

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **1** *L* # **1**

Coordination, Editorial

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

SECTION III: Recommended changes

Please note that the address and zip code for the IEEE Piscataway office has changed.
Please remove the P.O. Box completely and update the zip code to read '08854' in the
copyright notice on page 1.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.12.2.1.11** *P* **18** *L* **25** # **16**

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

'The bitmap value contains ' > 'A bitmap value which contains '
Also on page 21, line 4

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.12.2.1.12** *P* **18** *L* **35** # **31**

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

is 'ifIndex for the port component in link aggregation.' > 'ifIndex for the port component in
link aggregation status.'
Also on page 21, line 14

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The existing text is accurate as stands, in addition it is not clear what 'link aggregation
status' in the proposed text relates to since the string 'link aggregation status' does not
occur in the Link Aggregation clause.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.12.2.1.13** *P* **18** *L* **46** # **32**

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

is 'An integer value indicating the maximum supported frame size in octets on' > 'An integer
value indicating the maximum size of a supported frame (expressed in octets) for'
Also on page 21, line 25

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The suggest text, especially the '.. size of a supported frame ..' seems to imply a dynamic
value, this value instead is the maximum size the port can support, e.g, either 1518, 1522
or 2000.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.12.2.1.4** *P* **17** *L* **4** # **27**

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

is '32 bit' and s/b '32-bit' when used as an adjective. Also on:
page 19, line 37

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.12.2.1.4** *P* **17** *L* **7** # **14**

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

is 'This object contains the integer value derived from the list position of the corresponding'
and s/b 'This object contains an integer value derived from the list position of the
corresponding'
Also on page 19, line 40

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

CI 30 SC 30.12.2.1.8 P 17 L 49 # 15
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A
is 'A read-only Boolean value is derived from' > 'A read-only Boolean value derived from'
is 'object (defined in IETF RFC 3621) and is used to' > 'object (defined in IETF RFC 3621)
and used to'
the same on page 20, line 29-30

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC P 22 L 2 # 2
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A
Incomplete editing of title -- "values" should be "value"

SuggestedRemedy
Change to read: "(LLDP) type, length, value (TLV) information elements".

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79 P 22 L 2 # 43
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status A
"type, length, and values (TLV) information elements"

SuggestedRemedy
Should it be "type, length, and value (TLV) information elements" (one value per TLV)?

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79.1 P 22 L 10 # 41
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status A
Don't know what this is trying to say:
"the station's point of attachment to the IEEE 802 LAN required by the management entity
or entities"
Why does the management entity or entities REQUIRE a point of attachment to the IEEE
802 LAN? Is this the address used (not required, I would think) by the management entity
or entities to talk to others? Or what?

SuggestedRemedy
Please revise some more.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change '.. and the identification of the station's point of attachment to the IEEE 802 LAN
required by the management entity or entities.' to read '.. and the identification of the
station's point of attachment to the IEEE 802 LAN.'.

Will also change '.. same IEEE 802 LAN, the major capabilities ..' to read '.. same IEEE
802 LAN: the major capabilities ..'.

CI 79 SC 79.1 P 22 L 18 # 6
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R
is
'are provided in subclause 9.6 of'
s/b
'are provided in 9.6 in'

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response Response Status C
REJECT.

As this is a reference to an external standard, rather than internal, the fact that this is a
subclause that is being referenced should be kept.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

Cl 79 SC 79.1 P 22 L 5 # 5
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A

is
'The Link Layer Discovery Protocol (LLDP) specified in IEEE Std 802.1AB-20XX allows stations attached to an IEEE 802 LAN to advertise, to other stations attached to the same IEEE 802 LAN, the major capabilities provided by the system incorporating that station,'
s/b
'The Link Layer Discovery Protocol (LLDP) specified in IEEE Std 802.1AB-20XX allows stations attached to an IEEE 802 LAN to advertise to all other stations attached to the same IEEE 802 LAN, major capabilities provided by the system incorporating that station,'

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See other comments that change this, new text will read:

'The Link Layer Discovery Protocol (LLDP) specified in IEEE Std 802.1AB-20XX is a MAC Client protocol that allows stations attached to an IEEE 802 LAN to advertise to all other stations attached to the same IEEE 802 LAN: the major capabilities provided by the system incorporating that station ..'

