IEEE 802.3ax (IEEE P802.1AX) D1.0 Link Aggregation comments

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: A

Needs real front matter for Sponsor ballot

Suggested Remedy:
WG Chair to provide.

Response
Accept.

Comment Type: ER  Comment Status: A

The draft is shown as clean text without change bars. We are supposed to be evaluating whether the extraction from 802.3 and the conversion into text suitable for an 802.1 standard has been done suitably. This is exceedingly difficult to do when the new draft is not presented in change tracking form.

Suggested Remedy:
Have the scope of the recirculation cover the entire text and make the recirculation draft for ballot a change tracking version of the draft where the changes are the diff against 802.3-2005. There may be some areas where explanation (as editor's notes) ay be needed to explain just how and why changes are being made. When this is done, many more eyes can evaluate whether or not the extraction and conversion was done properly and completely.

Response
Accept.

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: R

higher aggregate bandwidth than the individual links that form the aggregation

Suggested Remedy:
higher aggregate bandwidth than an individual link within the Link Aggregation Group
(Actually, given the load balancing uncertainties, "aggregate bandwidth" is a dubious concept. "links that can deliver a higher aggregate throughput than an individual link within the Link Aggregation Group")?

Response
Reject.

The purpose has to match word for word the PAR purpose therefore to change this would require a modified PAR. The suggested change does not justify this.

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: A

1.2.207 defines link as "The transmission path between any two interfaces of generic cabling. (From ISO/IEC 11801.)", not between MAC clients.

Suggested Remedy:
Change "links" to "logical links"?

Response
Accept.

The definitions found in IEEE Std 802.3 do not apply to IEEE 802.1AX. This comment however does point out that there is no definition of link in the IEEE P802.1AX draft. The reason for this is the text that locally defined link in Clause 43 of IEEE 802.3 still remains in Clause 5 of this draft. These local definitions should be moved to Clause 3 since they should now be global for IEEE P802.1AX. To do this:

[1] Delete subclause 5.1.1
[2] Add the following to Clause 3 'Definitions':

3.a link: See Aggregation Link.
3.b port: See Aggregation Port.
3.c Key: See Aggregation Key.
3.d System: See Aggregation System.
Given the desire to reference the most current version of 802.3 (presumably with LAG removed) we should use the undated convention, as described in the intro. And not try to make sure this publishes at the same time as 802.3-2007 or since we are unsure if it will happen it is listed here as 802.3-200X.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to IEEE Std 802.3, ...

Response
ACCEPT.
See also comment #17.

Errata in producing draft.

SuggestedRemedy
Needs "I" leading the line.

Response
ACCEPT.

Typo in ISO: "SO/IEC 10165-2" to "ISO/IEC 10165-2"

SuggestedRemedy
As per comment

Response
ACCEPT.
**IEEE 802.3ax (IEEE P802.1AX) D1.0 Link Aggregation comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Do we want to encourage a common-sense check for updates and errata of the references?</td>
<td>REJECT.</td>
<td></td>
<td>If so, add &quot;Parties subject to agreements based on this standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the documents/standards indicated below.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The name format in the RFC 1155 Reference should be done consistently. The first name (Rose) is of the form: LastName, FirstNameInitial. The second name is of the form: FirstNameInitial. LastName</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick one format or the other for the names (presumably that is consistent with the way other references are done in 802.1) and stick to it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Should we be using the term 'MAC Bridge' or simply 'bridge' which was the term that was actually defined in IEEE Std 802.3-2005, MAC bridge was not. At a minimum 'Bridge' should be changed to read 'bridge'.</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change 'MAC Bridge' to read 'bridge' or at a minimum 'Bridge' to read 'bridge'. Do this change to Page 76, line 6 and line 53 as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Status:**
- **D/Dispatched:** A comment that has been dispatched to the appropriate parties for action.
- **A/Accepted:** A comment that has been accepted and acted upon.
- **R/Rejected:** A comment that has been rejected.

