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"
[Ed. RFC 2863 is titled Interfaces Group MIB,
and this is what should be used.]

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* **U**

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

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* **U**

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* **U**

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 **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* **U**

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* **U**

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* **U**

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* **U**

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* **U**

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 listed 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.