

Comments Received

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.1 MIB Rev Task Force 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 81
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 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 O

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 78
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 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 O

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 80
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 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 O

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 82
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 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 O

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 86
 Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 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 O

CI 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 87
 Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 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 O

Comments Received

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.1 MIB Rev Task Force 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 79
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P25 L40 # 89
 Ran, Adeo Cisco
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "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 O

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 88
 Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P28 L10 # 90
 Ran, Adeo Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "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 O

Cl 1 SC 1.6 P18 L22 # 83
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P28 L14 # 91
 Ran, Adeo Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 "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 O

Comments Received

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.1 MIB Rev Task Force 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P40 L26 # 74

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P44 L2 # 76

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

use Integer32 instead of INTEGER in SMIv2

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P44 L3 # 75

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P56 L13 # 77

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P56 L14 # 67

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 O

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P56 L15 # 68

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 O

Comments Received

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.1 MIB Rev Task Force 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

CI 5 SC 5.4 P56 L20 # 71
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValue is repeated twice in the list in lines 20 and 23.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValue entry in line 20, it is not needed - looks like a copy paste
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 5 SC 5.4 P56 L41 # 69
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 type of 'IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownRequest' in sequence and object type definition do not match: TruthValue vs INTEGER
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change type in IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to INTEGER
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 5 SC 5.4 P56 L42 # 70
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 type of 'IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownTime' in sequence and object type definition do not match: TruthValue vs Integer32
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change type in IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry definition to Integer32
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 5 SC 5.4 P75 L12 # 84
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 There are objects that were added to IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerEntry but not added to the IldpV2Xdot3LocSysGroup, affecting the compliance for the MIB module
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following objects into IldpV2Xdot3LocSysGroup definition (order is not important here)

- IldpV2Xdot3LocPDRRequestedPowerValueA
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPDRRequestedPowerValueB
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAllocatedPowerValueA
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAllocatedPowerValueB
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEPoweringStatus
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPDPoweredStatus
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerPairsExt
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerClassExtA
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerClassExtB
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerClassExt
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerTypeExt
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPDLoad
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPD4PID
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEMaxAvailPower
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAutoclassSupport
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAutoclassCompleted
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAutoclassRequest
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerDownRequest
- IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerDownTime
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageSupport
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentSupport
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerSupport
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergySupport
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasurementSource
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageRequest
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentRequest
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerRequest
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergyRequest
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageValid
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentValid
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerValid
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergyValid
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasVoltageUncertainty
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasCurrentUncertainty
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasPowerUncertainty
- IldpV2Xdot3LocMeasEnergyUncertainty
- IldpV2Xdot3LocVoltageMeasurement
- IldpV2Xdot3LocCurrentMeasurement

Comments Received

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.1 MIB Rev Task Force 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

IldpV2Xdot3LocPowerMeasurement
IldpV2Xdot3LocEnergyMeasurement
IldpV2Xdot3LocPSEPowerPriceIndex
IldpV2Xdot3LocTxFw
IldpV2Xdot3LocTxFwEcho
IldpV2Xdot3LocRxFw
IldpV2Xdot3LocRxFwEcho
IldpV2Xdot3LocPreemptSupported
IldpV2Xdot3LocPreemptEnabled
IldpV2Xdot3LocPreemptActive
IldpV2Xdot3LocAddFragSize

Proposed Response Response Status ○

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P75 L 34 # 72

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

IldpV2Xdot3LocReducedOperationPowerValue' is included in IldpV2Xdot3LocSysGroup, but not defined anywhere

SuggestedRemedy

Remove from the list of objects

Proposed Response Response Status ○

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P75 L 52 # 85

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

There are objects that were added to IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerEntry but not added to the IldpV2Xdot3RemSysGroup, affecting the compliance for the MIB module

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following objects into IldpV2Xdot3RemSysGroup definition (order is not important here)

IldpV2Xdot3RemPDRRequestedPowerValueA
IldpV2Xdot3RemPDRRequestedPowerValueB
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValueA
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAllocatedPowerValueB
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEPoweringStatus
IldpV2Xdot3RemPDPoweredStatus
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerPairsExt
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClassExtA
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClassExtB
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerClassExt
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerTypeExt
IldpV2Xdot3RemPDLoad
IldpV2Xdot3RemPD4PID
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEMaxAvailPower
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAutoclassSupport
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAutoclassCompleted
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEAutoclassRequest
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownRequest
IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerDownTime
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageSupport
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentSupport
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerSupport
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergySupport
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasurementSource
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageRequest
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentRequest
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerRequest
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergyRequest
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageValid
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentValid
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerValid
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergyValid
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasVoltageUncertainty
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasCurrentUncertainty
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasPowerUncertainty
IldpV2Xdot3RemMeasEnergyUncertainty
IldpV2Xdot3RemVoltageMeasurement
IldpV2Xdot3RemCurrentMeasurement

Comments Received

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.1 MIB Rev Task Force 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

IldpV2Xdot3RemPowerMeasurement
IldpV2Xdot3RemEnergyMeasurement
IldpV2Xdot3RemPSEPowerPriceIndex
IldpV2Xdot3RemTxFw
IldpV2Xdot3RemTxFwEcho
IldpV2Xdot3RemRxFw
IldpV2Xdot3RemRxFwEcho
IldpV2Xdot3RemPreemptSupported
IldpV2Xdot3RemPreemptEnabled
IldpV2Xdot3RemPreemptActive
IldpV2Xdot3RemAddFragSize

Proposed Response Response Status

Cl 6 SC 6 P77 L7 # 92

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X

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

Cl 8 SC 8.5 P167 L38 # 73

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

`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

Cl 9 SC 9.1 P177 L7 # 93

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"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