Cl 79 SC 79.1 P 22 L 5 # 44
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Need more information in the overview to relate this clause to the rest of 802.3. Response to D2.0 comment 40 said that IEEE Std 802.1AB covers the various items such as the architectural overview in Clause 6, the principles of operation in Clause 7 and a description of the protocol in Clause 10.
But a very quick review did not answer my questions (I found an MSAP but no proper layer diagram showing the MAC).

SuggestedRemedy

Please add text and diagram as necessary to address these questions:
Where does this clause fit into the layer diagram that is Figure 1 of most clauses?
Is this clause related to MAC Control? If not, what is it related to?
How are these TLVs send and received? Is it via the mechanism in Clause 57?
Which sublayer sends and receives these TLVs? Where does LLDP sit in relationship to the ISO/IEC Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) reference model and IEEE 802.3 CSMA/CD LAN model?
If some of these questions are answered in 802.1AB, could use references to specific points in it if appropriate.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

LLDP is a MAC Client protocol, therefore resides in the MAC Client layer shown in most of the IEEE 802.3 layer diagrams. Will change the 79.1 text '.. IEEE Std 802.1AB-20XX allows stations attached ..' to read '.. IEEE Std 802.1AB-20XX is a MAC Client protocol that allows stations attached ..'.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

CI 79 SC 79.1.1 P 22 L 23 # 17
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Link to Figure 79-1 is not live.
The same comment against (subclause, page, line)
79.2, 24, 1
79.3, 24, 27
79.3.1, 24, 40
79.4, 25, 32
79.4.1, 25, 47
79.5, 26, 37
79.5.1, 27, 4
79.6, 27, 31
79.7.1, 28, 22
79.7.2, 28, 39
79.7.2, 28, 40

SuggestedRemedy

Make all links to Figures/Tables in the text live !!!

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79.1.1 P 22 L 25 # 40
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type ER Comment Status R
GRATUITOUS CAPITALS
The vast majority of figures in 802.3 use mixed upper and lower case.
The reader can't be expected to know that some figures don't follow the house style
because they are like other very old figures, while others do follow the house style. It looks
unprofessional.
Even if we don't change old figures we should not keep digging a hole.

SuggestedRemedy

Change OCTETS to octets and so on.

Response Response Status W
REJECT.

This figure exactly matches the capitalization of the original found in IEEE Std 802.3-2008
Figure 3-1.

CI 79 SC 79.1.1 P 22 L 31 # 28
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status A
Why is the size of the LLDP frame limited to 1500 bytes?

SuggestedRemedy

If the size is indeed limited to 1500 bytes, provide reference for that fact in the text or
explain why. Otherwise, change to size consistent with P802.3as extension.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

As the note to the figure states 'The illustration shows the simplest form of an IEEE 802.3
LLDP frame; i.e., where the frame has had no IEEE Std 802.1Q tag header, or IEEE Std
802.1AE security tag, or any other form of encapsulation applied to it.'

Even if the frame were to include a IEEE Std 802.1Q tag header, or to add encapsulation,
it would not increase the 1500 limit that is shown in this figure as this relates only to the
LLDPDU. Any additional bytes beyond 1500 cannot be added to the LLDPDU, as they are
reserved for encapsulation, headers and trailers.

CI 79 SC 79.1.1 P 22 L 46 # 7
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A
is
'where the frame has had no IEEE'
s/b
'where the frame has no IEEE'

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79.1.1.1 P 22 L 50 # 34
Anslow, Pete Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status A
"of a IEEE 802.3" should be "of an IEEE 802.3"
Also in 79.1.1.2, 79.1.1.3 and 79.1.1.4

SuggestedRemedy

Change "of a IEEE 802.3" to "of an IEEE 802.3" in four places.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

