

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 123
Romascanu, Dan Avaya

Comment Type ER Comment Status R order

I could not figure out the logic of the order of the inclusion of the MIB modules. Maybe it is explained some place and I missed it.

SuggestedRemedy

As this order will probably stay with the evolution of the document I would suggest to follow the order of the development of the MIB modules - Ethernet Interfaces, Repeater, MAU, PoE, EPON, EFM, WAN, LLDP.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

An attempt was made to follow a "top-down" layering model, wherein modules corresponding to higher layers (e.g. LLDP) are described before modules corresponding to lower layers (e.g. MAU).

This was decided in a Task Force meeting in Quebec City, May 2009. (See also correspondence between the commenter and Geoff Thompson on the reflector).

Straw poll:

Leave it as is - 4

Chronological order (IETF, IEEE going forward) - 4

As the straw poll is evenly divided, there is no consensus for change, therefore the order of clauses will remain as is.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P16 L10 # 124
Romascanu, Dan Avaya

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

I do not think that the generic security considerations section 1.4 serves any useful purpose, as all relevant information is to be found in the specific security considerations sections for each MIB module.

SuggestedRemedy

I suggest to take it out.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The ballot resolution committee feels that the text has value. The commenter is welcome to suggest alternative text.

Cl 12 SC 12.5 P267 L22 # 125
Romascanu, Dan Avaya

Comment Type TR Comment Status A IANA

Did the WG discuss what will happen with modules that are being maintained by IANA? Is the plan to take over the administration and move the registry control under IEEE, or to continue to require IANA to maintain the modules? This will obviously impact the content of the IANA considerations sections like 12.5 or 14.5.

SuggestedRemedy

In any case IANA should be contacted after the WG makes a decision, and the process needs to be confirmed before the final approval of the document.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For discussion in committee. To this point, the assumption has been that we will maintain the status quo regarding the division of labor with IANA, that is IANA continues to maintain IANA MAU-MIB, and we incorporate by reference.

Cl 03 SC 3 P19 L3 # 142
Dawe, Piers IPtronics

Comment Type TR Comment Status A ref

List of definitions of terms must be immediately available to the reader. Draft says "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms [Bn] should be referenced for terms not defined in this clause." But this book is not available on the web and is not free, and relying on it sabotages "Get IEEE 802". The reader is not going to pay \$108.00 on the chance that a book he hasn't seen _might_ define a term in this document.

SuggestedRemedy

List all the terms that need definitions here. If a definition is long or difficult, could refer to a freely available reference e.g. 802.3 or an RFC, but would very much prefer just copying in definitions from other 802 and IETF documents as needed. Delete the sentence.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It's part of the boilerplate given to us by the SA.

IEEE Std 802.3 is already incorporated in the list of normative references.

See response to #245

Cl 99 SC P3 L # 238
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status R front
No introduction has been supplied

SuggestedRemedy

A draft is supposed to be complete before WG ballot. To have a placeholder rather than proposed text does not meet the requirement of completion. Please supply introductory text.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.
The introduction is not part of the standard, and is not subject to ballot. Therefore, the draft would meet the WG ballot requirements for completeness even if the introduction was entirely blank.

See also response to comment # 285

Cl 08 SC P L # 240
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Misplace page break

SuggestedRemedy

Remove page break so that the header "Contents" is on the same page as the start of the table of contents.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC P15 L28 # 241
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A

In editors note the reference to the 802.1 draft is not fo the appropriate form

SuggestedRemedy

Change to correct form per Style Manual: IEEE P802.1AB...

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It's actually IEEE Std 802.1AB-2009 now.
Check that we correctly reference IEEE Std 802.1AB-2009 throughout.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P16 L17 # 242
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A must-shall
It seems that the terms "RECOMMENDED" and "NOT RECOMMENDED" are being used in the IETF sense rather than according to IEEE usage.

SuggestedRemedy

There should probably be a note explaining that. I noticed such a not later in the draft. It needs to be moved forward.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Actually, the intent is to convert everything to IEEE usage of reserved words. In 1.4, page 16, line 17, reword the sentence as follows:
"Implementers should consider the security features..."

