

preliminary

IIEEP802.3.1a D2.0 MIB definitions for Ethernet Initial Sponsor ballot comments

comments

Cl 00 SC P L # [REDACTED]
NoName

Comment Type ER Comment Status D MEC

From MEC:
ACTION: Please update the front matter with the following new patent statement

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 02 SC P L # [REDACTED]
NoName

Comment Type ER Comment Status D MEC

From MEC:
ACTION: Please review the sources in Clause 2 and make sure that all are being cited normatively within the text of the standard. Currently, "ISO/IEC 10165-4:1992, Information technology—Open Systems Interconnection—Structure of management information—Part 4: Guidelines for the definition of managed objects" is not referenced within the standard.
Please determine whether this should be moved to the bibliography.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 02 SC 2 P 19 L 29 # i-31
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Title of the document changed with 2012 revision

SuggestedRemedy

IEEE Standard for Ethernet

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 02 SC 2 P 19 L 39 # i-32
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Style problem

SuggestedRemedy

IETF document titles should not be in italics.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
IEEE Staff editors have allowed this to go through MEC twice, and publication once.

Cl 02 SC 2 P 19 L 64 # i-1
Fieldsend, Andrew Not Applicable (N/A)

Comment Type G Comment Status D

In note 5, why not say that the RFCs are available online from the IETF itself, as the original source?

SuggestedRemedy

Change note 5 to reference <http://www.ietf.org/rfc.html> instead of <ftp://venera.isi.edu>.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 05 SC 5 P 365 L 40 # i-30
Kim, Yongbum Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type G Comment Status D

Uncomment this line 40 and lines 41, 42, 43, REVISION and DESCRIPTION,
The current best practice is to preserve all REVISIONS-DESCRIPTIONS history in reverse chronological order.

SuggestedRemedy

Uncomment this line 40 and lines 41, 42, 43, REVISION and DESCRIPTION, and move it below current revision and description that starts at line 45 for consistency to recent 802 MIB practices.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Lather, rinse repeat for other MIB modules.

Cl 05 SC 5.4 P 33 L 26 # i-11
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In the lldpV2Xdot3PortConfigTLVsTxEnable object the description states that 'The bit 0 is not used since there is no corresponding subtype.' yet the next sentence states 'The bit 'macPhyConfigStatus(0)' indicates that the LLDP agent should transmit 'MAC/PHY configuration/status TLV.' which appears to define bit 0.

SuggestedRemedy

If bit 0 is in use delete the statement that bit 0 is not used.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 07 SC 7.3 P 110 L 10 # i-2
Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This says "This statistic provides one of the parameters necessary for obtaining the packet error rate."

However, the readable frames would not be needed to find the errored packets per unit time (error rate). This is needed for the packet error ratio (in the same way that BER stands for bit error ratio).

Same issue on page 121 line 12.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"packet error rate." to:
"packet error ratio."

Make the same change on page 121 line 12

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 08 SC 8.2 P 143 L 16 # i-4
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In a number of locations in this Clause the term 'powered Ethernet' is used although the Clause title uses the correct IEEE 802.3 terminology 'DTE Power via MDI'.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that 'powered Ethernet' is replaced by 'DTE Power via MDI'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 08 SC 8.2 P 143 L 32 # i-5
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Suggest a better term to use that 'boxes' would be 'devices' as is used in the previous sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '.. in a PSE device. Ethernet switches are one example of boxes that ..' should be changed to read '.. in a PSE device. Ethernet switches are one example of devices that ..'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 08 SC 8.2 P 143 L 32 # i-12
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Suggest a better term to use that 'boxes' would be 'devices' as is used in the previous sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest that '.. in a PSE device. Ethernet switches are one example of boxes that ..' should be changed to read '.. in a PSE device. Ethernet switches are one example of devices that ..'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 08 SC 8.3 P 143 L 28 # i-6
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Suggest that a better term to use that 'mid-span boxes' would simply be midspans (see IEEE Std 802.3-2012 subclause 1.4.259).

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the text '.. and mid-span boxes.' Be change to read ' and midspans.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 08 **SC 8.5** **P 145** **L 37** # **i-7**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 Correct reference to IEEE 802.af (sic) in description, suggest it be updated to IEEE Std 802.3-2012 Clause 33.

SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest 'The MIB module for managing Power Source Equipment(PSE) working according to the IEEE 802.af Powered Ethernet (DTE Power via MDI) standard.' be updated to read '.. The MIB module for managing Power Source Equipment(PSE) specifies in IEEE Std 802.3-2012 Clause 33.'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 08 **SC 8.5** **P 146** **L 1** # **i-8**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Power Source Entity should be Power Source Equipment

SuggestedRemedy
 Change ' Power Source Entity' to read 'Power Source Equipment'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 08 **SC 8.5** **P 146** **L 55** # **i-13**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Suggest that '... module in the rack ...' should read '... module in a rack ...'

SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 08 **SC 8.5** **P 151** **L 14** # **i-14**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Suggest a better term to use that 'boxes' would be 'devices'.

SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest that '.. one example of boxes that ..' should be changed to read '.. one example of devices that ..'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 09 SC 9.1.1.6 P 160 L 62 # [REDACTED]
Berger, Catherine

Comment Type ER Comment Status D MEC

From MEC:

ACTION: 5 instances of ensure, 1 instance of assure, 5 instances of guarantee, and 20 instances of always are found within the text. Please review all instance and reword accordingly.

- Please review the text for any explicit or implicit guarantees made within the document, especially those that are safety-related. Avoid making guarantees if there is a possibility of unforeseen situations or circumstances altering an outcome. For example, words such as "ensure," "guarantee," "maximize," "minimize," etc., should be modified, if they are inaccurate. Substitutions might include "reduce" or "improve." For example, "to ensure safety" might be changed to "to improve safety" or "to prevent" might be changed to "to reduce."

For example, in 9.1.1.6, the sentence "This guarantees that..." could be changed to "This helps guarantee that..."

SuggestedRemedy

Review all instances and reword accordingly.

ensure: P16, L 53
ensure: P267, L60
ensure: P279, L34
ensure: P376, L15
ensure: P386, L43
assure: not found
guarantee: P159, L38
guarantee: P160, L63
guarantee: P160, L64
guarantee: P162, L61
guaranteed: P163, L13
always: P63, L26
always: P63, L61
always: P66, L12
always: P84, L63
always: P85, L21
always: P107, L24
always: P159, L7
always: P224, L47
always: P248, L7
always: P278, L38
always: P280, L42
always: P310, L48
always: P319, L34
always: P369, L25
always: P369, L52
always: P370, L16

always: P374, L41
always: P374, L64
always: P375, L21
always: P376, L60

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 10 SC 10.2.4 P 230 L 63 # i-26
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The attribute aSlowProtocolFrameLimit should be listed in Table 10-2 'Mapping of IEEE 802.3 managed objects.'

SuggestedRemedy

Add aSlowProtocolFrameLimit to Table 10-2 between aMaxFrameLength and aMulticastFramesXmittedOK.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

CI 11 SC 11.5 P 275 L 24 # i-3
Romascanu, Dan Avaya Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In the MIB module refered in Section 11.5 the MIB module that defines the IEEE8023-IF-CAP-STACK-MIB needs to be replaced with a reference to the IETF Internet-Draft <http://www.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-opsawg-rfc5066bis-01.txt>. This is in accordance to the decision of the coordination team between the IEEE 802 and the IETF leadership to continue to maintenance of this part of RFC 5066 by the IETF, as documented in Section 7.4 in <http://www.ietf.org/iesg/ieee/20121217/coordination-04.txt>

SuggestedRemedy

In the MIB ASCII text replace the IEEE8023-IF-CAP-STACK-MIB module definition with a note that points to the IETF Internet-Draft <http://www.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-opsawg-rfc5066bis-01.txt>

- Strike out any mention of IEEE8023-IF-CAP-STACK-MIB objects from the rest of the document.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 399** **L 36** # **i-10**
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

As stated in IEEE Std 802.3-2012 subclause 57.6.1 '.. Variable Branches may reference attributes, objects or packages. If an object or package is referenced, only the attributes within the object or package shall be found within the Variable Container. Actions shall not be found within Variable Containers.'. Based on this it seems that only attributes, objects and packages need to be listed in Table B-1 'Branch and leaf assignments for managed objects'.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider listing only attributes, objects and packages in Table B-1 'Branch and leaf assignments for managed objects' and delete entries for actions (for example acInitializeMAC, page 401, line 11), notifications (for example nRepeaterHealth, page 405, line 30), name bindings (for example nbMACName, page 416, line 30)

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 399** **L 43** # **i-9**
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Suggest that the 'Type' column should read 'OBJECT' for objects such as oMAC Entity.