Cl 79 **SC 79.1.1.1** **P 22** **L 50** # **36**
 Anslow, Pete Nortel Networks

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

This says "The Destination Address field of a IEEE 802.3 LLDP frame contains a group MAC addresses listed in Table 7-1"
 Table 7-1 lists several "group MAC addresses" so this text should read:
 "The Destination Address field of a IEEE 802.3 LLDP frame contains one of the group MAC addresses listed in Table 7-1"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "contains a group MAC addresses listed" to "contains one of the group MAC addresses listed"

Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 79 **SC 79.1.1.3** **P 23** **L 8** # **35**
 Anslow, Pete Nortel Networks

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

"field that contain the" should be "field that contains the" i.e. contains rather than contain.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "field that contain the" to "field that contains the"

Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

Cl 79 **SC 79.1.1.4** **P 23** **L 13** # **18**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

is
 'contains the Link Layer Discovery Protocol Data Unit (LLDPDU) which'
 s/b
 'contains the LLDPDU which'

LLDPDU is already defined

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT.

Also change 'The LLDPDU field ..' to read 'The LLDPDU field ..'.

Cl 79 **SC 79.1.16** **P 23** **L 24** # **19**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

In Figure 79-1, the FCS field is not shown.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Figure 79-1, replacing 'FRAME CHECK SEQUENCE' with 'FRAME CHECK SEQUENCE (FCS)'

Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Change '79.1.1.6 Frame Check Sequence (FCS) field' to read '79.1.1.6 Frame Check Sequence field'.

[2] Change 'The FCS field ..' to read 'The Frame Check Sequence (FCS) field ..'.

Cl 79 **SC 79.2** **P 21** **L 37** # **42**
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

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

"...Two port MAC Relay or a Bridge in between, so the characteristics of the MAC may change between sender and receiver of an LLDPDU...": I still doubt it. MACs don't move between sender and receiver. Do you mean the apparent MAC address may be modified, or the apparent or advertised characteristics of a MAC as shown in a TLV may be modified, or that the characteristics of sending and receiving MAC may/might/could be mismatched, or what?

SuggestedRemedy

Please revise some more.

Response **Response Status** **C**
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This means that characteristics of the sending and receiving device might be different, for example the sender could be half-duplex fiber while the receive could be full-duplex twisted-pair.

Change the text '.. LAN as the sender, as there could be a Two port MAC Relay or a Bridge in between, so the characteristics of the MAC may change between sender and receiver of an LLDPDU when these addresses are used.' to read '.. LAN as the sender, because there could be a Two-Port MAC Relay or a Bridge in between. Thus the characteristics of the sending and receiving DTEs could be different when these addresses are used.'.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

Cl 79 **SC 79.2** **P 21** **L 37** # **39**
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
Two port MAC Relay

SuggestedRemedy
Two-port MAC Relay

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will change to read 'Two-Port MAC Relay' to match the capitalization found in IEEE 802.1aj.

Cl 79 **SC 79.2** **P 23** **L 29** # **46**
Floor

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **A**
After discussion at the joint IEEE P802.3bc/IEEE P802.3at/IEEE P802.3az meeting it was agreed that the IEEE P802.3bc should faithfully transfer the requirements from IEEE Std 802.1AB to IEEE Std 802.3 and then IEEE P802.3at should perform changes that it requires, for example removing the requirement that if one TLV is supported all TLVs are supported.

SuggestedRemedy
Restore the text 'If any IEEE 802.3 Organizationally Specific TLV is supported, all IEEE 802.3 Organizationally Specific TLVs shall be supported.' to subclause 79.2.

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 79 **SC 79.2** **P 23** **L 37** # **20**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
is
'as there could be a Two port MAC Relay or a Bridge'
s/b
'as there could be a two-port MAC Relay or a Bridge'

SuggestedRemedy
per comment (adjectives are hyphenated)

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #42 and #39.

Cl 79 **SC 79.2** **P 24** **L 2** # **21**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **R**
is
'changes to these TLVs will be included in this clause.'
s/b
'changes to these TLVs will be included in Clause 79.'

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response **Response Status** **C**
REJECT.

