IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 0	SC 0	Р	L	# I-90	C/ 5	SC	5.4	P <b>30</b>	L <b>64</b>	# <mark>I-29</mark>
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates		Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates					
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY	Commer	nt Type	TR	Comment Status D		MA
may Whic	cause the port's ch is not correct u	rom an operationally "up" EFN rate degradation." "mau caus ise of "may".			actic scop	on within t	he limits standard	footnote is incorrect. "may" is (scope) of this standard. Use . What we mean with this is tr hout abusing "may". Also fix	ers of this standa	ard are not within the sion. Which can be
00	edRemedy				Suggested Remedy					
Change to: Removal of a PME from an operationally "up" EFMCu port, aggregating several PMEs, might result in rate degradation on the port.					Cha mod	nge to: U ule conta	Isers of ti ined in th	nis standard are granted perm is subclause so that it can be	used for its inte	ended purpose.
•	d Response POSED ACCEP	Response Status W			Make the same change on page 91 footnote. Make this same change on Page 132 footnote. Make this same change on Page 449 footnote					ge on Page 132
CI 3	SC 3	P <b>22</b>	L <b>37</b>	# 1-28	•	d Respon		Response Status W		
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates		PRC	POSED	REJECT			
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY	The	text of the	e footnote	e is informative (Style Manual	2020, section <sup>-</sup>	18.2) and not
"may	Definitions shall not contain requirements (IEEE SA rule). Even optional requirements. "may" is " used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard" and so does not belong in clause 3. Also, using "in a modular system" is very close to					normative. In this context, the "may" statement is appropriate as it is. Furthermore, the text of this footnote has been balloted before in various releases of IEEE Std 802.3, 802.3.1, and 802.3.2, with request for changes.				
using the term (module) in it's own definition, which is also not good. This is squarely in the "obvious" category so don't need it as part of the definition. ", it typically maps into one					No changes were made.					
	"slot"," is a characteristic of a module not part of defining the term.					SC	6.2.2	P <b>86</b>	L <b>63</b>	# <mark>I-</mark> 30
00	ggestedRemedy					Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates				
Dele	Delete everything except: "In the context of the MIB definitions, a specification of					Comment Type TB Comment Status D				

management capabilities related to the system." as this is the only part appropriate to clause 3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 6	SC	6.2.2	P <b>86</b>	L <b>63</b>	# 1-30	
Rolfe, Benjamin			Blind Creek As	sociates		
Commer	nt Type	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
This	is an inte	erestinalv	incorrect use of "may". " This	clause does n	ot include	

This is an interestingly incorrect use of "may". " This clause does not include mechanisms for controlling how one Ethernet endpoint may use this functionality to query the status or statistics of a peer Ethernet entity" quite explicitly stating that the functionality is not defined in this clause. So clearly stating "may" is the wrong word.

## SuggestedRemedy

Change to: This clause does not include mechanisms for controlling how one Ethernet endpoint uses this functionality to query the status or statistics of a peer Ethernet entity

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 6	SC 6.5	P91	L11	# 1-31		C/ 6	SC 6.6.2	P98	<i>L</i> 1	# 1-34
-		-		# 1-31		-			-	# 1-34
Rolfe, Be		Blind Creek	Associates			Rolfe, Be	•	Blind Creek	Associates	
Commen	51	Comment Status D			MAY	Commen	51	Comment Status D		MAY
,	not" is never corr ome or consequer	rect in an IEEE standard. Hince of an action.	lere it is meant to	describe a possible		admi	nistrative action "	OperStatus may not be up(1 the "note that" is a clue this		
Suggeste	edRemedy					•	rement (misuse of	r may ).		
chan	ge :"may not" to "	might not".				00	edRemedy			
,	l Response	Response Status W			Change to: Note that the object ifOperStatus might be other than u failure or administrative action				up(1) as a result of link	
PRO	POSED ACCEPT	•				Proposed	d Response	Response Status W		
CI 6	SC 6.5	P <b>91</b>	L13	# I-32		PRO	POSED ACCEPT			
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates			C/ 6	SC 6.6.2	P <b>107</b>	L <b>50</b>	# 1-35
Commen	t Type T	Comment Status D			MAY	-		Blind Creek		# 1-55
"may	not" is never cor	rect in an IEEE standard. H	lere it is meant to	describe a possible		Rolfe, Be	•		Associates	
outco	ome or consequer	nce of an action.				Commen		Comment Status D		MAY
Suggeste	edRemedy							at a frame may be lost in tra ssibility, not an optional requ		le possibility" is a strong
chan	ge :"may not" to "	might not".					edRemedy			
Proposed	l Response	Response Status W					ige "may" to "migh	nt"		
PRO	POSED ACCEPT						d Response			
		<b>D</b>				•	POSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
CI 6	SC 6.6.2	P <b>97</b>	L <b>53</b>	# 1-33		FRU	FUSED ACCEPT	•		
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates			C/ 6	SC 6.6.2	P108	L15	<b>#</b> I-36
Commen	t Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status D			MAY	Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates	
		ink" sounds a lot like stating on within the scope of this sta		and this sentence		Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY				
Suggeste	edRemedy					0		at a frame may be lost in tra ssibility, not an optional requ		ie possibility" is a strong
chan	ge "may be used	on that link" to "are available	e on that link".				0.1	onomicy, not an optional requ	inomonit.	
Propose	d Response	Response Status W				00	edRemedy	الغر		
,		•				Cnar	ige "may" to "migh	ι.		

