

Proposed Responses

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

CI **FM** SC **FM** P**9** L**17** # **58**
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**
 Missing list of participants
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fill in the list of participants of the WG ballot
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P**12** L**8** # **68**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** 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,"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Although not part of the actual standard I think these modifications provide additional clarity for the reader.

TFTD

CI **FM** SC **FM** P**12** L**9** # **67**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** 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 Delete ", which subsumed and superseded IEEE Std 802.3anTM-2006, IEEE Std 802.3apTM-2007, IEEE Std 802.3aqTM-2006, and IEEE Std 802.3asTM-2006"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.

With the additions from comment #68 this provides the context on the history of the document.

CI **1** SC **1** P**16** L**50** # **69**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** 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"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 TFTD
 Jon: edit standard dates and remove reference for this revision from 2012

CI **1** SC **1.4** P**18** L**5** # **70**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** 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.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed 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 D
 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.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3 P21 L64 # 71
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/various (self for this)
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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"]"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 TFTD
 Both the original link and the suggested link resolve to the same page "https://innovate.ieee.org/" Do we know the persistent link from IEEE?

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L # 64
 Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 MIB is missing
SuggestedRemedy
 Include MIB in the abbreviations
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED 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 D
 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
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED 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 D
 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"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Perform the indicated changes.

When reviewing this comment the editor noted that the capatilization of the abbreviations section wasn't consistent. TFTD if this is something that should be changed.

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

Proposed 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 D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Jon to add the exact text of the note...

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P39 L33 # 49

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.1 P77 L9 # 66

Schreiner, Stephan Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Missing oxford comma

SuggestedRemedy

insert oxford comma

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6 P82 L1 # 55

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 9 SC 9 P252 L1 # 56

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 9 SC 9.4 P324 L 54 # 57

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communication

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the requested change and add the following editors note:

"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication):

Reference to IEEE Std 802.1D was replaced with IEEE Std 802.1Q per Maintenance

Request 1383 (see

https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1383.pdf)"

Cl 9 SC 9.6 P324 L 54 # 59

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Change the 802.1D to 802.1Q

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Duplicate of Comment #57

The resolution of Comment #57 is:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the requested change and add the following editors note:

"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication):

Reference to IEEE Std 802.1D was replaced with IEEE Std 802.1Q per Maintenance

Request 1383 (see

https://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1383.pdf)"