Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **1** *L* **1** # 1

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

All copyright permission for excerpted text, tables, and figures shall be submitted to the IEEE prior to the start of ballot. If there are missing permission response letters, please submit them immediately to me (m.d.turner@ieee.org).

Prior to sending them to me, please ensure that the following are included in each response letter you obtain from the copyright owner:
"The permission response is on company letterhead (where applicable) or the original email from the copyright owner should be forwarded to me if the individual is the copyright owner (rather than a company)
"Permission has to be granted
"Non-exclusive, irrevocable, royalty free permission and require world rights for use of the material in the standard (either modified or unmodified, as requested by you)
"To modify and reprint in all future revisions and editions of the standard
"For use in all media known or hereinafter known

Sample permission request and response letters are available at the following Internet location:

<http://standards.ieee.org/guides/style/index.html>.

The following items indicate the need for copyright permission letters:
Excerpted text in x.x.
Table X
Figure X
Reproduced document in Annex X

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard:

Copyright permission letters are being sought from the RFC authors and the IETF Trust.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **1** *L* **1** # 2

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

If the draft contains a registration of objects (for additional information, visit the IEEE Standards Web site <http://standards.ieee.org/regauth/index.html>), the working group shall submit the document to the IEEE Registration Authority (IEEE-RA) for mandatory coordination (submit to a.n.weaver@ieee.org for review). The text containing the registration information should be highlighted in the draft and the clause should be noted in the email. If the working group believes that the draft may potentially contain a registration of objects or if the working group would like information about setting up a registration, contact the IEEE-RA as early as possible to prevent a delay in approval by the IEEE-SA Standards Board. Search on the following words: object identifier, unique identifier, and assignment of unique numbers.

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard:
Not Applicable. IEEE 802.3 already has an OID assignment, and all of the registered objects in the draft will be made under this assignment, except for those controlled by IANA.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 3

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *must-shall*

Use of reserved words:
IEEE style does not require reserved words such as "SHALL", "SHOULD", etc. to be capitalized.

SuggestedRemedy

Search for all instances of the reserved words “MUST”, “MUST NOT”, ‘REQUIRED”, “SHALL”, “SHALL NOT”, “SHOULD”, “SHOULD NOT”, “RECOMMENDED”, “MAY”, and “OPTIONAL” and convert to lowercase, upright font.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
For now, not the most important consideration. Leave capitalized in this draft for the sake of drawing attention to reserved words. Will be fixed in a future draft.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **35** # 4

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "should".

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.6** *P* **161** *L* **33** # 5

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

"the par" s/b "a pair".

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.6** *P* **161** *L* **14** # 6

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

This text (principles of the MPCP) appears to be pedagogy, and should not give the appearance of stating normative requirements. Thus, I think it would be appropriate to reword the sentence (deleting the word "must") as follows:

A concept of time exists in the MPCP in order to schedule the uplink transmission.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.3.1** *P* **168** *L* **41** # 7

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss in committee to perfect the wording. Here is a start:
Therefore, if this module is implemented, then the Interfaces MIB module defined in RFC2863 and the Ethernet-like Interfaces MIB module defined in Clause 11 shall also be implemented.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Join with previous paragraph, and reword the sentence as follows:
Therefore, if this module is implemented, the Interfaces MIB module defined in IETF RFC2863 and the Ethernet-like Interfaces MIB module defined in Clause 11 shall also be implemented.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.3.2** *P* **173** *L* **51** # 8

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss in committee to perfect the wording. Here is a start:
Therefore, if this module is implemented, then the MAU-MIB module defined in Clause 14 shall also be implemented.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Therefore, if this module is implemented, the MAU-MIB module defined in Clause 14 shall also be implemented.

Cl **11** *SC* **11.2.2** *P* **222** *L* **9** # 9

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is acceptable in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Insert after the word "must":
(wherein the word "must" is used in accordance with the requirements of IETF RFC 2119)

Cl **11** *SC* **11.2.2.4** *P* **222** *L* **45** # 10

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must". The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.
This is another tricky one. The whole paragraph could be re-written and the historical warning moved to a footnote. In addition, the next paragraph uses "REQUIRED" instead of "shall".

SuggestedRemedy

Dicuss in committee to perfect the wording. Here is a start:
All Ethernet-like interfaces shall return ethernetCsmacd(6) for ifType.
Information on the particular port type and operating speed is available from ifSpeed in the Interfaces MIN, and ifMauType in the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 14. All Ethernet-like interfaces shall also implement the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 14.(footnote)

footnote - There are three other interface types defined in IANAifType-MIB for Ethernet, namely fastEther(62), fastEtherFX(69), and gigabitEthernet(117). Management applications should be prepared to receive these obsolete ifType values from older implementations.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace the contents of 11.2.2.4 ifType with the following:

All Ethernet-like interfaces shall return ethernetCsmacd(6) for ifType.
Information on the particular port type and operating speed is available from ifSpeed in the Interfaces MIB, and ifMauType in the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 14. All Ethernet-like interfaces shall also implement the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 14.(footnote)

footnote - There are three other interface types defined in IANAifType-MIB for Ethernet, namely fastEther(62), fastEtherFX(69), and gigabitEthernet(117). Management applications should be prepared to receive these obsolete ifType values from older implementations.

Cl **11** *SC* **11.2.2.5** *P* **222** *L* **57** # 11

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the word "must".

Cl **11** *SC* **11.2.2.7** *P* **224** *L* **43** # 12

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **11** *SC* **11.2.2.8** *P* **225** *L* **15** # 13

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, and also in the next sentence. Also, I don't think it is wise to begin a statement of a normative requirement with "Note that".

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss in committee to perfect the wording. Here is a start:
These objects shall indicate the correct line speed regardless of the current duplex mode. They shall not indicate a doubled value when operating in full-duplex mode. The duplex mode of the interface may be determined by examining either the dot3StatsDuplexStatus object in this MIB module,
or the ifMauType MAU-MIB object defined in Clause 14.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.2.1.5** *P* **262** *L* **48** # 14
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions. Also, I don't think it is wise to begin a statement of a normative requirement with "Note that".

SuggestedRemedy

"Each PME and each PCS in the EFMCu PHY shall have a unique index..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.4** *P* **267** *L* **5** # 15
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is acceptable in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is. This is clearly an "unavoidable situation".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "should".

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **272** *L* **25** # 16
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must also exist" to "also exists".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **274** *L* **54** # 17
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "RECOMEMNDED" and "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, and it would be better to consistently use "should" rather than "RECOMMENDED".

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the description as follows:
"A unique value, greater than zero, for each PME configuration
profile in the managed EFMCu port. Values should be assigned contiguously starting from 1. The value for each profile shall remain constant at
least from one re-initialization of the entity's network management system
to the next re-initialization."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **275** *L* **7** # 18
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.
Could perhaps make the case for "unavoidable situation".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **275** *L* **29** # 19
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.
Could perhaps make the case for "unavoidable situation".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **276** *L* **37** # 20

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **277** *L* **42** # 21

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **277** *L* **50** # 22

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must" and "shall".
This is an interesting case. The description of this object uses several shall and must statements. In most cases, I agree with the usage (save for capitalization), but in the last use, on page 278, line 9, I think that MUST should be changed to "shall".

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize "SHALL" and "MUST" in this description. Change "MUST" to "shall" on page 278, line 9 [Attempts to change this object shall be rejected...].

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **278** *L* **27** # 23

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must and shall.
Another case of mixed usage of must and shall, and this time I think that most of the musts should be shalls.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change must to shall on p 278 l 54.
Change must to shall on p 278 l 62 [Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 279 l 1.
Change must to shall on p 279 l 6.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **279** *L* **42** # 24

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must and shall.
Another case of mixed usage of must and shall, and this time I think that most of the musts should be shalls.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change must to shall on p 279 l 56 [Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 279 l 64.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **280** *L* **22** # 25

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must.
Another case of mixed usage of must, and this time I think that most of the musts should be shalls.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 280 l 24 [Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 280 l 31.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **280** *L* **46** # 26

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must and shall.
Another case of mixed usage of must and shall, and this time I think that most of the musts should be shalls.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change must to shall on p 280 l 63 [Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 281 l 2.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **281** *L* **22** # 27

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 281 l 22.
Change must to shall on p 281 l 42.
Change must to shall on p 281 l 53.
Change must to shall on p 290 l 30.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **292** *L* **15** # 28

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must and shall.
Another case of mixed usage of must and shall, and this time I think that most of the musts should be shalls.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change must to shall on p 292 l 20.
Change must to shall on p 292 l 26 Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 292 l 31.
Change must to shall on p 292 l 35.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in this description.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **292** *L* **51** # 29

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must and shall.
Another case of mixed usage of must and shall, and this time I think that most of the musts should be shalls.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change must to shall on p 293 l 4 Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 293 l 38 Attempts to change this object shall...].
Change must to shall on p 294 l 2 Attempts to change this object shall...].

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in the EFMCu MIB module.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **302** *L* **48** # 30

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must and shall.
Another case of mixed usage of must and shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change "MUST NOT" to "shall not" p 302 l 48.
Change must to shall on p 302 l 54.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in the EFMCu MIB module.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **295** *L* **34** # 31

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **303** *L* **13** # 32

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 303 l 13.
change "MUST NOT" to "shall not" on p 303 l 16.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **304** *L* **47** # 33

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 304 l 47.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **305** *L* **18** # 34

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

change must to shall on p 305 l 18.
change must to shall on p 305 l 51.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **306** *L* **53** # 35

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

mixed usage of must and shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
change must to shall on p 306 l 53.
change "SHALL NOT" to "shall not" on p 306 l 56.
I think that the use of must on line 57 falls under the
"unavoidable situation" clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in the EFMCu MIB module.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **307** *L* **13** # 36

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MUST NOT" to "shall not" on p 307 l 13.
change must to shall on p 307 l 17.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **308** *L* **16** # 37

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

mixed usage of must and shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
change must to shall on p 308 l 16.
change "SHALL NOT" to "shall not" on p 308 l 18.
I think that the use of must on line 20 falls under the "unavoidable situation" clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in the EFMCu MIB module.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **309** *L* **8** # 38

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MUST NOT" to "shall not" on p 309 l 9.
Change must to shall on p 309 l 11.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **309** *L* **37** # 39

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "RECOMEMNDED".
It would be better to consistently use "should" rather than "RECOMMENDED".

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:

efmCuPme2BEquivalentLength values should be assigned in increasing order, starting from the minimum value.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **309** *L* **26** # 40

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style.
This is an ambiguously stated requirement. Is it okay to exceed two or three, of the limitations?
I think that the requirement is that the data rate not exceed any of the limitations.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to read:
When a 2BASE-TL PME is initialized, its data rate shall not exceed the following limitations:

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **310** *L* **53** # 41

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

mixed usage of must and shall

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
change must to shall on p 310 l 53.
change "SHALL NOT" to "shall not" on p 310 l 55.
I think that the use of must on line 56 falls under the "unavoidable situation" clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in the EFMCu MIB module.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **311** *L* **42** # 42

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

mixed usage of must and shall

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
Change "MUST NOT" to "shall not" on p 311 l 43.
Change must to shall on p 311 l 50.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **312** *L* **10** # 43

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 312 l 10.
Change "MUST NOT" to "shall not" on p 312 l 12.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.6** *P* **316** *L* **65** # 44

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

mixed usage of must and shall.

SuggestedRemedy

Decapitalize must and shall (probably need to do a GSR).
change must to shall on p 316 l 65.
change "SHALL NOT" to "shall not" on p 317 l 3.
I think that the use of must on p 317 line 4 falls under the "unavoidable situation" clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall" in all instances in the EFMCu MIB module.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.1** *P* **323** *L* **56** # 45

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

There is an extra space at the beginning of the paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

remove the space.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.2** *P* **324** *L* **4** # 46

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of must.
inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

suggest rewording as follows.
An interface which includes the Ethernet WIS is, by definition, an Ethernet-like interface, and an agent
implementing the objects defined in this clause shall also implement the objects required by the Ethenet-like interface MIB module defined in Clause 11.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Return the formerly silent "r" to the word "Ethernet".
An interface which includes the Ethernet WIS is, by definition, an Ethernet-like interface, and an agent
implementing the objects defined in this clause shall also implement the objects required by the Ethernet-like interface MIB module defined in Clause 11.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.4.2** *P* **324** *L* **63** # 47

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must is inconsistent with IEEE style, and the references to
RFC 3635 and RFC 3636 should be changed to point to Clauses 11 and 14, respectively.

