

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl FM SC FM P9 L17 # 58
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 Missing list of participants
SuggestedRemedy
 Fill in the list of participants of the WG ballot
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl FM SC FM P12 L8 # 68
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
Comment Type E Comment Status A *late*
 We have gotten to the point where saying "the initial version" and "the first revision" and the "second revision" we should just say dates. It will be more relevant, readable, and maintainable.
SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "(IEEE Std 802.3.1-2011)" after "the initial version"
 After "the first revision", insert ", IEEE Std 802.3.1-2013,", and after "this revision", insert ", IEEE Std 802.3.1b-202x,"
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolved as part of Comment # 69
 The Response for Comment #69 is:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See Comment_69_resolution.pdf

Cl FM SC FM P12 L9 # 67
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
Comment Type E Comment Status A *late*
 Not sure that the amendments incorporated into the 802.3-2008 revision have special relevance here (especially as the base standard is left out).
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete ", which subsumed and superseded IEEE Std 802.3anTM-2006, IEEE Std 802.3apTM-2007, IEEE Std 802.3aqTM-2006, and IEEE Std 802.3asTM-2006"
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Resolved with Comment #69
 The Response for Comment #69 is:
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See Comment_69_resolution.pdf

Cl 1 SC 1 P16 L50 # 69
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
Comment Type E Comment Status A *late*
 Editor's note about aligning the scope of the overview may well also apply to the text in the "Introduction" on page 12
SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest to add "and Introduction in frontmatter" after "Text of the Overview"
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See Comment_69_resolution.pdf

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P18 L5 # 70
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
Comment Type E Comment Status A *late*
 Use of the word "may" is that it is replaced by "is/are allowed to be", not "can possibly be". Better to use "could" here, to indicate possibility. (2 instances)
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "may be considered" with "could be considered" on both lines 4 and 14.
Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 2 SC 2 P19 L19 # 52
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The list of normative references contains a lot of tracked changes: underlines and strikethroughs. The clean version should not have them at all.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please remove any underline and strikethrough markup in the clean version of the document. They were not present in the published version of 802.3.1-2013. The same comment applies also to Clause 3.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.
 Need to work on this as the footnotes I'm unable to remove the underline

Cl 3 SC 3 P21 L64 # 71
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
 Comment Type E Comment Status A late
 The link to the IEEE Standards Dictionary Online (both the hyperlink and the text) are incorrect. (they go to the IEEE innovate page, which is IEEE Explore and has no mention of the dictionary)
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the link with
 "http://www.ieee.org/portal/innovate/products/standard/dictionary.html]"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use the same link that is used in IEEE Std 802.3-2022, footnote 31.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L # 64
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 MIB is missing
SuggestedRemedy
 Include MIB in the abbreviations
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add "MIB | Management Information Base" in alphabetical order in the abbreviations section.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L9 # 60
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status R
 Atn is mentioned as abbreviation, but i could not find it as a "stand alone word" in the document. On some places it is used in conjunction with other abbreviations e.g. "efmCuPmeLineAtnCrossing"
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove Atn from abbreviations list
 Response Response Status C
 REJECT.
 As the comment suggest, "Atn" is used in specific names and having this in the abbreviations aides the reader in understanding.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L22 # 61
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 The explanation of EFMCu contains an the abbreviation. Only two abbreviations have another abbreviation in the explanations. EFMCu and SLD. Other abbreviations like LLDP - LLDPDU, MPCP - MPCPDU, OAM - OAMPDU not using the abbreviation in the explanation
SuggestedRemedy
 Change "EFM copper" into "Ethernet in the First Mile copper"; Change "start of LLID delimiter" into "start of logical link identifier delimiter"
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L30 # 62
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 GDMO is mentioned as abbreviation, but i could not find it in the document
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove GDMO from abbreviations list
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L53 # 63
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 From my point of view, Mb/s is an unit and not an abbreviation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either remove "Mb/s" from abbreviations or add "Gb/s" to abbreviations
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Deleted the abbreviation for Mb/s

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L58 # 65
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status A
 MP2PE is mentioned as abbreviation, but i could not find it in the document
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove MP2PE from abbreviations list
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5 P4 L4 # 53
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 All references to 802.1AB are outdated, I think. The latest revision I can track is 802.1AB-2016 (<https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.1AB/6047/>)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace all dated references to 802.1AB with 802.1AB-2016
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove the dated reference to 802.1AB from page 25 line 4.

