Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 81

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Multiple locations in the draft MIBs
There are several locations where incorrect quotation marks are using, causing compliance issues

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all '"' symbols with '"' symbol
Replace all '"' symbols with '"' symbol
Replace all '"' symbols with '"' symbol
Replace all '"' symbols with '"' symbol

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 78

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Multiple locations in the draft MIBs
"LAST-UPDATED "202307310000Z" – July 31, 2023" statement uses incorrect separator, i.e., a single "-", whereby "--" should be used
The same applies to "REVISION   "202307310000Z" – July 31, 2023" statement
This issue was introduced by copying text from pdf / Access directly

SuggestedRemedy

Change "–" symbol with "--" symbols (make sure the proper symbol is being replaced)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 80

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

Multiple locations in the draft MIBs
There are several locations where comment markup was transferred, using the [MHxxx] markup.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all [MHxxx] comment markup from the draft MIBs, as well as any comment text that follows

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 82

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**

There are a few locations in draft MIBs where double quotation marks happens, i.e., "" is used at the start of description

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all "" with a single " mark

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 86

Jones, Peter   Cisco

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

minor changes comparing my "compiling" files vs Marek's. Diffs attached

SuggestedRemedy

Please make the changes shown in the mib-diffs_renamed_compiles.txt file

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Apply changes to "aLldpXdot3LocPowerClassExt", "lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownRequest" attributes.

Replace "and and" with "and"

Replace '"' to '"' (double quotation with a single quotation mark)

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 87

Jones, Peter   Cisco

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

We have smilint errors on the "clean" MIB text.
I have not yet resolved these.

SuggestedRemedy

Review the warnings on the attached mib_changes_check.txt file and decide what to do.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The only issue was identified for Clause 8 MIB module, and it is addressed under comment #73

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 **00**
SC **0**

Page 1 of 7
3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM

Cl **00** *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 79

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

Multiple locations in the draft MIBs
In Figure/Table references in multiple locations, there is "–" used instead of "-" and causes compliance issues

SuggestedRemedy

Globally replace "–" with "-" in all MIB files

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0**   *P* **0**   *L* **0**   # 88

Jones, Peter   Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Please use the smidump utility to produce a common structure/format for the MIBs.
I have drafted a procedure document that I intend to review with the group in Denver, including looking at the before and after MIB Text

SuggestedRemedy

Use proposed tools to programatically format the MIB files for consistency

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #83 for the new subclause on SMIv2 syntax validation and formatting

---

Cl **1** *SC* **1.6**   *P* **18**   *L* **22**   # 83

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D**

IEEE Std 802.3.2 contains a very important statement on the YANG module syntax validation. Similar statement is missing in IEEE Std 802.3.1

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new subclause 1.6 as follows

1.6 SMIv2 syntax validation
All SMIv2 modules included in this standard are SMIv2 (see IETF RFC 2578) compliant and pass automated checks using tools available at the time of publication, including the open source and/or free versions of SMIv2 validation 'smilint' (see https://linux.die.net/man/1/smilint), as well as other SMIv2 validation tools listed at https://wiki.ietf.org/group/ops/mib-review-tools. When using 'smilint' tool, 'smilint: level 8' and 'smilint: hide namelength-32' configuration options were used.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add a new subclause 1.6 as follows

1.6 SMIv2 syntax validation and formatting
All SMIv2 modules included in this standard are SMIv2 (see IETF RFC 2578) compliant and pass automated checks using tools available at the time of publication, including the open source and/or free versions of SMIv2 validation 'smilint' (see https://linux.die.net/man/1/smilint), as well as other SMIv2 validation tools listed at https://wiki.ietf.org/group/ops/mib-review-tools. When using 'smilint' tool, 'smilint: level 6' and 'smilint: hide namelength-32' configuration options were used. The 'smidump' utility was used to produce a common structure/format for SMIv2 modules included in this standard.

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 **1**
SC **1.6**

Page 2 of 7
3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM

Cl **5** *SC* **5.2**   *P* **25** *L* **40** # 89

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

"Version 1 of the IEEE 802.3 LLDP extension MIB module is deprecated"
It is not clear what "Version 1" refers to. The content of this clause does not have a version number.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide a detailed reference to the deprecated content, or clarify in some other way.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "Version 1 of the IEEE 802.3 LLDP extension MIB module is deprecated." to "Version 1 of the IEEE 802.3 LLDP extension MIB module is deprecated. LLDP-V2-MIB and LLDP-V2-TC-MIB are used instead."