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

C/ 6 SC 6.6.2 Page 2 of 15 8/14/2024 10:36:40 AM

## IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 6	SC 6.6.2	P <b>108</b>	L <b>45</b>	# I-37
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek A	Associates	
Comme	nt Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status D		MAY
		nat a frame may be lost in trai ssibility, not an optional requi		e possibility" is a strong
Suggest	tedRemedy			
Cha	nge "may" to "migl	ht".		
•	ed Response DPOSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
C/ 6	SC 6.6.2	·	1.0	# 1.00
••••			L <b>8</b>	# I-38
Rolfe, B Comme	enjamin <i>nt Tvpe</i> <b>TR</b>	Blind Creek A Comment Status D	Associates	ΜΑΥ
hint Suggesi Cha	this is stating a po tedRemedy nge "may" to "migl	hat a frame may be lost in tran ssibility, not an optional requi ht".		e possibility" is a strong
	ed Response DPOSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
C/ 6	SC 6.6.2	P <b>112</b>	L <b>34</b>	# I-39
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek A	Associates	
Comme	nt Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status D		MAY
dro		where frames are nit resource contention. " is s defined in this standard.	tating a possibilit	ty, not a permissible
Suggest	tedRemedy			
00	tedRemedy inge "may" to "migl	ht".		
Cha	,	ht". Response Status W		

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 6	SC 6.6.	2	P <b>112</b>	L <b>37</b>	<b>#</b> I-40		
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	B	lind Creek	Associates			
Commen	t Type TF	Comment Sta	atus <b>D</b>		MAY		
to dro sugg	op a frame, c	n clear if we're saying r if this is suggesting a "note that" (suggestin	a possibility	outside the scope	e of this standard, as		
Suggeste	edRemedy						
change "may' to "might"							
Proposed	d Response	Response Sta	itus <b>W</b>				
PRO	POSED ACC	EPT.					
CI 6	SC 6.6.	2	P <b>120</b>	L <b>49</b>	# I-41		
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	B	lind Creek	Associates			
Commen	t Type TF	Comment Sta	atus <b>D</b>		MAY		
OAN beha	/IPDUs" defir	in locally generated es a permissible action A cross reference what ut such this looks mo	here local g	eneration of OAM	PPDUs is defined		

would help. Without such, this looks more like an incorrect use of "may" to describe a possible outcome, not a permissible action within the limits (scope) of this standard.

#### ggestedRemedy

add a reference to where local generation of OAMPPDUs is defined in this standard or in a normative reference.

#### oposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace text "which may result in locally generated OAMPDUs" with "potentially resulting in locally generated OAMPDUs".

C/ 6 SC 6.6.2

## IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI <b>6</b>	SC 6.6.2	P <b>121</b>	L <b>6</b>	# I-42	C/ 6	SC 6	6.6.2	P <b>125</b>	L17	# <u>I</u> -44	
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY	Commen	nt Type	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
or pr is sta	ocedure defined? I	ty, or an optional requirement Use of technically incompleted ot a requirement, though it is guess.	e term "other inf	ormation" suggests this	" since multiple occurrences may be required to cross the threshold," is a misuse of "may" (see clause 1.3) - the phrase "are likely" suggests this is stating a possibility. It is not clear to which values "these values" refer.						
Suggest	edRemedy				Suggeste	edRemed	У				
char	nge "may" to "can" o	or "often will".						For threshold crossing events			
'	roposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				threshold, the number of events and the number of resultant Event Notifications are likely to be different.						
PRC	PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.					d Respon	se	Response Status W			
Cha	nge "may" to "can"		PROPOSED ACCEPT.								
CI 6	SC 6.6.2	# I <u>-</u> 43	Char	nged all in	istances	of "For threshold crossing eve	ents, since mult	iple occurrences ma	iy		
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		be required to cross the threshold, these values are likely different." to "For threshold crossing events when multiple occurrences cross the threshold, the number of events and the number of resulting Event Notifications are likely to						
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY							ly to
		tional requirement (permissi			be di	ifferent."			-		-
		"other information" defined i			C/ 6	SC 6	5.6.2	P125	L <b>45</b>	# I-45	
	n "may" is wrong.	an aoton that might happe			Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Suggest	edRemedy				Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
	nge "may" to "might	ı						ences may			
char	oposed Response Response Status W				be r	equired to	o cross th	he threshold," is stating a poss	sibility, and so is	s misuse of "may".	
		Response Status W			SuggestedRemedy						
Propose	POSED ACCEPT.				Change "may" to "can". Clarify to which values "these values" refer.						
Propose	•				Char	nge "may"	' to "can'	". Clarify to which values "the	se values" refer		

Changed all instances of "For threshold crossing events, since multiple occurrences may be required to cross the threshold, these values are likely different." to "For threshold crossing events when multiple occurrences cross the threshold, the number of events and the number of resulting Event Notifications are likely to be different."