SuggestedRemedy

suggest rewording as follows.
The ifTable shall be used as specified in Clauses 11 and 14 for the LLC Layer/MAC Layer/Reconciliation Sublayer/Physical Coding Sublayer.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The ifTable shall be used as specified in Clause 11 and Clause 14 for the LLC Layer/MAC Layer/Reconciliation Sublayer/Physical Coding Sublayer.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.4.3** *P* **325** *L* **4** # 48

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

suggest rewording as follows.
The ifTable shall be used...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.4.4** *P* **325** *L* **10** # 49

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

suggest rewording as follows.
The ifTable shall be used...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.5** *P* **325** *L* **44** # 50

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy

suggest rewording as follows:
An implementation of the MIB module defined in this memo shall set the...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.7** *P* **330** *L* **38** # 51

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
I think it may be used appropriately in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "shall"

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.8.1** *P* **330** *L* **53** # 52

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall in two places in this sentence:
The etherWisDeviceTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetMediumTable of the SONET-MIB -- in other words, for each entry in the etherWisDeviceTable there shall be an entry in the sonetMediumTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The etherWisDeviceTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetMediumTable of the SONET-MIB; in other words, for each entry in the etherWisDeviceTable there shall be an entry in the sonetMediumTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.8.2** *P* **330** *L* **64** # 53

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall in two places in this sentence:
The etherWisSectionCurrentTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetSectionCurrentTable of the SONETMIB -- in other words, for each entry in the etherWisSectionCurrentTable there shall be an entry in the sonetSectionCurrentTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The etherWisSectionCurrentTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetSectionCurrentTable of the SONETMIB; in other words, for each entry in the etherWisSectionCurrentTable there shall be an entry in the sonetSectionCurrentTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.8.3** *P* **334** *L* **39** # 54

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall in two places in this sentence:
The etherWisPathCurrentTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetPathCurrentTable of the SONET-MIB -- in other words, for each entry in the etherWisPathCurrentTable there shall be an entry in the sonetPath-
CurrentTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The etherWisPathCurrentTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetPathCurrentTable of the SONET-MIB; in other words, for each entry in the etherWisPathCurrentTable there shall be an entry in the sonetPath-
CurrentTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.8.4** *P* **334** *L* **52** # 55

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall in two places in this sentence:
The etherWisFarEndPathCurrentTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetFarEndPathCurrentTable of the SONET-MIB -- in other words, for each entry in the etherWisFarEndPathCurrentTable there shall be an
entry in the sonetFarEndPathCurrentTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The etherWisFarEndPathCurrentTable is a sparse augmentation of the sonetFarEndPathCurrentTable of the SONET-MIB; in other words, for each entry in the etherWisFarEndPathCurrentTable there shall be an
entry in the sonetFarEndPathCurrentTable and the same ifIndex value shall be used for both entries.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.2** *P* **335** *L* **8** # 56

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must.
This is an example of an "unavoidable situation".

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must" to "should"

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **338** *L* **34** # 57

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **339** *L* **7** # 58

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.
Also on line 11.

SuggestedRemedy

change must to shall on p 339 l 7.
change must to shall on p 339 l 11.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change all instances of "must" to shall in the Clause 13 MIB module.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **339** *L* **39** # 59

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.
Also on line 43.

SuggestedRemedy

change must to shall on p 339 l 39.
change must to shall on p 339 l 43.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **340** *L* **30** # 60

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 340 l 30.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **341** *L* **29** # 61
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 341 l 29.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **341** *L* **62** # 62
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 341 l 62.
Change must to shall on p 342 l 5.
Change must to shall on p 342 l 15.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **343** *L* **15** # 63
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 343 l 15.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.3** *P* **343** *L* **51** # 64
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 343 l 51.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.2.1** *P* **352** *L* **25** # 65
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change must to shall on p 352 l 25.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.2.1** *P* **352** *L* **36** # 66
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style.
In the first instance in this sentence, must should be changed to shall.
In the second instance, it may be appropriate to leave it as must.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first instance of must to shall:

...then the agent shall also support the Ethernet WAN Interface Sublayer
(WIS) MIB module defined in Clause 13, and must follow the interface layering model
specified therein.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
...then the agent shall also support the Ethernet WAN Interface Sublayer
(WIS) MIB module defined in Clause 13, and shall follow the interface layering model
specified therein.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.2.2** *P* **352** *L* **59** # 67
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*
use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy
change must to shall on p 352 l 59.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **361** *L* **17** # 68
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*
use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy
change must to shall on p 361 l 17.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **366** *L* **23** # 69
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*
use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy
change must to shall on p 366 l 23.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **367** *L* **63** # 70
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*
use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy
change must to shall on p 367 l 63.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **373** *L* **46** # 71
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*
use of must inconsistent with IEEE style

SuggestedRemedy
change must to shall on p 373 l 46.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **376** *L* **52** # 72
Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*
use of must inconsistent with IEEE style,
and I like the language that I suggested
previously about limiting the rate at which
notifications are generated.

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest rewording as follows:
There shall be a minimum interval of 5 seconds between rpMauJabberTraps notifications from a given repeater.

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The agent shall limit the generation of
consecutive rpMauJabberTraps so that there is at
least a five-second gap between them.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **377** *L* **1** # 73

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

use of must inconsistent with IEEE style, and I like the language that I suggested previously about limiting the rate at which notifications are generated.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest rewording as follows:
There shall be a minimum interval of 5 seconds between ifMauJabberTraps notifications from a given interface.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The agent shall limit the generation of consecutive ifMauJabberTraps so that there is at least a five-second gap between them.

Cl **02** *SC* **0** *P* **17** *L* **19** # 74

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

Hewlett-Packard Company, US Patents 5,293,635 and 5,421,024 is cited in the Normative reference clause. When Patents are cited it should be cited under the names of the creators and dated by the year of the filing. Here is a sample taken from Chicago:

Petroff, M. D., and M. G. Stapelbroek. 1980. Blocked impurity band detectors. US Patent 4,568,960, filed Oct. 23, 1980, and issued Feb. 4, 1986.

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard
Reformat reference to patent per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **02** *SC* **0** *P* **17** *L* **8** # 75

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

ANSI T1.231-1997 is cited in the Normative reference clause, however when cited in text it is cited as T1.231 (which isn't a big deal, because during editing we would correct it to ANSI T1.231). But when used in text it's not dated. If the intent is to use the latest version of the document, then the date should be left off in Clause 2 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard:
When in doubt, used the dated reference, I always say.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Use the dated reference, and correct in the text to ANSI T1.231-1997.

Cl **02** *SC* **0** *P* **17** *L* **11** # 76

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

ANSI T1.424-2004 is cited in the Normative reference clause, however when cited in text it is cited as T1.424 (which isn't a big deal, because during editing we would correct it to ANSI T1.424). But when used in text it's not dated. If the intent is to use the latest version of the document, then the date should be left off in Clause 2 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard:
When in doubt, used the dated reference, I always say.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Use the dated reference, and correct in the text to ANSI T1.424-2004.

Cl **02** *SC* **0** *P* **17** *L* **29** # 77

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

IEEE Std 802.1D-2004, is cited in the Normative reference clause, however when cited in text it is cited as 802.1D (which isn't a big deal, because during editing we would correct it to IEEE Std 802.1D). But when used in text it's not dated. If the intent is to use the latest version of the document, then the date should be left off in Clause 2 as well.

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard:
In this case, I think the reference should be dateless in Clause 2, because we always want to refer to the latest version of 802.1D

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Correct in text to IEEE Std 802.1D, and remove the date in Clause 2.

Cl **02** *SC* **0** *P* **17** *L* **39** # 78

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

From Michelle Turner IEEE-SA editor, via informal editorial coordination:

IETF RFC 1157, IETF RFC 1573, IETF 1905, IETF RFC 1988, and IETF RFC 2026 are not cited in text. Are they cited in the separate MIBs? If not, they will need to be cited in text if they are needed for the implementation of the standard, if not move to the bibliography.

SuggestedRemedy

Remedy from Howard:
Move them to the bibliography.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
While these can safely be moved to the bibliography,
surely we need to keep a normative reference to SNMP somewhere in the draft!
It appears that the most current and definitive reference is IETF STD 62, which is made up of IETF RFCs 3411-3418, and which defines SNMPv3.
Need to insert a citation, probably in subclause 1.3, second paragraph.

Cl **04** *SC* **0** *P* **21** *L* **1** # 79

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

Insert the following entries in the list of abbreviations, in alphabetical order:
AIS - Alarm Indication Signal
BIP - Bit Interleaved Parity
DTE - Data Terminal Equipment
ELTE - Ethernet Line Termination Equipment
ERDI-P Enhanced Remote Defect Indication - Path
GDMO - Guidelines for Definition of Managed Objects
IANA - Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
IETF - Internet Engineering Task Force
ITU - International Telecommunication Union
LAN - Local Area Network
LCD - Loss of Codegroup Deliniation
LLC - Logical Link Control
LLDP - Logical Link Discovery Protocol
LOP - Loss of Pointer
MAU - Medium Attachment Unit
MIB - Management Information Base
MII - Media Independent Interface
NMS - Network Management System
OAMPDU - Operations Administration Maintenace Protocol Data Unit
OSI - Open Systems Interconnection
PDU - Protocol Data Unit
PLM - Payload Label Mismatch
SMIv2 - Structure of Management Information version 2
SNMP - Simple Network Management Protocol
SDH - Synchronous Digital Signaling Hierarchy
SONET - Synchronous Optical Network
TDMA - Time Division Multiple Access
WAN - Wide Area Network
WDM - Wavelength Division Multiplexing
WIS - WAN Interface Sublayer

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See also comment # 271.
Consolidate the list of added abbreviations into this response.
AIS - Alarm Indication Signal
ARP - address resolution protocol
ASCII - American Standard Code for Information Interchange
BIP - bit interleaved parity
DTE - data terminal equipment
ELTE - Ethernet line termination equipment

ERDI-P enhanced remote defect indication - path
GDMO - Guidelines for Definition of Managed Objects
IANA - Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
IETF - Internet Engineering Task Force
IFG - inter-frame gap
ITU - International Telecommunication Union
LAN - local area network
LCD - Loss of Codegroup Deliniation
LLC - logical link control
LLDP - logical link discovery protocol
LLDPDU - logical link discovery protocol data unit
LOP - Loss of Pointer
MAU - medium attachment unit
MIB - management information base
MII - media independent interface
MTU - maximum transmission unit
NMS - network management system
OAM - operations, administration and maintenance
OAMPDU - operations, administration and maintenace protocol data unit
OID - object identifier
OSI - Open Systems Interconnection
PDU - protocol data unit
PLM - Payload Label Mismatch
RFC - Request for Comments
ROM - read-only memory
SMIv2 - structure of management information version 2
SNMP - simple network management protocol
SDH - Synchronous Digital Hierarchy
SONET - Synchronous Optical Network
TDMA - time division multiple access
TLV - type/length/value
WAN - wide area network
WDM - wavelength division multiplexing
WIS - WAN interface sublayer

Cl **05** *SC* **0** *P* **23** *L* **1** # 80

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *order*

It doesn't make a whole lot of sense to have an entire clause allocated for a single sentence of text. I originally thought that there would be more text in the conformance clause, but the existing sentence seems sufficient. I think it should be moved to subclause 1.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the text of clause 5 to subclause 1.5.
Renumber the subsequent clauses (ugh!).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Bite the bullet and do it (last!)
In the process, change the text to read:
"Specific conformance statements and compliance statements, written in accordance with IETF RFC 2580, are included in each MIB module. They can be found immediately below the strings "Conformance statements" and "Compliance statements".
See also (for information only) the response to comments # 153 and 154.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.2.4** *P* **46** *L* **61** # 81

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

"OA" s/b "OAM"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
GSR "OA" to "OAM" and "oOA" to "oOAM"
and make sure expansion always includes maintainance.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.3.3** *P* **47** *L* **37** # 82

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

"oOA" s/b "oOAM"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment # 81

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **60** *L* **26** # 83

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Change "must" to "shall".