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P29 L16 # 50
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A
 The URLs pointing to the ASCII version of MIBS are outdated during this revision project and should not be listed for now.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace all URLs containing http://www.ieee802.org/3/1/public/mib_modules ... with editorial note indicating that these will be replaced with actual posted ASCII files once the standard is approved, at which time the MIB file snapshot can be posted online and linked.
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P29 L22 # 51
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 The LLDP MIB URLs are dead at the current location, they need to be replaced with the newest ones posted on 802.1 website, especially since 802.1AB needs to be updated to 2016 release
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace LLDP MIBs with the following URLs:
 any reference to <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-MIB-200906080000Z.txt> with <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-MIB-201603110000Z.mib>
 any reference to <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-TC-MIB-200906080000Z.txt> with <http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/MIBs/LLDP-V2-TC-MIB-201603110000Z.mib>
 Response Response Status C
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1b D1.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 **SC 5.4** **P30** **L34** # **54**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

The MIB module revision date should be aligned with the standard approval date, when it is approved.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert an editorial note to update the revision date for all modules to match the approval date of the standard. This applies to all MIB modules

Insert an editorial note to update the revision description "REVISION "202307310000Z" – July 31, 2023" to match the approval date of the standard. This applies to all MIB modules

These both changes can be done by editorial staff and do not affect the technical content of the MIB

Response **Response Status** **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 5 **SC 5.4** **P39** **L33** # **49**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

Incorrect reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "30.12.2.1.20" to "30.12.2.1.19", which is the correct reference in IEEE Std 802.3-2022

Response **Response Status** **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 6 **SC 6.1** **P77** **L9** # **66**

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

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

Missing oxford comma

SuggestedRemedy

insert oxford comma

Response **Response Status** **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 6 **SC 6.6** **P82** **L1** # **55**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

Inconsistent formatting for MIB

SuggestedRemedy

When comparing MIB format in 5.5 and 6.6, the text in 6.6 seems to be using extra spacing between individual lines.

Please apply the MIB formatting from 5.5 to all MIBs in the document.

Response **Response Status** **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 9 **SC 9** **P252** **L1** # **56**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

Clause 9 is currently highly inconsistent. Introduction text mentions 1GE-EPON only, while MIB implies 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON as supported.

SuggestedRemedy

Since 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON use the same MIB structure (Nx25G-EPON does not), revise Clause 9 as shown in the p802.3.1.b-d1.0-hajduczenia-1.pdf, with the following changes shown:

- generalize the text of introduction to speak of EPON, defined as 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON
- generalize the MIB modules to cover all EPON variants
- update all references mentioning 1G-EPON clauses to cover both 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON alike
- update definition of dot3EponFecPCSCodingViolation, which has evolved in 802.3 over time and has not been updated for a long time

Response **Response Status** **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 9 **SC 9.4** **P324** **L54** # **57**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

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

Stranded reference to 802.1D

SuggestedRemedy

Update to 802.1Q, per Maintenance Request 1383 (see https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1383.pdf) and add a matching editorial note (copy from other locations where the same change was made)

Response **Response Status** **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl 9 SC 9.6 P324 L 54 # 59

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Reference to 802.1D still exists which per maint-1383 should be updated to 802.1Q

SuggestedRemedy

Change the 802.1D to 802.1Q

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Duplicate of Comment #57

The resolution of Comment #57 is:

ACCEPT