Cl **09**   *SC* **9.1.3**   *P* **151**   *L* **43**   # **86**

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

Management Architecture should be "Management architecture". There are many other spurious capitals, although I notice Clause 6 has been cleaned up. I've made this an ER because there are so many (look at the contents).

SuggestedRemedy

Please fix this and other similar examples throughout the document.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **36**   # **87**

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

Supporting Dan Romascanu's comment "I could not figure out the logic of the order of the inclusion of the MIB modules."

SuggestedRemedy

Whether you change the order or not, add text somewhere in Clause 1 (it could be a new "1.5 Organization of this standard" to tell the reader what's going on and where to find things.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

REJECT.
There is no concensus to change the order of the modules. Introductory text would be considered if it were contributed. The table of contents provides an outline of the document.

Cl **00**   *SC* **0**   *P* **1**   *L* **41**   # **89**

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

This draft of 802.3.1 has virtually no material to set the context or explain what it is about. No explanation of MIBs or SNMP, although there are a few references to IETF documents.

The introductory material for individual clauses ranges from two lines to 8 pages. It is extremely unbalanced and very lacking for "mainstream" Ethernet port types.
5. Ethernet logical link discovery protocol (LLDP) extension MIB module
has only two lines to set the context and explain what LLDP extension is about.
6. Ethernet operations, administration, and maintenance (OAM) MIB module
has a page and a half.
7. Ethernet repeater device MIB module
has half a page, which don't say what a repeater or repeater device is or how it works, but do provide references.
8. Ethernet data terminal equipment (DTE) power via medium dependent interface (MDI) MIB module
has a couple of paragraphs, doesn't have a reference to PoE.
9. Ethernet passive optical networks (EPON) MIB module
has 8 pages! Including a complete general-purpose teach-in for 1G-EPON.
10. Ethernet-like interface MIB module
has just two paragraphs,
"This clause defines a portion of the Management Information Base (MIB) for use with network management protocols in the Internet community. In particular, it defines objects for managing Ethernet-like interfaces.
Instances of these object types represent attributes of an interface to an Ethernet-like communications medium." No scope, no references, no background, architecture or meaningful introduction. Compare Clause 9.
11. Ethernet in the first mile copper (EFMCu) interfaces MIB module
has 1/3 page.
12. Ethernet wide area network (WAN) interface sublayer (WIS) MIB module
has 1/3 page.
13. Ethernet medium attachment units (MAUs) MIB module
has 1/3 page, containing a little useful history, but no primer on MAUs, CSMA/CD, 802.3 port types, network topology, ...

SuggestedRemedy

Originally I intended to abstain on this draft standard because I did not know what it was about. Now, I am voting against, because the draft fails to give the reader a reasonable chance to learn what it is about, what the scope and purpose of the overall document is, and of the individual clauses. The whole document needs an introduction, not just a description of document rearrangements. Clauses 10 and 13 need introductions. The balance between different clauses should be improved.

Response   *Response Status*   **W**

REJECT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open   W/written   C/closed   U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 1 of 4
Comment ID # **89**   7/16/2010 1:26:31 PM

The EPON text serves to educate users who may not be as familiar with this newer technology as they are with point to point or CSMA/CD Ethernet.

This standard is intended to be used by implementers of SMIv2 MIB modules for use with the SNMP network management protocol. Therefore, it should not be necessary to provide tutorial information about MIBs or SMIv2, or SNMP, especially since the normative references and bibliography provide ample background material.

Cl **13**   *SC* **13.1**   *P* **359**   *L* **9**   # 98

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

What is this clause for? As we use "MAU type" for all 802.3 port types, does this clause apply to all Ethernet ports? Does 10 apply to some and 13 to others? Or what?

SuggestedRemedy

Please explain.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Clause 10 applies to the MAC sublayer, and Clause 13 applies to the PHY. Clause 13 applies to all Ethernet ports. Clause 10 applies to all Ethernet DTEs, while Clause 7 applies to repeaters.

The SNMP-based network management community understands the word "interface" to mean the "network interface device or controller (e.g. a NIC) residing below the internet protocol (IP)." It is more than a dividing line between sublayers, or the MDI that appears on the bulkhead of a pice of equipment.