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **72** *L* **30** # 84

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...representing the minimum number of symbol errors occuring within a given window to cause an Errored Symbol Period Event."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **73** *L* **1** # 85

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...representing the minimum number of symbol errors occuring within a given window to cause an Errored Symbol Period Event."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **74** *L* **8** # 86

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"The number of frame errors that cause an Errored Frame Period Event."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reword the sentence as follows:
"The minimum number of frame errors that cause an Errored Frame Period Event."

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **74** *L* **17** # 87

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...an Event Notification OAMPDU is generated with an Errored Frame Period Event TLV..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **75** *L* **4** # 88

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"The number of frame errors that cause an Errored Frame Event."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"The minimum number of frame errors that cause an Errored Frame Event."

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **75** *L* **14** # 89

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...an Event Notification OAMPDU is generated with an Errored Frame Event TLV..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **3** # 90

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"The number of errored frame seconds that cause an Errored Frame Seconds Summary Event."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"The minimum number of errored frame seconds that cause an Errored Frame Seconds Summary Event."

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **15** # 91

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...an Event Notification OAMPDU is generated with an Errored Frame Seconds Summary Event TLV..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **72** *L* **40** # 92

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...an Event Notification OAMPDU is generated with an Errored Symbol Period Event TLV..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **73** *L* **12** # 93

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"...an Event Notification OAMPDU is generated with an Errored Symbol Period Event TLV..."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **73** *L* **33** # 94

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
"If true, the OAM entity sends an Event Notification
OAMPDU when an Errored Symbol Period Event occurs.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **73** *L* **36** # 95

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
The default value for this object is true for
Ethernet-like interfaces that support OAM.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **29** # 96

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
If true, the local OAM entity sends an Event
Notification OAMPDU when an Errored Frame Seconds Event
occurs.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **33** # 97

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
The default value for this object is true for
Ethernet-like interfaces that support OAM.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **47** # 98

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" may be properly used in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss in committee.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Use of "should" appears to be appropriate.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **53** # 99

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
If the system does not support dying gasp capability, setting this object has no effect, and reading the object always returns 'false'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **76** *L* **56** # 100

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should".
The reserved word "should" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
The default value for this object is true for Ethernet-like interfaces that support OAM.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **83** *L* **56** # 101

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Beginning here, and continuing for the next few object descriptions, we find the text "This group is [mandatory or optional] for all IEEE 802.3 OA implementations..." I think that "OA" s/b "OAM".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "OA" with "OAM".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **84** *L* **29** # 102

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
From RFC 2119, it appears that "must", "shall", and "required" are synonymous and interchangeable. The IEEE style is different, wherein "shall" is used to indicate mandatory requirements, and "must" is deprecated, shall not be used to indicate mandatory requirements, and is used to indicate unavoidable situations. On that basis, I believe that most instances of "must" in 802.3.1 should be converted to "shall", and particularly in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
At least one type of event shall be supported for entries to appear in this table.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **84** *L* **36** # 103

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
From RFC 2119, it appears that "must", "shall", and "required" are synonymous and interchangeable. The IEEE style is different, wherein "shall" is used to indicate mandatory requirements, and "must" is deprecated, shall not be used to indicate mandatory requirements, and is used to indicate unavoidable situations. On that basis, I believe that most instances of "must" in 802.3.1 should be converted to "shall", and particularly in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
Since the information in the notifications is dependent on the dot3OamEventLogTable, that table shall be implemented for notifications.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.7** *P* **85** *L* **34** # 104

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
From RFC 2119, it appears that "must", "shall", and "required" are synonymous and interchangeable. The IEEE style is different, wherein "shall" is used to indicate mandatory requirements, and "must" is deprecated, shall not be used to indicate mandatory requirements, and is used to indicate unavoidable situations. On that basis, I believe that most instances of "must" in 802.3.1 should be converted to "shall", and particularly in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
Note that all of these counters shall
be supported even if the related function (as described in
dot3OamFunctionsSupported) is not supported.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **98** *L* **11** # 105

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Once disabled, a port shall be
explicitly enabled to restore operation.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.8** *P* **101** *L* **24** # 106

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.
A shall would be inappropriate here because this is the
wrong place to impose requirements on the protocol
operation.
It might be appropriate to reword the sentence as follows:
"The reset shall not impede the transmission of the SNMP
response". However, since this module is rather long in the tooth,
I cannot justify making such a change, and I would rather fall back on the
"unavoidable situation" convention.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"In any
event, SNMP requires that a response be transmitted."

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **112** *L* **59** # 107

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
If this object is implemented, the value
shall be a valid count as defined
in the first paragraph of this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **113** *L* **34** # 108

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
If this object is implemented, the value
shall be a valid count as defined
in the first paragraph of this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **117** *L* **6** # 109

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
If this object is implemented, the value
shall be a valid count as defined
in the first paragraph of this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **117** *L* **41** # 110

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentence as follows:
If this object is implemented, the value
shall be a valid count as defined
in the first paragraph of this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **126** *L* **40** # 111

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.
A shall would be inappropriate here because this is the
wrong place to impose requirements on the management station.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "must set" to "sets"

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **128** *L* **34** # 112

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "should" and "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.
A shall would be inappropriate here because this is the
wrong place to impose requirements on the agent.
(Maybe a stretch to make this argument. Unavoidable situation?)

SuggestedRemedy

Leave both "should" and "must" as is in this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Leave the "should", change "must" to "shall".

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **131** *L* **13** # 113

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
This is a tough one. It may be appropriate to change this to "shall".
This is similar to the slow protocols constraint on the frequency of messages, and for good reason.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss in committee.
It might be wise to restate the requirement as follows:

There shall be a minimum interval of 5 seconds between rptrInfoHealth notifications from a given repeater.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change :
"The agent must throttle the…" to
"The agent shall limit the …"

Cl **08** *SC* **8.3** *P* **131** *L* **44** # 114

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
This is a tough one. It may be appropriate to change this to "shall".
This is similar to the slow protocols constraint on the frequency of messages, and for good reason.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss in committee.
It might be wise to restate the requirement as follows:

There shall be a minimum interval of 5 seconds between rptrInfoResetEvent notifications from a given repeater.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change :
"The agent must throttle the…" to
"The agent shall limit the …"

Cl **08A** *SC* **0** *P* **138** *L* **50** # 115

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave it as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Annex 8A has been deleted

Cl **08A** *SC* **0** *P* **140** *L* **8** # 116

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
It appears that the usage is correct in this case.
Also on line 11 and line 34.

SuggestedRemedy

Leave them as is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Annex 8A has been deleted.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5** *P* **146** *L* **56** # 117

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this description.

SuggestedRemedy

Change both instances of "must" in this description to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5** *P* **151** *L* **20** # 118

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this description.

SuggestedRemedy

Change both instances of "must" in this description to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5** *P* **152** *L* **49** # 119

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions, in two places in this description

SuggestedRemedy

Change both instances of "must" in this description to "shall".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5** *P* **153** *L* **16** # 120

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall" in this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
And also decap "should" on line 14.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5** *P* **153** *L* **28** # 121

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall" in this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.5** *P* **153** *L* **40** # 122

Frazier, Howard Broadcom Corp

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Use of "must".
The reserved word "must" appears to be improperly used in this case, by IEEE conventions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "must" to "shall" in this description.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 123

Romascanu, Dan Avaya

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *order*

I could not figure out the logic of the order of the inclusion of the MIB modules. Maybe it is explained some place and I missed it.

SuggestedRemedy

As this order will probably stay with the evolution of the document I would suggest to follow the order of the development of the MIB modules - Ethernet Interfaces, Repeater, MAU, PoE, EPON, EFM, WAN, LLDP.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
An attempt was made to follow a "top-down" layering model, wherein modules corresponding to higher layers (e.g. LLDP) are described before modules corresponding to lower layers (e.g. MAU).
This was decided in a Task Force meeting in Quebec City, May 2009.
(See also correspondence between the commenter and Geoff Thompson on the reflector).
Straw poll:
Leave it as is - 4
Chronological order (IETF, IEEE going forward) - 4
As the straw poll is evenly divided, there is no concensus for change, therefore the order of clauses will remain as is.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **10** # 124

Romascanu, Dan Avaya

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

I do not think that the generic security considerations section 1.4 serves any useful purpose, as all relevant information is to be found in the specific security considerations sections for each MIB module.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest to take it out.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The ballot resolution committee feels that the text has value. The commenter is welcome to suggest alternative text.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.5** *P* **267** *L* **22** # 125

Romascanu, Dan Avaya

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *IANA*

Did the WG discuss what will happen with modules that are being maintained by IANA? Is the plan to take over the administration and move the registry control under IEEE, or to continue to require IANA to maintain the modules? This will obviously impact the content of the IANA considerations sections like 12.5 or 14.5.

SuggestedRemedy

In any case IANA should be contacted after the WG makes a decision, and the process needs to be confirmed before the final approval of the document.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
For discussion in committee. To this point, the assumption has been that we will maintain the status quo regarding the division of labor with IANA, that is IANA continues to maintain IANA MAU-MIB, and we incorporate by reference.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **473** *L* **52** # 126

Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

1000BASE-T is supported by UTP and screened/shielded twisted-pair cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "UTP"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Thank you for reading the GDMO!

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **473** *L* **53** # 127

Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Full duplex 1000BASE-T is supported by UTP and screened/shielded twisted-pair cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "UTP"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Also replace "to be" with "as" on line 53
Thank you for reading the GDMO!

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **482** *L* **24** # 128
Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

10BASE-T, 10BASE-THD, and 10BASE-TFD are supported by UTP and screened/shielded twisted-pair cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "UTP" in lines 24, 26, and 27.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Thank you for reading the GDMO!

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **482** *L* **39** # 129
Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

100BASE-T4, 100BASE-TX, 100BASE-TXHD, and 100BASE-TXFD are supported by UTP and screened/shielded twisted-pair cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "UTP" in lines 39, 40, 43, and 45

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Thank you for reading the GDMO!

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **482** *L* **56** # 130
Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

100BASE-T2, 100BASE-T2HD, and 100BASE-T2FD are supported by UTP and screened/shielded twisted-pair cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "UTP" in lines 56, 58, and 61

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Thank you for reading the GDMO!

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **483** *L* **43** # 131
Maguire, Valerie Siemon

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

1000BASE-T, 1000BASE-THD, and 1000BASE-TFD are supported by UTP and screened/shielded twisted-pair cabling.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "UTP" in lines 43, 46, and 48

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Thank you for reading the GDMO!

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **1** # 132
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

What do you mean by "Managed objects"?

SuggestedRemedy

In particular, add a definition for "object" as used in this document.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
This should be defined in the normative references, and would be inappropriate to redefine here. We don't define the term managed objects in 802.3, either.

Find definitive reference for definition of managed object and include in our list of definitions, i.e.
Managed object: See IETF RFC XXXX.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **15** *L* **41** # 133

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

"MIB modules formerly specified within IEEE Std 802.3" reminds us that we need a statement of what is to be deleted from 802.3 (and anywhere else?) after this draft becomes a standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Add clear and enduring statements (not just editor's notes saying "copied from X") detailing exactly what this document supersedes, replaces or deprecates. Perhaps a table here and text near the beginning of each clause.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It is intended that the next revision of 802.3 will deprecate the GDMO definitions in Annex 30A and 30B, and a statement to that effect belongs in the draft of the revision of 802.3. It may be appropriate to include a statement in P802.3.1 subclause 1.0 along the lines of: "This document supersedes and makes obsolete IEEE Std 802.3-2008 Annex 30A and Annex 30B, IEEE Std 802.1AB-REV-2009 Annex F, and IETF RFCs 2108, 3621, 3635, 3637, 4836, 4837, 4878, 5066."

Cl **10** *SC* **10.6** *P* **181** *L* **64** # 134

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

16nsec

SuggestedRemedy

16 ns (several times)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Check that it doesn't break a syntax rule.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2** *P* **157** *L* **33** # 135

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

10.1.2 EPON Architecture Highlights is about six pages long and seems to contain a lot of unnecessary or outdated information. e.g.
The EPON standard, now part of IEEE Std 802.3
single-mode
ONUs can be located either in some remote location (e.g. basement in a multi dwelling unit) or directly at the subscriber premises. Various types of Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) can be connected to ONUs or even integrated with such devices.
The Ethernet MAC operates at the data rate of 1 Gb/s
New, EPON specific layers are added
and so on.