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3**   *P* **28** *L* **10** # 90

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

"Setting the object, lldpXdot3PortConfigTLVsTxEnable, to incorrect values"
The parenthetical commas seem unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Setting the object lldpXdot3PortConfigTLVsTxEnable to incorrect values".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3**   *P* **28** *L* **14** # 91

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**

"may be considered to be sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments" is awkward language.

Also, "may" has a special meaning in standard language, and is arguably not the right word here; anything _may_ be considered vulnerable somewhere. The sentence seems to suggest that these objects _are_ considered sensitive in some environments.

Several similar statements appear in multiple places in the document (I counted 10 instances of "may be considered sensitive").

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "are considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments".

Change other instances similarly.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4**   *P* **40** *L* **26** # 74

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Validation error for entries: 4PdualsigPD, 4PsinglesigPD, 2P - unexpected NUMBER, expecting LOWERCASE_IDENTIFIER

SuggestedRemedy

Replace globally as follows:
4PdualsigPD > fourPairDualSigPD
4PsinglesigPD > fourPairSingleSigPD
2P > twoPair
2PdualsigPD > twoPairDualSigPD

For consistency
singlesigPD > singleSigPD (change in Sig captialization)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Cl* **5** Page 3 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn *SC* **5.4** 3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.4**	*P* **44**	*L* **2**	# 76

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

use Integer32 instead of INTEGER in SMIv2

SuggestedRemedy

Change "SYNTAX   INTEGER" to "SYNTAX   Integer32" in lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerDownRequest

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.4**	*P* **44**	*L* **3**	# 75

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

access `write-only' is no longer allowed in SMIv2 in multiple locations in the MIB definition. SMIv2 changed the MAX-ACCESS write-only to read-write.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances (6 in total) of "MAX-ACCESS write-only" to "MAX-ACCESS read-write"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.4**	*P* **56**	*L* **13**	# 77

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

type of `lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerPairs' in sequence and object type definition do not match: Unsigned32 vs BITS

SuggestedRemedy

Change type in LldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to BITS

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.4**	*P* **56**	*L* **14**	# 67

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

type of `lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClass' in sequence and object type definition do not match: Unsigned32 vs INTEGER

SuggestedRemedy

Change type in LldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to INTEGER

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.4**	*P* **56**	*L* **15**	# 68

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

type of `lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerType' in sequence and object type definition do not match: INTEGER vs BITS

SuggestedRemedy

Change type in LldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to BITS

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.4**	*P* **56**	*L* **20**	# 71

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValue is repeated twice in the list in lines 20 and 23.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValue entry in line 20, it is not needed - looks like a copy paste

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 4 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.4**   3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.4**   *P* **56**   *L* **41**   # 69

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

type of `lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownRequest' in sequence and object type definition do not match: TruthValue vs INTEGER

SuggestedRemedy

Change type in LldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to INTEGER

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.4**   *P* **56**   *L* **42**   # 70

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

type of `lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownTime' in sequence and object type definition do not match: TruthValue vs Integer32

SuggestedRemedy

Change type in LldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to Integer32

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.4**   *P* **75**   *L* **12**   # 84

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status*   **D**

There are objects that were added to LldpV2Xdot3LocPowerEntry but not added to the lldpV2Xdot3LocSysGroup, affecting the compliance for the MIB module

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following objects into lldpV2Xdot3LocSysGroup definition (order is not important here)

lldpV2Xdot3LocPDRequestedPowerValueA
lldpV2Xdot3LocPDRequestedPowerValueB
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAllocatedPowerValueA
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAllocatedPowerValueB
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEPoweringStatus
lldpV2Xdot3LocPDPoweredStatus
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerPairsExt
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerClassExtA
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerClassExtB
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerClassExt
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerTypeExt
lldpV2Xdot3LocPDLoad
lldpV2Xdot3LocPD4PID
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEMaxAvailPower
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAutoclassSupport
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAutoclassCompleted
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAutoclassRequest
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerDownRequest
lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerDownTime
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageSupport
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentSupport
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerSupport
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergySupport
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasurementSource
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageRequest
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentRequest
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerRequest
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergyRequest
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageValid
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentValid
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerValid
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergyValid
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergyUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3LocVoltageMeasurement
lldpV2Xdot3LocCurrentMeasurement