This clause is Clause 79 so the text '.. This clause' is accurate.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

CI 79 SC 79.3 P 24 L 16 # 45

Vetteth, Anoop

Comment Type E Comment Status A

The Organizationally Specific TLVs are defined in Section 79.3, 79.4, ... , 79.6. Section 79.7 deals with selection management that is common for all TLVs. If dot3 were to introduce a new TLV it needs to be housed between Section 79.6 and 79.7 which will cause all the sections 79.7 and above to change their clause numbers.

SuggestedRemedy

Define the TLVs in subclauses 79.3.1, 79.3.2 ... etc. Re-number 79.7 to 79.4 etc.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Add a new subclause 79.3, this will include the last paragraph of the current 79.2 as well as table 79-1. In summary new subclause will read:

79.3 IEEE 802.3 Organizationally Specific TLVs

The currently defined IEEE 802.3 Organizationally Specific TLVs are listed in Table 79-1. Any additions or changes to these TLVs will be included in this clause.

(-- Include Table 79-1 --)

[2] Renumber subclause as follows:

79.3 -> 79.3.1

79.4 -> 79.3.2

79.5 -> 79.3.3

79.6 -> 79.3.4

79.7 to 79.4

etc

CI 79 SC 79.3 P 24 L 24 # 8

Hajduczenia, Marek

ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A

'Whether these settings are the result of auto-negotiation during link initiation or of manual set override action.'

Which settings are 'these settings' in this context? The ones included in pints a) and b) above ?

SuggestedRemedy

State clearly what is meant and which 'these' settings are meant

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change '.. these settings .' to read '.. the current duplex and bit-rate settings ..'.

CI 79 SC 79.3 P 24 L 35 # 22

Hajduczenia, Marek

ZTE Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

Figure 79-1 is really Figure 79-2.

Figure 79-2 is really Figure 79-3 (page 25, line 42)

Figure 79-3 is really Figure 79-4 (page 26, line 51)

Figure 79-4 is really Figure 79-5 (page 27, line 40)

SuggestedRemedy

Update the figure number and make changes in accompanying text

(page 24, line 27)

(page 25, line 32)

(page 26, line 37)

(page 27, line 31)

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

Cl 79 SC 79.3.1 P 24 L 39 # 23
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

'The auto-negotiation support/status field shall contain a bit map'
AFAIK, 'bit map' should be spelled as 'bitmap'
Global search and replace

SuggestedRemedy

per comment
see also <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bitmap>

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79.3.1 P 24 L 41 # 29
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R

is
'is one and the auto-negotiation status bit (bit 1) is zero,'
s/b
'is set and the auto-negotiation status bit (bit 1) is reset,'

SuggestedRemedy

bits are set / reset AFAIK

Response Response Status C
REJECT.

MIBs use GET and SET for read and write and the current use of SET is consistent with this. To use set in relation to setting a bit to one in the MIB as well would lead to confusion, hence we prefer to use one and zero.

Cl 79 SC 79.3.2 P 24 L 47 # 24
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

is '2 octet' and s/b '2-octet' when used as an adjective. Also on:
page 16, line 48
page 19, line 28

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 79 SC 79.4 P 25 L 30 # 9
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R

is 'The Power Via MDI TLV is' and s/b 'The Power via MDI TLV is'

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response Response Status C
REJECT.

This is the capitalization used in IEEE Std 802.1AB which we are transferring to content over to IEEE Std 802.3.

Cl 79 SC 79.4.1 P 25 L 51 # 30
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R

is 'NOTE 3—If bit 1 is zero, bit 2 has no meaning.'
s/b 'NOTE 3—If bit 1 is reset, bit 2 has no meaning.'

SuggestedRemedy

bits are set / reset AFAIK

Response Response Status C
REJECT.

See comment #29.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

CI 79 SC 79.5 P 26 L 40 # 33
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

'NOTE: As the Link Aggregation specification has now been removed from the IEEE 802.3 standard and is now standardized as IEEE Std 802.1AX, new implementations of this standard are encouraged to make use of the Link Aggregation TLV that is now part of the IEEE 802.1 extension MIB specified in Annex E of IEEE Std 802.1AB-20XX.'

