Cl **04** *SC* **4** *P* **24** *L* **13** # 117
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

physical layer entity

SuggestedRemedy

Physical Layer entity

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1.6** *P* **318** *L* **14** # 118
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Speling: nonresetable would be something to do with silk (seta) - isn't this to do with setting?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to nonresettable - global search and replace. Also Annex 12A non- resetable

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1.6** *P* **318** *L* **7** # 119
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Uneven font size in Table 12-3

SuggestedRemedy

Should all be 9 point

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.3** *P* **217** *L* **46** # 120
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says "Relation to the IEEE 802.3 MAU MIB", ... "the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 13". Clause 13 is called "Ethernet medium attachment units (MAUs) MIB module".

SuggestedRemedy

1. Be consistent: MIB or MIB module?
2. Use the same name for it every time. If the title of Clause 13 does not give the name of the MIB module concerned, mention it by name in 13.1.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"MAU MIB module".

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1.6** *P* **318** *L* **7** # 121
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Long table not laid out as effectively as it could be.

SuggestedRemedy

Size the first column to the longest word (aSectionSESThreshold), make the second column as wide as allowed. Similarly for Table 10-1.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will try. These tables are a real pain.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **31** # 122
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

This lists IETF STD 58 three times. I could not find IETF STD 58, but IETF's list uses the format "STD 58 (RFC2580)" which slightly reduces the confusion.
If there is no IETF STD 58, why do we (or IETF) mention it?

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IETF STD 58, RFC 2578, IETF STD 58, RFC 2579 and IETF STD 58, RFC 2580" to "IETF STD 58 (RFC 2578), IETF STD 58 (RFC 2579) and IETF STD 58 (RFC 2580)", here and in the references.
If IETF STD 58 exists, add it to the references.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change e.g. IETF STD 58 RFC 2578 to
IETF STD 58 (RFC 2578) on page 16 and in the list of normative references.

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **15** *L* **34** # 123

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

D2 comment 186:
Cross-referencing could be improved.
Please number the normative references 1, 2 and so on and refer to them with hyperlinks [1], [2] and so on.
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.

SuggestedRemedy

Please implement the hyperlinks, so that clicking on "802.3-2008" here takes the reader to p19 line 28, and so on. Then, it would be really nice if clicking on a reference in the reference list opened it; this could be done straightforwardly for IETF and ITU-T documents, and used to be possible between sections of 802.3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
There is an ongoing effort to improve the cross-referencing.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **18** # 124

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Editor's note says "The following references are correct, but the pointers to them in Annex A may need to be included/updated:" But the references in 1.3 are in 2. normative references, not annex A.

SuggestedRemedy

In later sections, please include and update, then remove the editor's note.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Remove the editor's note.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1.6** *P* **318** *L* **4** # 125

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Thanks for cleaning out rogue capitals (D2.1 comment 86). But some remain.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE 802.3 Managed Object" to "IEEE 802.3 managed object", change "How Corresponding SNMP Object Differs" to "How corresponding SNMP object differs".
Change other rogue capitals as they are discovered.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.2.2** *P* **212** *L* **17** # 126

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

10.2.2.3 mentions "the Interfaces MIB"? 10.2.2 p211 has "The Interface MIB defined in IETF RFC 2863" (note no s). 2 has "IETF RFC 2863, The Interfaces Group MIB" (note "Group" inserted).

SuggestedRemedy

Use the same name for the same thing every time, so that the reader can string search for it.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Consistently use
"Interface MIB"

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.2.4** *P* **214** *L* **3** # 127

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Bad terminology "Ethernet interface layer". It's neither interface nor layer.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "To better understand the issues surrounding the mapping of the IF-MIB packet and octet counters to an Ethernet interface, it is useful ... proper interpretation for the Ethernet interface layer." to "To better understand the issues surrounding the mapping of the IF-MIB packet and octet counters to an Ethernet MAC and MAC Control entity, it is useful ... proper interpretation for the Ethernet interface layer.".
In Figure 10-1, change "layer above" to "Sublayer above" (the bottom of the MAC is a full layer boundary, so "layer below" is OK).