**Response Status:**
- **O/Open:** A comment that is open for discussion.
- **W/Written:** A comment that has been written but not yet accepted.
- **C/Closed:** A comment that has been closed.
- **U/Unsatisfied:** A comment that is unsatisfied.
- **Z/Withdrawn:** A comment that has been withdrawn.

**Sort Order:**
- Clause, Subclause, page, line
IEEE 802.3ax (IEEE P802.1AX) D1.0 Link Aggregation comments

Cl 05 SC 5.1.1 P L #
Grow, Robert Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A
"3"? Without subsections, could use a leading "Clause".

SuggestedRemedy
Insert "Clause" before clause number.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This subclause has been deleted in response to comment #15.

Cl 05 SC 5.1.3 P 16 L 36 #
Grow, Robert Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A
This line seems very strange now in this format.

SuggestedRemedy
Either delete line, or move State Machine instructions to its own clause.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Suggest that subclause 5.1.4 'State diagram conventions' be moved to subclause 5.1.1 which has been deleted by comment #15. This will make the flow of the Clause much better and avoid the state diagram conventions breaking up the architectural introduction as the comment points out.

Cl 05 SC 5.1.4.4 P 18 L 54 #
Grow, Robert Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A
Bad table page break

SuggestedRemedy
Fix table border.

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 05 SC 5.2.4.1.1 P 24 L 24 #
Ganga, Ilango Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A
Typo: Change "IEEE Srd 802.3" to "IEEE Std 802.3"

SuggestedRemedy
As per comment

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 05 SC 5.2.5 P 25 L 31 #
Ganga, Ilango Intel
Comment Type E Comment Status A
Change "with an mac_service_data_unit" to "with a mac_service_data_unit"

SuggestedRemedy
As per comment

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.

Cl 05 SC 5.2.5 P 25 L 33 #
Ganga, Ilango Intel
Comment Type T Comment Status R
Refer to the statement ".the timing restrictions for Slow Protocols specified in IEEE Std 802.3 Annex 57a"

The timing requirements for LACP are referenced back to 802.3.

Consider to move the LACP specific requirements to a separate annex in 802.1X. Currently Annex 57A has references specific to LACP and marker protocol that could possibly moved to 802.1X.

SuggestedRemedy
Consider to move the LACP and marker protocol specific requirements to a separate annex in 802.1X, so that the requirements are self contained in 802.1X. Morever any future enhancements can be made within 802.1.

Response Response Status C
REJECT.

Slow Protocols will still be used by IEEE Std 802.3 for Clause 57 OAM, and based on this the agreement with IEEE 802.1 was that Slow Protocols would remain under the control of IEEE 802.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 05  | 5.4.10 | 53 | 24 | 30 | **Comment Type** E **Comment Status** R  
State diagram Variables, Functions and Timers are not listed in alphabetical order.  
Consider listing these in alphabetical order. Here and in other places in Clause 5.  
**Suggested Remedy**  
As per comment  
**Response** Response Status C  
REJECT.  
To allow easy comparison with the existing Clause 43 we will preserve the order as is at this time. |
| 06  | 6.1  | 85 | 14 | 46 | **Comment Type** TR **Comment Status** A  
Given the fact that this is supposed to be a simple extraction of LAG into a separate standard, it is inappropriate to re-root the management arc. And actually in Annex 6A and Annex 6B it is not.  
**Suggested Remedy**  
Change this note back to the original text in 802.3-2005  
**Response** Response Status W  
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
The note is indeed incorrect as the arcs have not been deprecated. There however doesn't seem to be much point including the old note either. Based on this the note will simply be deleted. |
| 05  | 5.5.4.1 | 68 | 32 | 1  | **Comment Type** E **Comment Status** A  
Text "as specified in Annex IEEE Std 802.3 Annex 57A.3." should read "as specified in IEEE Std 802.3 Annex 57A.3."  
**Suggested Remedy**  
Delete the word "Annex" before "IEEE Std 802.3 Annex 57A.3"  
**Response** Response Status C  
ACCEPT. |
| 06  | 6.1  | 85 | 40 | 39 | **Comment Type** E **Comment Status** A  
Change 'Agent' to read 'agent'.  
**Suggested Remedy**  
See comment.  
**Response** Response Status C  
ACCEPT. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>&quot;Layer Management&quot;</td>
<td>Not a defined term, can probably be lower case.</td>
<td>REJECT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06A</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>This isn't 802.3</td>
<td>Change 802.3 to 802.1AX.</td>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06A</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Given the fact that this is supposed to be a simple extraction of LAG into a separate standard, it is inappropriate to re-root the management arc. And actually in Annex 6A and Annex 6B it is not.</td>
<td>Change this note back to the original text in 802.3-2005</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06A</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>This is a draft of 802.1AX, the objects should be registered in the 802.1 tree.</td>
<td>Change {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) csma(3) csmacdmgt(30) to {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) bridge(1) bridgerngt(10) (or something like that :-)}}</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See comment #46. This note will simply be deleted.
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Comment Type: T  Comment Status: A
The arcs in 6A and 6B are the same as those in 30A and 30B. The note states the arcs are deprecated, if so why are they still here?