C/ 6 SC 6.6.2

# IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 7	SC 7.1.1	P131	L <b>23</b>	# I-46	CI 7	SC	7.3.2	P139	L <b>11</b>	# 1-48	
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek As	sociates		Rolfe, B	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY	Commer	nt Type	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
"These repeater MIB module objects may be used to manage non-standard repeater-like devices; however, defining objects to describe implementation-specific properties of non-standard repeater-like devices is outside the scope of this standard." - the "non standard" and "outside the scope of this standard" strongly indicate this is not a correct use of "may" but rather a warning of what can or might happen. If you want to stick with "may" you'd need to provide a normative reference to the non-standard uses that are permissible to be				ific properties of non- " - the "non standard" a correct use of "may" ck with "may" you'd	" This value may be allocated within the SMI enterprises subtree (1.3.6.1.4.1) " might not be correct use of "may". The following paragraph suggests this is informative, suggesting how an external (not defined in this standard) function might use this object. If this is meant to be "may" then we need more information on where to find the defined behavior.						
technically complete ;-)					SuggestedRemedy						
	edRemedy	,			char	nge "may	" to "migh	t"			
change "may" to "might"					Propose	d Respor	nse	Response Status W			
Propose	d Response	Response Status W			PRC	POSED	ACCEPT				
•	POSED ACCEP	,			CI <b>7</b>	SC	7.3.2	P <b>140</b>	L <b>1</b>	# <u>1</u> -49	
CI 7	SC 7.1.3.2	P132	L25	# 1-47	Rolfe, B	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Rolfe, B		Blind Creek As			Commer	nt Type	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
Commer	t Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY				e present in the repeater syst ot an action within the scope o			Stating
		uage in an informative note: "Ne epeater, it may appear as thoug			Suggest	edRemed	dy				
		vel protocol entity. However, this			char	nge "may	" to "migh	t"			
	agement, and this agement informat	s passing of tion is not part of the repeater fu	inctionality."		Propose PRC	•	nse ACCEPT	Response Status W			
Suggest	edRemedy					I OOLD	NOOEI I	•			
		ong): NOTE—When a network n	nanagement e	ntity is observing a	CI <b>7</b>	SC	7.3.2	P141	L <b>13</b>	<b>#</b> I-50	
pack	repeater, and observes the repeater passing packets to a higher level protocol entity, this is only a means of implementing management, and this passing of management information is not part of the repeater functionality					Rolfe, BenjaminBlind Creek AssociatesComment TypeTRComment StatusD					MAY
Propose	d Response	Response Status W		·	Misu	use of "m	ay".				
PRC	POSED ACCEP	г.			00	edRemed		ifies the port independently fro	om the repeated	r to which it is att	ached

change to "This identifies the port independently from the repeater to which it is attached

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2

# IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI <b>7</b>	SC 7.3.2	P <b>142</b>	L30	# I-51
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Cre	ek Associates	
Commen	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY
"may	e this may or may / or may not", and mative not norma	<ul> <li>not be possible dependi</li> <li>"possible" all wrapped a</li> <li>tive.</li> </ul>	ing on the type of po s a parenthetical - a	ort.)" has "note that" Ill clues this is
Suggeste	edRemedy			
Char	nge to: Note that	for some port types it is n	ot possible to physic	cally remove the port.
'	d Response POSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
CI 7	SC 7.3.2	P144	L <b>34</b>	# I-52
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Cre	ek Associates	
Commen	nt Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY
Perh entire Suggeste	aps on the impler e paragraph seen edRemedy	prescribe requirements, e nentation. I don't thin this is to be informative Thus le, it is possible, and may	s is what the group r my guess:	neans because the
	IP response to be	transmitted.		
	d Response POSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
Char	nged "For exampl	e, the implementor may c	hoose to delay the r	eset long enough to
		nse to be transmitted." to IP response to be transm		possible to delay the
16361			meu.	

Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek Associates						
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	D	MAY				
"Packets received during the test may or may not be transferred" is another obvious misuse of "may". Since none of the other listed items appears to state requirements (no normative language) guessing this shouldn't either.								
SuggestedRemed	'y							
change to: Pa	ackets re	ceived during the tes	t can be but are not requir	ed to be transferred				
Proposed Respon PROPOSED		Response Status IN PRINCIPLE.	w					
Changed "Packets received during the test may or may not be transferred." to "Packets received during the test can be transferred."								

P**144** 

L**50** 

# 1-53

MAY

CI <b>7</b>	SC	7.3.2	P147	L13	# 1-54					
Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek	Associates						
Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status D		MAY					
	"A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes" is stating a possibility.									
Suggeste	edReme	dy								

change "may" to "can"

SC 7.3.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

CI 7	SC 7.3.2	P <b>147</b>	L <b>43</b>	# I-55
Rolfe, Benja	amin	Blind Cre	ek Associates	

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This is a statement of fact: "A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes." Stating a possible consequence. Not an optional requirement.