SuggestedRemedy

Add 'OBJECT' to the 'Type' column for all objects entries in Table B-1 'Branch and leaf assignments for managed objects'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 412** **L 39** # **i-27**
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

Shouldn't the attributes aPSEActualPower, aPSEPowerAccuracy and aPSECumulativeEnergy be listed as part of the oPSE managed object class on page 412 since according to IEEE Std 802.3-2012 Table 30-4 'DTE Power via MDI capabilities' they are part of that object.

SuggestedRemedy

Move aPSEActualPower, aPSEPowerAccuracy and aPSECumulativeEnergy to be listed as part of the oPSE, between acPSEAdminControl and oMidSpan.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 417** **L 50** # **i-29**
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

I can't find an SNMP object that maps to Clause 30 attributes aLldpXdot3LocPowerType (leaf 358) through aLldpXdot3RemMaxFrameSize (leaf 413).

SuggestedRemedy

Either add a SNMP objects for these attributes or record the reason for exclusion as is done in Table 13-2 'Unmapped IEEE 802.3 managed objects'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The SMIv2 objects corresponding to these attributes can be found in the IEEE8023-DOT3-LLDP-EXT-V2-MIB defined in Clause 5. See for example: lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerType, lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerSource, lldpV2Xdot3LocPowerPriority, lldpV2Xdot3LocPDRRequestedPowerValue, lldpV2Xdot3LocPSEAllocatedPowerValue, lldpV2Xdot3LocResponseTime, lldpV2Xdot3LocReady, lldpV2Xdot3LocReducedOperationPowerValue, etc.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 419** **L 55** # **i-20**
Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

Delete the listing for the attribute aMACControlFunctionsSupported found on page 419 (line 55) allocated the branch of 7 and leaf of 414 since this is a duplicate, the attribute aMACControlFunctionsSupported is already listed on page 401 (line 44) with a branch of 7 and leaf of 93. Note: There seems to be a duplicate entry for aMACControlFunctionsSupported in Table 30-5 'EFM capabilities' in the oOAM managed object class in IEEE Std 802.3-2012, which was also in IEEE Std 802.3-2008. I suspect that this duplicate in IEEE Std 802.3 is what led to the duplicate here, I will submit a maintenance require to correct this in IEEE Std 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete duplicate Table B-1 entry for aMACControlFunctionsSupported.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 419** **L 57** # **i-21**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

Shouldn't the attribute aPFCEnableStatus be listed as part of the oMACControlEntity on page 401 since according to IEEE Std 802.3-2012 Table 30-1b 'Capabilities' it is part of that object.

SuggestedRemedy

Move aPFCEnableStatus to be listed as part of oMACControlEntity, between aUnsupportedOpcodesReceived and oMACControlFunctionEntity.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 420** **L 12** # **i-23**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

The object oEXTENSION (see IEEE Std 802.3-2012 subclause 30.3.8 EXTENSION entity managed object class) needs to be added to Table B-1 'Branch and leaf assignments for managed objects'. Since an object can be used in the Clause 57 OAM variable descriptor it should be added to this table.

SuggestedRemedy

Add oEXTENSION to Table B-1 between aTimeSyncDelayRXmin and aEXTENSIONMACCtrlStatus.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 420** **L 19** # **i-28**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

I can't find an SNMP object that maps to Clause 30 attribute aMPCPRecognizedMulticastIDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Either add a SNMP object for aMPCPRecognizedMulticastIDs or record the reason for exclusion as is done in Table 13-2 'Unmapped IEEE 802.3 managed objects'.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Please review the dot3RecognizedMulticastIDsTable along with its subordinate objects beginning on line 5 of page 217 of 9.6.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 420** **L 22** # **i-24**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

Shouldn't the attribute aSlowProtocolFrameLimit be listed as part of the oMACEntity managed object class oMACControlEntity on page 401 since according to IEEE Std 802.3-2012 Table 30-1a 'Capabilities' it is part of that object.

SuggestedRemedy

Move aSlowProtocolFrameLimit to be listed as part of oMACEntity, between aMaxFrameLength and aMulticastFramesXmittedOK.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl B **SC B.1** **P 420** **L 22** # **i-25**
 Law, David Hewlett-Packard Ltd

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

Shouldn't the attribute aSlowProtocolFrameLimit be listed as part of the oMACEntity managed object class on page 401 since according to IEEE Std 802.3-2012 Table 30-1a 'Capabilities' it is part of that object.

SuggestedRemedy

Move aSlowProtocolFrameLimit to be listed as part of oMACEntity, between aMaxFrameLength and aMulticastFramesXmittedOK.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Would the commenter care to clarify the difference between this comment as his comment #26 (i-24?)?