Suggested Remedy
Reconcile.

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #46, the note will be deleted.

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: R
This is a draft of 802.1AX, the objects should be registered in the 802.1 tree.

Suggested Remedy
Change
REGISTERED AS {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) csma(3) csmacdmgt(30)
to
REGISTERED AS {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) bridge(1) bridgemgt(10)
(or something like that :-)

Change
REGISTERED AS {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) csma(3) csmacdmgt(30)
to
REGISTERED AS {iso(1) std(0) iso8802(8802) bridge(1) bridgemgt(10)
(or something like that :-)

Response  Response Status: C
REJECT.

See comment #23.

In addition the advice of SNMP experts is that SNMP items should not have duplicate arcs - allocating IEEE 802.1 arcs would so this.

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: A
The text '.. can receive packets and forward them up to a higher layer entity for local consumption.' is the only use of the term packet within the IEEE P802.1AX draft and the term 'frame' would seem more correct based on what I believe are the correct definitions based on IEEE Std 802.3as-2006 give below:

frame - From Destination Address to Frame Check Sequence inclusive
packet - MAC frame plus Preamble, Start Frame Delimiter and Extension

Suggested Remedy
Suggest that '.. can receive packets and forward them ..' is changed to read '.. can receive frames and forward them ..'

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT.

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: A
This is a draft of 802.1AX, the SNMP should reflect that.

References to 802.3, 802.3ad, dot3, etc. should be changed.

Suggested Remedy
Change
to
1¿The ASCII for 6C.6 is available at http://www.ieee802.org/1/publication/index.html.

Many similar changes through the next few pages...

Response  Response Status: C
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The SNMP MIB will be provide through a IEEE 802.1 web site.
The REFERENCES in the MIB have changed. So the MIB has changed. You must at least change the date, and possibly add a REVISION line to acknowledge the original. And we may want to change the WG name as well...

**SuggestedRemedy**

- Change the LAST-UPDATED date to today
- Add a REVISION line for the original version noting it was published in 802.3ad
- Add another REVISION line with today's date indicating that the references were updated as a result of moving to a separate document.
- Finally, update the CONTACT-INFO to point to 802.1 WG and update the DESCRIPTION to 802.1AX

**Response**

- Response Status: W
- Accept.

---

The "last updated" should reflect the 2007 revision (this one).

**SuggestedRemedy**

- Change LAST-UPDATED À99112220000Z, to
- LAST-UPDATED À200705140000Z,

**Response**

- Response Status: C
- Accept in principle.

---

Since these are the first occurrences of these abbreviations in the draft suggest that they should be spelt out in full.

**SuggestedRemedy**

- Change 'MAC' to read 'Media Access Control (MAC)' and on line 3 'DTE' to read 'data terminal equipment (DTE)'.

**Response**

- Response Status: C
- Accept.

---

One in style of Shift+x, several in style of Shft-x.

**SuggestedRemedy**

- Change all to style of Shift-x.

**Response**

- Response Status: C
- Accept.