SuggestedRemedy

change "may" to "can"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/gener	CI 7	Page 6 of 15	
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn	SC 7.3.2	8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line			

# IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

# [ <u>1-59</u> MAY ve statement. "may" is a learly states this is not ne towards the lower end of ed through physical channel # [ <u>1-60</u>
ve statement. "may" is a learly states this is not ne towards the lower end of ed through physical channel
ve statement. "may" is a learly states this is not ne towards the lower end of ed through physical channel
learly states this is not ne towards the lower end of ed through physical channel
ed through physical channel
ed through physical channel
# <mark>I-60</mark>
# [ <del> </del> -60
# <mark>I-60</mark>
MAY
t correct use of "may".
# I-61
MAY
nan 565 bit times may or l a "may not" (never within the scope of the
within the scope of the
I

# IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI <b>7</b>	SC 7	.3.2	P150	L <b>53</b>	# 1-62	Cl <b>7</b>	SC	7.3.2	P <b>153</b>	L17	<b>#</b> I-64
Rolfe, Ben	jamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek	Associates	
Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D		MAY	Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status D		MA
fragme technic guessi Suggested change	ents may cally inco ng the p <i>Remed</i> y e "may"	/ exceed omplete s prior / to "can"	sociated with large diameter ValidPacketMinTime." is an pecification. If the latter this	informative stat	ement, or an	discr This the ir such sugg scop	etion." sounds mplemer . Which ests this e of this	like it migh ntor's discre o other cour s is an infor s standard.	s, other counters whose a t, possibly, be hiding an ar- etion". But we can't know hters may (optionally) be in mative statement - that so If this is meant to convey t should be so indicated in	ctual (optional) re because this isn' ncremented? The mething might of an optional imple	quirement! Hinted by "at t a correct statement of e following sentence ccur that is outside the ementation within the
Proposed I PROP		Se ACCEPT.	Response Status W			refer spec	enced h ified in t	ere. If this he scope o	is stating a possible conse f this standard, then "migh	equence of imple	mentation choices not
CI <b>7</b>	SC 7	.3.2	P <b>150</b>	L <b>58</b>	# 1-63			s always w	rong.		
Rolfe, Ben	jamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		Suggeste		•	ot" with "might".		
Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D		MAY	Proposed			Response Status W		
			cur in the value when the vange changes." is a statement		ect use of "may".	,	,	ACCEPT.	Nesponse Status W		
Suggested						C/ 11	SC	11.2.1.4	P <b>318</b>	L <b>8</b>	# I-99
change	e "may"	to "can"				Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek	Associates	
Proposed I	Respons	se	Response Status W			Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status D		MA
PROP	OSED A	CCEPT.							seconds for EFMCu ports		
CI 7	SC 7	.3.2	P153	L17	# I-72			ed" suppose o state a po	ed to be a condition on the ssiblity.	permitted action	? I think instead "may"
Rolfe, Ben	jamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		Suggeste	edReme	dv	·		
Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D		MAY	••		/" to "can".			
discret This so the imp such. sugges scope scope referen specifio	ion." bunds lik plemente Which o sts this i of this s of the st need her ed in the	ke it might or's discre other cour s an inforn tandard. tandard, it re. If this	s, other counters whose also t, possibly, be hiding an actu etion". But we can't know be neers may (optionally) be incr mative statement - that some If this is meant to convey ar t should be so indicated in th is stating a possible consequent f this standard, then "might" rong.	al (optional) rec cause this isn't emented? The ething might oc optional imple e description of uence of implen	uirement! Hinted by "at a correct statement of following sentence cur that is outside the mentation within the those counters - and nentation choices not	Proposed PRO		nse ) ACCEPT.	Response Status W		
Suggested											
Replac	e "may	or may no	ot" with "might".								
Proposed I	Respons	se	Response Status W								

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

C/ 11 SC 11.2.1.4 Page 8 of 15 8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM

IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

C/ 11	SC 1	1.2.1.4	Р	318	L17	# <u>1-</u> 98	
Rolfe, Ber	njamin		Blin	d Creek /	Associates		
Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Statu	5 D			MAY
scope	e of the s	tandard. I	ail to initialize" failir But a likely stateme statement.				the
Suggeste	dRemed	y					
			es may fail to initial others succeed"	ze while	others succeed"	to "some interfac	es
Proposed	Respon	se	Response Status	w			
PROF	POSED	ACCEPT	N PRINCIPLE.				
Chan	ged "son	ne interfac	es may fail to initia	lize" to "	some interfaces	can fail to initializ	e"
C/ 11	SC 1	1.2.3	Р	320	L <b>43</b>	# <u>1</u> -97	
Rolfe, Ber	niamin		Blin	d Crook	Associates		
1,0110, 001	ingannin		Diiri	I CIEEK /	1000010100		
Comment		TR	Comment Statu		looolateo		MAY
Comment " may	<i>Type</i> become	burdense		s <b>D</b> burdens	ome is somethin		is
Comment " may	<i>Type</i> become dard as a	e burdense a permisik	Comment Statu	s <b>D</b> burdens	ome is somethin		is
Comment " may stana Suggester	<i>Type</i> become dard as a dRemed	e burdenso a permisik Y	Comment Statu	s <b>D</b> burdens	ome is somethin		is
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon	e burdense a permisik V become"	Comment Statu ome" suggests that le action. Seems	s <b>D</b> burdens like some	ome is somethin		is
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon	e burdense a permisik V become" se ACCEPT.	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status	s <b>D</b> burdens like some	ome is somethin		is
Comment " may stana Suggester Chan Proposed PROF	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon POSED /	e burdense a permisik V become" se ACCEPT.	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status	s D burdens like some W 322	ome is somethin othing to be avoid	led, not permitted	is
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed PROF Cl 11	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon POSED / SC - njamin	e burdense a permisik V become" se ACCEPT.	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status	s D burdens like some W 322 d Creek /	L6	led, not permitted	is
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed PROF Cl 11 Rolfe, Ber Comment	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon POSED SC njamin Type be affec	burdense a permisik become" se ACCEPT. 11.4 TR	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status P Blin	S D burdens ike some W 322 d Creek / S D	Lecture is somethin thing to be avoid	led, not permitted # [ <u>I-95</u>	is J. MAY
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed PROF C/ 11 Rolfe, Ber Comment "may	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon POSED SC njamin Type be affect ard.	e burdense a permisik V become" se ACCEPT. I1.4 TR ted" is a s	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status P Blin Comment Statu	S D burdens ike some W 322 d Creek / S D	Lecture is somethin thing to be avoid	led, not permitted # [ <u>I-95</u>	is J. MAY
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed PROF Cl 11 Rolfe, Ber Comment "may stand Suggester	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon POSED SC njamin Type be affect ard. dRemed	e burdense a permisik V become" se ACCEPT. I1.4 TR ted" is a s	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status P Blin Comment Status tatement of fact, no	S D burdens ike some W 322 d Creek / S D	Lecture is somethin thing to be avoid	led, not permitted # [ <u>I-95</u>	is J. MAY
Comment " may stana Suggester Chang Proposed PROF Cl 11 Rolfe, Ber Comment "may stand Suggester	Type become dard as dRemed ge "may Respon POSED / SC njamin Type be affect ard. dRemed ge "may"	burdense a permisik become" se ACCEPT. I1.4 TR ted" is a s	Comment Statu ome" suggests that ole action. Seems to "becomes" Response Status P Blin Comment Status tatement of fact, no	S D burdens ike some W 322 d Creek / S D ot a perm	Lecture is somethin thing to be avoid	led, not permitted # [ <u>I-95</u>	is J. MAY

C/ 11	SC 11.4	P3	<b>วว</b>	L10	# I-91	
		-		k Associates	# 1-91	
Rolfe, Be	•			k Associates		
Comment	51	Comment Status	-			MAY
	is being used ir ."may lead to"	ncorrectly to describe	a pos	sible consequence,	not a permissible	
Suggeste	dRemedy					
chang	ge "may" to "mig	ht"				
Proposed	Response	Response Status	w			
	POSED ACCEP					
	OOLD AOOLI					
C/ 11	SC 11.4	P <b>3</b>	22	L13	# I-92	
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind	Cree	k Associates		
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status	D			MAY
	' is being used ir n."may lead to"	ncorrectly to describe	a pos	sible consequence,	not a permissible	
Suggeste	dRemedy					
chang	e "may" to "mig	ht"				
Proposed	Response	Response Status	w			
	POSED ACCEP					
C/ 11	SC 11.4	P3	22	L15	# <mark>I-93</mark>	
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind	Cree	k Associates		
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status	D			MAY
action discov	n."may lead to m ve" measn that v	ncorrectly to describe a nay lead to a wrongful vrongful discovery is a ngly suspect this is no	. perm	nitted action within th	·	
Suggeste chang	<i>dRemedy</i> ge "may" to "mig	ht"				
	Response	Response Status	w			

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

C/ 11 SC 11.4 Page 9 of 15 8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM

Received Comments	; II	EEE P802.3.	1b D3.0 MIB I	Rev Task	Force Initia	al Spor	nsor bal	lot comments			
C/ 11 SC 11.4	P <b>322</b>	L <b>20</b>	# I-94		C/ 11	SC	11.5.2	P <b>356</b>	L <b>49</b>	# <b>I-88</b>	
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates			Rolfe, Ber	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Comment Type TR	Comment Status D			MAY	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
"may head to anything" the scope of this standa	is clearly an informative lead ard.	l-in and not a pe	ermissible action	within				ed/deleted using the row creat RowStatus. "Seems information		echanism via	
SuggestedRemedy change "may" to "might'	и				Suggestee Chang		<i>dy</i> / be" to "a	re".			
Proposed Response PROPOSED ACCEPT.	Response Status W				Proposed PROF	,	nse ACCEPT.	Response Status W			
C/ 11 SC 11.4	P322	L <b>27</b>	# <u>I-96</u>		C/ 11	SC	11.5.2	P361	L <b>31</b>	# <mark>I-87</mark>	
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		_	Rolfe, Ber	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Comment Type TR	Comment Status D			MAY	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
"may cause" is a statem	nent of fact.							d/deleted using the row creati eRowStatus." might not be wr			tive
SuggestedRemedy change "may" to "might'	n				staten	nent inte	ended to a	direct the reader to where deta	ails of row creat	tion/deletion are c	lefined.
0,00					Suggestee	dRemec	dy				
Proposed Response PROPOSED ACCEPT.	Response Status W					es are cr		eted using the row creation/de eRowStatus.	eletion mechan	ism via	
C/ 11 SC 11.5.2	P <b>350</b>	L <b>26</b>	<b>#</b> 1-89		Proposed			Response Status W			
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates			,	,	ACCEPT				
Comment Type TR	Comment Status <b>D</b> t a permisible action within t	ha scapa of this	standard	MAY	C/ 11	SC	11.5.2	P363	L <b>5</b> 1	# I-86	P
-		he scope of this	standard.		Rolfe, Ber	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
SuggestedRemedy	ossibly indactes a pproblem	with the near D			Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
<b>c</b> 1	,	with the peer P						d/deleted using the row creati			
Proposed Response PROPOSED ACCEPT I	Response Status W							eRowStatus." might not be wr direct the reader to where deta			
Changed "This value m	ov indicato o possible" to "Th	sia valua indiaat			Suggestee	dRemed	dy				
Changed This value ha	ay indicate a possible" to "Th	ns value indicat	es a possible			es are cr		eted using the row creation/de eRowStatus.	eletion mechan	sm via	
					Proposed	Respor	nse	Response Status W			