SuggestedRemedy

Cut out the irrelevant stuff, correct the outdated stuff.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Need specific remedy.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2** *P* **157** *L* **33** # 136

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

physical layer

SuggestedRemedy

Physical Layer

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
And also Media Access Control sub-layer

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.2** *P* **158** *L* **20** # 137

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *scope*

"The EPON interface specification extends the specification of Gigabit Ethernet as described in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 35 and Clause 36. The Ethernet MAC operates at the data rate of 1 Gb/s..." is out of date

SuggestedRemedy

Generalise and simplify this clause to cover 10GEPON also.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The remedy asks for changes that go beyond the objectives for this project. Changes related to 10GEPON will be considered in a future amendment to or revision of 802.3.1

Cl **11** *SC* **11.4** *P* **243** *L* **60** # 138

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

64 bit

SuggestedRemedy

64-bit (nine or ten times in the document)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Do a GSR, be careful when doing this inside the MIB modules

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.1** *P* **352** *L* **10** # 139

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"It should be noted that the working group was not able to find": that's the second "It should be noted that" in one paragraph. If we write it, it should be noted - this is just padding.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
In fact, the entire sentence is unsupported in that the IEEE 802.3 Working Group has not conducted any such investigation.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.1** *P* **352** *L* **1** # 140

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

"will" is deprecated.

SuggestedRemedy

Be more sparing with the wills.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It should be noted that the changes made in this revision are not be entirely backward-compatible with MIB
modules that currently import MAU type object identity descriptors from the MAU-MIB; such modules
need to be revised to import those DESCRIPTORS from the IANA- MAU-MIB. Similarly, any management
applications that process the object identity definitions (e.g., to present the DESCRIPTION text to a user)
need to get those definitions from the IANA-MAU-MIB instead of the MAU-MIB. While it is true that
changes that require such adjustments are not strictly compliant with the SMIv2 rules governing MIB module
revisions (see [RFC2578] Section 10), in this case continued high maintenance costs that would result
from not making these changes make the deviation from the rules justified.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.1** *P* **351** *L* **60** # 141

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

What is "Jack type"? As it's a capital J, there should be a definition. I don't see one here or in 802.3

SuggestedRemedy

Add definition or eliminate the term.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Can't eliminate the term without pulling the thread that unravels the whole sweater.
Add a definition of jack type to Clause 3:
"jack type: The jack connector type, as it appears on the outside of the system. The type of mechanical interface to the transmission medium."

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **3** # 142
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

List of definitions of terms must be immediately available to the reader. Draft says "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms [Bn] should be referenced for terms not defined in this clause." But this book is not available on the web and is not free, and relying on it sabotages "Get IEEE 802". The reader is not going to pay $108.00 on the chance that a book he hasn't seen _might_ define a term in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

List all the terms that need definitions here. If a definition is long or difficult, could refer to a freely available reference e.g. 802.3 or an RFC, but would very much prefer just copying in definitions from other 802 and IETF documents as needed. Delete the sentence.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It's part of the boilerplate given to us by the SA.
IEEE Std 802.3 is already incorporated in the list of normative references.
See response to #245

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **5** # 143
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

"The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms" isn't in the reference list. There is no [Bn] list in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

See another comment that proposes removing the sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comments # 245.

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **7** # 144
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

These definitions need some work. Surely one can have a "system" without a repeater? What does "entity" mean here?

SuggestedRemedy

Improve the definitions list. I don't have the detailed remedy.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #291.

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **14** # 145
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

If a MAU is a unit, surely it's not an interface.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise the sentence.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The definition is out of date.
Replace the definition with:
repeater unit: The portion of a repeater that is inboard of its Physical Medium Attachment (PMA)/
Physical Signaling Sublayer (PLS), or PMA/Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS).

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **7** # 146
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

"System" is not a good choice of term, now we have OAMPDUs and AN so both ends of a link are visible to management.

SuggestedRemedy

"Station or PSE"? "DTE or PSE"?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comment #291.

Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **21** *L* **4** # 147
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

attenuation, bit error ratio, bandwidth, and more, are not proper nouns.

SuggestedRemedy

Use upper and lower case properly (see 802.3 1.5 Abbreviations for examples).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See response to comment #79

Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **21** *L* **23** # 148
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

Missing abbreviations

SuggestedRemedy

LLDP, TLV, probably more

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comment # 79.

Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **21** *L* **47** # 149
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

PHY does not mean Physical Layer. We've been over this before, several times.

SuggestedRemedy

Get it right!

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Add "entity".

Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **21** *L* **25** # 150
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

802.3 doesn't use Mbps.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all Mbps to Mb/s except as part of object names such as mauIfGrpAutoNeg1000Mbps.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Be verrrrry careful in implementing.

Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **21** *L* **4** # 151
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

Tidy up

SuggestedRemedy

Use tabs instead of hyphens to give the appearance of two columns (like 802.3 1.5 Abbreviations).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **29** *L* **4** # 152
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

"Mgn" is not used except as a component of object names.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the Mgn entry.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **05** *SC* **5** *P* **23** *L* **4** # 153
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Draft says "Specific conformance information is included in each MIB module." but I can't see much specific conformance information. In particular, where are the PICS?

SuggestedRemedy

Add PICS (or abandon 802.3 PICS).

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
A standard for managed objects definitions would have a Managed Object Conformance Statement (MOCS) rather than a PICS. However, we never wrote MOCS for Clause 30, or 30A or 30B. The MIB modules have specific conformance requirements, which can be found at the end of each module.
The conformance information meets the requirements of IETF RFC 2580.

Cl **05** *SC* **5** *P* **23** *L* **4** # 154

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"Specific conformance information is included in each MIB module." is too vague.

SuggestedRemedy

Give proper cross-references.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
We don't divide the MIB module definitions into subclauses because this would break the syntax rules. Conformance information is in fact included in each module, towards the end of each module. However, some of the time the comformance information is identified with the string "conformance information", and some times with "conformance statements". The latter seems to be preferred, so:
In C 6, P 42, L 35, change "Information" to "statements".
In C 7, P 83, L 33, change "Ethernet OAM Compliance group" to "Comformance statements".
In C 8, P 132 L 3, change "information" to "statements".
In C 8 P 134 L 35, change "Compliances" to "Compliance statements".
In C 9 P 153 L 45, change "Section" to "statements".
In C 9 P 153 L 50 , insert the line "- - Compliance statements", before the line "pethCompliances OBJECT IDENTIFIER…"
In C 10 P 216 L52, change "Statements" to "statements", and insert a carriage return above.
In C10 P 219 L 30, change "Compliance" to "Compliance statements".
In C 11 P 252 L 26, change "conformance information" to "Conformance statements".
In C 11 P 252 L 34, change "compliance" to "Compliance".
In C12 P 321 L 16, change "Statements" to "statements".
In C12 P 272 L 63, change "Statements" to "statements".
In C 14 P 377 L 9, change "information" to "statements".
In C14 P379 L 37, change "Compliances" to "Compliance statements."
See also the response to comment # 80

Cl **06** *SC* **6.1** *P* **25** *L* **26** # 155

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

M=Mandatory

SuggestedRemedy

To match 802.3, change to M = Mandatory (with spaces)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.2** *P* **26** *L* **1** # 156

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

In "IEEE 802.3/LLDP extension MIB cross reference", there seems to be a double space after "MIB"

SuggestedRemedy

If so, fix.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.2** *P* **26** *L* **17** # 157

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

auto-negotiation

SuggestedRemedy

Auto-Negotiation (multiple times)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Perform GSR to correct auto-negotiation to Auto-Negotiation. Beware of its potential appearance in MIB modules, and do not change those.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.2** *P* **26** *L* **46** # 158

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Badly split table

SuggestedRemedy

Adjust the table's number of orphan rows parameter so that the members of lldpV2Xdot3RemPortTable appear on this page, and let the bottom rows of a table to be continued have no line (like Table 7-1).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editor will to implement.

Cl **06** *SC* **6** *P* **25** *L* **1** # 159

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

Text mentions LLDP extension with nothing to say what LLDP stands for, what it means, or where the non-extended LLDP is to be found.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to abbreviations, definitions, references and text here as necessary.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Adding to abbreviations by response to comment #79.
Add IEEE Std 802.1AB-REV-2009 Station and Media Access Control Discovery to the list of normative references.
Add the following text to 6.0:
The logical link discovery protocol (LLDP) is defined in IEEE Std 802.1AB-REV-2009 Station and Media Access Control Discovery. Extensions to this protocol for Ethernet are defined in Clause 79 of IEEE Std 802.3.

Cl **06** *SC* **6** *P* **25** *L* **1** # 160

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *order*

It seems strange to put LLDP extension before the bread-and-butter stuff. I would have thought Clause 11 Ethernet-like interface MIB module, or 14. Ethernet medium attachment units (MAUs) MIB module, should come first.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider what the appropriate clause order is.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
Considered. There is no concensus to change the clause ordering. See also response to comment #123.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.4** *P* **31** *L* **49** # 161

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

24 bit

SuggestedRemedy

24-bit (like 64-bit later)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.4** *P* **33** *L* **24** # 162

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

"allowed on the local LLDP agent"? allowed by the local LLDP agent? other?

SuggestedRemedy

Anyway, add "agent" and if appropriate "LLDP agent" to the definitions. There's a definition of agent in 802.3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"...allowed by the local LLDP agent…"
Also insert "the" before "LLDP" on lines 31, 34, and 41.
Not sure that the definition of agent in 802.3 is generally accepted in the SNMP user community. Here is a possible definition that seems concordant with IETF RFC 3410 and which could be added to Clause 3:
"agent: An entity, typically implemented in software, which provides remote access to management instrumentation, via the Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)."

Cl **07** *SC* **7.1** *P* **45** *L* **10** # 163

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"provide some basic Operations and Administration (OA) functions on Ethernet media" but the medium is just cables or similar, it can't carry out any OAM function.

SuggestedRemedy

Not sure what the right word is - it's not "links" either.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reword the first two sentences into one as follows:
The IEEE 802.3ah Ethernet in the First Mile (EFM) Task Force added management capabilities to Ethernet-like interfaces to provide some basic Operations, Administration and Maintenance (OAM) functions.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.1** *P* **45** *L* **15** # 164

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

What does "protocols in the Internet community" mean?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "protocols such as ABCD or XYZ"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reword the sentence as follows:
This clause defines a MIB module for use with SNMP to manage these Ethernet-like interface capabilities.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.1** *P* **45** *L* **15** # 165

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"new Ethernet interface capabilities" already outdated.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "new", join sentence onto previous paragraph. Clean up other dated claims of "new" in the draft.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comment #164

Cl **07** *SC* **7.2** *P* **45** *L* **37** # 166

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

"the results of the Task Force are not strictly limited to [Ethernet-access] application" is a gross understatement. In particular, 100BASE-LX10 came from a separate "100BASE-FX over dual Single Mode Fibre" Call For Interest, and it is for any purpose, not necessarily access.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "strictly"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.2** *P* **45** *L* **32** # 167

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

History lesson is off topic.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete two paragraphs, from line 32 to line 53. Tidy up the relationship between the sentences at lines 14 and 56.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Delete the two paragraphs, and then
delete the sentence on line 14, as the sentence on line 56 explains things adequately.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.3.3** *P* **47** *L* **28** # 168

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 7-1 is not referred to.

SuggestedRemedy

If it's part of 7.3.3, mention it in the text of 7.3.3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Change the first sentence of 7.3.3 to read:
"Table 7-1 contains the mapping…".