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 5 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.4**   3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerMeasurement
lldpV2Xdot3LocEnergyMeasurement
lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEPowerPriceIndex
lldpV2Xdot3LocTxFw
lldpV2Xdot3LocTxFwEcho
lldpV2Xdot3LocRxFw
lldpV2Xdot3LocRxFwEcho
lldpV2Xdot3LocPreemptSupported
lldpV2Xdot3LocPreemptEnabled
lldpV2Xdot3LocPreemptActive
lldpV2Xdot3LocAddFragSize

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.4**   *P* **75**   *L* **34**   # 72

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

lldpV2Xdot3LocReducedOperationPowerValue' is included in lldpV2Xdot3LocSysGroup, but not defined anywhere

SuggestedRemedy

Remove from the list of objects

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.4**   *P* **75**   *L* **52**   # 85

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **D**

There are objects that were added to LldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry but not added to the lldpV2Xdot3RemSysGroup, affecting the compliance for the MIB module

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following objects into lldpV2Xdot3RemSysGroup definition (order is not important here)

lldpV2Xdot3RemPDRequestedPowerValueA
lldpV2Xdot3RemPDRequestedPowerValueB
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValueA
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValueB
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEPoweringStatus
lldpV2Xdot3RemPDPoweredStatus
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerPairsExt
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClassExtA
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClassExtB
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClassExt
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerTypeExt
lldpV2Xdot3RemPDLoad
lldpV2Xdot3RemPD4PID
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEMaxAvailPower
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAutoclassSupport
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAutoclassCompleted
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAutoclassRequest
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownRequest
lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownTime
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageSupport
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentSupport
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerSupport
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergySupport
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasurementSource
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageRequest
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentRequest
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerRequest
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergyRequest
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageValid
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentValid
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerValid
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergyValid
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergyUncertainty
lldpV2Xdot3RemVoltageMeasurement
lldpV2Xdot3RemCurrentMeasurement

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 6 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.4**   3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

lldpV2Xdot3RemPowerMeasurement
lldpV2Xdot3RemEnergyMeasurement
lldpV2Xdot3RemPSEPowerPriceIndex
lldpV2Xdot3RemTxFw
lldpV2Xdot3RemTxFwEcho
lldpV2Xdot3RemRxFw
lldpV2Xdot3RemRxFwEcho
lldpV2Xdot3RemPreemptSupported
lldpV2Xdot3RemPreemptEnabled
lldpV2Xdot3RemPreemptActive
lldpV2Xdot3RemAddFragSize

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6** *P* **77** *L* **7** # 92

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

Clause 6 relates to OAM as if it is a specific feature of EFM. The text in 6.1 refers to EGM, and 6.2 refers to Clause 57.

Since the previous revision, other flavors of Ethernet that include OAM have been added. In 802.3-2022, OAM is mentioned in clauses 97, 115, and 149. It appears as if these clauses are also relevant here.

If clause 6 is specific to the OAM in clause 57 of 802.3 and not to other usages of this term, then some clarification that other instances are not addressed by this clause is required.

If all flavors of OAM are relevant then the other ones should be listed too.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific changes were proposed.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5** *P* **167** *L* **38** # 73

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communication

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

`pethPsePortShortCounter' is not a child node under `pethPsePortEntry' - it is listed but not defined as a node under PethPsePortEntry

SuggestedRemedy

Remove it from pethPsePortGroup and pethPsePortEntry; I am unable to find any reference to a compatible counter in IEEE Std 802.3-2022, 30.9.1.xxx
Alternatively, to maintain the element indexes, create a stub definition and mark it as deprecated;
I prefer the alternative approach

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove it from pethPsePortGroup and pethPsePortEntry but do not renumber entries in the list.

Cl **9** *SC* **9.1** *P* **177** *L* **7** # 93

Ran, Adee   Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**

"1G-EPON and 10G-EPON (collectively referred to as EPON)"

There is also Nx25G-EPON in Clause 141. If it is relevant, it should be added to the list (and corresponding changes should be made to the clause text). Otherwise, it should be explicitly excluded.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Since Nx25G-EPON is not referenced, it is not covered. We do not want to list what is NOT included (the list would be very long for each module) and rather just list what is included, as covered by Clause 9.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Cl* **9** Page 7 of 7
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn *SC* **9.1** 3/5/2024 1:16:35 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line