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete "layer" from the text.
Change "layer above" to "sublayer above"
at the top of the figure.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.1.1.2** *P* **149** *L* **2** # 128

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Thanks for improving this figure. But the font is too small (it's 7.5 point, and 7 in the key). Minimum font size is 8 point. This figure isn't too crowded so we can use the proper font size.

SuggestedRemedy

Please use bigger font(s), at least 8 point.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.1.1** *P* **147** *L* **23** # 129

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

As noted in D2.1 comment 89, the balance between different clauses should be improved. Most MIB module clauses have next to no explanation of the thing they are managing yet this one has 7 pages, and I doubt that all of it is relevant to management.
Now we could add more than 7 pages of stuff to e.g. Clause 13, describing all the non-EPON physical layers, and several pages to 10, describing CSMA/CD and the Ethernet MAC.

SuggestedRemedy

If there are no volunteers for the above, prune the irrelevant material from 9.1.1. Examples of irrelevances are: basement, wavelength plan, FEC-protected EPON frame structure.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
There is no harm done by the inclusion of the material and it is balloted and approved text.

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **15** *L* **53** # 130

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

This paragraph explains why we are in this mess. But after consideration, I believe must get out it, and this project is our opportunity. An 802.3 standard must use 802.3 terminology, whether any different terminology has been common in the SNMP-based network management community or not (and as this standard with 802.3 defines 802.3 terminology, we now have the power to move on from out-of-date terminology).
802.3 1.1.1 Scope says "This standard defines Ethernet local area, access and metropolitan area networks." - not "Ethernet-like".
802.3.1 title is "IEEE Draft Standard for Management Information Base (MIB) definitions for Ethernet" - not "Ethernet-like".
The PAR scope says "This standard contains the Management Information Base (MIB) module specifications for IEEE Std 802.3, also known as Ethernet." - not "Ethernet-like".
The ballot invitation says "recirculation ballot on IEEE P802.3.1/D2.2 Ethernet MIB" - not "Ethernet-like".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The term "Ethernet-like" is retained in this document because of its common usage in the SNMP-based network management community." to "This standard uses the term "Ethernet" for consistency with IEEE Std 802.3."
and change "Ethernet-like" to "Ethernet" throughout, except for references.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
"Ethernet-like" is appropriately used for the reasons stated in the responses to previous comments, and as explained in the text referenced by the comment. In addition, the MIB module specification can be used to manage interfaces beyond those specified by IEEE 802.3, including interfaces that are
"Ethernet-like", but not Ethernet, as
defined by IEEE Std 802.3.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.18** *P* **22** *L* **19** # 131

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

This is not a definition, and for one document to say what is not in another (without saying where it is) is not helpful:
3.20 Unequipped: This defect is not defined by IEEE Std 802.3. An implementation that supports it should report it by setting the sonetPathUnequipped bit in the appropriate instance of sonetPathCurrentStatus.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change "This defect is not defined by IEEE Std 802.3." to "This defect is defined in ANSI T1.xxx." And/or, as "Unequipped" is not used anywhere else in 802.3.1 it should not be in the definitions, so insert a modification of the second sentence "An implementation that supports the "Unequipped" defect should report it by setting the sonetPathUnequipped bit in the appropriate instance of sonetPathCurrentStatus." in the body of the standard, and remove this definition.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove definition 3.18
Add to 12.1.6:
'An implementation that supports the "Unequipped" defect should report it by setting the sonetPathUnequipped bit in the appropriate instance of sonetPathCurrentStatus.'