Cl **07** *SC* **7.3.3** *P* **48** *L* **1** # 169

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Continued tables should say "(continued)"

SuggestedRemedy

Fix. There's a way to make Frame do this automatically (which should be in the template, maybe it isn't).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See response to comment # 215

Cl **07** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **46** *L* **12** # 170

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

"7.2.1 Remote Fault Indication
Remote fault indication"
Sort out the capitals. Either Remote fault indication or Remote Fault indication, both times. In 7.3, "Relation to the Other MIB Modules" should be "Relation to the other MIB modules"

SuggestedRemedy

As above, and scrub the draft.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
"Remote fault indication"
See response to comment # 217

Cl **07** *SC* **7.2** *P* **46** *L* **2** # 171

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

layer two ... layer three

SuggestedRemedy

Layer 2 ... Layer 3

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.2** *P* **143** *L* **27** # 172

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Too much advertising and history

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "The emergence of IP telephony as an application that allows voice applications to be run over the same infrastructure as data applications has led to the emergence of Ethernet IP phones, which have similar functions and characteristics as traditional phones. Powering the phone with the same cable used for signal transfer is one of the functions that are being taken as granted. The IEEE 802.3 Working Group addressed this within Clause 33 of IEEE Std 802.3."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
And, change the reference to RFC 3635 to point to Clause 11.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.2** *P* **143** *L* **35** # 173

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"IEEE Std 802.3 does not define a full management interface, but only the hardware registers that will allow for management interfaces to be built for a powered Ethernet device." Not so, IEEE Std 802.3 defines (usually optional) hardware registers for all sorts of things.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the negative: change to "IEEE Std 802.3 defines the hardware registers that will allow for management interfaces to be built for a powered Ethernet device."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **iii** *L* # 174

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Front matter needs an introduction

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the paragraph beginning "An introduction shall be supplied" with an introduction.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #285.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **iii** *L* # 175

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R** *front*

Line numbers missing

SuggestedRemedy

Add line numbers to front matter

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The front matter is not subject to ballot, so it doesn't need line numbers.
See the response to comment # 285

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **iii** *L* # 176

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

URLs need tidying up, other

SuggestedRemedy

Don't split URLs across lines. Underline all or none. Suggest colour them blue as 802.3ba. More generally, check for differences any differences in front matter boilerplate against a recent project e.g. 802.3ba, use the better alternative, and get the master updated.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The front matter boilerplate was supplied by the IEEE staff editor. The lack of color, which also shows up in internal cross-references, will be fixed in a future draft.
See response to comment # 285

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **iv** *L* # 177

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Which patent text?

SuggestedRemedy

Either show just the first alternative or add editor's note explaining why you are showing both.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
We don't have enough information to be able to select one or the other of the two blocks of the specified patent text at this time.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **v** *L* # 178

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Participants and Working Group's name missing

SuggestedRemedy

Fill in.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be supplied in a future draft.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **v** *L* # 179

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

[individual/entity] balloting committee: this isn't an entity balloting committee, but calling it an individual balloting committee is silly, as that means the the opposite of a multiple balloting committee.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "the balloting committee composed of individuals voted"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Select individual.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **vi** *L* # 180

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

2008

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 201X. Template needs updating.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **viii** *L* # 181

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Almost empty page

SuggestedRemedy

Start the contents here

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **xiv** *L* # 182
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Blank page. Even if the publisher insists on adding blank pages, we don't need them for drafts, and Frame makes it easy to control this (there are switches at file and book level).

SuggestedRemedy

Start each clause or annex on the next available page.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **viii** *L* # 183
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Contents not apparent in pdf bookmarks

SuggestedRemedy

Please make the contents appear in the pdf bookmarks.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **A** *SC* **A** *P* **383** *L* **7** # 184
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Some annex titles not apparent in pdf bookmarks.

SuggestedRemedy

Please make the Annex A, B... titles appear in the pdf bookmarks. An easy way to achieve the latter is to order them like the numbered annex titles e.g.
Annex 8A: Topology mapping
(informative)
rather than
Annex A
(informative)
Bibliography

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **A** *SC* **A** *P* **383** *L* **10** # 185
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *cross*

Cross-referencing could be improved.

SuggestedRemedy

Please number the bibliography entries A1, A2 and so on and refer to them with hyperlinks as [A1], [A2] and so on, as in 802.3.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **A** *SC* **A** *P* **383** *L* **10** # 186
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

Cross-referencing could be improved.

SuggestedRemedy

Please number the normative references 1, 2 and so on and refer to them with hyperlinks [1], [2] and so on.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Cross-referencing accepted. Numbering of normative references is contrary to both the IEEE style manual and the style used in IEEE Std 802.3.

Cl **B** *SC* **B.1.1** *P* **388** *L* **4** # 187
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

Draft says 'See "BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS" in 30.3.1.1.35;' yet this document does not contain a 30.3.1.1.35.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix (many similar cases).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

change each reference to say "IEEE Std 802.3 30.w.x.y.z",

Cl **C** *SC* **C.1** *P* **471** *L* **41** # 188

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

(i.e., approximately 4.294 × 109)
...
(i.e., approximately 1.844... × 1019)

SuggestedRemedy

You have already said it's approximate, so remove the three dots.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **C** *SC* **C.2** *P* **472** *L* **57** # 189

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

If this ASN.1 module is of use, shouldn't it be available as an ASCII download like the other big blocks of code?

SuggestedRemedy

Make this ASN.1 module available as an ASCII download like the other big blocks of code.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
It's not clear that it is actually of any use.
It is retained in the draft for historical reasons. The long term plan for the standard is to delete it once the maintainence of the SMIv2 modules is well established in the working group. There is no commercial value to the GDMO ASN.1 modules, and the working group has not published them in machine readable form.

Cl **C** *SC* **C.2** *P* **484** *L* **13** # 190

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *scope*

List of MAU types is not complete. Needs 10GEPON types, in future will need 802.3ba types.

SuggestedRemedy

Add missing MAU types. Note there are two lists, in different places, that are kept in the same order.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The remedy asks for changes that go beyond the objectives for this project. Changes related to 10GEPON will be considered in a future amendment to or revision of 802.3.1, tentatively identified as P802.3.1a. See the project plan and objectives described in: http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov08/frazier_3_1108.pdf

---

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.6** *P* **162** *L* **64** # 191

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

"however this is out of scope of IEEE Std 802.3." > "however, their specification is out of scope of IEEE Std 802.3."

SuggestedRemedy

clarification per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to:
"however, their specification is outside the scope of IEEE Std 802.3."

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.3** *P* **164** *L* **37** # 192

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

" defined in Clause 14, and Etherlike MIB module defined in Clause 11" - is Clause 14 and Clause 11 you refer to located in this draft? If so, the link is not live ...

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Will use live links in a future draft.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.3** *P* **164** *L* **51** # 193

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

"It is a bit different from the EPON layering diagram, " > "It is a different from the EPON layering diagram, " - we do want to avoid undefined quantifiers ...
also in line 54: "it is more convenient and neat to partition the management of the layers " > comment #25 against D1.2 was not implementd correctly.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Correctly implement the response to comment #25 against D1.2.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2** *P* **166** *L* **1** # 194

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Table 10-2 and Table 10-1 should be replaced in terms of order i.e. first show a table for an ONU prior to initialization and then the table for the ONU after initialization (in working more) - otherwise it is confusing

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Swap the order of the tables and swap the text that introduces the tables.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2** *P* **167** *L* **1** # 195

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Again, Table 10-4 and Table 10-3 should be reversed in terms of order i.e. first show initial state of the OLT tables (10-4) and only then state of the OLT tables in operating mode (10-3).

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Swap the order of the tables and swap the text that introduces the tables.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.1** *P* **157** *L* **34** # 196

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *scope*

"EPON interfaces" - should be "1G-EPON interfaces" for clarity. 10G-EPON is not covered ...
Also, in the same line: "EPON is a variant of" > "1G-EPON is a variant of"
Suggest to scrub the whole Clause 10 and replace "EPON" with "1G-EPON" for clarity. Otherwise, someone after reading 802.3av might think you also cover 10G-EPON in here which is not true

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In 10.1, change "...conform to
the Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPON) standard..." to
"...conform to
the 1 Gb/s Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (1G-EPON) standard…"

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.3** *P* **164** *L* **20** # 197

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

In Figure 10-6, FEC should not be shown as an independent sublayer, compare with figure 10-2. FEC is a PCS function and not a sublayer in its own rights.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
True enough. FEC is defined as a optional sublayer for 10GBASE-KR, and for 40GBASE-KR4/CR4 and for 100GBASE-CR10, but it is defined as an optional function within the PCS sublayer for EPON. Take the FEC sublayer out of the diagram, but leave the FECObjects alongside the PCS sublayer.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.3.1** *P* **168** *L* **41** # 198

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

"Implementing this module therefore MUST require implementation" - not quire sure whether MUST can stay in the text like this. Even though the text was improted from an RFC, it should be adapted to IEEE 802.3 specification language. Otherwise it is confusing what this MUST means and how it should be interpreted.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #7:
"Therefore, if this module is implemented, then the Interfaces MIB module defined in IETF RFC2863 and the Ethernet-like Interfaces MIB module defined in Clause 11 shall also be implemented."

Cl **10** *SC* **10.3.1** *P* **169** *L* **8** # 199

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

This is a comment against Table 10-5, 10-6, 10-7 and 10-8. It is not immediately clear where values such as "ONU2_octets_number" are defined. Per discussion during comments resolution of comments against D1.2, it was agreed that reference would be added to each table, indicating where individual variables / constants can be found. No text was added

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
No such text has been supplied. Will revisit when suggested text is supplied.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.7** *P* **163** *L* **13** # 200

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"improving the link BER from 10-4 to 10-12,"
use superscripts when refering to BER levels

SuggestedRemedy

Per coment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Use superscript for the exponents -4 and -12.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2** *P* **167** *L* **35** # 201

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Items "ONU1_MAC_Address is the MAC address of ONU1 EPON interface.
ONU2_MAC_Address is the MAC address of ONU2 EPON interface.
BRCT_MAC_Address is the MAC address of the broadcast EPON interface, which is the OLT MAC
address." should be bulleted to improve readability.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Cast the items as footnotes to the table

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1** *P* **157** *L* **9** # 202

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

"IEEE Std 802.3, which are extended capabilities to the Ethernet like interfaces." - unclear what this is intended to mea. Do you mean "IEEE Std 802.3, proviing extended capabilities to the Ethernet-like interfaces." ?

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Change to "IEEE Std 802.3, providing extended capabilities to the Ethernet-like interfaces."

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1** *P* **157** *L* **11** # 203

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *scope*

" referring to EPON" - suggest to change " referring to 1G-EPON. 10G-EPON systems and changes introduced to Clause 30 under IEEE 802.3av(tm)-2009 project are not covered in this Clause." since 10G-EPON is not covered at this stage.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment # 196.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.5** *P* **160** *L* **1** # 204

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

"Logical links also provide a solution for data privacy, " > "Logical links also provide a solution for privacy of data, " - otherwise the sentence does not read right

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Change to
"Logical links also provide a solution for privacy of data, "

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.1** *P* **158** *L* **5** # 205

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

The list should read as follows:
—Clause 30 - Management
—Clause 60 - PMD for EPON media (burst-mode PMD)
—Clause 64 - MPCP (Multi-Point Control Protocol), which defines the Multi-Point architecture, and control protocol for the media access of EPON
—Clause 65 - which defines a number of extensions to standard Gigabit Ethernet PCS, i.e.:
a) definition of Point-to-Point emulation function (Logical Topology Emulation - LTE) for the EPON
b) definition of the optional (frame-based) FEC
c) PMA for the EPON

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Cannot find the abbreviation LTE or the expansion Logical Topology Emulation in the context of EPON (in 802.3 or 802.3.1). LTE is used for Line Terminating Equipment in the WIS Clause (13). Not a good idea to introduce new abbreviations and terminology. Propose the following:
—Clause 30 - Management
—Clause 60 - PMD for EPON media (burst-mode PMD)
—Clause 64 - MPCP (Multi-Point Control Protocol), which defines the Multi-Point architecture, and control protocol for the media access of EPON
—Clause 65 - which defines a number of extensions to standard Gigabit Ethernet PCS, i.e.:
a) definition of Point-to-Point emulation function for EPON
b) definition of the optional (frame-based) FEC for EPON
c) PMA for EPON

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 206

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

There are 13 instances of the word "memo" in the draft. For example in 7.4 is "The Ethernet OAM MIB objects of this memo focus on ..."
What memo?

