Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ FM SC FM P9L 17 # 58 Hajduczenia, Marek **Charter Communication** Comment Status D Comment Type ER Missing list of participants SuggestedRemedy Fill in the list of participants of the WG ballot Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT. P12 **L8** C/ FM SC FM # 68 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this) Comment Type E Comment Status D late We have gotten to the point where saying "the initial version" and "the first revision" and the "second revision" we should just say dates. It will be more relevant, readable, and maintainable. SuggestedRemedy Insert "(IEEE Std 802.3.1-2011)" after "the initial version" After "the first revision", insert ", IEEE Std 802.3.1-2013,", and after "this revision", insert ",

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE Std 802.3.1b-202x."

Although not part of the actual standard I think these modifications provide additional clarity for the reader.

TFTD

C/ FM SC FM P12 L9 # 67 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this) Comment Type E Comment Status D late Not sure that the amendments incorporated into the 802.3-2008 revision have special relevance here (especially as the base standard is left out). SuggestedRemedy Delete ", which subsumed and superseded IEEE Std 802.3anTM-2006, IEEE Std 2007, IEEE Std 802.3agTM-2006, and IEEE Std 802.3asTM-2006" Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED REJECT. With the additions from comment #68 this provides the context on the history of the document. C/ 1 SC₁ P16 L 50 # 69 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this) Comment Type Comment Status D late Editor's note about aligning the scope of the overview may well also apply to the text in the "Introduction" on page 12 SuggestedRemedy Suggest to add "and Introduction in frontmatter" after "Text of the Overview" Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. **TFTD** Jon: edit standard dates and remove reference for this revision from 2012 SC 1.4 C/ 1 P18 L 5 # 70 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this) Comment Type E Comment Status D late Use of the word "may" is that it is replaced by "is/are allowed to be", not "can possibly be". Better to use "could" here, to indicate possibility. (2 instances) SuggestedRemedy Replace "may be considered" with "could be considered" on both lines 4 and 14.

Response Status W

late

Cl 2 SC 2 P19 L19 # 52

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The list of normality references contains a lot of tracked changes: underlines and strikethroughs. The clean version should not have them at all.

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove any underline and strikethrough markup in the clean version of the document. They were not present in the published version of 802.3.1-2013. The same comment applies also to Clause 3.

Proposed Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 3 SC 3 P21 L 64 # 71

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The link to the IEEE Standards Dictionary Online (both t he hyperlink and the text) are incorrect. (they go to the IEEE innovate page, which is IEEE Explore and has no mention of the dictionary)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the link with

"http://www.ieee.org/portal/innovate/products/standard/dictionary.html]"

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TFTD

Both the original link and the suggested link resolve to the same page "https://innovate.ieee.org/" Do we know the persistent link from IEEE?

C/ 4 SC 4 P23 L # 64
Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co, KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

MIB is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Include MIB in the abbreviations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 $\label{eq:masses} \mbox{Add "MIB | Management Information Base" in alphabetical order in the abbreviations section.}$

C/ 4 SC 4 P23

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

L9

60

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Atn is mentioned as abbreviation, but i could not find it as a "stand alone word" in the document. On some places it is used in conjuction with other abbreviations e.g. "efmCuPmeLineAtnCrossina"

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Atn from abbreviations list

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

As the comment suggest, "Atn" is used in specific names and having this in the abbreviations aides the reader in understanding.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L22 # 61
Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The explanation of EFMCu contains an the abbreviation. Only two abbreviations have another abbreviation in the explanations. EFMCu and SLD. Other abbreviations like LLDP - LLDPDU, MPCP - MPCPDU, OAM - OAMPDU not using the abbreviation in the explanation

SuggestedRemedy

Change "EFM copper" into "Ethernet in the First Mile copper"; Change "start of LLID delimiter" into "start of logical link identifier delimiter"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Perform the indicated changes.

When reviewing this comment the editor noted that the capatilization of the abbreviations section wasn't consistent. TFTD if this is something that should be changed.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L30 # 62

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

GDMO is mentioned as abbreviation, but i could not find it in the document

SuggestedRemedy

Remove GDMO from abbreviations list

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 4

Page 2 of 5

SC 4

1/2/2024 12:35:04 PM

CI 4 SC 4 P23 L53 # 63

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

From my point of view, Mb/s is an unit and not an abbreviation.