SuggestedRemedy

I am not sure whether I understand here. If Link Aggregation was moved to 802.1AX, and Link Aggregation TLV is included in Annex E of 802.1AB, why are we specifying Link Aggregation TLVs in here? Either explain why it is necessary to specify the same (apparently) material in two different places or remove 79.5 altogether.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If we were to remove this specification of the existing Link Aggregation TLV we would make existing implementations non-complaint. We are therefore taking the approach of deprecating the existing Link Aggregation TLV through the recommendation to use the new Link Aggregation TLV.

CI 79 SC 79.5.2 P 27 L 21 # 10
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A

is '(30.7.2.1.1).' and s/b '(see 30.7.2.1.1).'
Similar changes in:
page 28, line 23,
page 28, line 40
page 28, line 39

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

CI 79 SC 79.5.3 P 27 L 25 # 4
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Though I find the change acceptable (and consistent with the PICS), the change from "should" to "shall" produced inconsistencies with other TLVs -- 79.3.4 (p. 25, l. 24), 79.4.4 (p. 26, l.31), 79.6.2 (p. 28, l. 3) all still use "should".

SuggestedRemedy

Use "shall" parallel text for each of the above TLVs where a conformant implementation will only include one of the TLV type in an LLDPDU. P802.3at and P802.3az also need to use consistent (parallel) text for their TLVs (and I am not in the P802.3at Sponsor ballot group to enter a comment).

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This change could make existing implementations non-compliant and therefore should not have been done. If an existing implementation send two TLVs, although not recommended, it would be complaint. With this new change it would now be non-complaint and as such is beyond the scope of this project to make such a change.

The 'shall' will be changed back to read 'should'.

CI 79 SC 79.6.1 P 27 L 47 # 3
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Edits introduce grammar problem -- "the basic frames".

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete "the" (my preference) or change "frame" to "frames". Make parallel change on items b and c of the list.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[1] Change '.. only the basic frames MAC Client Data field size defined in 3.2.7, the maximum frame size field shall be set to 1518.' to read '.. only basic frames (see 3.2.7) the maximum frame size field shall be set to 1518.'

[2] Change '.. Q-tagged frames MAC Client Data field size defined in 3.2.7, the maximum frame size field shall be set to 1522.' to read '.. Q-tagged frames (see 3.2.7) the maximum frame size field shall be set to 1522.'

[3] Change '.. envelope frames MAC Client Data field size defined in 3.2.7, the maximum frame size field shall be set to 2000.' to read '.. envelope frames (see 3.2.7) the maximum frame size field shall be set to 2000.'

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

Cl 79 **SC 79.7** **P 28** **L 10** # **11**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
is 'following LLDP variable cross references to the LLDP' and s/b 'following LLDP variable cross references the LLDP'

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 79 **SC 79.7.1** **P 28** **L 25** # **12**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
Stretch column 2 to avoid line breaking

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 79 **SC 79.8.8** **P 33** **L 1** # **13**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
Column value/Comment for FST1-FST4 uses different font sizes. Align

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 79 **SC 79.8.8** **P 33** **L 1** # **25**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **A**
IMHO, PICS FST1/2/3/4 should have separate entries (rows) in the table even though they cover the same topic.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix accordingly.

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 3** **L 55** # **37**
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
Page numbers are too low.

SuggestedRemedy
Apply same fix as other projects have recently, fix any master or template.

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 9** **L 51** # **38**
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **A**
This isn't the up-to-date symbols page as used by .3ba and .3av.

SuggestedRemedy
Use the latest and check that it is filed in the IEEE 802.3 tools area.

Response **Response Status** **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #26.

IEEE P802.3bc D2.1 Ethernet LLDP TLVs comments

CI 99 SC 99 P9 L7 # 26
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Other projects modify List of Symbols, e.g. P802.3av

SuggestedRemedy

Check with 802.3 WG staff on the latest version of table of symbols and include it in the next draft. P802.3av added new symbols to the table.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The up-to-date symbols page is defined by what is in the IEEE 802.3 tools area on the web site, will make sure this draft uses the symbols page from the IEEE 802.3 tools area.

If IEEE P802.3av wishes to change the symbols page this needs to be done by updating the master copy in the tools area.