SuggestedRemedy

Change "memo" to "Clause" or other appropriate word for these 13 ocurrences.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comments # 232 and 286

Cl **09** *SC* **9.1** *P* **143** *L* **9** # 207

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This says "it defines a set of MIB objects to manage Power Ethernet Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE)"
But 802.3 (or 802.3at) does not use the term "Power Ethernet"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "it defines a set of MIB objects to manage Power via MDI Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE)"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.1** *P* **157** *L* **37** # 208

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This says "with the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) on the side of the Central Office and Optical Network Units (ONUs) on the side of subscribers."
This could be confused with the OLT being on the side of the central office rather than on the inside of it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "with the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) in the Central Office and Optical Network Units (ONUs) near the subscribers."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.7** *P* **163** *L* **13** # 209
Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
In "the link BER from 10-4 to 10-12" the "-4" and "-12" should be superscripts

SuggestedRemedy
Make them superscripts

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.7** *P* **163** *L* **27** # 210
Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
In "is added to the extended Gigabit Ethernet PCS per definitions, per 65.2 in IEEE Std 802.3." the "per definitions" is superfluous

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "is added to the extended Gigabit Ethernet PCS per 65.2 in IEEE Std 802.3."

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.1.2.5** *P* **160** *L* **6** # 211
Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
In "which shows an examples of an EPON" "examples" should be "example"

SuggestedRemedy
change to "which shows an example of an EPON"

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 212
Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *cross*
It would be helpful to make all references to other parts of this document links.

SuggestedRemedy
Make links:
Page 89, line 22 "Clause 9"
Page 164, line 37 "Clause 14" and "Clause 11"
Page 168, lines 42, 45, 48, 54 "Clause 11"
Page 173, lines 48, 51 "Clause 14"
Page 174, line 6 "Clause 7"
Page 222, line 18 "Clause 13"
Page 222, lines 51, 53 "Clause 14"
Page 225, lines 18, 58 "Clause 14"
Page 257, line 26 "Clause 7" and "Clause 10"
Page 323, line 20 "Clause 14" (space missing afterwards)
Page 325, line 60 "Clause 14"
Page 330, line 26 "Annex 13A"
Page 352, lines 33, 48 "Clause 11"
Page 352, lines 37, 48 "Clause 13"
Page 352, line 57 "Clause 8"

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.
Thank you for finding some of them. A lot of cross-reference work needs to be done.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1** *P* **257** *L* **20** # 213
Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**
Space missing in "margin).This"

SuggestedRemedy
Add space

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.4** *P* **266** *L* **44** # 214

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"There is a number of managed objects defined in the .." should be "There are a number of managed objects defined in the .."

SuggestedRemedy

Change "There is" to "There are"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 215

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

It would be helpful if all table titles for tables that split across pages included "(continued)" in the second and subsequent instances.

SuggestedRemedy

For all tables that are split across pages add (continued) after the title on all but the first instance. This can be done by:

Place the cursor at the end of table title on first page. Then click Special and Variable from the pulldown menu. Then insert "Table Continuation" variable. This will add the (continued) on subsequent pages.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Thank you for the framemaker advice.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.3** *P* **28** *L* **14** # 216

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

"may be considered to be sensitive of vulnerable in some network environments" does not make sense

SuggestedRemedy

Change "sensitive of vulnerable" to "sensitive or vulnerable" as in clause 9.4

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.3** *P* **46** *L* **65** # 217

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The two headings:
"7.3 Relation to the Other MIB Modules" and "7.3.1 Relation to Other MIB Modules" are confusingly similar

SuggestedRemedy

Change one or the other heading to clarify the difference

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the subclause heading 7.3.1.
Change the subclause head of 7.3 to be
Relation to other MIB modules.
See response to comment # 170

Cl **08** *SC* **8.1.1** *P* **89** *L* **41** # 218

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This says "the same instrumentation can be used to implement both the IEEE and IETF management standards."
but aren't the IETF documents moving in to IEEE 802.3.1?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "the same instrumentation can be used to implement both this the IEEE Std 802.3 management standards."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reword the sentence as follows:
The counters in this clause are defined to be the same as the counters defined in IEEE Std 802.3, with the intention
that the same instrumentation can be used to implement both standards.

Cl **08** *SC* **8.1.2.3** *P* **90** *L* **15** # 219

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This says "See [12] and [13] for details"
Where are these references?
Also [5] in 8.1.3.1

SuggestedRemedy

Include these these references in a way that allows the correct entry in clause 2 to be found.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the note and the associated editor's note.
Replace "MIB-II [5]" with "MIB-II in IETF RFC 1213"

Cl **08A** *SC* **8A** *P* **138** *L* **22** # 220

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *order*

This says "and d4, d5, and d6 on the third port." but d7 is there also

SuggestedRemedy

change to "and d4, d5, d6, and d7 on the third port."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comment 236 deletes Annex 8A, and leaves a pointer in Clause 8 that directs the reader to IETF RFC 2108, section 4 (which is where this material came from). See comment #236.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.3.1** *P* **168** *L* **40** # 221

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

"Implementing this module therefore MUST require implementation of ..." would be better with "MUST" replaced by "shall"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Implementing this module therefore shall require implementation of ..."

Likewise in 10.3.2 change "implementing this module MUST require implementation of" to "implementing this module shall require implementation of"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See responses to comments # 7 and 8.

Cl **11** *SC* **11.2.2.8** *P* **225** *L* **15** # 222

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

"Note that these object MUST NOT indicate a doubled value when operating in full-duplex mode. It MUST indicate the correct line speed regardless of the current duplex mode." would be better with the two "MUST"s replaced by "shall"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the two "MUST"'s with "shall"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comment # 13.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1** *P* **257** *L* **16** # 223

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

"Bit Error Rate (BER)" should be "Bit Error Ratio (BER)" as per the abbreviations in clause 4

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Bit Error Rate" to "Bit Error Ratio" here and also on page 280 line 15

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Also, change the exponents to superscripts on lines 16 and 20, and delete the carets.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.2** *P* **324** *L* **4** # 224

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

"and an agent implementing the objects defined in this memo MUST implement the objects required by" would be better with the "MUST" replaced by "shall"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "MUST" with "shall"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comment # 46.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.4.2** *P* **324** *L* **63** # 225

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

"The ifTable MUST be used" would be better with the "MUST" replaced by "shall"
Same for 13.1.4.3 and 13.1.4.4

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "MUST" with "shall"
Same for 13.1.4.3 and 13.1.4.4

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comments # 47, 48, 49.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.5** *P* **325** *L* **44** # 226

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

This "MUST" would be better as a "shall"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "MUST" with "shall"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comment # 50.

Cl **13** *SC* **13.1.8.1** *P* **330** *L* **52** # 227

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

The two "MUST"s would be better as "shall"s
Same for 13.1.8.2 through 13.1.8.4

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "MUST"s with "shall"s
Same for 13.1.8.2 through 13.1.8.4

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the reponses to comments # 52, 53, 54, 55.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.2.2.1** *P* **352** *L* **25** # 228

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

The two "MUST"s would be better as "shall"s
Same for the "MUST" in 14.2.2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "MUST"s with "shall"s
Same for the "MUST" in 14.2.2.2

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the responses to comments # 65, 66, 67.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.4** *P* **31** *L* **57** # 229

Anslow, Peter Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This says "This version of this MIB module is published as Clause 6 of IEEE Draft 802.3.1/D1.2;" which is an out of date reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Wouldn't it be better to change "published as Clause 6 of IEEE Draft 802.3.1/D1.2;" to "published as Clause 6 of IEEE 802.3.1;" so that this text does not have to be updated repeatedly?

Also on line 64

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment # 252

Cl **06** *SC* **4** *P* **29** *L* **16** # 230

Magee, Anthony ADVA Optical Network

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

This is the first link to a MIB text file in the document. When I try to load the MIB I get an error message sying that the mib conains unknown mib node lldpv2xdot30bjects.

Also I see messages about LLDP-V2-MIB and LLDP-V2-TC-MIB modules failing to be located.

SuggestedRemedy

If a framework MIB is needed to be able to load this MIB (and subsequant MIBs), is it possible to make a reference to those earlier in this draft standard?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The modules can be found on the IEEE 802.1 web site, but they are in a protected area along with IEEE 802.1AB-REV/draft 6.0. Since IEEE Std 802.1AB-REV-2009 is an approved standard, these modules should be available on the publicly accessible IEEE 802.1 MIBS page, but they are not yet. Worse, the link to the MIB in the approved draft of IEEE 802.1 appears to be broken (it takes you to the IEEE 802 LMSC home page).
Once these problems are fixed, a link should be placed in the IEEE8023-DOT3-LLDP-EXT-V2-MIB module, in the form of a comment right after each of the LLDP-V2-MIB and LLDP-V2-TC-MIB modules are imported.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **6** # 231

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

Where there are references to IETF standards and RFC the designation should be proceeded by 'IETF', some examples are give below. I also don't think there should be the square bracketed version of the designation afterwards which I think was an IETF style bibliography reference.

SuggestedRemedy

'.. STD 58 ..' should read '.. IETF STD 58 ..'.
'.. RFC 2578 [RFC2578] ..' should read '.. IETF RFC 2578 ..'.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **6** # 232

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Suggest that 'This memo specifies a MIB module ..' should read 'This standard specifies a MIB module ..'.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **02** *SC* **2** *P* **17** *L* **39** # 233

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

I don't see a normative reference to IETF RFC 1157, Simple Network Management Protocol, Case, J., Fedor, M., Schoffstall, M., and J. Davin, May 1990 in the body of the draft.

The same seems to be true for:

[1] IETF RFC 1573, Evolution of the Interfaces Group of MIB-II, McCloghrie, K., and F. Kastenholz, January 1994.

[2] IETF RFC 1905, Protocol Operations for version 2 of the Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMPv2), Case, J., McCloghrie, K., Rose, M., and S. Waldbusser, January 1996.

[3] IETF RFC 1988, Conditional Grant of Rights to Specific Hewlett-Packard Patents In Conjunction With the Internet Engineering Task Force's Internet-Standard Network Management Framework, McAnally, G., Gilbert, D., and J. Flick, August 1996.

[4] IETF RFC 2026, The Internet Standards Process - Revision 3, Bradner, S., October 1996.

SuggestedRemedy

If there is no normative reference these should be moved to the bibliography.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #78

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **7** # 234

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

The definition of 'System - A managed entity compliant with this MIB, and incorporating at least one managed 802.3 repeater.' worked when it was local to the Repeater MIB but within IEEE 802.3.1 it doesn't work anymore.

One of the first uses of the term 'system' after this definition is in LLDP MIB module that contains the text "This table contains one row per port of Ethernet port information (as a part of the LLDP 802.3 organizational extension) on the local system known to this agent.".

Also need to fix the reference to 'this MIB' to be to 'this standard'.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Redefined the definition of 'System' to be 'Repeater System - A managed entity compliant with this standard, and incorporating at least one managed IEEE 802.3 repeater.'

[2] Change the instances of 'system' on the Repeater MIB to be 'repeater system', for example the text:

-- Configuration and status objects for each
-- managed group in the system, independent
-- of whether there is one or more managed
-- repeater-units in the system.

would be changed to read:

-- Configuration and status objects for each
-- managed group in the repeater system,
-- independent of whether there is one or
-- more managed repeater-units in the
-- repeater system.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comment #291.

Cl **03** *SC* **3** *P* **19** *L* **31** # 235

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

While the 'stack' definition seems to exclusively relate to repeaters there is also reference to 'stack' in the PoE MIB, where the pethPsePortGroupIndex object states 'Group means box in the stack, module in a rack ..' (p146) and the EFM copper MIB, where it states '2BASE-TL and 10PASS-TS PHYs specified in the EFM-CU-MIB module are stacked (a.k.a. aggregated ormbonded) Ethernet interfaces ..' (p257) and 'The new tables ifCapStackTable and its inverse ifInvCapStackTable defined in the IF-CAP-STACK-MIB module below, extend the stack management with an ability to describe possible connections or cross-connect ..'.

SuggestedRemedy

Stack - A scalable system in which modularity is achieved by interconnecting a number of different system.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Stack - A scalable system in which modularity is achieved by interconnecting a number of different systems.

Cl **08A** *SC* **8A** *P* **137** *L* **1** # 236

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *order*

I suggest that Annex 8A be deleted and a reference made to Clause 4 of RFC 2108 instead. My reasoning is [1] topology mapping approaches have moved on since this text was first published in RFC2108, LLDP for example, and [2] the text of Annex 8 will still be available in RFC 2108 for anybody that still wants to read, reference of use it. Since I don't see any need for us to update this text I don't see any need for us to bring it into IEEE 802.3.1.

SuggestedRemedy

[1] Delete Annex 8A.

