Cl **00**   *SC*   *P*   *L*   # 4

Diab, Wael

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

The current containment model used in 802.3bc and 802.3at are different (802.3az has not made edits to that section yet). I believe that we need to decide which model to use for 802.3bc and make sure its adequately clear so that other 802.3 projects using LLDP can follow suite.

SuggestedRemedy

Please use this comment as a placeholder for the discussion in the Maintenance TF.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Based on the following motion that was passed during the joint IEEE 802.3at, IEEE 802.3az and IEEE P802.3bc, no change is required to IEEE P802.3bc.

Move:
• Affirm the containment model contained in IEEE P802.3bc D2.0 is the model used for LLDP related projects moving forward
• Request that IEEE P802.3at and IEEE P802.3az make the changes to their drafts to match above
• Copy the text from IEEE 802.1AB-2005 Section 5.2, items N and M to IEEE 802.3bc

M: D. Law S: H. Frazier
Technical (75%)
All: Y:15 N:0 A:6
Motion Passes

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.2.2.1**   *P* **12**   *L* **23**   # 101

Thompson, Geoff   Nortel

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

Regarding the statement: "Such containment is expected, but is outside the scope of this standard."
I do not agree with this statement. I believe that the containment for LLDP needs to be shown within this standard AND the LLDP MIBs need to have an established integral relationship with the established station management

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the referenced sentence
Add LLDP to the cotainment diagram
Make any other required changes to have the LLDP MIBs fully accessible via normal station management.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #4.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.2.3**   *P* **13**   *L* **3**   # 102

Thompson, Geoff   Nortel

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

Fig 30-6
Is show without relationship to any other management

SuggestedRemedy

Show relationship to station management containment diagram

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

See comment #4.

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COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn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 **30**
SC **30.2.3**

Page 1 of 3
13/03/2009 05:12:48

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.2.5**   *P* **13**   *L* **32**   # 68

Barnette, James   Vitesse Semiconducto

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

Repetitive use of LLPD where it seems that LLDP is intended. This first occurance is in the heading of Table 30-5. And it occurs in the table-of-contents in the front matter since it occurs in headers. The following additional occurances were found:
Page 14, Line 3, still in Table 30-5
Page 14, Line 44, Subclause 30.12.1
Page 14, Line 49, Subclause 30.12.1.1
Page 15, Line 12, Subclause 30.12.2
Page 15, Line 18, Subclause 30.12.2.1
Page 17, Line 44, Subclause 30.12.3
Page 17, Line 49, Subcluase 30.12.3.1

SuggestedRemedy

Change these occurances from LLPD to LLDP

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **30**   *SC* **30.2.5**   *P* **14**   *L* **32**   # 69

Barnette, James   Vitesse Semiconducto

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

Incorrect spelling of attribute: aldpXdot3RemPowerPairControlable
Also occurs in the following places:
Page 19, Line 19, Subclause 30.12.3.1.8 (this instance leads to front matter table-of-contents having this attribute incorrect)
Page 27, Line 43, Subcluase 79.7.3, Table 78-7

SuggestedRemedy

Change from aldpXdot3RemPowerPairControlable to aLldpXdot3RemPowerPairControlable

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79**   *P* **21**   *L* **25**   # 2

Muller, Shimon

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

It would be very helpful to the readers of this standard if the frame format for an LLDP data unit were provided.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a figure that shows an 802.3 LLDP frame, with all the relevant fields included: MAC addresses, reserved EtherType, TLV fields, etc.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will add an informative figure based on Figure D-1 'IEEE 802.3 LLDP frame format' of IEEE Std 802.1AB-2005.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.2**   *P* **21**   *L* **39**   # 16

Anslow, Peter   Nortel Networks

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

All of the Tables and Figures in clause 79 are numbered as 78-xx

SuggestedRemedy

Re-number all Tables and Figures in clause 79 to be 79-xx

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.2**   *P* **21**   *L* **40**   # 70

Barnette, James   Vitesse Semiconducto

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

References to figures and tables within clause 79 should not begin with 78.

SuggestedRemedy

Please correct figure and table numbers to be 79-... instead of 78-...

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

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 **79**
SC **79.2**

Page 2 of 3
13/03/2009 05:12:48

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.2**   *P* **21**   *L* **40**   # 18

Marris, Arthur   Cadence

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

    Table number is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

    Correct table to be clause 79 rather than 78 throughout the document.

    Also correct the figure numbers.

Response   *Response Status* **U**

    ACCEPT.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.6.1**   *P* **25**   *L* **30**   # 34

Booth, Brad   AMCC

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

    Draft makes reference to 802.3-2002. There is no such document anymore. As the
    reference relates to 802.3, which this is an amendment to, the reference to 802.3 is
    obsolete.

SuggestedRemedy

    Remove occurences in subclause of "of IEEE Std. 802.3-2002" and "of IEEE 802.3-2002".

Response   *Response Status* **W**

    ACCEPT.

Cl **79**   *SC* **79.8.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **7**   # 71

Barnette, James   Vitesse Semiconducto

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

    Incorrect self-reference to Clause 78. This also occurs in the following on Page 28, Line
    38, Subclause 79.8.2.2, in table

SuggestedRemedy

    Change reference from "Cluase 78" to "Clause 79"

Response   *Response Status* **W**

    ACCEPT.

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 **79**
SC **79.8.1**

Page 3 of 3
13/03/2009 05:12:48