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

 TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
 C/ 11

 COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected
 RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
 SC 11.5.2

 SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line
 SC 11.5.2

Page 10 of 15 8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM

## IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

	SC 11.5.2	P366	L30	# 1-85
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek	Associates	
efmC create	les may be create uPme10PProfileF ed and deleted?	Comment Status <b>D</b> ed/deleted using the row cre RowStatus. " Are there other is it permissible to use som g this is an informative state	er means by which ne other means? S	these profiles are specification is
	rement that follow			
••	<i>dRemedy</i> ge "may be" to "a	re".		
•	Response POSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	P <b>367</b>	L <b>8</b>	# I-84
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek	Associates	
to dat Perha the st Suggeste Chan	a rate and spectr aps the intention v ring can contain? <i>dRemedy</i> ge to:		ner things defined h its of information as	nere permisible also? s an exmaple of what
The s Imitat		ormation of this particular p	rofile, for example,	data rate and spectral
•	<i>Response</i> POSED ACCEPT	Response Status W		
C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	P <b>372</b>	L <b>54</b>	# 1-83
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek	Associates	
		Blind Creek	Associates	MAY
Rolfe, Be Comment "or a caus	<i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> micro-interruptior	Comment Status D may temporarily drop one ation of the aggregated EFI	or more PMEs in	MAY the aggregation group,
Rolfe, Be Comment "or a l caus that is Suggeste Chan or a n	<i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> micro-interruptior ing a rate degrad s not defined in th <i>dRemedy</i> ge to: nicro-interruption	Comment Status D may temporarily drop one ation of the aggregated EFI	or more PMEs in MCu link." is stating or more PMEs in t	MAY the aggregation group, g a possible occurance
Rolfe, Be Comment "or a causi that is Suggeste Chan or a n causi Proposed	<i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> micro-interruptior ing a rate degrad s not defined in th <i>dRemedy</i> ge to: nicro-interruption	Comment Status D may temporarily drop one ation of the aggregated EFI is standard. that temporarily drops one ation of the aggregated EFI Response Status W	or more PMEs in MCu link." is stating or more PMEs in t	MAY the aggregation group, g a possible occurance

C/ 12	SC 12.1.3	P379	L10	# I-81
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates	
Comment	t <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b>	Comment Status D		MAY

Not cuser if this is stating an optinal action within the scope of this standard or if it is stating a possible use of the MIB module. It reads more like the later. " The MAU-MIB module also provides the means to put a device in standby mode or to reset it; the latter may be used to re-initialize the WIS." which seems to be noting that the defined (permisible/optional) means of reseting the device can be used to re-initialize the WIS. It (clearly) is unclear as writen.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

The MAU-MIB module provides the means to put a device in standy mode, or to reset the device. Reset can be used to re-initialize the WIS.

Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 12	SC	12.3.2	P <b>393</b> L <b>59</b> # I-80	
Rolfe, Benja	amin		Blind Creek Associates	
Comment T	Гуре	TR	Comment Status D	MAY
Anothe	r misu	se of "ma	y" in an informative statement - explaining why the object is	

writeable.

SuggestedRemedy

change "may" to "can".

#### Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 13	SC 13.2	P <b>401</b>	L <b>24</b>	# I-79
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates	
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY

"These MAUs may be connected to IEEE 802.3 repeaters or to IEEE 802.3 (Ethernet-like) interfaces." is an informative statement. BTW, what is "Ethernet-like" about 802.3? It kindof just is Ethernet, right?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

MAUs can be connected to IEEE 802.3 repeaters or IEEE 802.3 interfaces.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

torial G/general	C/ 13	Page 11 of 15
en W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn	SC 13.2	8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM

IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

C/ 13 SC 13.2.3	P <b>402</b>	L55	# 1-65	C/ 13 SC	13.2.5.1	P <b>405</b>	L22	# I-78
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek A			Rolfe, Benjamin		Blind Creek A		
Comment Type T	Comment Status D	000010100	MA	Comment Type	TR	Comment Status D	000010100	МА
"may or may not" is net SuggestedRemedy change to "may" Proposed Response PROPOSED ACCEPT.	ver correct. Response Status W			Every use of possible FUT consequeinc was cut and different, nor	"may" in t "URE actives and po pasted fro n-normatives, what do	his paragraph is wrong. This vities of a standards dvelopm ssiblities clearly outsdie the s m an IETF document (in whic ve meaning). Other IETF lang es "standards-track" mean in of the reader	ent group. This cope of this star ch context lower gauge is not app	ative. It is describing includes stating facts, indard. Seems like this case "may" has propriate to this
				SuggestedReme				
				effects on the standard is re specification	e behavior equired, e is require	AU types wil require additiona of existing managed objects ither in a new standard or a re d to note any special propertion on the ifStackTable as noted i	. In such cases, evision of this sta es of the MAU ty	specification in a andard. Such /pes that it defines—for
				Proposed Respon	nse	Response Status W		
				PROPOSED	ACCEPT	IN PRINCIPLE.		
				Changed				
				effects on the specification required. Any	e behavior (which may such doo s—for exa	AU types may require addition of existing managed objects ay be a new document or a re- ument is required to note any mple, side effects on the ifSta	. In such cases, evision of this do y special propert	a standards-track cument) is also ies of the MAU types
				То				
				on the behav required, eith required to no	ior of exis ler in a ne ote any sp	AU types require additional m ting managed objects. In suc w standard or a revision of thi pecial properties of the MAU t able as noted in this standard	h cases, specific is standard. Suc ypes that it defir	cation in a standard is h specification is nes—for example, side

C/ 13 SC 13.2.5.1

## IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

C/ 13	SC 13.3	P <b>406</b>	L <b>6</b>	# 1-77		C/ 13	SC 1	3.5.2	P <b>406</b>	L <b>64</b>	# <u>I-75</u>	
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek A	Associates			Rolfe, Ber	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status D		٨	MAY	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
		er MIB module" seems an (inc er MIB modules. Some but not		statement of fact. I		action	within th	né limits (	ootnote is incorrect. "may" is (scope) of this standard. Use	rs of this stand	ard are not within th	he
Suggeste	dRemedy								What we mean with this is to nout abusing "may". Also fix			•
		A-MAU-MIB module defines a ule and by other MIB modules			ed	Suggested					•	
•	I Response POSED ACCEP <sup>-</sup>	Response Status W				modul Also c	le contaii hange fo	ned in th	is standard are granted perm is subclause so that it can be n page 389			IB
C/ 13	SC 13.3	P <b>406</b>	L <b>29</b>	# <mark>I-76</mark>		Proposed	• •	-	Response Status W			
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek A	Associates				POSED F					
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status D		٨	MAY	-						
conte it is pe inform	ext of an IEEE state ermissible, within native warning, s	means what you thin it means andard, "may be undesireavle" in the scope of this standard, to stating a fact. The "In some er I think you mean by "may be"	" is not what you o be undesireab nvironments" qu	ı mean. This says tha le. This is an alilfies this as "not	at	norma of this and 80	ative. In t footnote 02.3.2, w	his conte has bee vith reque	is informative (Style Manual, ext, the "may" statement is ap en balloted before in various r est for changes.	propriate as it i	s. Furthermore, the	
Suggeste	dRemedy					INO Ch	anges w	ere made	9.			
Chan	ge "may be" to "i	is".				C/ 13	SC 1	3.5.2	P <b>414</b>	L <b>5</b>	# 1-74	
Proposed	l Response	Response Status W				Rolfe, Ber	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
	POSED ACCEP	, Г.				Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status D			MAY
						Use o	f "may no	ot" All us	ses of "may not" are incorrect	in an IEEE sta	indard For this one	el

Use of "may not". All uses of "may not" are incorrect in an IEEE standard. For this one I am guessing that this is meant to define a permisible action within the scope if this standard, which is using only asubset of the enumerated values. I could be worng in which case the best coures is delete the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Agents may support a subset of the enumerated valules"

Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 13 SC 13.5.2

#### IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments

	SC 13.5.2	P419	L <b>54</b>	<b>#</b> I-73	
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Cr	eek Associates		
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status D			MAY
am g stand	uessing that thi ard, which is us	I uses of "may not" are inc s is meant to define a peri sing only asubset of the er s is delete the sentence.	misible action with	nin the scope if this	
Suggeste	dRemedy				
Chan	ge to "Agents r	nay support a subset of th	e enumerated va	lules"	
•	Response POSED ACCE	Response Status <b>N</b> PT.	I		
C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P <b>423</b>	L13	# <mark>I-71</mark>	
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Cr	eek Associates		
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status D			MAY
		avior specified above" is possibility. The purpose of	an informative sta		
stater define here. to exp	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6.4 ement. Is this inf	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r	as word meant
stater define here. to exp the re	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following plain why the no	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6.4 ement. Is this inf	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r	as word meant
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following plain why the no equirement that	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist follows.	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6.4 ement. Is this inf	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r	as word meant
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste Delet Proposed	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following plain why the no equirement that dRemedy	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist follows.	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6. ement. Is this inf is? It seems une	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r	as word meant
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste Delet Proposed	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following plain why the no equirement that dRemedy e the sentence I Response	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist follows.	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6. ement. Is this inf is? It seems une	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r	as word meant
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste Delet Proposed PROP CI 13	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following blain why the no equirement that <i>dRemedy</i> e the sentence <i>Response</i> POSED ACCEF SC 13.5.2	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir ormative requirement exist follows. <i>Response Status</i> M PT. P423	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6. ement. Is this inf is? It seems une	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r eded to correctly imp	as word meant
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste Delet Proposed PROI	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following blain why the no equirement that dRemedy e the sentence Response POSED ACCEF SC 13.5.2 njamin	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir ormative requirement exist follows. <i>Response Status</i> M PT. P423	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6.4 ement. Is this inf ts? It seems une L53 reek Associates	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r eded to correctly imp	as word meant olement
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste Delet Proposed Cl 13 Rolfe, Be Comment More	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following plain why the no equirement that <i>dRemedy</i> e the sentence <i>Response</i> POSED ACCEF SC 13.5.2 njamin <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> normative lang	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist follows. <i>Response Status</i> M PT. P423 Blind Cr	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6. ement. Is this inf ts? It seems une L53 reek Associates tement. "Note th	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r eded to correctly imp # 1-70 at this MAU may be	as word meant olement
stater define here. to exp the re Suggeste Delet Proposed CI 13 Rolfe, Be Comment More capat	ment of fact or ed in the IEEE The following plain why the no equirement that <i>dRemedy</i> e the sentence <i>Response</i> POSED ACCEF SC 13.5.2 njamin <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> normative lang	possibility. The purpose of SA Standards Board Oper paragraph states a requir prmative requirement exist follows. <i>Response Status</i> <b>W</b> PT. P423 Blind Cr <i>Comment Status</i> <b>D</b> juage in an informative sta	an informative sta this statement is ations Manual 6. ement. Is this inf ts? It seems une L53 reek Associates tement. "Note th	atement, perhaps a unclear. But "may" 4.7 is not the correct ormative statement r eded to correctly imp # 1-70 at this MAU may be	as word neant

Delete the sentence. Change next sentence to: To indicate that this MAU is capable of operating as a MAU type that is beyond the scope of this MIB, return the bit value bOther in addition to the bit values set for standards capabilities that are listed in the IANAifMauAutoNegCapBits TC."

#### Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 13	SC ·	13.5.2	P <b>423</b>	L <b>53</b>	<b>#</b> I-69
Rolfe,	Benjamin		Blind Creek As	sociates	
Comn	nent Type	TR	Comment Status D		MAY

More normative language in an informative statement. "Note that this MAU may be capable of operating as a MAU type that is beyond the scope of this MIB."

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence. Change next sentence to: To indicate that this MAU is capable capable of operating as a MAU type that is beyond the scope of this MIB, return the bit value bOther in addition to the bit values set for standards capabilities that are listed in the IANAifMauAutoNegCapBits TC."

Proposed Response	Response Status	W	
PROPOSED ACCEPT.			

C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P <b>437</b>	L <b>32</b>	# I-67
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates	
Commen	t Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status D		MAY

Use of "may" in an informative statement (NOTE that). Which is clearly describing something outside the scope of this MIB as it says "outside the scope of this MIB" in the sentence. But there might be an actual requirement lurking here, if this is meant to clarify the required action stated in the next sentence (I'm guessing), which is not all that clear (I may be guessing wrong - which is why leaving the implementor to guess is not ideal).

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence. Change next sentence to: To indicate that an interface or interfaces that support this MIB are attached to remote Auto-Negotiation entitles, return the bit value bOther in addition to the bit values set for standards capabilities that are listed in the IANAifMauAutoNegCapBits TC."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Unable to locate the context for this comment. The indicates page / line (437 / 32) contains the statement "STATUS current", and all search for the "outside the scope of this MIB" statement also do not produce any results.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

C/ 13 SC 13.5.2 Page 14 of 15 8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM

# IEEE P802.3.1b D3.0 MIB Rev Task Force Initial Sponsor ballot comments



Use of normative language in an informative note: " Note that interfaces that support this MIB may have capabilities that extend beyond the scope of this MIB" This is a statement of possibility, clearly asserted to be outside the scope fi this standard or

so it would appear from the words "beyond the scope of this MIB".

## SuggestedRemedy

**Received Comments** 

change to "Note that it is possible that interfaces supporting this MIB also have capabilities that extend beyond the scope of this MIB."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Deleted the statement. Nothing in the standard prevents interfaces to have capabilities not covered by this MIB.

C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P <b>438</b>	L <b>28</b>	# I-66
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek Ass	ociates	
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status D		MAY

MAY

Use of "may" in an informative statement (NOTE that). Which is clearly describing something outside the scope of this MIB as it says "outside the scope of this MIB" in the sentence. But there might be an actual requirement lurking here, if this is meant to clarify the required action stated in the next sentence (I'm guessing), which is not all that clear (I may be guessing wrong - which is why leaving the implementor to guess is not ideal).

#### SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence. Change next sentence to: To indicate that an interface or interfaces that support this MIB are attached to remote Auto-Negotiation entitles, return the bit value bOther in addition to the bit values set for standards capabilities that are listed in the IANAifMauAutoNegCapBits TC."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

C/ 13 SC 13.5.2

Page 15 of 15 8/14/2024 10:36:41 AM