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **46**   # 99

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

Text says "This standard contains the Management Information Base (MIB) module specifications for IEEE Std 802.3, also known as Ethernet." That means all of 802.3, including all recent amendments (the entry in 2. Normative references is undated). Also it says "...as well as extensions resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3." Yet response to e.g. D2.0 comments 190 and 297 say e.g. "updates resulting from 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, 802.3ba will be considered in a future amendment to 802.3.1".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "as well as extensions resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3." Insert "This standard addresses the published 802.3-2008 [and 802.3xx if any amendments since 802.3-2008 are indeed included]. It does not address 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, or 802.3ba."
Date the reference to 802.3 in Clause 2. It wouild be as well to list what's in and what's out there also.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The scope statement exactly matches the approved PAR. The scope statement was written so as not to require modification for each amendment to P802.3.1. The list of recent amendments to 802.3 that are included in the scope of the initial version of P802.3.1 was approved at the time the PAR was approved, and is reflected in the project objectives.

Cl **99**   *SC* **99**   *P* **2**   *L*   # 100

Dawe, Piers   IPtronics

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

Abstract says "This standard contains the Management Information Base (MIB) module specifications for IEEE Std 802.3, also known as Ethernet." That means all of 802.3, including all recent amendments (the entry in 2. Normative references is undated). Also it says "...as well as extensions resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3." Yet response to e.g. D2.0 comments 190 and 297 say e.g. "updates resulting from 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, 802.3ba will be considered in a future amendment to 802.3.1".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "as well as extensions resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3." Insert "This standard addresses the published 802.3-2008 [and 802.3xx if any amendments since 802.3-2008 are indeed included]. It does not address 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, or 802.3ba."

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The abstract is intended to be timeless, and not require updating every time the standard is amended.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID   Comment ID # **100**   Page 2 of 4

7/16/2010 1:26:31 PM

Cl **01**   *SC* **1.1**   *P* **13**   *L* **46**   # 108
Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI

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

The scope statement doesn't line up withe the statement in the preceding paragraph. Specifically, the previous paragraph says the standard "supersedes ...802.1AB-2009 Annex F" but the scope doesn't reflect that.

SuggestedRemedy

Not precisely sure, but I think the correct corrective text would show up in the 2nd sentence as "as well as extensions [specified in 802.1AB] resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3."

(or is it the case that this doesn't supersede 802.1AB, but rather that was done by 802.3at? It's all so confusing. I've lost track.)

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
IEEE Std 802.3bc incorporated some of the material from IEEE Std 802.1AB-2009 Annex F into Clause 79. IEEE P802.3.1 incorporates the remaining material from Annex F (i.e. the SMIv2 MIB module).
Thus, P802.3.1 is intended to supersede and make obsolete Annex F.
Changing the scope statement would require a change to the PAR, which doesn't seem warranted, since the inclusion of the LLDP extension MIB module can fall under the scope of "extensions resulting from recent amendments".

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.2**   *P* **17**   *L* **11**   # 111
Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI

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

The definition of "Chassis" is badly out of date. It needs to be expanded so that we can use it to reflect current product technology. Repeaters have gone away (though I have no particular objection to keeping them as a portion of the definition). Chassis are used these days for containing systems that contain multiple instances of 802.3 interfaces (MACs and their associated PHYs) that are configured as bridges/switches and/or various flavors of servers.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggested strawman:
3.2 Chassis - An enclosure for one managed repeater, bridge or networked system, part of a managed repeater, bridge or networked system, or several instances therof.
It typically contains an integral power supply and a variable number of available module slots.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the definition. See also the response to comment #13

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.3**   *P* **17**   *L* **15**   # 112
Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI

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

The definition of "Group" needs to be updated along with the definition of Chassis as outlined in a previous comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Response   *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
No suggested remedy provided.
See response to comments #111 and #13

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.10**   *P* **17**   *L* **48**   # 114
Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI

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

The term "CV" does not appear in the abbreviations section

SuggestedRemedy

Add "CV" to abbreviations or expand the term in the definition.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Expand CV to "coding violations".

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID

Page 3 of 4

Comment ID # **114**   7/16/2010 1:26:31 PM

Cl **03**   *SC* **3.17**   *P* **18**   *L* **18**   # **115**

Thompson, Geoff   GraCaSI

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

    This def'n is also badly out of date and needs to be updated in parallel with the update to the definition of Chassis.

SuggestedRemedy

    Strawman proposal:
    3.17 System interconnect segment - An internal segment allowing interconnection of ports belonging to different physical entities into the same logical manageable repeater, bridge or networked system. Examples of implementation might be backplane busses in modular hubs, or chaining cables in stacks of bridges/switches. It is not uncommon fo such segments to be a proprietary implementation.

Response   *Response Status* **W**

    ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
    3.17 System interconnect segment - An internal segment allowing interconnection of ports belonging to different physical entities into the same logical managed repeater, bridge or other system. Examples of implementation might be backplane busses in modular hubs, or chaining cables in stacks of bridges/switches. It is not uncommon for such segments to be a proprietary implementation.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID   *Comment ID #* **115**

Page 4 of 4
7/16/2010 1:26:31 PM