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove "Mb/s" from abbreviations or add "Gb/s" to abbreviations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Deleted the abbreviation for Mb/s

C/ 4 SC 4 P23 L58 # 65

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

MP2PE is mentioned as abbreviation, but i could not find it in the document

SuggestedRemedy

Remove MP2PE from abbreviations list

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 5 SC 5 P4 L4 # 53

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

All references to 802.1AB are outdated, I think. The latest revision I can track is 802.1AB-2016 (https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.1AB/6047/)

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all dated references to 802.1AB with 802.1AB-2016

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 5 SC 5.4 P29 L16 # 50

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The URLs pointing to the ASCII version of MIBS are outdated during this revision project and should not be listed for now.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all URLs containing http://www.ieee802.org/3/1/public/mib_modules ... with editorial note indicating that these will be replaced with actual posted ASCII files once the standard is approved, at which time the MIB file snapshot can be posted online and linked.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P29 L22 # 51

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The LLDP MIB URLs are dead at the current location, they need to be replaced with the newest ones posted on 802.1 website, especially since 802.1AB needs to be updated to 2016 release

SuggestedRemedy

Replace LLDP MIBs with the following URLs:

any reference to http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-MIB-200906080000Z.txt with http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-MIB-

201603110000Z.mib

any reference to http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-TC-MIB-

200906080000Z.txt with http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-TC-MIB-

201603110000Z.mib

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P30 L34 # 54

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The MIB module revision date should be aligned with the standard approval date, when it is approved.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert an editorial note to update the revision date for all modules to match the approval date of the standard. This applies to all MIB modules

Insert an editorial note to update the revision description "REVISION "202307310000Z" – July 31, 2023" to match the approval date of the standard. This applies to all MIB modules These both changes can be done by editorial staff and do not affect the technical content of the MIB

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Jon to add the exact text of the note...

C/ 5 SC 5.4 P39 L33 # 49

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Incorrect reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "30.12.2.1.20" to "30.12.2.1.19", which is the correct reference in IEEE Std 802.3-2022

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 6 SC 6.1 P77 L9 # 66
Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

_ ._ .

SuggestedRemedy

insert oxford comma

Missing oxford comma

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 6 SC 6.6 P82

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Inconsistent formatting for MIB

SuggestedRemedy

When comparing MIB format in 5.5 and 6.6, the text in 6.6 seems to be using extra spacing between individual lines.

L1

55

Please apply the MIB formatting from 5.5 to all MIBs in the document.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 9 SC 9 P252 L1 # 56

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Clause 9 is currently highly inconsistent. Introduction text mentions 1GE-EPON only, while MIB implies 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON as supported.

SuggestedRemedy

Since 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON use the same MIB structure (Nx25G-EPON does not), revise Clause 9 as shown in the p802.3.1.b-d1.0-hajduczenia-1.pdf, with the following changes shown:

- generalize the text of introduction to speak of EPON, defined as 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON
- generalize the MIB modules to cover all EPON variants
- update all references mentioning 1G-EPON clauses to cover both 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON alike
- update definition of dot3EponFecPCSCodingViolation, which has evolved in 802.3 over time and has not been updated for a long time

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 9 SC 9.4 P324 L54 # 57

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Stranded reference to 802.1D

SuggestedRemedy

Update to 802.1Q, per Maintenance Request 1383 (see

https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1383.pdf) and add a matching editorial

note (copy from other locations where the same change was made)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the requested change and add the following editors note:

"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication):

Reference to IEEE Std 802.1D was replaced with IEEE Std 802.1Q per Maintenance

Request 1383 (see

https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1383.pdf)"

C/ 9 SC 9.6 P324 L54 # 59

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Reference to 802.1D still exists which per maint-1383 should be updated to 802.1Q

SuggestedRemedy

Change the 802.1D to 802.1Q

Proposed Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Duplicate of Comment #57

The resolution of Comment #57 is: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the requested change and add the following editors note:

"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication):

Reference to IEEE Std 802.1D was replaced with IEEE Std 802.1Q per Maintenance

Request 1383 (see

https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1383.pdf)"