<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>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Insufficient front matter</td>
<td>See attached file</td>
<td>ACCEPT</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Metropolitan Area Networks</td>
<td><strong>REJECT.</strong> This text is out of scope as it is not related to the changes in the draft. This is consistent with other 802.1 standards and a form of the unabreivated name of the Sponsor, thus the present capitalization was used on the PAR title.</td>
<td>REJECT</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Clause 3.2 appears to define an agent with the same text as for clause 3.12 for &quot;frame&quot;. This seems to be either totally spurious or a placeholder for some other definition which is missing.</td>
<td>Either delete the definition or replace it with the intended one.</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SuggestedRemedy:**
Replace the 86 occurrences of "Behaviour" with "Behavior". Both British and American English spelling is acceptable, however brevity should trump word choice. Please use the one which has a shorter length to save paper and storage space.

In IEEE Std 802.3 the spelling "behaviour" is used throughout MIB clauses and their associated Annexes, and in any references to the behaviours defined there. Since ISO/IEC 10165-4:1991 is an ISO standard it uses the spelling 'behaviour' and to meet this externally defined template we need to use the same spelling. In all other instances the spelling 'behavior' is used.

**Response:**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #9

**Response:**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
There is an editorial error that has two definitions for agent. The incorrect (cut and paste, partially edited) definition will be deleted.
IEEE 802.3ax (IEEE P802.1AX) D1.1 Link Aggregation Comments

1. Cl 03 SC 3.8 P 15 L 12 # 10
   Dawe, Piers Avago
   Comment Type: T  Comment Status: A
   SuggestedRemedy
   conforms to ISO/IEC 15802-3: 1998 [ANSI/IEEE 802.1D-1998]. Note that dates here and
   in reference list do not match: which do you want?
   Response
   Response Status: C
   ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
   Add missing reference to 15802-3.

2. Cl 03 SC 3.22 P 16 L 6 # 11
   Dawe, Piers Avago
   Comment Type: T  Comment Status: A
   conforms to the ISO/IEC 10038 [ANSI/IEEE 802.1D-1998]
   SuggestedRemedy
   Remove the "the". Date both references or neither. Add references to reference list (dated
   or not).
   Response
   Response Status: C
   ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
   Remove the date from 802.1D, remove the, "the"

3. Cl 05 SC 5.1.3 P 20 L 37 # 13
   Dawe, Piers Avago
   Comment Type: E  Comment Status: R
   "LLC (LOGICAL LINK CONTROL) OR OTHER MAC CLIENT" is in 7 point while rest of
   figure is 8 point. ALL CAPS is not good style
   SuggestedRemedy
   Please change to 8 point or larger, upper and lower case as appropriate
   Response
   Response Status: C
   REJECT.
   This text is out of scope as it is not related to the changes in the draft. See comment #5.

4. Booth, Brad
   Comment Type: E  Comment Status: R
   Figure 5-4 and 5-5 are in the middle of text. Same also seems to apply
   to Figures 5-10 to 5-13.
   SuggestedRemedy
   Change formatting to move out of the text.
   Response
   Response Status: C
   ACCEPT.
   This text is out of scope as it is not related to the changes in the draft. See comment #5.

5. Cl 99 SC 99 P 3 L 12 # 12
   Dawe, Piers Avago
   Comment Type: E  Comment Status: A
   Please don't split URLs
   SuggestedRemedy
   Keep on one line: two URLs on this page
   Response
   Response Status: C
   ACCEPT.

6. Cl 99 SC 99 P 3 L 3 # 8
   Dawe, Piers Avago
   Comment Type: E  Comment Status: A
   Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks, Link Aggregation
   SuggestedRemedy
   Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks, Link Aggregation (3 changes)
   Response
   Response Status: C
   ACCEPT.
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<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>6.2.5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Object Name Object Type Operations Supported</td>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;IEEE 802.1AX Management&quot;: I didn't find a definition for this so why the capital M?</td>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>6.2.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>oAggregator (6.3.1) seems to be in bold while other similar items are not</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Status:** D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  
**Response Status:** O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn

**Sort Order:** Page, Line
Cl 06 SC 6.2.5 P 91 L 5 # 20
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status A
Link Aggregation Capabilities

SuggestedRemedy
Link aggregation capabilities

Response Response Status C
ACCEPT.
This text is out of scope as it is not related to the changes in the draft.

Cl 06 SC 6.2.5 P 91 L 7 # 19
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status R
Why are the package columns headed "DTE"?

SuggestedRemedy
Would "Package" be more useful?

Response Response Status C
REJECT.
This text is out of scope as it is not related to the changes in the draft. The packages are related to a DTE, rather than to other possible devices defined in Std 802.3. The table may grow in the future to include other devices than DTE.

Cl 06 SC 6.2.5 P 91 L 9 # 18
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status R
The package columns don't have to be so cramped

SuggestedRemedy
Resize to contents?

Response Response Status C
REJECT.
This text is out of scope as it is not related to the changes in the draft. These tables tend to grow with addition of other packages, the more compact format also reduces problems with parallax.