Delete the first sentence of the third paragraph, beginning on line 22. Reword the second sentence as follows:
SNMPv3 should be deployed, rather than previous versions of SNMP, and cryptographic security should be enabled.

Cl 02 SC P17 L20 # 243
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
References to particular patents imply an IEEE acknowledgement of essentiality.

SuggestedRemedy

The reference to HP patents needs to be removed. LoAs need to be solicited

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The Working Group chair has solicited an LoA.

Cl 00 SC P17 L60 # 244
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A
Remove this reference. The RFC doesn't apply to this work.

SuggestedRemedy

The RFC will probably be useful when soliciting an LoA from HP

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 03 SC P19 L3 # 245
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A ref

There is no such thing as an "Authoritative Dictionary" of "IEEE Standard Terms" (in spite of there being an IEEE publication with the referenced title. If one tries to "reference" that publication, one does not an authoritative definition, rather a glossary.

SuggestedRemedy

The text should be modified so that it would not be "referenced". at best, it should be consulted for suggestions. Better yet eliminate the text altogether. Move the reference to the bibliography so that it is done in an exactly parallel way to the way it is called out in 802.3. I.e. "[B43] IEEE 100, a glossary of standards terms titled The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, New York, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc."

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.
Move the reference to the bibliography.
How much pushback are we going to get from the staff editors?

Cl 06 SC 6.1 P25 L12 # 250
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A ref

This seems to be an external reference to some standard in 802.1. (one of the several)

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a formal external reference here.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See the response to comment #159

Cl 06 SC 6.3 P28 L1 # 251
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type ER Comment Status A ref

I believe that using the term "802.3" in the title of a sub-clause is self-referential and is not in line with the Style Guide.

SuggestedRemedy

Revise to our ordinary convention

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It's not self-referential, since 802.3.1 will be a separate standard from 802.3. However, "Std" should be inserted.
[Ed. "Std" should probably not be inserted]

Cl 06 SC 6.4 P31 L57 # 252
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The version reference buried in the text of the MIB module seems to be out of date (multiple places)

SuggestedRemedy

It seems the current system of having this information appear multiple times in the bowels of the MIB module is a bad idea. At a minimum, please correct. Preferably, come up with a system that is not such an ongoing editorial burden.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete the text on lines 53-58, taking care to leave the closing double quote behind.
Also delete the first sentence on line 64, taking care to leave the opening double quote behind.

Cl 06 SC 6.4 P33 L51 # 253
Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI

Comment Type TR Comment Status A cl6

The reference here to 9.1.2.1 points to somewhere in the introduction of the 10 PoE MIB module. Subclause 9.1 has no further subdivisions. I suspect that this (and probably numerous others like it) should really be external references to another (non-802.3) standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct with external reference here and in other like instances.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The references are to IEEE Std 802.1AB-REV, which has since been moved to IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 79. All of the references in this MIB module need to be updated to point to IEEE Std 802.3 79.??
[Ed. Actually, the references should point to the corresponding attributes in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 30]

Cl 00 SC P3 L10 # 285
Grow, Robert Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status A front

Need introduction prior to Sponsor Ballot. Other suggestions noted below.

Suggested Remedy

WG Chair needs to provide. I'm sure the WG Chair will highlight how 802.3.1 supports management of Ethernet as defined in IEEE Std 802.3-2008, as amended by 802.3bc (ballot announcement isn't a bad start). Include Downloads section (page iv) perhaps with a stronger than typical reference for downloadable modules, (don't just cut and paste the one from 802.3). It will be individually balloted (page v). SASB information (page vi) is obsolete, publication editor should fix (not worth correcting now unless we are very confident of approval this year).

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Front matter is under the control of the WG chair and the IEEE staff editor, it is not part of the draft standard, not part of the approved standard. It is not a valid basis for disapprove comments.

Insert the following text (which should look very familiar to the commenter) in the beginning of the front matter, at the beginning of the introduction:

"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): This front matter is provided for comment only. Front matter is not part of a published standard and is therefore, not part of the draft standard. You are invited to review and comment on it as it will be included in the published standard after approval."