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.2.5** *P* **214** *L* **34** # 132

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says "The defined standard MTU for Ethernet-like interfaces is 1500 octets."
Where is this number (1500) specified? The only definitions I can find in this document are 1522, for GEPON.
Where is the definition of MTU? I could not find it in this document or in 802.3 Section 1.
maxBasicFrameSize and maxEnvelopeFrameSize seem to be different. 3.2.7 MAC Client Data field gives a choice of 1500, 1504 or 1982.
If Clause 10 is for the MAC and MAC Control, is 1500 the correct number with Envelope frames? Draft says "This value should reflect the value seen by the MAC client interface."
MTUs shorter than 1500 octets are allowed too.

SuggestedRemedy

Define MTU in relation to Frame Size or MAC Client Data field, or don't use the term MTU.
Add appropriate reference(s).
Change "The defined standard MTU for Ethernet-like interfaces is 1500 octets." to e.g.
"The maximum MAC Client Data field length for most Ethernet port types is 1500 octets for basic frames, 1504 octets for Q-tagged frames and 1982 octets for envelope frames. This may be different for EPON"

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
MTU is expanded in the list of abbreviations.
It has been a well-understood term of the art for at least 30 years.

Cl **12** *SC* **12.1.3** *P* **314** *L* **17** # 133

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says:
"The MAU-MIB is needed in order to allow applications to control and/or determine the media type in use. That is important for devices than can support both the 10GBASE-R 10 Gb/s LAN format (which does not include the WIS) and the 10GBASE-W 10 Gb/s WAN format (which does include the WIS)."
But the difference between S and R is not the media type.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to
"The MAU-MIB is needed in order to allow applications to determine whether a WIS is present, and to control it."

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The comment is on unchanged portions of the text.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.2.4** *P* **214** *L* **2** # 134

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

"Case Diagram [CASE]" This seems to be special terminology for a non-802.3 context - I don't see any definition here.

SuggestedRemedy

Use 802.3 terminology, remove "[CASE]" or define what it means, make the capitalization consistent (text vs. figure title).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"[CASE]" is a pointer to the bibliography that must be updated to [B31]. Change "Diagram" in the text to "diagram".

Cl **01** *SC* **1.2** *P* **16** *L* **13** # 135

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

The explanation in the response to D2.1 comment 98 hasn't been implemented enough. It said "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."
It is necessary to clean this up in the standard (not just the comment database) so that an implementer (of anything) knows which clauses he must read and which are not relevant to what he is trying to implement: see D2.1 comment 89.
Also (D2.1 comment 87) the un-intuitive order of the clauses needs to be documented.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert new
1.3 Organization of this standard
Following the overview, normative references, definitions and abbreviations, eight clauses define MIB modules, ordered downwards through the stack of layers and sublayers, as shown in Table 1.
Insert Table 1, three columns:

Clause in 802.3.1	MIB module	Clause in 802.3
6	Ethernet OAM MIB module	57
7	Ethernet repeater [device?] MIB module	9
8	Ethernet DTE power MIB module	33
9	EPON MIB module	60, 64, 65
10	Ethernet MAC MIB module	4, 31
11	EFMCu MIB module	61, 62, 63
12	Ethernet WIS MIB module	50
13	Ethernet MAU and PHY MIB module	Most other clauses

Insert text:
There are three annexes, a bibliography, a GDMO specification and GDMO/ASN.1 definitions. Ethernet management is defined in 802.3 Clause 30 and the non-deprecated portion of Clause 5.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The suggested remedy essentially duplicates the table of contents, while inaccurately renaming several of the MIB modules. Furthermore, references to the various clauses of IEEE Std 802.3 that pertain to each MIB module are already included in the various clauses of P802.3.1 as necessary.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.3** *P* **217** *L* **46** # 136

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says "Support for the mauModIfCompl3 compliance statement of the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 13 is required for Ethernet-like interfaces. This MIB module is needed in order to allow applications to determine the current MAU type in use by the interface, and to control autonegotiation and duplex mode for the interface.
Implementing this MIB module without implementing the MAU-MIB would leave applications with no standard way to determine the media type in use, and no standard way to control the duplex mode of the interface."
However,
The word "interface" is misused (for 802.3), and not well defined in 802.3.1 - but it a reader might think it means a port.
Management is optional, so none of this is required. Maybe the words in their previous setting had a more constrained context; in an 802.3 document this is too wide.
If the speed is known to be 10G (and in practice, 1G) there is no need to "control the duplex mode of the interface".
Many port types do not have autonegotiation.

