at Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

Cl **06**   *SC* **6.7**   *P* **14**   *L* **51**   # `15`

Thaler   None entered

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

"without any additional multiplexing or addressing" seems to be contradicted by the note on the next page "as the LLPDU contains information that idenitfies the source of the LLPDU,….is able to be recorded independently…." Also see the Note on page 43 line 40 which indicates that the agent processes the address.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the contradiction

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT. This comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't changed text or a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to re-submit this comment at Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

Cl **08**   *SC* **8.4.3**   *P* **25**   *L* **37**   # `16`

Thaler   None entered

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

This says that bit 1 is the least significant bit in the field, but later views of the fields don't identify which is bit 1. For example Figure 8-4 doesn't identify bit 1 of the TLV type or TLV information string length fields

SuggestedRemedy

Make the information on bit significance relevant to the form in which fields are shown.

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT. This comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't changed text or a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to re-submit this comment at Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

Cl **09**   *SC* **9.2.1**   *P* **40**   *L* **16**   # `17`

Thaler   None entered

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

"retains this value until a subsequent state block executes a procedure that modifies the value." This isn't exactly true. In some cases such as rxInfoAge, a state machine procedure sets it false but something external to the state machines sets it true. In other cases such as txTTL, timer ticks cause the variable to count down.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the statement more accurate. Possibly by adding "or by a timer tick or an external event"

Response   *Response Status*   **C**

REJECT. This comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't changed text or a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to re-submit this comment at Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

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: Comment ID

Page 2 of 3
Comment ID # **17**
13/03/2009 06:54:54

Cl **09** 　　*SC* **9.2.5.10** 　　　　*P* **43** 　　*L* **48** 　　# 18

Thaler 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　None entered

Comment Type 　**E** 　　*Comment Status* **R**

Is there a reason that other variables have a "default" and this has a "recommended default"?

SuggestedRemedy

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT. There is no particular reason. However, this comment is out of the scope of this recirc, as it is a new comment from a balloter that previously voted approve and this isn't changed text or a "pile-on" on someone else's comment; the commenter is therefore asked to re-submit this comment at Sponsor ballot in the interests of making progress.

Cl **09** 　　*SC* **9.2.7.7.2** 　　　　*P* **50** 　　*L* **20** 　　# 19

Thaler 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　None entered

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

This appears to contradict the way the Time to Live TLV length is handled on page 49 line 19. In that case, length values greater than the current length of 2 are not considered an error

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the inconsistancy

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The text on P50 L20 should indicate that the TTL TLV is an exception to this rule. However, it would be procedurally more efficient to make the change at Sponsor ballot. The comment should be included in the cover letter for the Sponsor ballot and re-submitted at that time.

Cl **09** 　　*SC* **9.2.5.13** 　　　　*P* **44** 　　*L* **7** 　　# 20

Thaler 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　None entered

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

Why is this variable used rather than directly testing rxInfoTTL == 0 as is done for other tests of timers? Also what is the difference between rxInfoTTL and rxTTL?

SuggestedRemedy

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

REJECT. This is just a question, and the commenter does not propose a remedy.

Cl **D** 　　*SC* **D.3.1** 　　　　*P* **123** 　　*L* **15** 　　# 21

Thaler 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　None entered

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

This should either get a note similar to that at the beginning of Annex F or be removed

SuggestedRemedy

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This change should be made; however, it would be procedurally more efficient to make the change at Sponsor ballot. The comment should be included in the cover letter for the Sponsor ballot and re-submitted at that time.

Cl **09** 　　*SC* **9.2.9** 　　　　*P* **54** 　　*L* **17** 　　# 22

Rouyer 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　None entered

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

As it stands, the draft uses "somethingChangedRemote()" throughout.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace this occurrence of "somethingRemoteChanged();" with "somethingChangedRemote();".

Response 　　　　　　*Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This change should be made; however, it would be procedurally more efficient to make the change at Sponsor ballot. The comment should be included in the cover letter for the Sponsor ballot and re-submitted at that time.

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: Comment ID

Page 3 of 3
Comment ID # **22**
13/03/2009 06:54:54