[2] Update the text (P117, l57):

-- this function. 'Annex 8A, "Topology Mapping",
-- contains a description of an algorithm which can
-- make use of this table, in combination with the
-- forwarding databases of managed bridges/switches
-- in the network, to map network topology.

to read:

-- this function. Clause 4 "Topology Mapping" of
-- IETF RFC 2108 contains a description of an
-- algorithm which can make use of this table,
-- in combination with the forwarding databases
-- of managed bridges/switches in the network,
-- to map network topology. Devices may also
-- utilise the protocol and a set of managed
-- objects defined in IEEE Std 802.1AB Station
-- and Media Access Control Connectivity
-- Discovery to discover the physical topology
-- from adjacent stations.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Use "section" rather than "clause".

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 237

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

In general this draft does not appear to have the level of refinement we have come to expect of drafts forwarded to Working Group Ballot in 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

The entire draft should remain open to comment for at least the next recirculation

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
This draft is based on material that has undergone extensive public review over many iterations, over a period of many years. Consider also that the draft passed its initial Working Group ballot by a comfortable margin, an unusual occurrence in the recent history of projects of similar size and scope. However, the Task Force chair and editor intends to ask the Working Group chair to declare that the entire draft remains open for comment for the first Working Group recirculation ballot, to allow more time for experts to review the large volume of material, and also intends to ask that the recirculation ballot duration is adequate for this purpose.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **3** *L* # 238

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *front*

No introduction has been supplied

SuggestedRemedy

A draft is supposed to be complete before WG ballot. To have a placeholder rather than proposed text does not meet the requirment of completion.
Please supply introductory text.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
The introduction is not part of the standard, and is not subject to ballot. Therefore, the draft would meet the WG ballot requirements for completeness even if the introduction was entirely blank.

See also response to comment # 285

Cl **99** *SC* **6** *P* *L* # 239
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

It is pretty obvious that the SASB is not going to approve this document in 2008

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "2008" with "201N"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment # 285.

Cl **08** *SC* *P* *L* # 240
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Misplace page break

SuggestedRemedy

Remove page break so that the header "Contents" is on the same page as the start of the table of contents.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **15** *L* **28** # 241
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

In editors note the reference to the 802.1 draft is not fo the appropriate form

SuggestedRemedy

Change to correct form per Style Manual: IEEE P802.1AB...

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It's actually IEEE Std 802.1AB-2009 now.
Check that we correctly reference IEEE Std 802.1AB-2009 throughout.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **17** # 242
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

It seems that the terms "RECOMMENDED" and "NOT RECOMMENDED" are being used in the IETF sense rather than according to IEEE usage.

SuggestedRemedy

There should probably be a note explaining that.
I noticed such a not later in the draft. It needs to be moved forward.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Actually, the intent is to convert everything to IEEE usage of reserved words.
In 1.4, page 16, line 17, reword the sentence as follows:
"Implementers should consider the security features…"

Delete the first sentence of the third paragraph, beginning on line 22. Reword the second sentence as follows:
SNMPv3 should be deployed, rather than previous versions of SNMP, and cryptographic security should be enabled.

Cl **02** *SC* *P* **17** *L* **20** # 243
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

References to particular patents imply an IEEE acknowledgement of essentiality.

SuggestedRemedy

The reference to HP patents needs to be removed. LoAs need to be solicited

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The Working Group chair has solicited an LoA.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **17** *L* **60** # 244
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Remove this reference. The RFC doesn't apply to this work.

SuggestedRemedy

The RFC will probably be useful when soliciting an LoA from HP

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **3** # 245
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

There is no such thing as an "Authoritative Dictionary" of "IEEE Standard Terms" (in spite of there being an IEEE publication with the referenced title. If one tries to "reference" that publication, one does not an authoritative definition, rather a glossary.

SuggestedRemedy

The text should be modified so that it would not be "referenced". at best, it should be consulted for suggestions. Better yet eliminate the text altogether. Move the reference to the bibliography so that it is done in an exactly parallel way to the way it is called out in 802.3. I.e. "[B43] IEEE 100, a glossary of standards terms titled The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, New York, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc."

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.
Move the reference to the bibliography.
How much pushback are we going to get from the staff editors?

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **29** # 246
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The last sentence in the paragraph is slightly misleading

SuggestedRemedy

Please add the following text at the end of theparagraph:
"It is not uncommon for such segments to be a proprietary implementation."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **20** *L* # 247
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Blank page

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete excess blank pages.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **22** *L* # 248
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Blank page
(also page 30)

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete excess blank pages.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **05** *SC* *P* **23** *L* # 249
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Too much white space

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove two forced pages breaks.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.1** *P* **25** *L* **12** # 250
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

This seems to be an external reference to some standard in 802.1. (one of the several)

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a formal external reference here.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comment #159

Cl **06** *SC* **6.3** *P* **28** *L* **1** # 251

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

I believe that using the term "802.3" in the title of a sub-clause is self-referential and is not in line with the Style Guide.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise to our ordinary convention

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It's not self-referential, since 802.3.1 will be a separate standard from 802.3. However, "Std" should be inserted.
[Ed. "Std" should probably not be inserted]

Cl **06** *SC* **6.4** *P* **31** *L* **57** # 252

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The version reference buried in the text of the MIB module seems to be out of date (multiple places)

SuggestedRemedy

It seems the current system of having this information appear multiple times in the bowels of the MIB module is a bad idea. At a minimum, please correct. Preferably, come up with a system that is not such an ongoing editorial burden.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the text on lines 53-58, taking care to leave the closing double quote behind.
Also delete the first sentence on line 64, taking care to leave the opening double quote behind.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.4** *P* **33** *L* **51** # 253

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *cl6*

The reference here to 9.1.2.1 points to somewhere in the introduction of the 10 PoE MIB module. Subclause 9.1 has no further subdivisions. I suspect that this (and probably numerous others like it) should really be external references to another (non-802.3) standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct with external reference here and in other like instances.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The references are to IEEE Std 802.1AB-REV, which has since been moved to IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 79. All of the references in this MIB module need to be updated to point to IEEE Std 802.3 79.??
[Ed. Actually, the references should point to the corresponding attributes in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 30]

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **13** # 254

Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

In the sentence Even if the network itself is secure (for example by using IPSec), even then, ...

"even then" adds no value to the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the words "even then,"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **42** # 255

Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Not to pick on the word "even", but I don't see the value added by using "even" in the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

remove the "even"s so the sentence reads:

In such environments it is important to control GET and NOTIFY access to these objects and possibly encrypt their values when sending them over the network via SNMP.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.1** *P* **25** *L* **12** # 256

Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

There is a dash between the "1" and "802.1". I think the intended title of the table is 6-1.

SuggestedRemedy

remove the dash between the "1" and "802.1".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The autonumber format is correct.
802.1 s/b IEEE Std 802.1AB

Cl **06** *SC* **6.3** *P* **28** *L* **57** # 257

Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The word "even" adds no value

SuggestedRemedy

delete them so the sentence reads:

It is thus important to control GET and/or NOTIFY access to these objects and possibly encrypt the values of these objects when sending them over the network via SNMP

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.1** *P* **25** *L* **25** # 258

Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

The note at the bottom of Table 6-1 doesn't really decribe the superscript "a". Or the "M" in the cell for RX mode for the lldpV2Xdot3ConfigGroup has a spurious superscript "a" chanracter.

SuggestedRemedy

Either show the difference between M and M with the superscript "a" or delete the superscropt characters

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
This was copied exactly from IEEE Std 802.1AB-Rev Annex F, which is an approved IEEE Std.
The superscript "a" refers to the footnote. The footnote says that M=Mandatory. It is not necessary to footnote each instance of M, merely just the first. We also follow this convention in IEEE Std 802.3. See, for example, Table 44-1.

Cl **03** *SC* **0** *P* **19** *L* **9** # 259

Rannow, Randy Tyco Electronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

Repeater unit and Trivial repeater unit are defined. What is a "managed" repeater.
Page 19, Line 9:
Chassis - An enclosure for one managed repeater, part of a managed repeater, or several managed repeaters.
. It typically contains an integral power supply and a variable number of available module slots.

Numerous instances (e.g., Page 96, line 56) refer to "managed repeater" and I do not see a definition of "managed repeater".

SuggestedRemedy

[Ed. no suggested remedy provided for this comment.]
[Ed. In a follow up email, commenter asks that managed repeater be defined.]

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add the following definition:
Managed repeater - A repeater as defined by IEEE Std 802.3 incorporating a management entity that complies with the MIB module definition contained in Clause 8 of this document.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.0** *P* **19** *L* **18** # 260

Rannow, Randy Tyco Electronics

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

Page 19, Line 18:
Trivial repeater-unit - An isolated port that can gather statistics.

No "trivial repeater" used except in the definition, yet non-trivial used in multiple instances (e.g., Page 114, line 11).

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest defining non-trivial as this seems more relevant, less trivial.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add a definition for non-trivial repeater:
Non-trivial repeater - A repeater as defined by IEEE Std 802.3 having multiple ports.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.4** *P* **29** *L* **3** # 261

Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The Editor's note is confusing. Is the intent still to provide comments to the reflector or to do it via the ballot process?

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest deleting the editor's note

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the "Comments on the content…" sentence from this and similar editor's notes.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.5** *P* **50** *L* **13** # 262

Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

This section highlights a potential security issue with OAM. While I think there maybe benefit to highlighting that, I am less comfortable with recomendations on how to solve. I would simply highlight the issue and move on

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence that starts with "It should be used in environments"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It should not be used in environments where
this interface information is considered sensitive, and where the facility terminations are unprotected.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **16** *L* **10** # 263

Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *must-shall*

Section 1.4 uses caps for RECOMMENDED and NOT RECOMMENDED throughout. I do not think its stylistically correct to do that. I also believe that the style manual uses the word should: "should equals is recommended that"

SuggestedRemedy

Use the word should instead of RECOMMENDED and do not capitalize the entire word

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 264

Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Suggest changing "Editor's note" to say "Editor's note to be removed prior to publication"

SuggestedRemedy

see comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
At this point, they are all going to be removed prior to publication.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.1** *P* **45** *L* **7** # 265

Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The management capabilites of EFM are no longer "new" at this point.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the word new

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **08A** *SC* *P* *L* # 266
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *order*

I do not believe there is a set way for where an Annex should be located, however, in 802.3 we have the annexes all at the end of each section

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest moving Annex 8A from its current location to after the lettered annexes

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete Annex 8A.
See comment #236.

Cl **03** *SC* *P* *L* # 267
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

It would be helpful if this section was enumerated with sub sections and it was sorted in alphabetical order, especially for future revisions

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Sort the entries in alphabetical order, and cast them as numbered subclauses.

Cl **02** *SC* *P* **17** *L* # 268
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

Some of these references seem pretty dates. Im curious if we should go through and see if these documents still exist and/or if they have been updated.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* # 269
Diab, Wael Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *def*

The term group is defined in 802.3 1.4.181. The definition here refers to 802.3 but redifines the term

SuggestedRemedy

Reference the definition in 802.3 with the section number and only add what pertains to 802.3.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The definitions are not in conflict. The definition in 802.3.1 adds relevant information.
See also the response to comment # 274.

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **35** # 270
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

Module is generally used in a different way in the draft (MIB module).

SuggestedRemedy

Module - A building block in a modular system. In the context of MIBs, a specification of management capabilities related to the system. In the context of a chassis, it typically maps into one ‘slot’; however, the range of configurations may be very large, with several modules entering one slot, or one module covering several slots.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Use the suggested text, with the following change:
"...In the context of the MIB modules…"

Cl **04** *SC* *P* **21** *L* # 271
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

Missing acronyms

SuggestedRemedy

ASCII, IANA, IFG, LLDP, LLPDU, MIB, MTU, OAMPDU, OID, PDU, ROM, SDH, SONET, SMI, SNMP, TLV, WIS

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #79.

Cl **07** *SC* **7.2.4** *P* **46** *L* **60** # 272

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Remove hypenation at end of line.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Change the paragraph format pagination attributes to "don't hyphenate".

Cl **07** *SC* **7.3** *P* **49** *L* **30** # 273

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Incorrect assertion, perhaps only true for EFM. Need to add OAM to sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

...managed OAM objects...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"…OAM managed objects…"
And decapitalize "Module".

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **20** # 274

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

Group is not used uniquely in the draft. It is used as defined here and also for MIB groups (OAM module).