SuggestedRemedy

You might say something like "A management entity for an Ethernet port is required to support the mauModIfCompl3 compliance statement of the MAU-MIB module defined in Clause 13."
Change "This MIB module is needed in order to allow applications..." to "This MIB module may be used by applications...".

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
"interface" has a defined meaning in the context of SNMP MIB modules.
The comment is on unchanged portions of the text. See also the response to comment # 140.

Cl **99** *SC* **99** *P* **2** *L* # 137

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Following up D2.1 comment 100.
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". So we have established that the abstract is misleading, and could sucker people into buying an amendment that is no use to them.
Response said "The abstract is intended to be timeless, and not require updating every time the standard is amended."
This is not the case. The abstract has to truthfully reflect the document - for example, the 802.3 abstract contains "speeds of operation from 1 Mb/s to 10 Gb/s" so it is revised as new speeds are added. This document (801.3.1 first edition) isn't timeless, according to the plan it is a discrete step in a journey. When 802.3.1 gets to a stable scope (all of 802.3 including the amendments when last revised) -- then maybe we won't need to update the abstract again.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "as well as extensions resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3." Insert "This standard addresses the published IEEE Std 802.3-2008 and IEEE Std 802.3bc-2009 Amendment 2: Ethernet TLVs, but not 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az, or 802.3ba."

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The text that was added to the introduction on page iii explicitly describes what is included in this standard. The text in the abstract on page ii matches the scope statement from the approved PAR.
There is an error in the introduction, in that IEEE Std 802.3-2008 superceeded the list amendments. This will be corrected in the next draft.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.2.8** *P* **215** *L* **36** # 138

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

A medium is an arrangement of cables or backplane. This table is not about the media, it's about the ports.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 10–1 provides specific implementation guidelines for applying the interface group objects to Ethernet-like media." to "Table 10–1 provides specific implementation guidelines for applying the interface group objects to Ethernet ports."

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
"… to Ethernet-like interfaces."

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.3** *P* **218** *L* **46** # 139

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says "Implementing this MIB module without implementing the MAU-MIB would leave applications with no standard way to determine the media type in use, and no standard way to control the duplex mode of the interface."
The second part is not true: for 10G ports there is nothing to do, it's always full duplex.
As media (being metal, plastic and glass) are not managed anyway, the first part is false also. If it was meant that the "application" (whatever that is) would have no standard way to precisely determine the port type (e.g. is it 10GBASE-SR or 10GBASE-LR) - so what, we have layering so it usually doesn't need to know.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
Both parts of the sentence are true statements.

Cl **10** *SC* **10.2.2.2** *P* **212** *L* **18** # 140

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Specification of ifType in Clause 10 (which seems to be the management of MAC and MAC control) tries to say "All Ethernet-like interfaces shall also implement the MAU-MIB defined in Clause 13." It's quite unacceptable to bury a "shall" for one thing in a subclause about something else.

SuggestedRemedy

If the requirement is appropriate, change "All Ethernet-like interfaces shall also implement" to "Ethernet ports? management agents? are required to implement... (see n.m)" with a cross-reference, and check that there is a "shall" in the appropriate place (Clause 1?). If the requirement is excessive, use "should" or "recommended". Check the draft for any other misplaced shalls.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
It's not a misplaced shall. The following is
an explanation, not an editing instruction:
Anything that implements the Ethernet-like
MIB module shall also implement the MAU-MIB because an SNMP network management system learns things like the port type, operating speed, duplex mode, etc, from the MAU-MIB.
It would be difficult, if not impossible, to perform any useful network management of an Ethernet interface without this information

Cl **10** *SC* **10** *P* **211** *L* **1** # 141

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

The explanation in the response to D2.1 comment 98 hasn't been implemented enough. It said "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."
It is necessary to clean this up so that an implementer (of anything) knows which clauses he must read and which are not relevant to what he is trying to implement: see D2.1 comment 89.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Ethernet-like interface MIB module" to "Ethernet MAC MIB module".
Change "In particular, it defines objects for managing Ethernet-like interfaces." to "In particular, it defines objects for managing Ethernet MACs and the MAC Control sublayer in DTEs."
In 10.2 change "Instances of these object types represent attributes of an interface to an Ethernet-like communications medium." to "Instances of these object types represent attributes of an Ethernet MAC or MAC Control entity."

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The Ethernet-like interface MIB module is
an adjunct of the Interface MIB defined in IETF RFC 2863, and is defined in that context.

Cl **13** *SC* **13** *P* **339** *L* **1** # 142

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

The explanation in the response to D2.1 comment 98 hasn't been implemented enough. It said "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."
It is necessary to clean this up so that an implementer (of anything) knows which clauses he must read and which are not relevant to what he is trying to implement: see D2.1 comment 89.
Note that 802.3 1.4.219 defines MAU as: A device containing an Attachment Unit Interface (AUI), Physical Medium Attachment (PMA), and Medium Dependent Interface (MDI) that is used to connect a repeater or data terminal equipment (DTE) to a transmission medium. From that, I can see that a port type that isn't 10 Mb/s (without an AUI) does not have a MAU, so 13 does not apply - which may not be the intention.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Ethernet medium attachment units (MAUs) MIB module" to "Ethernet MAU and PHY MIB module".
Change "In particular, it defines objects for managing IEEE 802.3 Medium Attachment Units (MAUs)." to "In particular, it defines objects for managing IEEE 802.3 Medium Attachment Units (MAUs) and Physical Layer entities (PHYs). In this clause, the term "MAU" includes PHY if appropriate."

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.
The module in question has been known as the MAU-MIB for decades. It would cause harmful confusion in the user community for this standard to change the name now.

Cl **01** *SC* **1** *P* **15** *L* **42** # 143

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says "This document, as with other documents issued by this working group, reflects a certain stage in the evolution of Ethernet technology." but this is misleading. Draft does not represent the stage of the evolution of Ethernet technology as with other documents issued by this working group, but represents an out-of-date stage, without 802.3av, 802.3ba. Similarly, 1.1 Scope is misleading "This standard contains the MIB module specifications for IEEE Std 802.3 ... as well as extensions resulting from recent amendments to IEEE Std 802.3." The scope contradicts the invitation to ballot, which says "MIB module specifications for IEEE Std 802.3-2008 and IEEE Std 802.3bc-2009 Amendment 2: Ethernet TLVs."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "This standard supports [or is compatible with] IEEE Std 802.3-2008 (as published in 2008) and IEEE Std 802.3bc-2009 Amendment 2: Ethernet TLVs. A futureamendment is expected to support recent amendments of 802.3 including 802.3at, 802.3av, 802.3az and 802.3ba."
or insert this sentence at line 65.
Add 802.3bc to the normative references.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The draft does in fact reflect a certain stage
in the evolution of Ethernet. It reflects the stage identified in the project objectives, and this information is spelled out on page iii of the introduction.

There is an error in the introduction, in that IEEE Std 802.3-2008 superceeded the list amendments. This will be corrected in the next draft.
It is not necessary to add 802.3bc to the
normative references, because the undated reference includes all currently approved amendments.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 144

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

The response to comment 36 against D 2.0 changed several instances of Kbps to Kb/s. However, as per the Suggested Remedy of comment 36, this should use a lower case k for "kilo" rather than upper case.