SuggestedRemedy

Either delete or define for both contexts.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Preface the existing definition with: "Within the context of the repeater management MIB module defined in Clause 8:"
Otherwise, the word has its ordinary meaning (noun: an assemblage of objects regarded as a unit).

Cl **08A** *SC* *P* **137** *L* # 275

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *order*

Out of order.

SuggestedRemedy

Move to Annexes

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete this annex.
See the response to comment # 236.

Cl **99** *SC* *P* **11** *L* **8** # 276

Grow, Robert Intel

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

Line wrap problem caused by breaking hyphen in title.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with breaking hyphen in clause 14 title or optionally retain as comment to be passed to publication editor if only fixed at publication. Also line 53 (36.7 title).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **14** *L* **1** # 277

Grow, Robert Intel

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

Problems with base boilerplate?

These are changes, not revisions as indicated in the title.

The EDITORIAL NOTE is mostly redundant with the first paragraph of the following NOTE. My recommendation is to simply add a sentence describing the source of base text to the first paragraph of the NOTE and to eliminate the EDITORIAL NOTE (the first sentence of which uses the archaic term suplement and refers to our standard as a draft).

Though a useful convention, the use of dark blue for a cross reference external to the amendment, color (last time I checked) couldn't be used to have any significance in publication.

SuggestedRemedy

Line 1 -- Changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2008

Line 4 -- Delete EDITORIAL NOTE

Line 8 -- Insert new sentence at end of paragraph: "Unless otherwise indicated in the editing instruction, the base text in this amendment is from IEEE Std 802.3-2008."

It would be useful to have a determination from IEEE publication staff on what to do about the problem of external references (one more thing that would not have to be worried about if amendments and corrigenda were be published as editions rather than separately published).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4** *P* **14** *L* **30** # 278

Grow, Robert Intel

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

Unlike some other modes, Low Power Idle Mode is defined for a liited set of PHY types. Need to say so.

SuggestedRemedy

An optional mode defined for selected PHY types intended ...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **14** *SC* *P* **15** *L* **5** # 279

Grow, Robert Intel

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

The title isn't change marked (not shown as the instruction indicates), to not mark, it would need to be a Replace instruction.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change mark or change the editing instruction.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.10.3** *P* **21** *L* **11** # 280

Grow, Robert Intel

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

The introductory text to the PICS table item in this subclause needs to be modified with this approach.

SuggestedRemedy

Change introductory sentence to read: Check Y [ ] if the MAU identified in the previous subclause implements either 10BASE-T or 10BASE-Te;
check N [ ] if otherwise and attach an explanation.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.10.4.5.12** *P* **21** *L* **29** # 281

Grow, Robert Intel

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

Follow style guide or renumber? This one is a strong case for numbering TS1a rather than renumbering.

SuggestedRemedy

In harmonization with other amendments per decision of the WG Chair, I believe this should be renumbered as TS1a with the editing instruction modified to read: Change TS1 also inserting TS1a as follows:

Make consistent changes for 14.10.4.7.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 282
Grow, Robert Intel

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

Were almost there, but still have some inconsistent capitalization and usage of terms within the amendment for EEE's most significant capability -- LPI. It seems the most consistent uses are that EEE is the general function or capability, LPI is something signaled within a DTE or to a link partner, which can cause a device to enter LPI mode. Suggested edits are based on these assumptions. (If they are wrong, then different edits would be required and perhaps to locations other than those suggested.)

SuggestedRemedy

p,13,l.20 - should be "Low Power Idle (LPI)" [delete Mode]
p.14,l.30 - should be "Low Power Idle A signal sent to request entry into a power save mode, that may be ..."
p.31,l.35 - "... through the signaling of Low Power Idle ..."
p.50,l.25 - "with Low Power Idle (LPI) mode."
p.154,l.44 -

Proposed Response *Response Status* **Z**

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl **99** *SC* **Abstract** *P* **2** *L* **5** # 283
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Could be better written for longevity, 'recent' is relative.

SuggestedRemedy

'as well as extensions for subsequent amendments'
or
'as well as extensions for additions'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
...as well as extensions resulting from amendments…

Cl **99** *SC* **Contents** *P* **9** *L* **1** # 284
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Unnecessary page break

SuggestedRemedy

Remove

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will be fixed in a future version of the draft.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **3** *L* **10** # 285
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *front*

Need introduction prior to Sponsor Ballot. Other suggestions noted below.

SuggestedRemedy

WG Chair needs to provide. I'm sure the WG Chair will highlight how 802.3.1 supports management of Ethernet as defined in IEEE Std 802.3-2008, as amended by 802.3bc (ballot announcement isn't a bad start). Include Downloads section (page iv) perhaps with a stronger than typical reference for downloadable modules, (don't just cut and paste the one from 802.3). It will be individually balloted (page v). SASB information (page vi) is obsolete, publication editor should fix (not worth correcting now unless we are very confident of approval this year).

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Front matter is under the contol of the WG chair and the IEEE staff editor, it is not part of the draft standard, not part of the approved standard. It is not a valid basis for disapprove comments.
Insert the following text (which should look very familiar to the commenter) in the beginning of the front matter, at the beginning of the introduction:
"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): This front matter is provided for comment only. Front matter is not part of a published standard and is therefore, not part of the draft standard. You are invited to review and comment on it as it will be included in the published standard after approval."

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **6** # 286

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

'this memo'???

SuggestedRemedy

It this standard, or or if refering to SMI needs a less ambiguous reference to the first sentence. Search on memo (13 occurances) and make appropriate changes for context.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
It's supposed to refer to this document.
Some of the occurences of "memo" are used in conjunction with reserved words (must, may, recommended, etc). While searching and destroying "memo", take care to resolve the reserved word usage conflicts first.
See response to comment # 232

Cl **02** *SC* *P* **17** *L* **20** # 287

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

If this was included because the patents were considered essential, we should probably contact PatCom.

SuggestedRemedy

Refer question to PatCom on listing of patents.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
The Working Group chair is in process of seeking LoAs. Perhaps the Working Group chair could also bring this matter up with the PatCom chair, or perhaps the commenter could bring this matter to the attention of the SASB chair for advice?

Cl **02** *SC* *P* **17** *L* **25** # 288

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

Consider undated reference to the 802 standards we expect to track. It would be better with the introductory text we use in 802.3, than the standard text if dated references are retained.

SuggestedRemedy

Make Std 802, Std 802.1D and Std 802.3 undated.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See also the response to comment # 77.

Cl **02** *SC* *P* **17** *L* **57** # 289

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

Has WG Chair sent an LOA request for these patents?

SuggestedRemedy

I'd retain the reference unless PatCom indicates a received LOA supercedes the RFC.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The Working Group chair has solicited an LoA.
See also the response to comment #244

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **4** # 290

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *ref*

I believe the 'Authoritive' has been dropped from the title, and bad Bibliography reference (Biblography is Annex A).

SuggestedRemedy

Add Dictionary to Bibliography, and number Annex A references (e.g., [A1]).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comment #245.

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **7** # 291

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *def*

Definition for system seems rather limited and only relevant to one MIB module. I assume it was pulled from the repeater module. Usually 'system' is qualified, for example there are many uses of management system and managed system. The dot3Loc attributes seem to consistently qualify (local system), as do the dot3Rem attributes (remote system). The various EPON modules use system essentially in the same way as the repeater module. The use of 'system' in GDMO is not consistent, but seem to be part of complex names.

SuggestedRemedy

System - An entity compliant with one or more MIB modules of this standard.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **11** # 292

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Superflous period.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **03** *SC* *P* **19** *L* **20** # 293

Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Ambiguous 'IEEE 802.3 management standard'. I assume this was refering to Clause 30 when in the IETF document.

SuggestedRemedy

Add more precise pointer.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replace "...defined by the IEEE 802.3 management standard…" with "...defined in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 30…"

Cl **06** *SC* **6.3** *P* **28** *L* **14** # 294

D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

considered to be "sensitive of vulnerable" in some network environments - looks like a typo

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "sensitive or vulnerable"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
See the response to comment # 216.

Cl **06** *SC* **6.2** *P* **26** *L* **9** # 295

Barnette, Jim Vitesse Semiconducto

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *abb*

LLPDUs is undefined and probably mis-spelled

SuggestedRemedy

Probably intended LLDPUs which still requires definition

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Should actually be LLDPDU, which will be expanded in the list of abbreviations as Logical Link Discovery Protocol Data Unit

Cl **14** *SC* **14.3** *P* **355** *L* **50** # 296

Barnette, Jim Vitesse Semiconducto

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Bulleted list formatting incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "i) o " with a proper bullet paragraph format.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 297

Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *scope*

Coordinate the changes to managed objects specified in other 802.3 amendment projects that are already in sponsor ballot (for example P802.3az and P802.3bd)
These 802.3 amendments may be approved before P802.3.1 and hence the changes may impact P802.3.1 document.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The project objectives, which were approved by a unanimous vote of the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group on 13-Nov-2008, limit the set of amendments that will be included in the initial version of P802.3.1 to 802.3an, 802.3ap, 802.3aq, and 802.3as. See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov08/frazier_3_1108.pdf

As has been presented on numerous occasions, updates resulting from 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, 802.3ba will be considered in a future amendment to 802.3.1, tentatively identified as P802.3.1a. The rationale for this decision is that we had to draw the line somewhere for the current project, and we chose to draw it to include only those amendments to IEEE Std 802.3 that were approved as standards at the time the P802.3.1 PAR was approved.

Cl **14** *SC* *P* **351** *L* **1** # 298

Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *scope*

Clause 14 Ethernet MAU MIB module does not include the changes needed to support managed objects for 40 and 100 Gb/s MAUs. Since P802.3ba final draft is expected to be ratified by Jun'10, we should include the managed objects and changes needed to support 40 and 100 Gb/s MAUs (see Clause 30 in P802.3ba-D3.2).

SuggestedRemedy

Include managed objects and changes to existing managed objects required to support 40 Gb/s and 100 Gb/s (as specified in P802.3ba). Could be applicable to Clause 14 and other clauses/annexes (e.g Annex B and Annex C).

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The project objectives, which were approved by a unanimous vote of the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group on 13-Nov-2008, limit the set of amendments that will be included in the initial version of P802.3.1 to 802.3an, 802.3ap, 802.3aq, and 802.3as. See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov08/frazier_3_1108.pdf
As has been presented on numerous occasions, updates resulting from 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, 802.3ba will be considered in a future amendment to 802.3.1, tentatively identified as P802.3.1a. The rationale for this decision is that we had to draw the line somewhere for the current project, and we chose to draw it to include only those amendments to IEEE Std 802.3 that were approved as standards at the time the P802.3.1 PAR was approved.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **370** *L* **4** # 299

Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *scope*

Update ifMauFECMode object description as per changes specified in 30.5.1.1.14 (see P802.3ba-D3.2)

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The project objectives, which were approved by a unanimous vote of the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group on 13-Nov-2008, limit the set of amendments that will be included in the initial version of P802.3.1 to 802.3an, 802.3ap, 802.3aq, and 802.3as. See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov08/frazier_3_1108.pdf
As has been presented on numerous occasions, updates resulting from 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, 802.3ba will be considered in a future amendment to 802.3.1, tentatively identified as P802.3.1a. The rationale for this decision is that we had to draw the line somewhere for the current project, and we chose to draw it to include only those amendments to IEEE Std 802.3 that were approved as standards at the time the P802.3.1 PAR was approved.

Cl **14** *SC* **14.5** *P* **370** *L* **10** # 300

Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *scope*

Update ifMauFECCorrectedBlocks object description as per changes specified in 30.5.1.15 (see P802.3ba-D3.2)

Update ifMauFECUnCorrectableBlocks object description as per changes specified in 30.5.1.15 (see P802.3ba-D3.2)

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The project objectives, which were approved by a unanimous vote of the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group on 13-Nov-2008, limit the set of amendments that will be included in the initial version of P802.3.1 to 802.3an, 802.3ap, 802.3aq, and 802.3as. See: http://www.ieee802.org/3/minutes/nov08/frazier_3_1108.pdf
As has been presented on numerous occasions, updates resulting from 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, 802.3ba will be considered in a future amendment to 802.3.1, tentatively identified as P802.3.1a. The rationale for this decision is that we had to draw the line somewhere for the current project, and we chose to draw it to include only those amendments to IEEE Std 802.3 that were approved as standards at the time the P802.3.1 PAR was approved.