SuggestedRemedy

As they all seem to be in text or comments, change all 11 instances of "Kb/s" to "kb/s"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **11** *SC* **11.5** *P* **294** *L* **8** # 145

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

In this text, there are three instances of two numbers seperated by a hyphen.
The style manual contains: "Ranges should repeat the unit (e.g., 115 V to 125 V). Dashes should never be used because they can be misconstrued for subtraction signs"
As proposed in the Suggested Remedy for comment 36 against D 2.0, change these ranges to be in a "from x kb/s to y kb/s" format.
Note also, there is another comment regarding usage of kb/s instead of Kb/s.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "data rates 192-2304 Kb/s" to "data rates from 192 kb/s to 2304 kb/s"
Change "rates 2320-3840 Kb/s" to "rates from 2320 kb/s to 3840 kb/s"
Change "and 768-5696 Kb/s" to "and from 768 kb/s to 5696 kb/s"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **09** *SC* **9.3.2** *P* **163** *L* **27** # 146

Anslow, Pete Ciena

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

Comment 35 against D 2.1 changed all instances of "Ether-like" to "Ethernet-like". However, there is one instance of "Ether-like" left in the draft.

Is there some reason that this should not be changed to "Ethernet-like"?

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Ether-like" to "Ethernet-like".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
It was overlooked because of the extra space.

Cl **05** *SC* **5.4** *P* **35** *L* **11** # 147

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Draft says "as listed in IETF RFC 4836 (or subsequent revisions)" but the point of this draft is to replace IETF RFC 4836.

SuggestedRemedy

Here and in next paragraph, give the correct reference within this document. Same on page 39.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.
Change "IETF RFC 4836 (or subsequent revisions)" to "Clause 13".
Also on p35 l17
Also on p39 l37

Cl **03** *SC* **3.16** *P* **22** *L* **4** # 148

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

This definition contains a "shall", which isn't acceptable. Shalls go in the main normative clauses, not definitions.
Also it says "the MIB module defined in this clause" and "object etherWisFarEndPathCurrentStatus defined below": looks like the text has been moved from somewhere else.

SuggestedRemedy

Get rid of the "shall" in the definition. If appropriate, make the requirement in Clause 12.
Give correct reference to where etherWisFarEndPathCurrentStatus is defined.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The subclause is 3.14
This problem was introduced when the definition was moved from Clause 12 to Clause 3.
Delete "defined below."
Change "shall set" to "sets".
Change "this clause" to "Clause 12".

Cl **01** *SC* **1.1** *P* **15** *L* **60** # 149

Dawe, Piers IPtronics

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

Even after recent comment resolution, I cannot see whether this draft tries to impose a standard on some management entity that controls Ethernet port(s), or to impose a standard on those ports. It seems that the requirements are directed at the "agent", which I would think was part of the controlling entity, but the definition for agent says "provides remote access to management instrumentation" which muddies the waters.
D2.1 comment 89 (unsatisfied) tried to get some clarity on this.

SuggestedRemedy

State unambiguously that this standard specifies aspects of a management entity for controlling and monitoring Ethernet port(s), and does not specify the ports or their sublayers themselves (802.3 does that).

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.
The text identified by the comment exactly
matches the scope statement in the approved PAR. In addition, the text is unchanged from the previously balloted and approved text.

The statement "This standard contains the Management Information Base (MIB) module specifications for IEEE Std 802.3, also known as Ethernet." clearly indicates what the standard contains, and how it relates to IEEE Std 802.3.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **6** *L* # 150

NoName

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

David Law provided a list of working group members. Include this in the introduction.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* # 151

NoName

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

Emailed question from Dan Romascanu: why are the names of the MIB root objects inconsistent - i.e.
some end in MIB, a couple end in Mod and one has neither of the suffices?

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
ieeeefmcu is an exception because it isn't the root object of a single module.
Change the name of the root object in Clause 7 from ieee8023snmpRptrMod to ieee8023snmpRptrMIB
Change the name of the root object in Clause 12 from ieee8023mauMod to ieee8023mauMIB